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Chapter One

ABSTRACT

This research investigated core business conflict that occurs amongst government agencies when working together in regional development projects and initiatives. The intent is to develop methods to manage this conflict and so enhance the delivery of regional development outcomes. The research problem explored is:

‘Government Department core business – managing the impact of potential conflicts on regional development projects and programs’

The research involves three discipline areas – Government and governance, public sector management practices, and regional development. Government agency (GA) core business is determined by Government and delivered using public sector management practices that have shaped individual agency’s strategic plans, processes and systems for core business delivery. Regional development involves multiple agencies delivering their core business outcomes that contribute to regional development. Due to the focus by each agency on their own core business, core business conflict can occur when agencies work together.

A literature review did not uncover literature or research about GA core business conflict, therefore this is a new area of investigation. The literature studies and reports investigated and discussed a related area – issues and impediment to Whole-of-Government (WOG) and ‘joined-up’ government initiatives.

A qualitative inquiry methodology is used to build knowledge about this new area. The sample of participants is drawn from GAs’ staff who are involved in regional development projects and programs, or projects and programs that contribute to regional development. Data collection is through interviews and surveys with GAs’ representatives from 18 agencies, across three levels of Government and from two distinctly different regions (coastal and inland).

Two aspects of core business conflict are investigated – fundamental core business conflict that involves the underpinning philosophy and ideology of an agency, and functional/operational core business conflicts that include the strategic plans, policies, procedures and systems involved in delivery of core business, which also influence the design of program and project guidelines, and determine funding and staff resourcing.
Research findings contribute new knowledge and expand current knowledge regarding challenges and barriers to agencies working together. Findings also enhance the application of approaches and tools to facilitate effective WOG and collaborative agency work.

The research has resulted in a ‘process’ model to resolve the research problem that applies a holistic and comprehensive operational approach to addressing core business conflict. The ‘process’ model builds on the research findings and draws on information and tools from the literature.

The research has implications for theory, policy and practice in the three discipline areas involved in the research problem and as a new area investigated, has generated further research opportunities.
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<td>DEST</td>
<td>Department of Education, Science and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>Department of Employment and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEWWR</td>
<td>Department of Employment and Workplace Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIIRD</td>
<td>Department of Innovation, Industry and Regional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIMIA</td>
<td>Department of Immigration, Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>Department of Industrial Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITRDLG</td>
<td>Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLGP</td>
<td>Department of Local Government and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>Department of Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCITA</td>
<td>Department of Communication, Information Technology and the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOHA</td>
<td>Department of Health and Aging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoTaRS</td>
<td>Department of Transport and Regional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>Department of the Premier and Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPIF</td>
<td>Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAP</td>
<td>Dairy Regional Adjustment Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD</td>
<td>Department of State Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>Department of State Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDSI</td>
<td>Department of State Development and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTIR</td>
<td>Department of Training and Industrial Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTRDI</td>
<td>Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURD</td>
<td>Department of Urban and Regional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV Aus</td>
<td>Environment Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Education Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Ecologically sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EU European Union
FACSIA Department of Family, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs
GA Government Agency
ICT Information and Communication Technology
IPAA Institute of Public Administration Australia
KPI Key performance indicators
LGA Local Government Association
LGAQ Local Government Association of Queensland
MAC Management and Advisory Committee
MoU Memorandum of Understanding
MR Department of Main Roads
NOLG National Office of Local Government
NRM Department of Natural Resource and Mines
OECD Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OUM Office of Urban Management
QPS Queensland Police Service
QT Queensland Transport
RDA Regional Development Australia
RDO Regional Development Organisation
RDP Regional Development Program
REDO Regional Economic Development Organisation
RMCN Regional Managers Coordination Network
ROC Regional Organisation of Councils
SIP Service Integration Project
TBL Triple Bottom Line
UK United Kingdom
USA United States of America
WOG Whole of Government
WOGIA Whole of Government impact assessment

Specialised terms developed for this research

Winnow and hone approach – a descriptor developed specifically for the process of investigation in this research. The approach involves gathering rich data through interviews and sorting or ‘winnowing’ the data gathered to identify key factors and themes. The ‘honing’ process uses survey of the same subjects to further explore and refine information on the key themes and factors.

Whole-of-Government-impact-assessment (WOGIA) - A term developed for this research meaning a proposed policy, project or program development process to encourage agencies to identify positive and negative impacts, synergies and linkages, as well as partners or alliances relating to the policy, program or project.
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PROTOCOL ASSOCIATED WITH REFERENCING OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS AND RESEARCH

Since many references will be made to various Governments in Australia and their papers and studies, the following procedures have been adopted for uniformity:

- When referring to a particular Government, the name of the Prime Minister or Premier will be identified with that Government, for example the Howard Government or the Beattie Government.
- When referring to a Government study, the title of the study will be highlighted – for example ‘REDOs in Australia’
- When referring to a project/research commissioned by Government, the title of the report to government will be highlighted – for example ‘Sustainable Regional Development: Final report’.
1. Introduction

This chapter presents an overview and outline of the research activity, which examines Government agency (GA) core business conflict and ways to manage the impact on regional development projects and programs. Section 1.1 presents the overall background to the research. Section 1.2 outlines the research problem and issues, and the research contribution to knowledge. Section 1.3 provides justification for the research and Section 1.4 outlines the methodology. Sections 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7 cover the outline of the research thesis, definitions and delimitations respectively. Section 1.8 provides some initial conclusions regarding the overall research. The outline of this chapter is presented in Figure 1.1 below. The research thesis structure is provided in Figure 1.4 on page 18.

Figure 1.1
Structure of Chapter 1

1.1 Background
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1.4 Methodology
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1.8 Conclusions

Source: Developed for this research.
1.1 Background

This research investigates a problem that affects GAs working together. The problem relates to the issues and impediments that are experienced. Studies and reports reviewing Government activity in joint projects and Whole-of-Government (WOG) initiatives have uncovered issues and impediments that have occurred in the past (Management Advisory Committee 2004; Institute of Public Administration Australia 2002; Vincent 1999). Issues and impediments have also been identified in efforts to integrate policy development, regional development and for combined service delivery (Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003; Sorensen June 2000; Pritchard & McManus 2000; Fulop & Brennan 1997; Taskforce on Regional Development 1993; Weller, Forster & Davis (eds.) 1993).

The investigation examines the experiences of this problem when GAs are working together in regional development, but it also draws from WOG, ‘joined-up’ and integrated government initiatives associated with or that could contribute to regional development. The investigation focuses on a particular aspect of the issues and impediments - GA core business conflict.

Core business conflict may impact on the effectiveness of GAs’ programs, projects and services for Community. The research problem focuses on the impact of core business conflict on regional development and is connected with public sector management practices and Government and governance. These latter two areas affect how GAs operate, and their relationships with one another. The research problem therefore involves regional development, public sector management practices, and Government and governance. The three areas are discussed in more detail below.

Regional development involves the activities of Government, private sector and community stakeholders, and encompasses economic, social, environmental and infrastructure elements. Regional development outcomes are the sum of the core business outcomes of multiple agencies. Government’s role in regional development stems from its formulation of Acts, regulations and policies; the provision of infrastructure, and the design and funding of programs and delivery of products and
services to regional Australia, that impact on regional Australia, or that are specifically
designed to facilitate regional development outcomes.

The Government’s role in regional development has varied in level and focus
from interventionism to facilitation, and from a centralized approach to a decentralized
approach. The intent of a facilitation approach is to enable regions to play a stronger role
in their own regional development (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics (BTRE) (2003).

GAs are the instruments through which the Government addresses its priorities
and delivers its intended policy outcomes, including regional development policy
outcomes. Regional development involves multiple agencies, therefore coordination,
integration and collaboration of agency effort is fundamental. Greater detail on regional
development is provided in Chapter 2 section 2.2.

GA core business conflict has been identified as a factor which interferes with
GAs collaborating. GAs are delegated a core business responsibility by Government. In
seeking to fulfill this responsibility and contribute to addressing the Government’s
priorities, GAs develop their Vision and Mission, and internal structure, programs and
services. They also allocate resources and design processes and systems that support the
delivery of their outcomes. This focus limits what is available to dedicate to non-core
business projects and initiatives.

Government agencies deliver their core business using public sector management
practices. The reform of the public service in Australia, has taken place predominantly
over the last thirty years, since the Coombs Royal Commission in 1976. The changes
support greater efficiency, transparency, accountability and responsiveness from
Government (Coombs 1976), and affect how GAs are structured, manage resources and
staff, address reporting and accountability requirements, develop strategic plans and
design processes and systems for core business delivery. Writers such as O’Flynn
(2007), Verspaandonk, revised by Holland (2003), Keating, Wanna and Weller (eds.)
(2000), and Clark and Corbett (1999), provide examples of the changes across these
areas. Public service reform has therefore influenced how core business is delivered.
Public sector management practices can affect the level of core business conflict that
occurs. The practices have changed from structure and operational practices based on
the bureaucratic approach in the United Kingdom, (a colonial legacy), to a structure that reflects the issues and pressures on Governments in many of the developed countries. This includes community demand for a responsive, accountable and efficient government that is service-oriented (Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) (2000).

The role and impact of Australia’s governance system and the type of relationships that exist amongst the three levels of Government also contributes to core business conflict. This system determines levels of control, accountability processes and systems for audit, reviews and controls regulatory powers and funding, (federalism), and creates complexities of relationships in a three-tiered system of government (Pritchard & McManus (eds.) 2000; Sorensen 2000).

Australia’s governance system is based on the Westminster system and United States of America federalism (Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000; Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003). This leads to a complexity in working relationships between agencies at the three levels of government and affects power, authority, jurisdiction and centralized or decentralized agency structure. The complexity has implications for coordination and integration of policies, activities and outcomes. This is of growing importance in response to the many cross-cutting issues affecting Community, regions and the economy today, resulting in a greater number of WOG, joined-up Government and integrated government initiatives. (Management Advisory Committee 2004; Institute of Public Administration 2002).

The research explores two kinds of core business conflict – ‘fundamental core business conflict’, and ‘functional/operational core business conflict’, defined as such specifically for this research. Fundamental core business conflict relates to the philosophy of the agency and arises due to the responsibilities delegated to GAs by Government. These can be underpinned by Acts and regulations that an agency is responsible for administering. The philosophy is often reflected in the Mission and Vision statements of GAs. For example in Queensland, at the simplest level, the Environmental Protection Agency’s core business is to protect the environment, while the Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry’s core business is the economic development of Queensland.
Functional/operational core business conflict relates to the organizational structure, processes and systems developed by GAs to deliver their core business. Being focused on delivery of core business, these may negatively impact on how the GA can participate/contribute to any project, and can also clash with other GA’s structural/operational core business processes and systems.

1.2 Research problem

The research problem for this investigation is:

**Government Department core business – managing the impact of potential conflicts on regional development projects and programs**

Research investigates the nature of core business conflict as outlined in Section 1.1 amongst GAs involved in regional development and also explores what actions and processes have been established to manage or overcome issues and impediments that occur in joint GA projects and joined-up government initiatives. This information is then used to develop a solution to the research problem.

GA Core business conflict stems from public sector management practices and Government and governance processes. As previously discussed, Government determines GAs’ roles and responsibilities. This includes the implementation of Acts and regulations and the delivery of programs and services to achieve the Government’s priorities. This is their core business. The mechanisms, processes and practices to deliver the core business are drawn from public sector management principles and practices.

Chapter 3 presents the literature and research review that builds the theoretical framework upon which the research is based. The theoretical framework incorporates the three areas of Government and governance processes, public sector management practices and regional development.

Three issues have required a different approach to the literature review:

1. There is a need to enhance understanding of the context and influences within the framework affecting GAs working together, and ultimately GA core business conflict.

2. No extant literature was uncovered dealing specifically with GA core business conflict.
3 With no literature uncovered dealing with GA core business conflict, there is a need to investigate a related area - issues and impediments when agencies work together, and how they were managed. This would enable identifying similarities and key factors that may be relevant to core business conflict.

A key focus of the literature review therefore, is to build knowledge, and investigate the research problem through literature dealing the related field of issues and impediments, many of which, as the research uncovers, are caused by GA core business conflict. The literature research is presented in three sections:

- Evolutionary overview of Government and governance, public sector management and regional development to understand the influences in the contextual framework (Section 3.2).
- Issues and impediments (the related field) to agencies working together in regional development and WOG initiatives, with a view to identifying similarities and linkages with core business conflict (Section 3.3.).
- Processes and practices to manage issues and impediments, which may have relevance to managing core business conflict (Section 3.4).

**Literature and research gaps**

Findings from the literature and research review highlighted a number of gaps in the literature, regarding the research problem. No research was uncovered that specifically examined GA core business conflict. There was therefore no information regarding the nature of GA core business conflict, what was most dominant or the impact from GA core business conflict. The relationship between core business conflict and issues and impediments identified in research was unknown.

To resolve the research problem, it was necessary to explore what had been done to manage core business conflict. Information from the literature and research review regarding how issues and impediments had been managed was useful, but was targeting primarily WOG initiatives and was concerned with higher level policy and framework solutions such as the Management Advisory Committee report (2004). What was clear from the literature was that although best practice guidelines, checklists, tools and frameworks were designed, there was no comprehensive overall ‘how to’ process in
place to guide staff at the operational level. Such a process would support developing local and project specific solutions and management strategies. It would also be important to know what processes and practices had been adopted at this operational level to address issues, impediments and core business conflicts that could inform the design of the ‘process’ model.

Research issues

The following research issues emerged from gaps in the literature and research knowledge concerning core business conflict:
1. The nature of core business conflict.
2. The relationships between core business conflict and issues and impediments affecting GAs working together.
3. Dominant core business conflicts.
4. The impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs working relationships.
5. Processes and practices that can assist agencies to manage issues and impediments and core business conflict that could be included in a process model.

Answering the research issues makes a number of contributions to knowledge in this field. These are presented in detail in Chapter 6, Sections 6.3.1 (new knowledge) and Section 6.3.2 (expanding current knowledge); however a summary of this contribution is presented below:

New knowledge

- Knowledge about core business conflict, which has not been previously identified as a conflict factor when agencies are working together
- Knowledge about the nature of core business conflict
- The most common core business conflicts
- Core business conflict as an influence on GA relationships and the implementation and outcomes of regional development projects and other joint government initiatives
The contributory role of public sector management practices and government and governance to creating core business conflict
The implication of core business conflict on regional development.

**Current knowledge expanded**

- Issues and impediments and core business conflicts – relationship and linkages
- Joined-up, integrated and WOG processes, practices and barriers
- Tools, frameworks, processes and practices to support GAs working effectively together
- External factors that cause issues, impediments and conflict when GAs work together

In Chapter 6, it is argued this new knowledge and expansion of current knowledge is a contribution to knowledge, from the research.

**1.3 Justification for research**

Justification for undertaking the research is summarized in the points below. This is then followed by a more in-depth discussion on each point.

- Explores an old and long-standing problem from a new perspective
- Builds on and strengthens activities, processes and guidelines already developed to improve joined up government and collaborative initiatives
- Enhances capacity to achieving project outcomes, fulfill Government priorities in regional development and other joint initiatives resulting in greater benefit to community
- Supports sustainable regional development
- Supports the governance agenda relating to joined up, integrated and WOG government approach
- Has an end product for practical application.

**New dimension to an old problem**

The research explores a new dimension to an old problem that has plagued agencies working together. A number of reports, books and studies identify issues and
impediments to levels of Government and GAs working together (Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003; Edwards & Langford, (eds.) 2002; Department of Transport and Regional Development October 2000; Institute of Public Administration Australia 2000; National Economics 2001; Pritchard & McManus (eds.) 2000; Productivity Commission 1999; Fulop & Brennan 1997; Taskforce on Regional Development 1993). However, none have considered any of these specific issues and impediments as being related to GAs’ core business activities. Instead, the reports and studies have described the issues and impediments, with little investigation into the cause.

Many issues and impediments relate specifically to what is termed in this research as functional/operational core business conflict, including factors such as governance relationships, financial management systems and reporting and accountability processes, information sharing, and decision-making. (Management Advisory Committee 2004; Institute of Public Administration of Australia 2000; Vincent 1999). Investigating core business conflict as a barrier to working together has potential to identify new frameworks for core business incorporating linkages across agencies.

**Strengthens the foundations for ‘joined-up’, integrated and Whole-of-Government (WOG) activity**

The research is focused on further developing mechanisms to improve the practices and processes that support joined-up, integrated and WOG activities. The intent is to build on work that has already been undertaken to develop guidelines, checklists and recommendations to support GAs working together and joined up government activities. (Office of Public Service Merit and Equity 2004; Management Advisory Committee 2004; Queensland Department of Families 2002b)

However, the Management Advisory Committee (2004) study essentially deals with higher level issues addressed by WOG, generally involving formal structures and frameworks such as taskforces, inter-departmental committees and inter-departmental partnerships. The other documents referred to above do explore and provide some guidelines for the operational level of agencies working together, and are a useful reference.
Additional reference material was collected from the literature research involving reviewing and evaluating projects and case studies uncovered information on learnings, approaches used and recommendations.

What was evident in the findings was that they tend to deal with discrete areas such as suitable structure, financial management, reporting and accountability options. There was no holistic and practical process or comprehensive implementation tool to facilitate using the frameworks, guidelines and tools already developed.

The proposed research will further expand information regarding WOG and joined-up government approaches, and contribute to strengthening the foundation upon which such joint activities occur by addressing additional barriers that are uncovered and supporting a more effective inter-relationship of GA core business activities.

**Enhances capacity to achieve project outcomes, fulfill Government priorities in regional development and other joint initiatives, resulting in greater benefit to community**

Government and GAs role in regional development is outlined briefly in section 1.1. Chapter 2 explores the roles and responsibilities in greater detail. The complexity of regional development means multiple agencies are involved. However, if GA inter-relationships and activities are dysfunctional due to conflict, the overall effectiveness in working in regional development will be reduced, project outcomes may suffer, benefit to community may be reduced, and funds and effort may be wasted.

Further value of this research in regional development is demonstrated in relation to Government response to challenges facing regions. Dealing with the challenges, requires multiple GA action and support from all levels of Government (Beer, Maude, & Pritchard 2003; Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000; Keating & Davis 2000; Pritchard & McManus (eds.) 2000; Sorenson June 2000). Examples of challenges from this literature include but aren’t limited to, increased economic competition from a globalised market; shrinking rural and regional communities; loss of employment; low skill levels; loss of services and infrastructure; and a growing digital divide across
regional Australia. Core business conflict amongst GAs working together to address these challenges ultimately impacts on regional development outcomes. This can be due to outcomes of conflict, such as delays in decisions, the allocation of funds for projects, and conflicts over overlapping jurisdictional boundaries. Such impacts can also reduce the overall benefit to community, from projects.

Regional development practices that have paved the way for the regional development and focus on building up regional capabilities are strongly dependent upon the integrated and coordinated efforts of public and private sector stakeholders (McKinsey & Co 1994; Porter 1990). Collaborative efforts are included in these practices, which build on competitive advantage of regions, nurturing growth from within the region in order to be competitive in a global market (AHURI 1998; McKinsey & Co 1994; Porter 1990; Romer 1990). Government policy and its implementation reflect this integrated approach. As O’Connor, Stimson and Daly (2001) suggest, policy development needs to be both place and people based to respond to the many challenges facing regions within the global context. To do this effectively requires GAs to work together to develop an integrated regional policy or policies and then to act on these policies in a coordinated manner at the local level. The research outcome to manage the impact of potential conflicts more effectively has potential to enhance coordination, integration and collaboration amongst agencies and local stakeholders, and ensure that the view of non-government stakeholders of Government is not negatively affected as a result of GA conflicts.

Globalisation is forcing a redefining of local and regional economies (‘State of the Regions report’ 2001). New regionalism, a current influence on regional development philosophy, focuses on knowledge and the knowledge economy, with a new role for the local and national state, embeddedness of global firms, and an opportunity to deal with local disparities (Cited by Rainnie 2002 from the ‘State of the Regions Report’ 2001). New Regionalism has the potential to further drive the imperative for partnerships between government, private sector and non-government organizations. Initiatives that emerge will deal with cross-cutting factors and likely to involve multiple agencies. Issues and impediments, including core business conflict will
impact on these collaborative relationships. Through addressing core business conflict, the outcomes of this research have potential to improve the effectiveness of the GAs activities within a new regionalism paradigm.

**Supports sustainable regional development**

The research is also important from the perspective of sustainable regional development, which includes the need to incorporate the triple bottom line (TBL) and ecologically sustainable development (ESD) principles in regional development programs and projects. This approach requires that GAs take into account one another’s core business, including achieving economic, social or environmental outcomes, depending upon the charter of the GA. To achieve a balance between the three areas of ESD, GAs work together and negotiate the cost and benefits of their actions to seek trade-offs. Conflict of core business may occur during this process. This has implications for both individual agency and regional development performance outcomes, creating delays or reduced outcomes. The intent of this research is to investigate managing the impact of core business conflict within such deliberations.

**Governance, ‘joined up’ government and Whole-of-Government initiatives**

There has been a growing trend towards joined-up, integrated and WOG approaches internationally in response to the complexity of social, economic and environmental issues facing government, budgetary constraints, community expectations and needs, demand for efficiency and equity, cross cutting issues and the need to work across agency boundaries. (Cabinet Office 2006; Lenihan, Alcock, Kaufman & Thomas 1999; State Government of Victoria State Services Authority 2007).

Like Australia, other countries have experienced impediments to successful integration. Preparations for developing joined-up structures and governance arrangements include addressing interdependencies of agencies to achieve common outcomes, governance frameworks, ensuring capacity for integrated and accessible information; accountability and reporting arrangements; collaborative development of associated policies; managing horizontally and formation of networks, partnerships and
agreements (Lenihan et al 1999; and Christensen & Lægreid 2006a; Richards & Kavanagh, 2000 both cited in State Government of Victoria State Services Authority 2007). Particularly in Australia, the Institute of Public Administration Australia study (2002) identified a number of barriers to integration, examples being bureaucratic structure and culture, internal operational practices of the public sector and accountability requirements. Resolving the research problem will support improved capacity for joined-up and WOG initiatives.

**Practical application of end product**

The practical solution to the research problem is the production of a process model and implementation tool to facilitate the design and management of regional development projects involving multiple GAs and minimising core business conflict. The process model and tool is also a risk management tool identifying potential conflicts and issues early in project design or prior to implementation. This facilitates collaborative strategy development by project participants, to set in place a process to manage such factors. This pre-implementation strategy has potential to facilitate the progress of the project and the GAs’ achievement of individual outcomes relating to the project.

**1.4 Methodology**

Research into GA core business conflict involves exploring relationships that exist amongst people and the public service management practices facilitating GAs’ core business delivery, in relation to regional development project implementation and outcomes and influenced by Government and governance. The purpose has been to identify the how and why of core business conflict and its impact on regional development.

To gain this information, the research methodology is developed to capture the experience and attitudes of people involved in delivering GAs’ core business, but within the context of their involvement in regional development projects and activities or WOG
and joined-up government initiatives related to regional development. As there are no current theories relating to the research problem, or previous research from this particular perspective, the research approach is explorative and qualitative in its focus.

A research methodology described as the ‘winnow and hone’ approach has been developed for this research, using a combination of semi-structured interviews and a self-administered attitudinal survey using a Lickert-like scale. The interviews comprise the winnowing aspect of the methodology, to tease out from the research area the common themes and factors relating to GA core business conflict when working together in regional development projects. The honing process uses self-administered attitudinal surveys with a view to determining the level of agreement with key themes, the regularity of occurrence and to also indicate the perceived strength of impact of these factors.

Chapter 4 provides an in-depth description of the winnow and hone research methodology. This includes supporting rationale for its design drawn from other methodologies.

1.5 Outline of this thesis

The outline of the final report is represented in Figure 1.3 (page 17).

Chapter 1 has provided an overview of the research, identifies the research problem, indicates the contribution of the research to knowledge, summarises the research justification and methodology, and covers the definition of key terms and delimitations of the research.

Chapter 2 presents an overview of the regional development environment exploring the nature of regional development and providing a synopsis of the Australian Government approach to regional development and governance systems (up to 2008).

The chapter provides a closer examination of GAs’ core business and its role in regional development, the conflicts that exist amongst GAs’ core business and the influence this conflict has on regional development.
An examination of the public sector management practices follows, as they influence the delivery of GA core business, influence governance and the integration of Government activities and issues and impediments that are caused by core business conflict. The chapter concludes with a summary of the regional development environment relating to the three key discipline areas of regional development, government and governance and public sector management practices.

Chapter 3 presents a literature and research review related to the three key discipline areas associated with the research questions - regional development, Government and governance, and public sector management. The review builds the theoretical foundation upon which the research is based and identifies gaps in knowledge and research relating to the research question. Gaps determined the research issues to be explored in this thesis and noted earlier, but are outlined following the literature review in Chapter 3.

The theoretical framework developed from the literature inquiry is presented in Figure 1.2 (page 16), which is copied from Figure 3.1 in Chapter 3.
1. **The blue and yellow circles** represent the literature review. The literature review is covered in sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4. Section 3.2 provides a very brief overview of the evolution of Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development (blue circle). Section 3.3 covers reviews and research literature on regional development projects and initiatives, and joined-up, integrated and WOG programs and initiatives to identify the issues and impediments to agencies working together. Section 3.4 provides information on some suggested approaches, frameworks and guidelines to manage the issues and impediments to working together. Section 3.3 and 3.4 are the yellow circle and represent previous research in the field.
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2. **The red circle** represents the research problem area and is about the difficulties GAs have when working together.

3. **The purple circle** represents the boundaries for this research— including the research problem investigation being confined to Australia and research focusing on regional development.

4. **The green circle** represents the research gap that is identified and which the research aims to fill. The dominant gap is that no extant literature has been uncovered that deals specifically with the topic of core business conflict. Discussion of the gaps and implications for research methodology are in sections 3.5 and 3.6. A revised Figure representing findings from this research, in relation to the theoretical framework is in Chapter 6.

Chapter 4 argues the case for the research methodology providing a justification of methodology, outline of the unit of analysis, description of the instruments and procedures used, the validity and reliability of the method chosen, specific limitations that have not already been mentioned, method of analysis applied to data and ethical issues. Chapter 5 then presents the research findings.

Chapter 6 discusses the research findings for each research issue and in relation to the literature review and previous research. Chapter 6 also identifies how this research has contributed to knowledge in the field of investigation, identifies implications for theory, policy, practice and methodology and suggests areas for future research.

Figure 1.3 (page 18) summarises the chapter map of the research thesis.
1.6 Definitions

The following are definitions for terms used in this research:

1. **Collaboration** - Collaboration involves more than working together on joint initiatives and having joint outcomes. It involves maintaining communication and consultation to build awareness and synergy across agencies, as well as engaging in teamwork, partnerships, linkages, and alliances.

2. **Core business** - A GA’s core business is the role and responsibility delegated to a GA by Government. The core business involves two key elements:
   - Fundamental core business; and
   - Functional/operational core business activities.

2(a). **Fundamental core business** – An element of core business centred on the GA role and responsibility, as delegated by Government and is generally evident in the Vision
and Mission statements of the GAs and the underlying ‘philosophy’ applied in carrying
out their core business.

2(b). **Functional/operational core business** - Those activities that are developed
specifically by the GA in order to deliver on core business outcomes including, but may
not be limited to:

- Internal structure (often into Divisions or units) of a GA to concentrate staff and
  resources into key areas that will deliver on core business
- Strategic plan
- Unit or Divisional business plans
- Budget bids
- Budget allocation for projects, programs and staffing
- Staff allocation
- Programs and associated grants/funds
- Projects
- Staff teams
- Data and information collection, collation and use and the systems used to manage
  these (agent-specific software for example).

3. **Core business conflict** - This is the conflict that occurs amongst GAs when working
together. Core business conflict can be caused by either or both fundamental and
functional/operational core business factors. An example scenario that demonstrates
fundamental core business conflict could be the conflict arising from the construction of
a tourist resort which is an economic development on a foreshore. The construction
fulfils a GA economic core business objective associated with economic development,
as it increases regional employment and economic output for a region; however it
impacts on the environment, including the removal of some vegetation, for its
construction and operation and hence is in direct conflict with the GA with a core
business to protect the environment.

An example of functional/operational core business conflict could be a project instigated
by a community to achieve economic development that is also dependent upon the
support and contribution of a number of GAs. Whilst all stakeholder GAs are supportive
and have willingly joined the project group, a number of GAs may appear to be less than
cooperative or contributing to the project due to the fact that, for example:

- This is not a project associated with a KPI in the agency
- Funds from their budget are already otherwise allocated
- Staffing tasks and responsibilities are already mapped out
- Decisions required to be made have to be referred to the Director-General or Minister
  before some of the GAs can commit funds and other resources
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4 **Factor** - This term is used to describe an issue, feature, aspect or cause. In the research activity, the term is used in relation to areas from the interviews that contribute to core business conflict or issues and impediments when GAs work together.

5 **Integrated government** – This refers to government activities such as joint service delivery, joint policy and program development and implementation which relies on multiple agencies activities being integrated.

6 **Joined-up government** - This refers to both horizontal and across portfolio activity and focused on improving outcomes in a specific target group or geographic area. This may include working across different government boundaries and for different government responsibilities (Management Advisory Committee 2004).

7 **Regional development** – is defined as the intentional and focused activities of regional stakeholders to achieve sustainable development. These activities are directed at a sub-national area identified by a range of criteria and address both issues and opportunities. The activities develop soft and hard infrastructure, harness and improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural resource. The aim is to achieve sustainable regional development and build regional resilience, security and livability. Examples of outcomes include providing soft and hard infrastructure; strengthening and diversifying the regional economy; building social capital and community resilience; and enhancing regional lifestyle, security, amenity and competitive advantage.

The definition has been developed for this research, based on some aspects of the Australian Local Government Association definition of regional development (2004), and the Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics definition of a region, and reflects influences of current regional development theories. Activities associated with regional development include (but are not limited to):

- Improving the skill base in a region
- Developing infrastructure – both hard and soft (done by government or private enterprise or a public/private partnership)
- Attracting investment
- Expanding the markets, including exports of regional industries
- Strengthening regional industry performance
- Increasing innovation of products and service and technology uptake
- Developing community capacity
- Improving the environmental management
- Developing responsible and efficient resource use
- Developing sustainable natural resource practices
- Diversifying the economy
  - Enhancing the quality of life, including housing, lifestyle and leisure amenities
- Increasing the level of income
- Improving communication and access to information
- Establishing appropriate services and infrastructure to ensure public and industry safety and security

8. **Region** - The definition of region reflects the Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics’ (2003) definition being a sub-national area selected for a purpose using various defining elements such as jurisdiction, biophysical, culture, economic or a combination of elements. The purpose determines the region.

9. **‘Process’ model** – This is the model that is developed from the research to guide GAs when working together. The model describes the steps and tools that can be used to manage core business conflict.

10. **Pseudo-quantitative measure** – Numerical rating is used, to indicate tendency. There is no complex statistical analysis, instead the rating is analysed for frequency and bar charts are created illustrating the direction and strength of tendency on the scale.

11. **Themes** – This term is used to describe topics, views or issues that share common or closely related concepts, knowledge and theories, which were mentioned during the interview process, for example: the theme of ‘communication’ or ‘relationships’.

12. **Whole-of-Government (WOG)** – This approach involves all or most agencies from Government, including from different levels of Government. This research used the Management Advisory Committee (2004) definition:

   Whole of government denotes public service agencies working across portfolio boundaries to achieve a shared goal and an integrated government response to particular issues. Approaches can be formal and informal. They can focus on policy development, program management and service delivery. (Management Advisory Committee 2004, p4)

13. **Whole-of-Government-impact-assessment** – A term developed for this research meaning a proposed policy, project or program development process to encourage agencies to identify positive and negative impacts, synergies and linkages, as well as partners or alliances relating to the policy, program or project.
1.7  Delimitations

The following delimitations are to be noted:

- This thesis only focuses on Australia and Australia’s three levels of Government.
- Queensland was chosen as the State from which State agencies were drawn and also for the Local Governments and the two regional areas. Although each State approaches regional development in different ways, the fundamental principles are the same and all States are subject to the same Federal funding and policy positions. The research does not investigate differences across the States in relation to regional development.
- Data gathered for the design of the process model is taken from surveys with a selection of GAs identified as having a strong role in regional development (as defined by this research). For this reason the ‘survey sample’ is based on judgement sampling (Zigmund 1997).
- The two regions selected for the surveys are selected to provide a diversity of regional development environments. Selection is based on two regions that provide differences in:
  - Population
  - Primary economic activity
  - Geographical location in relation to the capital, Brisbane
  - Regional issues
  - Infrastructure provisions
  - Demography
  - One region is inland and remote from Brisbane. The second is a coastal region within driving proximity to Brisbane.
  - Regional development involves not only GAs, but also community (business and general); this research explores a particular problem associated with the GAs inter-relationships and does not consider any broader stakeholder group.

1.8 Conclusions

This chapter presented the foundation of the report and included an overview of the research area and the problem being addressed. The chapter then discussed the contribution to knowledge, research justification, and provides an outline of the whole
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report, followed by a summary of the methodology, definitions and delimitation of the research. In presenting these summaries, the chapter has met its objectives as noted in section 1.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the regional development environment, the Australian government system and governance processes, and a summary of public sector reform. Collectively these areas create the context in which this research is being undertaken. The chapter lays the foundation for the first part of the literature research in Chapter 3. This is an overview of the evolution and inter-relationship of the three key discipline areas in the theoretical framework, being Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development.
2.1 Introduction

Chapter 1 identified the research problem, posed research issues, and presented justification for the research. Methodology was outlined, with documented key terms and limitations of the research. Chapter 2 presents the environment within which the research problem exists, through exploring the key related discipline areas of regional development, Government and governance, and public sector management practices. The Chapter also clarifies the connection between GA core business and its role and responsibility in regional development, core business conflict and issues and impediments to government agencies working together.

Section 2.2 examines the nature of regional development. The section commences by defining a ‘region’ and ‘regional development’ for the purposes of this research, and gives a brief overview of some regional development theories influencing practices in Australia and Queensland. Queensland is explored in more detail since Queensland is chosen as the State from which State GAs, Local Governments and two regional areas are drawn. This is followed by a discussion on ESD principles and sustainable regional development. Regional development stakeholders are briefly outlined. The role of Government in regional development is then addressed.

Section 2.3 presents an overview of Government and governance processes in Australia, outlining the structure and functions of the three levels of Government in Australia, and their inter-relationships. The growing trend to achieve joined up or integrated government is briefly examined. This is due to its influence upon how agencies carry out their core business. The section concludes with a summary of some of the issues and impediments associated with the various levels of government working together.

Section 2.4 examines GA core business, core business delivery and contribution to regional development. The section illustrates the roles and responsibilities of GAs in regional development, which are shaped by the GAs’ core business. The section then explores the nature of core business conflict and describes the two types of conflict that
appear to occur: fundamental core business philosophy, and GA functional and operational structures and practices.

Section 2.5 explores some of the new public sector management practices and the link with GAs’ delivery of their core business. Changes stem from the adoption of private enterprise approaches to management and structure, including performance based contracts, supplier/buyer arrangements between divisions within a department, outsourcing of some services, strategic planning and the formation of key performance indicators as part of managing for outcomes.

Section 2.6 summarises the regional development environment and its relevance to the research question, which leads to a focus on themes in issues and impediments that occur in Government’s role in regional development and joined up Government. This is in addition to the issues that occur in the way GAs deliver core business, and arising from the changes to public sector management practices. Figure 2.1 sets out a map of this Chapter.

![Figure 2.1]
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Regional development environment

2.2 The nature of regional development
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- 2.2.2 Current theories and practices in regional development in Australia and Queensland
- 2.2.3 Sustainable regional development
- 2.2.4 Regional development stakeholders
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- 2.3.1 Structure and function of Government
- 2.3.2 ‘Joined up’ Government
- 2.3.3 Issues and impediments to Government working together

2.4 GAs ‘core business’ and core business conflict
- 2.4.1 GAs’ core business, its delivery and role in regional development
- 2.4.2 GAs’ core business conflict
- 2.4.3 Issues and impediments to GAs working together in regional development projects

2.5 Public sector management practices
- 2.5.1 New public sector management
- 2.5.2 Influence of new public sector management on GA core business delivery and core business conflict
- 2.5.3 Issues and impediments to embracing new public sector management practices

2.6 Conclusion

Source: Developed for this research.
2.2 The nature of regional development

Introduction

The nature of regional development is explored, commencing with a definition of regions and an outline of what constitutes regional development for the purposes of this research. The section then briefly outlines regional development theories and practices, and the influence of these on regional development approaches in Australia and Queensland. Sustainable regional development is also examined briefly. The final two sections outline GAs and Government role in regional development and present some of the issues and conflicts experienced by Government and GAs working together in regional development.

2.2.1 Defining regional development in Australia and Queensland

The definition of a region is fundamental to understanding the meaning of regional development. A region can be defined by criteria that are man-made, natural or a combination of both (see figure 2.2).

Figure 2.2
Definition of Regions

**Man-made**
- **Jurisdictional:** Areas relating to governance; GAs areas of responsibility and management etc. They encompass combinations of man-made and natural characteristics
- **Economic:** Economic zones; centres of inter-linked economic activity; location of dominant economic activity such as mining or agriculture etc.
- **Cultural/Heritage:** Customs/lifestyle and associated activities that include those that have emerged through historical influence (some Indigenous settlements) etc. These can establish socio-economic patterns also.
- **Demographic:** Determined by a combination of economic and social factors.

**Natural**
- **Geographic:** Geological, physical terrain etc. influencing economic, socio/cultural/heritage characteristics of regions
- **Climatic:** Tropical zone, coastal versus inland, sub-tropical etc. influencing economic, socio/cultural/heritage characteristics of regions
- **Biophysical:** Ecosystems – wetlands, savannah, rainforest, desert, marine etc. influencing economic, socio/cultural/heritage characteristics of regions

Source: based on information from the Bureau of Transport and Regional Services (BTRE), Department of Transport and Regional Services (DoTaRS) and the Australian Local Government Association (ALGA).
Source: Developed for this research.
Figure 2.2 illustrates the different criteria by which a region may be defined, either singly or in combination. Man-made criteria involve determining a region by factors that assist in carrying out a purpose, with many natural factors influencing the criteria, for example the range of criteria relating to jurisdiction of a GA could incorporate geographic features relating to natural resources such as agricultural land and the type of economic activity; or the level of population for the delivery of services. Natural resource or environmental management involves defining regions by natural criteria such as geography and biophysical features.

The definition of region used in this research reflects that of the Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics (2003). This is that a region is a sub-national area selected for a purpose. For example, the definition could be jurisdictional, biophysical, cultural, economic or a combination of these or other elements (See Figure 2.2). The purpose determines the parameters of a region.

For an area or activities to be considered regional, the purpose will define the regional boundaries. This is different to the Department of Transport and Regional Services (2001) definition of regional, which is described as the area outside capital cities including outback, rural and coastal areas. The definition for this research means that regional can encompass a capital city area. An example is the South East Queensland region.

In this research, regional development concerns the intentional and focused activities undertaken to achieve specific objectives and outcomes within a designated region. The definition of regional development used is based on definitions from BTRE and the Australian Local Government Association (ALGA). ALGA describes regional development as actions relating to harnessing economic, social, cultural and environmental resources in regions for sustainable progress and builds on regional competitive advantage. The ALGA also indicates that regional development is shaped by policies relating to infrastructure, finance, environment and social management (Australian Local Government Association 2004), thus recognising a key part of the Government’s role in regional development. Section 2.2.5 (page 44) explores the role of Government in regional development in more detail. The definition also reflects current regional development theories, for example Romer’s (1986, 1990) theory of endogenous growth and community and social capital building; Porter’s competitive advantage (1990); and Florida’s (2000) quality of place.
The definition of regional development developed for this research is therefore:

The intentional and focused activities of regional stakeholders to achieve sustainable development. These activities are directed at a sub-national area identified by a range of criteria and address both issues and opportunities. The activities develop soft and hard infrastructure, harness and improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural resource. The aim is to achieve sustainable regional development and build regional resilience, security and liveability. Examples of outcomes include providing soft and hard infrastructure; strengthening and diversifying the regional economy; building social capital and community resilience; and enhancing regional lifestyle, security, amenity and competitive advantage.

Examples of the desired outcomes from regional development activities and a selection of guiding principles are presented in Table 2.1, providing greater clarification of the meaning of ‘regional development’, as practiced in Australia, and as defined for this research.

Table 2.1
Desired regional development outcomes and guiding principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>PRINCIPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of services to people in regional Australia, which includes telecommunications, health, welfare and education</td>
<td>‘Government, businesses and communities have joint responsibility to address the problems facing regional Australia and should work together in a spirit of partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of infrastructure</td>
<td>A “bottom up” rather than a “top down” approach should be built into responses aimed at empowering communities at the local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation or retention of employment</td>
<td>Initiatives should be sufficiently flexible to cater for the particular circumstances and needs of various regional, rural and remote communities.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement or introduction of new labour force skills to suit the changing economic structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening of social and economic bases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering business and rural industry research innovation to become more competitive and to develop new products and processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving sustainable natural resource management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving efficient, affordable, reliable and accessible communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening and empowering communities and developing leadership skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic diversification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Gross Regional Product (GRP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in regional exports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater overall community prosperity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of mechanisms to improve social equity and access to services and information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased community cohesion and willingness to collaborate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of partnerships and engaging in collaborative efforts to achieve sustainable development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving and protecting the quality of life (for example through areas such as health, learning, leisure quality, security and work).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased investment in the region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compilation based on information from a range of literature (Collits 2003; Coombs (ed.) 2001; Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003) and material from DoTaRS and ALGA websites
Source for the principles: Regional Australia Summit Final Report of the Regional Australia Summit Steering Committee December 2000 p.3.
Source: Developed for this research
Outcomes are both qualitative and quantitative and are linked to economic, social, infrastructure and environmental outcomes. The principles have a strong reference to partnership between Government and Community in regional development, which differs from the early regional development practices that were primarily ‘top down’ Government intervention.

Each State in Australia approaches regional development differently, determined by the State’s own regional characteristics, government agencies’ portfolio responsibilities and economic priorities. Queensland for example, had a State Government priority worded as ‘Managing urban growth and building Queensland’s regions’ (Queensland Government 2004). In building Queensland’s regions the State Government at this time aimed to:

- Support Queensland’s regions through statewide infrastructure and regional job creation;
- Ensure that accelerated growth in South East Queensland is managed in an integrated and coordinated manner;
- Link Queensland through efficient and integrated transport options; and
- Build on the strength of Queensland’s diverse regions.


Queensland’s regional development aims reflect a number of the desired outcomes highlighted in Table 2.1, with a focus on infrastructure and employment. This concurs with the ALGA view that policy relating to infrastructure is a contributor to regional development. The Rudd Government’s infrastructure program for Australia in 2008 also reflects the importance of infrastructure for regions.

A common theme in the 21st Century in regional development, highlighted in the Regional Australia Summit Steering Committee (2000), is the notion of community self-help and the formation of partnerships and alliances involving both public and private sectors to achieve regional development outcomes. This theme is evident in the National and State regional development policies and programs that have followed.

### 2.2.2 Theories and practices in regional development in Australia and Queensland

Australian regional development policy was originally strongly interventionist and sporadic, particularly at the Federal level and concerned activities such as infrastructure for transport; fiscal equalisation; protectionism; specific population decentralisation policies and fostering expansion of large-scale export oriented
agricultural industries (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003; Glynn 1975 cited in Tonts 1999). Policy also included a focus on development in locations outside metropolitan areas, but not until recently focused on specific regions (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003). The Bureau considers that this reflects the division of powers with the States. Within State boundaries, the States have powers covering areas such as health, housing, education, land management, and law and order. The Bureau suggests that regional development activities tend to support strategic planning, business promotion and infrastructure development, and have a strong economic development focus.

The Australian Government approach in the 21st Century is now one that is based on policies and programs that assist regions to be proactive in their own regional development and to facilitate their capacity to manage change. (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003; Regional Australia Summit Steering Committee 2000; Bureau of Industry Economics 1994). The approach also identifies that Government and Community have a joint responsibility for regional development (Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government, viewed 21 June 2008; Regional Australia Summit Steering Committee 2000; Banks 2000). Previously under the Howard Government, eligible regional development projects were supported by targeted government assistance, for example from the National programs ‘Regional Solutions’ and ‘Regional Partnerships’ offered by the previous Department of Department of Transport and Regional Development. These programs have now ended, following the Australian Government elections in 2007. The current program under the Rudd Government is entitled ‘Better Regions’ and focuses on community infrastructure to contribute to liveability of regions.

Queensland had a regional development-specific program until mid 2007, the Regional Business Development Scheme. This was delivered through the then Department of State Development and Innovation. New funding programs have since been developed that contribute to industry and regional development – for example the Business and Industry Transformation Incentive. The Department is also focusing activities on key growth regions through the ‘Centres of Enterprise’ initiative. (Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry 2008).
Some influential regional development theories

A number of theories have influenced regional development strategies and policies in Australia and include, but are not limited to:

- **Growth poles** - locations of concentrated growth and development (Myrdal 1957, Hirschman 1958 cited in Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003) that are based on the grouping of industries around a dominant industry acting as a catalyst for growth (Darwent 1969 and based on ideas proposed by Perroux (1950)
- **Romer’s** (1986, 1990) endogenous growth, which refers to growth from within the region arising from decisions by investors, producers and consumers (cited in SGS Economics and Planning 2002)
- **Porter’s** (1996, 1990) diamond model of competitive advantage, including industry clusters and network development, where industry clusters are concentrations of interconnected companies and other elements such as factor and demand conditions, related institutional development and other conditions influencing regional competition and collaboration
- **Reich’s** theory (1992 cited in Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003) that borderless and nationless movement of goods, services and expertise shape an individual’s and a region’s capacity to contribute to the global economy through knowledge and expertise. The regional capacity to respond to the knowledge economy determines the potential wealth achievable by individuals and regions
- **McKinsey and Co’s** (1994) rejuvenation and redevelopment of regions through expanding economic and export activities as a basis for regional development as well as creating regional and local leadership and improving quality of life
- **Quality of place** (Florida 2000) where regional strength is about attracting and retaining the best talent.
- The influence of ecologically sustainable development (ESD) principles and the triple bottom line approach of balancing economic, social and environmental elements to achieve sustainable regional development.

Apart from endogenous growth theories, the Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics (2003) identifies the following regional development theory classifications:

- **Neoclassical** – supply side models with labour, capital and technology being considered as the three key determinants of growth
- **Neo-classical trade perspectives** where comparative advantage and opportunity costs are basis for trade between regions
• **Export demand (Keynesian) perspective** which is a demand-side model with exports being a key influence on economic growth

• **Cumulative causation perspective** – this brings together related theories of agglomeration economies, growth poles, flexible production systems, learning regions; product life cycles and competitive advantage

• **Social capital and cohesion** stressing degree of trust, reciprocity and networks to facilitate economic development and enhanced community well-being.

**New regionalism**

An emerging perspective in regional development is from new regionalism – driven by the effects of globalisation, and building on regional strengths, particularly regional ‘tacit’ knowledge. According to the ‘State of the Regions Report’ (2001), new regionalism draws on locally based innovation and learning capacity, clusters and collaboration, and on the drive at a local level to manage or instigate change. New regionalism represents a new role for local and state agencies (Rainnie 2002) in fostering a learning region and building knowledge and networks. Within this paradigm, collaborative partnerships of community and government rely on effective working relationships.

**Australia-specific regional development characteristics**

Australia’s regions are faced with particular challenges, which influence the way these theories may have been translated into action. Australian regional characteristics and challenges also influence the level of impact the actions have. The Bureau of Industry Economics (1994) highlights the influence of geography, climate, natural resource endowment, settlement patterns, land use and economic activity as some of the factors that contribute to Australia’s regions and varying regional performance. Historically, Australia’s economy has been narrow-based and focused particularly on resources - agribusiness and mining. This has meant that the impact of globalisation and increased competition in Australia’s traditional markets has impacted on rural communities. Many of these communities are now facing economic and population decline (McKenzie 1994 cited in Tonts 1999; Prichard & McManus (eds.) 2000). Changes and choices in lifestyle, employment, income expectations and demand for services drive the movement of people and economic activities – these are social trend changes (Collits 2003). However, the cost of providing and maintaining infrastructure and services, particularly in the light of the aging and declining population in rural and remote areas, is also creating regional development challenges and has resulted in
rationalisation of services in many instances, creating further rural decline. Australia’s regional development policy is considered to have contributed to or intensified spatial inequalities and this decline (Pritchard & McManus (eds.) 2000; and Alexander 1994; Smailes 1997; and Lawrence 1995 cited in Tonts 1997).

Another influential factor that shapes the nature of regional development in Australia is that Australia has scarce resources to allocate to regional development, unlike the United State, United Kingdom or Europe (Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003). Access to funding for regional development is dictated by the relationship with the Federal Government. The Federal Government collects 75 percent of the public revenue, but State and Local Government undertake much of the regional development activity (Dore & Woodhill 1999; Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003).

**Australian and Queensland regional development**

The influence of the previously mentioned regional development theories and the Australian-specific issues are evident in the Federal and Queensland regional development approaches and practices (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003). The regional development approaches build on the competitive and comparative advantages of regions and involve place-based economic development projects and initiatives. Other features of practices include activities and programs aimed at skilling and empowering communities and collaborative projects, often initiated by communities, to address regional issues and opportunities – ‘bottom-up’ driven regional development.

At the national level, regional development is delegated as a responsibility of the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government (as at 2008). This Department implements the national regional development policies and programs. Under the Howard Government, this Department was called the Department of Transport and Regional Services. The programs the Department delivered occurred through a network of Area Consultative Committees set up across Australia comprising regional stakeholders. The Rudd Government has replaced those committees with Regional Development Australia (RDA) Committees. The Rudd Government intends to build closer links between the RDAs and Local Government. Their role is to:

- Advise on community infrastructure
- Advise on regional issues and opportunities
Advise on local implementation of specific Commonwealth initiatives in the region, as requested
Facilitate economic development planning and investment attraction
Identify any unique local attributes that would favour the development of new and innovative industries
Promote initiatives to retain and expand skills and local businesses and industries
Disseminate information about Commonwealth programs
Undertake ad hoc consultations on behalf of Federal agencies where a regional network is required
Advise on adequacy of service delivery in regions
Build networks and relationships with other levels of government and key stakeholders in the region
Advise government on social inclusion issues
Advise on ways to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and coordination of Commonwealth regional initiatives.


Following the elections in 2007 the Rudd Government has also established the Better Regions program (Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government 2008). The focus is to contribute to investment in important community infrastructure to enhance liveability in regions and has commenced with $176 million to fund project identified by regional communities.

Other Federal Government Departments offer programs that contribute to regional development. Some examples include assisting research and innovation in industry, labour force skill development, technology transfer and improving business management skills. Whilst not directly tagged as regional development funds, the activities and outcomes contribute to regional development. A recent initiative under the Rudd Government is Centrelink’s Climate Change Adjustment Program. This aims to assist primary producers who are likely to be affected by climate change and also those affected by drought, and includes funds for training, risk management, and to seek professional advice.

Each State has developed GA structures, programs and initiatives to address regional development. Table 2.2 on page 35-37 is a summary of lead GAs involved in regional development, (as at September 2006). There have been changes since this audit of organisations was undertaken, including new organisations or frameworks following State elections and machinery of government changes. However, despite changes, this snapshot illustrates the fact that each State has an individual approach. Roles, responsibilities and practices amongst the different Departments and statutory bodies set up for economic and regional development however, are very similar. Victoria, Western Australian and Tasmania State Governments individually passed Acts in their
respective States, to support the structures which are set up. Tasmania has a formal partnership with Local Governments. Tasmania’s Act the *Tasmania Together Progress Board Act 2001* was set up to establish a body to monitor, promote and report on the 20-year social, environmental and economic plan for the State, known as ‘Tasmania Together’.

**Holistic regional development approaches**

Regional development is often considered primarily from a regional *economic* perspective evidenced in Table 2.2. The increasing pressures from globalisation, the influence of technology, social welfare issues, ageing population and industry structural adjustment require that regional strategies and policies look beyond ‘economic’ and are holistic. ‘Tasmania Together’, and ‘Growing Victoria Together’, being recent strategies demonstrating the incorporation of the broader spectrum of factors involved in regional development. The Queensland Government is also taking a more holistic approach. The Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry, was developing Regional Strategies based on key high growth areas that incorporated the collective activities of multiple Government Departments (at 2008).

There is a growing acknowledgement of the role of Local Government in regional development. This is evident in the newly named Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government at the Federal level, and Western Australia’s Department of Local Government and Regional Development.

**Table 2.2**  
*Summary of individual State’s structures for regional development (as at 2006).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government agencies</th>
<th>Departments responsible for regional development</th>
<th>Regional development objectives and mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Australian Capital Territory | The Capital Region Development Board (CRDB), previously the Australian Capital Region Development Council (ACRDC) is a joint initiative of the NSW and ACT Governments and was initiated in 1994 to facilitate sustainable economic, employment and investment development in the South East Region of NSW and the ACT. | The Council has two major roles:  
- taking a strategic approach to economic and community development in the region; and  
- selective project facilitation.  

The strategic role involves setting the strategic directions for the region, developing regional networks, lobbying on behalf of the region and providing advice to government on important issues. The organisation also facilitates projects and activities supporting the regional vision in the economic development strategy. It provides support to leverage funds from other sources, liaises with relevant Government tiers and GAs. Activities support government priorities for increasing exports, increasing regional investment, building economic capacity by supporting entrepreneurship, increasing employment and diversity of business, promoting the region and developing regional leadership and entrepreneurship. |

Table 2.2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of State and Regional Development</th>
<th>Regional development division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a range of services and programs to assist regions in NSW meet challenges through partnership between government and business and communities. DSRD works actively to build a strong state by delivery services to regional enterprises, industries and communities and recruits new investment to regional NSW. There are 20 DSDR offices and the Department supports Regional Development Boards. There are a range of programs that both attract investment and support relocation to NSW, including payroll and tax incentives, assistance with other costs and infrastructure. There is also a program specifically designed to assist regional areas hit by economic shock.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Department of Economic Development | The Tasmanian Development Board is responsible for the industry related activities of economic development. The Board focuses on investment and employment through implementation of the Government’s economic and social strategies. It has responsibility under the Tasmanian Development Act 1983 and owns the legal entity Tasmanian Development and Resources. There is a Partnerships Agreement with the Tasmanian Government and Local Governments. The partnership Agreements set out how the State and Local Governments will work together for social, economic and environmental outcomes. However, there are no statements particularly about regional development. The regional offices undertake business, industry and economic development activities. |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Department of Trade and Economic Development (DTED) is the South Australian Government’s key economic development agency.</th>
<th>DTED has the following objectives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase business investment • Maintain an internationally competitive business climate • Facilitate major projects • Encourage innovation • Promote trade • Ensure the development of a highly skilled workforce • Create and retain jobs • Build sustainable communities in regional South Australia. Work is guided by the State’s strategic plan, which it is regionalising. South Australia is regionalising its Strategic Plan. It includes 98 targets for the State under six policy areas including growing prosperity, improving well being, attaining sustainability, fostering creativity and innovation, building communities and expanding opportunity. The State’s framework for regional development is based on the 13 Regional Development Boards (RDBs). There is a Regional Communities Consultative Council (RCCC) which is an independent advisory body established by the Government to make recommendations to the Minister for Regional Development to help Govt. and communities strengthen community capacity to respond to local issues, including social, economic and environmental areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry</th>
<th>Aim of DTRDI is to capitalise on Queensland’s advantages to grow regional economies and strengthen industries, through delivering a range of services to achieve regional economic growth, transform and build up industries, assist business owners improve operational and management skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Innovation, Industry and Regional Development</th>
<th>Regional Development Victoria (RDV) was established as a statutory body by the Regional Development Victoria Act 2002, and began operation on 3 March 2003. The primary purpose of RDV is to facilitate economic, infrastructure and community development in provincial Victoria. RDV provides a coordinated approach to delivering programs, resources and services to rural and regional Victoria. RDV works with business and community groups and other Department agencies at all levels. RDV is the Government’s lead agency for shaping policy and building stronger economies, communities and infrastructure to create a strong and growing rural and regional Victoria.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 2.2 continues...
Table 2.2. continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government agencies</th>
<th>Departments responsible for regional development</th>
<th>Regional development objectives and mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Australian Government <a href="https://www.wa.gov.au">www.wa.gov.au</a></td>
<td>Department of Local Government and Regional Development</td>
<td>The Department of Local Government and Regional Development's vision is to increase the capacity of our multicultural communities to develop good government, economic growth, social well-being and environmental sustainability. A regional development policy has been produced. The Policy details how the government will work in partnership with regional communities to achieve improved programs and services. Every major aspect or regional activity is covered in the 16 outcomes, 86 outcome priorities and 111 strategies including economic development, natural resource management, health issues and recreation pursuits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Government set up nine Commissions covering all of Western Australia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The role of the nine commissions is detailed in the Regional Development Commissions Act 1993.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from individual State’s websites listed in the first column.

Source: Developed for this research.

Queensland

Within Queensland there has been some considerable flux relating to regional development. The State does not have a regional development strategy that covers the whole State, at the time of writing (May 2008). Until the election in 2004, the Department of State Development (DSD), renamed the Department of State Development and Innovation (DSDI) after the 2004 elections, had a division called the Office of Regional Development. This unit was responsible for overseeing the regional development of Queensland by coordinating input of needs and issues from the regions to government, providing input to policy development, supporting the regional offices of DSD in their regional development activities and developing tool and processes, and providing grants to assist regional economic development.

The office was disbanded after the 2004 election and the proposed focus was to devolve much of regional development activities to the regional offices by supporting them to take a leadership role in their regions. This included developing regional economic development strategic priorities for selected regions and working collaboratively with other agencies and organisations on projects and initiatives that would contribute to the Queensland Government priorities. The regional offices were expected to facilitate industry clusters, implement strategies to deliver products and services to grow regional business and develop regional economies, and work with other stakeholders to leverage funds from the Federal Government to help to implement...
the regional economic development priority projects. This approach reflects much of the endogenous growth theory (Romer 1986), industry clustering and building on regional competitive advantage (Porter 1990).

Within DSDI, a new unit called ‘Industry Sustainability’ was then formed. One of the unit’s objectives was to grow regional business and build regional economies. Many of the functions, tools and programs used by the previous Office of Regional Development remained in this unit.

There followed a number of other changes, including removal of ‘Innovation’ from the Department’s title, the inclusion and then subsequent removal of ‘Trade’ in Departmental activities, until the current situation in 2007. After a change in the Premier of Queensland, and the gaining of a new Minister, the Department again resumed a strong focus on regional development. This is reflected in its name ‘Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry’. It was intended that a regional development strategy be developed for key high growth areas in Queensland. Part of the strategy included focusing attention on high performing regions under the ‘Centres of Enterprise’ program. This program was aimed at building on the regional strengths, facilitating growth of high performing and technology smart industries, thus advancing the ‘Smart State’ capabilities for Queensland.

Elections in early 2009 have since resulted in yet another machinery of government change, the creation of a large department, the Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation (DEEDI), within which the agency for Economic and Industry Development and Innovation is located. This agency has a unit involved in regional development. The focus has changed, with the impact from the global economic crisis, to employment and job creation as well as regional development.

2.2.3 Sustainable regional development

Whilst regional development has waxed and waned in popularity over time and at both the Federal and State levels, sustainable regional development has gained increasing attention over the past decade. The stronger focus on sustainability emerged from the Bruntland Report of 1987 Our Common Future presented to the World Commission on Environment and Development (Dore & Woodhill 1999). This report triggered a global interest in the formulation of sustainable regional development
policies, programs and strategies. Of significance is the Agenda 21 Agreement, an outcome from the Rio Earth Summit in 1992.

Australia’s response to implementing Agenda 21 was undertaken in a series of individual steps. Initially, Australia’s approach was sectoral. Nine working groups, were set up to consider the implementation of ecologically sustainable development principles for different sectors of Australia's economy which have major environmental impacts. These were identified as agriculture; forest use; fisheries; mining; energy production; energy use; manufacturing; tourism; and transport. A report from these groups was produced in 1991 with more than 600 recommendations.

This was followed in 1992 by an inter-governmental process that all governments endorsed called The National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development (Dore & Woodhill 1999).

**ESD principles**

The ESD principles are contained within the 1992 National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development, (Ecological Sustainable Development Steering Committee 1992), and are defined as ‘development which aims to meet the needs of Australians today, while conserving our ecosystems for the benefit of future generations’ (‘National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development’ 2009). The strategy also states that ESD includes:

- Integrating the economic, social and environmental concerns and needs of the community
- Accounting properly for the economic costs of environmental degradation
- Accepting that each generation is responsible for the welfare of future generations
- Understanding environmental risk and uncertainty
- Understanding the global scale of environmental issues.

As such there are three objectives of ESD:

1. To enhance individual and community well-being by following a path of economic development that safeguards the welfare of future generations
2. To provide for equity within and between generations
3. To protect biological diversity and maintain essential ecological processes and life support systems.

Two main principles that underpin the objectives are:

- Incorporating ESD in decision-making, and
- The precautionary principle defined in Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration (1992) where lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for
failure to take action to prevent threats of serious or irreversible environmental damage.

Since these early agreements and development of the National Strategy, Australia has continued to work on improving the application of ESD principles and Agenda 21 actions. This has included passing a number of Acts, and developing and implementing a range of policies and strategies. Some examples include the National Strategy for Conservation of Australia’s Biological Diversity 1996, the National Local Government Biodiversity Strategy 1998, The Water (Allocation and Management ) Act 2000 and in Queensland, the Integrated Planning Act 1997.

A major impediment to Australia’s environmental management has been precise knowledge regarding the state of the environment. To this end Australia has now developed a ‘State of the Environment’ report which the Federal Government produces every five years. In addition a ‘National Land and Water Resources Audit’ will be regularly conducted.

A challenge arising from GAs applying ESD principles in policy making and programs, as indicated in the ‘National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development’, is the number of conflicting factors that have to be reconciled. These include consideration of both short and long-term goals, the degree of scientific uncertainty regarding the impacts of some courses of action, and the need to negotiate trade-offs when balancing environmental, social and economic outcomes in policies and program.

The Commonwealth and State Governments have put in place an Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment (Environmental Protection Agency 2007).

Federal Government initiatives to encourage sustainable regional development

An example of a Federal Government initiative to support sustainable regional development is the ‘Sustainable Regions Program’ that was offered by the Department of Transport and Regional Services (DoTaRS). This program has assisted communities that identified issues impacting on their sustainability. The program offered a planned and integrated approach to finding solutions for regions facing economic, social or environmental change. There have been 10 regions utilizing this program. (Department of Transport and Regional Development Services 2007). In addition, the National
Office of Local Government and Environment Australia set up a partnership to assist Local Governments to address Agenda 21 issues.

**Queensland Government initiatives to address sustainable regional development**

The Queensland Government established a process to assist all GAs and the general community to adopt ESD principles and has implemented principles and practices that build on ideas developed at the ‘Sustainable Queensland –Sustainable Jobs Summit’ held in August 2000. The Government included ESD elements in legislation such as the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*, *The Nature Conservation Act 1992* and the *Coastal Management Act 1995*.

Queensland identified a number of key principles for its policy on sustainability which included incorporating short and long term economic, social and environmental considerations in decision-making; ensuring health, diversity and productivity of the environment is maintained for the future; ensuring a fair share of resources and opportunity amongst present generations; adopting the precautionary principle which means that lack of scientific certainty is an inadequate reason for failing to take action to prevent environmental degradation; conserving biological and ecological diversity by protecting the variety of life forms, genetic diversity and ecosystems; and internalizing environmental costs into the cost of products to cover the true costs and life cycle costs of protecting and restoring environmental damage (from when inputs are produced through to waste disposal).

**Australia’s performance in sustainable regional development**

An evaluation report on the implementation of the National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development (1993-1995) listed the following achievements:

- The use by a number of jurisdictions of ESD objectives in legislation
- The use of state based environmental planning policies
- Numerous local government programs implementing ESD, for example salinity control
- Introduction of ESD approach to policy making, including, for example, the creation of the South Australian Environment and Natural Resources Cabinet Committee, the Tasmanian Sustainable Development Advisory Council and the establishment of the New South Wales Pricing Tribunal
- Inclusion in ESD in school curricula
- Changes to fisheries management
- Efforts to coordinate agricultural programs through Rural Partnership program
Cooperative national initiatives such as LandCare
Work to develop sustainability indicators

A subsequent report was completed by the Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (1996). The report notes that a few key sectors such as agriculture, mining and manufacturing demonstrate most visible efforts. It is difficult to fully determine progress and adoption of the principles. The report notes that there is increasing reflection of principles and objectives of the ‘National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development’ in government decision-making. Some jurisdictions are providing tools and educating the community. Managing costs and conflict in adopting the principles was noted as still posing challenges and a lag between action and impact on the environment. Agencies are also adopting institutional and legislative changes to support ESD.

An investigation by the Productivity Commission (1999) identified that a number of agencies considered ESD to relate primarily to the environment, and as a consequence, because their core business did not relate to environmental matters, they did not apply ESD principles to decision-making and policy development. The difficulty for Governments is that they must regulate others as well as apply ESD principles in their own planning and policy development. The Productivity Commission recommended the application of output based management as a tool to assist departments and agencies develop, monitor and coordinate policies designed to achieve ESD objectives.

Other literature such as the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development(OECD) report (April 1998) and Environment Australia identified the limitations of Australia’s efforts in sustainable development. Australia’s performance in sustainable development suggests that there is limited action in Australia in support of sustainability, despite many studies and reports demonstrating the long-term benefits to Australia (Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003). Perhaps this is due to Australia’s reluctance to change the current type of economic growth, redesign older industries and embrace new ones. In addition, it was highlighted that there is no proper process to tackle sustainable regional development, which would achieve desired outcomes and engage business and community in adopting more sustainable practices. Dore and Woodhill (1999) cited in Beer, Maude and Pritchard (2003) suggest that the devolution of legislative powers, decision-making authority and resources to regional organisations could well improve Australia’s performance in sustainable regional development.
The OECD (1998) review of Australia’s environmental performance suggests a possible cause for the limited performance of Australia. The review indicates that Australia tends to focus more on economic objectives than sustainable development factors, with rural producers and manufacturers focused on economic survival. This attitude tends to be supported at the political level also, to protect short-term economic and political interests. The Regional Forests Agreement is cited as an example.

**Climate change**

The impacts of climate change have become the new inspiration for sustainable regional development. Since the 2007 Australian Government elections, at national and state levels, climate change committees and special organizations have been set up. The Rudd Government established a Department of Climate Change, and ratified the Kyoto Agreement. The purpose of the Department of Climate Change is to address associated economic, social and environmental issues. The Australian Government has committed to addressing the issues and to contribute to global efforts relating to management of climate change. This includes reducing emissions; working with the international community and preparing for the inevitable impacts of climate change. The Australian Government has embraced a comprehensive plan of action to reduce national emissions. Key elements include: reducing greenhouse gas emissions; study on reducing emissions; modeling and analysis in short, medium and long term; implementing an emissions trading scheme; setting up renewable energy sources; investing in research; reducing land emissions; and assisting business and households to manage energy more wisely (Department of Climate 2008).

Queensland has established an Office of Climate Change within the Environmental Protection Agency. In addition, the Queensland Climate Change Centre of Excellence has been set up. This office has been established to conduct research and to provide information and research into climate change and its impact in Queensland. Queensland also has a climate change strategy ‘ClimateSmart 2050’. (Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Climate Change 2007).

**2.2.4 Regional development stakeholders**

Regional development stakeholders refer to groups and individuals that benefit from, having a stake in regional development projects, activity or the outcomes; are a key contributor of resources; or may be impacted by a regional development policy. The Government and the Community are the two broad groups of stakeholders. Within
Community there are many sub-group stakeholders. Some examples of sub-groups include farmers, youth, the disadvantaged, Community interest groups, ratepayers and the private sector and industry sectoral groups.

**Business and industry**

Stakeholders in the business and industry community may include all business and industry operators or involve specific target industry sectors or economic activities, for example, agri-business, manufacturing or tourism. The business and industry community is both a benefactor and a contributor to regional development, benefitting from the opportunity to grow and prosper. This is in terms of achieving increased profits and longevity of operation (and thus employment), which in turn contributes to individual business operator wealth and economic outcomes for the region. An important area that links both public and private sectors as contributors and beneficiaries, is that of public/private partnerships for example, to provide infrastructure or for major projects within regions.

**Government departments and agencies**

GAs are stakeholders in regional development due to the fact that elements of their core business rely on successful outcomes for specific components of regional development. These include, but are not limited to: protection and management of natural resources; rural adjustment following changes in markets for primary industry products; equity of access to education and training; increase in regional employment opportunities; improved accessibility to health services; and the development of a priority industry sector in a region.

**2.2.5 The Government and GA role in regional development**

There is considerable debate about the role of Government in regional development. As Gary Banks, Chairman of the Productivity Commission indicated in his address *Meeting the challenges of change in Regional Australia* (2000), Government is limited in what it can and should do, to support regional development.

As identified earlier (page 30), the 21st Century role of Government in regional development is more of a facilitator and partner to support communities in their self-help regional development activities, building on the region’s competitive advantage and using strategic partnerships. The Government role is also as creator of an environment that fosters regional development, through appropriate policy development.
and a regulatory framework that support business and industry innovation and growth. Programs and policies are aimed at facilitating for example, labour skill development, export market expansion, investment attraction, improved services to community and supporting community leadership (Collits 2003; Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003; Department of Transport and Regional Services 2001).

The role of the three levels of Government in regional development

With three levels of Government in Australia, each level has a different role relating to their authority and responsibilities in regional development. Whilst the Federal Government is primarily involved at the higher policy level, the State Governments and particularly Local Governments are more intimately involved in the practical application of regional development activities for regional development outcomes.

Despite the greater actual involvement by State and Local Government in regional development, Sorenson (2000) indicates that the Federal Government still has considerable influence. This arises from the type of business operational environment that Government fosters through the formulation of Acts and regulations, Trade Agreements, allocation of funds for grants and subsidies, and the macro and micro economic policies developed. In addition, Federal Government is responsible for telecommunications infrastructure, which is a key enabler to regional development, and controls the social security system and university education, which relate to two other major regional development influences. As the key revenue collector, it also is strongly placed for funding regional development programs and to contribute to infrastructure development.

The role of State Governments in regional development is more of a service provider (education, health, infrastructure) and environmental manager according to Sorensen (2000). There are some individual programs and funds developed at the State level that support business and industry growth. However, the level of funds they receive from the Federal Government, or can raise through State taxes, restricts the States’ efforts in regional development.

Local Government has gained an increasingly greater role in regional development in the last decade, but with no increase in power and limited resources (Dore & Woodhill 1999). The regional development involvement arises from the Local Government responsibility for:
- land use planning, regulation and approval of development affecting economic development and employment
- position of leadership - responsibility to and representation of, local communities and their well-being
- provision of some funding for community development and enhancement (cultural, environmental programs and initiatives)
- implementation of Federal and State programs and planning structures
- Place management initiatives
- By-laws controlling business and community activities
- Investment attraction
- Provision of infrastructure and services, including through joint venture delivery
- Promotion of tourism and regional attractions and cultural activities
- In some regions, offering incentives for investment attraction
- Management of sustainable development agenda through the land use planning and environmental management role
- Its role as a regulator on behalf of the State and Federal Governments.


The role of Local Government in regional development has evolved, creating challenges and pressures for Local Governments and local governance roles (Bellamy, Meppem, Goreddard & Dawson 2003). Increased responsibilities and community expectation of the role of Local Government, combined with increasing costs and the challenges facing rural communities has created considerable financial and service delivery challenges for small Local Governments. Bellamy et al. see three key principles to enhance local governance: setting up appropriate institutional arrangements; capacity building; and developing knowledge to resource the transition to local governance.

At the Local Government level, there are many barriers to regional development. Some examples are: absence of a shared agenda; mistrust about funds following plans; no structural coordination between Department Heads and Local Governments; and no real commitment to subsidiarity and devolution (Spokes 2004). Amongst the challenges noted in the Preparing Queensland Local Government for the Challenges of the 21st Century (Local Government Reform Commission 2007) are:

- Sustaining social fabric and viability in large areas in the west
- Rural economies under transition from traditional primary production to diverse economic activities
- Intense economic activity for some areas following mining booms, requiring millions of dollars worth of infrastructure provision
Managing growth in regional and coastal cities and SE Queensland
Managing impacts from climate change; and
Responding to community expectations for environmentally sustainable development.

These factors and others such as local governments being under-resourced and under-skilled have led to the recent local government amalgamations in Queensland in 2007 to create larger entities. The combined resources and increased rate base is anticipated to contribute to and improve viability as an operational unit. Whether this means greater regional development capacity and improved regional development outcomes from these larger entities remains to be seen.

Queensland has set up a protocol between State and Local Governments setting out the roles and responsibilities of each. The protocol also articulates the ‘spirit’ of and need to be committed to cooperation and collaboration required to address the issues facing local government areas. (Queensland Government March 2006).

The government and its policy development role

Government policies are a powerful influence on regional development. Effective policies concern four key areas: getting the basics right; assisting regions to realise their potential; consideration of selective incentives, and dealing with inequality of outcomes (Bureau of Industry Economics (BIE) 1994). The BIE sees that central to policies are those that affect the business environment, for example financial management of the public sector; provision of infrastructure and amenities; competition and the regulatory framework; operation of the labour market and the stability and predictability of policy.

Policy development is fraught with the internal conflict of trade-offs between equity and efficiency (Tonts 1999) and complexity of and interdependencies in the environment to which the policies apply. Policy challenges and debates facing government at all levels concern the interdependencies of policy settings economically, socially and environmentally; increasing volatility and uncertainty of a globalising and fragmented world leading to expectations that Government will address the competing priorities of security and freedom (Hutton & Giddens 2000; also OECD 2001; Bauman 1999; and Dror 2001 cited in Wiseman in Rainnie & Grobbelaar 2005). Wiseman also indicates there is criticism regarding the managerialist faith in hierarchical and rational planning involving linking mission statements, goals, objectives, programs and
performance as clear cause and effect chains (Rhodes 1997; Bogason 2000; Considine 1994 cited by Wiseman in Rainnie & Grobbelaar 2005).

The interconnectedness of policy decisions upon regional development outcomes is demonstrated by the rationalisation of services in rural regions, implementation of the national competition policy, and the fiscal and trade policies which were focused on building Australia’s competitiveness and productivity. Such policies have resulted in a range of impacts on regions and their communities, including an increase in regional disparity (Pritchard & McManus (eds.) 2000; Sorensen 2000).

Following the Regional Australia Summit in 1999 a mechanism was set in place to identify the regional impact of any new policy, requiring policies to be assessed and a ‘Regional Impact Statements’ provided. Whilst this mechanism will not affect the issues identified, it hopefully means that policy development and implementation will be better informed, scoped and evaluated, with the impact on and the interest of regions being considered.

Sorenson (2000), in looking at regional policy challenges also echoes the complexity of the policy development environment raised earlier and notes the following:

- Many issues that Government has to manage, that cannot be controlled by Government
- The need for inter-GA coordination and cooperation across three levels of Government for policy development
- Political cycles making policy development unstable
- Regional needs and issues changing as regions are affected by external factors
- Community expectations of Government and its role
- Limits of competency in government to develop policy on complex issues.

What does become clear is that development of regional policy reflects some unrealistic expectations of Government in terms of achieving spatially even development; difficulties regarding the Government’s role and type and level of intervention (Collits June 2000). Regional policy is about a deliberate attempt by Government to influence regional development outcomes for the economy, community or the environment, or all three areas (Collits September 2003). Collits sees the policy approach polarising to two overarching goals of decentralisation and reducing inter-regional disparity. With so many players and externalities affecting the regional
development environment there are limits to what regional policies can achieve. Collits (September 2003) has identified that there is some consensus regarding regional policy:

- Sustainable development
- Regionalism and regional competitive advantage
- ‘bottom-up’ and community driven
- Facilitation, partnerships, self-help ethos and emergence of new meso level organisations
- Importance of regional leadership
- Focus on growing existing business and industry, rather than industry attraction
- Selective and targeted regional assistance, not open ended assistance

**GAs in regional development**

The other Government role in regional development takes place through the GAs as instruments of Government. The Government delegates a specific role, responsibility and budget allocation to the GAs, which forms their core business charter. Key performance indicators (KPIs) are developed by the GAs to fulfil the charter and account for budget expenditure.

The nature of regional development and the spectrum of outcomes that it involves (refer to Table 2.1, page 28) require that there is inter-GA collaboration in most regional development activities and projects. Whilst some GAs are directly associated with regional development, others contribute to the regional development environment as a result of outcomes from programs and services that address particular public needs, interests and issues. Table 2.3 presents a selection of GAs at the Federal and State (Queensland) level as at 2007, indicating their role/responsibility and commenting on each GA’s contribution to regional development. For the purpose of this investigation, the contribution of each agency is categorised into three key areas:

- Enhancing and managing the environment in which business and industry operate
- Social and cultural support and development to improve the quality of life and capacity of communities
- Environmental and resource management and protection to ensure sustainability and availability for the future

From Table 2.3 it can be seen that activities undertaken by GAs include export market development, facilitating Trade Agreements, designing and implementing programs and initiatives to develop workforce skills, provision of funds for business and industry development, innovation and access to technology, as well as to support
community projects to enhance social, cultural and quality of life in communities; programs and initiatives to protect the environment and manage resources, and to improve health and well-being in communities. Table 2.3 demonstrates that multiple agencies contribute to regional development through their various roles and responsibilities.

**Table 2.3**

*Examples of GAs role and responsibility and contribution to regional development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>ROLE/ RESPONSIBILITY AND PROGRAMS</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION TO REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry—Australia</td>
<td>Agricultural, pastoral, fishing, food and forest industries; Water, soils, and other natural resources; Rural adjustment and drought issues; Rural industries inspection and quarantine; Primary industries research including economic research; Commodity marketing, including export promotion and agribusiness; Commodity-specific international organisations and activities; Administration of international commodity agreements; Administration of export controls on agricultural, fisheries and forestry industries products; Food policy, processing and exports.</td>
<td>Rural and regional area development through the control, support, research, development and marketing of primary industries. The agency also has a regulatory role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts</td>
<td>The Department provides strategic advice and professional support across a wide range of policy areas including: the arts and cultural development; broadcasting and online regulation; information and communications technology; post and telecommunications; intellectual property; and sport. The Department also administers legislation; regulations; grants and incentives to industry and the wider community; and supports advisory councils and committees. In world forums, the Department looks at ways to maximise Australia's opportunities in global markets and on related international treaties and agreements.</td>
<td>Supports regional development through development of the Arts, communication technology and processes and associated industries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education, Science and Training</td>
<td>Education, Science policy, promotion of collaborative research in science and technology, training, including New Apprenticeships and training services and Co-ordination of research policy, research grants and fellowships.</td>
<td>Supports regional development by enhancing regional access to, participation in and benefit from research. Also contributes to regional labour force skill development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Employment and Workplace Relations</td>
<td>Employment policy, including employment services; Job Network; Labour market programs, including the Work for the Dole scheme; Workplace relations policy development, advocacy and implementation; Promotion of flexible workplace relations policies and practices; Coordination of labour market research; Australian government employment workplace relations policy, including administration of the framework for agreement making and remuneration and conditions; Occupational health and safety, rehabilitation and compensation Equal employment opportunity; Work and family issues.</td>
<td>Contributes to regional development through the implementation of labour market programs, and the management of industrial relations that affect labour and job creation/take up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
<td>External Affairs, including- relations and communications with overseas governments; treaties, including trade agreements; bilateral, regional and multilateral trade policy; international trade and commodity negotiations; trade promotion; international development co-operation; diplomatic and consular missions; international security issues, including disarmament, arms control and nuclear non-proliferation; public diplomacy, including information and cultural programs; International expositions; Provision to Australian citizens of secure travel identification; Provision of consular services to Australian citizens abroad; Overseas property management, including acquisition, ownership and disposal of real property.</td>
<td>Contributes to regional development through the negotiation of Trade Agreements and marketing of Australian products and capability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3 continues...
Table 2.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>ROLE/ RESPONSIBILITY AND PROGRAMS</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION TO REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transport and Regional Services</td>
<td>Transport safety, including investigations Land; Civil aviation and airports, including aviation security; Delivery of regional and rural specific services; Maritime time transport including shipping; Regional development; Matters relating to local government; Planning and land management in the Australian Capital Territory; Administration of the Jervis Bay Territory, the Territory of Cocos (Keeling) Islands, the Territory of Christmas Island, the Coral Sea Islands Territory, the Territory of Ashmore and Cartier Islands, and of Commonwealth responsibilities on Norfolk Island; Constitutional development of the Australian Capital Territory; Constitutional development of the Northern Territory of Australia; Natural disaster relief in the form of financial assistance to the States and Territories.</td>
<td>Contributes to regional development through its role as key agent for transport and as a source of funding for regional development projects under the Regional Solutions and Regional Partnerships programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources</td>
<td>Manufacturing and commerce including industry and market development; Industry innovation policy and technology diffusion; Promotion of industrial research and development; Mineral and energy industries, including oil and gas, and electricity; Energy-specific international organisations and activities; Biotechnology, excluding gene technology regulation; Export services; Energy and resources science and research; Geoscience research and information services, Marketing, including export promotion, of manufactures and services; Investment promotion, attraction and facilitation; Enterprise improvement; Tourism industry; Construction industry; Small business policy and implementation, including business entry point management; Facilitation of the development of service industries generally; Bounties on the production of goods; Patents of inventions and designs, and trade marks; Country of origin labelling; Weights and measures standards; Civil space issues; Analytical laboratory services; Geodesic, mapping, remote sensing and land information co-ordination; Ionospheric prediction; Radioactive waste management; Administration of export controls on energy products.</td>
<td>Contributes to regional development through improving regional industry innovation and overall growth performance, managing natural resource based industry activity and marketing and promoting industry capability for Australian industries and investment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENSLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of State Development and Innovation (as of 2007 Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry)</td>
<td>The Department is responsible for the economic development of Queensland and within this charter is the responsibility to support regional development.</td>
<td>Contributes to regional development through the provision of planning for infrastructure, investment attraction, policy input on regional matters, grants and programs to assist regional and industry development, focusing on Centres of Enterprise – high performing economic regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>The Department supports and provides advice to the Premier and Cabinet. It also provides public sector leadership by ensuring the effective, efficient and timely achievement of the Government's priorities through proactive and collaborative leadership. Actions include:</td>
<td>Contributes to regional development through engaging communities and providing a conduit to government on issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordinating and fostering cross-agency whole-of-government and policy initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fostering community engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collective assess strategic issues for policy development and service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure delivery on government priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Communities</td>
<td>The Department delivers community services to the public and strengthen and protect the well-being of Queenslanders. They deliver services to youth, aged, special needs, disabled, children, volunteers, offenders, homeless, disadvantaged, families with a range of needs including crisis, abuse and violence.</td>
<td>Contribution to regional development is indirect in that it responds to the social and community needs and issues in regions. The Department therefore is part of the social fabric supporting and strengthening communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 2.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>ROLE/ RESPONSIBILITY AND PROGRAMS</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION TO REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries</td>
<td>The Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries focuses on innovative world class food, fisheries and fibre industry, using research and technology to ensure world class industry operation and sustainability. They also support rural communities to achieve self-reliance. There are four outputs: Biosecurity, industry development forestry and fisheries. Examples of regional development activities include planning through the SEQ 2021 Rural Futures – Regional Planning Context. This brings two projects together – the Regional Development Strategy for Agriculture within the 2000 SEQ Regional Framework for Growth Management and the SEQ Rural Enhancement Strategy part of the South East Queensland Regional Organisation of Councils activities in ‘Rural Enhancement Strategy for SEQ’. The Rural Futures incorporates the objectives and principles of both projects.</td>
<td>Contributes to regional development through enhancing the performance and competitiveness of primary industries and fisheries and supporting rural communities and farmers to improve rural prosperity and ways of doing business. Research and development contributes to the development of new products, providing diversification opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Protection Agency</td>
<td>The Department’s role is as a lead agent on all environmental matters. It works with community to protect the natural and cultural heritage, and achieve a healthy and sustainable environment to support social and economic well-being. The agency protects natural a cultural heritage, promotes sustainable use of natural capital, ensures a clean environment. In doing this, the agency works with other stakeholders from both public and private sectors.</td>
<td>Contribution to regional development is to protect natural assets and encourage sustainable development and eco-efficient industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Local Government and Planning</td>
<td>The Department develops and improves frameworks for responsive and effective local government, plans sustainable development and manages the built environment. It also manages the distribution of funds to councils for infrastructure. The Office of Urban Management is currently managing the development of SE Queensland. The Department managed the development of the following regional planning projects: Whitsunday, Hinterland and Mackay - WHAM 2015 Regional Planning Project, Central Queensland Regional Growth Management Framework (RGMF), Far North Queensland Regional Plan, Gulf Regional Development Plan, South East Queensland - SEQ 2021 Regional Framework for Growth Management (RFGM), Townsville-Thuringowa Regional Strategy Plan, Wide Bay Regional Plan. ESD principles are fundamental to these plans, as is the concept that they would ensure a coordinated approach to regional development. The consultative process during the development of the plans, acknowledgement of differing GAs responsibilities and programs does take place, thereby creating at least an initial step towards encouraging effective inter-relationships.</td>
<td>As Local Government plays a key role in regional development, this agency and its policies, programs and funding allocation is a key contributor to regional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Infrastructure and Planning (newly formed in 2007)</td>
<td>Newly formed in 2007, reflecting the view that economic development is strongly reliant on infrastructure. Following Government acknowledgement of Queensland’s strong growth and increased demand for social and economic infrastructure, growing threat to such fundamental services and supply of water, this department is focused on achieving sustainable development for Queensland through delivery, planning facilitation and coordination of major infrastructure projects. Finite resources such as water and fossil fuels means that strategies and infrastructure development for sustainable delivery of services is required. The Department will guide and see to completion, major resource and infrastructure projects to deliver social and economic infrastructure. (Ministerial Statement 2007-2008)</td>
<td>Sustainable development and efficient and smart use of resources have become a fundamental building block for sustainable regional development. The focus on provision of major infrastructure for example water and energy is fundamental to supporting regional development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3 continued...
### Table 2.3 continues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>ROLE/ RESPONSIBILITY AND PROGRAMS</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION TO REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Employment and Industrial Relations</td>
<td>The role of this Department is to lead policy development and deliver services that ensure a safe, equitable and productive work environment to support the continued economic growth and social well being in Queensland.</td>
<td>Development of industrial relations regulations, policies and systems underpin constructing a strong and productive workforce which is fundamental to regional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Mines and Energy</td>
<td>The role of this Department is to world class mining industry and sustainable energy market to support economic growth in Queensland.</td>
<td>The agency contributes to regional development through ensuring cost effective and reliable energy supply to industry and ensuring that the mining industry, which is a key contributor to the Queensland economy, is both competitive and safe. Many rural and regional supply chains are attached to the mining sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Treasury</td>
<td>Treasury manages the Queensland Government’s finances and focuses on strengthening the State’s economic and fiscal position. It provides policy expertise and advice, and the strategic and financial services framework for Government to achieve sustainable long-term economic and fiscal performance.</td>
<td>Treasury is fundamental to regional development, through its role to control government fiscal performance, spending, budget allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Roads</td>
<td>Responsible for much of the road infrastructure which in such a regionalised state, is of considerable importance to regional development.</td>
<td>Transport and distribution are fundamental to regional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Transport</td>
<td>The Department’s role and responsibility is to deliver and operate efficient and integrated services and infrastructure.</td>
<td>Transport and distribution are fundamental to regional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Employment and Training (as of Department of Education, Training and the Arts)</td>
<td>The Department plays a major role in improving the quality of life, economy and sustainability of Queensland and its communities. It is focusing on the key Government priority of achieving a ‘Smart State’ through ensuring appropriately skilled workforce to support not only the Smart State agenda, but to ensure maximum employment outcomes. It also contributes to building social capital in the regions and supporting a culture of life long learning and learning communities. The newly formed Department has a vision for a creative and clever Queensland ‘creating a state where knowledge, creativity, innovation, and skills stimulate and enduring economic growth and social development. (Ministerial Statement 2006-07)</td>
<td>The Department plays a key role in regional development through ensuring appropriately skilled workforce, learning communities, access to and knowledge of information sources. Education and training also enable capacity to adjust to new employment opportunities and emerging industries as regional economies change. The focus of the new department is also to enhance community through developing and nurturing the cultural and heritage elements in community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from information on Departments’ websites as cited in the first column.
Source: Developed for this research.

### 2.2.6 Regional development and conflict and issues faced by Government

As evident from Table 2.1 (page 28) and Table 2.3 (page 50-53), regional development is a complex area involving the public and private sectors and influenced by political cycles, policies, impacts of exogenous factors and market forces. In carrying out its role in regional development, various levels of Government are faced with a number of conflicts and issues. A selection is listed below and categorised for this research, to illustrate both the complexity and the spectrum involved. The list has been compiled from a variety of literature sources (Collits 2004; Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003; Pritchard & McManus (eds.) 2003; Dore & Woodhill 1999 cited in Bellamy, Meppem, Goddard & Dawson 2003; Sorenson 2000). These issues contribute
to the difficulties faced by GAs when working together investigated through the research, and reported in more detail in Chapters 3 and 5.

1. **Conflict of national/state/regional needs**
   - The pursuit of the national good at the expense of individual regions
   - Power imbalance between the three levels of government
   - Lack of understanding of regional perspectives which are overshadowed by national objectives for economic growth
   - Conflict of equity and efficiency in expenditure of public monies

2. **Limitations to coordination, cooperation and collaboration**
   - Three tiers of Government that make regional development policy and program design, funding and implementation complex
   - The conflicting and disjointed roles of the three levels of government
   - Competitive federalism
   - Poor inter-GA coordination and cooperation arising from competing priorities and jurisdictional boundaries and responsibilities
   - Bureaucratic structures and culture
   - Conflict amongst the levels of government affects ability to cooperate to achieve sustainable regional development
   - Silo mentality amongst GAs and across levels of Government
   - Multiple agencies and non-government organisations involved in regional development activities, often having different goals and agendas for the region and its development
   - Accountability complexities across the levels of Government

3. **Shifting of responsibilities and inconsistency of policy**
   - Increased pressure on Local Government to take over a greater percentage of regional development responsibility
   - Policy instability due to political cycles
   - Restructuring of GAs and their core business charter following elections
   - Politicisation of regional development
   - Changing policy focus and centralized versus decentralized approaches
   - Subsidiarity and devolution of power

4. **Resource and operational issues**
   - Limited resources in Local Governments to carry out the regional development role
   - Challenge as to where to spend funds in regions – infrastructure or services
   - Lack of cost sharing capacity and structures amongst GAs and levels of Government
   - Small population and resulting limitations to tax base to supply funds
   - Distance creating expense for travel, service delivery and communication infrastructure
5. Competing and conflicting priorities
   - Equity and efficiency and social justice
   - Economic, social and environmental balance in sustainable regional development
   - Freedom and security

6. Exogenous factors
   - Limited Government control over many of the exogenous factors that affect regions such as globalisation, increased market competition, rapidly changing technology
   - Speed of change in regions and the capacity for Government to respond in a timely fashion
   - Regions are challenged to continually renew themselves in response to exogenous factors and need help to do this
   - Market driven regional development combined with policy responses has created regional disparity

2.3 Australian Government structure

This section outlines the structure and function of Government and presents mechanisms that support coordination and inter-relationship of three levels of Government. The section also gives a general overview of joined-up and integrated government activities and ends with a summary of some of the issues and impediments experienced when agencies and levels of Government work together.

2.3.1 Structure and function of Government

As outlined in section 2.2.5 (page 44), Government has a key role in regional development. This section provides a general overview of the structure of Government in Australia, as at 2007. This structure adds a level of complexity to regional development policy, programs and funding allocation as previously noted in section 2.2.2 (page 29). The structure also presents challenges for coordination and integration of the priorities and activities of each level of Government to ensure efficient use of public money, equitable access to delivery of services and to achieve regional development outcomes.

A brief evolutionary history of Government and governance forms part of the literature review in section 3.2 in Chapter 3. The purpose of this section is merely to present the framework of Government and governance arrangements, outline main responsibilities of the different levels of Government and mechanisms for coordination. The section also briefly looks at joined-up government.
Federal Government

The Australian Constitution of 1901 set up the Federal system of government illustrated in Figure 2.3, which distributes power between six States and two Territories. The Constitution determines the law-making boundaries between Federal and State governments. As such, laws can be developed at the Federal level that must be implemented at the State level. States can also make laws, but in the event of a State law contravening a Federal law, the Federal law prevails - a potential area for conflict and mismatch between the levels of government and may be considered to be ‘responsibility without power’ for the States.

Figure 2.3
The structure of Government in Australia

The system of government in Australia reflects the Westminster system where government is divided into three distinct areas comprising the legislative, executive and judicial powers (Parliament of Australia: Education – Parliament An Overview, 2002). The relationship is such that there is a separation of power amongst the three areas. Parliament has the legislative power to make laws; the Executive has the power to administer laws and carry out the activities of government and the Judicature has the judicial power in the country through the court system. Members of the executive must also be members of the legislature.
State Government

Australia has six State Governments and two Territory Governments and each State also has its own Constitution. State Governments are responsible for areas that impact most on everyday life. All States have a Parliament made up of two Houses like the Federal Government, except Queensland, which has only one House of Parliament. The Territories also have only one House – in the case of the Australian Capital Territory, the Legislative Assembly and for the Northern Territory, the Legislative Council. Responsibilities and activities follow the Westminster system similar to the Federal level of Government, with a general separation of powers through the Executive, Judicial and Legislative structure. (Parliament of Australia 2007).

Local Government

Local government bodies, as the third layer of government, are created by legislation at the State and Territory level (Australian Government 2008) and are responsible for making decisions relating to local town/city and regional matters, for example signage, traffic control, libraries, waste management and provision of some infrastructure. Revenue is collected through rates, fees and fines which pay for the services provided by local government. Revenue and is also received from the State and Federal Governments.

Table 2.4 on page 58 illustrates the three levels of Government, their chief areas of concern and some suggested influence upon regional development. Of relevance to the research issue is that both Federal and State Governments set up GAs with specific core business charters, determined by Government, to implement policies and programs, many of which will contribute to regional development.

Table 2.4 also demonstrates that whilst the three levels of Government seem somewhat distinct, there are overlaps and linkages in regional development activities, for example infrastructure. Federal and State level of Government both have GAs that have responsibilities that are similar, for example the Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries in Queensland and the Federal Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Australia. The focus varies from being a national perspective for one and a state perspective for another.
Table 2.4
Areas of main responsibilities of the three levels of Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEDERAL</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEY AREAS:</td>
<td>KEY AREAS</td>
<td>KEY AREAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Defence</td>
<td>• Education</td>
<td>• Guide and shape community through land-use planning and development of by-laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trade and Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>• Health Services</td>
<td>• Are responsible for implementing some Acts and Regulations set at a State or Federal Level eg Environmental Protection Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Telecommunications</td>
<td>• Police and Prisons</td>
<td>• Funding from Federal and State Government and raised through rates and levies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Currency, Postage etc.</td>
<td>• Roads, Rail</td>
<td>• Provision of some infrastructure and services to residents and industry for example libraries, water, waste collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responsible for overall economic and social policy setting</td>
<td>• State Government role similar to Federal Government in terms of developing overall economic and social policies for the State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responsible for taxation</td>
<td>• Development of State Acts and regulations</td>
<td>• Influence on regional development occurs through specific actions such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manages larger issues such as national security and welfare</td>
<td>• Funding from Federal Government and State taxes and levies</td>
<td>- Attracting investment,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides funding to both State and Local Government to pay for services to taxpayers and for programs initiated at the Federal level</td>
<td>• Represents the State nationally in terms of fiscal and trade policies</td>
<td>- Controlling industry development through land use planning and approval of business and industry applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formulates and passes Acts and develops supporting regulations</td>
<td>• Provision of funds to GAs and communities for projects and programs</td>
<td>- Providing some funds, undertaking business development strategies and action plans for their region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Influence on regional development occurs through specific actions such as:
- Development of policies and programs that are focused on achieving State Government priorities in areas such as Health, Education, Environmental and Resource Management for implementation by GAs
- Creating a supportive business and investment environment
- Attracting investment
- Infrastructure planning and development
- Allocating funds to projects, programs and GA service providers

Influences on regional development occur through GAs as instruments of Government:
- Forms and funds a range of GAs such as Department of State Development and Innovation with a core business charter delegated by Government
- Policies, programs and projects implemented by the different GAs that contribute to achieving the priorities and KPIs to deliver their core business
- Some GAs responsible for development of Infrastructure, a key enabler for regional development for example telecommunications

Source: Compiled from information from Australian, State and Australian Local Government websites.
Source: Developed for this research.

Across Australia (States and Territories), there are a large number of GAs, Statutory Boards, Commissions and organizations receiving some funding from Government, for example Regional Development Boards and Natural Resource Management Groups. These organizations implement policies and programs that have been developed at the Federal, State or Local Government level. Each one of these
GAs, organizations and groups has strategies and action plans for activities that will contribute to regional development. The large number of players creates challenges for coordination and integration of regional development activities. The multiplicity of organizations and different levels of government involved in regional development featured as an issue in the evaluation of Regional Development Organisations (Fulop & Brennan 1997).

**Parliament**

Membership of Federal Parliament includes the Queen, who is represented by the Governor-General, and elected representatives in the two Houses of Parliament - the Senate and the House of Representatives. The State Parliaments are similarly structured, with the exception of Queensland and the Territories. These Government structures only have one House. Australia is a constitutional monarchy, a federation and a parliamentary democracy. Parliament has five main functions:

- To provide for the formation of government
- To legislate
- To provide funds needed for government
- To provide a forum for popular representation
- To scrutinise the actions of government.


Many of the functions of Parliament have a strong impact on regional development. This occurs through the formation of Acts and regulations, distribution of taxes, formation of policies and programs and the allocation of funding to the States, Local Government and GAs to support infrastructure development, programs and delivery of government services.

**Cabinet**

Cabinet is the key decision-making area of the Federal and State Governments and is made up of senior Government Ministers. Ratification by the Federal Executive Council, makes the decisions of Cabinet legal.

**Committee system**

Within the system of Government in Australia there is a governance process referred to as the Committee system. This is used to review and monitor government activities, investigate issues and concerns that may lead to new or amended Acts, policies and programs. Organisations and the public can communicate views through
these Committees. Committees also examine public administration and funding. (Senate Brief No 4, December 1998).

In terms of regional development, a Committee can consider regional needs and issues identified both through GAs, and from the community, and are thus a tool and conduit for communities to represent regional concerns, issues and opportunities.

**Coordination and inter-relationship of the three levels of Government**

Having considered the structure of the three levels of government in Australia, and identified some of the main elements of their influence in regional development, an emerging question is: ‘*How do the three levels of government inter-relate and coordinate their activities in regional development?*’ A number of formal vehicles support and enhance the relationship between various levels of government (based on arrangements in 2006). Table 2.5 presents these groups and includes a brief summary of their purpose.

In relation to the research problem, despite these formal arrangements to encourage coordination and cooperation, core business conflict is still very much an issue, but has an added dimension relating to the focus and responsibilities of each level of government that may also cause conflict. For example, due to the fact that Local Government’s role includes provision of infrastructure to support the communities within their jurisdiction, State and Federal priorities may focus on larger infrastructure issues that have a state or national significance.

### Table 2.5

**Formalised groups that enhance relationships between various levels of Government (as at 2006)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Council of Australian Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: <a href="http://www.coag.gov.au/">http://www.coag.gov.au/</a></td>
<td>The Council of Australian Government (COAG) is a forum where national policy reforms can be initiated, developed and implemented as this activity relies on cooperation between the three levels of government. In terms of objectives, the group consider major issues by agreement and cooperation on structural reform of government. They also consider reforms that would achieve an integrated, efficient national economy and single national market. COAG comprises the Prime Minister, State Premiers, Chief Ministers of the Capital Territory and the Northern Territory. The president of the Australian Local Government Association is also a member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ministerial Councils</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Source: http://www.rdcouncil.gov.au/    | Other structures aimed at assisting cooperation between levels of government are the ministerial councils that comprise National, State and Territory ministers and with relevant representatives from Local Government and the governments of New Zealand and Papua New Guinea. These councils meet to develop and implement inter-government action in specific areas. Contention amongst the levels of government include:  
  - Devolution of power  
  - Federal role – monopoly of taxation revenue  
  - State recipients of funds and equity of allowances |

Table 2.5 continues…
Table 2.5 continued

| Area Consultative Committee (operated through DoTaRS) | A national network of Area Consultative Committees (ACCs) exists that operates within and are funded by, the Federal Department of Transport and Regional Services. These committees provide a link between Federal Government and rural and metropolitan Australia. They are volunteer community based organisations that provide a conduit to government on local social and economic conditions. They work in partnership with the Department of Transport and Regional Services identifying opportunities, priorities and development strategies for the regions in which they are located. Their charter is to build community capacity and assist communities to find local solutions to local problems. They work on community growth through building business, creating jobs and fostering sustainable economic development, and work with relevant State departments and agencies associated with these areas. Source: Developed for this research. |
| Australian Local Government Association | The Australian Local Government Association (ALGA) provides a link between the State and Territory Local Government associations and their member councils to the Federal Government. Key activities include representation of local government on national bodies, ministerial councils, providing submissions to government and parliament. The organisation also works to raise the profile and concerns of local government and provides forums to facilitate local government input into the development of national local government policies. Source: Groups and organisations set up to facilitate coordination across levels of Government |
| QUEENSLAND | This Department’s aims to ensure a sustainable ‘built’ environment and effective local government system for Queensland. The Department develops and improves frameworks for enhancing the systems and functions of local governments. Other activities include providing funding to councils for the provision of infrastructure and services, working with councils towards finding the best strategies and actions to achieve sustainable development, providing performance based solutions for planning and ensuring a safe, healthy and environmentally responsive built environment. To fulfil these aims, the organisation has to interface with other GAs. Source: Information drawn from the website references in the left hand column. |
| The CEOs Employment, Economic Development and Infrastructure Committee (with representation from relevant GAS) | This is an inter GA group formed by the CEOs of relevant GAs that meet to discuss cross-regional and inter-GA roles and activities in addressing issues and factors associated with employment, economic development and infrastructure. Source: Information drawn from the website references in the left hand column. |
| Regional Organisation of Councils (larger networks of regional councils such as SouthROC, NorsRoc, WesROC) | These various organisations are aggregations of regional councils which work together to support and advance sustainable regional development amongst their member councils. A number of key activities that are identified include working towards integrated activities in the regions and assessing, monitoring and re-dressing the impact of government policies and programs. These organisations therefore act as a conduit for local governments represented by each ROC to the Federal and State Government. Source: Information drawn from the website references in the left hand column. |
| Community Cabinet and Ministerial Regional Community Forums | Queensland has also developed a system of community engagement that aims at bringing government to the regions through a consultation process set up under the Community Cabinet and Ministerial Regional Forum activities. At Community Cabinet meetings, community groups can make formal deputations to Ministers. The Ministerial Regional Community Forum provides people living in regional Queensland with the opportunity to get involved in Government decision-making processes. Cabinet Ministers use the Forums to gain a regional perspective on government policies, programs and initiatives from input from Forum members. Source: Information drawn from the website references in the left hand column. |
| Regional Managers’ Forums, changed to Regional Managers’ Coordination Networks | Membership includes most senior regional representatives from Local, State and Federal Government and GAs from the three levels of government. The core objectives are to assist GAs to achieve economic, social and environmental benefits for Queensland’s regions through coordinating cross-agency initiatives at the regional level. It is also to ensure that services align with government priorities and community needs by supporting collaboration across state government agencies and with local government, business and community. The aim is to: Source: Information drawn from the website references in the left hand column. |

Source: Information drawn from the website references in the left hand column.

Source: Groups and organisations set up to facilitate coordination across levels of Government
Source: Developed for this research.

Apart from these formal forums and organisations/committees aimed at assisting coordination and cooperation amongst the three levels of government, the Federal and
State Governments cooperate in many areas such as those where the States and Territories are formally responsible. These include education, transport, health and law enforcement. As income tax is levied federally, this is often the subject of strong debate amongst the levels of government regarding access to revenue and duplication of expenditure functions. Bearing in mind the importance of revenue to regional development through programs and activities such as infrastructure development, grants, training and education programs and investment incentives, this area of contention has a considerable potential impact on regional development.

2.3.2 ‘Joined up’ Government

Of particular relevance to this research is joined up government in Australia. This has implications for and is affected by the way GAs relate to one another and work collaboratively within the framework of government. The complexity of regional development requires the coordination and integration of multiple GAs activities, together with other stakeholders. For example a high level of unemployment may involve social issues regarding family structure, family dysfunction, substance abuse, low income levels and access to education, as well as issues relating to the delivery of training, transport, and telecommunications. Sorenson (2002) in his discussion regarding policy issues and regional development identifies competing priorities and complexities in the regional development environment. In addition, the cost of dealing with complex issues is better shared. In terms of improved government service delivery and outcomes, integration and coordination can reduce costs and duplication across Government and amongst GAs (Management Advisory Committee 2004; Institute of Public Administration 2002).

The purpose of this section is to provide a brief overview and comment on joined-up government, because this is an increasing feature of the Government response to complex issues, including those in the regional development environment in which the research problem exists.

International trends

Internationally and within Australia there has been growing pressure to investigate methods for governments and their departments to work more effectively and efficiently. Issues and challenges faced by government include social and technological changes and community attitudes and expectations; pressure for efficiency and effectiveness; ‘voice and choice’ pressures; focus on outcomes; service delivery
collaboration and the associated risks of managing multiple service providers identified by the United Kingdom Cabinet Officer (Cabinet Office 2006).

A study in Canada identified that the old command and control approach was obsolete today and that interdependence, collaboration, and using networks is shaping new ways of working to achieve joint planning and decision-making; integrated service delivery; common practices and standards, and joint report and evaluation (Lenihan et al. 1999). There is strong commitment to government being joined-up and having seamless service delivery (Shergold 2004). Internationally, for example, Canada has been focusing on horizontalism and New Zealand has been investigating integrating policy, before it is owned by a department (Shergold 2004). Shergold notes that whilst the need for this change is obvious, how to do it is not.

**Australia**

Trends towards coordination of Government is strongly evident in Australia. One of the key drivers for joined up government is to reduce costs and improve services (Barrett 2000). Barrett also identifies factors that appear to be fundamental to the success of a joint approach, whether one-off for a project or a longer-term service provider agreement, to adequately address accountability and risk management with each party having a clear understanding of their role and responsibility. Prime Minister Howard indicated there would be an increase in whole-of-government approaches, collectively owned by several Ministers (Barrett 2000).

As identified by the Institute of Public Administration study (2002), the focus for joined up government is to improve the quality and diversity of government service delivery at limited cost; however it also enables agencies to access expertise from across agencies and engage in public-private sector-civil society collaborations. The study points out that this has resulted in a growing number of joint initiatives being developed across the nation and also greater stress to seek more effective and efficient ways of delivering government services and programs, motivated by financial and social pressures.

A range of mechanisms exist that are being increasingly used to facilitate GAs working together, for example partnerships, Memorandum of Understanding (MoUs) and formal Agreements and protocols. Such arrangements assist in overcoming many of the technical problems relating to the jurisdictional, legal, financial, risk and accountability issues. Each is constructed to suit the needs of the collaborative activity
with some examples being integrated service delivery Agreements; one-stop-shops; and special purpose taskforces. Chapter 3 investigates literature and studies aimed at enhancing WOG activities.

The focus for much of the WOG and joined-up approach is high level, the commitment to improving inter-agency collaborative work extends down into agencies at their operational level, for example the social services provider group of GAs identified that a coordinated and integrated approach was more effective to address many issues and would also result in better client service (Queensland Department of Families 2002). To this end the Department of Families produced *A Handbook for Integrated Governance* and a companion guide to assist staff in the Department, and other Departments with whom they worked, to have a tool to assist them in joint projects and service delivery.

The Institute of Public Administration, Australia study (2002) into joined up government identified a number of global factors that are creating pressure for governments to seek ways to integrate and coordinate their activities. These include:

- Globalisation
- Public dissatisfaction with governments
- Rising public expectation of the role and services of governments
- Budget stringency
- Technology improvement

Currently in Australia and Queensland, joined up government can be viewed from two perspectives:

- joining up through individual projects and activities where GAs and different levels of Government have endeavoured to collaborate and integrate activities for a specific purpose or project, which may involve a selection of GAs or be WOG initiatives, and
- joined up government resulting from a formal policy, operational and philosophical approach to effectively integrate the levels of government and their agencies.

The main thrust in Australia relates primarily to the first area. Some project examples include:

- Community renewal project in Queensland
- Safer WA

Source: Project examples from the Institute of Public Administration 2002

However, Centrelink, is more akin to the second joined-up approach. It is a Statutory Authority within the Family and Community portfolio, which delivers
services and coordinates with a range of other GAs to respond to effectively deliver Commonwealth services to eligible customers.

Investigating joined up government therefore, may contribute learnings that will assist in resolving the research question. This is because, in addressing the impediments and issues associated with achieving a joined up approach, elements of GA core business conflicts may also be addressed. Section 2.4 (page 67) explores this linkage further.

From a practical and operational perspective, a number of initiatives have been undertaken that focus on creating internal systems WOG linkages. These initiatives could be considered evidence of an increasing effort to integrate GAs corporate activities. Examples include the Shared Services initiative in Queensland which is a WOG approach to corporate service delivery to standardise some business processes, consolidate technology and pool resources and expertise. Under the model, GAs have joined in clusters for specific activities such as cost effective information and communication technology for finance and human resources, facilities management, and document and records management. CorporateLink, PartnerOne and Corporate Solutions are in the Shared Services Agency. (Queensland Treasury, Shared Services Initiative, viewed 25 July 2008, http://www.sharedservices.qld.gov.au/).

### 2.3.3 Issues and impediments to Government working together

Issues and impediments to government working together is explored in greater detail through the literature review in Chapter 3; however a summary of some of the issues and impediments that have been identified during the research and compilation of this chapter are presented below.

The Institute of Public Administration Australia study *Working Together – Integrated Governance* (2002) identified a number of barriers that impede government working together effectively. Some of these are practical barriers that can be eliminated, such as access to information, incompatible technology platforms used by GAs’ and the costs of setting up and managing shared delivery of services. Other impediments relate to culture and current structures within the public service. Addressing the former is likely to be easier than the latter. Barriers identified are:

- The separation of powers
- Integration of activities is often hindered by the level of Government above where the project has been initiated
Political cycles and their influence on policy, programs and even a GAs existence and structure
- Structural, political and internal relationship barriers
- Conflict of accountability versus flexibility
- Lack of ability to pool funds and then account for them
- Limitations in management capabilities to work cooperatively
- Conflict of strategic vision compared to incremental changes
- Policies and programs that are discrete and associated with the GAs core business only
- Turf wars and protective attitudes towards jurisdictional responsibilities
- Fragmented government
- Competitive federalism
- Devolution and sharing of power within a complex accountability framework
- Budget stringency and accountability

A study undertaken by the Queensland Department of Family Services (2002a) identified issues relating to ‘grass roots’ activities of officers attempting to work with other GAs and across Government:
- Difficulty amongst staff regarding the limits of integration and coordination
- Understanding what ‘governance’ and ‘integrated governance’ means
- The lack of tools, models and guides to assist integrated governance activities
- Cultural barriers which manifest as inflexibility, stalling tactics, jurisdictional gates
- Omission of stakeholders from initial scoping and planning
- Inflexibility of lead agency
- Lack of resources to support projects
- Omission to draw on other colleagues’ experience and expertise
- Individual personalities with their agendas
- Budget already allocated to programs and projects to deliver core business
- Difficulties both internally and from the GAs’ own Ministers

Added to this list are those that emerge from having compiled this Chapter on the regional development environment:
- The hierarchical structure of the three levels of Government
- The position of the Federal Government in collecting tax and allocation of budgets
- Resolving conflicting GA charters for example economic development versus environmental protection
- Competing values and priorities to achieve consideration that ESD principles apply principally to environmental issues
- Interpretation of sustainability varies according to the charter of the GAs involved
- Shifting priorities as a result of changes following elections (Queensland’s oscillating focus on regional development being evidence of this factor)
- Ability to gain agreement on resource allocation, based on election commitments, competing priorities at different levels of Government
• Capacity of Government to respond to impacts from exogenous factors limited by budget and political cycles, and
• Difficulties in current functional/operational factors in Government and GAs working collaboratively resulting in prolonged policy development and cumbersome decision-making processes.

To bring about change and encourage a move towards joined-up government requires both a structural change, as well as a cultural change. Of key importance is political support, and from former Prime Minister John Howard’s statement referred to earlier, this should increase in the future (Barrett, 2000). As such, the focus of this research is timely.

2.4 GAs and their core business and core business conflict

This section outlines the nature of GA core business, its contribution to regional development and what aspects of core business conflict are to be explored through the research. The links with new public sector management practices are introduced, but further explored in section 2.5.

2.4.1 GAs’ core business, its delivery and contribution to regional development

GA core business

Government determines a GA’s roles and responsibilities to deliver on the government priorities and election commitments. The role and responsibilities dictate the charter of a GA. This in turn shapes the Mission and Vision and the Corporate Plan of the GA, including the allocation of budgets and the key performance indicators (KPIs) for the department as a whole and its individual units.

GA core business delivery

The GA structures itself into units or Divisions that are relevant to the key areas that contribute to fulfilling the charter and delivering on the Government’s priorities and election commitments. Each Division and unit within the GA then develops its own business/operational plan and KPIs to contribute to the GAs charter and overall KPIs. This includes the development of programs, services and products. In addition, internal processes, systems and procedures are developed in order for the GA to operate and achieve its KPIs and address their particular area of responsibility relating to the Government’s priorities and election commitments. These are GA-specific.

This bureaucratic structure and manner of operating, while influenced by new public sector management practices (explored further in section 2.5), is insular and
inward focused. This contributes to the functional/operational core business conflicts that arise when GAs have to work together, as the functional/operational elements are designed to achieve each GA’s own core business, espoused in their charter. It is difficult for agencies to see beyond their core business and agency boundaries and they have little financial flexibility (Graycar 2007).

However, with the overall shifting philosophy moving towards joined up government, it is evident from examining the Annual Reports from a number of GAs, that there is a growing inclusion of statements and KPIs in GA plans that refer to working with other agencies and in partnership. The Division/unit or individual person within a GA, working on the joint program or project, usually develops the practicalities and the procedures to work together. As demonstrated by the background research and experience of the writer of this study, there are often problems experienced at this grass roots level of working in partnership or collaboratively with other GAs in regional development. These issues tend to be associated with conflict over core business.

**GA core business and regional development**

Regional development, as outlined in section 2.2, is a complex area and deals with issues and opportunities that encompass the responsibilities of many GAs. Table 2.6 illustrates the connection amongst a selection of the desired regional development outcomes and some of Queensland’s GAs (based on 2006 departments). From the GA list it can be seen that the activities of GAs are very much inter-related. For example, assisting business to grow requires access to skilled labour, research and development, appropriate transport and distribution infrastructure, and suitable industrial land for industry expansion.

**Table 2.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIRED OUTCOMES</th>
<th>GAs THAT CAN CONTRIBUTE (based on agencies in Queensland in 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Creation or retention of employment</td>
<td>• Department of Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvement or introduction of new labour force skills to suit the changing</td>
<td>• Department of Education, Training and the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic structure</td>
<td>• Department of Employment and Industrial Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhancement of human capital</td>
<td>• Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fostering business and rural industry research innovation to become more</td>
<td>• Department of Employment and Industrial Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitive and to develop new products and processes</td>
<td>• Department of Education, Training and the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.6 continues...
Table 2.6 continues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIRED OUTCOMES</th>
<th>GAS THAT CAN CONTRIBUTE (based on agencies in Queensland in 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of services to people in regional Australia, which includes telecommunications, health, welfare and education</td>
<td>Department of Child Safety&lt;br&gt;Department of Communities&lt;br&gt;Department of Corrective Services&lt;br&gt;Department of Education, Training and the Arts&lt;br&gt;Department of Emergency Services&lt;br&gt;Department of Mines and Energy&lt;br&gt;Department of Housing&lt;br&gt;Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation&lt;br&gt;Department of Main Roads&lt;br&gt;Department of Natural Resources and Water&lt;br&gt;Department of the Premier and Cabinet&lt;br&gt;Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries&lt;br&gt;Department of Public Works&lt;br&gt;Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry&lt;br&gt;Disability Services Queensland&lt;br&gt;Queensland Health&lt;br&gt;Queensland Police Service&lt;br&gt;Queensland Transport&lt;br&gt;Queensland Treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of mechanisms to improve social equity and access to services and information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving and protecting the quality of life (for example through areas such as health, learning, leisure quality, security and work).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening and empowering communities and developing leadership skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Improvement of infrastructure<br>Achieving efficient, affordable, reliable and accessible communication | Department of Communities<br>Department of Mines and Energy<br>Department of Housing<br>Department of Infrastructure and Planning<br>Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation<br>Department of Main Roads<br>Department of Natural Resources and Water<br>Department of the Premier and Cabinet<br>Department of Public Works<br>Department of State Development and Innovation<br>Queensland Health<br>Queensland Police Service<br>Queensland Transport<br>Queensland Treasury |
| Strengthening of social and economic bases<br>Industry expansion<br>Economic diversification<br>Increase in Gross Regional Product (GRP)<br>Increase in regional exports<brGreater overall community prosperity<br>Increased investment in the region<br>Improved access to capital<br>Improvement in overall industry competitiveness and productivity | Department of Communities<br>Department of Education, Training and the Arts<br>Department of Emergency Services<br>Department of Employment and Industrial Relations<br>Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation<br>Department of Main Roads<br>Department of Natural Resources and Water<br>Department of the Premier and Cabinet<br>Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries<br>Department of Public Works<br>Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry<br>Queensland Health<br>Queensland Police Service<br>Queensland Transport<br>Queensland Treasury |
| Achieving sustainable natural resource management<br>Environmental sustainability | Department of Mines and Energy<br>Department of Local Government, Planning, Sport and Recreation<br>Department of Main Roads<br>Department of Natural Resources and Water<br>Department of the Premier and Cabinet<br>Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries<br>Department of Public Works<br>Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry<br>Environmental Protection Agency<br>Queensland Health<br>Queensland Transport<br>Queensland Treasury |
| Formulation of partnerships and engaging in collaborative efforts to achieve sustainable regional development | Whole-of-Government |

Source: Information drawn from [www.qld.gov.au](http://www.qld.gov.au) and individual agency websites
Source: Developed for this research.
2.4.2 GAs’ core business conflict

As outlined in Chapter 1, GA core business conflict is evident in two areas. The first relates to the philosophy that underpins the core business or charter described in a GA’s Mission and Vision statement or documented purpose. This stems from the Government’s delegated role and responsibility for the GA.

Table 2.7 on page 71 is a cross-section of GAs from the Federal and Queensland State Governments (as at 2006) and a summary of their core business and role and responsibility. The core business focus has been classified in terms of its focus, for example primarily economic, social or environmental, or a combination. Shaded areas indicate GAs that address all three areas through different programs and activities, as described in their responsibilities. The variations in focus and thus priorities and desired outcomes can lead to core business conflict. Machinery of government changes do not alter the intent of the Table, which is to illustrate the mixture of core business roles and responsibilities of agencies that are likely to work together in regional development.

The second area of core business conflict arises from structural/operational policies, process, systems and procedure factors developed by the GA to carry out the core business. These are unique to each GA, with limited flexibility to be changed when working with other GAs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT/AGENCY</th>
<th>ROLE &amp; RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE FOCUS</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Australia</td>
<td>Agricultural, pastoral, fishing, food and forest industries; Water, soils, and other natural resources; Rural adjustment and drought issues; Rural industries inspection and quarantine; Primary industries research including economic research; Commodity marketing, including export promotion and agribusiness; Commodity-specific international organisations and activities; Administration of international commodity agreements; Administration of export controls on agricultural, fisheries and forestry industries products; Food policy, processing and exports.</td>
<td>ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td>Industry Development Regional Assistance programs For example, the Rural Partnerships Program was announced in 1995 as a joint venture between the Commonwealth and State Governments to help regional communities to address agricultural, environmental and resource management issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Communications, Information and the Arts</td>
<td>The Department provides strategic advice and professional support across a wide range of policy areas including: the arts and cultural development; broadcasting and online regulation; information and communications technology; post and telecommunications; intellectual property; and sport. The Department also administers legislation; regulations; grants and incentives to industry and the wider community; and supports advisory councils and committees. In world forums. The Department looks at ways to maximise Australia’s opportunities in global markets and on related international treaties and agreements.</td>
<td>ECONOMIC SOCIAL</td>
<td>Incubator program Art Indemnity Art Bank Art Training Board Australian Post and the Postal Industry Building on IT Strengths – Advanced Network Programs Commercial Radio Blackspots Cultural Gifts Program Distributed National Collections program Film – Australian Official Co-production program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education, Science and Training</td>
<td>Education, Science policy, promotion of collaborative research in science and technology, training, including New Apprenticeships and training services and Co-ordination of research policy, research grants and fellowships, radioactive waste management.</td>
<td>ECONOMIC SOCIAL</td>
<td>Wide range of schemes, programs and grants to support education and training initiatives and research. There are also a number of Indigenous programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Employment and Workplace Relations</td>
<td>Employment policy, including employment services; Job Network; Labour market programs, including the Work for the Dole scheme; Workplace relations policy development, advocacy and implementation; Promotion of flexible workplace relations policies and practices; Coordination of labour market research; Australian government employment workplace relations policy, including administration of the framework for agreement making and remuneration and conditions; Occupational health and safety, rehabilitation and compensation Equal employment opportunity; Work and family issues.</td>
<td>ECONOMIC SOCIAL</td>
<td>Programs relating to improving employment participation rates, employment prospects, workplace relations, rights and responsibilities. This includes grants and funding to support workplace initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transport and Regional Service</td>
<td>Transport: Planning, safety, regulation and investigation and programme implementation; Aviation: Security, operations, safety, airports regulation and investigation; Regional: Development, planning, programme implementation and service delivery; Territories: Self governing territories, non-self governing territories and natural disaster management; Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics: Research, economic analysis of transport and regional statistics.</td>
<td>ECONOMIC SOCIAL ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td>Regional Partnerships programs Local Government Incentive program to assist in delivery of services Transport programs associated with education, safety, transport delivery for all forms of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT/AGENCY</td>
<td>ROLE/RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE FOCUS</td>
<td>PROGRAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Employment and Training</td>
<td>The department helps Queenslanders reach their potential through a responsive vocational education and training system. It achieves this by managing the apprenticeship and traineeship training organisations and overseeing the quality of the training provided; and funding training that meets the needs of Queensland's industries, communities and jobseekers. Through its 15 TAFE Queensland institutes and four agricultural colleges the department is the largest provider of post-compulsory education in the state. Under the Breaking the Unemployment cycle initiative, the department is responsible for employment programs that give Queenslanders the opportunities, skills and experience they need to take their place in the workforce. Through the Office of Youth Affairs, the department is committed to helping young people participate in government processes and actively encourages them to become involved in decision making that impacts upon their lives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Department of Local Government Planning, Sport and Recreation | The role of the Department of Local Government and Planning is to deliver a better and sustainable built environment and local government system for the people of Queensland. We do this by developing and improving frameworks, which deliver:  
  * a responsive and effective local government system;  
  * funding to councils to facilitate the provision of infrastructure and services;  
  * sustainable development that balances social, economic and environmental values;  
  * performance based solutions for contemporary planning; and  
  * a safe, healthy and environmentally responsive built environment.  
At the same time as helping to create better communities, the Department contributes to the State Government’s Priorities.

| Environmental Protection Agency | The role of this Department is to protect the environment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | ENVIRONMENTAL            | Landscape  
Sustainable Industries  
Sustainable natural resource management  
Environmental protection and maintenance of biodiversity |
| Department of State Development and Innovation | The Department of State Development and Innovation works to support sustainable economic development in Queensland that will secure growth and employment. The Department is the Queensland government’s lead agency in relation to economic development and is the focal point in the State government for raising and negotiating matters impacting on the State's development with other levels of government. The Department contributes to economic growth by fostering a positive business environment for business and industry, promotes sustainable regional development, actively pursues strong partnerships with key industry sectors, aggressively seeks to identify major new opportunities to assist the State's future development and involves the private sector in capturing these opportunities, and strengthens the State's export performance. Ensuring a whole-of-government approach, the Department also supports innovative enterprises, boosts the development of projects and works to ensure that efficient infrastructure meets the changing needs of industry to enhance Queensland’s economic strength and competitiveness. |

|                     |                                                                              | SOCIAL                   | Breaking the unemployment cycle  
TAFE Queensland Smart Job Program for young people  
Community Jobs Plan  
Community Employment assistance program  
Private Sector Employment program  
Public Sector employment program  
Workers Assistance program  
Community Training partnerships  
Mature Age program  
Community Responsive Training program |
|                     |                                                                              | ECONOMIC                 | Queensland Industry Development Scheme  
Queensland Industry Location Scheme  
Regional Business Development Scheme  
Leadership and Management program |

Source: Information drawn from each department’s website.  
Source: Developed for this research.
2.5 Public sector management practices

This section briefly covers changes to the public sector management practices since the Royal Commission Report by Coombs (1976) in order to complete the context in which regional development policy and practices are undertaken. The literature review in Chapter 3, section 3.2.2 presents an evolutionary summary of changes to public sector management practices and illustrates the influence of Government and governance practices on the changes, as well as the links and influence upon regional development.

2.5.1 Public sector reform

The report by Coombs (1976) identified the need for the public sector to adjust to the changing political and operational environment. The public sector has changed from an institution that was centralised, administrative, regulation and service oriented, formally and tightly controlled, to one that although still policy focused, is more political, with greater input from Ministers, more responsive to the state and society and embracing many of the new management practices from the private sector (Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000). The role is more of a facilitator to achieve social economic and environmental outcomes, deliver better services to the public and also as an enabler in governance processes (Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000). The focus has shifted from input controls and rules to quantifiable output measures and performance targets (Aulich, Halligan & Nutley (eds.) 2001).

Current systems and procedures reflect new public sector management practices, for example, managing for outcomes; performance-based management; contracting of senior staff; and approaches such as balanced scorecard planning and management. The aim is to achieve efficient and effective delivery of core business outcomes that fulfil the Government priorities.

In the light of this shift in the public sector in Australia, the theories of change appear to be based on the conflict between global external factors, Australia’s responses to these factors evidenced in its economic, social and political arenas (Keating et al. (eds.) 2000) and the power of the public sector’s own traditions, cultural norms, entrenched practices and the influence of these on their relationship with Government.
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This could be considered to be the public sector’s own evolutionary path and status as instruments of Government (Naschold 1995; Rhodes 1997a cited in Keating et al. (eds.) 2000).

Keating in Davis and Keating (2000) identified four key factors creating change in the public sector that are considered most relevant to this study. These same factors are an integral part of the regional development environment and influence the ability of Government to become joined up. They are:

- Globalisation
- Technology
- Changes in society (education levels, family structure, lifestyle, values, employment and income) and community expectations of the public service and government
- Political divides and attitudes to government, its processes and performance.

The resulting changes in the public sector management and operational practices are presented in Tables 2.8 and 2.9 (Page 75) adapted from Keating, Wanna and Weller (eds.) (2000). From these Tables the pressure of public accountability, budget stringency, political influence and new private sector management concepts and practices are evident.

Table 2.8 illustrates that there is a strong role for public/private interaction and partnership, monitoring and management and an increasingly commercial focus on achieving government outcomes within budgetary constraints.

**Table 2.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Past public service practice</th>
<th>Change public service practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketisation</td>
<td>Service delivery and some use of contractors</td>
<td>Purchaser/provider split, competition with private providers for contracts to deliver public services; increase in contracting out services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate management</td>
<td>Focus on probity, precedence and accountability; uniformity of service provision; input focused budgets; central agency control, clerical approach; public service career merit approach.</td>
<td>Managing for outcomes; introduction of competition and choice for service providers; freedom of information; citizen rights for redress; output measurement; decentralization; risk management; business unit approach methods; short term performance based contracts for SES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>Significant part of role in economy and labour market; regulation core agency role and structure.</td>
<td>Economic regulation not command and control, but managed markets and use of fiscal and other incentives or disincentives; decentralization of labour market to individual bargaining; shift of regulating utilities to monitoring contracts and auditing performance; National Competition Policy; separation in some agencies of regulatory arm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political control</td>
<td>Westminster culture of public service as neutral, institutional; monopoly of policy advice; merit protection.</td>
<td>Ministers have made changes to public service to ensure they can set priorities and influence implementation –very politicized; pluralisation of policy advice; open competition for senior appointments including ministerial intervention in them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8 continues...
2.5.2 Influence of new public sector management on GA core business delivery and core business conflict

The changes depicted in Tables 2.8 and 2.9 and discussed in section 3.2.2 in Chapter 3, influence the relationship across the public sector, community and government. It must be pointed out here that the previously mentioned joined-up government philosophy is likely to cause further changes to a number of these areas in the future. Of particular relevance to this section is the identification of the functional and operational changes in the public sector and the potential influence on GAs delivery of core business presented in Table 2.9.

Table 2.9
Internal changes in the public sector and influence on GA core business delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Potential relevance to GAs core business delivery (research can confirm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural reform</td>
<td>Devolution and decentralization; some specialization of areas; wider source of information, analysis and policy advice; flatter agency structure; acceptance of risk management; goal focused organisations; formation of executive agencies such as Centrelink and the formation of the Public Sector Act 1999 that provides core valued for the Australian Public Service</td>
<td>Has shaped structures and internal processes in order to have regional offices or areas of specialization. These are tailored to the charter of each GA. Goal focus directly links to core business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment relations reforms</td>
<td>No unified public service; use of agency and individual-level agreements; emerging pay disparities within and between agencies; improved morale and motivation, but limited ability to take up opportunities; flexibility in staffing and secondments; Employment advocate to approve agreements for employment.</td>
<td>Effective core business delivery is dependent upon the experience and expertise of staff. This includes levels of specialization in some agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.9 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Potential relevance to GAs core business delivery (research can confirm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management reforms</td>
<td>Introduction of Senior Executive Services with limited mobility across agencies; development of new Senior Officers grades; introduction of performance appraisal systems and some performance pay for senior management; adoption of equal opportunity employment.</td>
<td>Risk-averse senior management. Staff driven by achieving their performance outcomes, that may impact on participation in and support for joint GA activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management and budgeting reforms</td>
<td>Required to provide forward estimates of budget requirements and justify them with a view to ensuring full cost is covered and providing some certainty to complete projects or programs funded; program and budget management at portfolio level; use of contestability in costing outputs to reduce costs; devolution of assets management to agencies including sales and rationalization; introduction of regular ‘off-sets’ and efficiency dividends; use of accrual accounting methods, reporting and budgeting.</td>
<td>Influences internal budget allocation and ability to support additional projects; lock budget into projects and programs that fulfill KPIs, therefore inability to contribute funds to additional projects and initiatives from other GAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial reforms</td>
<td>More efficient purchasing; professional and consistent use of tenders as a supervisory tool for contracts; user charge practices between agencies; consistency in government-business enterprises with separate commercial units; separation of regulation and service delivery; revenue management by agencies.</td>
<td>Use of contractual service providers and the strong commercial approach within agencies impacts on relationship and ability to share information or services with other GAs. However sharing services and information are both elements of ‘joined up’ government and GAs working together in regional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and reporting reforms</td>
<td>Focused objectives and strategic cabinet planning; provision of annual Program Performance Statements in parliament; publication of financial and assets reports creating greater scrutiny of financial management.</td>
<td>Limits GAs ability to be flexible and responsive with funding allocations and imposes pressure to have ‘deliverables’ that demonstrate achievement of KPIs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.).(2000). Source: Developed for the research.

These changes noted in Table 2.9 influence the following in GAs:

- Internal structure
- Corporate management strategies and principles
- Methods of managing internal and external client relationships to achieve outcomes
- Development of performance-based management systems and processes for review
- Strategic Plans and divisional operational plan design and content
- Budget planning, monitoring and reporting
- Human Resource practices within GAs and thus their available expertise
- Internal management practices, processes and operational systems (except those governed by legislation)

### 2.5.3 Issues and impediments to embracing new public sector management practices

Adoption of private sector management practices in a public sector organisation may create a number of internal conflicts and challenges:

- Having to respond to and be accountable to multiple masters – Ministers, internal management, community
Reconciling budget stringency with an increased spread of ‘outcomes’ to achieve resulting from election commitments, ministerial directives and the growing expectations of community

Reconciling commercial outcomes with high quality service delivery, as expected by the public

The creation of risk-averse senior management due to performance-based contractual tenureship for employment

Accountability to Ministers and Government, which is completely different to the accountability environment in the private sector (i.e. to public, consumers and investors)

Development of Corporate Strategic plans and the associated KPIs are often political directives, thus not always initiated from within the organisation

The requirement for new skills amongst management and personnel in keeping with the demands of new management practices, for example requiring the combining of a commercial orientation in planning, program, product and service design; marketing knowledge and skills; management of internal and external clients; negotiation skills; customer service; equity; and quality assurance.

Other relevant issues, impediments and challenges can be found in literature by Keating et al. (2000):

Fragmented service delivery due to use of contractors (and associated costs of coordination, equity of service level, monitoring and evaluation)

Strategic planning to manage complex systems of service delivery

Role of public sector managers is complex and requires providing policy advice to ministers, managing departments and managing external relations. This involves the skills to monitor and control programs, budgets and human resources using audit, performance indicators and performance-based management tools require significant management skill capacity (These are in addition to the skills referred to in the previous section.)

Accountability complexity and inadequate tools to manage the requirements (for example, cannot delegate accountability as a public service provider)


2.6 Conclusion

This Chapter has presented an overview of the regional development environment and context in which the issues of core business conflict exists. Section 2.2 covered regional development, providing a definition for region and regional development as used in this research; explored key regional development theories and their evidence of influence in Australia and Queensland; sustainable regional development; regional development stakeholders; and the Government role in regional development, particularly through the activities of GAs. The section concluded with consideration of the regional development environment and the conflicts and issues faced by Government.

Section 2.3 outlined the Australian Government structure and functions of Government, briefly examined joined up Government and considered the issues and impediments to government working together. Section 2.4 then explored the GAs as instruments of Government, delivering their core business and the role of their core business in regional development. This section introduced core business conflict. Section 2.5 examined public sector management practices from the perspective of new public sector management, the influence of these changes on GAs core business delivery and then ended with a consideration of the issues and impediments to embracing new public sector management practices.

Strong linkages exist across the issues and impediments faced by:

- Government in regional development
- GAs in regional development
- GAs working together, and
- Issues faced by GAs in adopting new public service management practices.

The next chapter, chapter 3, focuses on building the theoretical foundation underpinning the research. The chapter identifies gaps in literature and research, which form the research issues to be examined through this research.

A different approach is taken for the literature review. This is because a greater understanding of the evolution of the three discipline areas is required to understand influential factors in the context within which core business conflict occurs. In addition, no literature has been identified that deals with core business conflict and this has
necessitated looking at literature in a related area that identifies issues and impediments experienced when agencies work together. The literature review includes:

- Literature that provided information on the evolution of Government and governance, public sector management and regional development, and identified the inter-disciplinary links and influences
- Literature that investigated issues and impediments to WOG and joined-up Government initiatives and also literature capturing information on processes and practices to manage issues and impediments and to facilitate agencies working together.
3.1 Introduction

Chapter 2 outlined the regional development environment in which the research problem occurs. The key discipline areas involved are regional development, Government and governance, and public sector management. This chapter builds the theoretical framework for the research based on these three discipline areas.

Literature review methodology

An innovative approach to the literature review is applied. Three factors have necessitated this:

1. There is a need to enhance understanding of the context and influences within the framework affecting GAs working together, and ultimately GA core business conflict.
2. No extant literature was uncovered dealing specifically with core business conflict in GAs.
3. With no literature uncovered dealing with GA core business conflict, there is a need to investigate a related area - ‘issues and impediments when agencies work together’, and how they were managed. This would enable identifying similarities and key factors that may be relevant to core business conflict.

The literature review intent is therefore to build knowledge, and investigate the research problem through literature dealing with a related field in a public sector environment. The literature research is presented in three sections:

- Evolutionary overview of Government and governance, public sector management and regional development to understand the influences in the contextual framework (Section 3.2).
- Issues and impediments (the related field) to agencies working together in regional development and WOG initiatives, with a view to identifying similarities and linkages with core business conflict (Section 3.3.).
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- Processes and practices to manage issues and impediments, which may have relevance to managing core business conflict (Section 3.4).

The outline of this chapter is presented in Figure 3.1 on page 82. The theoretical framework for the chapter is presented in Figure 3.2 on page 83. Details of individual section contents are presented below.

Section 3.2 presents a brief evolution of the three discipline areas to build a picture of the context for GA interaction and core business conflict. Figure 3.3 on page 85, sets out the basic contextual framework involved. This figure is amended following the literature review. The revised Figure on page 132 documents key influences and factors affecting the GAs’ operational environment that have emerged/changed during the evolutionary process of the three discipline areas.

With no identified literature investigating GA core business conflict directly, section 3.3 looks at reviews and studies of WOG and joint GA initiatives. The reviews and studies selected identify issues and impediments experienced when GAs work together, with some presenting learnings, key success factors, and actions undertaken to manage issues and impediments. Where applicable, each review or evaluation contains a summary of each project or program under the headings:
- Background
- Methodology
- Sample
- Results or summary of findings.

Where possible the results or summaries are presented in a Table containing headings covering issues and challenges; learnings, success factors; and processes and practices used. The findings from section 3.3 contribute to the overall knowledge and information associated with challenges for GAs when working together.

Section 3.4 looks specifically at literature that focuses on approaches, solutions, guidelines and tools to improve GAs’ working together in WOG and joined-up government projects.

Section 3.5 reviews the findings from the research in relation to the research problem. Gaps in the literature and current knowledge relating to the research problem are presented.
Section 3.6 sets out the research issues that arise from the gaps in literature and knowledge and links these to a proposed methodology to address the research gaps. Section 3.7 closes the chapter offering some conclusions regarding the theoretical framework for the research.

Figure 3.1
Outline of Chapter 3

Source: developed for this research.

Figure 3.2 on page 83 presents the theoretical framework as a basis for the literature and research review. Coloured circles represent the different elements of the framework covering literature research exploring the evolution of the three discipline of Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development; research problem area, boundaries of the research; previous research into issues and impediments and mechanisms to improve GAs working together; and research gaps in relation to the problem area. The research gaps are the focus of this investigation.
1. **The blue and yellow circles** represent the literature review. The literature review is covered in sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4. Section 3.2 provides a very brief overview of the evolution of Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development (blue circle). Section 3.3 covers reviews and research literature on regional development projects and initiatives, and joined-up, integrated and WOG programs and initiatives to identify the issues and impediments to agencies working together. Section 3.4 provides information on some suggested approaches, frameworks and guidelines to manage the issues and impediments to working together. Section 3.3 and 3.4 are represented by the yellow circle and are the previous research in the field.

2. **The red circle** represents the research problem area and is about the difficulties GAs have when working together.
3. **The purple circle** represents the boundaries for this research- including the research problem investigation being confined to Australia and research focusing on regional development.

4. **The green circle** represents the literature and research gaps identified, and which this research aims to fill. The dominant gap is that no extant literature has been uncovered that deals specifically with the topic of core business conflict. Discussion of the gaps and implications for research methodology are in sections 3.5 and 3.6. A revised Figure representing findings from this research, in relation to the theoretical framework is in Chapter 6.

### 3.2 Government and governance, public sector management and regional development

**Introduction**

Chapter 2 outlined the regional development context in which the problem exists. The purpose of section 3.2 comprising sub-sections 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 of the literature review is to present a brief overview of the evolution of each of the three discipline areas of Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development. Figure 3.3 is the inter-disciplinary context map for the research and literature review. Following section 3.2.3 a revised map is presented in Figure 3.5 on page 132. This revision captures information drawn from the literature review, and documents some of the key influences and impacts that have changed the context in which the research topic exists.
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Figure 3.3
Map of the context for research and literature review

1. Government and governance - changes & pressures to coordinate & improve efficiency – Section 3.2.1
   Determine how public sector will be structured and function, and dictates agency core business responsibility

2. Government Agencies apply public sector management practices to focus on delivering core business determined by Government

3. Public Sector Management Practices – Section 3.2.2
   Directs process, systems, financial management, planning, reporting and accountability, performance management, program and policy design
   Investigate changes to be responsive to Government

4. Issues and opportunities requiring agencies to work together

5. MECHANISMS: Section 3.3 & 3.4
   Cooperation, collaboration, partnerships, Memorandum of Understanding, Agreements joined-up government initiatives, integrated service delivery initiatives, WOG initiatives

6. BARRIERS – CONFLICT, ISSUES & IMPEDIMENTS – the main focus Section 3.3 & 3.4

7a REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES & OUTPUTS Section 3.3.1
   ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, INFRASTRUCTURE

7b OTHER GOVERNMENT OUTCOMES - Section 3.3.2

Source: Developed for this research.

Explanation for Figure 3.3.

1. Government determines the roles, responsibilities, budget, Acts, regulations and policies for GAs, which is their core business. (Section 3.2.1).

2. Government and governance processes are implemented through public sector management practices. GAs apply public sector management practices to deliver their core business responsibilities and desired outcomes. The practices ensure that government activities are carried out efficiently and effectively.

3. Public sector management practices influence how GAs carry out their core business. (Section 3.2.2).

4. Government is challenged with managing complex issues and opportunities requiring GAs to work together. Difficulties occur when GAs work together. (Section 3.3).
5. Various mechanisms already exist that are aimed at facilitating GAs to work together, for example, Memorandum of Understanding and Partnership Agreements (summarised in Tables in sections 3.3 and 3.4).

6. Issues and impediments interfere with the effectiveness of GAs working together and ease with which they work together – the subject of this research. (Sections 3.3 and 3.4 contain Tables noting issues).

7a. and 7b. The issues and impediments to agencies working together affect regional development and other Government outcomes and outputs (Section 3.3.1 and 3.3.2)

### 3.2.1 Government and governance brief evolutionary overview

This section examines literature covering the evolution of Government and governance in Australia. The literature deals with the Australian Government. Influences and governance practices seen at the Australian Government level affect State, Territory governance practices, but States’ and Territories’ specific responses are not explored individually. The nature of Australia’s federation arrangements dictating inter-governmental relationships is also explored.

The section only briefly presents early government and governance before moving on to discuss drivers of change. The last segment explores the changes in government and governance.

**Early government and governance**

Australia’s system of government comprises three tiers, Federal, State and Local Government. Federal and State Government are part of the Constitution. Local Government is not (Dore & Woodhill 1999).

The historical foundation of Australia’s Government structure and governance practices spring from its colonial roots in Britain. The structure is based on the Westminster system, but includes a federal system similar to the United States of America. (Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.). 2000; Beer, Maude & Prichard 2003).

At the time when the Constitution was developed there was economic depression; major industrial unrest; some areas of society were living in abject poverty; customs and excises inhibited free trade across the colonial boundaries; the rail system and immigration
system were uncoordinated; and colonies varied in size and population (Vardon 2007). A key focus of the Constitution and founding of the system of government in Australia was to create a system to unify the colonial states, but allow, through federalism, an opportunity for States to manage their own affairs. The Australian Senate was intended to ensure the States’ rights in a new Australian Government (Vardon 2007).

In the early years, Government and policy development was centralised, with no involvement by the public (Beer, Maude & Prichard 2003). Government governed with sole authority and legitimacy, post World War II (Considine 2005 cited in Crowley & Coffey 2007) and the Government policy perspective was essentially egalitarian (Argy 2004), with the role of the Commonwealth Government as interventionist (Australian Public Service (APS) (2003).

Drivers of change for Government and governance

Drivers of change can be summarised as: globalisation; information technology (speed of, access to information, ideas and values and supporting rapid movement of goods and money); changes in society (spread of education; women in the workforce; changed family type, demographic changes); changes in public expectations of Government and in prevailing values and beliefs of society (increasing social and economic divides, environmental and moral issues); and lastly changing ideas and political divisions (Keating in Keating & Davis 2000).

Australia also became more pluralistic and complex as a society, increasing pressure on governance (Argy 2004; Keating in Keating & Davis 2000). Increased migration post-war and adaptations to facilitate Indigenous people into the mainstream life of the nation created additional social pressures (Australian Public Service Commission 2003). There were changes to old classes and loyalties; opening up of the economy to competitive pressures; increasing individualist values; new patterns of work; and changes to social relationships, families and ethnic composition (Argy 2004). These changes occurred at the same time as the improvements in communication technology that provided a vehicle for new interest groups and social movements to disseminate their views globally (Argy 2004; Keating in Keating, Wanna & Weller (2000. Tasks which previously took time to complete, could now be done within days, or hours (Australian Public Service 2003).
Other drivers included a risk society; a growing focus on sustainability; challenges to traditional political structures and ideologies; and the growing influence of civil and social capital (Dore & Woodhill 1999).

Environmental management and sustainability issues were also drivers of change. A conflict occurred between environmental and economic priorities from the 1960s where a focus emerged on pesticides, air and water pollution and wilderness conservation (Davis & Weller 2001). This broadened in the 1980s to include toxic waste, ozone depletion and destruction of biodiversity, finally emerging in the 1990s to a concern regarding global warming (Davis & Weller 2001).

Climate change threats therefore stimulated a renewed policy focus on sustainability. Potential issues were broad spectrum affecting economies, health and welfare, and the environment (Crowley & Coffey 2007). Sustainability was therefore a driving force for the adoption of ‘green planning’ (Crowley & Coffey 2007). Green planning focuses on comprehensive and integrated policies, plans and strategies to address environmental problems (Dalal-Clayton 1996 cited in Crowley & Coffey 2007). Achieving sustainability was not about quick fixes, but commitment by governments to economy, ecology and society equally and for the long term ( OECD 2002 cited in Crowley & Coffey 2007).

Managing environmental and economic priorities from a policy perspective was complex (Sorenson 2000). One of the development dilemmas for example, was creating long term sustainability in primary industries as well as protection of high quality environment (Sorenson 2000). Sorenson identified 10 different elements that influence the policy environment and represent management challenges and competing priorities. They were: biophysical resource endowment; geographic accessibility; human and social capital; demography; changing lifestyle preferences; space transforming technologies; new production technologies; expenditure on public infrastructure; business development and management; and international events. Not all of the elements can be changed or effectively managed by Government. In addition, there were community needs, expectations and issues that also had to be addressed (Sorenson 2000).

The drivers of change mentioned in the previous points created competing priorities for Government to manage. Good governance is concerned with balancing cost effectiveness, whilst reflecting community priorities, and using a political process that are
consistent, transparent, accountable, fair and just (Argy 2004). This made policy conflict more difficult to manage. The trade off between equity and efficiency, and alternative sets of social values (egalitarian and communitarian values relative to individualistic values) were two areas where conflict is evident according to Argy.

**Government and governance changes**

The Australian Government has become consultative, transparent, accountable and responsive (Beer, Maude & Prichard 2003). In addition, Government adopted approaches such as steering, partnering and devolving authority (Considine 2005 cited in Crowley & Coffey 2007).

Government has a broader role today involving the following roles and tasks: a clearing house; endorsing routine business; making authoritative policy choices, legitimising public sector activities; information exchange; arbiter; resolving disputes between agencies and ministers; decision-makers, coordination to prevent overlap and duplication and inconsistencies (Keating in Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000). The roles also includes the allocation of resources, development and monitoring of budgets, crisis management and the handling of internal party disputes to the list of Government activities (Davis 1997 cited in Keating, Wanna &Weller (eds.) (2000).

Changes in governance could be summarised as follows: managerial reforms; competition; choice and managed markets; holistic client services and contractual arrangements with service providers; corporatising and development of other structures from which government could choose to deliver services (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001). However, the division of responsibilities amongst government departments still reflected traditional government functions (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001). The changes related to roles and responsibilities, preferred processes and tools, and government accountability.

Service delivery has also changed. In the past, governments delivered most services including telecommunications, coal, electricity, rail, airlines, education and social services (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001). Establishment of statutory bodies were one of the ways Government began to undertake commercial and regulatory functions, and by the mid 1980s there were more than 250 Commonwealth statutory bodies and 18 government enterprises (Australian Public Service 2003).
Poor returns and the need for competition to drive better performance meant a withdrawal by government, privatisation and less public investment in these areas (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001). However the State’s responsibility for social development had increased, including provision of human services (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001). Since the 1990s in excess of A$90 billion dollars of publicly owned organisations have been sold to the private sector (Australian Public Service 2003).

Corporatisation of services such as post and telecommunications occurred at the end of the 1980s (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001). Other changes followed, with the introduction of purchaser/provider divisions to separate responsibility of purchasing services for the public from the responsibility of supplying the services. The shift was described as governments changing to ‘steering’ rather than ‘rowing’ (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001). The Government adopted a regulatory role over privatised areas such as controls on prices, provision of accessibility to other operators and determining community service obligations (Australian Public Service 2003).

Changes in expectations, living styles and ideas have forced Governments to change the way they deliver services (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001). Examples cited were changes in how social services are provided, with response to demand for more client-focused services involving the private sector for service delivery.

The changes to service delivery introduced competition with the use of private providers and the creation of competitive markets. This change was influential in improving government capacity and the recognition of diversity in community through offering choice to customers (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller (2001). To improve efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery, the Government moved to outsourcing and contracting-out, using a competitive tendering process (Australian Public Service 2003).

With the expansion of government roles and responsibilities and increased complexities of government activity, accountability became an issue (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001). To address accountability, parliament established a committee system with the ability to investigate government policy and administration, and agencies providing performance information to these committees. Accountability to citizens is through administrative law and the ability to seek review of government decisions (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001).
Other changes enhancing accountability followed and included the introduction of Freedom of Information, which allows ordinary people to challenge the Government (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001). In addition, Departmental Heads and Chairs of Government Boards appointed were made accountable to Government; and a performance management system was set up to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources and achievement of outcomes (Gallop 2007). The achievement of outcomes became more complex because achievement was not just reliant on public servants, but also relied on the involvement and actions of industry and non-government agencies (Gallop 2007).

The authority of government was and still is derived from laws passed by parliament and funds voted/allocated by parliament for declared purposes (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001). The Weberian system of bureaucratic government was considered sufficient until the role of government expanded in the 1970s (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001). At this time Government reviewed its own processes in the light of increasing citizen dissatisfaction and the need to be more responsive. The Government instigated the Coombs Royal Commission Report in 1976, to investigate its performance and make recommendations to improve performance and other governance and management issues.

The Coombs report (1976) highlighted the need for governance processes to become more efficient, transparent and accountable. This included changing administration from being bureaucratic, with limited responsibility for performance, to contract mode and greater management responsibility. The Commission also called for governance to be more democratic, inviting community participation and consultation and sought to improve the decision-making processes. The changes to the public sector from the 1970s, with the focus for efficiency, influenced the delivery of agencies’ regional development programs and service delivery. Changes to the public sector are explored in more detail in section 3.2.2.

A major factor that has affected changes in Government and governance practices concerns the relationship between government and society, including a growing citizen disenchantment and increased expectation of government service to citizens. (Davis in Davis & Weller 2001; also Nye 1997 cited in Davis & Weller 2001; and studies by Verba 1963, Norris 1999, Papadakis 1999 cited in McAllister & Wanna in Davis & Weller 2001). The loss of trust was associated with threats to traditional Australian values resulting from economic and cultural changes and a feeling that the Government had lost control and
authority (Keating in Davis & Keating 2000). Keating was also of the view that highly educated citizens are more critical of government performance.

The decline in trust also reflected changes in social attitudes, and greater individualism (Putnam 1995, cited in Davis & Weller 2001). Governments needed to manage the consequences of changing values and attitudes through policy, client oriented service delivery and accountability to citizens and referred to developing an ‘enabling state’ or ‘third way’ (Davis in Davis & Weller 2001). The growing dissatisfaction with government meant that the new governance practices developed, reflected the views of remoteness, irrelevance and untrustworthiness of politics and created the need to ‘establish legitimacy in the face of the erosion of public trust’ (Bishop & Davis 2001, p191 cited Crowley & Coffey 2007). Government responsibility to communicate with all members of society has meant that there is an obligation to keep the public informed about policy changes.

Government policy changes have reflected the complexity and diversity of issues with which governments dealt. Government policy increasingly focused on economic performance, productivity and efficiency (Argy 2004). The economic policies of the previous three decades created major social changes, showing shift from communitarian social policies to individualism and materialism (Argy 2004). The regional and economic development issues discussed in section 3.2.3 concern the social and economic changes that occurred as a result of a policy focus on productivity, markets and efficiency.

Other policy changes reflected many of the external societal changes, for example the increased participation of women in the workforce in the 1970s onwards necessitated extension in welfare policies (Davis & Keating 2000). Flow-on impacts of women in the workforce caused considerable drop in single income families and affected the traditional nuclear family structure. Social policy was increasingly focused on individual needs and delivery of multiple programs that suited a variety of needs (Davis & Keating 2000).

Of particular relevance to regional economic development were the industry policy changes: industry protection; industry adjustment; liberalisation and deregulation; and industry and industry capability enhancement policies. The Federal Government role in policy was strengthened by the emergence of forming national policy frameworks and increased centralisation of revenue (Davis & Keating 2000). At a State level there was
greater interest in sectoral and regional implications of economic policy (Warhurst et al. 1988; Stewart 1994, cited in Davis & Keating 2000).

Government and governance focus on regional development waxed and waned over time, with policy shifts reflecting issues faced by regions, for example the following changes in regional development policy foci are evident: political protection for rural/regional areas; support for depressed regions or regions with severe industry restructuring problems; recurring phases of urban and regional development influenced by desire to protect lifestyle; efforts to address social justice issues and managing population growth; State government concern for regional growth to coordinate economic and social infrastructure; and more recently the emerging policies to build urban synergies and a knowledge economy (Davis & Keating 2000). Section 3.2.3 further explores regional development policy changes.

During the 1990s pressures on Government led to: development of the user pays system for government services; Local Government reform; state agency reform; transfer of greater responsibilities to Local Government; formation of regional organisations and community participation and stakeholder consultation (Dore & Woodhill 1999). In addition, deregulation of the labour market and radical welfare changes occurred, with less of a focus on equity of distribution (Argy 2004).

One of the key drivers of change raised earlier was the impact of globalisation on Governments and governance. Impacts in Australia and New Zealand included: the removal of protectionism; new governance processes and the formation of some new institutions, despite retaining a ‘Westminster’ process of governance (Minstrom & Wanna 2006). The greatest change was in policy and institutional behaviour at a national and sub-national level, with policy responses driven by globalisation and international markets, but also part of nation-building (Minstrom & Wanna 2006).

Advances in information and communication technology have affected Government and governance practices (Davis in Davis & Keating 2000). Advances enabled the rapid transfer of information in the public and private sectors, creating new patterns of work; capacity for rapid financial transactions; and connectivity with community. These advances have changed the nature of service delivery, community engagement and information management (Davis in Davis & Keating 2000).
Another driver of change previously mentioned, was the challenge of sustainability. Government response began in the 1960s, focusing on water, pesticide and air pollution according to Papadakis and Young in Davis and Keating (2000), and was followed in the 1970s, with concern over energy consumption and nuclear radioactivity. The concern regarding global warming and diminishing biodiversity emerged in the 1990s (Papadakis in Davis & Keating 2000), posing a major challenge for Government, being the conflict between economic and environmental tensions that exist in addressing sustainability.

The Government changes that have emerged relating to sustainability are both policy and institutional. Changes since the 1960s included the Office of the Environment being established in 1971 and the Environmental Council in 1972. Since this time, through the Whitlam Government years, a broader focus emerged with the setting up of the Department of Urban and Regional Development, the establishment of the National Parks and Wild Life Service and the Australian Heritage Office (Papadakis & Young in Davis & Keating 2000).

The Hawke Government introduced the application of ecologically sustainable development principles (ESD), however response and support across three levels of Government to ESD was fragmented according to Papadakis and Young in Davis and Keating (2000).

There has been a growing Government focus on sustainable development since the establishment of ESD principles influencing policy, development of schemes and programs, an increase in voluntarism and self-help strategies (Lawrence 2004). Lawrence argues that the focus has encouraged the development of sub-national regional governance approaches filled with tension and contradiction. The new governance approaches involve multi-level partnerships, knowledge exchange, devolution of decision-making and joined-up institutional arrangements (Lawrence 2004). The new governance arrangements identified by Lawrence are particularly relevant to the research problem.

These self-help arrangements are evident in the Government’s response resulting in establishing the national Landcare programs, community-based natural resource management, involving community partnerships. In 1997 the National Heritage Trust was initiated, receiving funding of $1.5 billion until mid 2001, followed by another $1 billion for a further five years. This was Australia’s largest investment in environmental programs.
(Landcare, Bushcare, Rivercare and Coastcare) and they all relied on cooperative regional
delivery (Lawrence 2004).

In his examination and review of these programs, Lawrence (2004) highlighted some
of the challenges, conflicts and negativities associated with both regional governance
approaches for sustainability and the reality of what can be delivered by communities.
Tensions and contradictions existed in local governance including: responsibility given to
community, without power; increased marginalisation and exclusions of some groups;
accountability issues; and mistrust (Lawrence 2004).

Increasing international focus on global warming has further driven new institutional
arrangements, such as the Australian Greenhouse Office and more recently under the new
Rudd Government, a Department of Climate Change (Department of Climate Change 2008).
Individual States have also responded by developing new institutions, for example
Queensland has an Office of Climate Change and Climate Change Centre of Excellence.

Another area where change has occurred concerns the relationship between the
Federal and State Governments, the nature of federation. Federalism has allowed the States
to manage their own affairs (Vardon 2007). The level of independence to manage their
affairs however, is strongly influenced by the nature of federalism. The relationship
fluctuates and Hollander and Patapan (2007) captured the flux of the Federal/State
relationship, citing Matthews (1980) who divided federalism into periods that reflected the
nature of the relationship that existed. Matthews labelled the stages as: coordinated from
1900-1920; cooperative from 1920-1940; coercive from 1940-1945; and returning to
coordinated form 1950-1975, with new federalism being the descriptor he used from 1975
onwards.

A number of other authors have used different descriptors, but all provide some
indication of the nature of the relationship between the Federal and States’ and Territories’
Government. For example, the Management Advisory Council report (2004) referred to the
style of federalism from the 1970s as cooperative, because the focus was to improve
coordination and avoid duplication and overlap. Painter (1998a cited in Hollander & Patapan
2007) described the period during the Hawke and Keating Governments as collaborative
federalism, and Parkin and Anderson cited in Hollander and Patapan (2007) describes the
Howard Government period as regulatory federalism.
The emergence of regionalism and localism, evidenced by Lawrence (2004) in the discussion about Government approaches to addressing sustainability, is becoming a more dominant feature of Government and governance. Regionalism can be described as a shift from government (administration) to governance to encompass collaboration, and including elements of ‘management by negotiation’ with key stakeholders and partners (Loechel, Lawrence and Cheshire 2005; and Lawrence 2004; Reddel 2002a; Stoker 1998 cited in Loechel et al. 2005). Section 3.2.3 explores regionalism further within the context of the evolution of regional development.

The drivers of change, growing complexity of issues to be dealt with by Government and pressures to be responsive to community need have shaped public sector management change. This includes the growing imperative for GAs to work collaboratively (Management Advisory Committee, 2004; Institute of Public Administration 2002).

3.2.2 Public Sector Management brief evolutionary overview

This section looks at the evolution of the public service, which is linked to the influences and factors that affected Government and governance principles explored in section 3.2.1. The section begins with a brief outline of the service pre-1970. The key triggers of change are then noted. This is followed by a more detailed exploration of changes to the public service and discussion on new public sector management. The final segment looks at future prospects and current challenges emerging from the changes.

Pre 1970s

The Australian Constitution and Government arrangements are based on the British Westminster system. The public service reflects similar organisational structures and cultures to the British system. In the past, the public service was viewed as neutral, anonymous, merit-driven and a place for a career, and the public’s relationship with the public service reflected these perceptions (Weller in Keating, Wanna & Weller 2000).

In the 1950s and 1960s the public service comprised a strict hierarchy of offices, central agencies responsible for personnel policy and financial management, staff supporting policy development and program delivery. This involved considerable budget consumption for administration (Keating, Wanna and Weller (eds.) 2000).
During the 1980s and 1990s, many countries and national structures of governance experienced challenge, resulting in restructuring, and the adoption of market principles and business techniques (Osborne & Gaebler 1992; Yergin & Stanislaw 1998; Christensen & Laegreid 2001, cited by Minstrom & Weller 2006). Australia was therefore not alone in experiencing and responding to pressures for change in government roles and responsibilities, governance processes and public sector administration.

**Triggers of change**

Triggers for public sector reform included: globalisation; poor economic performance; influence of information technology; changing social, demographic and cultural dynamics; and the changing role between the state and civil society (Australian Public Service 2003; Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000). In addition, Government was faced with managing increasingly complex issues, therefore Ministers were required to be far better informed and the role of Government and agencies diversified (Weller in Keating, Wanna & Weller 2000).

Continuing influences on public sector management changes were: growth of government; changing role of government; the pace of change; economic performance; politicians seeking greater influence; private sector solutions for public sector (outsourcing); managerial approaches emphasising performance; technological change, particularly information technology; and internationalisation of innovation and public administration occurring more rapidly due to the global consciousness and interdependencies (Halligan in Aulich, Halligan & Nutley (eds.) 2001). These triggers reflect the drivers of change for Government and governance in section 3.2.1.

**Changes in the public service**

Whilst changes in public sector management have been explored by many writers, the investigations of Verspaandonk, revised by Holland (2003), Clark and Corbett (1999), Davis and Rhodes in Keating, Wanna and Weller (eds.) (2000), Keating, Wanna and Weller (eds.) (2000), and O’Flynn (2007) are selected. This is because the writers differ in the way they group and classify the changes and this serves to illustrate the various dimensions of the changes. Information is also drawn from the Australian Public Service (2003) ‘Occasional Paper 2’.
Verspaandonk revised by Holland (2003) categorised three areas of change: openness, internal equity and welfare, and efficiency and effectiveness. Greatest pressure was for efficiency and effectiveness. These three areas are described in more detail below:

- **Openness** related to citizens having greater access to information and ability to review and scrutinies government performance and public service activities. This was through the Administrative Appeals Tribunal and the introduction of Freedom of Information. There was also a new customer service charter and Purchasing Advisory and complaints.

- **Equity and welfare** relates to employee conditions, equal employment opportunity and Occupational Workplace, Health and Safety and workforce diversity.

- **Efficiency and effectiveness** relates to the use of public resources, particularly human and financial, to gain optimum benefit. This was through use of private sector management approaches, market mechanisms and performance control.

Another perspective was to divide changes in the public service into five stages, which were: growth in the states of service departments; wartime transformation in the 1940s of Commonwealth public service and formation of policy capability; questioning of public service capacity for responsiveness and performance in the 1970s; major program management improvement in the 1980s; and contract state initiatives in some jurisdictions and reduction in public service in 1990s (Clark & Corbett 1999).

The public service, from its early days, was responsible for development, and overseeing the construction of physical infrastructure. The public service therefore managed land, public works, railways, irrigation, scientific support for agriculture and later, education (Clark & Corbett 1999).

There were also two distinct phases of change in Australian public sector management. In the 1980s there was a focus on internal reforms and corporate management (Alford 1998; Yeatman 1997) cited in O’Flynn (2007). This included corporate planning based on central goals; comprehensive program budgeting; management improvement; contract employment for managers; central auditing and performance monitoring. The second phase was the marketisation phase in the 1990s, which accompanied the discourse of economic rationalism (Pusey 1991 cited in O’Flynn 2007). Marketisation proposed to develop market solutions to government failure. Activities included creation of a market in
the public sector; use of contracts to define activities and services and government relationships (O’Flynn 2007).

Changes have occurred in the relationship between the Government and public service, more specifically relating to the relationship between Ministers and the public service (Clark & Corbett 1999). The change appeared in the 1960s with governments and Ministers desiring advisors in agencies with sympathetic understanding of their party. An outcome of this was that Ministers strengthened private offices, reorganised portfolios, abolished departments and created new ones, engaging senior public servants that were most appropriate to their needs and political philosophy. This approach peaked particularly in the Whitlam Government era (Clark & Corbett 1999).

The catalyst for change in public sector management was the Coombs Report in 1976 commissioned by the Whitlam Government, (mentioned in section 3.2.1 page 91). The report triggered the commencement of many of the more radical changes in the public service.

Changes that occurred following the report included: corporate management initiatives concerned with achieving greater efficiency; using modern budgeting practices; and contracting out of services (Davis & Rhodes in Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000). There was also greater gender balance; contractual arrangements for senior officer employment; use of merit principles for employment, and anti-discrimination and equity policies for human resource management. (Davis & Rhodes in Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000). In addition, information technology was changing the way the public service operated.

Internal restructuring and the compiling of large super agencies took place in 1987 under the Hawke Government, reducing the number of agencies from 30 to 16 (Weller, Forster & Davis 1993). However, this was followed by a return to agency specialisation in the 1990s according to Weller et al. (1993).

Changes also occurred in a regulatory way. The early Australian public service was governed by the Federal Public Service Act of 1902 and 1922 (Australian Public Service 2003; Verspaandonk, revised by Holland 2003; Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000). In 1984 the Public Service Act was reformed, and a new Public Service Act was delivered in 1999. The passing of the Public Service Act 1999 provided the core principles upon which
the Australian public service now operates. Amendments to this Act and the Financial Management and Accountability Act 1997 allowed new agencies to be created to carry out functions not suitable for one department, such as the Australian Greenhouse Office, the National Oceans Office and the Australian Government Information Management Office (Management Advisory Committee 2004).

Each State also has Acts that guide the State public service, for example in Queensland there is the Public Sector Ethics Act 1994, Public Service Act 1996 and the Whistleblowers Protection Act 1994 (APS 2003).

Table 3.1 captures a number of the key changes experienced in the Australian public sector, which then flowed on to the States’ and Territories’ public sectors, including employment and human resource management, regulatory roles, financial and information management; relationship with Ministers; and service and program delivery. Changes have also occurred in the way agencies do business and their focus, as well as internal operational changes.

Table 3.1
Overview of public sector management changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous approach – internal &amp; external</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery a government monopoly</td>
<td>Purchaser/provider split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of contractors primarily for construction</td>
<td>Public sector compete with private providers (must be competitive neutral), significant increase in contracting out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-size-fits all approach</td>
<td>Introduction of choice for service provision &amp; FOI as avenue for redress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on probity, precedence &amp; accountability</td>
<td>Management for outcomes &amp; managerial prerogatives,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on process</td>
<td>Focus on results, use of outcomes/output framework for reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic approach to service delivery</td>
<td>Customer oriented service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male dominated (women had to resign if they married)</td>
<td>Equal opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career based (entrenched system for those already employed)</td>
<td>Merit based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monopoly of policy advice to government</td>
<td>Research and access to expertise, public consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central control of budget, personnel and practices</td>
<td>Devolved management of budgets &amp; personnel to managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant centralised approach to managing the service</td>
<td>Devolved management responsibility and instigation of reporting processes to CEOs and Ministers, risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>Public management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrenched systems and procedures</td>
<td>Greater flexibility and responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>Private sector management principles and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited accountability</td>
<td>Full accountability to public – open and transparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered service, government monopoly</td>
<td>Outsourcing, privatisation and contractual agreements using private sector, also agency competition with private sector; competition and contestability; accessibility, customer service charters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information paper based and limited transmission/access</td>
<td>ICT technology revolutionised information management and public accessibility to information Business unit approach to measure performance; conduct strategic &amp; business planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic management</td>
<td>Use of strategic planning and business planning outcomes focused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 continues…
### Table 3.1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous approach – internal &amp; external</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Central budget control</td>
<td>- Decentralised budget management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employment arrangements male dominated, entrenched system, patronage practised</td>
<td>- Equal opportunity, anti-discrimination, gender balanced. OWH&amp;S, performance based contractual senior positions; enterprise bargaining; pay disparities between agencies; introduction of SES level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bureaucratic skill and familiarity with system</td>
<td>- Managerial, personnel, project and financial management and communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Merit protection through appeal process</td>
<td>- SES structure &amp; short term contracts; loss of junior grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accounting and financial management non-accrual</td>
<td>- Improved staff morale &amp; flexibility for employment; use of performance appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Significant role in economic &amp; labour market policy</td>
<td>- Accrual accounting; emphasis on forward estimates with full long-term costs; program management &amp; budgeting at portfolio level; devolution of assets management to agencies; asset sales and rationalisation; introduction of ‘offsets’ and efficiency dividends; adoption of accrual accounting; tender management; user-charges between agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regulation core part of agency &amp; built into their structure</td>
<td>- Economic regulation less command &amp; control towards managed markets and use of fiscal incentives/disincentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regulatory role in economic &amp; labour market</td>
<td>- Decentralisation; shift from regulating utilities to monitoring contracts and auditing financial performance; National competition policy &amp; separation of regulatory roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Westminster assumption public service ‘neutral’</td>
<td>- National competition policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monopoly of policy advice</td>
<td>- Separation of regulatory arm of public service from service arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Merit protectionism</td>
<td>- Ministers initiate changes, set priorities, influence implementation; pluralisation of policy advice, ministerial involvement in recruitment of senior officers; competition for senior positions, senior officers provide policy advice to Minister to fulfil accountability to parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Key utilities publicly owned also Government trading companies &amp; public corporations. Changes began with Whitlam Government corporatisation of Australia Post and Telecom</td>
<td>- Performance management for agency heads; leadership capabilities important; focus on leadership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Administrative provincialism of agencies</td>
<td>- Preference for private ownership; sale of major Commonwealth assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Extensive devolution to for decision-making; outsourcing client-based services; greater demands for coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1987 saw reduction of number of Departments under the Hawke Government, but later in 1990’s return to specialist departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Flatter agency structure &amp; formal introduction of executive agencies like Centrelink, devolution &amp; outsourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased focus on risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technology solutions, drive towards interoperability of information management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Developed for this research

Source: Summary of key public sector management changes

### New public sector management

The changes have been referred to as ‘new public sector management’ O’Flynn (2007). Elements included in the new public sector management included: a strong focus on management; use of performance appraisal to encourage efficiency; disaggregating public bureaucracies into agencies that deal with each other on a user-pays basis; use of quasi market practices such as contracting, fostering competition, and working on cost cutting issues. Senior positions became limited term contractual engagements (Hood 1991 cited by Davis & Rhodes in Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000). Private sector management principles were introduced including managing for outcomes, business planning, and quality assurance, and greater political and ministerial control of Departments relating to policy management.

Specific characteristics of this new public sector paradigm were: hands-on professional management; explicit standards and measures of performance; emphasis on output controls; disaggregation of units in the public sector; greater competition in the public sector; private sector management practices; and greater discipline and thriftiness in resource use (Hood 1991 cited by O’Flynn 2007).

The changes in public sector management and the complexity of issues influencing government roles and responsibilities created a need for joined-up and whole-of-government (WOG) approaches and a growing need for collaboration and coordination across agency portfolios. (Management Advisory Committee 2004). The Management Advisory Committee report (2004) was a detailed investigation into joined-up, integrated and WOG activities.

In the past, WOG activities were mostly pursued through organisational restructuring and machinery of government changes, whereas today it is more about the culture, capabilities and relationships to support, model and conceptualise WOG solutions (Briggs 2005). This involves not only working across portfolios and jurisdictions, but integrating policy and programs to achieve outcomes more efficiently and effectively. It is about changing the thinking in agencies seeking to integrate and having shared outcomes as well as how agencies work collaboratively (Briggs 2005).

There are three areas of WOG - how the public service communicates, how the public service integrates policy, and how the service does things (Briggs 2005). Section 3.4 uncovers some of the difficulties in WOG and initiatives where agencies must work together, including in regional development projects and initiatives.

In closing this section on public sector management changes, the Australian Public Service Commission ‘State of the Service 2006 – 2007 Report’ provides a good summary, illustrating that changes related to overall philosophy, as well as operational changes, for example: shifting from silos to networks as a way of working; focusing more on WOG outcomes, not single agency outcomes; being more responsive to stakeholder needs; less program management just within agencies but rather shifting to managing across agencies; a focus on citizens experience across agencies; reduction in specific agency reporting, to
shared outcomes reporting; emphasis on cooperative resourcing; reward and recognition for
vertical and horizontal management; sharing information and cooperative knowledge
management; shared leadership; WOG values incorporated into agency cultures; and
capability development focusing on collaborative ways of working. The studies by the
Management Advisory Committee (2004) and the Institute of Public Administration (2002)
identified and considered these areas in developing recommendations and tools to support
GAs working together in WOG projects.

The Australian public service now has more people with qualifications than in
previous years; engages more senior personnel; and involves more mature aged personnel.
The report indicated that challenges facing the public service included building agency
capacity, modernising employment arrangements, building sustainable leadership and
monitoring ‘corporate health’ (Australian Public Service ‘State of the Service 2006-2007
Report’).

Changes in societal structure and complexity; ICT creating a 24/7 access to
Government; and increasing competitive and contestable service delivery through a wide
range of mechanisms (for example direct, self-regulating, 3rd party, partnerships) were also
part of the context and operational challenges faced by the public service (Australian Public

Future prospects

There are a number of difficulties that have been identified in implementation of the
new public sector management practices, for example: challenges to competitive practices;
increased costs in contract preparation and management; lack of evidence of efficiency of
privatisation, contracting and use of markets (O’Flynn 2007) and others cited by O’Flynn
such as Entwhistle & Martin (2005) O’Flynn & Alford (2005), Minogue (2000), as well as
between individual demands and public interest, erosion of accountability and responsibility
due to fragmentation and risk taking in the public sector ( Lawton 1998) cited in Minogue

Some ‘unintended consequences’ were identified from application of new public
sector management, which included fragmentation of service delivery in an effort to provide
choice; introduction of a new range of organisations into the horizontal and vertical
coordination arena; impact on the government’s ability to ‘steer’; complexity of corporate management environment requiring greater management skill; accountability affected by the difficulties in ‘steering’ as well as complexities in order to know who is accountable for what outcomes (Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000). There was also the tension between consumer responsiveness and traditional political accountability; politicisation; and the inclusion of a diplomatic role within managerial roles for senior staff to manage internal and external networks, whilst still ensuring that their agencies ‘deliver’ (Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000).

A new paradigm may be emerging (O’Flynn 2007). This paradigm is a public value approach, which draws away from market versus state philosophy and is based on the work of Moore (1994) cited in O’Flynn (2007). Public value, according to O’Flynn is multi-dimensional incorporating collective preferences mediated politically and consumed by citizenry, not just through outcomes, but as a result of just and fair processes (O’Flynn 2005b, cited in O’Flynn 2007). O’Flynn indicated that others could see it as a value created by government through laws and services and regulation, a yardstick to measure resource allocation decisions using appropriate systems of delivery. There are strong links with the creation of public value being akin to the creation of private value for stakeholders (Moor 1995 cited in O’Flynn 2007). The outcome of this new paradigm is the redefining the management of the challenges of efficiency, accountability and equity (Stoker 2006, cited in O’Flynn 2007), with the inference that the future of the public sector, in adopting this paradigm or version of it, may encompass:

- less competitive approach
- focus on relationships
- express the collective preferences
- multiple objectives including service outputs, satisfaction outcomes, trust, legitimacy.

- multiple accountability including citizens and customers
- adopting a menu of alternative delivery mechanisms to suit need, selected pragmatically

### 3.2.3 Regional Development brief evolutionary overview

Chapter 2 provided an overview of the regional development environment in which the research problem exists, with some limited comment on the evolution of regional development in Australia. The chapter also identified some of the issues and challenges faced by Government when working in regional development.
This section examines the general evolution of regional development in Australia from a national perspective. The intent is to present some of the major factors that have influenced the course of regional development in Australia and to note some of the key approaches and policies. The policies and influences have shaped the regional development activities and approaches adopted by State and Local Government, but these are not dealt with in detail.

The section looks first at some general observations regarding the early evolution of regional development. The section then covers eras of post-war, 1960s – 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000-2008. The conclusion includes two figures. Figure 3.4 on page 129 illustrates the inter-relatedness and influences of Government, governance and public sector management on regional development. Figure 3.5 on page 132 reconstructs Figure 3.3 – the map of the context for the research and literature review. The figure incorporates key factors and influences uncovered through the literature research on the evolution of Government, governance, public sector management and regional development.

**Regional Development general**

Regional development policy in Australia has been shaped by the activities of different jurisdictional institutions and agencies, levels of government, under different macro-economic conditions (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics or (BTRE) (2003). BTRE has categorised regional development policy broadly reflecting macro-economic influences, as follows:

- **Between 1788-1900 early colonial regional development policies** were based on expanding primary industries, building basic infrastructure (railways, roads and bridges) and providing transport. There was focus on employment and expansion of emerging manufacturing industries. Goals, incentives and grants were available for new resource developments. Bounties, tariffs and other trade measures were in place to protect colonial markets.

- **The pre-trade liberalisation** policy era was from 1920s – 1970s. This involved protecting and growing home markets through tariffs and other industry policies. Settlement patterns and population growth creating highly urbanised centres also drove attempts to encourage population decentralisation and ‘regionalisation’ through inter-governmental regional committees of the 1940s. The Federal
Government developed ‘regionalised’ programs with a spatial delineation of administrative and service delivery areas. Policies focused on developing further secondary and tertiary industries to diversify the economy. The increasing disparity across regions led to fiscal equalisation principles and measures to address social and structural adjustment issues in non-metropolitan areas.

- **Post-trade liberalisation** is the final era from the mid 1980s, which involved structural adjustment programs and the management of adverse regional employment impacts arising from trade liberalisation, open markets and globalisation. In addition, BTRE noted that there were policies to address sustainable development and to address market failures such as resource degradation.

The involvement of Federal and State Government in regional development has historically been centralist in approach, involving policy about delivering services and supporting regional development by national policies and initiatives, rather than being responsive to regional needs (Coombs (ed.) 2001).

Broad regional policy in the past was driven by high level goals such as population decentralisation from capital cities; federal fiscal equalisation for unified standards of public service provision; and measures to address social and economic disparities from structural adjustment, employment changes and business performance in non-metropolitan areas (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003).

Early regional development could be described as land taking, mining, maritime activity, with ports being extremely important (Wilson in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). Wilson noted that settlement patterns were continent wide, with strong pastoral and construction activity between 1861 and 1890. This followed the gold rush period in 1851 – 1860. Pastoralism, according to Wilson, determined location of regional towns to service farming areas, transport routes to ports for export, and industry related activities in towns.

Population settlement patterns in early Australia meant there was a concentration of people in cities and less settlement in the hinterland due to agricultural development (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003). The gold rush in the mid 1800s, triggered a rapid population increase. Advances in technology in late 19th century fuelled agglomeration
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of construction, manufacturing and services in urban centres; and in-migration of surplus labour to cities as mining decreased (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003).

Five forces shaped Australia’s economy and population and the characteristics of early regional development. They were: natural resource appraisal and appropriation; immigrant labour and capital; internal migration and agglomeration; and transport changes and innovation (Wilson in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). The combination of these forces, according to Wilson, led to comparative advantages and specialisation in regions.

A key influence on regional development policy and government intervention has been and still is, federalism, in particular the Commonwealth delegation of financial assistance in tied general purpose grants to States and Territories (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003; Dore & Woodhill 1999). As outlined in the previous section 3.2.1, the nature of the relationship between Federal and State Governments oscillates around control, power and authority. Uniform income taxation introduced in 1942, gathered by the Commonwealth has enabled the Commonwealth to pursue fiscal policy objectives in the national interest (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003).

Pre 1970s the Commonwealth’s regional development policy was primarily to equalise States’ capacity to provide public services, via grants (Higgins & Zagorski 1989). The power the Commonwealth has is due to the fact that the Commonwealth collects most of the revenue and has the power to distribute the revenue, as it sees fit (Dore & Woodhill 1999).

State and Local Governments’ regional development policies after Federation, focused on decentralisation (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003). There was a view that large cities were unhealthy; lifestyle was better in the country with the desire to promote rural population growth (Vipond in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). State Governments provided incentives to encourage external firms and in-migration to regional areas, including low cost loans, loan guarantees; subsidies on industrial land and buildings; streamlining approvals and regulatory processes; and subsidies for utilities (Vipond in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989).

Post War

Government intervention and policy in regional development post war, until 2002 can be divided into the following stages:
- **1940-1970 Post war federal reconstruction policies** (ministry of Post-War Reconstruction); direct industry strategies; a ‘regionalised’ focus and formation of inter-regional committees; industry tariffs and location incentives

- **1972 – 1975 Growth Centres Program and urban renewal projects**; locational program funding; public investment in infrastructure; planning and land acquisition activities; establishment of regional authorities to encourage ‘growth centres’

- **Early 1980s Country Centres Project; Office of Labour Market Adjustment** to address structural unemployment arising from trade liberalisation and open economy; commencement of a shift to community self-help; programs focusing on longer term regional economic benefits; regional employment initiatives like business incubators, training and assistance

- **Mid 1980s endogenous growth strategies based on comparative advantage**; community participation in local planning; establishment of Area Consultative Committees for local and regional policy development; employment, education and knowledge industry initiatives; investment in R & D and vocational training

- **1990-2002 Whole-of-Government (WOG) approach to regional issues**; market oriented policies; social capital building; public infrastructure development in non-metropolitan areas with service shortfalls; sustainable development of degraded regions; Federal agency cooperative frameworks; programs based on community self-help; investment in rural transaction centres; natural resource management programs for degraded regions

**Source:** Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003.

There were a number of influences on regional development since the war, which provides some contextual setting in relation to the stages of regional development presented above by BTRE. The influences included economic fluctuations; industry structural adjustment; and concern regarding security, income, employment growth, urban congestion, rural recession, and environmental issues (Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989).

Each of the three levels of government have an individual view of their own role in regional development. The Commonwealth held the view that the national objectives of
efficiency and equity apply spatially and required the Governments to work together. The States considered that due to their role in infrastructure and service provision, they should have the leading role in regional development. Local Governments’ view was that because of their role of managing regional communities, Local Government should be part of any national policy consideration in regional development. Evident in these views is the Federal/State lead role in regional development and Local Government stake in regional development (Garlick in Dore & Woodhill 1999).

Early regional policy was strongly interventionist post-war, particularly in the 1950s and 1960s and focused on adjusting regional disparity (Zagorski in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). Curtin and Chifley both adopted regional development policies. Curtin encouraged a coordinated regional development planning approach through the Ministry of Post War Reconstruction (Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989).

There was effort to coordinate regional development and planning between tiers of government and organisations across regions (Beer in Prichard & McManus (eds.) 2000). The aim was to develop underutilised economic potential in non-metropolitan areas. However Menzies did not proceed with this approach. Chifley developed top-down driven initiatives as part of his regional policies to decentralise and adjust settlement patterns to sparsely populated areas, but these were soon abandoned (Beer, Maude & Prichard 2003).

These early regional policies were linked with national and economic processes. The Federal Government therefore was concerned with spatial direction of population and employment and avoided issues like social welfare and income (Vipond in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989).

Regional economic development policies in the 1950s and 1960s involved strategies to attract large national or multi-national firms and external investment through subsidies and financial incentives, being an exogenous approach to regional economic development (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003).

1960s and 1970s

Regional development and governance practices were generally centralised (Coombs (ed.) 2001), and in 1965 a Committee was set up to look at decentralisation, as all states faced pressures from rapidly growing urban centres and costs of providing infrastructure (Neutze in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). In addition settlement patterns created an urban

In the 1970s both the Whitlam Government, and to some extent the Fraser Government, adopted a decentralised regional development philosophy, and in 1972 the National Urban and Regional Development Authority was set up (Prichard & McManus (eds.) 2000). Following a change of Government, Whitlam set up a new Department, the Department of Urban and Regional Development (DURD), promoted growth centres such as Albury Wodonga, established programs such as the Area Improvement Program targeting disadvantaged areas, as well as the Regional Employment Development Scheme (Prichard & McManus (eds.) 2000). The focus was decentralisation and the promotion of designated growth centres (reflecting growth pole theories), as well as urban renewal in large cities (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003; Neutze in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989).

Regional development was very much about addressing the problems of cities, urban pressure and future economic and social development (Vipond in Higgins & Zagorsky (eds.) 1989; Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003). The National Urban and Regional Development Authority was renamed the ‘Cities Commission’. (Prichard & McManus (eds.) 2000). The Fraser Government coalition from 1976 – 1983 wound down DURD and most of the programs set up by the Whitlam Government (Prichard & McManus (eds.) 2000).

The Whitlam Government had commissioned a green paper on ‘Rural Policy in Australia’ which was the first attempt at a unified rural policy since the 1940s (Cockfield & Botterill, 2006). This paper highlighted the need for rural structural adjustment and acknowledged the impact of issues facing the rural sector from a welfare perspective (Cockfield & Botterill, 2006). A number of reconstruction schemes were developed. In terms of rural agricultural activity and communities, this was the beginning of much debate regarding intervention, industry structural adjustment and action to address the welfare of rural communities (Cockfield & Botterill, 2006).
Following a number of reviews, the Rural Adjustment Act 1992 was passed. In 1996 the scheme was again reviewed and replaced by another package, the Agriculture Advancing Australia scheme (Cockfield & Botterill 2006).

Another program instigated at this time was the ‘New Cities’ program that provided funds for growth centres and 12 areas were chosen. Development Corporations were established and money was made available to buy and develop land. This was the first strong focus into regional development since Chifley and was a top-down approach (Sorenson 2000).

Another aspect of government intervention in the 1970s and 1980s, was the provision of essential infrastructure described as the ‘resource frontier’ (p2) and triggered by the minerals boom (Higgins & Savoie, 1994 cited in Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003).

Between 1973 and 1979 the economic impacts from the oil crisis occurred, creating manufacturing decline and increase in unemployment (Vipond in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). These impacts influenced Government policy for regional development. Some of the response to these impacts included policies focusing on developing manufacturing industries (Jackson 1975, cited by Taylor and Garlick) and a White Paper on Manufacturing Industries in 1977, which suggested that regional industry adjustment assistance was required (Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989).

It was during this time of negative economic impacts and challenges facing Government that the 1976 Coombs Royal Commission on Australian Government Administration was undertaken. Section 3.2.2 page 96-101 documents some of the changes to the public service triggered by this report (Davis & Rhodes in Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000).

The Australian economic and settlement profile contributed to the economic decline that began in the 1970s, being resource extraction, with limited cities, and limited infrastructure outside the cities (Higgins & Zagorski 1989).

1980s

There was a decline in regional development activity at the Federal level, with the policies developed in the 1970s being wound up from 1982 – 1983 (Vipond in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989).
Prior to the last two decades, quality of life was more even across Australia, but then radical social, economic and political reform had a major impact on regional Australia (Beer, Maude & Prichard 2003). Reforms included: opening up of the economy to a global market; reduction of protection of a number of industries; industry rationalisation; floating the Australian dollar; which affected the competitiveness of exports; de-regulation of the financial markets, and privatisation of many government services, including telecommunications and government owned banks, as outlined in section 3.2.1. (Beer, Maude & Prichard 2003; Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003).

In essence, this was a shift of the Government’s perspective from the economy to marketisation, with a flow on effect to the social and economic areas of regions. Negative social and economic impacts occurred in regional Australia as a result of these economic policies, including a decline in regional lifestyle, increased regional disparity, loss of firms from regions, and increased unemployment (Beer, Maude & Prichard 2003).

An ageing population added to the issues faced by regions. The impacts on and issues affecting regions were contributing factors to community disenchantment with Government (Beer, Maude & Prichard, 2003).

The regional development environment changed and became more complex. Some of the influences and factors that affected regional development policy in the 1980s included: recession; national issues of monetary and fiscal policy; wage issues; inflation; and growing unemployment (Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). These factors led to micro economic reforms, which included a need to assist adjustment in urban and rural areas, and to promote equity and accessibility (Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). According to Taylor and Garlick this resulted in a centralised approach that was compensatory and advocated employment creation strategies.

The impacts of regionalisation and globalisation were contributors to regional disparity (Prichard & McManus (eds.) 2000). Gerritsen in Prichard & McManus (eds.) (2000 p 123) suggested that in addition to the impact of globalisation, the policy conflict between equity and efficiency in new public sector management practices, (which had involved withdrawal of some public sector services in the rural areas), may also have contributed to rural decline.
Government allowing market forces to ensure national wealth and prosperity as a contributor to regional decline has been the subject of considerable debate by many, for example as cited in Australian Housing and Urban Research (2002) by: Lawrence (1987), Taylor (1996), Smailes (1996), Black et al. (2000;), Prichard and McManus (eds.) (2000).

Another perspective on the approach to regional development from the 1970s onwards is that it was neoliberalist, which culminated in the 1980s and 1990s (Tonts & Haslam-McKenzie 2005). Tonts and Haslam-McKenzie use as examples, some of the reforms presented earlier such as: liberalisation and deregulation of economies, privatisation of State owned services and enterprises, reduction in welfare spending and the use of market principles; and for regional development a reduction in government involvement in economic development and infrastructure.

The Hawke Government undertook limited regional development activities, delivering the ‘Country Centres’ project and ‘Strengthening Local Economic Capacity’ programs (Sorenson 2000). The ‘Country Centres’ project was a project with community driven solutions, local management of development activities and private sector involvement (Taylor & Garlick 1989 cited in Bureau of Transport & Regional Economics 2003). The Office of Labour Market Adjustment was also established to look at unemployment issues and support local business incubators (Beer in Prichard & McManus (eds.) 2000).

The Hawke Government also focused on the public service, policies and programs. As mentioned in section 3.2.2, the Hawke Government reduced the number of government departments in an effort to streamline agency activities. The Hawke Government wanted to close gaps and duplication in government services and introduced interventionist policies and programs, creating a welfare state. There was an identified need for spatial consideration in policy development to overcome the impediments to communities, requiring tailored programs and also encouraging communities to help themselves (Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989).

From the mid 1980s regional policy began to reflect a longer-term view of regional competitiveness (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003), rather than the previous focus of compensatory and equity issues with disadvantaged and poorly performing areas (Garlick in Dore & Woodhill 1999). During the 1980s the endogenous growth theories
based on comparative advantages became evident (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003).

Both growth and decline in regional situations created their own social and economic problems. This meant that broad spectrum policies were not applicable and there needed to be effort to develop human capacity, build strong linkages with community and government, and to reconsider resource use and efficiency and effectiveness (Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989).

A change occurred in Government in relation to the philosophy on regional development policy. The changed philosophy was that the government role was facilitatory, to help regions to help themselves, with Government removing the impediments to growth (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003; Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski 1989). It was also evident that regions would differ in their needs, illustrated by Taylor’s and Garlick’s three types of regional characteristics: growth regions, potential for growth regions, and declining regions. Regional policies needed to reflect a local approach according to needs, encouraging communities to self-help, break down parochial attitudes and the targeting of government help to meet local conditions (Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski 1989).

There was a greater awareness of the need for coordination across spheres of Government. Coordination of regional development across tiers of government was identified at the Local Government Ministers’ Conference in 1986 (Garlick in Dore & Woodhill 1999). There was a need for the encouragement of horizontal integration of government policies and programs to identify complementarities, conflicts, redundancies and duplication (Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski 1989).

1990s

During the 1980s and 1990s government policies and approaches were influenced by various theories, particularly relating to regional economic development. Examples include: Paul Romer’s theories regarding growth being driven by knowledge; the ‘new regionalism’ of Cook and Morgan; Putnam’s social capital theory; Porter’s and Enright’s theories building on the growth pole concepts from the fifties, with regional growth being based on co-location, competitive advantage and collaboration of firms in high growth industries; Henton’s collaborative leadership and Florida’s development success based on human and creative capital (Collits 2003).

Regional development policy and programs during this time focused on addressing unemployment, for example through the ‘White Paper on Employment and Growth’ cited in Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics (2003). A federal program implemented as part of this paper focused on building regional economies by gaining access to world markets, developing business opportunities, and also building social capital and regional leadership (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003), reflecting Porter’s concepts.


The Kelty Taskforce Report ‘Developing Australia: A Regional Perspective’ identified the need for better coordination of government programs, and greater encouragement for self-help in communities (Forth 1996). The report also successfully put regional development back on the national agenda. The report recommended modernising transport and communication infrastructure, improving education and setting up Regional...
Development Organisations to develop regions and coordinate regional development policy (Tonts & Haslam-McKenzie 2005).

The resulting Keating Government’s regional program is described as ‘report led recovery’ ((Fulop & Wiggers de Vries 1997, p 41), with problems being viewed as essentially economic, and the initiatives being concerned with competitive regionalism (Fulop 1993, 1996; Hurley 1993 cited in Fulop & Wiggers de Vries 1997).

The role of Government in regional development in the 1990s became one of a change agent (Sorenson 2000). Examples of this role, are the Federal program ‘Strengthening Local Economic Capacity’ of 1992 to improve regional business and local government skills, and the ‘Working Nation’, 1994 targeted at expanding business horizons, workforce skills and institutional leadership (Sorenson 2000).

There was a view that these programs were flawed conceptually (Sorensen 1994; Sorensen & Baker 1996, cited in Sorensen 2000). This was because there was limited capacity in regional development institutions to transform business culture, and limited infrastructure included. However the programs did assist in shifting recognition that regional development rested with the local communities. The levels of government set the context in which development took place and which assisted those who become victims of change (Sorenson 2000). Additionally, regions and communities varied in their capacity to manage change, and to be adaptive and entrepreneurial (Sorenson 2000).

The Keating Government set up the regional development program in 1994, which included funding Regional Development Organisations (RDOs) that were community based to undertake strategic regional planning and capacity building (Beer, 2000 cited in Bureau of Transport & Regional Economics 2003). This was part of the Keating Government’s policy to position the nation as globally competitive and was combined with industry and macro-economic policies (Dore & Woodhill 1999).

The Federal Government also set up Area Consultative Committees across Australia’s regions comprising community, unions and business members. This federal policy approach was of concern to the State and Local Governments, as both had the view that they had prime responsibility for regional development (Dore & Woodhill 1999).

The REDOs had to implement regional strategies, including a large number of State and Federal Government programs, and often involving local government strategies as well
The Federal Government viewed the REDOs as a vehicle to have more adaptive, dynamic and flexible institutional structures. REDOs were to draw on the cross section of regional leaders involved in REDOs to drive competitive regions (Fulop & Wiggers de Vries 1997).

The findings of the Productivity Commission report of 1996 had challenged the value of state and federal cash transfer based assistance, and also selective industry assistance, with the view being it was just shifting costs to other industries and distorting location of business. (Bellamy, Meppem, Gorddard and Dawson 2003). The report also identified the importance of regional development initiatives that build regional leadership, ameliorate pace and scale of regional adjustment, using local knowledge, supporting learning across regions and cooperation within regions (Bellamy et al. 2003). A further Productivity Commission Report in 1999 did not consider the regional development policies in place to be productive and expressed the view that they appeared uncoordinated, and overlapped State and Local Government regional development (Bellamy et al. 2003).

When the Government changed, the Howard Government withdrew the funding and focus of the Federal Government from regional development in 1996. However the issues facing Australia arising from globalisation and the impacts in regional Australia from policies to increase productivity and competitiveness did not diminish. The Howard Government struggled with the compromise between political expediency and desire to support regions, adopting a more WOG approach to delivery of services and implementation of policies (Beer, Maude & Prichard 2003).

The philosophy was to ameliorate impacts of the inevitable restructuring of the Australian economy, without interfering in the process of change (Beer, Maude & Prichard 2003). ‘Rural Transaction Centres’, ‘Networking the Nation’ to develop communications, and small programs such as the ‘Regional Solutions Programs’ are example of programs instigated at this time. These programs aimed to address some of the regional disparity issues, equity of access to services and decline in rural areas. The policy approach however, continued to reflect the philosophy of regional self-help and developing regional leadership.

Irrespective of which theories were adopted to inform policy and program development, conflicts occurred for government and regional development policy in managing changes affecting regional Australia (Sorenson 2000). Conflicts noted included:
coastal versus inland development; regional centres versus small peripheral country towns; national development versus regional development; conflict amongst alternative infrastructure investments (rail lines, airports, alternative telecommunications etc.); infrastructure versus services; regional residents versus shareholders (of companies providing services in rural communities such as banks). These conflicts, Sorensen indicated, are also compounded by other factors such as limitations of Government resources; the parameters of what is considered to be ‘good governance’; Constitutional responsibilities and the need for commitment to future generations in terms of sustainability (Sorenson 2000).

There was a growing influence of the issues faced in rural areas, including rural decline intensified by: low commodity prices; drought; out-migration; inadequate or declining services; limited knowledge-based industry representation; and a growing perception of economic and social inequality (Sorenson 2000). These factors were strong drivers for regional development policy change and were highlighted at the Regional Australia Summit of 1999. The summit brought together leaders from across Australia to discuss addressing issues affecting regional Australia. The Summit represented the direction for 2000 onwards. Further detail of the summit outcomes is presented on page 120.

Three themes appear in the changes of approach to regional development. They are: developing different industries; the need to be ‘smart’ and build on intellectual capacity; and government adopting a different role in regional development other than providing grants to address regional disparity (Beer, Maude & Prichard 2003).

The State government regional development activities at this time focused on strategic planning, business promotion, infrastructure development and supporting a range of local development organisations and boards (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003). These boards and organisations, had as the most common function, encouraging businesses to grow, through supporting planning, education and training services and promotional activities to attract investment (Beer 2000, cited by Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003).

State Governments had variously relocated agencies to regional areas as part of a push for regionalisation; used financial incentives; invested in infrastructure; provided incentive schemes to attract skilled professionals; funded research and development; provided business services to improve business operations; supported clustering initiatives;
and undertaken social capital building and community economic development (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003).

At the Local Government level, local governments assisted in the delivery of Federal and State programs, and by the nature of the role of local government at a regional level, influenced investment and development decisions through land-use planning and zoning (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003).

The role of Local Government changed from ‘roads, rates and rubbish’ to a primary role in land use planning, and regulation and approval of development (Bellamy et al. 2003). Local Governments were involved in regional development organisations, state administered environment and planning arrangements and federally funded programs such as Roads to Recovery, as well as social enhancement in place management initiatives, which focus on a particular location to address economic and social issues and needs. The Community Renewal program by the Department of Housing in Queensland is an example. Their role included ensuring the sustainability of the development in their area of jurisdiction (Bellamy et al. 2003).

However the absorption of the additional responsibilities put Local Government under pressure financially and from increased expectations from community. There was no room for parochialism, therefore Local Governments addressing issues for their own communities, had to look beyond their boundaries and seek partnership and strategic alliances. There was a need to focus on both structural and process aspects of regional governance (Bellamy et al. 2003).

Local Government needed to ensure the proper institutional arrangements are in place to effectively carry out their roles, build capacity to enable collective inter-sectoral capacity in decision-making and negotiations at a wider level. Local Governments also needed to manage the process by resourcing the transition to the new collaborative way of working, and building knowledge (Bellamy et al. 2003).

In 1999 the Howard Government document Regional Australia: Meeting Challenges focused on delivering micro and macro economic management of the Australian economy, as well as emphasising improving services to regions (Prichard & McManus (eds.) 2000). The Regional Australia Strategy perpetuated a WOG approach involving working with
communities to plan viable futures (Anderson & McDonald 1999 cited in Prichard & McManus (eds.) 2000).

The Howard Government’s regional development approach was a continuation of the neoliberal approach, evidenced in the two policy documents of Regional Australia: Leading the Way in 1996 and Regional Australia: Our Commitment in 1998 (Tonts & Haslam-McKenzie 2005). Tonts and Haslam-McKenzie also pointed out that during the Howard era there was the rise of the ‘One Nation Party’, and a growing dissatisfaction from rural and regional voters. This drove a policy shift from neoliberalism to collaboration, personal and collective responsibility between government and community, and re-engagement of community (Tonts & Haslam-McKenzie 2005).

During the 1990s there was also a growing interest in ecologically sustainable development (ESD). ESD had been a concern as far back as 1962 with the early work of Rachel Carson The Silent Spring and E.F. Schumacher Small is Beautiful in 1974. However, the profile of sustainability and ESD principles were considerably raised with what is referred to as the Brundtland Report of 1987 – Our Common Future which was an initiative of the World Commission on the Environment (Dore & Woodhill 1999).

The United Nations Rio Earth Summit conference developed a blueprint for sustainability which was composed in Agenda 21. Further global momentum for sustainability was achieved through the 1997 Kyoto Conference on Climate Change, focusing on greenhouse gas emissions. Sustainable development concepts are often filled with unresolved issues regarding balance and what ESD means in terms of economic, social and environmental policies and strategies (Dore & Woodhill 1999).

Australia’s recognition and endorsement of the concepts of ESD across all governments in the early 1990s was through the National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development (COAG 1992) and the Environment Protection Act 1997 (Dore & Woodhill 1999).

2000 –2008

The final report by the Regional Australia Summit Steering Committee (2000) from the Regional Australia Summit of 1999 gave an indication of the complexities facing regional development policy and action. The report contained almost 250 strategies to address regional issues. There was evidence of a stronger commitment for greater collaboration,
cooperation and integration of effort by the three tiers of Government to achieve regional
development outcomes. A summary of key outcomes, recommendations and actions is
presented below:

- The summit recommended a vision for Regional Australia and a number of guiding
  principles, which were that government, business and communities have joint
  responsibility to address problems and should work together; a bottom-up approach
  should be adopted; and initiatives should be flexible to cater for particular
  circumstances and needs of various regional, rural and remote communities.
- The Summit identified areas of change that included community empowerment,
  community economic and business development; and a goal of equity of services in
  regional communities. There was a determination that a clear and cooperative approach
to improve service delivery was agreed by Regional Development Ministers from
States, Territories, Local Government and the Commonwealth.
- A number of other key actions were identified including refinancing of rural programs;
  and a focus on infrastructure, water and roads, education and health. Of particular note
  is the implementation of ‘Rural Impact Statements’, to identify regional impacts of any
  new policy on regional Australia. Amongst the programs and funding commitment was
  $90 million to the ‘Regional Solutions Program’ focusing on helping regions facing
  challenges and strengthening economic and social bases in these areas. A goal was to
reduce the gap in economic opportunity between country and city.
- Another outcome of the summit was a Government commitment that delivery of
  programs and communication were to focus on facilitating better coordination across
  agencies. This approach reflected the focus in the European Union, OECD countries
  and United Kingdom. The report also indicated the intention that the regional
  development strategy should be long term.
- Of the Future, the Summit reiterated support for undertaking a range of things,
  including: increasing cooperation across government; a 10 year MoU between levels of
  Government; building on local networks established through the application of various
  programs. In terms of improving service delivery, in 2000 the Regional Development
  Ministers and the Australian Local Government Association agreed on a ‘Framework
for Cooperation’, and also agreed to collaboration in areas of shop front delivery and leadership.

The signing of a ‘Framework for Cooperation’ (Regional Development Council 2000) amongst the three levels of Government represented an affirmation of the need for the three levels of government to work collaboratively. The Regional Development Council (RDC) outlined the Framework, which incorporated the following as important: co-operation across government levels; building community capacity; diversifying regional economies; growing and attracting businesses; and fostering innovation and working cooperatively on public and private sector infrastructure.

The RDC also outlined some underpinning principles as part of the Framework being: partnerships; community inclusiveness; and long term commitment by Government. The RDC described the Framework intent to be to reduce duplication and overlap; encourage communities to set their own priorities; improve cooperation and flexibility amongst levels of Government to address individual regions’ needs. In addition, it was noted that Governments were to cooperate with the private sector to assist investment, consult with each other, find new ways to leverage optimum benefit from resources and use existing structures.

The roles of the three levels of Government outlined in the framework were:

– **The Federal Government** - to work in partnership with communities to foster self reliant regions, support community plans and aspirations, opportunity take-up by reducing impediments to growth, building skills and infrastructure and delivering targeted coordinated programs and services. The Federal Government role is also to assist communities to adjust to social, economic, technological and government induced change and to meet challenges to sustain productive natural resources.

– **State and Territory Governments** - to deliver policies, programs and services to enhance economic performance by building on comparative and competitive advantage, business development, community development and capacity building, foster innovation and skills development and improve access to services and manage the environmental quality of regions.

– **The Local Government** - to continue to support and manage progress of local and regional activities and use multilateral agreements between governments and agencies to improve services, planning, funding and delivery of programs.
As previously mentioned, the Federal Government had developed the ‘Regional Australia Strategy’ as part of the 1998-1999 budget, with a focus on WOG help to address regional needs. This included for example, improving regional services; supporting employment and business initiatives; enhancing regional infrastructure; supporting rural initiatives and addressing environmental sustainability. Some strategies that were implemented included the ‘Rural Plan, Rural Communities Program’, and ‘Rural Transaction Centres Program’. (Annual Report 1998-1999).

A series of statements in the early 2000s communicated the Howard Government’s intent and approach to regional development. The essence of the approach is presented in the brief summaries below:

– In ‘Regional Australia: Making a Difference’ (Commonwealth Government 2000) the statement communicated an underlying intent to address regional disparity, an effort to assist regional Australia to share in the country’s prosperity, and to ensure improved equity of access to services and infrastructure. The statement referred to the findings from the Regional Australia Summit 1999.

– The Department of Transport and Regional Services paper ‘Stronger Regions – A Stronger Australia’ outlined the Federal Government’s approach to regional development, including a growing ‘national’ strategy approach for a number of areas, for example in transport and natural resource management. The document also acknowledged the importance of addressing social and economic impacts of change, environmental issues and community equity of access to services. New initiatives proposed included the ‘Sustainable Regions Program’, support for exporters, a regional business development analysis, enhancement to the ‘National Competition Policy’ and a program to raise awareness of and access to Government information. However, in the forward to the document, there was a clear message regarding the Government’s role and responsibility in regional development and the responsibility of community to share the issues:

‘It needs to be made crystal clear that where it is decided that change is required in the national or common interest, then the broader community must share the
burden of those changes. This is a vitally important principle for dealing with both economic and technological change, and for responding to challenges of better natural resource management in Australia. The Government looks to communities themselves to identify and work to realise the potential of their regions.’

Source: Forward by John Anderson, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Transport and Regional Services in ‘Stronger Regions – A Stronger Australia’

In the statement ‘Regional Australia: Partners in Growth’ (Commonwealth Government 2001), there was continued promotion of the ‘partnership’ philosophy and the Federal Government’s collaborative activities with regional communities to achieve regional development outcomes.

Approach themes relating to regional development evident in the late 1990s into 2000 and beyond were: a focus on decentralisation rather than regional economic disparities; a shift away from population decentralisation to industry based objectives, which was then followed by policies looking at longer term economic potential in regions based on comparative advantage and market opportunities; increasing community participation; provision of regional infrastructure for public services and to support industry competitiveness; and lastly a greater emphasis on education and training to build social and human capital (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003).

There were some consistent policy themes being: provision of efficient infrastructure; facilitating labour market opportunities; fostering local business innovation and expansion; leadership training and social capital building; promotion of regional competitive strengths; and providing better coordination across tiers of government (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003).

A growing influence on current regional development theory is that of regionalism. At the OECD conference entitled ‘Learning Cities and Regions’ held in Melbourne in 2002, the theoretical foundations of ‘new regionalism’ underpin the approach and policy prescription of the OECD, with new regionalism likely to have a significant impact on economic, social and environmental policy (Rainnie 2002).

Globalisation has driven regionalism, and the ‘State of the Regions’ report in 2001 indicated that there was a re-emergence of local and regional economy as a unit of innovation. Regional stakeholders were seen to be key players (Rainnie 2002).
Regions in this instance are broader than traditionally conceived, according to Rainnie (2002). The Australian Local Government Association’s 2001 ‘State of the Regions’ report reflected elements of new regionalism and that regionalism is also evident in State Government regional approaches (Rainnie 2002). ‘Victoria as a Learning Region’ is an example of applying this approach. The concept of creating ‘learning regions’ and the pursuit of a knowledge-based economy, need regions to be connected to the global economy, to have collaborative regional networks and an informed, learning regional community (Garlick in Dore & Woodhill 1999: pp184-185).

Five elements have been identified in new regionalism, being: transition to a knowledge economy; clusters; encouraging embeddedness of global firms; a new role for the local and national state; and dealing with disparities across regions (‘State of the Regions’ report 2001) cited by Rainnie 2002). The OECD sees economies shifting from manufacturing and production of physical goods to information handling, knowledge accumulation and knowledge goods (Rainnie 2002).

Significant in new regionalism is tacit and codified knowledge, with tacit knowledge being seen as at the centre of new regionalism. Emerging regional development strategies are reflecting knowledge, collaboration and partnerships between government, private sector and non-profit organisations (Rainnie 2002).

As with other regional development theories, there are critics (Rainnie 2002 cited Lovering 1999, and McKinnon, Cumbers & Chapman 2002). Lovering (1999) and McKinnon et al. (2002) noted, for example, that there is the risk that by devolving responsibilities to regions, State and Federal Government will no longer take responsibility for addressing the issues of struggling regions. This shifts the social policy from welfare to individualistic responsibility, and from being distributional to being competitive (Rainnie 2002).

Other flaws are the limited understanding of just what ‘knowledge’ is crucial and the view that unskilled work will disappear (Rainnie 2002). Additionally, the replicability of the clusters models to the Australian scene including the complexities of which Porter speaks, could take regional Australia some time to achieve (Rainnie 2002).

There is also the issue of conflict between policies seeking to address social exclusion and those seeking to develop the economy (Ash Amin 1999 cited in Rainnie 2002). There is
a need to move from a culture of command and hierarchy to a reflexive culture that encourages diversity of knowledge, expertise and capability (Ash Amin 1999 cited in Rainnie 2002). Additionally the institutional base should be broadened and that social economy be mobilised through the growing influence of community projects (Ash Amin 1999 cited in Rainnie 2002). Partnerships and collaborations often exclude those at whom they are targeted, which challenges the notion of community involvement and partnerships as an avenue to engage disenfranchised groups (Geddes 2001, cited in Rainnie 2002).

Regionalism and localism as a focus for regional development creates governance challenges in relation to devolution, joined-up and WOG approaches. (Loechel, Lawrence & Cheshire 2005). Governance now includes non-state entities and there is a growing focus on place-based modes of governing, planning and decision making (Jones 2001; Reddel 2002a cited in Loechel et al. 2005). State and local government face significant challenges in new ways of governing at a regional level. This includes finding ways to work across levels and portfolios to deliver WOG outcomes, and involving non-government sectors (community and business) in the decision-making process (Lawrence 2004, Everingham, Cheshire & Lawrence 2003, Reddel 2002b, cited in Loechel et al. 2005).

The checkered evolutionary history of Government in regional development, including policy focus and program approaches may be crystalising into specific themes. A consensus may have been reached amongst Australian governments regarding regional development issues and solutions (Collits 2003). The consensus involves the following themes: sustainable development; regionalism and regional competitive advantage; region specific policies and local solutions to local problems; the implementation of a bottom up and community driven approach for economic development; facilitation and partnerships with a self-help ethos and new organisations at a meso level to drive regional strategies; emphasis on regional leadership; focus on existing business rather than industry attraction; and more selected and targeted regional assistance.

**Rudd Government in 2008**

Following the election of the Rudd Government in 2007, machinery of Government changes adjusted the previous Department of Transport and Regional Development Services, to the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government. The core business is described as contributing to:
‘the prosperity of the economy and the wellbeing of all Australians by assisting regions to realise their potential and manage their own futures.’


The Rudd Government outlined a regional development approach in a statement in March 2008 that has highlighted the Government’s new vision for regional Australia - being based on building partnerships, clearly articulating that regions develop solutions, rather than Government; ensuring a government that is responsive to local priorities and regional needs; and new investment in infrastructure, broadband, health care, education, skills development, innovation and water, as illustrated in the closing points of this section and articulated in the extract below:

‘This Government’s new vision for Regional Australia is based on building partnerships to ensure the Government is responsive to local priorities and needs, but is underpinned by major new investments in the areas of infrastructure, broadband, housing, health care, education skills development, innovation and water. The message to regional communities is clear – this Government will work with you to make your solutions work. We will bring fresh ideas and a new approach which will harness the potential of our regions and develop them for a better future.’


Infrastructure is a strong focus of the Rudd Government. The *Infrastructure Australia Act 2008* was passed in April 2008 enabling the establishment of Infrastructure Australia. This body will develop the strategic blue print for future infrastructure in partnership with States and Territories, Local Governments and the private sector. Commonwealth Government, Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government 2008). Previous regional development programs have ceased and the Rudd Government has committed to assist local communities through the ‘Better Regions’ program, focusing on developing important community infrastructure to enhance the livability of regions. More recently, in response to the economic crisis, infrastructure construction has been included in the Economic Stimulus Package as a way to create business and employment opportunities (Australian Government, Economic Stimulus Package 2009).
As part of re-engaging community the Rudd Government held the 2020 Summit, seeking comments and ideas to build a ‘modern Australia’ (Australian Government, ‘2020 Summit’ 2009). In addition, the Rudd Government has embraced sustainability and climate change, having set up a Department of Climate Change.

The Rudd Government is replacing the Area Consultative Committees with Regional Development Australia (RDA) Committees. The focus of the RDAs is to be a vehicle to communicate regional development needs and issues from individual regions. The RDAs are to establish a close relationship and alignment with the States’ and Territories’ own regional development structures and organisations. (Regional Development Australia 2009).

Conclusion

The impact of GA core business conflict on agencies working together in regional development is central to this research. Sections 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 have traced the evolution of Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development, and provided some indication of the influence of the changes and drivers in each area, upon each other.

Figure 3.4 (page 129) illustrates the interconnectivity of the three areas of Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development, and shows that regional development, being at the heart of the activity of GAs and Government is therefore strongly impacted by Government and governance, and public sector management practices. For the purposes of this diagram regional development is simplified into four areas of outcomes: economic, social, environmental and infrastructure.
1. The yellow highlighted area represents regional development, which is at the heart of the area of investigation.

2. Regional development involves economic, social, environmental and infrastructure outcomes, represented by the coloured dotted line intersecting circles.

3. Government and governance processes (represented by the orange circle), control and influence what occurs in the four key areas of regional development, and influences the regional development environment in which the private sector operates. Government and governance also influences the structures, functions, processes and systems of public sector management practices and therefore shapes how GAs deliver their core business.

4. GAs core business and activities are directed and operationalised through public sector management practices and broadly cover the four areas of regional development – being economic, social, environmental and infrastructure. The areas of the intersecting dotted line circles not encompassed by the purple public sector circle represent the activities of...
the private sector and non-government agencies in the four areas that contribute to regional development.

Figure 3.5 (page 132) updates Figure 3.3 from page 85, and illustrates the impact of some of the factors and influences upon the contextual map for the research, drawn from the literature overviews contained in section 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3. The factors and influences create the dynamic environment in which the research problem exists. The increased complexity of issues affecting regions and communities, policies and practices aimed at efficient use of limited resources, impacts of globalisation and technology and the emergence of regionalism and localism for governance play a strong role in shaping regional development and the imperative for GAs to work together.

The pink shaded boxes capture some of the influences on the research problem context and include such factors as:

– **influences upon the Government and governance process areas** - including exogenous factors such as economic shifts, increased competition due to globalisation, community expectations, challenges of equity and efficiency, sustainability, climate change

– **Government and governance changes that affect public sector management practices and GAs role, responsibilities, outcomes and thus core business** - including responsiveness, community consultation, efficiency, effectiveness and social justice, technology, information management and impact on service delivery and community engagement, scarce resources, accountability and transparency, and influences of federalism, regionalism and localism

– **Public sector management practices** – including marketisation (user pays, outsourcing), contractual service provision, performance management, managing for outcomes, accrual accounting, accountability, politicisation, SES contractual
employment, private sector management approaches such as business and performance planning and evaluation, community service charters

- **the need for GAs to work together** – complexities of issues and factors, cross-cutting issues and issues requiring national response, interdependencies, case management and place management.

- **mechanisms adopted to facilitate working together and WOG approaches** – including MoUs, partnership Agreements, shared service arrangements, taskforces, one-stop shops

- **barriers, issues and impediments to effective collaboration** – pressure to deliver on core business outcomes, organisational structure, culture and practices, budget allocation

- **potential new mechanisms to facilitate GAs working together** – adoption of a holistic approach to regional development, coordination and integration of policy, planning, programs and services, collaborative activities for place-based and case management, new regional governance arrangements

Section 3.3 of the literature review captures the issues and impediments to agencies working together and section 3.4 looks at some of the approaches, processes and tools that have been developed to address the issues and impediments affecting GAs working together.
Figure 3.5
Revised map of the context for research and literature review

Drivers
Influence of changing economic structure, lifestyle expectations, community expectation, equity & efficiency; sustainability, climate change, globalisation; new regionalism; social & community obligations; equity; global agendas; global financial market; emerging new economies & competition; relationships between Government and citizens.

Government and governance
Government determines how public sector will be structured and function, and dictates agency core business responsibility.

Changes & pressures
Community consultation, coordination across 3 tiers; WOG policy development; balance efficiency with social justice; benefits & impacts of macro versus micro policies; sustainability and climate change; community expectation; technology & information management & impact on service delivery; expertise & capacity to deal with complexities of environment to be governed; scarce resources to deliver government outcomes; representation; loss of community trust; accountability & transparency; institutional narratives, nature of federalism; competing priorities.

Government Agencies
- apply public sector management practises to focus on delivering core business
- Complexities of issues & needs being addressed
- Co-dependencies across agencies to achieve outcomes
- Scarce resources
- Organisational culture & structure not conducive to working together
- Constant re-structuring

Public Sector Management Practices
- Directs process, systems, financial management, planning, reporting and accountability, performance management, program and policy design
- Investigate changes to be responsive to Government
- Market driven - commercial; user pays, efficiency & effectiveness, outsourcing & contracting; private sector management practices - performance management of staff; EEO employment arrangements, business planning; financial management - accrual accounting; accountability & reporting – multiple masters (cabinet, ministers, DG, Community), community service charters

Issues and opportunities requiring agencies to work together
- Inter-dependencies of agencies; shared responsibilities; community obligation; equity & sufficiency; place management & case management

BARRIERS – CONFLICT, ISSUES & IMPEDIMENTS – Section 3.3 investigates this
- Responsibility from Government to deliver core business; structures & organisational culture, processes & systems under new public service management; social obligation & service delivery

MECHANISMS:
- Cooperation, collaboration, partnerships, Memorandum of Understanding, Agreements joined-up government initiatives, integrated service delivery initiatives, WOG initiatives, one-stop shops, taskforces,

NEW MECHANISM
- Holistic policy development; adoption of a collaborative culture & philosophy; use of tools & processes within formal and informal arrangements to facilitate ease of working together; inclusion of public/private/community sectors in partnerships

COORDINATION OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES & OUTPUTS INCLUDING OUTCOMES & OUTPUTS FROM ALL AGENCIES
- Holistic – economic, social, environmental & infrastructure; inter-dependent agency activities; place-based projects; influence from regionalism and localism & government adoption of self-help policy focusing on fostering regional & community capacity building

Source: Compiled from the literature review in sections 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3.
Source: Developed for this research.
3.3 Issues and impediments to agencies working together

Section 3.3 explores the GAs’ challenges when working together from two perspectives - regional development and the Government approach for joined-up, integrated and WOG initiatives.

Although articles such as Vincent (1999), and the Management Advisory Committee (2004) study identify that agencies focusing on their own core business is a barrier, no literature or research has been identified that deals specifically with GA core business conflict. This section therefore looks at related literature examining the issues and impediments identified when agencies are working together, contained in reviews and studies of joint projects and WOG initiatives.

3.3.1 Issues and impediments experienced in Regional Development

Reference 1 (A study) - Fulop L, & Wiggers de Vries M (1997) A Preliminary Study RDO in NSW

This study is an initial evaluation of the Regional Economic Development Organisations (RDOs) set up under the Commonwealth Government funding in the early 1990s. The study had a New South Wales focus and was supported by the University of Wollongong through ARC Small Grant. This preceded a further study (covered as Article 2), conducted on RDOs across Australia.

It must be pointed out that this study is not about agencies working together, but about non-government RDO organisations. The learnings extracted from the study highlight some issues and impediments in working with levels of Government and GAs in regional development.

Background

A number of studies and reports preceded this report, the most relevant of which was a major evaluation of the Regional Development Program (RDP) commissioned by the Department of Transport and Regional Development, a new department created by the Howard Government in 1996. McKinsey and Company undertook this review, which concerned the first Regional Economic Development Organisation (REDO) set up. There were interviews with regional stakeholders, including disaffected groups and a benchmark
study including searching global competitive benchmarks, functional and process benchmarks and strategic benchmarks. The intention was to define global best practices. By the time the study was completed the Howard Government had abolished the RDP. The Government had undertaken a National Commission of Audit in 1996 and found that the program represented inefficiencies, overlaps and duplication (Regional & Enterprise Development Network, 1996:1 cited in Fulop & Wiggers de Vries 1997).

The study of this report was hoping to address issues raised about these success factors and other challenges faced. The aims of the study were therefore to investigate how REDOs were responding to regional initiatives, constructing profiles of REDOs in NSW; generate data to compare and contrast outcomes and objectives of REDOs and develop some indicators to benchmark regional economic development through this mechanism.

The REDOs were the first attempt to draw non-government organisations into the national strategy for economic development, and also for regions to be drivers of their own regional development fate.

**Methodology**

Two questionnaires were completed by committee members and the Executive officers undertaken face-to-face where possible. There were 45 questions of both open ended and pre-coded for Committee Members. A general Questionnaire about REDOs had 51 open ended and pre-coded questions. REDO members were able to review results before publishing.

**Sample**

The sample comprised four REDOs in New South Wales. The organisations being investigated were set up with the intention of developing and promoting regional development, planning and capacity building. They were expected to assist regional stakeholders to develop a more integrated, cooperative and efficient approach to regional planning. Funding was from the Keating Government’s allocation of approximately $150 million in 1994 to support establishment of REDOs and implementation of regional development initiatives.

**Results**

- Results of the study included a lot of information about the ‘how’ and ‘what’ of setting up, operating, determining outcomes and objectives of REDOs. Not all issues raised are
recorded here. Instead, comments and issues relevant to issues and impediments to working together have been extracted. Some refer to REDO and GAs’ interaction and others are relevant because they are simply about working together in regional development. Results are shown in Table 3.2.

- When asked about important criteria for effectiveness, respondents identified that improved cooperation amongst stakeholders was desirable. This would include the GA stakeholders too.
- In the General Questionnaire, impediments to performance included complexity of reporting, accounting and auditing requirements. This tends to indicate that GAs involved were required to capture this information for their own reporting purposes, and had systems and processes that were complex.
- Negative factors mentioned included inconsistency in what was done; inaction; conflict; unreasonable demands (not clear whether this was by community or government); politics – both internal and general; onerous reporting and accountability and application and review processes. Problems with Government were specifically mentioned in 2 responses, one with the federal and one with the state.

### Table 3.2

Summary of results of preliminary study of REDOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty and sensitivities of relationship building</td>
<td>• Improving cooperation amongst regional stakeholders • Collaborative action • Shared vision and goals • Trust and openness • Free flow of information. • Having a strategic plan in place</td>
<td>Nil noted</td>
<td>• Identifying common goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of reporting and accountability required by government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing strategic plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for a coordinated approach to regional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Understanding teamwork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from analysis of Fulop L, Wiggers de Vries M (1997) A Preliminary Study of RDOs in NSW.

Source: Developed for this research.

**Conclusion**

The diversity of regional stakeholders, levels of government and GAs involved represented the key challenge to REDOs. GAs working together in regional development would potentially face the same challenges. These challenges were compounded by what Sorenson (1994), cited in Fulop and Wiggers de Vries (1997) described as Government’s centralised strategies that don’t recognise regional identities, circumstances, expectations and opportunities.
The study followed article 1 reviewed above. The study covered 15 Regional Economic Development Organisations (REDOs) across Australia. There were 75 committee members and 15 Executive Officers who completed questionnaires. The study was undertaken through an Australian Research Council Collaborative Grant with the University of Wollongong and the National Committee on Regional Cooperation, under the auspices of the Australian Local Government Association.

**Background**

REDOs were set up across Australia as part of the Federal Government’s Regional Development Program between 1994-1996. The purpose was to boost Australia’s international competitiveness from the local level through initiating and implementing strategic regional development projects. By 1996 47 REDOs were established. An evaluation of the program was commissioned by the Department of Transport and Regional Development, a new department created by the coalition government in 1996. McKinsey and Co undertook the review. Evaluation was in two parts and included interviews with regional stakeholders, including disaffected groups and a benchmark study. The aim of the evaluation was to define global best practice in regional development. The study was completed in 1996 and titled ‘Supporting Regional Leadership: Unfinished Business’. The report was critical of administration of the regional development program and supported regional leadership teams and development of economic data bases. In 1996 a pilot study was undertaken of 4 REDOs (see previous study).

**Methodology**

The methodology was a qualitative one and involved data collected via interviews. Interviews were administered in person or over the phone. Data was analysed for key issues.

**Sample**

For this study seven of the REDOs from the McKinsey and Co study were included. The organisations were to be from across Australia, in both regional and rural areas and have a full-time executive officer. Some cross-border REDOs were included. Fifteen were
chosen, with nine being from previous organisations with a predominantly local government base, and the other six were new organizations set up under the regional development program.

**Results**

A large component of the report looked at the roles, operational issues and activities of the REDOs. Information in relation to the topic of this research has therefore been gleaned from the responses and recorded in Table 3.3. In addition, a list of important elements to successfully manage regional development initiatives was drawn from the information.

**Table 3.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding was identified as major issues</td>
<td>Financial government needs to be a key stakeholder and show leadership</td>
<td>Nil noted</td>
<td>One goal was to build regional cooperation amongst diverse stakeholders. This relies on cooperation and coordination to develop strategic plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of regional understanding by Federal Government</td>
<td>Federal Government needs to work together with the State on regional development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of infrastructure seen as an important part of regional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the Federal Government</td>
<td>Gain strong support from State and Local Government</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formation of leadership teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and accountability confusion in areas across borders</td>
<td>Reassess funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of empowerment locally</td>
<td>Don’t politicize</td>
<td></td>
<td>Breaking down regional boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicisation</td>
<td>Coordination of regional development across levels of Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that State Government wanted to close REDOs</td>
<td>Local Government be involved and lobby Federal Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A national blanket policy is not achievable, needs flexibility</td>
<td>State Government minimize impact of State boundaries on regional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to trust</td>
<td>Liaise with Government, particularly Federal Government who was providing funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding compliance to bureaucratic and pre determined idelogues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochialism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing the Federal Government would support its own program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of faith in the Government by community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor communication across levels of Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of resources in regional development through overlap and duplication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Developed for this research.

**Conclusion**

This study primarily points to the need for Government at all levels to be coordinated and consistent in regional development. In general terms, any organization, government or
non-government aiming to achieve regional development outcomes through regional stakeholders, needs a capacity to manage things like stakeholder relationships, parochialism, coordinated activities and resources.

Reference 3 (a review) Dore, J & Woodhill, J ‘Sustainable Regional Development Final Report 1999 – Cape York Peninsula Land Use System (CYPLUS) project Greening Australia

This report investigates the challenges of improving communities, economic performance and environmental management through regional initiatives. The report is in essence, what Dore and Woodhill (1999) describe as a ‘stock take’ of sustainable regional development. It analyses and makes recommendations of what is required to optimize sustainable regional development in the future. The report is an output from a project by Greening Australia in collaboration with the Australian Local Government Association. The report was funded by the Commonwealth Government through the Department of Transport and Regional Services and supervised by Environment Australia. Material is from multiple sources and includes seven case studies. Information was gathered through literature research and discussions for the bulk of the report with national, state and local players. It also drew material together from a national conference and provides an extensive literature review. The Cape York Peninsula Land Use System (CYPLUS) case study in Queensland is chosen for this research.

Background

CYPLUS was an integrated planning activity and one of the case studies documented in the Sustainable Regional Development Final Report (Dore & Woodhill 1999). This was one of seven regional case studies. The focus for all the case studies is sustainable regional development.

The CYPLUS project covered an area of 137,200 sq km in the north-eastern extremity of Australia comprising a diverse natural environment with a monsoonal climate. It is sparsely populated (approximately 18,000) with predominantly Indigenous persons and Torres Strait Islanders. Weipa, Thursday Island and Cooktown are the largest towns. The project emerged as a result of conflicts and concerns regarding development proposals, environmental issues, Aboriginal land rights in Cape York, land speculation for tourism and mining. Indigenous concerns for conservation had resulted in successive State and Commonwealth government lobbying for land use planning. The Hawke Government had
supported regional planning for the area and in 1988 the Queensland National party appointed engineering consultants to conduct a resource analysis. Following recommendations from the report and Goss Labour Government election, the joint study CYPLUS was agreed. It was to be undertaken in 3 stages. Stage 1 involved information collection begun in 1992 and finished by 1995. This was to have a broad picture of resources, ecology, land use, economy, society and culture and issues identification. Stage 2 was to focus on strategy development to begin late 1995. The final strategy was released in 1997 for approval. This had a vision, principles, broad policies and mechanism for implementation. Stage 3 was the implementation. CYPLUS offers an ideal example of the tensions and conflicts across levels of government, community and regional processes.

A taskforce was set up by Department of the Premier, Economic Development and Trade to oversee Stage 1. An inter-Governmental management Committee through the office of the Coordinator-General was to oversee the process of public participation. There was a research program to collect data and community based research. People, Land and Nature working groups were set up by the taskforce.

From stage 1 the lead agency in Queensland was transferred from Brisbane based in the Office of the Coordinator-General, to the Cairns office of the Department of Local Government and Planning. A Cape York Regional Advisory Group was set up. This group was important for stage 2 and had 15 key stakeholders. Stakeholders were from a broad range of people, communities and Indigenous organisations, Land Councils, industry representatives from pastoralism, mining, tourism and fishing, unions Queensland Mining Council Cairns and Far North Environment Council, Australian Conservation Foundation and Wildlife Preservation Society. Numerous departments were also involved. The Cook Shire Council was the main Local Government involved.

Methodology

This was a case study and involved the collection and collation of information from a variety of sources, including speaking with members of the Advisory Group.

Results

Lessons were collected for the case study from a review of stage one by Howlett (1996), in Dale & Bellamy 1998 and cited by Dore & Woodhill 1999). Lessons identified the following:
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- Unresolved philosophical division between a development oriented bureaucracy in State agencies and preferences of the regional taskforce group
- Queensland Government approached CYPLUS in a technocratic, centralised planning way, controlling decision-making
- Government drove its own agenda in allocating funds and commencing scientific research before community consultation.
- Community suspicion of Government
- Failure to communicate purpose of CYPLUS to the community
- Politicisation of activities in the area with the East Coast Conservation zone declaration occurring just before the election

Stage 2

For Stage 2 the Cape York Regional Advisory Group (CYRAG) was formed for strategy development and had 15 key stakeholders. CYRAG developed a set of decision-making principles for sustainability, self determination, reconciliation, value-based planning, social justice, maintenance of biodiversity and ecological processes, cultural values, community involvement and management efficiency.

Davis et al. (1993) and Mercer (1995) cited in Dore and Woodhill (1999) noted that organizational structures and the Federal system of government posed problems for pursuit of decentralised and integrative approaches to policy development and implementation. The problems in CYPLUS were seen as too complex to maintain bipartisan support. Difficulties included the fact that the Local Government did not have authority to make decisions; there were issues of Native Title; and the fact that the region encompassed World Heritage areas affected levels of support.

Results

Results from the case study are presented in Table 3.4. Key issues related to relationships and trust, decision-making, poor project design, timeframe limitations. Solutions and processes concerned developing appropriate governance structures, community engagement, clearly defined government roles and responsibilities and rules of engagement, with key success factors resting on leadership, cooperation, and respect and clearly articulating decision-making processes.
Table 3.4
Summary of results of the Cape York Peninsula land use system (CYPLUS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time to build trust and relationships</td>
<td>Get decision-making right</td>
<td>Nil noted</td>
<td>Ability to negotiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult shifting perspective to see ‘the bigger picture’</td>
<td>Integrate, but don’t just pay lip service to integration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership and leadership style important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process back to front and should have had problem identification first, before data collection</td>
<td>Determine appropriate roles and responsibilities for Government and Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generating spirit of cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional decision-making processes in a community driven process</td>
<td>Be clear about directions and decisions, reporting and accountability requirements and processes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging rights and interests of different Indigenous groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to address the practical dynamics of bringing community and government together</td>
<td>Clearly determine boundaries of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education on technical, negotiation and institutional requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack knowledge of institutional, technical and negotiationary requirements at a regional level</td>
<td>Better classification and organization of information and data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clearly articulate the decision-making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframes</td>
<td>Communication is very important</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clearly determine the roles and responsibilities of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional arrangements for WOG initiative like this</td>
<td>Make the institutional arrangements clear and also those for negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government not seen as committed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with various Acts Minerals Resources Act, Land Act, State Development Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed messages from Commonwealth and State Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination across levels of Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and data management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Stage 3 was the implementation. At the time of writing the report, Dore and Woodhill (1999) indicated that challenges ahead would be whether State and Commonwealth Government would honour and accept the validity of the strategy. It was notable that CYPLUS broadened to be more than environmental.

Conclusion

The CYPLUS project was extremely complex in the nature of issues it was seeking to address, involved Acts and transgressed highly sensitive cultural areas. Many of the issues and challenges that occurred however, are similar to those identified elsewhere in this literature review, illustrating that whether community driven, or Government instigated and led, WOG initiatives faced similar challenges.
Background

This project was a collaborative project funded by the Australian Research Council Linkage Grant program and was supported by the Queensland Government Departments of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy, Main Roads, Queensland Transport, Local Government Association of Queensland, Griffith University, Central Queensland University and the University of Queensland.

The overall aim was to investigate the complexities of how, when, why governments do and should collaborate with each other, other spheres of government and community to deliver programs and services. The study was a three year study. The project intent was to: assess value of multi-sectoral collaboration and positive long term regional and broader government outcomes; determine enabling accountability frameworks and mechanisms; decide who and what makes best value collaborative partnerships; identify structural institutional arrangements such as regional coordination mechanisms, managerial strategies, participant capacities and to build capacity and potentially policy coherence (Guthrie, 2003 page 1).

Methodology

The methodology applied was action research, engaging all partners in a collaborative inquiry process. The scale and breadth of the project meant only one cycle of action research could be undertaken. A case study approach was applied within the action research. Five case studies were involved. These were selected through the Central Queensland Regional Managers’ Coordination Network, government partner representatives and university researchers. Case studies were:

- Airlie Beach/Whitsunday project based in Proserpine and Airlie Beach, initiated by Department of Main Roads in 2004 and including state and local government and community undertaken in partnership with Whitsunday Shire Council, Whitsunday Development Corporation and Whitsunday Chamber of Commerce and Queensland Transport, and with an intent to have appropriate planning in place to manage growth and deliver sustainable development.

Central Queensland: A New Millenium Regional Planning program was a collaborative regional planning project covering 14 local governments, with the first part of a three year process launched in 1999, and overall aims for the Regional Planning Advisory Committee to guide the development of a broad based regional plan focusing on regionally significant issues, involve a broad spectrum of population, foster collaboration between and beyond government and establish a triple bottom line approach.

Gladstone Integrated Regional Transport Plan, previously known as the Gladstone Road Transport Infrastructure Planning Framework Project, was a local government integrated transport planning project involving state and local governments including Gladstone City Council, Calliope Shire, Department of Main Roads, Queensland Transport, Gladstone Port Authority, Queensland Rail, Department of Local Government and Planning, Department of Natural Resources and Mines and linkages to the then Department of State Development and Innovation focusing on integrated approach for the Gladstone and Calliope region to connect transport corridors, spatial development and land use.

Yeppoon Bypass/Capricorn Coast Integrated Development project which was an initiative of the Livingstone Shire Council to revitalize the CBD and foreshore with key stakeholders being broader community, six state government agencies, local producers, freight handlers and retailers.

A detailed literature review was undertaken initially, followed by gathering of data through semi-structured interviews with a range of stakeholders involved in the case studies. By the end of 2005, 59 interviews were conducted of 45 minutes to 1.5 hours. All but a few were recorded. Additional interviews were to be undertaken in Brisbane head office of agencies.

Sample

Case studies selected had to enable study of how tiers of government and agencies work together to make decision for government outcomes spanning social, economic and environmental areas. The case studies were also required to involve some future activity, include perceptions and values and benefit to people, rather than just economic cost and benefit and be varied in level of complexity and issues. It was also important that the case studies demonstrated regional issues, allowed action research for ongoing activity, allowed
comparison of different types of collaboration and could investigate the logistics and funding for researchers involved.

**Results**

The Engaged Government project encompassed more than just looking at GAs working together, but included community engagement and therefore a wider spectrum of stakeholders. For the purposes of this research however, information is extracted from this report focusing on aspects that relate particularly to the GA inter-relationship and is captured in Table 3.5. Politicisation, voluntaristic nature of engagement, bureaucratization and departmentalism and planning were key issues. Solutions were to develop processes and tools, common purpose, governance frameworks, project parameters and rules for interaction. Learnings were the poor integration of systems, difficulties understanding collaboration and institutional issues.

**Table 3.5**

**Summary of preliminary findings from the Case studies involved in the Engaged Government project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Voluntaristic approach to engaged government, rather than a model</td>
<td>● Develop a common purpose</td>
<td>● Phase 1 findings</td>
<td>● Better understanding of institutional complexity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Politicisation and ministerial influence on regional collaborative activity</td>
<td>● Align structures and systems with regional needs</td>
<td>● Purpose was fragmented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Collaboration with a range of issues related to how to collaborate, the value of collaboration differs amongst people involved and relationship factors</td>
<td>● Develop capabilities and innovation</td>
<td>● Lack of integration of systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Bureaucratisation including departmentalism</td>
<td>● Develop governance frameworks, vision, principles and strong business rationale</td>
<td>● Poor capability for working new ways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Planning and implementation relating to relationship between planning and implementation, scale, linkage to resources</td>
<td>● Clearly define regional boundaries, policy imperatives tied to cabinet objectives, budget process and performance management systems</td>
<td>● Case study themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Develop appropriate accountability and authority</td>
<td>● View that compliance model rather than voluntary model of collaboration would have negative impacts on relationship and level of cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Support regional governance system</td>
<td>● Collaboration is highly dependent upon people and relationships, including the value people place on working together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● If devolution approach used ensure transfer of authority to appropriate local and community level</td>
<td>● Individual personalities, including leadership qualities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.5 continued…*
Table 3.5 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>• Development of formal or informal rules for interaction</td>
<td>• Legislation &amp; statutory frameworks restrict what agencies can do &amp; collaboration is not part of the frameworks, suggesting collaboration should be included in legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Determining the most effective number of parties to be involved</td>
<td>• Existing collaborative efforts – lack of understanding of what collaboration means</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Paradoxes were evident in: competing expectations and demands; whole-of-State and regional planning and service provision; regional and local planning versus service provision; silos and working collaboratively in a place; ideological issues relating to instrumental motivation; participative/associative democracy – a representation. The research also identified that a range of coordination approaches were possible.

Conclusion

Being an action research exercise, this particular paper was the second report of findings with further material available dealing with other aspects of the research. However there were some themes and issues affecting GAs working together that are reflected in other research and joined-up or collaborative GA project reviews covered elsewhere in this section. These include politicization, bureaucratization, departmentalism, decision-making capacity and legislative and statutory limitations.

Note:

In a related research commentary paper from the Engaged Government project Loechel, Lawrence and Cheshire (2005) explored broader factors than those involved in this research, including market forces, community and other non-government regional stakeholder organizations involved in participatory projects, a number of government-specific factors were noted. These include:

- Dissonance between high level bureaucratic/political decision making and lower level community planning
- Regional strategies being dependent upon the alignment of individual regional strategies of agencies
- Top down versus bottom-up decision-making
• Difficulties between a policy development and service delivery role, with city-based bureaucrats having limited knowledge of regional issues
• Power relations within emerging multi-level modes of governing
• Need for regional managers to gain higher level bureaucratic and political support for regional initiatives
• Government agencies operating in a two-way accountability (government and community).

The paper also noted some issues to be addressed that include:
• Building trust across agencies
• Encouraging positive and cohesive working across agencies
• Identifying factors, conditions, enablers for and barriers to long term success in collaborative arrangements
• Identifying and managing risks, dilemmas, paradoxes
• Developing capacity for collaboration and participatory activities
• Identifying range and limits in collaboration
• Dealing with power, community, institutional capacity, social exclusion and marginalization
• Understanding politics, personalities and institutional agendas
• Balancing need for bureaucratic protocol, correct procedure and accountability with trust, reciprocity, goodwill, flexibility and compromise.

3.3.2 Issues and impediments experienced in joined-up Government, Integrated Government and whole-of-Government initiatives


The review of WOG activities in the New South Wales public sector was carried out between February and July 1998. It was undertaken for the Premier’s Department.

Background

There were many WOG initiatives being undertaken, the Department was concerned that there was insufficient knowledge about the activities, and that they were not well
understood or acknowledged. People involved frequently raised issues concerning how
difficult WOG activities were to do. The Department was interested in gathering information
on the difficulties to determine what could be done to alleviate them. The review was a high
level one. The intention was to be broad and impressionistic and not to undertake an
individual evaluation of each initiative.

There were 19 WOG initiatives with a wide range of objectives. Most common
objectives were to focus on better services for customers; collaboration between relevant
agencies and levels of government; community participation; tailored responses to regional
and local needs; more cost effective use of resources; and questioning and redesigning the
way services are delivered to reflect people’s needs, not bureaucratic structures.

Vincent indicated that there was no one correct model for WOG initiatives. Three
options were suggested by Vincent:

- **case management** requiring redesign of traditional service delivery – is potentially costly,
  needs a common client group and clear identification of their needs. Agencies involved
  must be willing and have sufficient funds
- **place management** requires pooling of funds, collaborative service delivery and must
  have cost benefit
- **redesign of agencies** to bring together related services, although restructures aren’t
  proven to provide better service, but is useful if collaborating will definitely improve
  service, reduce costs.

Vincent identified a number of benefits from WOG activities. They included:
encouraging a cultural change to think across the boundaries; and suggested that the
networks and groups that form can be used for different projects. WOG activities help to
develop skills of collaboration, consultation and negotiation. Vincent was of the view that
there was greater involvement of community in initiatives and this offered agencies the
opportunity to develop processes for this, that WOG approaches help to redefine customer
service and make it interactive, rather than passive service delivery, and that. WOG also
provides a new way to address rural and remote area needs.
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Results

Results are presented in Table 3.6. Key issues noted reflected difficulties associated with core business and agency structure, legislative responsibilities and budgeting and accountability developed specifically to service the agency, creating challenges when GAs work collaboratively. Creativity, flexibility, joint planning and coordination of issue management were noted as solutions. No single approach was the ‘right’ for all. The importance of champions designated funding, staff skills and leadership was noted.

Table 3.6
Summary of results review of collaborated and integrated services in NSW public sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working together in WOG initiatives is demanding and frustrating. This is because the activity is outside the normal parameter of agency systems and status quo.</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties are seen to exist because agency structures and legislative frameworks reflect administrative convenience or tradition, and do not relate to individual or community needs.</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministers’ responsibilities reflect organisational and legislative structures and heads of agencies have contractual arrangements with the minister, not consumer group or community.</td>
<td>Inventiveness to find solutions</td>
<td>Commitment of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting and financial accountability is for individual agency purposes, not WOG.</td>
<td>Coordinated issue management for one-off time-limited issues – perhaps with a protocol set up</td>
<td>Effective champions &amp; sponsors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework for agency operation is based on individual agency function, not focusing on collaboration. It therefore can foster competition and exclusion.</td>
<td>Joint planning</td>
<td>Designated funding rather than trying to source funds from other budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency culture reflects the above issue.</td>
<td>Running a pilot program first to test arrangements &amp; structures Creativity</td>
<td>Leadership Stability &amp; continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a tension between WOG initiatives and agency’s normal framework of operation.</td>
<td>Coordinated issue management for one-off time-limited issues – perhaps with a protocol set up</td>
<td>Staff skills in planning, negotiation, managing relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency structures &amp; traditional functions &amp; operational arrangements can be barriers</td>
<td>Potentially three option – case management, place management, agency re-design</td>
<td>Need a different mind-set for decision-makers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Conclusion

Agency structures and legislative frameworks were seen as a key barrier. Vincent noted that agencies’ framework of operation are based on their function, not collaboration, and service the needs of the agency - suggestive of a core business focus. Agency culture was also identified as a barrier. Vincent considered that it was important to work on cultural change and pointed out that WOG initiatives needed to be separately resourced. In terms of models that would be useful, Vincent was inconclusive, but outlined a few and indicated the
issues that would need to be addressed and some of the structures that could be established. Vincent highlighted the detrimental effect of agency restructuring on consistency in WOG projects.


The Management Advisory Committee (MAC) report reviewed relevant experience of delivering WOG projects to identify better, practical ways of working across organisational boundaries. The review involved undertaking case studies.

Background

The MAC report noted that the Australian Government dealt with issues that face Australian Society that are increasingly complex, requiring strategic responses crossing the boundaries of Ministers’ portfolios. Additionally, the Australian Public Service was structured on portfolio responsibilities. The service experienced difficulties addressing the opportunities and issues arising from the complex and changing environment. The MAC initiated this project to identify views and capture information on processes and practices to assist flexibility and responsiveness. This was in relation to policy development, integration of program design, implementation and service delivery.

The MAC project was to:

- Articulate the different purposes and dimension of WOG approaches
- Identify what is needed to facilitate and support effective WOG initiatives
- Develop a good practice guide to assist agencies to adopt WOG approaches where appropriate

The MAC report compiled the findings into key areas:

- Structures and processes
- Culture and capability
- Information management and infrastructure
- Budget and Accountability framework
- Connections outside the public service: engagement in WOG activities
- Managing crises
The ‘Good Practice Guide’ referred to elsewhere in this research in Section 3.4 emerged out of this activity. WOG work includes design and delivery of policy, programs and services. This can arise from a top-down formal approach or at a local level and in conjunction with community.

**Methodology**

The project undertook literature research and captured information for the report through a case study approach. The project looked at both international and Australian experience, which formed the case studies. Findings from the research were summarised. The initiatives chosen for this research are the Australian ones only. The MAC project captured information from the case study analysis in the following areas:

- Budget and accountability framework for identified priorities
- Structural options and processes including inter departmental committees, taskforces and joint project teams
- Client and community-based approaches including Indigenous, rural and regional
- Crisis management
- Information structure
- Culture and training in the Australian Public Sector

The selection of case studies is presented below:

**Case study 1 – Australian Government natural resource management team (NRM team).**

**Background**

The team was responsible for the Australian Government’s strategy on sustainable natural resource use. It was established in 2002. It involved the Department of Environment and Heritage and the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and concerned the delivery of two programs – the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality National Plan. The budget was $1 billion between 2002-07.

Both programs were based on integrated planning and delivery at a regional community level. The team comprised over 100 staff and worked directly to two ministers. The Minister co-chaired a multi-jurisdictional Natural Resource Management Ministerial Council of Federal, State and Territory environment and agriculture Ministers.
Results

Three issues were evident – concern regarding the loss of individual department focus, including reluctance to join up policy development, differences in agency systems and processes and federal programs at a regional level, with a community focus. Developing good relationships, danger in over consultation of community and the single approach to natural resource management was an effective mechanism were some of the learnings. Success factors included having clear objectives, high level political commitment, with recognition that joint decision-making processes take longer. The team established agreed operating and administrative procedures and IT for seamless operation and also set up a mechanism for shared financial decision-making. Results are present in Table 3.7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solution, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk of losing some individual departmental priorities or desired outcome</td>
<td>Establishment of agreed operating protocols, administrative processes and decision-making structure</td>
<td>benefit of integrating areas of ‘logical fit’</td>
<td>based on clear, joint objectives understood and shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beware of over-collaboration</td>
<td>development of a business plan setting out roles and relationships of all agencies</td>
<td>better strategic outcomes; simplified face of government to community</td>
<td>high level political mandate for integrated outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join-up for program delivery, but not policy</td>
<td>management and responsibility</td>
<td>single approach to natural resource management</td>
<td>recognition of joint decision-making process taking longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural challenges and employee perceptions</td>
<td>Team building, special recruitment for purpose</td>
<td>importance of interpersonal relationships</td>
<td>secretaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two different personnel sections with different agreements and practices</td>
<td>creation of internal standardised operating protocols for seamless IT, financial, program administration, personnel and email systems</td>
<td>multiple community consultation can be wearisome for both parties.</td>
<td>co-location of employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial regulations and delegations</td>
<td>establishment of mechanisms for shared financial decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support from both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering Federal programs at a regional level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Case study: Australian Government natural resource management team (NRM team).

Source: Developed for this research

Conclusion

The case study highlights the benefit of working across agencies in areas where there are joint responsibilities, and common goals and outcomes required. Relationships, clear objectives and high level authority and support are considered crucial. Development of appropriate systems, processes for reporting and accountability are also important. However, issues such as the cultural differences between agencies, the differing employment agreements for each agency, and different financial and delegation processes presented a challenge.
Case Study 2 Australian Greenhouse Office

Background

The Australian Greenhouse Office (AGO) had responsibility for coordinating the Australian Government’s WOG response to Australia’s international obligations and national policy objectives for greenhouse and climate change. It was established in 1998 as part of the Government response to the Kyoto protocol negotiations.

The group resided in the Environment portfolio but reflected many parties’ interests. It was to adopt integrated, balanced approach and facilitate economic and environmental benefits for Australia in responding to the greenhouse challenge. Multiple objectives include national interests for jobs and employment and to contribute to reducing greenhouse emissions. It became an executive agency under the Public Service Act 1999.

Corporate governance changed from initially being accountable to the Ministerial Council on Greenhouse. Later it became accountable only to the Minister for Environment and Heritage in 2001. This changed in 2003 to being the Environment Minister as well as Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources.

Results

The main issues related to difficulties of senior officers to reconcile responsibility and reporting for a joint project within the Financial Management Act framework. Agencies had different models and culture. A number of different groups were set up to oversee the project. Amongst key learnings was the benefit of having an organisation focused on greenhouse emissions rather than spread across portfolios and the importance of balancing administrative processes with the requirements of WOG reporting. High level support and strong leadership were also important. Key success factors included setting up the right structure, gaining senior staff support and understanding stakeholder capacity. Results are presented in Table 3.8.
## Table 3.8
### Summary of results of the Australian Greenhouse Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Initial problems for secretaries with accountability under the Financial Management and Accountability Act 1997</td>
<td>- Set up group made an executive agency in 2000</td>
<td>- Focused effort on greenhouse emission in one area rather than spread across portfolios allowing knowledge to be built.</td>
<td>- Got the structure right, changed over time to ensure reflect economic and environmental factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Different accountability models impacted differently on effectiveness of policy development</td>
<td>- Used ministerial council model, then single minister and then dual ministers Interdepartmental committee on Sustainable Environment,</td>
<td>- Produced a forum to free agencies from interagency administrative burden so they could address issues</td>
<td>- Understood capacity of stakeholders and responded appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need for joint decision-making between two departments</td>
<td>- Combined state process reporting through the IDC</td>
<td>- Kept negotiations going</td>
<td>- Established a high level support for policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Initial cultural differences from seconded employees, and different certified agreements et Perception this is another silo</td>
<td>- Focused on developing a cultural identity for the group</td>
<td>- Need to balance administrative difficulties of reporting structure in WOG way</td>
<td>- Recruited right people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Issues owned by agency, not stakeholders</td>
<td>- Developed separate documentation for both processes</td>
<td>- Structures need to suit purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WOG work is not the core interest for many agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>- High level support is important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Effectiveness and rigour of consultation early on</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Strong organisational culture important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Two policy development processes, challenge information management</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify information management needs and issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provided single point of access with comprehensive and coherent position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Australian Greenhouse Office case study.
Source: Developed for this research.

### Conclusion

This case study concerned the formation of a new entity in which agencies could participate equally and provide a single point of access in relation to greenhouse issues. High level support and good structures and process were important. As with the previous case study, difficulties occurred that related to the financial accountability area. Policy development was also a challenge for two areas. Internal culture and adjustments being required by seconded staff reflected similar comments in the previous case study.

### Case Study 3 Goodna Service Integration Project

The Goodna Service Integration project (SIP) was developed to test how community and government and non-government agencies can work together to improve community well being. A goal was to be able to transfer what was done here to other areas of Queensland.
Background

The service area, in an outer part of Brisbane towards Ipswich, has a population of 9000 and long term problems from socioeconomic disadvantage, high unemployment, low income, low home ownership, child abuse and domestic violence.

The intention was to try to enhance the capacity of GAs to integrate responses to community needs through a collaborative partnership between State, Federal, Local Government. It was funded from 2000-2003. There was a particular focus on planning, funding, implementation and evaluation of strategies to reduce crime, improve school retention rates community health and other issues.

Results

The themes of the issues relate to dealing with overcoming community cynicism, staff adapting to new ways of working and the fact that agencies worked differently, centrally led project poorly coordinated locally, and the importance of regular communication. The project group reviewed policy and frameworks for funding; developed outcomes reflecting each agency; had a dedicated project officer and built a website and database to assist with communication. Amongst the learnings were how to work collaboratively, the importance of relationships, care for Government not to ‘drive’ community and the fact that it would take time for results. Results are presented in Table 3.9

Table 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needed to change how staff carried out duties as well as program delivery</td>
<td>Reviewed policy and funding frameworks.</td>
<td>How to work collaboratively with different organisations both government and non government</td>
<td>Maintaining good relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Began centrally located, not a regional focus so local effort of multiple agencies poorly coordinated</td>
<td>Developed outcomes to reflect the aims of each participating agency and aligned to government priorities</td>
<td>Relationships make or break projects and require frequent communication and excellent interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Engagement of community stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on how to ensure project could continue past a coordinator role</td>
<td>Dedicated project coordinator Ipswich Council and University of Queensland shared lead role</td>
<td>Personal commitment can motivate people</td>
<td>Forming good relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong leadership as past history of failure</td>
<td>Project and research officers moved the project forward</td>
<td>Developing story for others to engage along the way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated officer</td>
<td>Ongoing consultation and encouragement for openness and honesty</td>
<td>Emphasise sustainability and develop sustainable processes from the beginning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism from community</td>
<td>Foster learning culture and skills for consultation and building trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal and informal learning needed Staff from different organisational structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9 continues…
### Table 3.9 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Needed an information infrastructure e.g. community website</td>
<td>● Position description and performance agreements put in place</td>
<td>● Government not to ‘drive’ as community is to be engaged and set priorities and then link with government priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Regular communication required</td>
<td>● Built a website and maintained a database for regular communication</td>
<td>● Formal course to help the transition as part of the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Sensitivity of issues being dealt with</td>
<td>● Permission process to share information</td>
<td>● Different skill sets to normal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Tension created by different agency approaches to problems</td>
<td>● A measurement and modelling strategy</td>
<td>● Create tools to assist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● requirements for measure for inputs and evaluation of spending</td>
<td>● Engagement of a locally based dedicated project and research officer</td>
<td>● Communication is very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Resource coordination from different agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Centrally located agencies need to consider neighbourhood level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Funding not provided for overall external evaluation’</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Time is needed to see outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Traditional evaluation not suitable</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Use champions to build momentum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Little flexibility to pool resources to address local problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Dedicated resource</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Different reporting and accountability required</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Establish integrity up front</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● People and agencies working together for first time</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Challenge traditional ways of problem solving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● No new resources available, just improve services and integrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Goodna Service Integration case study.

Source: Developed for this research.

### Conclusion

This project relied heavily on the relationship with and engagement of community, including non-government agencies. Previous efforts in the area had not been successful and the community was sceptical. This put extra pressure and an added dimension to managing relationships and people. There were difficulties in relation to having centralised agencies in charge of a regional project and the gap this created. Organisational structures and cultures affected how agencies worked together. This linked to reporting and accountability, flexibility to adjust programs and coordinate resources. Ensuring a locally based dedicated resource and plenty of consultation assisted the management of the project, engagement with community and ability to develop shared goals.

### Case study 4 Sustainable Regions Program

#### Background

The Sustainable Regions Program (SRP) was a new pilot program launched in 2001. It focused on community building and sustainable development. It encompassed economic,
social and environmental elements and resources. Funding was approximately $100 million from 2001-02 to 2005-05. 8 regions were supported under the program. In Queensland these were Atherton Tablelands and Wide Bay Burnett.

Result

Key issues are centred on difficulties with WOG approaches. There was also inflexibility in agency programs, difficulty meshing national objectives at a local level. Solutions included forming a WOG network of Deputy Secretaries; six monthly reports to Minister and the location of an executive officer locally. Learnings included needing greater program flexibility, senior leadership and commitment were necessary, a need to have direction at the regional level and keep officers informed as to how integration will occur. Success depended on articulation of key strategic directions; strong leadership, willingness to work together and defining a shared vision. Results are presented in Table 3.10 below.

Table 3.10
Summary of results of the Sustainable Regions program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This was part of a new policy process</td>
<td>Formation of SRA Government WOG network of Deputy Secretaries to assist in coordinating across agencies</td>
<td>No need for co-location of agencies</td>
<td>Clear articulation of key strategic directions and priorities by local based committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexibility of agency programs</td>
<td>Agencies contacted separately to clarify responses for input to evaluation</td>
<td>Need for greater flexibility in programs</td>
<td>Leadership and support from the top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty meshing national objectives with local objectives</td>
<td>Community Advisory Committees set up</td>
<td>Senior leadership and commitment required</td>
<td>Willingness to work together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More focus on process than program</td>
<td>Six monthly reports to government and Ministers on SRP activities</td>
<td>Policy development takes time for implementation</td>
<td>Shared vision to focus on problems and achieve outcomes for people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen as a Federal government driven activity</td>
<td>Executive officer was local and accessible</td>
<td>Inform officers how integration and coordination will occur</td>
<td>Pooling resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues dealt with are complex</td>
<td>Federal agency built constructive relationship to help local advisory committees</td>
<td>Importance of bilateral relationships and WOG networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs lateral thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs to be directed in region, not centrally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOG request for input to project did not obtain relevant information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value in exploring WOG funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information overload on communities due to complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td>WOG is resource intensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation levels varied</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to identify common outcomes for funding and reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to funds was a good incentive for cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse local advisory committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between internal and WOG accountabilities – Portfolio Budget Statements do not enable delivery of WOG outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value local knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time taken to assess funding applications</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assist local advisory committee to understand role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical impediments to responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher level group not a substitute for improving mechanisms between Departments to progress things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better understanding as to how WOG fits into everyday work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOG is resource intensive and additional budgets were not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy area committed to project, but program areas less so</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sustainable Regions Program case study.
Source: Developed for this research
Conclusion

This project had some similarities in issues faced, to the previous case study. It was a regionally delivered program, from a centralised agency and experienced similar challenges in relation to the Goodna project. At this larger scale it was important for bilateral and WOG networks to be involved. There was a feeling that WOG funding wasn’t explored as much as it could be. Senior leadership and commitment and establishing a shared vision were important. However there was a challenge in meshing national objectives with regional objectives. In addition, incorporating agency programs presented challenges as many were inflexible.


Background

Managing issues on Government social housing estates required WOG response. The solution was considered to be place management. This is not a new solution as this was the focus for the program ‘Building Better Cities’ in early 1990s. Under this regeneration program it was community renewal. It was identified that there was a need not just for infrastructure, but to address social issues and social justice. This involved multiple agencies. Although not voiced as a regional development project, this WOG initiative is essentially a regional development place management project. It included infrastructure, social capacity building, with a potential to improve economic performance in the surrounding economic activities in the target area.

There was therefore a need for coordination and collaboration across different agencies relating to management of public housing estates. The Public Housing agencies embraced this need and adopted different approaches to resolving the issues. Public sector reform has seen the introduction of market and commercial practices to achieve efficiency and effectiveness. This has resulted in Public Housing Departments reorganizing their internal management processes accordingly. New South Wales and South Australia separated their housing into property management and tenancy management. Queensland also restructured its housing agency to separate out functions and responsibilities, but differently to South Australia and New South Wales. With the Commonwealth State Housing
Agreement funding having dropped by 15 percent, budgetary constraints were an issue, compounding the need for efficiency in management of resources.

This review involved five case studies on community renewal or regeneration through collaboration of different combinations of agencies, led by the agency involved in public housing and estates in each State.

Two of the pilot projects are considered from the paper for this research. They are South Australia’s Salisbury North, and Manoora, in Queensland. In South Australia, a new Department had recently been created that incorporated family and community services and housing. Queensland used existing Departmental structures. The intent was to coordinate the delivery of services and address cross-cutting issues collaboratively on these estates to achieve ‘renewal and regeneration’. Previous regeneration projects had focused on physical infrastructure. These were holistic in their approach, requiring support from multiple agencies.

**Methodology**

The study involved empirical analysis of information from the case studies. South Australia and Queensland case studies are chosen for comment.

### Table 3.11

**Summary of results of WOG models of State generation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Role of public institutions in social integration</td>
<td>● Development of the overarching groups to coordinate project.</td>
<td>● As yet no indication that a WOG approach has made a significant difference</td>
<td>● Benefit in establishing an overarching WOG group for administration &amp; coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Conflict of efficiency and effectiveness and social justice</td>
<td>● Access to a special pool of funds.</td>
<td>● There needs to be some managerial reform across the public sector to support creative &amp; responsive agencies</td>
<td>● Important to have dedicated pool of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Resource limitations</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Relationships easier in Manoora as this was a smaller community than the South Australian one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Difficulties working with a newly structure Human Service Department in South Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Don’t embark on new approaches with a newly developed department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Developed for this research.

**Results**

Results are presented in Table 3.11. Taylor (2000) cited in this review indicated that financial support was needed, but that collaboration does not necessarily result in better
Chapter 3

service delivery. Issues included the roles of Public Institutions in social integration, resource limitations and the conflict of efficiency and effectiveness with social justice. Solutions included developing overarching group to coordinate and pooled funds, also seen as the key success factors.

Conclusion

The two key factors that stand out from this review are that there is a need for an effective framework and structure to be set up to facilitate working together. Timeframes for assessing the outcomes are long and therefore may pose some difficulties for reporting. There is suggestion that the public service needs to embrace more creative management and innovation to respond to WOG situations. This project reflects the argument raised in the literature on Government and governance regarding the conflict of efficiency and social justice (Section 3.2.1)

Reference 8  (review)- Morgan Disney & Associates Pty Ltd (Lead) with Tracey Whetnall Consulting & Wis-Wei Consulting Pty Ltd
Synopsis Review of the COAG Trial Evaluations  Nov-06 Report to the Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination (OIPC)

Background

The aim of the COAG trials in 2002 was to find different and more effective ways for all levels of government and agencies and Indigenous communities to work together. Each trial site had an Australian government lead agency and respective state agency. Most had high level authority support from agencies, as high level leadership from government was important. Arrangements varied across the sites. Some had WOG and inter-governmental groups, but some sites had joint interagency activity working complementarily and using joint funding. Funding for the sites came from different sources also. This independent synopsis report looks at what worked well, the challenges and lessons. An evaluation framework was created to compare the 8 sites.

Results

The COAG Trials for Indigenous communities provided some valuable learnings regarding managing inter-cultural relationships and sensitivities. There was some distrust and scepticism about how the project would progress, but generally people were pleased to be working together, although there were different interpretations of the concept of ‘shared
responsibility’. The projects raised the level of trust, and where staff were consistent, trust levels were highest. Other positive outcomes included the concept of place management was developed. Table 3.12 presents results.

Issues related to how to work together, limited skills in cultural appropriate communication, lack of understanding of purpose. Solutions focused on management, coordination and leadership. Learnings related to respect and ensuring community understanding, and flexibility with leadership as very important.

**Table 3.12**

**Summary of results of synopsis review of the COAG trial evaluations Nov 06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● objectives of the trial misunderstood</td>
<td>● Some sites developed place managers</td>
<td>● Government to work respectfully with communities;</td>
<td>● Leadership &amp; management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● needed to work out how to work together</td>
<td>● Some sites had issue-based working groups</td>
<td>● Government staff need training on protocols and processes to deal with communities.</td>
<td>● Leadership at all levels of community important too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● needed to develop manageable objectives and priorities and evaluate</td>
<td>● joint officer group at COAG for information sharing and coordination</td>
<td>● Avoid blame and stay focused by being responsive and flexible.</td>
<td>● Stakeholders involved should not be too many to handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Learning to develop respectful, trusting relationships was very important and took time. Working outside agreements occurred when partners got frustrated about how long it took.</td>
<td>● access to regional managers forums</td>
<td>● WOG approaches need systematic changes locally, state and federally to suit the community.</td>
<td>● Important to maintain momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Trial recognised need to make changes at all levels of government &amp; community.</td>
<td>● Intergovernmental connection most positive need good leadership,</td>
<td>● Understand how to work differently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Issues for agencies with high staff turnover;</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Negotiate and ensure outcomes and goals are clearly understood in the same way by all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● staff in government lacked skills to deal with Indigenous communities didn't communicate clearly to communicate the shared bit</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Importance of building relationships Skills needed are listening skills, facilitating skills, teamwork skills; interpersonal skills for consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● There were some inter-departmental conflicts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>● flexibility balance tension between short and long term goals competence in managing and sharing knowledge sufficient experience and authority to act at the local level local level tolerate mistakes and manage risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Many issues related to cultural sensitivity and knowledge of protocols</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Suggest a differential model for engagement in WOG exercises. Looked at partnership structures, some existing, some developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Expectations too high.</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Planning and processes - need to be realistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Negotiations took too long</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Outcomes include agreement on flexibility, negotiation process, sharing information, respecting view points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● The project identified key areas where community needed to improve understanding and actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from analysis of: Morgan Disney & Associates Pty Ltd (Lead) with Tracey Whetnall Consulting & Wis-Wei Consulting Pty Ltd Synopsis Review of the COAG Trial Evaluations Nov-06 Report to the Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination (OIPC).

Source: Developed for this research.
Conclusion

Whilst each site approached the project slightly differently there were some common factors. Leadership and support at the higher Government level was important to be able to engage key decision-makers to resolve issues. A key difficulty with this trial centred on cultural protocols and difficulties, and the limited skills amongst agency personnel to manage the difficulties. Cultural and skill problems affected communication between stakeholders. This was also evident from the fact that there were misunderstandings regarding the purpose of the trials and goals and outcomes desired.


Background

The research was commissioned by the Institute of Public Administration of Australia (IPAA) as a National Research Project in 2000. The research examined integration across agencies and levels of government within a framework of governance. Integration was viewed as something that can occur around service delivery, programs, and for WOG initiatives. The paper identified structural, bureaucratic, political and internal barriers, with internal barriers being the most prominent.

Integrated governance was seen to cover:

- Pooled budgets
- Triple bottom line analysis
- Government/voluntary sector compacts and other partnerships including with private sector and other levels of government
- Relationships between provider and clients
- Coordination of service delivery
- Broad policy frameworks
- Integrated planning
- One stop shops
- Community based Cabinets
- Summits/ Roundtables/Visioning
- Networks
- Tendering with partnering criteria
- Joint database
- Joint intake and referral mechanisms
- Joint indicators

Methodology

The methodology involved three elements: a literature review looking at drivers and theories of integration, examination of seven case studies from around Australia, proposed by each State, and analysis and reporting.
A framework and questionnaire were developed from the literature for exploring the case studies. The framework consisted of the following elements: global influences, archetypal method of public sector control, a grid representing policy and government, processes for integration (seen as networking, cooperation, coordination, collaboration and partnership), barriers to overcome, and assumed outcomes of the projects.

Case studies involved interviews and focus groups and an internal review of data. This was followed by a workshop in Melbourne. Ideas and findings were presented at the IPAA National Conference in 2001. The case studies are listed below:

- **Case study 1 Centrelink** (Australian Government) integrated service delivery model – exploration of the one-stop-shop concept and the Disability and Carers Service Delivery Improvement Strategy.

- **Case study 2 Service Tasmania and Centrelink** (Tasmania) integrated service delivery model – partnership commenced in 1998 between Centrelink and ‘Service Tasmania’ to provide Commonwealth and State government services from some common sites. Combinations of services available varied.

- **Case study 2 Regional Coordination Program** (New South Wales) program integration – The program began in 1994 as a pilot to develop improved Government response to issues faced by rural and regional communities. The program was then extended over the State by 1999. Regional Coordinators lead and support projects that benefit the community. The Strategic Projects Division of New South Wales Premier’s Department manages the program and 37 agencies contributed funds.

- **Case study 3 Community Renewal** (Queensland) program integration – this formed part of the Queensland 1998 Crime Prevention Strategy, with the primary goal to be to fund and implement strategies that would reduce crime. This is a place-based approach with national allocation of funds for each area.

- **Case study 4 Safer WA** (Western Australia) program integration – this is a WOG and community initiative, with the strategic direction being set by the Standing Committee on Law and Order. The project involved 14 districts and over 80 community based SAFER WA committees.

- **Case study 5 Working Together** (South Australia) Partnership agreements – The project was to provide a practical framework for interaction between the Department
of Human Services and non-government community service provision in South Australia. This includes things such as shared purpose, principles, framework for distributing resources, contracting principles, performance principles and shared skill development.

- **Case study 6 Victoria’s approach to WOG** (Whole of Government integration) – examination of Victoria’s approach to integration involving the framework for joined-up government incorporating the ‘triple bottom line’. The framework emerged from the frameworks of four separate departments. The following areas were also the subject of inquiry: pooled budgets, community capacity building to encourage more integration of government services, encouraging cross-department support; development of joint indicators; use of intranet and IT for communication and e-government.

**Results**

Seven key findings emerged from the case studies:

1. Integration can be divided into three integration categories: service delivery, programs, and WOG.

2. Integration can occur at any level in government, but often a level can be hindered by lack of integration above it. Activities to assist integration and possible barriers include:
   - **Government level**, integration can be assisted through adopting integrated outcomes - This depends upon leadership capacity, policy commitment, resource commitment and commitment to stakeholder consultation. **Influencing factors** include negotiation skills and capacity at political level; preparedness to collaborate across sectors and boundaries; acknowledgement of barrier and opportunities. The **main barriers** stem from political cycles, public attitudes and public accountability.

   - **Senior management level** integration can be assisted by changing systems such as outcomes based funding, joint KPIs and integrated IT systems – **influences and factors** include public policy capacity; program development capacity and flexibility of policy development; knowledge and commitment of public policy; commitment to collaboration and partnership; high level funding Agreements and infrastructure support and commitment. **Barriers** could be departmental silos,
lack of data, lack of flexibility of funding, poor understanding of performance indicators and accountability for decision-making.

- **Program management level** integration can be assisted by pooling resources, willingness and passion of key players to work together, development of shared vision, purpose and relinquishment of some control – **influences and factors** include program management capacity, flexibility of policy and service development; commitment to collaboration and partnership; capacity to link funding Agreements and performance Agreements; ability to develop Agreements, procedures and protocols and understanding the relevance of performance indicators. **Barriers** identified included lack of data, lack of flexibility in funding, poor understanding of performance indicators, mismatch between policy objectives and program outcomes; accountability of decision-making.

- **Service delivery level**, integration can be assisted by development of co-located services such as one-stop-shops, integrated IT systems, networking and service coordination options – **influences and factors** include authority to act; capacity to implement policy and program; adequate resources for processes; adequate resources for implementation; commitment to collaboration and coordination; understanding the local environment and capacity to manage local resources. **Barriers** identified inadequate management processes; inconsistent and inflexible resources; mismatch between demand and policy objectives and government focus on accountability against customer service. Further complications from poor skills, lack of will, financial silos, territoriality and lack of political mandate.

3. Structural, political and internal barriers are notable, with bureaucratic barriers seen as the greatest. Federalism, branches of government, constitutional and legal requirements also impact on integration. Organisational culture and political and stakeholder influences are strong influences.

4. Common success factors include political commitment to new government working relationships, flexible funding arrangements and at the Australian Government level, engagement by the Premier’s Department and Treasury. In addition, problems often require multi-agency response thus traditional policy and program responses are not appropriate; technology has potential to facilitate integration; all staff need to be
committed at service delivery and program levels; senior and middle management need appropriate skills; flexibility in funding programs; alternative funding such as pooled or different ways to appropriate funding for place-based and outcome-based budgets; inclusion of integration and collaboration in performance appraisal and development of ownership across stakeholder group.

5. Leadership is important, from the Premier downwards, although it was acknowledged the Premier cannot be accountable for everything, but the Premier’s Department could be an incubator and give responsibility to lead agencies where relevant.

6. Governance by committee was seen to not always be more effective than top-down governance; however there was a need for an individual lead agency to have responsibility to ensure that the integrated approach works.

7. Integration is challenging and resource intensive, and is not always what is required. There was acknowledgement that agency ‘core business’ needed to continue. Issues to be addressed in an integrated way would be those that can only be solved by partnership and where agencies acknowledge multiplicity of responsibility.


General success factors identified in the study included creating a shared vision; clarifying objectives and direction; vertical and horizontal sharing. It was also acknowledged there was no unique way to set up partnerships; rethinking was required regarding the nature, form and terms for inter-organisational collaboration; every ‘joining-up’ will vary according to characteristics of where it is occurring; and networks, building trust, good informal relationships and mediation are important. Lastly, front line staff have a key role and need to redefine, vary and strengthen the role in implementing joined-up initiatives.

General and common barriers noted were lack of skills, lack of will, financial silos, territoriality, political mandate, lack of systems integration, culture, high transaction costs, and existing structure.

Table 3.13 on page 166-170 captures the findings from the seven case studies.
Each case study has some mutuality amongst collaborating agencies such as location, clients, or outcomes. The case studies involved differing levels of government and both generic and specific policy areas.

Table 3.13
Summary of the Institute of Public Administration Australia ‘Integrated Governance’ research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study &amp; Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE DELIVERY:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrelink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Client departments needed to</td>
<td>● The importance of strong leadership at CEO level and senior executive level</td>
<td>● Strong political backing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adopt more joined up approach</td>
<td>● Important to redesign service delivery processes to accommodate more effectively the new way of working</td>
<td>● Senior management leadership &amp; commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Limitations in the</td>
<td>● Important to have flexibility in service delivery</td>
<td>● Good executive management &amp; organizational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purchaser/provider relationships</td>
<td>● Need feedback loop between service delivery &amp; policy development</td>
<td>● Investment in resources to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Variation in level of</td>
<td>● Outcomes accountability rather than process output relevant</td>
<td>● Develop new models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commitment from agencies</td>
<td>● Limitations to integrating service products if separate branding, accountability, procedures &amp; delivery</td>
<td>● Entrepreneurial culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involved</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Investment in IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Not all shared vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● IT interface with new systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrelink continued</td>
<td>● Agencies still wanting own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>products badged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Delay in internal linkages for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centrelink being set up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Lack of integration amongst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agencies beyond the service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Difficulties from both</td>
<td>● Important to clarify what each party will get from the joint activity</td>
<td>● Recognition of mutual advantage model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organizations to gain agreement</td>
<td>● Starting at a local level &amp; building good relationships</td>
<td>● Willingness to innovate to work outside defined territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on logistics &amp; legality</td>
<td>● clients interested in level of service, not how it happens</td>
<td>● Agreement on a focus on increased customer service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Limited integration as services</td>
<td>● Find champion to promote model</td>
<td>● Political mandate at Commonwealth and State level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offered from same location, but</td>
<td>● Ensure mandate or higher level commitment</td>
<td>● Shared boundaries with Centrelink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>systems &amp; accountability</td>
<td>● Reduce bureaucracy</td>
<td>● Service Tasmania also included State and Local Government services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>separate</td>
<td>● Clarify individual &amp; mutual agency advantages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Limitations in Centrelink</td>
<td>● Agree protocols, but foster flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services as Centrelink seen as</td>
<td>● Maintain transparency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a specialist provider within</td>
<td>● Recognise early wins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Lack of engagement of client</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>departments on discussion about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>integrated service delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Political will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● IT limitation, cost and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Operational difference between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centrelink &amp; Service Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Organisational culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Differing organizational &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3.13 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study &amp; Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSW Regional Coordination</strong></td>
<td>Level of collaboration between CEOs lag behind multi-agency success at regional level</td>
<td>Location of management of program/initiatives in Premier’s Department.</td>
<td>Located in Premier’s Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success is dependent upon the skills of regional coordinators</td>
<td>Support &amp; leadership of CEO of Premier's Department &amp; Cabinet is critical</td>
<td>Strong support of Premier &amp; Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Coordination Managers Groups are essential as some agencies don’t see projects as core business</td>
<td>Resources need to be allocated to regional coordinator who operates at a senior level</td>
<td>Coordinators &amp; support staff regionally located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Manager of State agencies &amp; the regional coordinators set regional priorities &amp; manage projects &amp; issues</td>
<td>Funds need to be available</td>
<td>Staff with good communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Managers’ Forums are for multi-agency response, allocate &amp; monitor projects, network across agencies &amp; share information &amp; work across government levels</td>
<td>Regional coordinators not to be involved in issues that are a single agency issue</td>
<td>Coordinators given strategic roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community Renewal Queensland</strong></td>
<td>Flexible funding source to meet community needs in renewal area – place budgeting</td>
<td>Regional coordinator role flexible &amp; support being a ‘change agent, negotiator &amp; channel to Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departments redirects community response</td>
<td>Management &amp; structures complex as involves community &amp; coordinated government activity</td>
<td>Strong central program with pragmatic results, not overshadowed by coordination as an end goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like of central integration at head office</td>
<td>Renewal coordinators, central program staff, local renewal facilitators, community reference groups, project coordination groups, Local Government, Regional managers’ Forums, local Members of Parliament, Crime Prevention Taskforce &amp; interdepartmental committees set up</td>
<td>Acceptance that not everything has to be coordinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration seen as add-on to core business by some agencies</td>
<td>Important to have support &amp; leadership from Premier Minister &amp; CEO</td>
<td>Community reference group determines eligible projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reluctance to share &amp; be open in discussion</td>
<td>More time for establishment &amp; planning</td>
<td>Projects need an auspicing department to manage implementation of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different political parties between state and local government</td>
<td>Allowance made for different departmental cultures</td>
<td>Community action plans are cross-cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget limitations</td>
<td>Cross-cutting issues don’t necessarily lead to integration</td>
<td>Network is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff burn out</td>
<td>Integration is resource intensive</td>
<td>Discretionary pool of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of continuity of projects ending once renewal funding runs out</td>
<td>Discretionary pool of funding required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity of stakeholder group</td>
<td>Linking with urban renewal means visible changes can be seen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silo mentality of some agencies</td>
<td>Sometimes need to respond &amp; then seek permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of time spent on planning properly due to pressure to commence the program</td>
<td>Feedback to community important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad hoc Regional Managers’ Forums</td>
<td>Need to give credit to community for self-government, where it is due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community cynical</td>
<td>Outcome can become the process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varying levels of resources &amp; capacity in communities</td>
<td>Politically sensitive &amp; needs to be managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3.13 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study &amp; Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safer Western Australia</td>
<td>Department of Premier &amp; Cabinet provides policy, coordination &amp; secretariat support</td>
<td>Challenge of meeting government needs &amp; community expectations</td>
<td>While not all aspects of the program were not integrated with separate reporting structures, the whole is united under the SAFER WA Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of the Safer WA Council to advise Government on law and order &amp; oversee the programs</td>
<td>Need to set up benchmarks to measure success</td>
<td>Local level has lateral links into community district committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A CEOs working group implement cross-agency decisions from the Cabinet Standing Committee on Law and Order</td>
<td>Not be over directive, but support local community effort</td>
<td>District committees hared members with District Inter-agency working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEO committee also ensures coordination &amp; cooperation</td>
<td>Involvement of Premier is important for WOG strategies</td>
<td>Hierarchical link from District Committees reporting to CEO working group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formation of 14 District Interagency Working Groups</td>
<td>If activity seen as ‘additional’ to normal business, core business will dominate</td>
<td>Minutes from various meetings circulated amongst groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not all levels integrate, but reporting included all levels &amp; lateral links occur locally</td>
<td>Government policies can create barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in government lead to pressure to ‘brand’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integration needs policy coordination, pooled KPIs; CEOs held accountable in performance appraisal; shared budget. Link to regional development; percentage of funds to be for joint initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee structure may be support at local level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration falters if problems occur or there are departmental restructures. Be wary of setting up separate entity to support process as it may take away from integration success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Different engagement rules for rural &amp; urban areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local government is important to involve, although participation levels will vary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 3.13 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study &amp; Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS**  
South Australia Working Together |  
- Significant variation in the relationships in the government & non-government groups & sectors & locations making working together a considerable challenge  
- Relationship complex & pluralistic between government & non-government organizations  
- Each sector has own structures, decision-making process & this creates tension in managing the legal aspects of the inter-relationships  
- History & lack of trust  
- Different cultures within the Department of Human Services  
- Inflexibility of funding agreements  
- Different semantic interpretations  
- Capacity in middle management of agency  
- Willingness to change bureaucratic systems  
- Staff turnover  
- Lack of internal integration in agency |  
- Iterative process developing a framework for Department of Human Services to work with non-government organisations |  
- Each sector’s perception of one another affects the relationship  
- Relationship quality can affect level of cooperation  
- Release of some power/territory & authority to support integration  
- Need to build ownership of those involved  
- Important to have right people involved committed to representing their sector  
- Need consistent attendance from representatives for continuity & consistency  
- Need to involve more than two sectors with focus more on delivery of better services  
- Need to accept the evolutionary process that expands as it progresses  
- Non-government sector willing to accept leadership from one peak body  
- Build on existing processes,  
- Allow sufficient time to establish & build relationships & processes |  
- Increase in funding to both sectors involved (non-government & non-government)  
- Increase in alignment of objectives between the two sectors  
- Articulation of common goals between Department of Human Services & peak groups  
- Realisation that government agency needs to have internal integration too  
- Strong support of CEO  
- Ability of key body to represent all non-government groups involved  
- Non-government needed to choose own representative  
- Involvement of Department of Human Services & not other agencies in early stages  
- Longevity of stakeholders from non-government sector  
- Viewed as pragmatic approach to pragmatic problems  
- Strong commitment of both sectors  
- History of collaboration on which to build  
- Culture of risk taking  
- Non government sector funded to undertake own consultation  
- Adequate resourcing provided |
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### Table 3.13 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study &amp; Issues</th>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Learnings</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growing Victoria Together</strong></td>
<td>- Framework set up covering Victoria's strengths &amp; challenges; important issues; progress measures; initial; priority areas of innovation economy; community building, environmental sustainability, early years, work &amp; family. Principles include integrating social, economic &amp; environmental &amp; governance outcomes; capability reflecting public expectations; mix of objective &amp; subjective measures; use of valid, reliable data; use of plain language; linked to capability statement of Government. Incorporate <em>Growing Victoria Together</em> into corporate &amp; business plans of departments. Incorporate <em>Growing Victoria Together</em> in performance agreements. Map data to ensure continuity, definitions, accounting rules, reporting so data can be performance &amp; reporting mechanism for output &amp; business planning. Develop system for cross-cutting issues. Explore pooled, place-based funding. Knowledge management strategies to map &amp; capture flow of knowledge to multiple policy sources. Integrated governance related training.</td>
<td>- Ensure Ministers &amp; staff are involved. - Engage early. - Have strong research case. - Show initiative. - Ensure political, public sector &amp; community champions. - Two central agencies to work together – Treasury &amp; premier and Cabinet. - Engage middle managers of agencies. - Showcase examples show relevance. - Joint up outcomes &amp; outputs. - Understand that process involves hard work, difficulties &amp; challenges. - As much a craft as a science.</td>
<td>- High level support. - Good business case. - Leadership within community and government. - Ensure to promote successes. - Gaining commitment from all stakeholders. - Reliable and rigorous data to inform planning and strategies. - Link to government capability statement and all agency business plans. - Identify outcomes that are easy to monitor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Conclusion

The research indicated that to break down barriers to integrated outcomes some structural, bureaucratic, political and internal changes were required and these have been
happening at a global level as well as in Australia. The research did not recommend that everything was integrated and delivered jointly, as there was a view that Departments still needed to specialize. The research did suggest systemic changes required, including different ways to achieve transparency and accountability in government and governance, particularly where stakeholders outside of Government are involved. Shared accountability also required cultural change according to the study and policy entrepreneurs and acceptance of greater risk.

From a practical perspective, the research highlighted the importance of having a structure in place that draws all players together. It also highlighted the need to establish processes and systems to integrate each agencies’ own reporting and accountability, as well as that required for WOG reporting (where applicable). The impact of philosophical culture and operational practices of agencies was also evident when individuals had to work together, signifying the importance of good ‘people management’ and relationship building.

Overall, what was clear from the study is that integration of government and its service delivery will continue to evolve as the bureaucratic culture changes, government continues to change in response to the many factors and issues to be managed, and with changes in technology. The study indicated that implications for the future were the evolution of a more dynamic and flexible government and public sector.


Background

In Section 44 of the Public Service Act 1999 the Australian Public Service Commissioner is required to provide a report each year on the public service to the Prime Minister who presents the report to Parliament. This is the tenth report since reporting was instigated in 1998, and covers the activities and human resource practices of the Australian Public Service, covering achievements, contributions to Government to meet policy objectives and outcomes. Of specific relevance to the research problem is Chapter 10, which covers WOG activity.
Chapter 3

Results

Chapter 10 noted that the focus on WOG activities has increased, but that it was still challenging for agencies to undertake. The report cited agency culture, institutional frameworks, financial governance and accountability, technology and agency capability as some of the outstanding issues. There was recommendation that cross-agency outcomes that all agencies can report against need to be agreed in WOG activities.

A number of issues were identified as being experienced when GAs worked on WOG initiatives and rated them as high priority to be addressed. The issues were: enhancing ICT; improving financial accountability to facilitate WOG work; ensuring agency performance management recognizes WOG work; building relationships with other agencies; ensuring agency SES, executive leaders and other personnel involved in WOG activities have the capacity to collaborate. The highest priority was building relationships. The report also documented the percentage of senior personnel who had experienced the issues. The top areas related to other staff having the capacity to collaborate and key staff having the capabilities to collaborate.

The report also noted that for effective WOG work, supportive systems must be in place and cites governance, accountability and ICT as key areas. Reference is made to the Management Advisory Committee (2004) report and indicated that the findings of the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) is that there was a need to seek improved horizontal relationships and accountability.

The ANAO felt that the financial and accountability framework in place was flexible enough to support WOG work, however perception across agencies identified through surveys, does not necessarily concur with this view. The ANAO cited an example of flexible financial arrangements related to the Government’s Indigenous arrangements where funds were sought that could be used across agencies. Flexible pooled funds across portfolios were mentioned as one particular option to fund WOG initiatives. However, despite these arrangements, the ANAO noted that there was still insufficient attention to policy implementation to reflect the original intent of the program with agencies needing more guidance about how to address the financial and accountability requirements in WOG activities. In addition, programs themselves lacked the flexibility to make the most of the funding arrangements.
Another area noted by the ANAO was the development of outcomes and outputs suitable for WOG activities. A survey of 44 agencies subject to the Financial Management Act found that none of the agencies had cross-agency outcomes, and ANAO suggested this needed to be considered.

It was also identified that further work needed to be done on cross-agency structures and approaches for WOG initiatives. This included clarifying authority and when activities shifted from a central agency to a line agency, establishing clear lines of accountability. An example cited by ANAO was the review of the drought assistance program which lacked a WOG implementation plan, had limited cross-agency strategies, no framework to support assessment of the implementation of the full range of drought assistance available.

Identification of risk across WOG projects was also seen as lacking by the ANAO. Recognition and resolution of risk across agencies in WOG initiatives was seen as important.

Other areas noted included: developing a shared understanding of what each agency was trying to do in WOG initiatives and how they would contribute to the overall outcomes and broad policy issues, beyond their own agency; having in place appropriate internal agency structures and systems that support WOG activities, which included procedures to support localized decision-making; recognition within agencies of inter-agency work; appropriate skills amongst personnel for cross-agency and WOG work; and the need to establish formal guidelines for multi-agency decision-making.

ICT was an area that was seen to represent greater information sharing and connectivity across agencies. However, despite a lot of work being undertaken in this field, agencies generally felt that ICT was not well networked and integrated to support the WOG agenda, and neither was there strong agency commitment to do something about the limitations.

The final two areas highlighted as still requiring improvement related to agency culture and capability. The Management Advisory Committee (2004) report had identified that these elements were important to address to improve WOG approaches. Whilst the survey for the ‘State of the Service Report 2006-2007’ indicated that Australian Government agencies considered that the culture for collaboration was strong, it was not deeply embedded; equally whilst surveys indicated that senior officers were considered to
have capabilities relevant to WOG working arrangements, there were still agency reports of skill set gaps.

**Conclusion**

Chapter 10 also indicated that there is still much to be done in processes, systems and procedures to facilitate collaboration, and also to change agency culture. The implementation of the findings of the Management Advisory Committee report (2004) had not been as successful at changing the public services as had been hoped. Complexity and expense to make changes are seen as contributing factors. There was still considerable effort required in budget and accountability, improved cross-agency frameworks and structures, governance arrangements that foster cross-agency work, improvement in ICT, agency culture and capability.


**Background**

‘Growing Victoria Together’ is an innovative way to guide Government policy and actions in the medium term, communicate policy directions to citizens and engage with stakeholders to work collaboratively on implementing the policies. It is built on shared visions and the application of the ‘triple bottom line’ to policy. The approach represents a new policy paradigm following on from economic rationality, market decision-making and organizational managerialism. This involves sustainable policy development that reflects the complexity of economic, social and environmental inter-dependencies, with organizational decision-making based on networks, partnerships and alliances between public, private and community.

The article examines the ‘Growing Victoria Together’ as a case study, looking at the trends that led to the need for the development of this joint government approach. The article examined the early preparation to set up the new approach, including the consultation process and influences on the design of the approach. This led to the ‘Growing Victoria Together’ booklet, which outlines the approach being taken. The article traces the evolution of the project approach and the various frameworks and policy
strategies that were adopted. Key strengths are identified and also the challenges and potential problems.

**Results**

Of particular interest to the research question are the challenges faced and the approaches adopted. Key challenges were to develop an output structure as a planning tool for budgeting and performance measurement that was not as complex and that needed to be longer term. Three dimensions were chosen to fit a triple-bottom-line approach. The same basic template was used to facilitate integration. Another challenge was balancing top-down and bottom-up policy processes. Early work established mandate and ownership from key stakeholders.

Main organization structures and relationships supporting the approach were: the Policy Development and Research Branch of the Department of Premier and Cabinet; the Framework Interdepartmental Committee convened by a deputy secretary of the Department of Premier and Cabinet; Chiefs of Staff meeting convened from the Premier’s office; the Victorian Economic, Environment and Social Advisory Committee providing an ongoing forum to check and encourage connecting network from stakeholders to broader constituency. The ‘Growing Victoria Together’ booklet was developed to guide strategic policy, communicate government integrated social, economic and environmental directions, provide medium (5-10 years) policy framework and provide a basis for engagement of stakeholders.

Further challenges included measurement and benchmarks; available data, policy priorities to achieve progress, implications of policy on regions and population groups, how to show the connection of resources, corporate and business planning, and how to engage other departments. A framework was developed that aligned departmental objectives and outputs, which incorporates cross-cutting issues, corporate and business plans, with all departments developing triple-bottom-line policy.

The ‘Growing Victoria Together’ approach is medium term, integrates economic; social and environmental governance issues and outputs; has a small number of tangible measures; is informed from a range of knowledge sources; has significant ministerial and public sector ownership; is short and easy to communicate. Adams considers that the approach focuses on outcomes and inter-dependencies and is ‘a work in progress’.
Potential problems are seen to be a lack of buy-in from communities and line departments; lack of skills in the public sector; failure to understand cause and effect; identifying broad indicators that are difficult to measure and hold people accountable; slide back to valuing quantitative analysis; inability to influence rigidities of programs and output structures in cross-cutting objectives; and a failure to understand the ease with which managerialism and economic rationalism can slip into policy.

3.4 Processes and practices to manage the issues and impediments

This section summarises research, reviews and literature that has identified a number of processes and practices designed, recommended or used to manage issues and impediments when GAs work together. Section 3.4.1 outlines some of the processes and practices identified as being important or actually adopted. Section 3.4.2 documents details of guidelines and checklists that have been developed. For additional reference, the Tables in Section 3.3 studies and reviews document approaches and practices adopted in each project to manage issues and impediments being experienced.

3.4.1 Processes and practices


In outlining Victoria’s WOG approach to taking care of children’s welfare in Victoria, Michael White was actually speaking about ‘managing for outcomes’. However, as this is a WOG project, the mechanisms that have been put in place to facilitate WOG outcomes and the integration of individual agency activities are worth noting and include:

- Development of specific WOG group (the Children’s Services Coordination Board) to drive policy development
- Development of a WOG system to capture and monitor data (Child Welfare Monitoring System)
- Development of a regional mechanism (regional managers’ forums) to coordinate policy input
Chapter 3

Conclusion

The approach involves formation of a purpose-specific group, appropriate system for information capture and monitoring and a regional mechanism to coordinate policy input. White acknowledged that there would be difficulties in the actual implementation.


Background

The article has been chosen because it refers to an area that contributes to agencies’ reluctance to participate in WOG and joint activities. This is ‘risk’, which is more complex in cross-agency and collaborative agency activities. The issue was identified in an audit in 2003 that found that although inter-agency risks were considered in joint activities in some instances, generally they were often not fully recognised. The audit found that Memorandums of Understanding, contractual arrangements and service agreements were used to manage inter-agency matters, however there was no information or guidance on how to manage the inter-agency risks identified.

The audit recommended that risk management was undertaken for all joined-up government activities and that the State Services Authority dealt with these risk management issues in material it produced. The document indicated that an important activity in joined-up initiatives would be for the stakeholder agencies to recognise inter-agency risks and agree on its management. Suggestions for management included:

- Formal risk management process to be applied when agencies collaborate with other organisations
- Greater information sharing across agencies, particularly if actions of one organisation may impact adversely on another and the setting up of appropriate structures for communication to deal with the risk
- A need to ensure departments understood one another’s risk management approach and collaborate on jointly managing aggregated risk or missed opportunities
- Risks to be assessed according to whether impacting on two or more agencies and special consideration for risks that would have state-wide impact
A need to develop clear policy and guidelines to help agencies deal with joined-up government risks

State Services Authority to conduct research into joined-up government initiatives to identify practices to support achieving government outcomes and the State Services Authority to develop support material.

**Conclusion**

Recognition of and developing collaborative approaches to managing risks in GAs’ joint initiatives were considered important. The recommendation was that guidelines were to be developed to assist GAs to undertake risk assessment and planning.


**Background**

This paper is a review of national and international experiences in joined-up government. The paper was prepared as background to research for a project that the Victorian Services Authority was undertaking on joined-up government and included a literature review, discussion of definition of joined-up government, and the context and benefits of such an approach. Joined-up government activity was considered to occur across portfolios, departments within a tier of government, across tiers of government, and between government and other sectors or the community. The paper identified joined-up initiative activities such as WOG strategic objectives, policy development, program management, regulation and shared service delivery and one-stop-shops. The paper then explored the background to joined-up government by drawing on international literature covering new public sector management, complexity of problems and citizen expectations.

With reference to international experience, the adoption of private sector practices known as new public sector management practices, were considered to have contributed to the difficulties experienced when GAs work together. The practices affected vertical and horizontal accountabilities, delivery of outputs, with shared outputs often being of a lower priority. In addition the paper, citing Polite (2003), noted the complexity of issues that governments were addressing as also contributing to the needs and challenges for agencies to work together. Barts (2005a) and Mulga (2005) also cited in the paper, highlighted that
consumer expectation for coordinated, integrated and accessible services from government was an additional pressure to achieve improved joined-up government.

**Findings**

The resulting paper identified a number of critical success factors: agreeing on shared goals; measuring and evaluating programs to fulfil goals; ensuring sufficient resources; strong leadership; and sharing responsibility. References cited included: Ling (2002), National Audit Office (2001), Park & O’Leary (2006).

The paper noted the need for specifically tailored structured processes and approaches. Ling (2002) is cited as indicating that work practices to facilitate GAs working together could be divided into: new ways of working (shared leadership, pooled budgets, merged structures and teams); new types of organisation (culture, values, information and training); accountability and incentives (shared outcome targets, performance measures and regulations); and service delivery (joint consultation/involvement, shared clients, shared customer interface). The dimensions are represented in Table 3.14.

**Table 3.14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New ways of working</th>
<th>Culture and philosophy</th>
<th>New accountabilities</th>
<th>New ways to develop policies, programs and deliver services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Shared leadership</td>
<td>• Incorporate WOG values in portfolio cultures</td>
<td>• Shared outcomes and reporting</td>
<td>• Collegiate approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on expertise</td>
<td>• Information sharing and cooperative knowledge management</td>
<td>• Flexibility around service outcomes</td>
<td>• Focus on WOG outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cooperative resourcing</td>
<td>• Effective alignment of top-down policies with bottom-up issues</td>
<td>• Performance measures that encourage collegiate behaviour</td>
<td>• Consultation and engagement with clients and users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexible team processes and outcomes</td>
<td>• Relevant skills development including negotiation</td>
<td>• Reward and recognition for horizontal management</td>
<td>• Shared customer interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agreed conflict resolution</td>
<td>• Recognition of differences</td>
<td>• Agreed terms of reference and timeframes</td>
<td>• Joint budget allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Established decision-making processes</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective evaluation and review mechanisms</td>
<td>• Compatible information technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comprehensive shared strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Benefit to all participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint communication strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared skills development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear and agreed goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Whilst partnerships are identified as a mechanism to help agencies work together, it was acknowledged that it required time to build the relationships which facilitate effective
partnerships. The paper also highlighted that there was still a tension between central governance and decision-making and having flexibility at a local level. A range of changes were seen as needing to occur such as networked governance (Considine & Lewis, 2003; Keast & brown, 2002) cited in the paper; flexibility around funding (Rubin & Kelly, 2005) also cited in the paper, and developing new ways to engage with community (Allen, 2006; Skidmore, Bound & Lownsborough, 2006) cited in the paper.

Conclusion

The paper defined WOG and joined-up activities as occurring across-agencies and tiers of government, and involving the development of policy, programs, regulations and mechanisms for joint service delivery. Critical success factors included agreeing shared goals, accountability and incentives (being shared outcomes, performance measures and regulations) and service delivery involving shared clients and outcomes. The key components identified as best practice included new ways of working and developing policies; a new approach to designing programs and delivering services; managing new accountabilities and culture and philosophy, to be based on Management Advisory Committee (2004) and Office of Government Commerce (2005) both cited by the Victorian Services Authority. The paper concludes that tension between central governance and localised control impacts on the collaborative culture, cooperation and integration at the ground level. The paper also noted that as the issues requiring joined-up approaches are complex, involve different stakeholder values and conflicts, sufficient time and resources and flexibility to develop tailored solutions is necessary.

Reference 15 Victorian State Services Authority (November 2007) Victorian approach to joined up government – an overview Victorian State Government

Background

The Victorian State Services Authority produced this report as an overview of approaches to joined-up government activities, given the challenges experienced by agencies.

The paper defined joined-up government activities as: new ways of working across organisations, new types of organisations, new accountabilities and incentives and new ways to deliver services. joined-up government was thus about relationships that move from networking to coordinating, cooperating and finally collaborating.
Chapter 3

The report noted that complex policy issues that are cross cutting, not fitting into departmental boundaries, portfolios or tiers of government were drivers of joint government initiatives. The intention was to identify how to better integrate and coordinate government policy and service delivery. The report only considered government working across departments and/or levels of government, not with the private sector. The report explained that the Victorian Government has made changes over the last decade to better address the complexity of issues, including creating mega departments, organisation around place based responses and establishing offices to drive coordination.

The document covers the context and dimensions for joined-up government that included international literature, an overview of Victoria’s approaches, an outline of approaches and resources allocation, exploration of issues and challenges, and opportunities to strengthen approaches.

**Methodology**

The report used case studies and consultation with senior managers from ten Victorian Government departments. Interviews were also conducted with local government and chief executive, non-government and academics, leading to over 70 interview involving 110 people. In addition, an extensive literature research was undertaken.

**Results**

Thirty nine projects were examined with the projects falling into the following categories: cross cutting policy issues (10), placed based (9), population or client group based (7), integrated service delivery (10), and levels of government (3). A selection is included in Table 3.15, which demonstrate the spectrum of findings and issues across a range of project categories.
Table 3.15
Summary of Victorian Government approaches to joined-up government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Governance and funding structure summary</th>
<th>Key success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CROSS-CUTTING POLICY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Set objectives, outcomes and performance targets for cross-cutting issues</td>
<td>● Identify coordinating structure</td>
<td>● High level of political and bureaucratic commitment and leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Direct and coordinate government activities across portfolios</td>
<td>● Establish roles and responsibilities and systems and processes to support delivery</td>
<td>● Supportive organizational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing family violence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Good stakeholder relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Overseen by five Ministers involved and an inter-departmental committee.</td>
<td>● Agree common objectives, targets, outcomes and performance indicators</td>
<td>● Trust, confidence and shared responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● A family violence coordination unit provides support to the initiative and the governance structures</td>
<td>● May include developing a coordinating forum of the lead and associated Ministers</td>
<td>● Clarity of goals and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Go for your life’s healthy living</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Complementary processes for direction setting, planning and review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Overseen by a Ministerial Forum and Leadership Group</td>
<td>● May involve a high level leadership group or inter-departmental committee</td>
<td>● Clear roles and responsibilities and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Secretariat provided by one agency providing support to Ministers, governance structure and assists with collaboration and integration across the initiative</td>
<td>● May include associated working groups and project teams</td>
<td>● Recognition of mutual benefits and outcomes from joint effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLACE-BASED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Clarity of evaluation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Identify and prioritise key issues</td>
<td>● Require structures for coordination at regional and/or local level</td>
<td>● Dispute resolution in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Collate data and information on local communities</td>
<td><strong>State level projects</strong></td>
<td>● Appropriate skills and capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Undertake joint and integrated planning with the community</td>
<td>● Ministers coordinating forum sets direction and monitors implementation</td>
<td>● Sufficient and appropriate resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Improve service coordination and delivery</td>
<td>● High level project leadership group with membership of departmental secretaries or senior officers to provide advice to Ministerial group and coordinate and oversee implementation</td>
<td>● Planning and accountability systems in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Set up new service initiatives</td>
<td>● Cross-departmental working groups or project teams with staff from policy or program areas who collaborate with partners to implement policies and programs</td>
<td>● Incentive and reward systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood renewal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Evidence-based information to support joined-up approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Key personnel - Place Manager, Education and Learning Coordinator, and Participation and Partnership Officer</td>
<td>● Cross-departmental regional groups of staff from policy and program areas in the region who oversee the integrated delivery in the regional location</td>
<td>● Appropriate skills and capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Local committee of residents</td>
<td><strong>Place-based projects</strong></td>
<td>● Clarify roles and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Funds not pooled but aligned to community priorities</td>
<td>● Branch or program area with responsibility for implementation and engaging other departments</td>
<td>● Identification of high priorities by Ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lake Tyers Community renewal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Development of WOG policy frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Funding provided by the Victorian Government under the Fairer Victoria for four years</td>
<td>● Place based project manager to coordinate</td>
<td>● Identification of each agency’s roles, responsibilities and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Commonwealth provided funding to assist with housing, health and sewerage system upgrade</td>
<td>● At the local level have membership groups of local residents</td>
<td><strong>BUILDING THE CULTURE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Project overseen by the Lake Tyers Interdepartmental Committee of Commonwealth, State and Local Government representatives</td>
<td><strong>FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>● Flexibility, persistence, innovative and creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Departments also staffed at the local level</td>
<td>● Joint departmental funding – consolidated funding bid including all departments, accountability with host department, time limited funding.</td>
<td>● Team focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Single department funding arrangements – funding may span departmental boundaries, but other parts of project may involve individual departments making a funding bid</td>
<td>● Think across boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Pooled funding – departments transfer into a pool funds for the initiative, partnership responsible for deciding allocation and responsibility for expenditure with new or existing governance arrangement</td>
<td>● Tolerate mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Client based or brokerage funding – funding allocated to clients not service and funds used to purchase services for the client’s</td>
<td>● Manage risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Build strategic alliances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Encourage diversity of views, cultures and appreciate the strengths in each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Capacity to balance tension between short and long term goals (Source Briggs 2005 cited in the report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.15 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solutions, processes &amp; practices</th>
<th>Governance and funding structure summary</th>
<th>Key success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POPULATION-BASED</strong></td>
<td><strong>Funding continued...</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLANNING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Develop policy framework to coordinate departmental activity</td>
<td>● Resource realignment – departments re-allocate from existing funding for the new priority or existing services refocus on priorities</td>
<td>● Need to identify high priority issues by Ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Implement multi-pronged strategies for education, health, employment, justice, community support)</td>
<td>● Supporting shared staff – initiative funds staff that resource the initiative providing secretariat, coordination, monitoring and may involve staff secondments</td>
<td>● Develop WOG policy frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Realign program and service priorities and components</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Identify joint priorities by State Coordination and Management Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Research, design and fund new initiatives <strong>Victorian Indigenous Affairs Framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Identify high priorities by department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Adoption of outcomes approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Provision for partnership coordination and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Ministerial taskforce set up and a Secretaries group to oversee implementation of framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Ministerial taskforce coordinates WOG activities in the framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEGRATING SERVICE DELIVERY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● New service models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Co-location in ‘one-stop-shops’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Better use of technology such as internet portals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Coordination of case management and service planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Adopting client-based funding model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Class Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Victorian Business Committee responsible for strategic guidance &amp; facilitating initiative &amp; engaging stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Membership of others such as Consumer Affairs Victoria, Victorian WorkCover Authority, and various Victorian Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Neighbourhood Justice Centre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Department of Justice working with other Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Project Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Community Liaison Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● A Partnership &amp; Accountability Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORKING ACROSS LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Joint state and local planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● All Departments to review their strategic planning requirements of local government so that local government could incorporate state government requirements to streamline planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from analysis of: State Services Authority (November 2007) *Victorian approach to joined up government – an overview* Victorian State Government. Source: Developed for this research.

**Conclusion**

The report examined government working across departments or levels of government, but did not investigate government working with community or private sector. Thirty nine projects were explored. The projects covered the areas into which the Victorian Government saw joined-up government activities falling: cross cutting policy, place-based, population or client-based, integrated service delivery and across levels of government.
The report captured the key features and approaches in the different scenarios and drew out key success factors before identifying actions for further improvement.

To improve Victoria’s approach to joined-up government, key areas to be further developed included: applying enabler practices and key success factors; embedding joined-up government as an integral way of working requiring changes to systems, leadership, accountability; building the culture; clarifying expectations, roles and responsibilities; undertaking planning for joined-up initiatives; integrating state-wide and local planning; establishing an outcomes framework for joint accountability; aligning rewards and incentives based on joint approaches; allocating resources through different mechanisms and overcoming issues with inter-departmental transfers; encouraging innovation and managing risk; enhancing skills and capabilities of staff and leaders; and lastly, learning from experience through evaluation of joined-up projects to inform improvements.

3.4.2 Guidelines and tools


Background

This document looks at the different and competing imperatives that contribute to successful WOG work. It captures successes and failures. The document acknowledges that success was also about changing the culture and building models for government solutions. Building collegiality at the highest levels was seen as important and so was having the right skill set at this level of management. Results are noted below regarding some guidelines about GAs working together:

- **Undertaking an assessment or business case process to justify working together** to be able to recognise a WOG issue.

- **Determining the nature of a suitable structure** for the task. A whole range of factors were to be considered in making a choice about appropriate structure. They included, but are not limited to: level of contention, dates and timing, issues involved, nature of outcomes and their complexity, and whether short, medium or long term; level of cooperation required; nature of task that has to be undertaken; range of stakeholder
views about the issue and task; any established arrangement in place (if it is a joint service delivery). Structures suggested included Inter-departmental Committees, Taskforces (for longer projects); joint teams, agency arrangements and frontier agencies. The paper suggested that consideration of the structure and the characteristics of the task (policy development, program design or review, program management or service delivery; cross-jurisdictional and cross-sector; crisis management) should occur. The guide provided a useful Table to assist with assessing these factors. Lead and support roles were also to be determined.

- **Creating a culture for success.** This related to attitudes (flexible, openess, persistence), values (trust, commitment) and ways of managing people, for example, team work. This formed part of building the working relationship.

- **Managing information,** which may involve using current processes or developing new ways. Issues to be considered included level of sharing, principles, standards, protocols, costs, shared workspace and IT platforms.

- **Using a budget and accountability framework** – this required consideration of outcomes (single or common), outputs and administered items, for example revenue, expenses, assets and liabilities; whether there was a purchaser/provider relationship; accountability to which minister/s, and performance measures.

- **Managing contacts outside the public service and engagement of others** required knowing the communities of interest; their awareness of policies and programs, whether client bases overlapped; as well as whether solution and task will suit the community of interest need. The guide provided a flow chart indicating assessment of whether the approach is top-down or bottom-up. This section also lists approaches for community engagement.

Other tools included a Table to determine how complex the issue was and the pressure to act; a tool to determine the form and management of relationships or partnership.

Sections 7, 8 and 9 of the guide dealt with managing a crisis, making interdepartmental committees work effectively and exploring international perspectives relating to WOG activities.
Conclusion

The good practice guide presents a series of discussions on the topics, poses questions to highlight aspects for consideration and provides tools such as Tables, flow charts and diagrams. The layout suggested that this was a progressive process that would be followed, once the business case for working together was established.

Note – Additional material is now available on the Australian Public Service Commission Management and Advisory Committee site:

Presented below are a range of tools and strategies that have subsequently been developed at the Australian Government level to support GAs working together in WOG initiatives. They include:

- 2006 e-government strategy
- Australian Government Technical Interoperability Framework
- An Australian Government Website
- FedInfo
- Fedlink – secure agency information sharing network
- Guidelines for establishing and facilitating communities of practice – this is a group of peers who agree to work together, share knowledge, develop expertise and solve problems. (Communities of Practice, 2008)
- National Service Improvement Framework: The Online Council of Ministers determined the need for better integration of service delivery across all jurisdictions. The Online Council of Officials created the Integrated Transaction Reference Group to develop strategies for integrated services. This group developed the National Service Improvement Framework (NSIF) to help to identify and enable collaborative service projects. (National Service Improvement Framework 2008)

- Prime Minister and Cabinet Implementation Unit
- Source IT
- The Australian Government Business Process Interoperability Framework – Enabling Seamless Service Delivery (2007). This provides a guide and set of tools to assist with working together and has been endorsed by the Business Process Transformation
Committee. Tools include a roadmap providing steps for agencies to move towards interoperability; list of Australian Government sources to support and guide collaborative activity; capability maturity model for agencies to identify their current level of business process interoperability; and a series of case studies to illustrate some current management strategies, business processes and approaches being used.

- ‘Working Together’ Guide – providing a best practice checklist of areas to be addressed. Key areas are communication, organisations set up such as working groups, determining the structure and operational framework, setting Terms of Reference, setting up financial frameworks, management arrangements, reporting to home agencies, record keeping, reviewing, behaviour standards, role and responsibilities of ‘special purpose groups’ set up. (‘Working Together’ Guide 2008)


Background

These guidelines were produced by the Office of Public Sector Management in Queensland, following the tabling of Premier Peter Beattie’s ‘Realising the Vision: Governance for the Smart State’ in Parliament. The document defined seamless government as referring to joined-up government; multi-agency collaboration; integrated service delivery; cross-cutting projects; and collaborative partnerships. This also included working across levels of government. The intention was to better manage information sharing; partner with community; achieve integrated future focused policy and a public service workforce that encourages innovation. The guidelines were developed following some investigation into issues when working together. The purpose was to assist agencies achieve whatever integrating structure or relationship is necessary to realise the vision.

Findings

Seven critical success factors were identified and included: alignment with government priorities; clear common purpose; leadership; good governance; relationships; learning capacity; resourcing. Each factor was dealt with separately and included explanation as to why the factor was important, what was done and what challenges were likely. Table 3.16 presents the findings. Issues included differing priorities between
agencies, agency culture, skills, communication, leadership and authority and lack of clarity regarding responsibilities, staff turnover. Solutions included gaining ministerial support, demonstrating benefit to community, agreeing process and outcomes, developing project boundaries and methodology, building relationships, determining how to measure success, ensuring staff skills can be developed to suit need.

Table 3.16

Queensland Government – Seamless Government issues, solutions and success factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues &amp; challenges</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Differing and competing priorities may exist between agencies</td>
<td>● Clarify project link to government priorities</td>
<td>● Alignment with government priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Tension may exist between seamless government project and agency core business</td>
<td>● Demonstrate project benefit to community</td>
<td>● A clear common purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Gaining support and funding</td>
<td>● Gain Ministerial and DG support</td>
<td>● Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Officers work as representatives of their agency, not as cross-agency personnel</td>
<td>● Consult with Treasury and Department of Premier and Cabinet</td>
<td>● Good governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Inability to agree on purpose, goal and outcomes</td>
<td>● Explore perspectives of all agencies</td>
<td>● Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Ensure clear lines of communication due to confusing lines of accountability</td>
<td>● Agree on process and outcomes</td>
<td>● Learning and capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● No support by agency internal structure or delegations</td>
<td>● Discuss how the above align with individual agency’s outcomes</td>
<td>● Resourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● If no benefit from levels of authority seen, not likely to succeed</td>
<td>● Identify stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Leader authority needs to be recognised across Lack of clarity about responsibility</td>
<td>● Map boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Need to conform to external accountability mechanisms – legislative and statutory</td>
<td>● Map priorities, obstacles and constraints (legislation, policies, industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>requirements, agreements, administrative arrangement, risk management assessments</td>
<td>concerns; issues with communication; shared responsibilities central and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Time to establish relationships</td>
<td>● Develop and agree project methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Culture and work patterns in public service not congruent with working seamlessly</td>
<td>● Identify sponsor (Minister, DG etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Insufficient commitment from staff</td>
<td>● Determine project leader and clarify authority in team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Turnover of staff creates discontinuity in relationship and shared understanding</td>
<td>● Make links to governance arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Requires different skills in planning, facilitating, influencing</td>
<td>● Determine support required to project leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Build relationships amongst all stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Manage views, expectations and levels of commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Clarify and agree roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Determine behaviours to build trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Identify staff skills and develop means of acquiring skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.16 continued
### Table 3.16 continues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues &amp; challenges</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson learned are often only applicable in this joint setting, need to share the knowledge in other forums so that others don’t repeat the same mistakes.</td>
<td>Determine how success and progress is measured</td>
<td>● Determine how success and progress is measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of appropriate planning, experience, skills and resources</td>
<td>Agree group operating protocols</td>
<td>● Agree group operating protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding inappropriately allocated</td>
<td>Address conflict resolution methods and how to manage lack of commitment</td>
<td>● Address conflict resolution methods and how to manage lack of commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay in coordinating funding and conflicts</td>
<td>Ways to provide coaching and mentoring</td>
<td>● Ways to provide coaching and mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared resources issues may occur</td>
<td>Documentation of success and limitations</td>
<td>● Documentation of success and limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder to monitor and measure so costs and benefits harder to report</td>
<td>Determine how to share learnings</td>
<td>● Determine how to share learnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Join up early in project development and engage Treasury and DPC for policy framework and resourcing strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Join up early in project development and engage Treasury and DPC for policy framework and resourcing strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Establish high level steering committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Establish high level steering committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Ensure resources available</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Ensure resources available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Understand budget implications (pooled, new, dedicated funds etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Understand budget implications (pooled, new, dedicated funds etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Consider agency time/fund contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Consider agency time/fund contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Consider staff location options</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Consider staff location options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Additional resources, efficient use of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Additional resources, efficient use of resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Developed for this research.

### Conclusion

As a guide, this document identified seven critical success factors for successful seamless government. Information was provided on the how and why of addressing these success factors. Dot points listed actions or approaches to be used. These were progressive from assessing the project links to government priorities through to operational details of project methodology, clarifying roles and responsibilities, planning and evaluation, and resourcing (human and financial).


### Background

This paper starts from the premise of the challenges Government faces to deal with complex situations as well as the challenges of responding to community expectations of government, with the goal for the Queensland Government to provide comprehensive, integrated responses. The paper acknowledged that successful cross-agency initiatives remain limited and explored why this is the case. The paper drew on case studies and information from practitioners from Australia and overseas, including the Government Service Delivery project conducted by the former Office of the Public Service.
Commissioner in 1999 – 2000; the Goodna Service Integration Project and Community Renewal Program; the findings from the review by the Institute of Public Administration of Australia (2000). In addition the paper reviewed literature on experiences with service integration in other Australian jurisdictions, New Zealand, Canada and the United Kingdom. The paper noted elements that constitute successful multi-agency collaboration and also identified the impediments to multi-agency collaboration using examples from the case studies and reference literature for illustration.

Seamless government was defined as the delivery of services so that organisational, professional and funding arrangements within and between agencies do not affect achievement of results and recipients are unaware of the multiplicity of providers. This would require working both horizontally and vertically and relied on partnerships, sharing of ideas and information, and developing satisfactory accountability processes. There were five methods of collaborative service delivery mentioned in the paper: **principal agent delivery** that may involve the contracting of another agency to deliver the service; **linking** where two or more agencies cooperated; **lead agency coordination** of the contribution of other agencies; **case management** where the services to a client are coordinated across the agencies providing them; and **service integration** where a group of agencies jointly plan, fund and manage a package of services.

Six principles are identified for seamless service:
- Not everything is linked
- Focus on results to be achieved
- Plan services from the client/user viewpoint
- Information to be shared by providers of linked services
- Undertake joint planning
- Manage for outcomes, rather than outputs

**Findings**

Table 3.17 (page 191) captures the issues and challenges, approaches and solutions suggested, and notes the key success factors. Issues related to management culture, agency silos and regional managers’ failure to accept collaboration as part of core business. Also there were no guides as to how to address multi-agency outcomes, resourcing and issues
about duplication of functions. Solutions suggested included having different leadership arrangements and might also involve planning across agencies, agreeing a shared purpose and devoting time to build inter-agency relationships. Budget issues could be addressed by directing all government resources towards priorities and having coordination committees for each priority. Success was seen to be associated with factors such as political support, relationships, common goals, adequate resourcing and developing effective frameworks for delivery.

Table 3.17
Findings of ‘Seamless Service Delivery’ research paper 3 Queensland Government 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues &amp; challenges</th>
<th>Approaches &amp; Solutions</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Management culture where each agency has developed specific professional ethos;</td>
<td>● Principle agent – a single government agency contracts another agency (within or ex-government) to deliver services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● ‘silos’ which create narrowly focused goals;</td>
<td>● Linking – two or more agencies to cooperate to improve individual service e.g. sharing data, facilitating access of client to each other’s services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● regional managers discouraged from pursuing collaborative actions by the management in their agencies;</td>
<td>● Lead agency – one agency assumes leadership role and coordinates contribution of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● regional managers negative and dismissive of working collaboratively, seeing it as an additional area to their normal work;</td>
<td>● Service integration – group of agencies jointly plan, fund, and manage delivery of package of services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● unwilling to support collaboration if activity doesn’t relate to core business of division;</td>
<td>● Integrated planning across agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● cost in time and money;</td>
<td>● Development of a shared purpose and priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● lack of budget allocation and no funding for collaborative activities;</td>
<td>● Time and effort dedicated to developing interagency relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Being distracted from agency outcomes.</td>
<td>● Change how budget proposals submitted to government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Outputs and outcomes – Managing for outcomes budget system emphasises limits of programs and the differentiation between them requiring delivery on stated outputs</td>
<td>Budget arrangements to change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Lack of guidelines as to how to address multi-agency collaboration</td>
<td>● All resources directed towards each government’s priority outcomes brought together for review by government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Traditional agency-centred management practices &amp; no effective head office mechanism for multi-agency initiatives</td>
<td>● Coordinating committees for each government key priority to guide allocation of resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Planning for outcomes – strategic planning is undertaken by each agency in isolation resulting in poor coordination &amp; narrow focus</td>
<td>● Coordinating committees advise government on reallocation across agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Time pressures</td>
<td>● Coordinating committees report to government on progress towards priority outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Differences in values, cultures and language across agencies and with communities involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Management cultures in agencies reinforced by budget and accountability processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Overlap and duplication of functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Resource allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The paper identified issues and challenges including management culture; ‘silos’; lack of agency processes and systems to accommodate working together; no guidance to
officers on working collaboratively; the constraining influence of management for outcomes and the associated budgeting arrangements and traditional agency-centred management approaches. The current structures, planning and management were identified as encouraging single and isolated agency activity. The overall intention of adopting the solutions proposed was to improve service provision to communities and for those services to address the individual needs of the community.

Key success factors included political support and support at senior levels; developing good relationships; sharing common goals and priorities; adequate resources, including staff; frameworks for operation and accountability and ensuring vertical and horizontal relationships are managed.

Five framework models were mentioned: principle agency, linking, lead agency, service integration, and integrated planning. Amending the budget allocation process was seen as a key area to address in order to facilitate agency collaboration and allow greater flexibility in allocating resources.

Reference 19 Handbook for Integrated Governance Department of Families October 2002

Background

With recognition of the difficulties faced by agencies when working together, the handbook was developed to assist staff that work collaboratively on projects with other government agencies and non-government agencies. The handbook focused on integrated governance.

Methodology

Following a forum in 2001 an independent consultant was contracted to research and develop the guidelines. Case studies were reviewed and also other literature to compile the handbook and its accompanying guide. The handbook referred to the Institute of Public Administration of Australia study of 2000, OECD studies and looked at lessons learned from departmental initiatives. These included the Brisbane Inner City Place Project, The Gold Coast Integrated Responses to Young People at Risk; the Social Justice Human Services Sub-Group of the Regional Managers of Government Forum (Sunshine Coast); and the Youth Accommodation and Support Model (Caboolture).
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Results

The guidelines indicated that integration applied to interagency, collaboration, networking, joined-up government, partnerships and breaking down silos. In relation to governance it related to the way planning occurred, decisions were made, resources were allocated and managed, and accountability. In joint initiatives, for example decision-making, planning, resourcing, defining goals, objectives and outcomes and accountability must be mutually agreed. Table 3.18 presents the issues, approaches and solutions and key success factors.

Table 3.18
Issues, solutions and success factors from the Integrated Governance handbook by Department of Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues &amp; challenges</th>
<th>Approaches &amp; Solutions</th>
<th>Success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Struggle to understand the semantics used in integration and governance</td>
<td>Must be outcomes focused and outcomes must be agreed, including the reporting procedures</td>
<td>Be outcomes for client focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding as to how proposed new way of working is different to current networking etc.</td>
<td>Leadership (Political and Departmental) at macro and micro level.</td>
<td>Ensuring early engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to determine departmental role in initiatives that already have a structure</td>
<td>Macro level - government commitment. Micro level - staff acceptance of responsibility for achieving project goals.</td>
<td>Resourcing support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential lack of line support</td>
<td>Leadership (commitment of key CEOs and senior management and structures for dialogue)</td>
<td>Leadership at political, departmental, CEOs and from active staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the nature of governance in joint initiatives</td>
<td>Leadership (all staff at program and service level)</td>
<td>Stakeholder ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers tend to be structural, cultural or systemic</td>
<td>Protocols and tools for sustainable and effective effort – use of common forms, agreed processes, joint protocols developed at local level or higher.</td>
<td>Parameter setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration may be hindered by levels above in the bureaucratic hierarchies</td>
<td>Creating ownership with all stakeholders</td>
<td>Allowing adequate time for results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks in collaboration – employment of staff, accountability for outcomes and use of and accountability of pooled funds</td>
<td>Resourcing the initiative including for a dedicated officer to drive the initiative – can be pooled, contributory from each participant.</td>
<td>Properly resourced projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding, accountability and decision-making</td>
<td>Increased flexibility of funding such as brokerage funding, buying services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies for pooled budgets; one agency identified to manage the funds. Negotiate how funds are used and accountability measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capitalising on the use of technology use of databases. Concern for privacy issues will need to be addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition of long term benefits and ensure realistic expectations form about the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using performance appraisal to support collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of existing joint agency frameworks such as place management, regional managers’ forums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of joint working groups or team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of appropriate administrative outcomes; flexibility and capacity to respond to issues and difference amongst agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share costs of client focused shared service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address risks of collaborating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploring and clearly identifying agency capacity and agreed processes for decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarify employment details and supervisory procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Examples of integrated governance

- **Planning** (Local area planning, place based planning, round tables)
- **Decision-making mechanisms** (Ministerial committees, steering committees, taskforces, working groups, regional forums)
- **Funding arrangements** (pooled, tendering with partners, brokerage)
- **Service delivery** (one-stop-shop, coordinated delivery in co-location or outsourced, joint intake and referral mechanisms, common assessment tools, joint or common databases)
- **Accountability** (Triple bottom line analysis, joint indicators, joint reporting mechanisms, single agency financial accountability model, a line agency allocated responsibility to manage pooled funds).

Companion tool guide

A companion tool guide was produced to go with the handbook. This provides resources and checklists for staff, plus sample agreements and protocols. The tools addressed issues such as decision-making and planning. Case studies were provided as a resource. Material includes:

- Manager’s checklist to decide whether to be involved in integrated projects and the governance issues
- Memorandum of Understanding sample
- Draft network protocol
- Project and case study examples
- Employment checklist
- Staff skills checklist

Conclusion

The Handbook and the Companion Tool guide provides some practical tools, checklists and sample documents to facilitate the adoption of some of the solutions and approaches noted in the handbook. The handbook identified that there was difficulty understanding what integrated governance meant and how it would affect the way agencies worked together. It was also noted that often there was a lack of line support to work collaboratively. Success was seen as being based on leadership, engaging early with partners, ensuring adequate resources, setting parameters and having adequate timeframes.
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The solutions noted leadership, adopting agreed protocols and tools, allocating sufficient resources and funds, including possibly pooled funding; ensuring stakeholder ownership and looking at mechanisms to support working together such as technology; Use of specific joint groups (both current and established for the project) were also adopted in some of the case studies.

Reference 20 Oliver P ‘Role of Government Coordination in Civic Engagement: Experience of Queensland, Australia’, Adjunct Research Fellow, Centre for Governance and Public Policy, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

Background

This paper is one of the outputs of the Engaged Government project referred to elsewhere in Section 3.3 (page 142). The paper looks at Government coordination and civic engagement. Central to the discussion are citizen trust, new public sector management and engaged government. The paper has been selected from the range of papers developed from the research because it summarises some of the outputs of the Engaged Government project, being models, tools and a framework to assist government and community in collaborative initiatives. It must be noted that this collaboration incorporates the wider regional stakeholder group and thus encompasses more than the research problem under investigation, which is confined to GAs’ core business conflict as a barrier to GAs working together.

Model, framework and tools:

- **An ideal collaborative model (ICM)** – cited as based on work by Whelan and Oliver (2005. The model considers the collaborative and non-collaborative ‘space’.
- **Issue, Context and Stakeholder Analysis System (ICASA)** – a mechanism for participants to shift from non-collaboration to collaboration and presents the basis for a business case to support/not support working together. The model includes questions and rating systems to assist with defining the problem, identifying potential collaborators, how to engage on identified issue/s and the economic costs and benefits of working together, findings are then summarised for deliberation and action. The final step helps to guide actions for inter-agency collaboration and can be rated. The result identified flexibility and possible resolution and processes to use.
• **Collaboration, Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (CMEF)** – also developed from the work of Whelan and Oliver (2005) cited in this paper. This model guides monitoring and evaluation of outcomes and is four dimensional covering outcomes, social processes, change and decision-making. The model is flexible and adaptable to different life cycle stages of working together, with the four dimensions being inter-related.

In addition, the research has also produced discussion papers:

- ‘Whose outcomes? A Proposal for Regional Budgeting’ – information guiding stakeholder funding and resourcing
- ‘Institutional Structures that Encourage Engaged Governance’ – presents information to guide stakeholders in developing appropriate structures to work together
- ‘Agency Culture and Engaged Government’ – presents information about recognising and managing different organisational cultures

**Conclusion**

The ‘Engaged Government’ project dealt with a broader context than the focus of the research problem under investigation in this research, however the research has resulted in tools, models and information papers that are a resource for agencies involved in WOG, joint initiatives, particularly involving community engagement.

**General conclusions on approaches, tools and guidelines**

The literature review has demonstrated that there are issues and impediments when GAs work together and that the imperative to address them has led to the development of diverse solutions and approaches. What is also clear is that whilst many of the issues and impediments experienced are common or similar, and solutions and approaches adopted contain commonalities also, the nature of the joined-up, WOG or integrated initiative requires some situation-specific or project-specific solutions and approaches to be developed by participants.

Table 3.19 (page 198) summarises the findings of the extant literature project evaluations and reviews undertaken. The Table presents brief details of the review,
evaluation or research activity of projects and joint initiatives for regional development, joined-up, integrated and WOG programs. The Table then outlines the methodology used; documents the key findings relating to issues, solutions and success, and records any limitations of the review, evaluation or research.

Issues and difficulties experienced when GAs work together drive innovative solutions. In broad terms the issues noted cover governance structures; inter-government, inter-departmental and inter-personal relationships, and practical elements relating to operational processes and systems. These include technical, regulatory, accountability, and financial areas. Organisational culture and staff skills for working in collaborative environment also contribute to the issues.

Key success factors included leadership, good communication, defining decision-making capabilities, commitment, innovation, gaining high level support, and having local champions. Resourcing issues could be addressed by having designated or pooled funds, and staff with appropriate skills. Having high political mandates, clearly defined joint outcomes, agreed operational procedures and governance frameworks were also identified. Other success factors that were commonly noted were shared vision and goals, mutuality, staff consistency, links to Government priorities, compatibility and interoperability of IT systems, clear roles and responsibilities, identification and management of joint activities, and collaborative planning.

The literature examined presented a wide variety of approaches and solutions to addressing issues and impediments when working together. These include: development of new mechanisms, frameworks, partnerships and agreements to guide and oversee GAs working together. To counter process and system difficulties and interoperability, solutions also include development of new processes and systems, as well as development of WOG policies addressing areas such as shared financial accountability. To address program and service issues, solutions have included designing of more flexible programs and services, and innovative use of technology. To address cultural and skill difficulties, education, training, and developing incentives that recognise, reward and embrace collaboration and colleagueship were undertaken.
Table 3.19 Summary of research literature on issues and impediments to agencies working together discussed in sections 3.4.2, 3.4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area, Title, author and date</th>
<th>Brief details</th>
<th>Methodology (if a research activity)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development joint initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Organisations (REDOs) in NSW – A Preliminary Study Fulop, L. &amp; Wiggers de Vries, M, National Committee on Regional Cooperation, 1997 Section3.3.1 Reference 1 page 133</td>
<td>Study of 4 regional development organizations in NSW, set up under the Commonwealth regional development program under Keating. This was undertaken in 1996.</td>
<td>Qualitative research using two levels of interviews with open-ended and coded questions. There was a general questionnaire and one for Chief Executives of the organizations.</td>
<td>Issues: Organisations operational difficulties that link to the research topic; raised: complexity of reporting and accountability and auditing requirements; difficulty getting clear and prompt policy interpretations from Government officials. Program complexities and inflexibilities for region’s needs. Relationships amongst regional stakeholders (would be the same as those for GAs working in this field), were identified as being important. The same issues of trust, honesty, forging common goals to help to work collaboratively were identified.</td>
<td>This was seeking data on the key factors for successful establishment and operation of REDOs. It was not to identify issues and impediments per se. However there were questions relating to this. This demonstrates the community effect of issues and impediments. The REDOs were only from NSW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the Challenge – Regional Economic Development Organisations (REDOs) in Australia. A National Study Executive Report. November 1997 prepared by L. Fulop and M Brennan, University of Wollongong and Australian Local Government Association Section3.3.1 Reference 2 page 136</td>
<td>Second study of the REDOs set up under Prime Minister Keating’s regional development program. This study was adjusted after funding for REDOs was removed. Focus on how REDOs adjusting to loss of funding and strategies and options for the future. Not revisiting issues in first study.</td>
<td>Qualitative research involving interviews. Fifteen REDOs from across Australia participated. Questionnaires were administered in person, where possible, or by telephone conversations. Study funded by Australian Research Council</td>
<td>Issues: Due to funding cuts, lost confidence in Federal Govt commitment in regional development. Processes bureaucratic; Cooperation, coordination and better communication across three levels of government regarding regional development. Suggest all agree on regional development approach. Need to acknowledge regional differences in planning. This study demonstrates the community effect of issues and impediments &amp; lack of consistent policy direction from the Federal Government.</td>
<td>Like the previous report was not looking at issues and impediments, but is useful because the difficulties identified are an outcome of core business conflict issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape York Peninsula Land Use System (CYPLUS) Case study from Sustainable Regional Development – Final Report J Dore and Woodhill (1999) Greening Australia Section 3.3.1 Reference 3 page 138</td>
<td>The CYPLUS was a planning initiative triggered by the increasing number of conflicts relating to development and economic activity proposals, environmental issues, and Aboriginal Land Rights. CYPLUS was a joint land use study incorporating stakeholders from all three levels of Government, multiple agencies and community. This is one of seven case studies in the final report, &amp; was chosen as it was from Queensland. Information was collected and collated from a variety of sources and interviews were undertaken to capture data. Information was analysed and compiled into a report on the projects. This included key insights and critical issues, observations and lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Issues: complexity of project; issues with management; engagement; communication, consultation; poor coordination, integration, cooperation and collaboration across levels of government and amongst agencies involved. Timeframes, achievable outcomes and governance of the process were challenges also. Solutions/Successes: included clearly defining roles, responsibilities, boundaries, outcomes and processes; ensuring appropriate cultural approaches used</td>
<td>The project involved a wide range of complex and contentious issues. Implementation had not commenced and was in doubt due to waning support from Federal and State Governments. The report illustrated serious difficulties in appropriate community engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.19 continues…
**Chapter 3**

**Table 3.19 continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area, Title, author and date</th>
<th>Brief details</th>
<th>Methodology (if a research activity)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
*Section 3.3.1 Reference 4 page 142* | This project was a collaborative project funded by the Australian Research Council Linkage Grant program and involved Queensland Government Departments of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy, Main Roads, Queensland Transport, Local Government Association of Queensland, Griffith University, Central Queensland University and University of Queensland. The aim was to investigate the complexities of how, when, and why government do and should collaborate with both other levels of government and agencies and with community. The study spanned three years. The aim was to assess the value of multi-sectoral collaboration, outcomes for regional development and broader government and to determine frameworks, processes and managerial strategies and mechanisms that would assist collaboration | This was an action research, involving only one cycle of action research, due to scale and breadth of study. A case study approach was applied within the action research structure with five case studies involved | **Issues**: Voluntarist approach to engagement in government, rather than a model; politicization and ministerial influence; issues on how to collaborate effectively and with value; relationship; bureaucratization; departmentalism; planning and implementation relationship and scale and linkage to resources; fragmented approaches difficulty adjusting to working new ways, paradoxes relating to silos, decision-making, legislation and statutory frameworks constraints; established pattern of collaboration.  
**Solutions/processes**: develop common purpose, align structures and systems to regional needs; develop capabilities, apply innovative solutions; develop governance frameworks, vision, principles and strong business rationale; define boundaries, and tie to Cabinet and budget objectives; develop appropriate accountability and authority process; support regional governance system; ensure proper authority transferred locally where necessary; develop formal and information rules for interaction | The study is about community & government engagement & effective frameworks for engagement, thus covers different types of issues, but does capture impediments to GAs working together. |
| **Whole of Government, integrated and joined-up government initiatives** | Conclusions drawn by the author from a review undertaken of NSW integrated WOG initiatives | No details supplied regarding how the review was undertaken | **Issues**: WOG is not a dominant mode in which agencies work; GAs’ structures reflect legislative framework & administrative convenience, not service community need; Ministers’ responsibilities reflect agency organization & legislative structures; budgeting and financial arrangements reflect individual agency outcomes; service delivery based on discrete agency delivery so system does not encourage collaboration; public service culture, training and socialization reflect this division; turbulence and discontinuity from restructuring agencies; tension between structural and systemic framework in which agencies operate  
**Solutions/success**: of WOG enthusiasm, commitment, champions or sponsors, imperative to change, designated funding; need cultural change, leadership, stability and continuity; Encourage rewarding WOG behaviour; people focus on initiatives, not WOG; improve communication & information sharing | No detail of how review undertaken. Comments are predominantly the individual’s viewpoint, however the comments relate to issues and impediments when GAs work together. |

Table 3.19 continues…
### Table 3.19 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area, task, author and date of publication</th>
<th>Pathway and Advisory Committee: Connecting Government natural resource management team (NRM) with the Environment portfolio</th>
<th>Methodology (if a research activity)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and Advisory Committee: Connecting Government natural resource management team (NRM) with the Environment portfolio</td>
<td>The project undertook literature research and captured information through a case study approach. The MAC project captured information from the case study analysis in the following areas: Budget and accountability framework for identified priorities. Structural options and processes including interdepartmental committees, taskforces and joint project teams. Client and community-based approaches including Indigenous, rural and regional partnerships. Crisis management. Information structure.</td>
<td>Issues: concerning conflict with departmental other priorities; cultural change in staff required; different systems for HR, finance, delegations and decision-making. Success/solutions: used having clear, high-level political mandate; co-location of staff support of secretaries; establishment of operational and administrative protocols; harmonisation of information systems.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Greenhouse Office (AGO) had responsibility for coordinating the Australian Government's WOG response to Australia's international obligations and national policy objectives for greenhouse and climate change. It was established in 1998 as part of the Government response to the Kyoto protocol. It was responsible for delivering the National Greenhouse and Energy Efficiency Fund, and for developing and implementing strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It became an executive agency under the Public Service Act 1999.</td>
<td>Australian Greenhouse Office (AGO) had responsibility for coordinating the Australian Government's WOG response to Australia's international obligations and national policy objectives for greenhouse and climate change. It was established in 1998 as part of the Government response to the Kyoto protocol. It was responsible for delivering the National Greenhouse and Energy Efficiency Fund, and for developing and implementing strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It became an executive agency under the Public Service Act 1999.</td>
<td>Issues: secretaries had difficulties under the Financial Management Act 1997 and different accountability procedures; difficulties initially with joint decision-making; cultural differences in staff seconded from different agencies; different filing, certification agreements; agency-owned structures for management; understanding capacity of stakeholders; establishing high level support for policy; recruiting the right people; making it an executive agency.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.19 continues…*
### Table 3.19 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area, Title, author and date</th>
<th>Brief details</th>
<th>Methodology (if a research activity)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caste study 2 continued</strong></td>
<td>The purpose of the AGO was coordinating the Australian Government’s WOG response to Australia’s international obligations and national policy objectives for greenhouse and climate change. This area impacts on regional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management and Advisory Committee ‘Connecting Government’ WOG responses to Australia’s priority challenges</strong></td>
<td>The Goodna Service Integration project (SIO) was developed to test how community and government and non-government agencies can work together to improve community well being. A goal was to be able to transfer what was done here to other areas of Queensland. The area, in outer part of Brisbane, towards Ipswich has a population of 9000 and long term problems from socioeconomic disadvantage, high unemployment, low income, low home ownership, child abuse and domestic violence. The intention was to try to enhance the capacity of GAs to integrate responses to community needs through a collaborative partnership between State, Federal, and Local Government. It was funded from 2000-2003. Changes was informed from research with a particular focus on planning, funding, implementation and evaluation strategies to reduce crime, improve school retention rates, improve community health and other issues. This project was responding to a socio-economic issue in a specific location. The purpose was to test how community and government and non-government agencies can work together to improve community well being. Outcomes are long term and not part of the review of this project.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Issues: related to needing to change both the operational way of working as well as program delivery; internal coordination challenges for agencies in a centralized position, dealing in a regional setting; staff from different organizational cultures; tension regarding different ways to problem-solve, allocated resources and evaluate input costs; resource coordination; flexibility to pool resources. Success/solutions: relied on developing good relationships, communication and having a dedicated resource. Some processes adopted to address issues included reviewing policy and funding available; developing joint agency outcomes to achieve agency and government priorities; developing permission processes to share information; developing a measurement and modeling structure.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management and Advisory Committee ‘Connecting Government’ WOG responses to Australia’s priority challenges</strong></td>
<td>The Sustainable Regions Program (SRP) was a new pilot program launched in 2001. It focuses on community building and sustainable development. It encompasses economic, social and environmental elements and resources. Funding was approximately $100 million from 2001-02 to 2005-06. 8 regions were supported under the program. In Queensland these were Atherton Tablelands and Wide Bay Burnett. Program was targeted at specific regions and relied very much on capability at the local level.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Issues: new policy being implemented; inflexibility of agency programs; difficult to reconcile national objectives with local objectives; process rather than program focused; varying cooperation levels; difference between internal and WOG accountabilities Portfolio Budget Statements do not accommodate reporting on WOG. Success/solutions: stemmed from clearly articulating strategic directions and priorities; having leadership at the top; shared vision; pooling resources formed SRA WOG network of Deputy Secretaries – high level support and facilitate coordination; Community Advisory Groups set up; Dedicated resource located locally and accessible. Federal agency built up good relationships.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.19: Case Studies Recap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area, Title, author and date</th>
<th>Brief details</th>
<th>Methodology (if a research activity)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthurson, K Whole of Government Models in Estate Regeneration: The Way Forward Just Policy No 29 April 2003 Section 3.3.2 Reference 7 page 157</td>
<td>Examines five case studies on community renewal or regeneration through the various Departments associated with public housing and estates. Explores adoption of the different models. Outcome of project is more long term. Acknowledge unable to tell if WOG really made a difference yet.</td>
<td>Empirical analysis conducted on five case study regeneration projects</td>
<td>Issues: South Australia experienced difficulties in working together with a newly structured Human Services Dept. Don’t restructure agencies, as this detracts from activities. Success/solutions: Established an overarching administrative structure to coordinate; support for developing responsive agencies; support for WOG group to coordinate project; need special dedicated pool of funding; no evidence to suggest WOG renewal has made a difference yet.</td>
<td>Program will take a long time to see benefits, thus the success of applying solutions is unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Disney &amp; Associates Pty Ltd (Lead) with Tracey Whetnall Consulting &amp; WisWei Consulting Pty Ltd Synopsis Review of the COAG Trial Evaluations Nov-06 Report to the Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination (OIPC) Section 3.3.2 Reference 8 page 159</td>
<td>WOG focus on improving service delivery to Indigenous Communities – trial set up as a result of COAG. Study was to investigate the issues, challenges, learnings from setting up these joint working arrangements.</td>
<td>Case studies across 8 sites involved using an evaluative framework on the activities, processes and outcomes of the joint partnerships.</td>
<td>Issues: Apart from the cultural difficulties that added a dimension to the issues and challenges, they were the same as those identified as being related to core business conflict. A key factor of the study was the struggle of getting down to the ‘how’ you work together. There was reference to using the Connecting Government guidelines, but no specific way of actually how you do the things recommended in the guidelines. Solutions: Engage place managers; set up issues based working groups and work on inter-governmental relationships.</td>
<td>Complexities and the fact that Indigenous Programs have the added dimension of cultural issues and challenges that historically have not been well managed by government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Public Administration of Australia ‘Working Together: Integrated Governance’ 2002 Section 3.3.2 Reference 9 page 161</td>
<td>The research was commissioned by the Institute of Public Administration of Australia (IPAA) as a national project in 2000. The research examined government integration across agencies and levels of government within a framework of governance. Integration was seen as occurring in three areas: service delivery, program implementation and for WOG initiatives dealing with complex problems.</td>
<td>There were three components to the methodology; a literature review looking at drivers and theories of integration; undertaking seven case studies from around Australia. A framework and questionnaire were developed from the literature review for exploring the case studies. The case studies involved interviews and focus groups. A workshop was also held.</td>
<td>Issues Service delivery: more joined up; purchaser provider issues; IT problems; internal agency difficulties; logistics &amp; legalities; organizational culture. Programs – integration at high level not necessarily translated at regional level; coordinator skills; central integration &amp; local level issues; sifo; ad hoc engagement; seen as add on to agency activity; different delegations; legislation &amp; boundary issues. Partnerships – variation in relationships that were complex; individual structures &amp; decision-making; poor history of past relationships; inflexibility; staff turnover; internal integration poor; balance of vision &amp; action; managing multiple conflicting stakeholder expectations. Solutions Service delivery – formalized partnerships on the ground. Programs – funded from consolidated fund or flexible funding arrangements; management at high level; representative groups across States to work through multi-agency responses locally; renewal coordinators &amp; facilitators locally; establishment of purpose specific council to advise Government; CEO working group to work across agencies Partnerships - iterative process; set up framework at the beginning; integrate social, economic &amp; environmental outcomes; incorporate working together in performance agreements; develop system to address cross-cutting issues; explore pooled, place-based funding; improve knowledge management, mapping, sharing; provide integrated governance training.</td>
<td>The case study findings are dated due to policy changes that have taken place since the study. As with any study of GAs activities, programs &amp; policies that extend into a new Government’s term, changes will occur. Studies all involve larger projects that cover the state or multiple sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3.19 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area, Title, author and date</th>
<th>Brief details</th>
<th>Methodology (if a research activity)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian Public Service Commission report ‘State of the Service Report 2006-2007’</strong> Section 3.3.2 Reference 10 page 171</td>
<td>Section 44 of the Public Service Act 1999 requires that the Australian Public Service Commissioner provides a report each year on the public service to the Prime Minister. This is the 10th report since reporting was instigated. Chapter 10 of this report examines WOG activities and explores issues and challenges that are still required to be addressed.</td>
<td>The report was the outcome of a review process. It included findings from surveys and discussions with senior management to gather data undertaken by the Australian National Audit Office. Forty four agencies were surveyed.</td>
<td><strong>Issues</strong> agency culture, institutional frameworks, financial governance and accountability arrangements, technology and agency capability considered outstanding issues. Also there was a need to recognize WOG work, greater focus on leadership and development of inter-agency relationships at senior level. There was some doubt regarding capacity amongst some staff to collaborate. ICT was seen as an area that needed considerable work to facilitate collaborative activities. <strong>Solutions</strong> Improved ICT interoperability, connectedness and capacity; enhancement to financial and accountability framework with greater flexibility for cross-agency funding and pooled funds. This flowed into having greater flexibility in program design. Further work required on cross-agency structures and clarifying authority and recognition and management of risk in WOG initiatives; improving performance management to include cross-agency work.</td>
<td>This report looks at the Australian Government public service; however many of the issues and possible solutions apply to State Governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dumas D &amp; Wiseman J</strong> Navigating the Future: A case study of Growing Victoria Together Australian Journal of Public Administration no 62 pages 11-23 June 2003 Section 3.2.2 Reference 11 page 174</td>
<td>The article examines the Growing Victoria Together initiative, the new policy paradigm to integrate economic, social and environmental outputs to facilitate integrated governance, the drivers to its development, the process to set it up, addressing issues such as the framework for performance and accountability, the critical organizations involved, the challenges and anticipated future problems.</td>
<td>Critical analysis of the evolution of the project</td>
<td><strong>Issues</strong> framework that integrates agency activities and priorities and that can have reportable and accountable outcomes that are not too onerous; adequate measurements; connecting corporate and business planning; skills to deliver; community and line departments buy-in; lack of understanding of cause and effect; outputs for cross-cutting activities</td>
<td><strong>Solutions</strong> A Resource management framework developed to align departmental objectives and outputs; establishment of special committees for such as the Framework Interdepartmental Committee; Chiefs of staff regular meetings with Premier; the setting up of the Victorian Economic, Environment and Social Advisory Committee; development of the Growing Victoria Together booklet; application of triple-bottom-line to all policy development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes, tools, practices, guidelines already being used</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael White ‘Victoria’s approach to putting children first’, paper in Public Administration Today, Issue 8 July – September 2006 Institute of Public Administration Section 3.4.1 Reference 12 page 176</strong></td>
<td>Article looking at managing for outcomes in a WOG initiative to address caring for Victoria’s children. It includes mechanism to facilitate WOG integration and activities</td>
<td>Not research, is a commentary on the topic</td>
<td>Development of special purpose WOG groups such as one to oversee policy and one to coordinate at a regional level. A WOG information repository and monitoring system was also developed.</td>
<td>Indirectly relevant as the article is about processes and groups set up to manage for outcome for WOG initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.18 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area, Title, author and date</th>
<th>Brief details</th>
<th>Methodology (if a research activity)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Auditor General’s office ‘Managing risk across the public sector: Toward good practice inter-agency risks – joined up government’ (2007)</td>
<td>The article was selected because it refers to an important issue associated with GAs working together – risk management in cross-agency initiatives. The issues was identified in an audit in 2003</td>
<td>This is not research, but a paper that makes recommendations following the audit that uncovered this issue.</td>
<td>Suggestions to manage risk include: Formal risk management processes to be in place; greater information sharing across agencies working together regarding risks and development of appropriate structures to deal with risk and aggregated risk; ensure departments understand one another’s risk management; development of clear policy guidelines to help agencies deal with joined-up government risks. It was suggested that State Services Authority conduct research into joined-up government initiatives to identify practices to support achieving government outcomes. The solution being that if risk is addressed formally and managed, potentially this could assist in reducing offers’ risk aversion attitude.</td>
<td>Not research, but dealing with a topic that may contribute to GA core business conflict – risk aversion attitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government of Victoria Victorian Services Authority Joined-up Government ‘A review of national and international experiences’ (2007)</td>
<td>The paper was produced as background research for a project the Victorian State Services Authority was undertaking on joined-up government.</td>
<td>The paper examines literature and government reports dealing with joined-up government. Literature covers the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada and Finland.</td>
<td><strong>Best practice identified:</strong> new ways of working (shared leadership, pooled budgets, merged structures and teams), new types of organisation (culture, values, information and training); accountability and incentives (shared outcome targets, performance measures and regulations); service delivery (joint consultation/involvement, shared clients, shared customer interface)</td>
<td>The paper was background research for the Victorian Government in progressing its joined-up government and WOG agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Services Authority ‘Victorian approaches to joined up government’ (2007)</td>
<td>The Victorian State Services Authority produced this report as an overview of approaches to joined-up government activities. The intention was to identify how to better integrate and coordinate government policy and service delivery. The report only considered government working across departments and/or levels of government, not the private sector</td>
<td>Case studies and consultation with senior managers from ten Victorian Government departments. Interviews were also conducted with local government and chief executive, non-government and academics, leading to over 70 interview involving 110 people. In addition, an extensive literature research was undertaken. Thirty nine projects were examined covering: cross cutting policy issues (10), placed based (9), population or client group based (7), integrated service delivery (10), and levels of government (3).</td>
<td>Drivers complexity of issues being managed by government that does not fit into departmental boundaries, levels of government, or portfolios. <strong>Solutions</strong> Governance approach included setting out joint objectives &amp; outcomes, targets; set up high level group, coordination groups, cross-departmental working groups, community working groups, and taskforces. Funding approaches include joint funding; joint bid from consolidated funds, single agency funding, pooled funds, client based funding brokering, departmental resources &amp; staff realigned, including secondments. Practices included identifying priority issues, collecting data, joint planning (including with community), place manager engaged, setting up local committees, agreeing departmental roles and responsibilities, develop coordination mechanism &amp; frameworks for inter-operability, new models for service delivery.</td>
<td>The paper relates specifically to Victoria’s approaches to joined-up government activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 3.18 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area, Title, author and date</th>
<th>Brief details</th>
<th>Methodology (if a research activity)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Advisory Committee ‘Connecting Government – Whole of Government Response to Australia’s Priority Challenges Good Practice Guide 3.5.2 Reference 16</td>
<td>Following the production of the MAC Report, the guidelines were compiled, based on the key sections identified through the report.</td>
<td>The Guidelines were produced as a result of the research mentioned under the previous section.</td>
<td>The guidelines acknowledge there is no strict formula to apply to working together. Two approaches are used. The first is where an individual agency looks at its work to make decisions about collaboration and the second is looking at the roles of other agencies as the starting point. Individual agency start from own perspective, decisions regarding policy development &amp; planning; implementation &amp; delivery, &amp; accountability &amp; reporting. The second approach look at roles of other agencies &amp; what would trigger the need to involve them. Must build business case to support the project &amp; whether this will support a WOG approach. The guidelines look at different structures &amp; provide a table to guide this decision. To create a culture for success &amp; discusses ‘networking or managing horizontal culture’ (p5 guidelines) and the means to encourage support. The guidelines then look at how information is managed &amp; shared. Budget &amp; accountability frameworks are explored, followed by making connections outside the public services &amp; involving others. A flow chart provides some guidance to determine whether a top down or bottom up approach is best. This section also includes a Table to assist with determining how complex the issue is. Other tools include one to determine the type of working relationship that would be suitable. Sections 7 and 8 deal with managing a crises &amp; involving international entities.</td>
<td>The MAC focus is very much at the strategic and WOG level, rather than the functional ‘grass roots’ level. It deals with many of the technicalities &amp; accountability structures, rather than the ‘how to’ at the operational end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Public Sector management Queensland Government – Seamless government Improving the outcomes for Queenslanders now and in the future Section 3.5.2 Reference 17 page 187</td>
<td>Premier Peter Beattie tabled ‘Realising the Vision: Governance for the Smart State’ in Parliament’. This clearly indicates the importance of achieving seamless government activity. This document identified this as joined-up government; multi-agency collaboration; integrated service delivery; cross cutting projects; and collaborative partnerships.</td>
<td>Following discussion and investigation into Gas working together, the guidelines were developed to assist agencies to achieve whatever integrating structure or relationship was necessary to realize the vision.</td>
<td>The paper identified challenges and the critical success factors and included a discussion of options to address the challenges presented as a checklist.</td>
<td>It is specific to the Queensland public sector environment, directed at fulfilling Premier Beattie’s ‘Realising the Vision: Governance for the Smart State’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Public Service Commission ‘Service Delivery Challenges’ Research paper 3 ‘Seamless Service Delivery’ November 2007 Section 3.5.2 Reference 18 page 189</td>
<td>Paper acknowledges that GAS working together face challenges</td>
<td>Case studies and practitioner information from Australia and overseas, including a literature review.</td>
<td>Issues management culture, agency ‘silos’, focus on core business, reluctant to support non-core business projects, cost in time &amp; money, own agency outcomes are traditionally agency-centric, culture &amp; values differ across agencies. Solutions proposes 4 models – principal agency contracts other agencies, linking &amp; cooperating amongst agencies, lead agency role to manage whole project, service integration involving relevant agencies, development of new budget allocation process in government with funds directed at achieving government priorities. Success factors political support, relationship (vertical &amp; horizontal), adequate resourcing, purpose-specific frameworks &amp; mechanisms to aid working together.</td>
<td>Paper is specific to Queensland public sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area, Title, author and date</th>
<th>Brief details</th>
<th>Methodology (if a research activity)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department of Families ‘Handbook for integrated Governance’ 2002</td>
<td>Hand book developed for staff to assist in working with other agencies. Practical ways to shape and influence direction and outcomes of integrated work. The Department hosted a one day forum in 2001 to explore the new approach to governance. An independent consultant explored the integrated governance area and developed the hand book. Five objectives were: Develop set of users friendly principles and guidelines Define and analyse the legal/legislative and practical enablers Develop innovative methodologies and address accountability and risk management Contributed to development of a generic Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>Four case studies were used to develop the hand book from Brisbane Inner City Place Project; Gold Coast Integrated Response to Young People at Risk; Social Justice Human Services Sub-group of the Regional Managers of Government Forum (Sunshine Coast); the Youth Accommodation and Support Motel (Caboolture).</td>
<td>Identified from IPAA and OECD reports that success more likely in resources project including staff time; few legislative barriers; barriers structural, cultural or systemic; even with support structural, cultural &amp; systemic barriers can impact negatively; an initiative may work on the ground, but above it there is lack of integration; focus should be outcome to clients; risks tend to relate to accountability of funds, responsible financial management and employment related aspects. <strong>Issues:</strong> difficulty with terms and ideas of integration unclear of limits of integration; up line support; confusion regarding different and appropriate approaches; determining meaning of governance; hard to identify benefits for clients; ensuring engagement of all stakeholders; resourcing support; leadership; parameter setting; adequate time for results.. <strong>Outcome:</strong> determine what needs to be down, how, by whom and by when.</td>
<td>Developed for the Queensland public sector environment. Although the paper identifies the activities behind the designing of the tools, Memorandum of Understanding, and checklists are general to the GA working together environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Oliver P ‘Role of Government Coordination in Civic Engagement: Experience of Queensland, Australia’ | This paper is one of the outputs of the Engaged Government project referred to in section 3.3. The paper looks at Government coordination & civic engagement. Central to the discussion are citizen trust, new public sector management & engaged government. The paper has been selected from the range of papers developed from the research because it summarises some of the outputs of the Engaged Government project, being models, tools and a framework to assist government and community in collaborative initiatives | The project involved case studies, but this paper | Model, tools and framework developed:  
- An ideal collaborative model (ICM) - The model considers the collaborative and non-collaborative ‘space’.  
- Issue, Context and Stakeholder Analysis System (ICASA) – a mechanism for participants to shift from non-collaborative to collaboration and presents the basis for a business case to support/not support working together. The model includes questions and rating systems to assist with defining the problem, identifying potential collaborators, how to engage on identified issue’s and the economic costs and benefits of working together, finding are then summarised for deliberation and action. The final step helps to guide actions for inter-agency collaboration and can be rated. The result identified flexibility and possible resolution and processes to use.  
- Collaboration, Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (CMEF) – This model guides monitoring and evaluation of outcomes and is four dimensional covering outcomes, social processes, change and decision-making. The model is flexible and adaptable to different life cycle stages of working together, with the four dimensions being inter-related. | The project encompassed a broader range of stakeholders than the research issue under investigation in this research and involves Government and Community engagement. Successful civic engagement & collaboration is a key element. |

Source: Developed from the literature reviewed for this research as documented in the first column of this Table.
3.5 Gaps in the literature and identification of research issues

Introduction

In conducting a literature search for the literature review, no literature or research was uncovered specifically about GAs core business conflict affecting GAs working together, including in regional development. The literature chosen for review was selected because it dealt with a related area investigating issues and impediments where GAs work together. The literature comprised research studies and papers, and WOG and joint initiative project reviews or evaluations that focused on regional development or contributed to regional development. Many of the reviews and studies also included solutions, approaches and identified key success factors to facilitate GAs working together.

Research issues

The first gap in the literature concerns GA core business conflict due to the fact that no literature was uncovered that dealt with this topic. Core business conflict is central to the research problem ‘Government Department Core Business – managing the impact of potential conflicts on regional development projects and programs’

To address this gap and learn more about the nature of core business conflict, two research issues for investigation are proposed:

1. The nature of core business conflict.
2. Dominant core business conflicts.

The literature provided information on issues and impediments experienced when GAs work together. Broadly, issues and impediments touched on operational factors, accountability, legislative and regulatory constraints, technology, leadership and culture. The research problem explores potential conflict of core business and many of the identified issues and impediments would appear to be closely linked to how GAs plan, conduct, report on, and evaluate delivering their core business. This indicates a second knowledge gap concerning the relationship between GA core business conflict and the issues and impediments that have been uncovered.
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To investigate the link and relationship the third research issue proposed is:

3. **The relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs working together.**

The literature made some reference to impacts of issues and impediments on joint initiatives and GAs’ relationships when working together. Where this occurred it was captured indirectly in terms of the issues that were identified, for example poor relationships or communication, or lack of agency commitment. No literature was uncovered that explored the impacts of issues and impediments on projects or agency relationships, thus indicating a third gap in knowledge. To explore the impacts further, the fourth research issue proposed is:

4. **The impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs working relationships.**

The research problem seeks to manage the impacts of potential core business conflict in regional development projects. A number of the literature research papers and reviews identified solutions and approaches that were developed or recommended. In addition, others included frameworks, models, guidelines and checklists. As identified in the conclusion of section 3.4, whilst there are common issues faced, and common elements incorporated in the tools developed to facilitate GAs working together, elements of the solutions, approaches and tools are tailored to the specific joint initiative and its participants.

There is no comprehensive ‘how to’ model and project implementation tool for use at the ‘grass roots’ level that can draw on the current knowledge and incorporate the resources that are already available. There is a need for a model that would support and be flexible enough to foster the development of project-specific solutions by participants.

To inform the development of the model, further information will be sought from GA officers at the lower management and operational level concerning key factors and issues that a process model and implementation tool needs to include. Further exploration for solutions may also uncover other elements that are not in the current literature. To this end, the fifth research issue is:
5. Processes and practices that can assist agencies to manage issues and impediments and core business conflict that could be included in a process model.

The previously identified research issue: Dominant core business conflicts will also contribute to the model design.

3.6 Proposed methodology

The research issues that emerged from the literature review to address the gaps and build on the current knowledge are listed below:

1. The nature of core business conflict.
2. The relationships between core business conflict and issues and impediments affecting GAs working together.
3. Dominant core business conflicts.
4. The impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs working relationships.
5. Processes and practices that can assist agencies to manage issues and impediments and core business conflict that could be included in a process model.

Research issues 1 and 3 explore the nature of core business conflict. Research issue 2 seeks to identify the linkage between core business conflict and issues and impediments experienced when GAs are working together. Research issue 4 aims to identify the impacts of the core business conflict on projects and GA relationships. This will also contribute to an understanding of the nature of core business conflict and provide some indication of areas that a process model needs to be able to address. Research issue 5 focuses on capturing information that will both inform the design of the process model and implementation tool, and provide a source of reference.

The literature and research identified did not uncover information regarding GA core business conflict, but rather identified issues and impediments that occurred when agencies were working collaboratively, potentially an outcome of GA core business conflict. The research problem is a new area to be investigated. With no previous work on this topic, the research needs to be exploratory. To investigate the topic and build
knowledge relating to the topic, a qualitative research methodology is more appropriate than a quantitative methodology.

As a new topic area, the data needs to be rich to gain a comprehensive understanding of GA core business conflict, for example, what conflicts happen, how often and what the impacts are. GA staff with experience in joint initiatives, WOG projects and regional development projects would be the source from which this information could be drawn. Rather than a focus group, individual views and experiences are desirable to reduce the risk of ‘group think’, so the most appropriate qualitative method would be through personal interview. The potential sample size is not large, making interviews practicable. Analysis of the interview material will seek common issues or factors that affect GAs working together that can be grouped into particular ‘themes’. An example of a theme could be financial accountability and thus issues or factors dealing with this kind of area would be grouped under this theme.

The interviews will provide rich initial baseline data relating to the research issues, but this will need to be investigated more thoroughly, which will build on the knowledge already gained from the extant literature regarding issues and impediments and solutions developed when agencies work together. A mixed research methodology is therefore proposed. The methodology will also incorporate the application of a self-administered attitudinal survey by interviewees. The survey will use a five point Lickert-like scale to explore the key themes, issues, and factors identified through the interview process.

The survey instrument will be designed to investigate three dimensions of each key theme, issues or factor. The three dimensions are: the respondent’s level of agreement, their perceived level of impact and their view of the rate of occurrence of each theme, issue or factor. The purpose is to refine the information already captured through the interview process, thus broadening the understanding of the problem being investigated and potential solutions or management approaches. Respondents will evaluate each dimension based on their own experience.

As the area under investigation is new, insufficient is known about the factors and variables, therefore complex statistical analysis of data collected through the survey will not be undertaken. Bar graphs will be created to provide a visual indication of
respondent tendency to agree or disagree, to consider impacts high or low and consider rate of frequency of occurrence to be always or never.

The author has named the research methodology the winnow and hone approach. The ‘winnow’ process refers to the gathering and analyzing of interview data from GA personnel, to isolate the common themes, issues, and factors relating to GA core business conflict when GAs are working together in regional development projects or joint initiatives. The ‘honing’ process refers to the survey process, which examines in greater depth, the dominant themes, issues, and factors from the three dimensions described above.

Two new research instruments will be created. No instruments appropriate to the topic of research were identified in other studies. The first instrument will be a set of open-ended interview questions and the second will be the self-administered attitudinal survey. The content of the survey will be drawn from the interviews.

## 3.7 Conclusions

The literature review set out to achieve two objectives. The first was to provide a clear picture of the context in which the research problem exists. The second was to investigate literature in the related field of joined-up WOG and joint GAs projects as a related area to the research problem. Whilst there is literature dealing with conflict management and negotiation in organisations, there was no literature was uncovered that dealt specifically with GA core business conflict when working together in regional development.

To fulfil the first objective, literature was reviewed to construct a broad evolutionary picture of the three discipline areas involved in the investigation, being Government and governance, public sector management and regional development. Figure 3.2 on page 83 illustrates the interconnectivity of the three areas of Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development. Regional development is at the heart of the activity of GAs and therefore subject to the influences of Government policy, is strongly impacted by Government and governance, and public sector management practices that determine how GAs deliver their products and services.
Figure 3.5 on page 132 illustrates the impact of some of the factors and influences upon the contextual map for the research. These are drawn from the literature reviews contained in section 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 covering the evolution of Government and governance, public sector management and regional development.

The research problem therefore exists in a dynamic and challenging environment. For example, factors such as globalisation, technology, citizen expectations of government and participation in government, and the emergence of regionalism and localism present governance and policy challenges. In addition, public sector practices face increasing pressure to adopt policies and practices to achieve efficient use of limited resources, yet be client focused and responsive. Regional development concerns increasingly complex issues and needs affecting regions and communities that demand integrated and coordinated responses from GAs, a strong imperative to successfully work together.

To address the second objective sections 3.3 and 3.4 examined literature comprising reviews and research concerning GAs joint projects and WOG initiatives. This literature uncovered many issues and impediments experienced when agencies work together covering areas such as legislation and regulatory factors, budget allocation and financial accountability, incompatibility of technology, processes and systems that were designed to deliver individual agency outcomes, not for joint delivery, and management practices and organisational culture.

The literature also contained descriptions of approaches used to manage the issues and impediments, or involved studies to develop checklists, models and frameworks that would improve agencies’ ability to work together. Examples of solutions included developing structures and frameworks, such as forming high level groups and taskforces, or working groups at the operational level. Gaining Ministerial and senior management endorsement and support was seen as very important. New technology solutions were developed, partnerships and agreements were set up to clarify roles, responsibilities and tasks, and new systems and procedures were developed to enable joint delivery, joint reporting, sharing information, pooling financial resources and sharing staff resources.

Despite no literature being uncovered that looked specifically at agency core business conflict, the literature findings provide a sound foundation from which to
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explore the research problem. Section 3.5 identified research gaps and the research issues that can address the gaps. These stem from the fact that there has been no previous investigation into GA core business conflict, and that some similarities were identified with previously uncovered issues and impediments when agencies work together. Further investigation of solutions and practices adopted to manage issues and impediments would help to identify core elements that need to be addressed. It was also noted that the impact on projects and outcomes, the cost of conflict, was not explored in the literature.

The final section, section 3.6 presented the proposed research methodology. The methodology to be adopted is based on the specific characteristics of the problem being a new area of investigation and requiring the capture of rich data. A qualitative research methodology was selected, using interview and survey instruments. Chapter 4 discusses and provides details of the methodology.
4.1 Introduction

Chapter 2 presented an overview of the regional development environment in which the research question arises. Chapter 3, the literature review, built the theoretical framework underpinning the research. This included a brief evolutionary history of the three discipline areas of regional development, Government and governance and public sector management practice.

With no literature uncovered dealing specifically with the research topic, research and reviews of regional development projects, joined-up, integrated and WOG programs and initiatives were examined to investigate the research problem. Issues and impediments to GAs working together were identified from the literature. The literature also provided information on approaches, models, frameworks and processes that were recommended or used to manage the difficulties experienced, which would facilitate GAs working more effectively together. The final part of the chapter identified gaps in the literature and previous research from which the research issues were developed. The chapter also proposed a research methodology designed to explore this new area of investigation and build knowledge that could inform addressing the research problem.

The purpose of chapter four is to present details of the proposed methodology to investigate the research problem. The chapter begins with justification for the chosen methodology in section 4.2, outlines the implications for the methodology that emerged from the findings of the literature review, and includes the nature of the problem. The section also describes the ‘winnow and hone’ methodology approach and discusses paradigm issues.

Section 4.3 deals with limitations. The chapter then moves on to outlining different aspect of the methodology. Section 4.4 covers the unit of analysis and ‘sample’ details. Section 4.5 covers the research instruments including any issues with these and a discussion on validity and reliability. Section 4.6 outlines the administration of the research activity and discusses issues related to data collection.
Section 4.7 describes the method of analysis, with section 4.8 providing evidence of assumptions. Section 4.9 outlines the use of computer programs to assist with analysis and the method of analysis used. Section 4.10 discusses ethical issues and is followed by section 4.11, which is the conclusion. An outline of the chapter is represented in Figure 4.1.

**Figure 4.1**
**Structure of Chapter 4**

Developed for this research.

**Literature and research gaps and research issues**

The research methodology has been designed to investigate the five research issues, repeated below for reference:

1. The nature of core business conflict.
2. Dominant core business conflicts.
3. The relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs working together.
4. The impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs working relationships.

5. Processes and practices that can assist agencies to manage issues and impediments and core business conflict that could be included in a process model.

4.2 Justification of methodology

Overview of research implications from the literature review

The implications for methodology of the literature review findings are detailed below.

- The topic for research is a new area because no research and literature was uncovered relating specifically to GA core business conflict. The research will therefore be exploratory.

- As a new area of investigation, the data collected needs to be rich, with the purpose being to build concepts and expand understanding. A qualitative research methodology is thus more appropriate.

- GA staff with experience in regional development projects and other joint initiatives are the best source of information. The sample chosen will draw from this staff pool across agencies and levels of Government involved in regional development.

- Interviews provide a mechanism to gather rich qualitative data. However, as an exploratory investigation, and to gain a deeper understanding of the research problem, the findings from the interview will be further explored in more detail through a rating survey conducted with the same participants.

- The literature research uncovered models, frameworks, guidelines and checklists to assist GAs to work more effectively together. Some involved project-specific solutions. There is no ‘how to’ model and implementation tool to effectively draw this material together for those operating at the ‘grass roots’ level. Further investigation of approaches and tools used by staff and key factors to be addressed will contribute to developing the process model and implementation tool.

Detailed discussion

As there is no previous research on GA core business conflict, the research methodology chosen is qualitative and theory building. Qualitative inquiry seeks to understand phenomenon in context-specific settings, whereas quantitative methods use experimental methods and quantitative measures to test hypothetical generalizations.
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(Hoepfl 1997). Quantitative methods and the positivist paradigm can provide wide coverage of a range of situations, are fast and economical and can draw from large samples, but tend to be inflexible, artificial and do not provide much understanding of the processes or significance that people attach to actions (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe & Lowe 2002). Qualitative research seeks illumination, understanding and extrapolation to similar situations; it is research that is arrived at by means other than statistical processes and quantification (Strauss & Corbin 1990 cited in Hoepfl 1997). Qualitative research can more fully describe a phenomenon and potentially contribute to greater understanding of it (Guba & Lincoln 1997). New fields of study, with little investigation previously undertaken have few hypotheses and limited knowledge about the phenomenon under investigation (Patton 1990). They therefore benefit from a qualitative inquiry. However, this research is not strongly focused on theory construction as a primary objective, but is intended to produce a greater understanding of the nature of GA core business conflict, its occurrence, impact and management. This is through investigating the experiences, perceptions and opinions of GA staff. Data gathered may infer preliminary theories that can be explored by other research. Additional rationale for using a qualitative approach is due to the fact that the research is not to prove a null hypothesis (Patton 1990; Easterby-Smith et al. 2002). There are limiting factors of focusing on a null hypotheses, as this focus does not acknowledge things about a phenomenon that may not be statistically relevant, but are relevant in the setting being explored (Hoepfl 1997 cited in Cronbach 1975, p124).

Gaining breadth and depth of information

The research, reviews and evaluation reports contained in the literature review, have not investigated the issues and impediments identified in depth. In the quest for greater depth and breadth, the methodology designed incorporates the use of inductive analysis (Patton 1990). The investigation is not focused on finding the ‘absolute truth’ (Patton 1990) regarding the area of research, but involves identifying the most common shared experiences, perceptions, opinions and attitudes regarding GA core business conflict and practices adopted to manage this conflict.

To delve deeper, the proposed methodology design seeks confirmation of the most common themes, factors and issues from the interview data. The approach incorporates looking at different dimensions of the dominant and most common issues and factors through the application of an attitudinal survey. The survey draws on
agency staff perceptions as well as experience. The survey design is structured to measure the strength of tendency of respondents for agreement or disagreement, to consider the level of impact high or low, and consider the rate of occurrence as always or never, based on respondent’s own experience. However, seeking deeper knowledge increases the understanding of the topic being investigated, but reduces generalisability (Patton 1990).

The research, reviews and evaluation reports identified issues and impediments, but did not explore the impact or influence on projects and joint initiatives. The content of the interview and the attitudinal survey instruments investigate these impacts and influences directly.

**The nature of the problem**

The nature of the problem under investigation requires detailed data. This is because it concerns finding a way to manage the problem. This indicates that there is a need to explore the topic from a number of different perspectives, resulting in better understanding of the problem. The qualitative methodology is ideal for this task as it allows more in-depth data to be gathered, provides more perspectives on the phenomenon being investigated, creating a picture of the perceptions and views of the people in relation to the research question. (Patton 1990; Fielding & Fielding 1986, cited in Easterby-Smith 2002).

The subject matter and the environment around the topic of the research problem concern the interplay between people, systems and procedures, organizational structures, and governance. Investigation of the subject matter of people and organisations and their structures aligns with social and behavioural sciences where qualitative methodology is often used.

Whilst there are some commonalities across GAs, each GA has a different ‘organisational culture’ and has also established unique internal organisational structures, processes and systems to deliver its core business. Many of these operational elements reflect modern public sector management practices such as ‘performance-based management’, ‘balanced score card’ planning and development of cross-cutting internal teams. These elements have a strong influence on personnel experience, and shape personnel attitudes, perceptions and values within the context of respondents’ work environment. The methodology design is therefore focused on trying to capture some of this contextual fabric in order to identify the most common and strongest
experiences. Findings will indicate the factors that should be incorporated in the process model design and implementation tool.

**Mixed methodology**

The indication from the research and literature review is that the solution to the research problem is twofold:

- Gaining a greater understanding of the nature of the problem
- Developing a comprehensive process model and implementation tool to provide an operational framework for GA staff to use when working together.

The need to capture rich data and then explore the findings from analysis of this data in more depth requires a second research method for data collection. Reflecting Patton’s (1990) view that the qualitative methodology may also be used in conjunction with quantitative data, the methodology includes a ‘pseudo-quantitative’ measure. The term pseudo-quantitative is used due to the fact that detailed statistical analysis of the results is not undertaken as required by quantitative methodology, the rationale being that the topic under investigation is new, and insufficient is known about the factors and variables involved that could be explored using a standard quantitative methodology. Complex statistical analysis of data collected is therefore not appropriate. Of more relevance is to confirm findings from the interviews and to investigate the findings in more depth to inform the design of the process model and implementation tool. Greater knowledge regarding some of the variables may also highlight topics for future research.

The pseudo-quantitative method applied is an attitudinal survey using a Lickert-like measuring scale. The survey is designed to measures three different aspects of the same item to determine the need to include the item in the process model. The aspects are disagreement or agreement, level of impact as high or low, and rate of occurrence to be always or never.

The survey analysis is limited to a simple frequency bar graph showing general tendency of respondents between semantic opposites, indicated by the number of respondents at either side of the neutral position of ‘three’, and indication of strength based on number selecting the highest or lowest rating of the semantic statements.

The issues and value of mixed methodology have been well-debated. There is the view that caution should be applied in using mixed methods because it may lead to confusion and contradiction (Easterby-Smith et al. 1990). However this could be considered to represent an opportunity for investigation as to why contradictions occur.
There is also the view that mixing the paradigms associated with each approach mitigates the negative elements of methodological mixing of different enquiry methods and data collection strategies (Patton 1990 cited in Guba & Lincoln 1988). Other issues raised in the debate about mixed methods are associated with maintaining internal consistency and issues with the logic of different approaches and their supporting paradigms (Crotty 1998).

‘Quantitizing’ is the analysis and transformation of information from the interview findings to the survey instrument applied by Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998, p 126) and cited by Sandelowski (1999). Although some of the common themes, issues and factors are transformed into units for the survey instrument in a similar way to ‘quantitizing’, the process actually used is more flexible and allows the inclusion of areas from the interviews to be explored in the survey instrument, that appear as unusual or particularly interesting.

4.2.1 The ‘winnow and hone’ methodology approach

The research methodology chosen is described as the winnow and hone approach.

The winnowing process involves gathering and analysing interview data from semi-structured interviews with GA personnel, to isolate the common themes, issues, viewpoints and factors relating to GA core business conflict when GAs are working together in regional development projects or joint initiatives.

The honing process then examines in greater depth, the dominant themes, issues, factors and views, through the application of self-administered attitudinal surveys. The survey questions ask respondents to rate three dimensions for each issue or factor. The three dimensions are the level of agreement with the items listed, the perceived level of impact they have, and the frequency of occurrence (which would be based on the respondent’s experience). The results indicate a tendency to:

- Agree/disagree
- Consider impact as high/low
- Consider occurrence as never/always (often described as tending towards being frequent/infrequent)

To undertake these two investigative processes, two research instruments have been developed. One is an interview instrument containing open-ended questions (refer
Appendix 1) and the second is a quantitative instrument, which is a self-administered attitudinal survey based on findings from the interview (refer Appendix 2).

The findings from the winnow and hone approach contribute to the design of the process model and implementation tool and include:

- Those issues/factors with which there is a high level of agreement
- Factors that have a high impact
- Factors that affect relationships and project implementation and outcomes
- Factors that occur frequently or always.

Figure 4.2 is a diagrammatic representation of the winnow and hone approach.

---

**Figure 4.2**

*The winnow and hone approach*

1. **DATA COLLECTION**
   - Rich data collection through interviews

2. **WINNOWING PROCESS**
   - Sort data into dominant themes
   - Identify sub-groups within each theme
   - Extract dominant issues and factors to be explored further in the surveys

3. **DATA COLLECTION**
   - Attitudinal survey

4. **HONING PROCESS**
   - Seek confirmation of key issues and factors
   - Investigate 3 dimensions of each issue or factor to refine knowledge about the area under investigation:
     - level of agreement
     - degree of impact
     - frequency of occurrence

5. **OUTCOME FROM RESEARCH**
   - Contribute to resolving the research issues
   - Information for ‘process’ model captured
   - Contribution to knowledge regarding GA core business conflict, its impact & management

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Describes the winnow and hone approach
1. The initial data is captured through semi-structured open-ended interview questions conducted with middle management and operational staff in GAs involved in regional development and located at head office and regional locations.

2. The interview data is winnowed (sifted and sorted) into themes and then to factors and issues.

3. The most dominant factors and issues are selected and incorporated into the self-administered attitudinal survey, the mechanism for the honing process, for further investigation. Unusual factors or issues may also be included.

4. Based on their experience, respondents rate on a five point Lickert-like scale across the three areas of investigation: agreement/disagreement, which is indicative of a confirmation/disconfirmation of the key themes, factors and issues; level of impact being high/low of the core business conflict factor/issue; and rate of occurrence as always/never of the issue or factor.

5. The results contribute information to resolving the research problem by providing information on significant issues and factors to be included in the design of the process model. The findings contribute new knowledge regarding core business conflict, and the impact on GAs relationships and projects, when working together. Results contribute to understanding the relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments experienced and ways GAs can manage these difficulties.

4.2.2 Paradigm issues

Paradigms create a framework for investigation and action, a set of basic beliefs, but also constrain these areas according to the parameters of the paradigm (Guba & Lincoln 1997; Patton 1990). In addition, there is academic bias for and against certain approaches, attached to the various paradigms (Patton 1990).

There are many debates regarding paradigms, their characteristics, limitations and applications in relevant methodological approaches. These debates consider one paradigm against another discussing their relationship to various methodological approaches suited to particular investigative objectives (Fetterman 1988a; Patton 1986, 1988c, p 177-217; Lincoln & Guba 1985; Cook &Reichardt 1979; Filstead 1970, cited in Patton 1990). The debate is based on two fundamentally different paradigms (Patton 1990):
• Logical-positivism using quantitative and experimental methods to test hypothetical-deductive generalisations; and

• Phenomenological inquiry, using qualitative and naturalistic approaches to inductively and holistically understand human experience.

The research methodology should not be constrained by paradigms, but should select those or one which supports the purpose of the research and its outcomes and the resources available for investigation (Patton 1990).

In keeping with this view, this research embraces aspects of the philosophy of two paradigms one being ‘constructivism’ (Guba & Lincoln 1997) and the other being ‘phenomenological’ in nature (Patton 1990). The elements of constructivism relating to this investigation are the view of reality attached to this paradigm. Reality is constructed by people, subject to change and socially based (Patton 1990). Part of this reality includes GAs delivering core business within the context of public sector management reform, and a governance philosophy seeking to ‘connect’, ‘network’ or ‘join up’ government. In a regional development environment, it involves GAs having to work together because regional development outcomes stem from the efforts of multiple agencies implementing policies and delivering services.

In terms of the phenomenological approach Patton summarises what is involved in this philosophy or paradigm by posing the question ‘What is the structure and essence of experience of this phenomenon for these people?’ (Patton 1990, page 69). This captures to a large degree the approach of this research. The phenomenon under investigation of course is GA core business conflict. However whilst the perspective adopted under this paradigm or philosophy usually includes the researcher applying a ‘participant observation methodology’, however for this research the approach adopted is one that investigates the experiences and the subjects’ interpretations through interview and survey procedures.

4.3 Limitations

The delimitations were outlined in Chapter 1, page 22 and noted as: the research focuses on Australia, and Queensland is chosen as the State from which State and Local Government agencies are drawn; the focus is on GAs working in regional development (as defined for this research) and sample agencies are those that have a role in, or strong contribution to regional development; two regions with different characteristics were selected within Queensland to capture information from GAs in regional development
based on regions that had different characteristics; and the research did not include non-
government regional development stakeholders.

A number of limitations emerged during the time undertaken for research. These
relate to natural disaster events, elections and amalgamations in Local Government.

There were two natural disaster events, Cyclone Larry and Cyclone Monica. These events affected one of the regions that was selected and occurred immediately after the self-administered attitudinal surveys were sent. Regional staff and Head Office staff in a number of the agencies participating in the research were involved in response and recovery to these events. For this reason, there was only a 50% response rate to the survey. It was considered inappropriate and unprofessional to press for returns.

The names of some Government Departments and their structures and focus have been adjusted during the machinery of Government changes that follow elections. Since the commencement of this research there have been Federal and State elections. Government agencies’ names and responsibilities are included as they were at that point in time in the research process.

In addition, the Local Governments in Queensland have undergone amalgamation. The boundaries and areas now differ to those involved in interview and survey activity. The target regions refer to pre-amalgamation local governments. These limitations do not seriously affect the validity or reliability of the research or detract from the outcome of the research.

4.4 Unit of analysis

The ‘population’ from which the sample was drawn included GAs at national, state and local government levels and no other organizations. The sample is purposeful (Patton 1990), as the area for investigation is quite specific dealing with the impact of GA ‘core’ business and ‘core’ business conflict arising amongst GAs involved in regional development. The total sample size comprised GAs from national, Queensland State and Local Government (in two regions), identified as contributing to regional development outcomes (with the definition of regional development as defined by this research).

4.4.1 Sample

The sample used includes representation from three levels of government and from two regions. The two regions chosen were areas around Bundaberg and Mount
Isa. The boundaries chosen for the regions were those that concurred at the time of selection, with the area covered by the Department of State Development regions (as of 2007 Department of Tourism, Regional Development and Industry). Due to different jurisdictional boundaries, this resulted in some agencies involved in the research having these areas as only part of their region, or having parts of more than one of their regions overlaying the Department of State Development region. In the latter case, only one representative from one of the regions was chosen.

Sample size selected is shown in Table 4.1 in relation to the ‘population’ size which comprises all Federal GAs, Queensland State GAs and Local Governments. There were 20 Local Governments under the pre-amalgamation arrangements that fell within the ‘region’ encompassed by Bundaberg and Mount Isa regional boundaries as described above. A potential total of 72 interviews and surveys could be completed (allowing for head office and regional representation to be selected). Survey respondents were to be the same people as those who participated in the interviews.

Table 4.1  
**GAs approached and participating in the research (2005/6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Actual number of GAs – the ‘population’ as at January 2006</th>
<th>Number of GAs approached, identified as directly associated with regional development – the potential ‘sample’</th>
<th>Number of agencies agreeing to participate from those approached – the actual ‘sample’</th>
<th>Total number of potential interviews if all agencies had responded</th>
<th>Total number of interviews (including Head Office and Regional Office personnel)</th>
<th>Total number of surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint State &amp; local representative</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT BUNDABERG</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT MOUNT ISA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from analysis of the participant profile details.
Source: Developed for this research.

The rationale for the selection of two regional areas was based on regions that had very different regional characteristics. These are summarised in Table 4.2. The regions also had to include offices of the GAs chosen for the study. As regional jurisdictional boundaries are varied, and in some instances encompass huge areas in Queensland, the nomination of a coastal area and an inland area, more than 1000 km apart ensured that there would be different regional offices of the same department in each region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Mount Isa</th>
<th>Bundaberg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Brisbane, capital of</td>
<td>More than 1000km</td>
<td>Within driving distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location</td>
<td>Inland</td>
<td>Coastal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key infrastructure</td>
<td>Rail and Road</td>
<td>Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transport</td>
<td>Regional airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water supply</td>
<td>Several sources of water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional airport</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic profile</td>
<td>Mining and mining</td>
<td>Tourism, Horticulture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services, Pastoral,</td>
<td>Sugar, Pastoral,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail, Property</td>
<td>Education, Engineering,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and business</td>
<td>Manufacturing, Retail,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness with other economic</td>
<td>Limited, best</td>
<td>Road, rail or air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centres</td>
<td>communication by</td>
<td>linkages north and south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>air</td>
<td>highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>35,868*</td>
<td>132,626*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population age profile % over 65</td>
<td>Lower level of</td>
<td>Higher level of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retirees</td>
<td>retirees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remoteness and isolation</td>
<td>Many remote</td>
<td>No truly remote communities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communities that</td>
<td>but rural shires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can be isolated</td>
<td>that are small and face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the wet</td>
<td>resource issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major employment</td>
<td>Major employment</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in mining, retail,</td>
<td>fishing, retail,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education, health</td>
<td>manufacturing, health and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and community</td>
<td>community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean taxable income</td>
<td>$43,681*</td>
<td>$37,988*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Australian Bureau of Statistics, Regional Population Growth, Australia and New Zealand (Cat. 3218.0) 2001 Geographic boundaries

* Source: Australian Taxation Office, Unpublished data, 2001 Geographical Boundaries

Source: Table developed for this research.

4.5 Instruments or procedures

This section outlines the instruments used to collect the data both for the interview as well as the survey activity.

4.5.1 Instruments

Interview

As previously mentioned in the description of the winnow and hone approach (Section 4.2.1 pages 220-222), two research instruments were used. They were developed for the purpose of this research as no instrument was discovered in the literature research that could have been used or adapted. The first is a semi-structured interview, (See Appendix 1). This was conducted with personnel at both a Head Office and a Regional Office, where possible, for each of the GAs selected. The questions are standardised open-ended questions (Patton 1990) that allow limited probing to help clarify respondent’s meaning. This reduces the flexibility of response and potential greater detail that could be collected, as well as the ability to explore interesting topics; however it ensures that there is minimal variation in interview content, reduces interview bias that can occur in a more conversational approach, and establishes legitimacy and consistency of data. This strengthens the reliability of data gathered from the respondents. It also reduces the chances of having data that could not be aggregated and compared and helps the interview to remain focused (Patton 1990).
**Table 4.3**

*Examples of interview questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEW QUESTION EXAMPLES</th>
<th>1. With which other GAs does your agency’s core business conflict?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. What effect does core business conflict have, when the agencies concerned are working together?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Think of some projects in which your agency has been involved with multiple agencies – what issues and impediments arose during those projects?</td>
<td>6. Please outline any examples of fundamental core business conflict whilst working with other agencies in joint projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Please outline any examples of functional/operational core business conflict that has occurred whilst working with other agencies in joint projects.</td>
<td>13. In the projects to which you have referred during this interview, what was done to overcome the issues and impediments/ core business conflict that occurred?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Examples from the interview questions.

The interview and the analysis of interview data represent the ‘winnowing’ component of the research methodology. Through conducting interviews the GAs’ officers’ own perception and experiences concerning the research topic are captured. The interview questions in relation to the research issue being investigated are shown in Table 4.4. In addition to answering the questions, details of the agency and interviewee profile were recorded that covered:

- agency core business focus - economic, social, environmental, economic/social, economic/environmental, social/environmental and social/economic/environmental
- Agency location – head office, regional - Mount Isa, regional - Bundaberg
- interviewee role - management, field staff, management/field

The purpose of gathering this data was to identify whether there was any difference in experience between head office and regional office, the focus of the agency core business and the role of the interviewee.

**Table 4.4**

*Table showing research issues and the interview questions developed to capture data relating to the issue.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Issues</th>
<th>Interview questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigating the nature of core business conflict</td>
<td>1. With which other GAs does your agency’s ‘core’ business conflict?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. When your agency works with GAs, what is the effect of core business conflict on working together?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. With which GAs does your agency’s ‘core’ business work well or complement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. In what way does the fact that your agencies have concurring or complementary core business affect working together?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Please outline any examples of fundamental core business conflict whilst working with other GAs in these projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Please outline any examples of functional/operational core business conflict whilst working with other GAs in these projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. What difference is there in the level and type of ‘core’ business conflict experienced when your agency is the lead compared to when another agency is the lead, in a regional development project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. What other factors, not related to ‘core’ business conflict, may cause issues and create impediments to GAs working effectively together?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4. continues…
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Issues</th>
<th>Interview questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Investigating the relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs working together | 5. What issues and impediments arose during the projects affecting how the GDAAs worked together?  
6. Please outline any examples of fundamental core business conflict whilst working with other agencies in joint projects.  
7. Please outline any examples of functional/operational core business conflict that has occurred whilst working with other agencies in joint projects.  
8. Describe any connections between the ‘issues and impediments’ experienced in any of these projects and the two types of core business conflict examples that you have outlined? |
| Finding out the dominant core business conflicts                                  | 10. What would be the dominant issues and impediments or ‘core’ business conflicts experienced by your agency when working with other GAs?                                                                                |
| Investigating the impact of core business conflict on regional development projects and GAs working relationships | 2. When your agency works with GAs, what is the effect of core business conflict on working together?  
9. What effect did the issues and impediments or core business conflicts we have discussed have on the projects, their implementation and outcomes? |
| Exploring the processes and practices that can assist agencies to manage issues and impediments and core business conflict that could be included in a process model | 13. What was done in the projects we have been speaking about, to overcome or manage the issues and impediments or ‘core’ business conflicts?  
14. What was the level of success of these efforts?  
15. What causal factors relating to ‘core’ business conflict should a process model document in order to develop strategies to manage or reconcile them? (Give examples if required).  
17. How could ESD principles be used to reduce core business conflict? |

Source: Questions developed for the interview.  
Source: Developed for this research.

**Surveys**

The second instrument was a self-administered attitudinal survey based on a Lickert-like five point scale semantic differential scale. (Refer Appendix 2). Issues that arise with surveys and scale include:

- Wording that may be ambiguous and cause misinterpretation
- Debates regarding the size of the scale
- Perception by respondents that the gaps between the ratings are equidistant
- Order of the questions have the potential to influence responses
- Risk of automatic response
- Whether to include a ‘neutral’ point and the risk of people selecting this rather than making a decision
- Respondents unwilling or unable to provide accurate responses

(Source: compiled from Ray 1997; Vaughan & Hogg, 1998; Friedman & Amoo 1999; Malhotra 2007)

The survey is constructed with three statements relating to the same factor. The statements developed are probing into three areas:

- Tendency to disagreement or agreement with a statement regarding the selected issues or factors
- Tendency to consider the impact of the issues or factors presented as high or low
- Tendency to consider the factors or issues as occurring never or always.

Table 4.5 (page 229) provides examples of questions 1a, b and c, and 9a, b and c. Question 9 illustrates how the factors that have been identified as significant from the interviews are placed for rating in the survey.
Table 4.5
Example of survey questions from Appendix 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1a. Please indicate the level of agreement on the scale of 1-5 with the statement that: 'Agencies with an economic or environmental responsibility and core business are more likely to experience 'core business conflict'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1b. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of impact on agency working relationships, of core business conflict between agencies with an economic core business and an environmental core business focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1c. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the rate of occurrence of core business conflict likely between agencies with an economic core business focus and ones with an environmental core business focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9a. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the statement that 'Core business conflict affects project implementation and outcomes in the ways listed below'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9b. What is the level of impact of the effects of core business conflict as listed to the left, on project implementation and outcomes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9c. What is the rate of occurrence of the impacts of core business conflict listed to the left, on project implementation and outcomes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reduces outcomes
- Slows down or stops project
- Creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated
- Implementation is inefficient
- Resources and time wasted on resolving issues
- Withdrawal of support & consequently, effort, by some stakeholders
- Increase the overall 'cost' of the project (time, funds and personnel effort)

Source: Survey table compiled using results from interview data analysis.
Source: Developed for this research.
Following analysis of the interview data, the most common factors and issues were used in the survey instrument. This is the honing process of the methodology. Unusual factors that emerged in the discussion that were worthy of further investigation were also included. Additional facets of individual items were explored further through the survey.

The purpose of conducting the survey is to gain confirmation of the issues, factors and viewpoints through an indication of agreement. It is also to determine the level of significance or influence the selected items may have relating to impact, as well as frequency of occurrence. This helps to identify areas that should be included in the process model and implementation tool. Respondents were also asked to indicate their agency focus and location, and their position (management, field staff), as previously occurred in the interviews.

The rationale for dividing each question into three areas is to investigate different aspects of the same factors – agreement/disagreement (confirmation) that they are important, identification of those with a high or low impact on GA working relationships and projects, and identification of frequency of occurrence as never/always.

The scale chosen for this study is a five point semantic differential scale. Although the choice of a small scale runs the risk of simplifying how each individual might feel, this has been done purposefully, aiming to reduce the range of decision available. On the scale, three is neutral or indicative that a respondent does not have a firm conviction that tends towards the positive or negative end of the scale. Whilst acknowledging that the result at best is indicative only, due to the limitations in a simplified scale, it does not allow for a wide range of interpretation between the semantic positive and negative choice. When descriptor words are used in a rating scale, there can be issues regarding whether respondents will perceive equal-sized gradations amongst the words in the scale (Vaughan & Hogg 1998). For this reason, the scale was constructed with only two extremes of a rating.

The survey content is drawn from the results of the interviews and is undertaken by the same participants as were interviewed. This means that the definitions and issues being rated are familiar, and so is the context to which they apply.
4.5.2 Pilot

Interviews

A draft set of interview questions was piloted with three respondents and evaluated in two ways. Firstly the pilot respondents were asked about the questions from the perspective of clarity, invasiveness or threat (from a personal/professional perspective), time impost, and whether the supporting material ensured ‘an informed consent’ could be provided.

The trial respondents were then asked to complete and then provide evaluative feedback on the format, ease of use, clarity and any semantic ambiguity in the self-administered attitudinal survey.

The second evaluation was conducted by the researcher. This involved checking the response data in terms of appropriateness and sufficiency of information provided in relation to the research issues being investigated. The data analysis process was also reviewed and recording and analysis procedures refined. As a result of the evaluations several questions were reworded and a number were removed. The decision to group responses concerning similar areas together into themes was also identified.

Completed forms were reviewed for errors and omissions, following up where it appeared that these had occurred in order to determine the reason. This information also led to some adjustments in wording.

Surveys

The first five surveys were used as a trial, to ensure that the directions for completion were followed, and that respondents understood what to do. Validating the scale was not undertaken due to the fact that the Lickert-like scale used was basic, seeking indication of tendency either side of the neutral position of the score ‘three’. In addition, standard statistical analysis was not going to be undertaken. Whilst respondents were already familiar with the terminology and subject matter from the interviews, as well as the intention of the survey, they were asked about the clarity of the statements to be evaluated. Minimal adjustment was made to wording and an example of how to complete the survey was placed at the beginning of the instrument.

4.5.3 Discussion of issues

The method for recording interviews varies. The two most common approaches are to write down responses during the interview, or to tape the interview. Patton (1990)
favour tape recording, whilst Lincoln and Guba 1985 p 241 cited in Hoepfl (1997) see the tape as intrusive with the added risk of perhaps failing to record.

Asking for people’s opinions and perceptions in interviews and measuring attitudes through survey carries the risk that responses will be influenced by internal (mood, social, maturational and psychological state) of respondents, and external influences on the respondent (time and competing priorities from work, location, organizational culture and situational environment). The interviewer’s written recording skills and the social relationship established between interviewee and interviewer also influence the interview process (Easterby-Smith et al. 2002).

There are a number of methods that have been developed to capture attitudinal survey data. Four examples drawn from Vaughan and Hogg (1998) are: Thurstone’s method of equal-appearing intervals; Lickert’s method of summated ratings; Guttman’s scalogram; and Osgood’s semantic differential. Vaughan and Hogg (1998) identified that attitudinal-seeking tools have several assumptions in common, being that:

- Subjective attitudes can be measured, and
- A particular item or other behaviour indicating an attitude has the same meaning for all respondents.

The assumptions represent a weakness in such an approach. What is common also across those who have developed attitudinal rating is that attitudes are seen to exist along an evaluative continuum ranging from favourable to unfavourable (Vaughan & Hogg, 1998). In addition to these concerns, Vaughan and Hogg also indicate that there is a lack of agreement about the definition of attitude and also common methods of measurement. Even if there is agreement, they suggest the treatment of the data varies also. Attitudes are considered to comprise three elements: cognitive, affective and behavioural.

Further concerns relating to surveys particularly involve individual interpretation of the statements, the influence of semantics, question ambiguity and difference in respondent frame of reference, which can lead to different interpretations of the question (Ray 1997). In relation to the survey in this research, all the survey respondents had been interviewed and were thus familiar with the terminology and concepts associated with the area of investigation.

One difficulty with asking questions and conducting surveys is that respondents may feel concerned about indicating their true feelings and opinions, particularly as they
are public servants. Respondents can be affected by how they perceive the interviewer (Ray 1997). For this reason, the anonymity of the responses and the way that information was to be captured, aggregated and represented was carefully explained to respondents prior to conducting the interview and surveys. Respondents also had the opportunity to change what they had said when a summary of the interview was sent to them.

The researcher, as part of the instrument (Patton 1990) has experience in the issues being investigated. The researcher has worked in the public service for twelve years. Experience has been at both regional and head office locations. The background and experience of the researcher therefore could contribute to an ability to ‘empathise and identify’ with the interviewees and their situation and meant that the common ‘gov speak’ used amongst public servants was not a barrier in communicating ideas. However, this empathy also highlights the need for the researcher to be mindful of maintaining Patton’s (1990) ‘empathetic neutrality’.

Another issue, explored earlier in relation to paradigms (see section 4.2.2 pages 222-223), concerns the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches in the winnow and hone methodology. There are a growing number of researchers using mixed methods to look at different perspectives of the area of investigation (Easterby-Smith et al. 2002) who cite Fielding and Fielding (1986) as recommending the use of both approaches. However, Easterby-Smith et al. caution the use of mixed methods because of the risk of finding contradictions and confusions. In relation to this research, it is not a mixed methodology in the purist sense. The design of the surveys using a Lickert-like semantic differential scale and the method of analysis are simple in structure, with simple analysis based on frequency, rather than detailed quantitative analyses. The aim is to seek a general tendency indication on the rating scale only. It is therefore considered to be a pseudo-quantitative method.

### 4.5.4 Validity and reliability

Validity and reliability arise from the scientific research methodology to support the search for truth, using quantitative research methodology. In qualitative research, the underpinning paradigm regarding truth and reality differs to that which underpins quantitative research. A number of researchers cited by (Hoepfl 1997) have addressed this problem, creating new approaches to demonstrating aspects of validity and reliability, such as Cronbach (1975), Lincoln & Guba (1985), and Kirk & Miller (1986).
In considering validity in relation to the social constructivism view of qualitative research, Table 3.6 (Easterby-Smith et al. page 53) documents the different approaches to addressing validity, reliability and generalisability across positivist, relativist and social constructivist research. For social constructivism, similar to the perspective of this research, they pose questions. For validity, the question is asked as to whether the study clearly gains access to the experiences of those in the research. In terms of reliability, the question is about transparency and how sense was made from the raw data. From the point of view this research, interviews with those directly involved in regional development projects and joint initiatives contributes to addressing the first question. The methodology used demonstrates the transparency involved in making sense from the raw data, addressing the second question. This includes checking the interpretation of responses with interviewees to remove misinterpretations.

The nature of qualitative research allows for some bias, researcher influence and thus risks to validity and reliability. However, it is important to point out that qualitative research does not search for a single truth and accept a single reality (Easterby-Smith et al. 2002; Patton 1990), thus the quest for rigour to ensure that findings are not meaningless is somewhat different. This does not mean that the research does not have rigour. There must be awareness and documenting of factors that influence the research environment and therefore data output. This can ultimately affect results and findings.

Validity in qualitative research is thus seen to involve four areas: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These are explored in more detail below.

Credibility is based on whether the findings of the data are an accurate outcome from the data. There are influences on the data quality at the recording stage during interviews, the write-up stage from the interviews and then in the analysis where data is sorted and grouped into themes. Researcher bias and interpretation of interviewees meaning could affect the analysis (categories and themes for sorting), and therefore results. To overcome this issue, confirmation of the accuracy of interview data was sought from all interviewees. The process of sorting and analyzing the data has been developed to reduce the risks in the analysis process. This has involved a two stage process of analysis –first for themes and then for variations in the themes so as not to excessively simplify findings and therefore causing loss of meaning.
Transferability relates to whether the findings can be applied outside the project. The findings for this research relate to findings from related area in the literature review concerning research in regional development projects and initiatives, and joined-up, integrated and WOG projects, programs and initiatives. This was because no research was identified that covered the topic of investigation – GA core business conflict. The research investigation is designed to include examination of the relationship between core business conflict and issues and impediments experienced when agencies work together, enhancing potential capacity for transferability of findings.

Dependability reflects the integrity and standard of the data collection process, data analysis and theory generation. Dependability relies upon developing a rigorous process for data collection, analysis and development of any theory. The research intent is not to develop a theory, but to explore a new area. Section 4.6 outlines procedures designed and applied to improve the level of rigour in the data collection process and section 4.7 outlines how the data is analysed.

Confirmability is how well the findings are supported by the data. This depends a great deal on the analysis procedures undertaken and the influence of any assumptions made relating to the sample, data and in its analysis. The analysis process developed for the research aims to strengthen the link between findings and data by developing an analysis process that involves identifying common factors and issues and categorizing the data into themes. The themes are further sorted into sub-groups of common factors or comments within each theme, allowing for greater breadth in the analysis. The process for sorting and grouping main themes and sub-groups is outlined in Section 4.7.1 (page 241). The most dominant factors or issues and any unusual factors are then explored through the survey, which is undertaken by the interviewees. The survey analysis is simple, identifying the tendency to agree/disagree, consider the impact high/low and the occurrence of the selected factors or issues.

The aspects of quality and trustworthiness of qualitative research are strongly disputed by some. For example Smith and Heshusius (1986) cited by Hoepfl (1997), believe that categories are little different to standard terms used, and suggest that what is important is that the information in the reality, whether existent or interpreted, is independent of the researcher. Smith and Heshusius also claim that qualitative research is an interpretation of others’ interpretations, thus is not an independent reality.

The following offers some discussion regarding traditional areas relating to research:
Internal validity - (is there another reason to explain the outcome?). Qualitative research involves interpretation of words and actions, with the researcher playing a lead role (Maxwell, cited in Winter 2000). This presents a challenge in testing internal validity. The discussion of definitions and examples prior to the interviews aims to reduce this risk.

External validity, which is the same as generalisability (Ray 1997), does not have the same relevance to qualitative research as it does to quantitative research. In a sense the ideas developed can have application in other research, but do not meet the criteria for generalisability, as it applies to a quantitative research methodology (Winter, 2000). This is because this research is investigating a particular issue relating to a specific set of operational situations (GAs working together) and organizational structures and therefore generalisability is limited to this context.

In relation to the attitudinal survey, validity and reliability issues can be considered in a similar context to those for quantitative research. It could be argued that this aspect of validity is not a key consideration. This is due to the fact that the survey approach is being used to further explore findings from the interviews, narrowing down or ‘honing’ the data, not seeking to achieve a wide generalisability as mentioned above. The intention is not to expand the findings to a wider population, but to use as an indicator for the design of the process model. Most importantly, the survey results are not being used to contribute to the development of a hypothesis.

Reliability could be considered an issue for attitudinal surveys. This is due to the influence of personal factors relating to respondents such as motivation, understanding of subject matter and time available to participate. These are factors highlighted in issues relating to surveys in Section 4.5.3 (page 231-233). The reliability of the attitudinal survey findings is stronger due to the fact that this was the second phase of the research, and respondents were familiar with the content, context and purpose, from participating in the interviews.

4.6 Administration of research activity

This section presents the activities and procedures undertaken for the research. The section covers permission, interview and survey process in section 4.6.1 and 4.6.2 and then discusses data collection issues relating to interview and survey methods in section 4.6.3.
4.6.1 Permission

Letters requesting permission to undertake the research and seeking nomination of potential participants and their contact details were sent to each of the Directors-General (State GAs), Secretary (Federal GAs) and CEO of Local Governments in July 2005. (Refer Appendix 3 for an example). Follow-up was by telephone contact and email to arrange interviews with agencies agreeing to allow staff to participate.

4.6.2 Interview schedule, protocol and survey process

Interviews

Face-to-face or telephone interviews were arranged, depending upon what was most convenient for participants. The locations of the face-to-face interviews varied, depending upon the participant’s choice. Locations choices included offices or meeting rooms at the respondent’s place of work, and in cafes. Information about the research, a copy of the interview questions and informed consent forms were sent to potential interviewees. (Refer Appendix 4). Some federal agency interviews were undertaken in Canberra. Several interviews were also arranged by telephone, due to time/distance/commitments of interviewees.

As interviews were confirmed, an interview schedule was set up, with interviews being undertaken mid-September 2005 through to February 2006. Some GAs took time to respond, causing the timeframe for interviews to extend over six months. In addition, Christmas and the associated holiday time meant that some staff delegated by their Director-General to participate, were away and had to be contacted in 2006.

Interview Protocol

Following personal introductions, the respondents were asked whether they had any questions about the research. Questions that arose were answered and then it was confirmed that the participant was happy to proceed with the interview. Participants then provided the signed informed consent form. Interviewees were advised that their responses would be written down and then summarized, with a summary being sent to them by email, for review. This was to ensure that the record of the information was accurate and to provide an opportunity for the person to add/remove information.

Prior to commencing the interview, key definitions were discussed to ensure that the participant understood the terms and their significance in the research.
The interview was then conducted and comments recorded on the sheet. If there were any difficulties understanding the question, it was reworded. In instances where the response was limited, or the respondent asked for clarification regarding the type of information being sought, this was provided. The interviewer did not provide additional comment or encourage responses. No personal details or other identifying details were recorded. Data was recorded relating to GA core business focus, location of the person’s role (regional or in head office) and position (whether management, field staff or a combined role).

Interviewees were advised that once all interviews were completed and results analysed, a self-administered attitudinal survey would be sent out to them, as explained in the informed consent form.

**Interview recording**

The interviews were recorded by hand. The interview responses were transferred from the handwritten record into an Excel spreadsheet record for each respondent. A copy of this was sent to each interviewee to review, providing the opportunity to correct misinformation, misinterpretation or to add further comment. Returned responses/confirmations were aggregated for each question. The responses were then broken into individual points, as respondents tended to mention several items in a single sentence. Each of these individual items was listed, recording beside them the respondent’s agency core business focus (economic, social, environmental and various mixes of these three areas), the position of the respondent (manager, field, management and field) and location (head office, regional office). The individual comments were then sorted into themes or sub-groups.

**Surveys**

Surveys were sent out after all the interviews were completed and the interview data had been analysed. Earliest interviewees had the longest time to wait to receive a survey. The surveys were to be sent by email, with a covering email referring to the interview and reminding the participants of the purpose of the survey and its relationship to the interview.

Participants were instructed to complete the survey by placing an ‘x’ in the box on a scale of 1 – 5, representing their opinion in response to a statement or question. Participants were requested to send their response back by email and reminded that if they have any questions or concerns, to contact the researcher or university. Contact
details were to be provided for both. No personal details or other identifying details were recorded. Once again, data was recorded relating to GA core business focus, location of the person’s role (being regional or in head office) and position (whether management, field staff or a combination). Table 4.6 documents the steps undertaken to conduct this research.

Table 4.6
Steps taken to conduct the research activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH STEPS</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify GA sample from Federal, State and Local Government, fitting the criteria that the GA core business, programs and activities contribute to regional development as defined for this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prepare questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prepare the framework for the survey with the details to be filled in after analysis of the questionnaire data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prepare ‘Research Background Information’ paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prepare informed consent form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prepare interview response record sheet. This includes space for the response and space for related comments which is not directly relating to the question, but provides contextual background to responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare Interview summary sheet to send back to respondent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Prepare interview data recording system in Excel spreadsheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Complete and submit ethics application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Prepare letter to Director-Generals of each target GA outlining research activity and requesting permission to conduct interviews and follow-up surveys. (see example in Appendix three)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Trial the questionnaire and make modifications if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>On receipt of Ethics approval, post out letters to target GAs together will copies of all relevant documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Set up record system for contact with GAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Enter letters of rejection or confirmation into record system, which also includes contact details for personnel who will be interviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Undertake reminder email and phone calls for all GAs that do not respond within four weeks. Continue reminders or liaison with relevant personnel in order to set up interviews as opportunities arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Interview schedule compiled as confirmations are received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Conduct interviews and record responses on the interview record sheet. (First level of interpretation as interviewer records responses).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Transfer responses to the interview summary sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Summary of interview sent to respondent for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Data amended if required and then individual points placed in an Excel spreadsheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Apply first level of ‘winnowing’ – sort individual data points into common themes and sub-groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Incorporate dominant themes into the self-administered attitudinal survey, or unusual factors for further investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Excel spreadsheet set up to record survey responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The self-administered surveys sent out, with a set time-frame for return.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A follow-up phone call and email sent reminding late returns. A closure date confirmed and no further effort made beyond this to retrieve any more responses. Nil responses recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Analysis of survey responses based on frequency of rating and indicating a ‘tendency’ to agree/disagree, consider impact high/low and occurrence always/never.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Record results of interview and survey data by each research issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Review and discuss findings in relation to the research problem and contribution to knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research
Source: Steps developed to conduct the research
4.6.3 Data collection issues - interviews

Interviews

It is generally accepted that in qualitative research, the researcher is part of the instrument of inquiry. Recording of the information requires careful listening, selecting of appropriate information, which may be coloured by the interviewer (Patton, 1990). Thus the skill, consistency and rigour in the person’s approach are important and could vary when a number of data collectors are used. Only one researcher was involved in the research. The researcher is a public servant and has experienced some of the elements under investigation when working on regional development projects. Care was taken not to influence or presume responses and meaning from interviewees, due to familiarity with the factors being examined.

As previously discussed, qualitative inquiry is good on depth, however it lacks breadth, as interviews and surveys take time and are hard to write up. In terms of the research activity, there is the potential for the researcher to influence data at a number of junctures through the data instruments and the actual collection process, for example:

- Question design and wording which can ‘lead’ a response in the interview (clarify basis upon which the questions have been designed to participant)
- The manner in which the question is asked and any additional clarification explanations that might also ‘lead’ the respondent (this can occur if respondents ask for examples given by other GAs to assist them)
- Listening/interpreting leading to further questions to clarify meaning – danger of leading the subject response
- Selection of information to record in the first instance and then recording using some of researcher’s terms to distil information into more concise chunks – could lose some meaning (send summary of interview to respondent to check)
- Interpretation of information recorded that is sent back to respondent should assist in reducing loss of information and misinterpretation, but provides the respondent with the opportunity to change their response, in hindsight
- The process of sorting, aggregation and classification of information– creating categories and gathering themes, which assume that comments that are collected together as similar, are in fact, similar or the same in meaning presents an interpretation and a semantic challenge.

Surveys

Issues associated with the data collection for surveys have already been explored in section 4.5.3 (page 231). They are summarized here as:

- Internal ‘respondent’ factors (mood, psychological traits, respondent perception of their ‘position and authority’ – noted by researcher)
- External influences on the respondent (time and competing work priorities, situational environment and organizational culture – noted by researcher)
- Issues associated with assumptions that attitudes can be measured and evaluation can exist on a continuum scale (Vaughan & Hogg 1998)
- Individual Interpretation (Vaughan & Hogg 1998)
- Concern by respondents of perception of them (Ray 1997)
- Research influence and bias (Patton 1990)
- Word ambiguity (Vaughan & Hogg 1998)

4.7 Method of Analysis

This section is divided into two sub sections. Section 4.7.1 outlines the method of analysis for the interviews and defines ‘significance’ in the interviews. Section 4.7.2 presents the method of analysis for the surveys and defines ‘significance’ in the survey

4.7.1 Interviews

The first layer of analysis occurred once interviewees confirmed their responses as accurate. The information was aggregated and broken into individual statements. The analysis involved sorting the statements into similar topic areas to identify key themes, common statements and issues or ideas. This process can be described as involving constant comparison, qualitative content and narrative analysis techniques (Sandelowski 1999), whilst Patton (1990) describes the process as inductive analysis. Guba (1978) cited in Patton (1990) suggests the research is looking for ‘recurring regularities’. The categories were then viewed to ensure that data had been correctly assigned and melded with other data in the group, and that when different categories were compared, the differences were clear. If items could not be assigned, then the categories were reviewed, and a new category created.

Once this first layer of sorting was completed, the categories of similar topics were grouped into themes. The themes were not pre-supposed, but emerged from the
results. The themes used were also applied to other questions in the first instance, but new themes could be formed for each question, if none of the existing themes applied. These two processes were completed for all questions until there was a comprehensive list of themes and each question had answers grouped under the relevant themes. The final list of themes is in Appendix 6. Greater detail on the type of information included in each theme is in Appendix 7.

The second layer of analysis concerned analyzing the statements that had been grouped under a single theme to determine if there were sub-groups within that theme. Two examples are presented below to illustrate how this is done. They are for the themes of ‘communication’ and ‘cooperation’:

**COMMUNICATION**

If there were 10 communication-related statements, these would be further analysed to determine if there were sub-groups, for example internal communication, cross agency communication, IT communication. 2 statements might relate to internal communication, 5 to cross-agency communication and 3 relating to IT. There are therefore 3 sub-groups and a total number of 10 responses.

**COOPERATION**

If there were 11 cooperation statements these could be analysed for sub-groupings and in this example there are two sub-groups: sharing resources and sharing information. Six agencies may have spoken about sharing resources and five may have referred to sharing information. There are therefore two sub-groups and a total of 11 responses.

An example of this deeper analysis is in Table 4.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of sub-groups in the theme</th>
<th>Total number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-agency communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>COOPERATION</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>COOPERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed from this research.

Source: compiled from data from interview responses.
Comments that did not fit into themes and other information that helped to create the context of the discussion, were also recorded in the raw data. This acted as a point of reference to recall the discussion, and provided value-adding to comments and opinion when specific cases were explained. Specific cases were not reported in the research results to protect anonymity. The themes were converted into a bar graph showing the number of sub-groups under the theme, and then the total number of responses for that question. Details of interview results are in Appendix 8.

Interview questions 1 and 3 were analysed differently. These two questions investigated agencies with which the respondent’s agency experienced conflict, and then agencies with which the respondent’s agency had complementarity of core business. The responses were graphed to show the agencies nominated in each response to each question. The graph illustrated the GAs with highest number of nomination from other GAs. The core business focus (economic, social, environmental, or a combination of two or all three) was noted to determine if there were specific core business areas that led to conflict or support mutuality.

Interview questions 8, 11, 12, 14 and 17 analysis involves sorting responses into groups of common responses for the individual question as responses are not part of the wider ‘themes’ gathered for the research. For example question 8 asked ‘Describe any connections between the ‘issues and impediments’ experienced in any of these projects and the two types of core business conflict examples that you have outlined’. Responses were then grouped according to the most common descriptions used by respondents, which in this case were ‘the same’, ‘linked to some degree’, ‘closely aligned’, ‘one leads to the other’, ‘connection at a functional/operational level’ and ‘unsure’.

**Interview ‘significance’**

The meaning of ‘significance’ in the interviews was determined by the number of common and related issues, view points and factors which were categorized into themes. Significant themes were those that attracted a high number of interviewee comments. At a second level, highly significant factors and view points in the sub-groups were those with a high number of interviewees who had discussed topics in those sub-groups. Tables were produced highlighting the significant items in yellow. As an illustration, taken from Table 4.8 (page 244), there are two themes - ‘agency performance’ and ‘communication’. Within those two themes are sub-groups of comments. For example ‘agency performance’ had comments relating to agencies
focusing on their own KPIs, poor coordination & limited synergy amongst agencies, and low motivation to be committed. The sub-groups that are shaded are significant factors or comments that would be explored in the survey, having been raised by five or more interviewees.

Other factors, issues, or points of view may be considered significant because they add a new dimension to the research or issue under discussion and are noted by more than five interviewees. Appendix 8 includes the detailed commentary, Tables and graphs of interview analysis.

Table 4.8

**Significant sub-groups in a theme to be explored in the survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE GROUPINGS</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments related to this theme</th>
<th>THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on own core business and KPIs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor coordination &amp; limited synergy between agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low motivation to be committed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduces ability to negotiate &amp; encourages defensiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research
Source: compiled from data from surveys.

4.7.2 Analysis of self-administered surveys

From the interviews, the dominant themes or most common issues and factors mentioned were scoped into statements that explored further the interview findings and captured additional information for the research issues. Ratings for each survey question were recorded in an Excel format and colour coded (refer to page 248 for an example in Table 4.10). A frequency count of each rating was recorded and graphed as a bar chart to provide a visual representation of frequency. This assisted in identifying the ‘tendency’ in a visual sense, across the three elements being investigated, for example disagreement/agreement, high/low impact and never/always occurrence. The mode was noted. Appendix 9 records the rating scores, simple frequency graphs and an indication of the tendency.

Survey ‘significance’

‘Significant’ results are those where 50 percent or more of respondents rate a tendency within an individual dimensions (agree/disagree, high/low impact, occurrence never/always). Significance is therefore determined by:
Strong tendency to agree/disagree, with rating 1 and 2, or 4 and 5 by 50 percent or more of the respondents

Strong tendency to consider the impact high/low, with rating 4 and 5 or 1 and 2 by 50 percent or more of the respondents

Strong tendency to consider the occurrence as always/never, with rating 4 and 5 or 1 and 2 by 50 percent or more of respondents

Fifty percent or more of respondents rating 3, a neutral position is also considered significant, or where the neutral position is the mode.

‘Significant’ factors specifically relating to the research problem are those that have 50 percent or more respondents with a tendency to: agree, consider the impact to tend to be high, and to consider the occurrence to be frequent or always. The factors that are ‘significant’ results are shaded in the Tables. Table 4.9 is an example of one of these Tables.

Table 4.9
Significant survey results for factors affecting agency relationships and showing highlighted in yellow, significant factors relating to the research problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level of neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘encourages agencies to focus on their own benefit from projects’</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘creates reluctance to share information’</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Reduces desire to cooperate and collaborate’</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>2 = 1 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Results in poor communication’</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced ability to negotiate</td>
<td>8 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>No of respondents consider impact high/low</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 5 = high impact 1 = low impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘encourages agencies to focus on their own benefit from projects’</td>
<td>9 high</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘creates reluctance to share information’</td>
<td>8 high</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Reduces desire to cooperate and collaborate’</td>
<td>9 high</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Results in poor communication’</td>
<td>10 high</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘reduces ability to negotiate’</td>
<td>11 high</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>No. of respondents consider occurrence never/always</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = never 5 = always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘degrades relationships’</td>
<td>8 frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Reduces cooperation and collaboration’ (refer Figure 5.10)</td>
<td>8 infrequent</td>
<td>1 = 1 never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘encourages agencies to focus on their own benefit from projects’</td>
<td>6 frequent</td>
<td>3 = 5 always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘results in poor communication’</td>
<td>9 frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Reduces the ability to negotiate’ (Refer Figure 5.11)</td>
<td>5 infrequent</td>
<td>1 = 1 never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘creates reluctance to share information’</td>
<td>6 frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: compiled from survey data for this research.

4.8 Evidence of assumptions

An assumption that the sample size would be small was met. This was because the sample size was based on GAs that had a core business and outcomes that contribute to regional development. The group of GAs is a finite group, being for
agencies at the Federal, Queensland State and Local Government levels. Those at the local level were only those from the two regional areas selected. All the agencies identified for the research were approached regarding participation.

Assumptions relating to survey rating of ‘three’ as being ‘neutral’ are based on the fact that the Lickert-like scale is a 5 point scale. Respondents were able to indicate complete agreement/disagreement, definitely high or low impact and occurrence as never or always. The only other choice is just below or above rating 3 towards either end of the semantic scale. A selection of ‘3’ was described as indicating ‘neutral’.

4.9 Computer program for analysis and method of analysis

This section describes the computer programs used for analysis. Section 4.9.1 discusses recording and analysis of the interview data. Section 4.9.2 describes the use of Excel to record the survey data and to create simple frequency bar charts.

4.9.1 Interviews

Microsoft Excel was used to record the data from the interviews. Interview responses were transferred from the interview sheet to an Excel spreadsheet for each interviewee, for each question, and noted as individual statements or points. The answers were sorted into themes that emerged from the commonality of responses. These themes were built as the analysis of interviews progressed. The list of themes is in Appendix 6. Appendix 7 provides detail of the content included in the themes.

Themes were sorted into sub-groups and the number of answers that fell into that sub-group was counted. A table was compiled of this information, which was converted into a bar chart, using excel. This visually illustrates the dominant themes. A copy example of the bar chart is at Figure 4.3.
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Figure 4.3

**Bar graph to illustrate the key themes regarding the effect of core business conflict on agencies working together and the total number of responses from interviewees**

- **Source:** Developed for this research.
- **Source:** Developed from interview data for this research.

Questions 8, 11, 12, 14 and 17 were not questions that contributed to the general list of themes that were cumulatively compiled through the analysis. Instead the most common groupings of responses specifically relevant to the question were captured. For example Question 14 asked how successful were the approaches and practiced adopted by agencies to address core business conflict, with groupings being ‘very successful’, ‘successful’, ‘quite successful’. Questions 1 and 3 were treated differently too, as these documented the number of interviewee nominations for agencies with which their agency had experienced conflict or complementarity. Counts were represented as a frequency bar graph.

### 4.9.2 Surveys

Survey response ratings were recorded in an Excel spreadsheet for each question and each of the three areas of ‘Agreement’, ‘Impact’ and ‘Occurrence’. The responses were colour coded. Yellow was used for ratings of 1 and 2, 3 was not coloured, and 4 and 5 were coloured blue. This provided an immediate visual picture of level of tendency to agree or disagree, whether impact is low or high and rate of occurrence being never to always. Ratings for each were recorded in a frequency list for each item. This was converted into a frequency bar graph using Excel. An example of the colour coding is in Table 4.10 and of the frequency bar graph at Figure 4.11 for 1a,b and c of the survey.
Table 4.10

Colour coded responses for respondents for survey question a, b and c ‘Agencies with an economic or environmental focus more likely to experience core business conflict’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Developed from survey data for this research.

Figure 4.4

Example of a frequency bar graph of survey respondents results for level of agreement that core business conflict affects project implementation and outcomes by reducing outcomes

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from survey data for this research.

4.10 Ethical issues

The ethical issues to be considered related to the fact that people were being asked to give an opinion or evaluation in a situation linked to their employment. There was a risk a respondent could be identified due to the staffing and responsibility structures in some GAs. As a result, there was a need to consider the impact on the respondent relating to:

- Performance evaluation
Psychological stress associated with making judgment statements about colleagues
Political implications
Management implications, should the findings suggest a negative impression regarding a GA’s cooperative culture in an environment where cooperation and coordination was important.

To overcome these issues to some degree, a letter requesting permission to conduct interviews and send surveys was sent to the Director General of each GA. The letter requested nomination of suitable staff members. Nominated staff were contacted and received a summary of the research project. Respondents then completed and signed an informed consent. Respondents were asked before the interview if they still wished to participate.

To protect identity, responses were anonymous. To protect confidentiality the data was coded and aggregated. The original information was then destroyed.

Ethics approval was gained from Southern Cross University Ethics Committee on the 16 May 2005. The Approval number was ECN-05-54.

4.11 Conclusion

In summary, the design of the methodology to investigate the research problem responded to the following issues:

- No current theory for the specific topic of investigation, therefore the methodology developed must be exploratory and inductive
- No previous research into this specific topic area.
- Complexity of the subject matter for investigation, as it involves exploring the interplay of people, organisational systems and processes, and approaches to governance, requiring a social research type approach.
- Identification of the attitudes, perceptions and experiences of public sector personnel when working together in joint projects, particularly regional development projects
- Exploring some elements in greater depth

Chapter 5 analyses the data and presents results of the research. The analysis is presented by research issue and includes data analysis from both the interviews and the surveys for each individual research issue. Table 4.11 documents the interview and research questions that are investigating each research issue.
Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Issues</th>
<th>Interview questions</th>
<th>Survey questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The nature of core business conflict</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12</td>
<td>1a, b and c; 2a, b and c; 3a, b and c; 5a, b and c; 6 a, b and c; 7a, b and c; 8a, b and c; 12a, b and c, and lastly 14a, b and c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs working together</td>
<td>5, 6, 7 &amp; 8</td>
<td>4a, b and c; 7a, b, and c; and 8a, b and c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dominant core business conflicts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11a, b and c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of core business conflict on regional development projects and GAs working relationships</td>
<td>2, 9</td>
<td>5a, b and c; 9 a, b and c; 10a, b and c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes and practices can assist agencies to manage issues and impediments and core business conflict that could be included in a process model</td>
<td>13, 14, 15, 17</td>
<td>13a, b and c; 14 a and b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL AREAS INVESTIGATED**

| Impact on community perception of government/government image | Arose from interview discussions | 10a, b, and c investigated an issue that was raised through the interviews |
| Non-core business conflict | 12. What other factors, not related to core business conflict, may cause issues and impediments to agencies working together? | 12a, b and c investigated non-core business conflict factors that create conflict. |

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Interview and survey questions plotted against research issues.

Chapter 6 will discuss the findings of the research against the findings from the literature review. It will also define the research’s contribution to knowledge and the implications for theory, policy, practice, and methodology. The chapter closes by presenting recommendations for further research.
5.1 Introduction

Chapter 4 outlined the methodology including its justification, and provided details on the unit of analysis, instruments used, administration procedures, limitations and ethical considerations for the research.

Chapter 5 analyses the data. Chapter 6 will discuss the findings from Chapter 5 within the context of the literature and identify the contribution to knowledge. The chapter will also outline the implications for theory, policy and practice, methodology, and suggest further research.

Section 5.1.1 outlines the parameters of ‘significance’ in the results, while section 5.2 presents the participant profile, and section 5.3 is the introduction to the research issues. Findings from both the interviews, and then confirmed and explored by the survey data analysis as a means of correlation, are presented in Sections 5.4 – 5.8.

The research issues outlined in Chapter 1 (page 7) are covered individually, with one per section. The findings answer the research problem posed in section 1.2 of chapter 1. Section 5.9 is the conclusion to chapter 5 and introduces chapter 6, the final chapter. An outline of the Chapter is presented in Figure 5.1

In brief, the objectives of Chapter 5 are to present the results of the interviews and the survey by individual research issue and to consolidate the implications of the results.
5.1.1 Approach to data analysis

The data analysis in Chapter 5 is presented by individual research issue. The interview findings are presented first, followed by the associated survey questions that investigate the key factors, themes or issues arising from the interview. This includes survey questions investigating anomalous or unusual views, some examples being the community perception of Government arising from core business conflicts impacts; the debate concerning the influence of complementarity of agency core business; and conflict between economic and environmental focused agencies. Results from other questions that link to the research issues may be repeated.
Interviews

Interview questions 1, 3, 8, 11, 12, 14 and 17 had question-specific common answers that were noted only for the individual question. Analysis of all other questions involves summarising respondents’ comments in relation to specific theme areas. The themes emerge out of the analysis, and comprise areas or topics that are related or similar that can be grouped together, for example items associated with ‘relationships’; or ‘power, authority and jurisdiction’; or ‘reporting and accountability’. A theme may contain a number of sub-groups, for example ‘Communication’ may have sub-groups relating to ‘internal communication’, ‘inter-agency communication’ and ‘willingness to share information’. Each summary contains the following:

- Analysis of respondents comments in relation to key themes (for example communication, relationships, power, authority and jurisdiction) or common responses in the case of questions 1, 3, 8, 11, 12, 14 and 17
- Additional points made by interviewees are noted that provide context to the discussion and issues
- Documentation of unusual views
- Comments on any differences apparent between head office and regional offices, amongst different levels of government, evident from differing officer responsibility; or agency core business focus
- A Table showing dominant factors, issues or views to be explored in the survey grouped by theme and showing sub-groups and the number of respondents for that sub-group within the theme
- A bar chart illustrates the total number of responses in a theme and also shows the number of sub-groups that fell under that theme, indicating the diversity of related elements discussed within the theme.

Tables 5.1 and 5.2 on page 254 show examples of themes and their sub-groups. Table 5.1 has two themes – agency performance and communication. Shaded areas to be included in the survey are individual sub-groups or themes mentioned by a high number of interviewees, but at least by more than five interviewees. Table 5.2 shows an example of the Table recording the number of sub-groups in a theme and the total number of responses from interviewees. Shaded items are explored in the survey. This Table is converted into a
frequency bar graph as part of the analysis. Full details of the interview analysis are in Appendix 8.

Table 5.1

Example of part of a Table showing the relationship between groupings and themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE GROUPINGS</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments related to this theme</th>
<th>THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on own core business and KPIs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor coordination &amp; limited synergy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low motivation to be committed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduces ability to negotiate &amp; encourages</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defensiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed from this research
Source: Developed from interview responses.

Table 5.2

Example part of a Table of counts for themes and categories from interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of sub-groups that fall into this theme</th>
<th>Total number of responses from interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agency performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community and clients</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcomes and deliverables</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processes and systems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources &amp; info resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed from this research
Source: Developed from interview responses.

At the end of the interview question analysis implications of the interview findings for the research issue are placed in a shaded box and are used as a reference in Chapter 6.

Questions one and three from the interview are recorded as a frequency bar graph displaying the agencies nominated for conflict or complementarity. The frequency bar graph is followed by a brief summary of the associated interview discussion.

Surveys

The survey analysis commences with a list of the key factors, issues or views drawn from the interviews, followed by a written analysis of the findings from the survey.
Significant results are presented in a Table. As with the end of the interview analysis, implications of the findings for the research issue under investigation are placed in a shaded box at the end of the survey summary.

Bar graphs are not included for most questions due to the large volume of figures. However bar graphs are provided for: questions one, two and three; to illustrate an anomalous responses; and for parts of questions investigating a single factor identified as warranting individual investigation, such as in question eight - 13a, b and c and question 14 – 3a, b, and c. Bar graphs and detail of results for all the survey questions are contained in Appendix 8.

5.1.2 Significance

Significance for both interviews and surveys is repeated for reference and presented below.

Interviews

The meaning of ‘significance’ in the interviews is determined by the number of common and related issues, view points and factors which are categorized into themes. Significant themes are those that attract a high number of interviewee comments. At a second level, highly significant factors and view points in the sub-groups are those with a high number of interviewees who had discussed topics in those sub-groups. Tables record this information and significant items are shaded. The sub-groups shaded are significant factors or comments that are explored in the survey, having been raised by five or more interviewees.

Other factors, issues, or points of view may be considered significant because they add a new dimension to the research or issue under discussion and are noted by more than five interviewees. Appendix 8 includes the detailed commentary, Tables and graphs of interview analysis.

Surveys

The survey uses a Lickert-like scale of 1 – 5. Three aspects of factors or issues are rated: the level of agreement; the perceived impact from the issues; and the frequency of occurrence of the factor or issue.
‘Significant’ results are those where 50 per cent or more of respondents rate a tendency within an individual dimensions (agree/disagree, high/low impact, occurrence never/always). Significance is therefore determined by:

- strong tendency to agree/disagree, with rating 1 and 2, or 4 and 5 by 50 per cent or more of the respondents
- strong tendency to consider the impact high/low, with rating 4 and 5 or 1 and 2 by 50 per cent or more of the respondents
- strong tendency to consider the occurrence as always/never, with rating 4 and 5 or 1 and 2 by 50 per cent or more of respondents
- Fifty per cent of respondents tending to support all three areas being investigated
- Fifty per cent or more of respondents rating 3, a neutral position is also considered significant, or where the neutral position is the mode.

‘Significant’ factors specifically relating to the research problem are those that have 50 per cent or more respondents with a tendency to: agree, consider the impact to tend to be high, and to consider the occurrence to be frequent or always. These factors are shaded in the Tables that present ‘significant’ results.

5.2 Participant profile

A total of 31 people participated at the interview stage of the research. They represented five Federal government agencies, ten State Government agencies and four Local Governments, with one from Mount Isa region and three from the Bundaberg region. One respondent represented a role across both Local Government and State Government. Eleven of the interviewees were located in a head office; 10 were from the Mount Isa region and 9 from the Bundaberg region, with one based in Brisbane and serving state and local governments. Two Federal interviewees were based in Brisbane as the ‘regional’ office and the remaining 3 were in head office locations elsewhere.

Table 5.3 outlines the ‘sample’ within the context of the ‘population’. A total of 54 agencies represented the ‘population’ as at 2006. Forty agencies were approached for the sample. These were identified as having direct involvement in regional development. Nineteen agencies agreed to participate. A total of 72 possible interviews could take place, if head office and regional office in both regions participated. Thirty one officers participated.
The same respondents were to participate in the survey, but due to the occurrence of Cyclones Larry and Monica, only 16 were able to respond to surveys. Four were Federal, eight were State and four were Local Government representatives.

Table 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Actual number of GAs – the 'population' as at January 2006</th>
<th>Number of GAs approached, identified as directly associated with regional development – the potential 'sample'</th>
<th>Number of agencies agreeing to participate from those approached – the actual ‘sample’</th>
<th>Total number of potential interviews if all agencies had responded</th>
<th>Total number of interviews (including Head Office and Regional Office personnel)</th>
<th>Total number of surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint State &amp; local representative</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT BUNDABERG</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT MOUNT ISA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed from this research.
Source: Compiled from data collected about participant profile.

The core business of each agency is classified in the following categories: economic, social, environmental, economic/environmental, economic/social or a combination of all three.

Of the 31 respondents, four described their agency as having only an economic focus, two described their agency as having purely a social focus, three described their agency focus as environmental, eight identified their agency focus as economic and social, six described their agency focus as economic and environmental, eight indicated their agency covered all three areas, with the representative for both State and local government also indicating all three areas. Of the 31 individuals interviewed, 25 were managers, 5 were field officers and management, 1 only was a field officer; 11 were located in head office (including in Canberra for Federal agencies). The number of participants from one agency varied between 2 and 3.

5.3 Introduction to research issues

Research issues identified in chapter 3, are explored through the interviews and surveys. Appendix 1 contains a copy of the interview questions, and Appendix 2 contains a copy of the survey. The interviews drew on respondent’s experience of working in joint
projects with other agencies. The interviews were not taped, information was hand written during the interview. Each respondent received an interview summary for review. Only three made amendments, modifying some information for clarification and adding extra comments. Appendix 8 contains details of data collected in the interviews.

5.3.1 Interview themes

Key themes were identified from analysis of interview questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15. As outlined in chapter 4, section 4.7.1 (page 241-244), a ‘theme’ is used to describe topics, views or issues that share common or closely related concepts, knowledge and theories, which were mentioned during the interview process, for example: the theme of ‘communication’ or ‘relationships’. The themes are presented below.

General themes from interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability, performance reporting</th>
<th>Efficiency and duplication</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency benefit</td>
<td>Government performance (achieving priorities, image in eyes of community)</td>
<td>Political issues and influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency performance (against core business and KPIs, against government priorities and image in eyes of community)</td>
<td>Location issues</td>
<td>Power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and finance</td>
<td>Legislation and regulation</td>
<td>Processes and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Management structures and approaches</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and clients (benefit and perceptions)</td>
<td>Mutuality and complementarity including leverage off each other)</td>
<td>Project impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community expectation</td>
<td>Organisational structure and culture</td>
<td>Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Outcomes and deliverables</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and collaboration</td>
<td>Personnel related</td>
<td>Resources and information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophical core business conflict</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WOG culture and approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greater detail of what is included in each theme is in Appendix 7. Interview questions where responses were not grouped by these themes were 1, 3, 8, 11, 12, 14 and 17. These questions investigated other aspects of the research problem and are presented below:

1. With which other GAs does your agency’s core business conflict?
3. With which agencies does your agency’s core business concur or complement?
8. What connection is there between the issues and impediments that your agency has experienced when working together with other agencies and what I have described as core business conflict?
11. How does being the lead agent affect the level and type of core business conflict compared to just being a participant in a project?
12. What other factors, not related to core business conflict, may cause issues and impediments to agencies working together?
14. How successful were the efforts to address the issues and impediments or core business conflict?
17. How could ESD principles be used to reduce core business conflict?

Details of interview analysis are in Appendix 8. Survey results are in Appendix 9.

## 5.4 Research Issues 1 - The nature of core business conflict

### Introduction

Interview questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 11 and 12 provide information on this topic. Survey questions confirm or disconfirm the most common items and explore each in greater depth. Survey questions are 1a, b and c; 2a, b and c; 3a, b and c; 5a, b and c; 6a, b and c; 7a, b and c; 8a, b and c; 10-1a, b and c, 12a, b and c, and lastly 14 - 5a and b. The summary of findings for each research issue is presented in sections 5.4 – 5.8. The interview findings are presented first, followed by the associated survey question results. Shaded statements or questions are at the beginning of results to inform the reader of the focus of the investigation.

### 5.4.1 Interview and survey findings

#### Investigating whether conflict exists between agencies

**Interview question 1** With which other GDAAs does your agency’s core business conflict?

The question identified agencies, which experienced conflict with each other. The results are shown in Figure 5.2. The Environmental Protection Agency, Department of State Development, and Department of Natural Resources are the top three agencies nominated, as creating ‘conflict’, with the Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries being fourth.

Figure 5.2 bar graph lists 12 Federal and 10 State agencies and one local government, reference to Local Government Association of Queensland and nomination of ‘levels of government’ were also noted as sources of conflict. Non-government agencies mentioned were Telstra and Ergon. Five agencies did not nominate any agency. State agencies were the most nominated and represented most often agencies with an economic, environment, and economic and environment combined core business. The issues relating to conflict amongst and with economic and environmental agencies was further explored in survey question 1a, b and c and question 7 – 2a, b and c.
In examining the agencies that nominated one another as sources of conflict, economic and environmentally focused agencies could be expected to experience most conflict. Survey questions 1, a, b and c investigated this and survey findings provided some limited support for this view. Table 5.4 records the significant aspects of economic and environmental focused agencies experiencing conflict with 50 per cent or more respondents having indicated a tendency to agree/disagree, consider the impact high/low and the occurrence never/always. Results are not significant specifically in relation to the research problem (50 per cent of respondents indicating agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence). The Table also notes neutral ratings that are significant because five or more respondents rated neutral and thus influence the overall strength of the tendency of responses. There is high neutrality for impact and level of occurrence. (Refer figures 5.3-5.5).
Table 5.4
Significance of responses relating to economic and environmental focused agencies experiencing core business conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level of neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘conflict between economic and environmental focused agencies’</td>
<td>8 agreement</td>
<td>2 rating 1 = agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>No. of respondents consider impact high/low</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 5 = high impact 1 = low impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘conflict between economic and environmental focused agencies’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occurrence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>No. of respondents consider occurrence never/always</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = never 5 = always</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘conflict between economic and environmental focused agencies’</td>
<td>6 tending to always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.3
Bar graph indicating level of agreement with conflict between agencies with an economic or environmental focus of core business

Figure 5.4
Bar graph indicating level of impact of conflict amongst agencies with an economic or environmental focus

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.3 indicates a tendency to agree that agencies with an economic or environmental focus of core business are more likely to experience core business conflict than those that do not have a core business primarily focused on economic or environmental outcomes.
Figure 5.4 (previous page) indicated a slight tendency to consider the impact to be high if conflict occurs, however 50 per cent of respondents were neutral in response to this statement.

**Figure 5.5**

*Bar graph indicating rate of occurrence of conflict amongst agencies with an economic or environmental core business focus*

Survey question 7-2a, b and c investigated the clash between economic and environmental focused agencies as a fundamental core business conflict. A fundamental core business conflict is one that is centred on the GA’s role and responsibility, as delegated by Government and is generally evident in the Vision and Mission statements of the GAs and the underlying ‘philosophy’ applied in carrying out their core business. There was a tendency to disagree, although if this particular fundamental core business conflict occurred the impact was considered to be high, but occurrence was considered infrequent. Figures 5.6 – 5.8 on pages 263-264) illustrate responses.
**Figure 5.6**

*Bar graph indicating level of agreement that conflict between economic and environmental agencies is a fundamental core business conflict*

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.6 shows that respondents indicated a tendency to disagree that the conflict between economic and environmental agencies was a fundamental core business conflict.

**Figure 5.7**

*Bar graph indicating level of impact of conflict between economic and environmental agencies as a fundamental core business conflict*

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.7 shows that respondent tendency was to consider the impact fairly high, of conflict between agencies with economic or environmental focused core business. This response differs from the ‘neutral’ response in 1b; however this questions concerns economic versus environmental clashes as a ‘fundamental core business conflict’.
Figure 5.8

Bar graph indicating rate of occurrence of conflict between economic and environmental agencies as a fundamental core business conflict

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.8 shows that respondents had a tendency to consider the frequency of occurrence was low for fundamental core business conflict arising from economic and environmental conflict. Views for occurrence differed to those expressed in 1c, but again this question relates to the conflict being a fundamental core business conflict. 1c displayed a tendency to consider conflict occurred with some degree of frequency (Figure 5.5). This was off-set by the fact that an equal number of respondents were neutral.

The nature of core business conflict

The conflict between agencies with an economic focus and environmental focus was not considered to be a fundamental core business conflict. The impact of this type of conflict was considered to tend to be high. However opinion differed regarding the rate of occurrence between 1c and 7-2c, with one considering it to tend to be frequent and the other indicating frequency tending to be low. This difference could reflect the fact that question 7 was investigating this conflict as a fundamental core business conflict.

Core business conflict: Impact on inter-agency relationships

Interview question 2 What effect does core business conflict have, when the agencies concerned are working together?

This question explored the impact of core business conflict on inter-agency relationships when agencies work together. Respondents found it difficult to divorce ‘impact on relationship’ from ‘impact on projects’. This was demonstrated by the fact that respondents used examples of impacts on projects, such as project delays, to describe what occurred.
There was no discernable difference in responses between head office and regional offices or amongst agencies with different core business focus. Federal agencies identified the importance of good policy and considered the social impact of programs in their discussions.

Relationships were seen to be degraded, with lack of trust and frustration influencing how individuals interact. Sometimes this was seen to lead to defensive and obstructive attitudes. Interviewees stated that communication deteriorated as a result of poor relationships. This included reluctance to share information and considerable loss of ability to negotiate. Interviewees also noted that agencies tended to focus on their own benefits and meeting their key performance indicators from the project, rather than the whole project.

Other points not related to impacts on relationship included mention that projects often involved a trade-off of economic and environmental areas. This reflected question 1 response of conflict between agencies with these areas as a focus of their core business. Respondents raised the issue of philosophical core business conflict. This concerned an agency’s key principles involved in carrying out its core business, with the view expressed that principles could be considered to be at risk. Ministerial interference and political agendas were also mentioned as affecting ability to work with various agencies. These points do not relate to GA core business conflict.

The WOG approach was not seen as lessening the conflict by some respondents. The view was that conflict still occurred due to the nature of roles and responsibilities of agencies delegated by Government, and the constraints of Acts and Regulations agencies must apply.

Power, authority and jurisdiction was raised, but the discussions concerned the issues relating to this area, such as hierarchy of authority, agencies reluctant to operate outside jurisdiction, dispute of authority and responsibilities.

A number of interviewees suggested the Community viewed Government’s performance as uncoordinated and clients experienced frustration and confusion when relationships amongst agencies were poor. Dominant themes are illustrated in Figure 5.9.
Figure 5.9

Bar graph showing the common themes of impacts on GAs working relationships

Figure 5.9 shows that factors relating to relationships, communication, cooperation and agency performance (which particularly included agencies focusing on their own benefit), resources (with willingness to share information being affected) are the dominant themes. Power, authority and jurisdiction contained the widest range of topics.

Table 5.5 illustrates the range of sub-groups in the themes that emerged from question two, as well as the number of total responses within a theme. The shaded items were explored through the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE GROUPINGS</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments related to this grouping</th>
<th>THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on own agency benefit &amp; KPIs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor coordination &amp; limited synergy between agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low motivation to be committed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduces ability to negotiate, become defensive, withdraw to jurisdictional position</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community poor view of government – uncoordinated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community and clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholder/client confusion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>community and clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reluctance to share information</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of cooperation or desire to cooperate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duplication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>efficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 continues…
Table 5.5. continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE GROUPINGS</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments related to this grouping</th>
<th>THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOG approach not necessarily effective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOG approach can be effective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior management block progress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slowing down of projects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>outcomes and deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affects outcomes and results</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>outcomes and deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delineation of responsibility issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hierarchical authority applied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retreat to jurisdictional role only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputes over power &amp; authority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seek alternative ways to achieve outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>processes and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts and regulation issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degraded quality and effectiveness of</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defense of roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of trust and openness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reluctance to provide resources or funds</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Resources and information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste resources to overcome conflict</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Resources and information resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview data.

The nature of core business conflict

Implication for the research issue concerning the nature of core business conflict is that conflict degraded relationships; affected communication; reduced the ability to negotiate; made agencies focus on their own KPIs in a project, and reduced willingness to share information. These elements are important aspects of working together, thus core business conflict has the potential to have a serious impact on agencies working together.

Survey responses 5a, b, c

Survey question 5a, b and c asked respondents to rate level of agreement, level of impact and rate of occurrence against statements regarding the impact of conflict on agencies’ relationships when they worked together. The most common effects identified in the interviews and explored in survey questions 5a, b and c were:

- Degrades quality and effectiveness of relationships
- Reduces desire to cooperate and collaborate
- Results in poor communication
- Encourages agencies to focus on their own benefit only from projects
- Reduces ability to negotiate
- Creates reluctance to share information

One agency was neutral on all effects. Overall, there was a general tendency to agree that the items listed above were dominant effects of core business conflict on agencies’ working relationships and that the impact of these factors tended to be high. Responses were
not strongly supportive of frequency of the occurrence of these factors affecting agency relationships when working together.

There was high neutrality for agreement on ‘reduced ability to negotiate’; and for impact on ‘degrades relationships’, ‘focus on agency benefit’, ‘reluctance to share information’, ‘poor communication’; and high neutrality for level of occurrence on ‘focus on agency benefit’, ‘reduced ability to negotiate’, and ‘reluctance to share information’.

Table 5.6 records the effects on agency relationship with the 50 per cent or more respondents having indicated a tendency to agree/disagree, consider the impact high/low and the occurrence never/always. The Table has also noted the number of neutral ratings of five or more that influence the overall results for the effect investigated. ‘Results in poor communication’ was significant specifically in relation to the research problem.

**Table 5.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant factors affecting agency relationships</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level of neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘degrades relationship’</td>
<td>8 agree</td>
<td>2 = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘encourages agencies to focus on their own benefit from projects’</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘creates reluctance to share information’</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Reduces desire to cooperate and collaborate’</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>2 = 1 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Results in poor communication’</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced ability to negotiate</td>
<td>8 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact No of respondents consider impact high/low</th>
<th>No of respondents rating 5 = high impact 1 = low impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘degrades relationships’</td>
<td>7 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘encourages agencies to focus on their own benefit from projects’</td>
<td>9 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘creates reluctance to share information’</td>
<td>8 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Reduces desire to cooperate and collaborate’</td>
<td>9 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Results in poor communication’</td>
<td>10 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘reduces ability to negotiate’</td>
<td>11 high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence No. of respondents consider occurrence never/always</th>
<th>No of respondents rating 1 = never 5 = always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘degrades relationships’</td>
<td>8 frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Reduces cooperation and collaboration’ (refer Figure 5.10)</td>
<td>8 infrequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘encourages agencies to focus on their own benefit from projects’</td>
<td>6 frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘results in poor communication’</td>
<td>9 frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Reduces the ability to negotiate’ (Refer Figure 5.11)</td>
<td>5 infrequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘creates reluctance to share information’</td>
<td>6 frequent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Significant negative views showing 50 per cent rating occurrence as not frequent were for ‘reduces cooperation and collaboration’ (view Figure 5.10), and for ‘reduces the ability to negotiate’ (view Figure 5.11).
Figure 5.10

Bar graph showing tendency to consider lack of desire to cooperate occurs infrequently

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.10 indicates that ‘lack of desire to cooperate’ is considered to tend to occur infrequently.

Figure 5.11

Bar graph showing high neutral rating for level of occurrence of reduced ability to negotiate

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.11 shows high level of neutrality regarding occurrence of ‘reduced ability to negotiate’.

Nature of core business conflict

Implication for the research issue concerning the nature of core business conflict is that the most significant impact of core business conflict affecting agency relationships when working together, was that it degraded relationships and resulted in poor communication. Two anomalies were noted, being ‘lack of desire to cooperate’ that was considered not to occur frequently and ‘reduced ability to negotiate’ was rated neutrally by 50 per cent of respondents. It was noticeable that a number of the effects also attracted a higher level of neutral rating (5 or more), with the highest being ‘reduced ability to negotiate’.
Community view of Government as uncoordinated due to core business conflict

Survey 10-1a, b and c

Survey questions 10-1a, b and c explored the level of agreement, considered impact and rate of occurrence of Government being seen as uncoordinated by community. There was general agreement that there was this community view, and that the impact was high, however whilst a larger number of respondents considered the rate of occurrence to tend to be frequent, five respondents rated this neutrally and four respondents, two of whom rated ‘one’ or ‘never’ indicating occurrence to be infrequent. Table 5.7 shows significant results where 50 per cent of respondents rated tendency to agree/disagree, impact to be high/low, and occurrence tending to always/never. The findings do not indicate significance in relation to the research problem (50 per cent rating agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence).

Table 5.7
Significance relating to opinion that government is viewed as uncoordinated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level of neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Core business conflict affects Government image – being seen as uncoordinated’</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>1 = 5 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>No of respondents consider impact high/low</td>
<td>No. of respondents rating 5 = high impact 1 = low impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Core business conflict affects Government image – being seen as uncoordinated’</td>
<td>9 high</td>
<td>1 = low impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>No. of respondents consider occurrence never/always</td>
<td>No of respondents rating 1 = never 5 = always</td>
<td>High level of neutrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Core business conflict affects Government image – being seen as uncoordinated’</td>
<td>6 tended towards always 4 tended towards never</td>
<td>0 = always 2 = never</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.12 (page 271) illustrates the divergence of views relating to level of occurrence, indicating some support that this view by community tends to occur frequently.
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Figure 5.12
Bar graph showing discrepancy in views regarding rate of occurrence that community views government as uncoordinated

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Nature of core business conflict
The implication for the research issue concerning the nature of core business conflict is that there is agreement core business conflict can cause community to view government as uncoordinated and that the impact of this is high, but there is not a strong case to support that the occurrence of this tends to be frequent.

Investigating agency complementarity of core business occur?

Interview question 3 responses. With which agencies does your agency’s core business concur or complement?

This question investigates agency complementarity of core business. The question counterbalances question 1 that investigated whether agencies experienced conflict with one another. The bar graph in Figure 5.13 shows the agencies nominated by respondents as having complementarity of core business with the respondent’s agency.
Twenty five agencies were nominated. Ten were Federal agencies, with the balance being State or Local Government agencies. Eighteen agencies were the same as those nominated in question 1 as creating conflict of core business with respondent’s agencies. Two non-government organisations were noted - The Regional Managers’ Coordination Network (RMCN) and Local Government Association Queensland (LGAQ). The Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of State Development had the most nominations by respondents for having complementarity of core business. They feature also as those being nominated as creating ‘conflict’ in question 1.

There was no noticeable difference between head office and regional office responses. Agencies with an economic, environmental or economic and environmental core business focus once again were frequently nominated and are shaded black in Figure 5.13, with the exception of Department of Environment and Heritage.

Federal agencies noted that projects in which they tended to be involved were often Whole-of-Government (WOG) and cut across government levels and many agencies. Examples cited include ‘Blue Print for the Bush’, natural resource management groups and the Council of Australian Government (COAG) actions to improve service delivery to Indigenous communities. Such projects were dependent upon good relationships for
achieving outcomes. Local Government highlighted the need to be able to interact with many agencies and across levels of Government.

In response to this question, WOG initiatives were seen to encourage synergy and support working across agencies. This challenges the view expressed in Question 2 that WOG approaches do not necessarily reduce conflict due to the role and responsibilities of agencies.

The impact of complementarity on reducing core business conflict is explored through survey 2a, b and c.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of core business conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The implication for the research issue concerning the nature of core business conflict is that agencies identified a lot of complementarity with each other. The economic and environmental agencies attracted high level nominations, with the exception of the Department of Environment and Heritage. WOG activity was seen as encouraging synergy, whereas for question 1 regarding conflict, WOG was not seen as necessarily contributing to reducing conflict. Agencies with an environmental focus are shaded black.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agency core business complementarity and its influence on level of conflict experienced amongst agencies when working together

Survey question responses 2 a, b and c

This question investigated whether complementarity of core business reduced core business conflict when agencies worked together. Overall findings suggest that agencies with complementarity would experience less core business conflict than those without; that if conflict did occur, the impact from core business conflict had a slightly greater tendency to be lower when their core business was complementary, and that the tendency for occurrence of core business conflict would tend to be infrequent. Table 5.8 shows the significant views. Figures 5.14, 5.15 and 5.16 (page 274-275) are bar graphs illustrating the response ranges.

Table 5.8 records significant results with the 50 per cent or more respondents having indicated a tendency to agree/disagree, consider the impact high/low and the occurrence never/always. Rating of impact was not significant as there were less than 50 per cent of respondents rating either side of neutral. There were no results specifically significant in
terms of the research problem (having 50 per cent or more agreement, tendency to consider impact high and occurrence to be frequent).

Table 5.8

Significance relating to agency core business complementarity reducing core business conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level of neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency core business complementarity reduces core business conflict</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>No. of respondents consider occurrence never/always</td>
<td>No of respondents rating 1 = never 5 = always</td>
<td>High level of neutrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency core business complementarity reduces occurrence of core business conflict</td>
<td>8 tendency to occur frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.14

Bar graph showing level of agreement that agencies with complementarity of core business experience less core business conflict

![Bar graph showing level of agreement that agencies with complementarity of core business experience less core business conflict](image)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.14 shows that respondents had a high level of agreement that agencies with complementarity of core business experienced less core business conflict than those without complementarity.
Figure 5.15
Bar graph showing level of impact on core business conflict if agencies have complementarity of core business

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.15 shows respondents had a greater tendency to consider the level of impact of core business conflict to tend to be low when agencies have complementarity or linkages of core business.

Figure 5.16
Bar graph showing rate of occurrence of core business conflict by agencies that have complementarity or linkages of core business

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.16 shows that respondents had a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of core business conflict was infrequent when agencies have complementarity of core business.

Nature of core business conflict
Implications for the research issue regarding the nature of core business conflict, is that complementarity of core business is seen to have positive effects on reducing the level of core business conflict, its impact and rate of occurrence.
Influence of complementarity of agency core business on agency relationships

Interview question 4 What effect does having concurrent or complementarity of core business between agencies have, when these agencies are working together?

This question explores how complementarity of core business amongst agencies affects their relationships when working together. As with Question 2, agencies had difficulty separating effects of complementarity of core business on inter-agency relationships from the impacts on projects.

Three respondents did not see complementarity as necessarily positive, suggesting that there was competition amongst agencies to claim outcomes. Complementarity created complicated internal and external relationships and reporting, possibly contributing to overlap in jurisdiction that resulted in duplication of services and customer/consumer/community confusion.

Regional offices highlighted cooperation more than head offices. An equal number of Federal and State agencies spoke of cooperation. Federal agencies mentioned WOG initiatives, but only one State agency mentioned such activities.

In describing the influences of complementarity of core business on agency relationships and communication, respondents used terms such as trust, honesty and respect. Areas most likely to benefit from complementarity of core business were:

- **Relationships** – more cordial, productive and positive; this influences other areas such as negotiation, cooperation and communication.

- **Cooperation and collaboration**, including information sharing – arising from good relationships. This facilitates desire to share information; involves less resources to resolve conflicts and encourages forging of strategic partnerships with a greater willingness to work outside core business for overall project benefit.

- **Communication** – more open with greater understanding of each other’s perspectives. This leads to ease in negotiation and improved image of Government within community where it is seen as cohesive and working effectively together.

- **Mutuality, complementarity** and agency benefit- mutual benefit means agencies can fulfil their Key Performance Indicators (KPI) through common goals arising from
complementarity of core business. They can also leverage off each other. Overall, there is benefit to agencies that contribute to their achievements and outcomes.

General discussion highlighted the need to identify common goals, creating a united and consistent message to community, with reference to the fact that complementarity of core business supported having shared fundamental philosophy, so helped in finding the common goals. However, conflict was still considered possible due to differing perspectives of the same activity and its intended outcome. As an example, social housing was seen as an infrastructure asset by some agencies, whereas another agency viewed housing from its social value – providing a home.

Dominant themes that emerged in the discussion are shown in Figure 5.17. The survey explored most common factors and views further. This was to confirm, examine impact and frequency of the perceived value of complementarity of core business in reducing core business conflict, and to explore the opposite view expressed of the perceived possible negative impacts when agencies work together. Relationships had the widest range of comments relating to the theme.

Figure 5.17
Bar graph showing themes relating to the effects of complementarity on agencies working together

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview data.
The dominant themes were relationships; cooperation and collaboration; communication; agency benefit and mutuality; and improved ability to negotiate and share information. The latter two are both part of communication.

Table 5.9 illustrates the range of sub-groups in the themes that emerged from question two, as well as the number of total responses within a theme. The shaded items were incorporated into the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE GROUPINGS</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments in the groupings</th>
<th>THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enables quality relationships</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive environment to work together</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater awareness, understanding and respect for each other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong, effective relationship</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better benefits to community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>community and clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication across agency and within departments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond quicker to project needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project moves faster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easier to achieve goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can equally report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can be a problem for claiming outcomes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage of funding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>cooperation and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more productive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>cooperation and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing resources and information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>cooperation and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages cooperation and collaboration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cooperation and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work towards shared goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>cooperation and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work towards mutual benefit of all agencies involved &amp; leveraging off each other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>mutuality, complementarity &amp; agency benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages partnerships</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>mutuality, complementarity &amp; agency benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go outside core business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mutuality, complementarity &amp; agency benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mutuality, complementarity &amp; agency benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good and easy communication and negotiation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open dialogue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports network building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to share information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty and frankness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieve outcomes more easily</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>outcomes and deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less resources used for conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government seen as single entity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>government performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater flexibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>program and project benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run smoothly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>program and project benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>program and project benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear delineation of responsibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>power and authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview data.
Investigating the influence of complementarity of agency core business

Survey question responses 3a, b and c; 6a, b, and c; 2a, b and c; and 7-4a, b and c,

Introduction

Survey questions 3 a, b and c examined whether complementarity of core business had a negative effect on agencies working together, as suggested in the interviews. The findings are compared to survey question 6a, b and c responses that investigated further the positive influences of complementarity of core business. The findings of survey questions 2a, b and c and 7-4a, b and c are also relevant in drawing a conclusion about this debate.

Survey responses 3 a, b and c

Survey 3a, b and c findings indicated that 50 per cent of respondents agreed that complementarity of core business created overlaps and duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes, however six disagreed, with 1 respondent rating 5. The level of impact of complementarity of core business conflict in creating overlap, duplication and difficulty claiming outcomes was considered low and frequency of occurrence was also considered low, with 50 per cent of respondents being neutral.
Table 5.10

**Significance relating to complementarity of core business conflict creating duplication, overlap and difficulties claiming outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level of neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complementarity of agency core business creates overlap, duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes, leading to core business conflict</td>
<td>8 agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of respondents consider impact high/low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementarity of agency core business creates overlap, duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes, leading to core business conflict</td>
<td>9 low</td>
<td>1 = low impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occurrence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of respondents consider occurrence never/always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementarity of agency core business creates overlap, duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes, leading to core business conflict</td>
<td>9 infrequent</td>
<td>1 = 1 never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.

Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Table 5.10 records the significant responses concerning complementarity of agency core business creating overlap, duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes. There were no responses that were significant specifically in relation to the research problem – agreement, considered high impact and frequent occurrence. Figures 5.18 – 5.20 (pages 280 -281) are bar graphs illustrating the responses.

**Figure 5.18**

*Bar graph showing level of agreement that complementarity of agency core business creates overlap, duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes*

![Bar graph showing level of agreement that complementarity of agency core business creates overlap, duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes](image)

Source: Developed for this research.

Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.18 shows 50 per cent of respondents indicated a tendency to agree that complementarity of agency core business created overlap, duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes, the strength of support is off-set by six respondents who had a tendency to disagree, including one respondent who rated this 5 for disagree.
Figure 5.19

**Bar graph showing level of impact of complementarity of agency core business on creating overlap, duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes**

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview data.

Figure 5.19 shows that respondents had a tendency to consider the level of impact to be low, of complementarity of agency core business creating overlap, duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes.

Figure 5.20

**Bar graph showing level of occurrence of complementarity of agency core business creating overlap, duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes**

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview data.

Figure 5.20 had a high level of neutrality (50 per cent of respondents), with the remaining responses indicating a tendency to consider the level of occurrence to be infrequent, of complementarity of agency core business creating overlap, duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes.
Survey question 6a, b and c

Survey 6a, b and c investigated the most dominant effects of complementarity of agency core business on agency relationships when working together, identified through the interviews. The most common effects were:

- Supports quality and effective relationships
- Encourages cooperation and collaboration
- Communication is easier
- Information sharing occurs

- Work towards mutual benefits from project and leverage off each other
- Improves ability to negotiate

There was general agreement with the effects of complementarity amongst agencies on their relationship as noted in the six areas identified above. There was also a general tendency to consider the impact to be high, and to consider the rate of occurrence of the effects as frequent.

Table 5.11 records the factors with the 50 per cent or more respondents having indicated a tendency to agree/disagree, consider the impact high/low and the occurrence never/always. All are significant (agreement, high impact, high occurrence), in relation to the research problem and thus shaded.

Table 5.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of core business conflict</th>
<th>Significance of complementarity of agency core business enhancing agency working relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Supports quality and effective relationships’</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Encourages cooperation and collaboration’</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Communication is easier’</td>
<td>15 agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Information sharing occurs’</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Work toward mutual benefit from projects &amp; leverage off each other’</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Improves ability to negotiate’</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11 continues…
Table 5.11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>No of respondents that consider the impact high/low</th>
<th>No of respondents rating 5 = high impact 1 = low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Supports quality and effective relationships’ 10 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘encourages cooperation and collaboration’ 9 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Communication is easier’ 11 high</td>
<td>3 = 1 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘information sharing occurs’ 12 high</td>
<td>3 = 1 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Work toward mutual benefit from projects &amp; leverage off each other’ 11 high</td>
<td>3 = 1 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Improves ability to negotiate’ 10 high</td>
<td>1 = 1 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>No of respondents that consider occurrence tends to be never/always</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 5 = always 1 = never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Supports quality and effective relationships’ 9 frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Encourages cooperation and collaboration’ 11 frequent</td>
<td>2 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Communication is easier’ 11 frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘information sharing occurs’ 11 frequent</td>
<td>2 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Work toward mutual benefit from projects &amp; leverage off each other’ 10 frequent</td>
<td>2 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Improves ability to negotiate’ 11 frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.  
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

All of the areas chosen for investigation by the survey attracted 50 per cent or more respondents with a tendency to agree, consider impact high and occurrence to be frequent.

**The nature of core business conflict**

Implications regarding the research issue about the nature of core business conflict were that complementarity of agency core business affects agency working relationships across the six areas investigated, and most notable in communication, information sharing, mutual benefit and leverage, and improving ability to negotiate. The findings build a strong case for seeking complementarity or for identifying complementarity as a tool to facilitate agencies working together.

Interview question 2 regarding effects of core business conflict on agency relationships included similar items being negative impacted, with the opposite of mutual benefit being agencies focusing on their own benefit.

**For agencies with complementarity of core business, investigating whether different interpretations of key roles is a fundamental core business conflict**

**Survey question 7-4a, b and c**

Question 7 explored areas identified in the interviews as fundamental core business conflict. Question 7-4a, b and c investigated specifically the issues concerning differing interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business as a fundamental core business conflict.
Respondents disagreed with ‘differing interpretation of agency key roles and objectives amongst agencies with complementarity of core business’ being a fundamental core business conflict, however if it occurred the impact was considered high, but the occurrence infrequent. The bar charts in Figures 5.21, 5.22 and 5.23 (pages 284-285) illustrate the responses.

Figure 5.21

*Bar graph showing level of agreement that differing interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business is a fundamental core business conflict*

![Bar graph showing level of agreement that differing interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business is a fundamental core business conflict](source)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.21 shows that there was a fairly strong tendency to disagree that differing interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business was a fundamental core business conflict.

Figure 5.22

*Bar graph showing the level of impact of differing interpretations of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business*

![Bar graph showing the level of impact of differing interpretations of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business](source)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.22 shows respondents tended to consider the impact to be
high from differing interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business as a fundamental core business conflict, if this occurred.

Figure 5.23

Bar graph showing level of occurrence of differing interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business

![Bar graph showing level of occurrence of differing interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business](image)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.23 shows that respondents considered the level of occurrence to be infrequent, of differing interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business as a fundamental core business conflict.

Table 5.12 records significant responses regarding the interpretation of key roles and objectives amongst agencies with complementarity of core business with the 50 per cent or more respondents having indicated a tendency to agree/disagree, consider the impact high/low and the occurrence never/always. However, these results are not significant specifically in relation to the research problem because no factor was rated by more than 50 per cent of respondents on all three dimensions for agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence.

Table 5.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance of interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business as a fundamental core business conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Differing interpretation of agency key roles and objectives amongst agencies with complementarity of core business'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Differing interpretation of agency key roles and objectives amongst agencies with complementarity of core business'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Differing interpretation of agency key roles and objectives amongst agencies with complementarity of core business'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.
Comparison of responses from 2a, b and c; 3a, b and c and 6a, b and c

As previously identified, the findings from survey questions 2a, b and c suggested that agencies with complementarity were less likely to experience core business conflict than agencies that did not have complementarity of core business; that the impact from core business conflict had a greater tendency to be lower when there was core business complementarity, and that the tendency for occurrence of core business conflict was not frequent.

The positive influence of complementarity of GA core business concurred with the findings in 6a, b and c that identified that agency core business complementarity enhanced relationships and had a positive influence, which were generally the opposite of the negative impacts of conflict on agency relationships discovered in interview question 2.

Respondents indicated some level of agreement in survey question 3a, b and c that complementarity of core business led to overlap, duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes. The impact was considered to be low and 50 per cent of respondents were neutral regarding the level of occurrence. Overall, therefore the case that complementarity of core business leads to overlap, duplication and difficulties in claiming outcomes is not strong.

Question 7-4a, b and c identified that respondents tended to disagree with the differing interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business occurring as a fundamental core business conflict. Respondents indicated that if this conflict did occur, the impact was considered to be high, but respondents indicated a strong tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of to be low.
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**Examining fundamental core business conflict**

**Interview question 6** Please outline any examples of fundamental core business conflict whilst working with other agencies in joint projects.

This question explored what may be involved in fundamental core business conflict. A fundamental core business conflict is one that is centred on the GA’s role and responsibility, as delegated by Government and is generally evident in the Vision and Mission statements of the GAs and the underlying ‘philosophy’ applied in carrying out their core business.

Respondents drew from their own experience of working with other agencies in regional development projects. However, respondents struggled to give examples of this type of conflict. Twelve respondents stated they had never experienced fundamental core business conflict.

Fundamental core business conflict related to two main areas – legislation and the philosophical/ideological issues relating to economic philosophy and values versus environmental philosophy and values. The spread of all three levels of government and regional and head office was present in these two main areas. Federal agencies, with one exception, did not identify experiencing fundamental core business conflict. Agencies also stated it was more important to focus on what was possible to do together.

Those who identified fundamental core business conflict noted elements that related to a clash of philosophical and ideological elements. Some respondents nominated legislation and differences in interpretation of legislation across agencies, which linked to
power, authority and jurisdiction views; whilst others noted the philosophical/ideological
issues relating to economic philosophy and values versus environmental philosophy and
values and just general ideological differences. There were no outstanding differences
between Head Office and Regional Office respondents. There was no noticeable difference
amongst agencies at different levels of Government or the role position of respondents.

Respondents indicated that interpretation and jurisdictional responsibility meant some
agencies had similar core business intentions, but that the interpretation of their core business
differed and thus created difficulties.

Discussions also revolved around views relating to power, authority and jurisdiction. For
example, respondents suggested that agency legislative responsibilities created a power
and authority role over other agencies with no legislative power, and that the legislative
responsibilities of agencies were fundamental to those agencies’ modus operandi and were
seen as indubitable. The lack of power behind an agency’s responsibility to deliver its core
business, for example having no Acts legitimising agency activity was also seen to have an
impact on working together. In addition, agencies could interpret Acts differently.

Unrelated to the question was the view that difficulties were more related to
delivering core business for political masters, including their instruction for policy changes,
instead of responding to and servicing community. This is a non-core business issue.

The dominant themes from the discussion are shown in the bar chart in Figure 5.24.

*Figure 5.24*

*Bar graph of the main themes associated with fundamental core business conflict*

![Bar graph of the main themes associated with fundamental core business conflict](image)

Source: Developed for this research.

Source: Compiled from analysis of interview data.
Figure 5.24 (previous page) illustrates that the main fundamental core business conflict themes are interpretation of Acts and regulations; philosophical and ideological core conflict; power, authority and jurisdiction; and economic versus environmental focused agency clash. The only other area related to agency performance where agencies saw focusing on their own core business as the only legitimate activity. Power, authority and jurisdiction had the widest range of comments in this theme.

Table 5.13 illustrates the range of sub-groups in the themes that emerged from question six, as well as the number of total responses within a theme. The shaded items were incorporated into the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clash of service delivery related philosophy/ideology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Philosophical core business conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow or purist interpretation of own core business and area of responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Philosophical core business conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General philosophical/ideological differences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philosophical core business conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative powers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Legislation and regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative interpretations for core business and conflict arising in order to fulfill core business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Legislation and regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative responsibility shapes core business and focus of decisions creating conflict</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Legislation and regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic versus environmental focus influencing decisions and values</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Economic versus environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on own core business, seen as only legitimate focus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional overlap with agencies that have complementarity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher level focus on agency’s own individual jurisdictional responsibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power through legislative role creating conflict</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different interpretation of key roles &amp; objectives in agencies with core business complementarity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview data

**Nature of Core Business Conflict**

Implications for the research issue about the nature of core business conflict, were that fundamental core business conflict was not seen as being common. However areas that were identified being related to fundamental core business conflict included interpretation of Acts and regulations, philosophical difference between philosophy and ideology; issues relating to power, authority and jurisdiction; and economic versus environmental focused core business conflict clash.
Survey questions 7a, b and c

Survey questions 7a, b and c examined the main areas of potential fundamental core business conflict identified through the interviews. The areas to be further explored in the survey were:

- Philosophical/ideological differences generally
- Economic focused agencies’ clash with environmental focused agencies due to fundamental differences of values.
- Conflict in interpretation of Acts & regulations in order to fulfil core business
- Differing interpretation of key roles and objectives amongst agencies with core business complementarity

There was not a strong level of agreement across the four factors noted, with the exception of philosophical/ideological differences generally. There was disagreement about conflict between economic and environmental focused agencies, and differing interpretation of key roles and objectives amongst agencies with complementarity of core business. Interpretation of Acts and regulations had a slightly strong tendency to agree, but five respondents rated this neutral (Refer Figure 5.25).

If the factors listed above occurred, the level of impact was considered high, especially economic/environmental conflicts and different interpretations of Acts and regulations. Philosophical/ideological differences attracted a neutral rating from six respondents. Level of occurrence tended to be considered to be infrequent, with the exception of philosophical/ideological differences that attracted a neutral rating by six respondents.

Figure 5.25 and 5.26 (pages 291) show neutral ratings as the mode. Figure 5.26 is also unusual as it displays evenly balanced opinion either side of the stronger neutral position.
Figure 5.25
Bar graph showing level of agreement with conflict in interpretation of Acts and regulations in order to fulfill core business

Figure 5.25 shows the conflict arising from differing interpretation of Acts and regulations in order to fulfill core business is rated neutral by five respondents and the remaining respondents have only a slightly greater tendency to agree with this as a fundamental core business conflict.

Figure 5.26
Bar graph showing high level of neutral rating regarding the level of occurrence of philosophical/ideological conflicts

Figure 5.26 shows that respondents’ opinion was evenly spread either side of the mode which was a neutral position of three.

Table 5.14 records significant responses regarding the items being explored as fundamental core business conflicts. Significant responses are those with 50 per cent or more respondents having indicated a tendency to agree/disagree, consider the impact high/low and
the occurrence never/always. No results are significant specifically for the research problem, which would include 50 per cent of respondents having agreement, and considering impact to be high and occurrence to tend to be frequent. The Table notes neutral ratings that are significant or influence the overall strength of tendency of responses. These include agreement for ‘conflict in interpretation of Acts and regulations in order to fulfil core business’, high impact of ‘philosophical/ideological differences generally’ and occurrence of ‘philosophical/ideological difference generally’.

**Table 5.14**

*Significant responses relating to factors identified as fundamental core business conflicts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No of respondents rating 1 = agreement or 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level of neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Economic focused agencies’ clash with environmental focused agencies due to fundamental differences of values’</td>
<td>9 disagree</td>
<td>1 = 5 disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict in interpretation of Acts &amp; regulations in order to fulfil core business (refer Figure 5.25)</td>
<td>6 agree</td>
<td>2 = 1 agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Differing interpretation of key roles and objectives amongst agencies with core business complementarity’</td>
<td>9 disagree</td>
<td>1 = 5 disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>No of respondents consider impact high/low</strong></td>
<td><strong>No of respondents rating 1 = low or 5 = high impact</strong></td>
<td><strong>High level of neutrality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical/ideological differences generally</td>
<td>6 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Economic focused agencies’ clash with environmental focused agencies due to fundamental differences of values’</td>
<td>11 high</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Conflict in interpretation of Acts &amp; regulations in order to fulfil core business’</td>
<td>11 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Differing interpretation of key roles and objectives amongst agencies with core business complementarity’</td>
<td>10 high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occurrence</strong></td>
<td><strong>No. of respondents consider occurrence never/always</strong></td>
<td><strong>No of respondents rating 1 = never or 5 = always</strong></td>
<td><strong>High level of neutrality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical/ideological differences generally (refer Figure 5.26)</td>
<td>5 frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Economic focused agencies’ clash with environmental focused agencies due to fundamental differences of values’</td>
<td>8 infrequent</td>
<td>1 = 1 never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Conflict in interpretation of Acts &amp; regulations in order to fulfil core business’</td>
<td>9 infrequent</td>
<td>2 = 1 never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Differing interpretation of key roles and objectives amongst agencies with core business complementarity’</td>
<td>10 infrequent</td>
<td>1 = 1 never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data

**The nature of core business conflict**

Implication for the research issue about the nature of core business conflict relating to fundamental core business conflict was that this type of conflict was not as frequent, was hard to identify and did not have strong ratings. Of the key factors identified as fundamental core business conflicts there was agreement for philosophical/ideological differences, but opinion was more neutral regarding impact and level of occurrence. There was disagreement regarding economic and environmental philosophical conflicts and different interpretations of roles and objects, with occurrence for both considered infrequent, but impact high if they occurred. There was a neutral focus relating to agreement for different interpretation of Acts and regulations, a tendency to consider impact high, but occurrence infrequent. Impact was highest for economic/environmental conflicts and different interpretations of Acts and regulations.
Investigating functional/operational core business conflict

**Interview question 7** Please outline any examples of functional/operational core business conflict that has occurred whilst working with other agencies in joint projects.

This question explored functional/operational core business conflict. The areas associated with power, authority and jurisdiction, and reporting and accountability are the dominant themes from the interviews. Power, authority and jurisdiction as a theme covered a spectrum of areas that are identified as examples of functional/operational core business conflict. These related to levels of control, management, authority and delegation that in turn affected capacity for decision-making. The responses from interviewees also reflected the issue of centralised and de-centralised agencies that affected decision-making and local level of authority when working together. Interviewees suggested there were conflicts between regional staff committing to projects at the regional level that had little support at the head office level or within their own hierarchy. Interviewees indicated this area also contributed to the complexities that existed for reporting and accountability from a region, due to hierarchical structures. An additional area that affected functional/operational core business was the jurisdictional boundaries. Sometimes these overlapped or services provided were duplicated or involved mutual clients.

Intangible areas that influenced how agency operational functions are carried out were mentioned and included corporate and management culture, which influenced attitudes.

Respondents highlighted that there were differing processes and systems amongst agencies to deliver their core business. Interviewees raised a number of functional/operational conflicts relating to these two themes. These included the agencies’ own strategic plans and units’ business plan that were focused on delivering on their agency core business, with little flexibility to embrace new projects and activities. These plans, it was pointed out, determined budget and funding for programs. Other issues mentioned were differing processes and systems for reporting and accountability; financial management and accountability; and information management.

Program design was also a functional/operational conflict area, which related to agencies’ core business. Interviewees considered that inflexibility in criteria of programs and
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funding and mismatch in funding cycles from agencies that do ‘rounds’ of funding, created difficulties.

Resources and information are highlighted as an area of conflict, with agencies having already committed their resources to deliver on their own core business. Agency culture was seen to influence willingness to share information and resources.

Staffing and personnel issues were identified by interviewees. They concerned the level of ‘acting’ roles, creating staffing inconsistencies, and the ability to make staff available, when the agency required staff to fulfil their own core business activities and services. In addition, staff skill levels were raised as an issue. These staffing issues reflected organisational structure and management, with the skill issue being non-core business related.

There were some slight differences between head office and regional office respondents. These are highlighted below:

- **Head office** respondents highlighted overlap of jurisdiction; commitment at operational level that is not supported upwards in the agency; corporate style; different financial systems; program design; agency commitment to delivering on KPIs in core business; accountability; and funding that is contingent on other agencies also providing funding.

- **Regional respondents** highlighted funding cycles and level; no succession planning for staffing reflecting the difficulties that constant staff movements and ‘acting’ roles caused; staff shortages; and head office making decisions that were not related to regional situation and needs.

Other differences included: reporting and accountability comments that were dominated by agencies with an economic and social focus; issues regarding overlaps and duplication raised by environmental focused agencies; finally, Local government was dominant in comments regarding program design and flexibility.
Figure 5.27 identifies the key factors and issues raised by interview respondents, as functional/operational core business conflicts.

**Figure 5.27**

*Key factors and issues relating to functional/operational core business conflict*

| Source: Developed for this research. |
| Source: Compiled from analysis of interview data |

Dominant areas for investigation through the surveys included internal structures, agencies focusing on their own KPIs, resource limitations affecting commitment levels, strategic plan constraints, inflexible programs, funding and funding cycles, limitations in local decision-making, reporting and accountability differences, lengthy approval process, timeframes to deliver, staff availability, staff skills and experience and duplication and overlap of services. Power, authority and jurisdiction had the widest range of comments in this theme.

Table 5.15 presents the sub-groups in each theme and total responses to each theme for question 7. The shaded areas were further explored through the survey.
### Table 5.15
**Number of sub-groups in each theme and total responses to question 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agency focus only on own core business to deliver on their own KPI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference in targets for each agency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level of openness or defensiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ministerial communication needs &amp; issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication &amp; overlap</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication amongst agencies serving same clients &amp; with similar programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies’ strategic plans leave little room for discretionary participation &amp; financial support of projects</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Management structures and approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silo mentality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Management structures and approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporate culture &amp; style,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organisation structure &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal structures &amp; procedures meaning agencies may have to deal with different areas within one agency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Organisation structure &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff availability due to constant staff change including many ‘acting’ roles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Personnel related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no succession planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personnel related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff skills &amp; experience &amp; ability to address regional needs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Personnel related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy differences &amp; clashes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external political pressure to fulfill a Ministerial expectation or commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Political issues &amp; influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval processes are lengthy causing delays</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference between operational level &amp; senior management in level of support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differing decision-making procedures and levels amongst agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centralisation versus decentralisation affecting capacity for decision-making at the local level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local decision-making limited</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency turf protection for decision-making</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jurisdictional boundaries &amp; cross-overs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different delegation between commonwealth &amp; state</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding cycles mismatched</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of flexibility in processes &amp; systems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different processes &amp; systems creating</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interdependency of funding arrangements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of flexibility in programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program design with different criteria, including for funding</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple &amp; repetitive reporting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountability is dominant driver for some agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different and onerous reporting requirements &amp; timeframes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding complexities and fiscal requirements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centralised reporting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15 continues…
Table 5.15 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reluctant to give commitment due to limitations in resources and funds as funds committed to own core business outcomes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources generally</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding resources available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties with timeframes and milestones</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframes unrealistic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timeframes for achieving outcomes &amp; milestones</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concurrent timeframes hard to manage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview data

The nature of core business conflict

The implication for the research issue regarding the nature of core business conflict is that the dominant themes of functional/operational core business conflict relate to power, authority and jurisdiction (encompassing things like delegation, decision-making, centralised/decentralised agency arrangements, boundaries), and reporting and accountability. Intangible factors in an operational sense, included organisational and management culture. Practical operational issues related to different processes and systems, different financial and reporting arrangements, business and strategic planning, information and resource limitations, program and funding criteria, and personnel issues (acting roles, skill levels). There were also issues relating to agency performance (focusing on own KPIs), timeframes and efficiency (duplication and overlap amongst agencies with similar programs).

Head offices tended to highlight factors relating to jurisdiction, corporate style, funding, reporting and accountability and fulfilling KPIs. Regional offices highlighted staff issues, funding cycles and constraint and head office decision-making. Overlaps and jurisdictional issues were highlighted by economic and environmental focused agencies. Local Governments raised issues regarding program design and flexibility.

The survey explored the dominant themes and sub-groups within themes of functional/operational core business conflicts identified in the interviews.

Survey question 8a, b, c

Survey questions 8a, b and c investigated the following areas drawn from the interviews:

- Conflict due to internal structures i.e. the spread and responsibilities of different internal units (meaning that in joint projects, agencies may have to deal with several different areas of one department)
- Each agency focuses on fulfilling their own KPIs
- Reluctance to make commitments due to limitations of resources (funds and people already committed to deliver core business)
- Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects or discretionary budget
- Programs and funding criteria are inflexible
- Funding cycles are mismatched

297
• Decision-making is limited at the local level (i.e. centralised control)
• Approval processes are lengthy
• Reporting and accountability is onerous & differ across agencies
• Timeframes for achieving outcomes/ milestones
• Staff availability, including the fact that many agencies have staff in ‘acting’ roles

• Staff skills and experience relating to regional needs
• Duplication and overlap of services, particularly with agencies that have similar programs

One respondent declined to rate these questions at all. Overall, respondents indicated agreement with the dominant functional/operational core business conflicts identified through the interview process occurred when agencies worked together. ‘Overlap and duplication, particularly agencies with complementarity of core business’ had an equal number of respondents supporting agreement and disagreement, but still a tendency to agree due to four respondents rating 1 (Refer Figure 5.28 page 300). The largest number of respondents agreed with ‘Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects and discretionary budget’ (12 respondents, four rating ‘one’), with ‘onerous and different reporting and accounting’ attracting the highest number rating one for agreement (5 respondents). Staff skills and experience attracted a high neutral rating by five respondents.

Generally, respondents indicated that the impact of these factors, when they occurred, was high. However, ‘Reporting and accountability is onerous and differs across agencies’ attracted equal number indicating impact tending to be high or low (Refer Figure 5.29 page 301). ‘Overlap and duplication, particularly amongst agencies with similar programs and services’ had only a slightly stronger tendency to consider impact high as the mode extended equally across rating two, three and four. (Refer Figure 5.30 page 301).

The level of occurrence, however, did not contain a similar convergence of views. ‘Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects and discretionary budget’ attracted the greatest number of respondents rating the occurrence as frequent (12, with one rating ‘five’). Higher neutral ratings were made for some factors, including ‘Reluctance to make commitments due to limitation of resources’ (seven rated this neutral), and ‘agencies focus on own KPIs’ and ‘timeframes to achieve outcomes and milestones’ both having six respondents rate them neutrally. More respondents indicated a tendency for ‘duplication and overlap of services, particularly agencies with similar programs and services’ to occur less
frequently, but there was a slightly greater tendency to consider this to occur frequently due to two respondents rating this five or ‘always’. (Refer Figure 5.31 page 302)

Significant factors with 50 per cent or more respondents indicating tendency to agree/disagree, considering the impact as high/low and occurrence tending to be never/always are shown in Table 5.16. The most significant factors relating to the research problem are shaded (having agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence rating by 50 per cent or more respondents across all three areas).

Table 5.16
Significant responses relating to functional/operational core business conflict factors and issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict due to internal structures i.e. the spread and responsibilities of different internal units (meaning that in joint projects, agencies may have to deal with several different areas of one department)</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>3 rating 1 = agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each agency focuses on fulfilling their own KPIs</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>4 rating 1 = agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to make commitments due to limitations of resources (funds and people already committed to deliver core business)</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td>4 rating 1 = agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects or discretionary budget</td>
<td>12 agree</td>
<td>4 rating 1 = agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs and funding criteria are inflexible</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td>2 rating 1 = agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding cycles are mismatched</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>3 rating 1 = agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making is limited at the local level (i.e. centralised control)</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>4 rating 1 = agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval processes are lengthy</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>4 rating 1 = agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and accountability is onerous &amp; differ across agencies</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>5 rating 1 = agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframes for achieving outcomes/milestones</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>3 rating 1 = agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conflict due to internal structures i.e. the spread and responsibilities of different internal units (meaning that in joint projects, agencies may have to deal with several different areas of one department) | 8 high | 1 rating 5 = high impact |
| Reluctance to make commitments due to limitations of resources (funds and people already committed to deliver core business) | 8 high | 1 rating 5 = high impact |
| Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects or discretionary budget | 12 high |

Programs and funding criteria are inflexible | 9 high | 1 rating 5 = high |
| Funding cycles are mismatched | 8 high | 3 rating 5 = high |
| Decision-making is limited at the local level (i.e. centralised control) | 10 high | 2 rating 5 = high |
| Approval processes are lengthy | 9 high | 3 rating 5 = high |
| Timeframes for achieving outcomes/milestones | 10 high | 2 rating 5 = high |
| Staff availability, including the fact that many agencies have staff in ‘acting’ roles | 9 high |
| Staff skills and experience relating to regional needs | 8 high |
| Each agency focuses on fulfilling their own KPIs | 6 always | 1 rating 5 = always 6 |

Table 5.16 continues…
Table 5.16 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = never or 5 = always</th>
<th>No of respondents tending to consider occurrence as never/always</th>
<th>High level of neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to make commitments due to limitations of resources (funds and people already committed to deliver core business)</td>
<td>7 always</td>
<td>5 rating 5 = always</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects or discretionary budget</td>
<td>12 always</td>
<td>1 rating 5 = always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs and funding criteria are inflexible</td>
<td>8 always</td>
<td>1 rating 5 = always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval processes are lengthy</td>
<td>8 always</td>
<td>2 rating 5 = always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and accountability is onerous &amp; differ across agencies</td>
<td>8 always</td>
<td>3 rating 5 = always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframes for achieving outcomes/ milestones</td>
<td>7 always</td>
<td>2 rating 5 = always</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff availability, including the fact that many agencies have staff in ‘acting’ roles</td>
<td>10 always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

The most significant factors relating to the research issue that are functional/operational core business conflicts relate to ‘Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects or discretionary budget’, ‘program and funding criteria are inflexible’, and ‘approval processes are lengthy’.

Staff problems are obviously an issue (availability, acting roles and capabilities), but respondents appear ambivalent about rating skills and experience limitations as demonstrated by neutral ratings. Interesting and anomalous results are presented in Figures 5.28 -5.32 on pages 300-302.

*Figure 5.28*

*Bar graph showing responses relating to the functional/operational core business conflict of duplication and overlap, particularly with agencies that have similar programs*

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.28 shows an equal number of respondents tending to agree or disagree with the functional/operational core business conflict of duplication and overlap of services,
particularly with agencies with similar programs. However, there is a stronger tendency to agree due to four respondents rating this one.

Figure 5.29

Bar graph showing equal opinion regarding the level of impact of the functional/operational core business conflict of onerous and differing reporting and accountability.

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.29 shows that there is equal opinion regarding the level of impact as tending to be high or low of the functional/operational core business conflict arising from onerous and differing reporting and accountability.

Figure 5.30

Bar graph showing responses for the functional/operational core business conflict impact of duplication and overlap of services, particularly of agencies with similar programs.

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figures 5.30 presents almost equal opinion on impact tending to be high or low, of the functional/operational core business conflict of duplication and overlap of services,
particularly of agencies with similar programs. There is a slightly greater tendency to consider the impact high due to two respondents rating this five.

**Figure 5.31**

*Bar graph showing level of occurrence of functional/operational core business conflict due to overlap and duplication of services, particularly amongst agencies with similar programs*

![Graph showing level of occurrence of conflict due to duplication and overlap of services, particularly amongst agencies with similar programs.](image)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.31 shows that a larger number of respondents considered the rate of occurrence to be infrequent for the functional/operational core business conflict due to duplication and overlap of services, particularly amongst agencies with similar programs. However, there is a slightly stronger tendency to consider this to be frequent due to two respondents rating five ‘always’.

**Figure 5.32**

*Bar graph showing rate of occurrence of functional/operational core business conflict due to staff skills and experience relating to regional needs*

![Graph showing rate of occurrence of conflict due to staff skills and experience relating to regional needs.](image)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.32 is particularly unusual, with responses shared equally
across rating two, three and four, resulting in no definitive tendency.

### The nature of core business conflict

Implication for the research issue regarding the nature of core business conflict is that the dominant functional/operational core business conflicts stem from power, authority and jurisdiction, processes and systems, agency performance, program and funding criteria inflexibility, efficiency and duplication, reporting and accountability, staffing issues, resource and information resources. Functional/operational factors are both practical factors (different systems and procedures, financial and reporting, different organizational structures) and intangible factors such as organizational and management cultures.

In terms of the research problem, this type of core business conflict is strongly influenced by public sector management practices due to many of the factors involving systems, procedures and policies. Some factors identified are the consequences of this type of conflict, for example timeframes to achieve outcomes and deliverables.

The largest number of respondents agreed with ‘Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects and discretionary budget’. Agreement was strongest for ‘Onerous and different reporting and accounting’ with the highest number rating one for agreement (5 respondents).

The most significant functional/operational core business conflicts are ‘Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects or discretionary budget’, ‘program and funding criteria are inflexible’, and ‘approval processes are lengthy’.

Opinion regarding the rate of occurrence of conflict due to staff skills and experience relevant to regional needs was spread evenly over rating two, three and four.

### Lead agency role – impact on whether more or less conflict is experienced

**Interview question 11** How does being the lead agent affect the level and type of core business conflict compared to just being a participant in a project?

This question examined the influence that being a lead agent had on the level and type of core business conflict experienced. As no themes emerged in the responses, no bar graph is provided to illustrate themes in the responses.

Responses were inconclusive regarding whether the lead agent role affected the level and type of core business conflict experienced. However there were a number of interesting viewpoints discussed that are presented below. The dominating discussion areas concerned: commitment, authority and a lead agent’s responsibilities.

There were two perspectives on the role of lead agent in relation to level of conflict. The first was that the lead/s may experience conflict because they were responsible for the project, but had the power to deal with issues, and could cause conflict in the process of
managing people, resources and driving the project. The level of the lead agency authority was considered to also influence capacity to manage conflict.

The second perspective was that the lead/s might experience less conflict because they have a greater commitment and motivation to achieve outcomes, because of a vested interest in and responsibility for the project. They would have to manage any factors that threatened the project, to ensure their own outcomes from the project. Effectively managing and reducing conflict was therefore to their advantage.

The status of agencies as lead or non-lead and level of commitment an agency had was also raised. Non-lead agencies were seen as subservient, having to comply with requests from the leads agency/ies. There was the view that this could result in non-lead agencies having a lower level of commitment. Alternatively it could lead to an agency adopting a role of support and collaboration. Interviewees felt that this subtle difference would influence conflict levels.

Five interviewees indicated that it was not about being the lead or not being the lead agency, but about the quality of the team to manage the project and ability to do that well.

Other issues discussed concerned reciprocity of inter-agency activity and the usefulness of partnership or Memorandum of Understanding arrangements that would set out roles and responsibilities and deliverable.

As the lead/s role and the competency of the lead was considered to have a potential to influence capacity to manage or resolve core business conflict, a survey question asked the value of including selection of lead agency in the process model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The nature of core business conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implication for the research issue concerning the nature of core business conflict regarding whether being a lead agency affects the level of core business conflict experienced is that there were three main viewpoints. They were: level of commitment; level of authority; and responsibilities of a lead agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five interviewees felt that lead agency role was irrelevant; it was about the quality and capability of the team involved in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were opposing viewpoints regarding whether the lead agency experienced more or less conflict. There was a view that there was less conflict as it was the responsibility of the lead to manage the project to reduce or avoid conflict, and it was to their advantage to maintain a low level of conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opposing view was that the lead agency role and responsibility and motivation to drive project could create conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confirming the value of including identifying the lead agent role in the process model

Survey 14-5 a and b

This survey question is part of the final survey question which seeks respondents’ indication of their level of agreement with factors identified for inclusion in the process model, as well as their opinion regarding the level of impact the inclusion of the listed items could have on reducing core business conflict. Question 14-5 a and b specifically asked about including identifying the lead agency in the process model and the impact this could have on reducing core business conflict.

Respondents indicated that there was strong tendency to agree that the lead and their role should be included in the process model. The level of impact of doing so is considered high. Both Figure 5.33 and 5.34 are significant with more than 50 per cent of respondents indicating agreement and the impact to be high.

Figure 5.33
Bar graph indicating level of agreement to include identifying lead agent in process model

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.33 indicates strong support for including identifying the lead agency in the process model.
The nature of core business conflict
Implication for the research issue concerning the nature of core business conflict indicates that including the lead agency role and responsibility in the process model is desirable.

Conflict caused by non-core business factors

Interview question 12 What other factors, not related to core business conflict, may cause issues and impediments to agencies working together?

To explore more widely the conflict experienced when agencies work together, this question investigated non-core business conflict factors

The most dominant factor related to politics. The main issues included political and ministerial interference, political agendas, political influence, and differing political parties at the various levels of Government. All Federal agencies mentioned political influences.

The second most dominant factor was ‘personalities’. Elements relating to personality covered ego, control and authoritarianism, career motivation, management style, and risk aversion. Some respondents also expressed the view that management style could be influenced by the culture of the organisation.
Other factors mentioned were associated with location. These included remoteness affecting staffing; access to expertise and limitations in the range of services and communications available. Distance and isolation were identified as creating challenges for agencies meeting together, liaising with head office, and with head office having little understanding of the local situation and needs. One other situational issue raised by a number of interviewees concerned limitations of resources within the community, which was seen to affect what agencies could achieve in cooperation with community.

Interviewees also cited Community expectations of government as an issue, including the mismatch between what the Government wanted to achieve and what the community considered they needed, or wanted.

The lack of skill and experience amongst staff in regions, as well as difficulty retaining skilled staff was identified as a problem. Although this is not explicitly linked to distance and remoteness, interviewees considered these factors could influence staff decisions to leave.

The demographics of the region were seen to play a role in creating difficulties, with examples being low incomes, low skills, and an ageing population, creating a challenging environment in which to achieve outcomes. Federal agencies also referred to the local situation in a community as an influential factor creating issues, and included drought, racial factors and economic downturn.

The last factor mentioned related to Government and machinery of government. Interviewees indicated that general Government culture and structure meant that there was no clear mandate in Government about how agencies should effectively inter-relate and cooperate. Core business was seen to be subject to change. This was due to constant re-shuffling of departments, both internally and externally, which created disruption to relationship building, and could involve amendments to jurisdictional responsibilities.

It was felt that there was a need for Queensland to decentralise its agencies from South East Queensland. A number of interviewees indicated that agencies should not be withdrawing staff from regions, as this compounded the problem of regional communities facing reduced or poor service provision.
The spread of non-core business factors affecting agencies working together is illustrated in Figure 5.35, which clearly shows that political and personality factors dominate. Political factors have the widest range of comments in that theme.

**Figure 5.35**  
*Non-core business-related factors that cause conflict*

![Bar chart showing the distribution of non-core business-related factors causing conflict among agencies.](chart)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview data.

Table 5.17 presents the sub-groups within each theme and the number of responses falling into the two groups.

**Table 5.17**  
*Number of sub-groups in each theme and total number of responses in themes involved in non core business-related conflict.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>govt response to community mismatch with community needs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>community expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations regarding what government will do</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochialism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>local attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ownership of projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>local attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personalities generally</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Personalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17 continues…
Table 5.17 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ego &amp; desire for kudos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personalities career focus therefore risk averse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive &amp; authoritarian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>management style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old fashioned management style</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Management style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unable to be strategic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>management style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political influence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>political factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial interference &amp; political agendas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>political factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differing political parties at the various levels of government</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>political factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local politics &amp; lobby groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>political factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politicising of issues &amp; client needs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>political factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political capability of DGs and Ministers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>political factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic changes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>exogenous influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>war</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>exogenous influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>exogenous influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought, economic downturn</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Local situational environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/cultural issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local situational environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact from natural disasters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>natural disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>staff competency(skills &amp; experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retention of skilled &amp; experienced staff &amp; turnover levels</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>staff competency(skills &amp; experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community resource limitations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>media influence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>media influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demographics affect regional projects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff changes cause loss of corporate knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>loss of corporate knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance affecting meeting &amp; links with head office</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>tyranny of distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance &amp; isolation or remoteness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>tyranny of distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff changes from reorganisation &amp; also new areas with whom to deal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>departmental reorganisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk aversion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>organisational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way of conducting business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>organisational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past experience of dealing with agency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>agency image &amp; standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standing amongst peer agency - value, power therefore respect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>agency image &amp; standing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview data.

Areas selected for further investigation in the surveys included political influence, personality factors, resource limitations, local situation, demographics, distance and community expectation.

The nature of core business conflict

Implication for the research issue concerning the nature of core business conflict is that other factors also cause conflict, and some of these are quite powerful. The dominant factor was politics (political interference and influence, political agendas and differing political parties across three levels of Government. Personalities were also a key influence. Other factors included distance and isolation, demographics, and local situation, for example drought. Staff skills and experience and machinery of government changes were also cited as issues.
Survey 12a, b and c

This question investigated the most common non-core business-related factors that interviewees indicated cause conflict when agencies work together. The areas investigated by the survey cover:

- Ministerial influence/interference
- Political agendas
- Different political parties at the three levels of government
- Personality
- Management style (e.g. authoritarian)
- Resource limitations in community
- Local situational environment (e.g. drought, racial issues)
- Demographics
- Distance and level of isolation
- Community expectation.

Overall there was general agreement that the non-core business issues listed above affect agencies working together. ‘Different political parties at three levels of government’ (14 respondents, six rating ‘one’) and ‘Political agendas’ (14 respondents, three rating ‘one’) attracted the highest number of respondents, with the former also having the highest number of respondents rating ‘one’. The factor with the weakest agreement was ‘Management style’, (six respondents, two rating ‘one’), which had only a slightly stronger tendency to agree. There were an even number of respondents either side of the neutral three, but two rated ‘one’ (agree) and only one rated ‘five’ (disagree). (Refer to Figure 5.36, page 311).

Impact was considered highest for ‘Ministerial interference/influence’. The impact of ‘Political agendas’ and ‘different political parties at three levels of Government’ was also considered high, and both also had a high number of respondents rating ‘five’. ‘Resource limitations in community’ had a higher neutral rating than other ratings (Refer to Figure 5.37, page 311).

The opinion on rate of occurrence was diverse. ‘Ministerial influence’, ‘political agendas’ and ‘Different political parties at three levels of Government’ were rated as tending to occur frequently, with the ‘political party’ factor being the one attracting the larger number of responses. ‘Management style’, ‘Resource limitations in community’, ‘local situation’, ‘demographics’ and ‘distance and isolation’ were generally considered to occur infrequently. ‘Personality’ issues attracted a high neutral rating for occurrence by 50 per cent of respondents (Refer Figure 5.40 on page 313).
Opinion was only slightly in favour of high impact for ‘Local situational environment’, as both high and low impact attracted the same number of responses, with two respondents rating five and one respondent rating one (refer to Figure 5.38, page 307).

Opinion regarding demographic issues was inconclusive. Opinion was spread across a tendency to consider the impact high, neutral choice and tendency to consider impact to be low. However there was a slightly stronger tendency to consider the impact to tend to be low, with the rating of ‘one’ by one respondent. (Refer to Figure 5.39, page 312).

**Figure 5.36**  
*Bar graph indicating only slight tendency to agree that management style is a non-core business issue*

Source: Developed for this research.  
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.36 shows that there is an almost even opinion with management style as a non-core business issue of management style.

**Figure 5.37**  
*Bar graph indicating a high neutral rating of ‘resource limitations in community’*

Source: Developed for this research.  
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.
Figure 5.37 (previous page) shows there was a high neutral opinion regarding the level of impact of the non-core business conflict issue of resource limitations within the community affecting agency relationships when working together.

**Figure 5.38**

*Bar graph indicating an almost even opinion regarding 'local situational environment'*

![Bar graph showing local situational environment impact](image)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.38 indicated a slightly stronger opinion regarding the impact of local situational environment.

**Figure 5.39**

*Bar graph indicating the level of impact of demographics on agency relationship*

![Bar graph showing demographics impact](image)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.39 shows that opinion was almost evenly spread across tendency to consider impact low, neutral and high. However, the rating 'one' strengthened the tendency to consider impact to be low.


Figure 5.40
*Bar graph indicating high neutral opinion regarding the occurrence of personality difficulties*

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.40 shows a high neutral opinion regarding the rate of occurrence of non-core business factor of personality difficulties affecting agency relationships when working together.

Figure 5.41 shows that opinion regarding ‘Community expectations’ was spread equally between considering the occurrence to tend towards always or never.

Figure 5.41
*Bar graph indicating an equal opinion regarding the level of occurrence of the influence of community expectation.*

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.
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Significant factors with 50 per cent or more respondents indicating tendency to agree/disagree, considering the impact as high/low and occurrence tending to be never/always are shown in Table 5.18. The most significant factors relating to the research problem are shaded (having agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence rating by 50 per cent or more respondents across all three areas).

**Table 5.18**

*Significant responses relating to factors that are non-core business related*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No of respondents rating 1 = agreement or 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level of neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial influence/interference</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>1 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political agendas</td>
<td>14 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different political parties at the three levels of government</td>
<td>14 agree</td>
<td>6 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource limitations in community</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>4 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local situational environment (e.g. drought, racial issues)</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>4 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>1 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance and level of isolation</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td>2 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>No of respondents consider impact high/low</th>
<th>No of respondents rating 1 = low or 5 = high impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial influence/interference</td>
<td>14 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political agendas</td>
<td>13 high</td>
<td>6 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different political parties at the three levels of government</td>
<td>13 high</td>
<td>6 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>8 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource limitations in community</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>6 low</td>
<td>1 = 1 low</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance and level of isolation</td>
<td>10 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community expectation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>No. of respondents consider occurrence never/always</th>
<th>No of respondents rating 1 = never or 5 = always</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial influence/interference</td>
<td>9 always</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different political parties at the three levels of government</td>
<td>10 always</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management style (e.g. authoritarian)</td>
<td>8 never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>9 never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance and level of isolation</td>
<td>8 never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

The most significant factors relating to the research problem are ministerial influence/interference; different political parties at the three levels of government. Factors attracting higher neutral responses regarding impact are ‘Resource limitations in community’ and ‘Demographics’, and in rate of occurrence, ‘Personality’.
The nature of core business conflict
Implication for the research issue concerning the nature of core business conflict is that there are also other factors that affect agencies working effectively together. The most dominant are political elements (ministerial influence and interference, political agendas and different parties at different levels of government) with ‘Ministerial influence and interference’ and ‘Different parties at different levels of government’ being most significant. Distance and level of isolation was also a significant factor, but was seen to occur infrequently, with responses likely. It was agreed that ‘Personalities’ caused conflict and had high impact, however there was a strong ‘neutral’ position regarding level of occurrence. ‘Management style’ and ‘Demographics’ were also considered to occur less frequently.

5.5. Research Issue 2 - The relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs working together

Introduction

The interview questions 5, 6, 7 and 8 and survey questions 4a, b and c; 7a, b, and c; and 8a, b and c investigate this issue. Interview and survey findings already covered in section 5.4 are reviewed against the issues and impediments identified by participants.

5.5.1 Interview and survey findings

The second research issue examines the link between core business conflict and the conflicts, issues and impediments identified by agencies when working together.

Issues and impediments experienced when GAs work together

Interview question 5 Think of some projects in which your agency has been involved with multiple agencies – what issues and impediments arose during those projects?

This question asked interviewees to identify issues and impediments they have experienced when working together in projects. The data from this question and questions on the functional/operational and fundamental core business conflict are compared to find links and commonalities between core business conflict and issues and impediments identified.

The issues and impediments identified by interviewee were of three types. There were practical issues such as mismatched funding cycles and reporting requirements. There were outcome issues that were caused by another issues such as project delays caused by limited decision-making capacity at a local level. The third types of issues were intangible issues, with ‘personalities’ and ‘agency culture’ being examples.
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The key practical issues mentioned included limited decision-making capacity locally; jurisdictional boundary overlaps and gaps; rigid performance measures and demand to fulfil KPIs; different and multiple reporting and accountability requirements; duplication of activities; mismatched funding cycles; inflexibility in funding and program criteria; legislative timeframes, concurrency and other issues; limited resources from poorer agencies; staff inconsistency and onerous bureaucratic processes.

The outcome issues included: project delays; community expectations not fulfilled; uncoordinated agency activities; inability to deliver on outcomes and deliverables within timeframes; poor cooperation and collaboration; and negative impact on inter-agency relationships. Intangible issues included risk-averse management and personalities.

Many of the key themes inter-relate, or exist in slightly different forms under other themes and within sub-groups, for example ‘organisational structure and culture’. Management practices and operational processes reflect the organisational culture and structure. Onerous bureaucratic processes may have been developed due to the management structure and organisational structure and culture. Another example was that an agency’s power, authority and jurisdiction shape the processes and policies that an agency develops to carry out their core business.

Interviewees highlighted that new public sector management practices, policies and principles influenced management style and approaches, and organisational structure and processes. This included the strong focus on efficiency, effectiveness, and equity of access to services.

Key areas in program design mentioned related to limitations in flexibility in funding and eligibility criteria, but also included reference to the difficulties that different funding cycles create in trying to coordinate funding applications for projects. This area links to processes and systems.

Interviewees indicated legislative requirements from multiple GAs involved in projects as posing problems due to concurrency requirements, conflict and ‘grey’ areas that emerged as legislation was applied within projects. Interviewees pointed out that this could be because of the unique situation in which a combination of legislation was being applied.
Legislation also affected/dictated timeframes for projects and could create ‘conditional’ situations.

Organisational culture and structure were seen to affect values, policy and relationships. Internal structure was considered by some interviewees to create difficulties because sometimes an agency had to deal with several different units within a department. In addition, some units conflicted with each other.

Government performance was seen to be affected and there was a perception that Government activities were ‘uncoordinated’. Interviewees also mentioned that the rigid performance measures and demand to focus on KPIs meant that agencies did not always fully commit or had limited capacity to commit to projects outside their core business.

Jurisdictional boundaries and responsibilities and gaps were raised as part of power, authority and jurisdiction themes. Additionally, the issues associated with limited decision-making capacity locally created timeframe problems, including issues arising from centralised versus decentralized agencies. This could be linked to power and authority. Several interviewees stated that centralised agencies lacked regional knowledge. Another influence mentioned was the limiting effect that arose due to lack of senior authority to support projects.

Interviewees also identified personnel factors that included concern over the skills of some staff in regions, lack of regional knowledge at head office and the difficulty of keeping staff so that corporate knowledge was constantly lost. There seemed to be a major issue with lack of consistency of staff in projects, due to ‘acting’ roles. The impact of negative personalities was also raised as an issue.

The most commonly mentioned issue relating to agency performance was the fact that agencies focused on their own KPIs and core business. Other issues mentioned relating to this area included agencies’ need for kudos and recognition of outcomes, which was also a problem when agencies were involved in WOG activities.

In the management structure and approaches theme, risk aversion was a key issue, followed by management exhibiting a silo mentality and using authoritarian approaches. The culture of the agency was seen to influence management approaches as much as individual personalities.
Efficiency and duplication was linked to the power, authority and jurisdiction theme. Duplication from overlapping jurisdictional boundaries and shared clients was mentioned. Confusion amongst clients was considered an issue where two agencies had the same client group.

Onerous bureaucratic processes were highlighted as a problem in processes and systems. This area linked with implementing programs, gaining approval and the different reporting and accountability processes used. Additional views were that agencies had different processes and systems that were not easy to integrate when working together.

Resources and information resources included access to funds as issues, particularly from ‘poorer’ agencies’ that had little ability to contribute to projects. Their contribution tended to be ‘in kind’.

Government performance in relation to Community expectations was of concern for social and economic focused agencies particularly. The point was made that community expectations were not fulfilled sometimes.

In terms of reporting and accountability, interviewees mentioned multiple reporting needs and particularly the difficulties created by different reporting and accountability expectations and processes. Reporting and accountability was commented on more by head offices and by agencies with an economic or economic and social focus.

A number of interviewees were of the view that many of the projects were derived from or were to be driven by community introduced other difficulties such as engagement of community and fitting such projects into already established agency plans. The strategic level of planning in an agency was therefore seen as a limiting factor in some agencies, restricting their capacity to contribute to/participate fully in projects.

Political issues do not relate to core business conflict. However interviewees mention them as an issue they faced. The issue includes political influence and interference as occurring.

The themes attracting the most discussion included power, authority and jurisdiction; program design; agency and government performance; organisational structure and culture; outcomes and deliverables, reporting and accountability; personnel; management structures and approaches; legislation and regulations; government performance; community and client
benefit; efficiency and duplication; personalities; cooperation and collaboration; timeframes and communication.

Dominant themes that arose from the discussion are shown in Figure 5.42. Power, authority and jurisdiction have the widest range of comments in that theme.

**Figure 5.42**

*Bar graph showing the common themes of issues and impediments affecting agencies working together as identified by interviewees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on fulfilling KPIs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid performance measures</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of WOG versus need to fulfill State agencies’ own KPI</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays in project</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.19 continues…
Table 5.19 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have to re-negotiate project outcomes</td>
<td>2 outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays on achieving outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
<td>3 Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about delivering on own agency outcomes</td>
<td>3 Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor communication</td>
<td>6 Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community expectation unfulfilled</td>
<td>8 Community &amp; client benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community let down by slowness or limitations in project outcomes</td>
<td>4 Community &amp; client benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralised agencies not in touch with regional needs</td>
<td>3 Community &amp; client benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to cooperate or collaborate</td>
<td>5 Cooperate &amp; collaborate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to share information</td>
<td>4 Cooperate &amp; collaborate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of services, particularly to shared clients</td>
<td>5 Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of activities and previous efforts</td>
<td>7 Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects do not fit neatly in jurisdictional boundaries</td>
<td>2 Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited decision-making locally</td>
<td>10 Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boundary overlaps and gaps</td>
<td>9 Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies unwilling to work outside jurisdictional boundaries creating gaps</td>
<td>3 Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues stemming from centralized and decentralized agencies</td>
<td>3 Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community view of government as uncoordinated</td>
<td>6 Government performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncoordinated agency activities</td>
<td>9 Government performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation can be restrictive</td>
<td>2 Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation issues</td>
<td>3 Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation timeframes and concurrency</td>
<td>11 Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silo mentality</td>
<td>Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk averse management</td>
<td>9 Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management culture authoritarian</td>
<td>3 Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management capability limited</td>
<td>2 Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational culture creates barriers</td>
<td>3 Organisational structure &amp; culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal organization structure in silos</td>
<td>8 Organisational structure &amp; culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and structure of organizations does not encourage working together</td>
<td>4 Organisational structure &amp; culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal conflicts affect projects</td>
<td>3 Organisational structure &amp; culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff skill levels</td>
<td>3 Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff availability</td>
<td>3 Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting roles interrupt continuity of staffing in projects</td>
<td>11 Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities</td>
<td>9 Personalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political interference &amp; point scoring</td>
<td>6 Political</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.19 continues…
### Table 5.19 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political agendas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State versus Federal politics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some agencies' processes are complex &amp; slow things</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Processes and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies differ in processes for spending money</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Processes and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onerous and bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Processes and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different processes used by agencies complicate things, e.g. contracting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Processes and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexibility of funding criteria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs do not fit community need very well</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding cycles are mismatched</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited flexibility outside of own agency core business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reporting and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and accountability requirements differ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reporting and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to use multiple reporting &amp; accountability processes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Reporting and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict over reporting and accountability processes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reporting and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial reporting can complicate reporting needs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reporting and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources available</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorer agencies unable to commit funding resources, so provide only in-kind support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe blow out due to delays</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing timeframes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview data.

---

**The relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs working together**

The implications for the research issue concerning the relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs working together is that there are three categories: practical issues, issues that are the outcome of another issue, and intangible issues.

Areas associated with processes and systems and management and accountability are strongly influenced by the legislative and regulatory roles of some agencies. These areas are also shaped by public sector management practices and legislative requirements.

The top ten issue themes are power, authority and jurisdiction; program design; agency and government performance; organisational structure and culture; outcomes and deliverables, reporting and accountability; personnel; management structures and approaches; legislation and regulations.

**Survey 4a, b and c**

Survey questions 4a, b and c sought to confirm the list of issues and impediments.
identified as most dominant from analysis of the interview data. The survey also investigates the level of impact each had, as well as how often they occurred. The issues and impediments from the interview were:

- Political issues (agendas, interference, party difference)
- Personality difficulties
- Decision-making limitations locally
- Jurisdictional boundary overlaps & gaps
- Rigid performance measures & demand to fulfill own KPIS
- Differing & often multiple reporting & accountability requirements
- Onerous bureaucratic processes
- Project delays
- Duplication of activities
- Community expectations not fulfilled
- Uncoordinated agency activity
- Funding cycles mismatch
- Inflexibility of funding criteria & programs
- Legislative timeframes &/or concurrency requirements
- Limited resources from ‘poorer’ agencies
- Staff constantly changing due to ‘acting’ roles, no continuity
- Risk averse management
- Internal agency silos

There was general agreement with the issues identified above occurring when agencies worked together. However ‘jurisdictional boundary overlaps and gaps’, which had a mode of ‘three’ indicating a high level of neutrality, and ‘limited resources from poorer agencies’ showed a tendency for respondents to disagree. (Figures 5.43 and 5.44 on page 322-323). One other factor, ‘Funding cycles mismatched’, was rated neutral (score of three) by fifty per cent of respondents (Figure 5.45 on page 323). Strongest agreement was for ‘Political issues’ (13 respondents, two rating ‘one’); ‘Decision-making limitations locally’ (13 respondents, two rating ‘one’); ‘Personality difficulties’ (11 respondents); ‘Onerous bureaucratic processes’ (11 respondents, four rating ‘one’); and ‘Project delays’ (11 respondent, three rating ‘one’). The factor with the most rating ‘one’ for agreement (five respondents) was ‘Internal agency silos’.

*Figure 5.43*

**Bar graph showing high level of neutral response to jurisdictional boundary overlaps and gaps as an issue when working together**
Figure 5.43 (previous page) shows the mode as ‘three’ representing a high level of neutral opinion regarding agreement as to whether jurisdictional boundary overlaps and gaps were an issue when agencies worked together.

**Figure 5.44**

*Bar graph showing tendency to disagree that limited resources are available from ‘poorer’ agencies*

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.44 shows that there was a slightly stronger tendency to disagree that ‘limited resources available from ‘poorer’ agencies’ was an issue when agencies worked together.

**Figure 5.45**

*Bar graph showing high level of neutral opinion regarding funding cycles being mismatched as an issue when GAs worked together*

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.45 shows the mode as ‘three’ with 50 per cent of respondents holding the neutral opinion regarding agreement that mismatched funding cycles are an issue when agencies worked together. Of the remaining respondents, there was a tendency to agree.
In terms of impact, highest impact identified by respondents was for ‘Personality difficulties’ (11 respondents, one rating ‘five’); ‘Decision-making’ (10 respondents, two rating ‘five’); ‘Community expectations not fulfilled; (10 respondents, two rating five) and ‘Risk averse management’ (10 respondents, one rating ‘five’).

There were neutral responses for six issues. Of those, there were four where the remaining respondents tended to consider the impact to be high: ‘Jurisdictional boundaries, overlaps and gaps’; ‘Different and often multiple reporting and accountability requirements’; and ‘Onerous bureaucratic processes’.

Neutral ratings where the remaining respondents for these areas indicated a tendency to consider the impact to be low included ‘Funding cycles mismatched’, ‘Rigid performance measures and demands to fulfil own KPIs’; and ‘Limited resources available from poorer agencies’. Figures 5.46 – 5.51 on pages 324-327 show the high neutral opinions.

Figure 5.46
*Bar graph showing high neutral rating for the impact of jurisdictional boundaries and overlap*

![Bar graph showing high neutral rating for the impact of jurisdictional boundaries and overlap](image)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.46 shows the high level of neutrality and the slight tendency for remaining respondents to consider the impact of jurisdictional boundaries and overlap issues to be high, when agencies worked together.
Figure 5.47
*Bar graph showing high neutral rating for the impact of differing reporting and accountability issues*

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.47 shows that the mode was three, thus indicating a high neutral rating. This is for the impact of differing and multiple reporting and accountability as issues when agencies worked together. Amongst the remaining respondents, an equal number of respondents indicated a tendency to rate the impact as high and low. However, the rating by one respondent of ‘five’ indicated a slightly stronger tendency to consider the impact to be high.

Figure 5.48
*Bar graph showing high neutral rating for the impact of onerous bureaucratic processes as an issue when agencies work together*

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.48 shows that the mode was three for the impact of ‘onerous bureaucratic Processes’ when agencies worked together, representing a high neutral rating. Of the
remaining respondents there was a strong tendency to consider the impact to be high.

**Figure 5.49**

*Bar graph showing high neutral rating for the impact of rigid performance measures and demand to fulfill KPIs as issues when agencies work together*

Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.49 shows the mode of ‘three’ for the impact of ‘rigid performance measures and demand to fulfil KPIs’ representing a neutral rating. Amongst the remaining respondents there was a strong tendency to consider the impact to be low (six respondents, with one rating ‘one’ for low).

**Figure 5.50**

*Bar graph showing high neutral rating for the impact of funding cycles being mismatched as an issue when agencies are working together*

Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.50 shows that the mode was ‘three’ showing a high neutral rating for the impact of funding cycles being mismatched as an issue when agencies worked together. Amongst the remaining respondents there was a tendency to consider the impact to be low.
Figure 5.51  
*Bar graph showing a high neutral rating for the impact of limited resources from poorer agencies as an issue when agencies work together.*

Figure 5.51 shows the mode as ‘three’, representing a high neutral rating for the impact of limited resources from ‘poorer agencies’ as an issue when agencies work together. Of the remaining respondents there was a tendency to consider the impact to be low.

Opinion on frequency of occurrence varied also and exhibited some degree of neutrality on a number of issues. Issues that respondents considered occurred frequently were ‘Political issues’ (11 respondents, one rating ‘five’); ‘Personality difficulties’ (10 respondents); and ‘Decision-making (10 respondents, one rating ‘five’). Fifty per cent of respondents indicated a tendency to consider ‘Duplication of activities’ to occur infrequently (Refer Figures 5.52) and slightly less than 50 per cent considered ‘Limited resources from poorer agencies’ as infrequent (Refer Figure 5.53, page 328).

Figure 5.52  
*Bar graph showing tendency to consider that duplication of activities occurs infrequently*

Source: Developed for this research.  
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.
Figure 5.52 (previous page) shows 50 per cent of respondents consider the occurrence of ‘duplication of activities’ to be infrequent.

Figure 5.53
Bar graph showing a tendency to consider limited resources from poorer agencies to occur infrequently

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.53 shows that 50 per cent of respondents consider the occurrence of ‘limited resources from poorer agencies’ to be infrequent.

Issues that attracted a high neutral response included ‘jurisdictional overlap and gaps’, with most of the remaining respondents indicating a tendency to consider the occurrence frequent, and ‘rigid performance measures and a demand to fulfill KPIs’, with most of the remaining respondents indicating a tendency to consider the occurrence infrequent.

Of note were two areas that had a neutral response by 50 per cent of respondents in relation to occurrence. They were ‘onerous bureaucratic processes’, with more of the remaining respondents indicating a tendency for this to occur frequently, and ‘legislative timeframes and concurrency’, which had evenly divided opinion for frequent and infrequent occurrence.
Figure 5.54  
*Bar graph showing a high neutral rating regarding the occurrence of issues relating to jurisdicational boundaries and overlaps*

![Jurisdictional boundaries & overlaps issues](image)

Source: Developed for this research.  
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.54 shows a high neutral rating for jurisdicational boundaries and overlaps occurring as an issue, and amongst the remaining respondents, a tendency to consider the occurrence frequent.

Figure 5.55  
*Bar graph showing high neutral rating for occurrence of rigid performance measures and demand to fulfill KPIs*

![Rigid Performance measures & demand to fulfill KPIs issues](image)

Source: Developed for this research.  
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.55 shows the mode of ‘three’, indicating a high neutral rating for occurrence of ‘rigid performance measures and demand to fulfill KPIs’. Amongst the remaining respondents, there was a slightly stronger tendency to consider occurrence infrequent, with one respondent rating ‘one’ for low.
Figure 5.56

*Bar graph showing 50 per cent high neutrality for occurrence of onerous and bureaucratic processes*

Figure 5.56 shows 50 per cent of respondents rating neutral the occurrence of onerous and bureaucratic processes, and of the remaining respondents, a tendency to consider this occurs frequently.

Figure 5.57

*Bar graph showing fifty per cent high neutrality for occurrence of legislative timeframe and concurrency issues*

Figure 5.57 shows 50 per cent of respondents rated neutral the occurrence of ‘legislative timeframe and concurrency’ issues.

Significant factors with 50 per cent or more respondents indicating tendency to agree/disagree, considering the impact as high/low and occurrence tending to be never/always are shown in Table 5.20. Where the mode is ‘three’ indicating high neutrality, this is also shown. The most significant factors relating to the research
problem are shaded (having agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence rating by 50 per cent or more respondents across all three areas).

Table 5.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political issues (agendas, interference, party difference)</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
<td>2 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality difficulties</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making limitations locally</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional boundary overlaps &amp; gaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid performance measures &amp; demand to fulfill own KPIS</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differing &amp; often multiple reporting &amp; accountability requirements</td>
<td>9 agreement</td>
<td>1 – 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onerous bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td>4 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project delays</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of activities</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>1 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community expectations not fulfilled</td>
<td>8 agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding cycles mismatch</td>
<td>Remaining opinion supports agreement 5</td>
<td>1 = agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexibility of funding criteria &amp; programs</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>4 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff constantly changing due to ‘acting’ roles, no continuity</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk averse management</td>
<td>8 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal agency silos</td>
<td>8 agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>No. of respondents tending to rate impact high/low</td>
<td>No. of respondents rating 5= high, 1 = low</td>
<td>High level neutrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political issues (agendas, interference, party difference)</td>
<td>8 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality difficulties</td>
<td>11 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making limitations locally</td>
<td>10 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional boundary overlaps &amp; gaps</td>
<td>Remaining opinion supports high 5</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid performance measures &amp; demand to fulfill own KPIS</td>
<td>Remaining opinion supports low 6</td>
<td>1 = 1 low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differing &amp; often multiple reporting &amp; accountability requirements</td>
<td>Remaining opinion supports high 5</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onerous bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>9 high</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project delays</td>
<td>8 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community expectations not fulfilled</td>
<td>10 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexibility of funding criteria &amp; programs</td>
<td>9 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative timeframes &amp;/or concurrency requirements</td>
<td>8 high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources from ‘poorer’ agencies</td>
<td>Remaining opinion supports low 6</td>
<td>2 = 1 low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff constantly changing due to ‘acting’ roles, no continuity</td>
<td>8 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk averse management</td>
<td>10 high</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal agency silos</td>
<td>9 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.20 continues…
### Table 5.20 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to consider occurrence frequent/infrequent</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = never, 5 = always</th>
<th>High level neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political issues (agendas, interference, party difference)</td>
<td>11 frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality difficulties</td>
<td>10 frequent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making limitations locally</td>
<td>10 frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional boundary overlaps &amp; gaps</td>
<td>Remaining opinion supports frequent 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid performance measures &amp; demand to fulfill own KPIs</td>
<td>Remaining opinion supports infrequent 5</td>
<td>1 = 1 never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onerous bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>Remaining opinion supports frequent 6</td>
<td>2 = always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project delays</td>
<td>9 frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of activities</td>
<td>8 infrequent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative timeframes &amp;/or concurrency requirements</td>
<td>Remaining opinion evenly spread over frequent and infrequent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources from ‘poorer’ agencies</td>
<td>8 infrequent</td>
<td>1 = 1 never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk averse management</td>
<td>8 frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal agency silos</td>
<td>8 frequent</td>
<td>3 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

The most significant factors in relation to the research problem are ‘political issues’, agendas, interference, and party differences’; ‘personality difficulties’; ‘decision-making limitations’; ‘project delays’; ‘risk averse management’; and ‘internal agency silos’.

### The relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs working together

Implication for the research issue concerning the relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs working together was that the most common issues included two non-core business intangible factors - politics and personalities.

There were 12 practical issues raised: decision-making; jurisdictional boundary overlaps; rigid performance measures and KPIs; different and multiple reporting and accountability; onerous bureaucratic processes; duplication of activities; funding cycles mismatch; inflexibility of funding and programs; legislative timeframes; limited resources from poorer agencies; staff constantly changing, and internal agency silos (the last attracting the greatest number of respondents rating ‘one’ for ‘agree’).

Outcomes issues caused by other issues included project delays, unfulfilled community expectations and uncoordinated government activity. There was one intangible issue - risk averse management.

Impact and occurrence attracted high neutral ratings. However, the greatest level of agreement was for political, personality, decision-making and project delays. The most supported high impact issues were personality, decision-making, community expectations and risk averse management.

The issues most supported for frequent occurrence were: political, personality and decision-making.
Interview question 8 What connection is there between the issues and impediments that your agency has experienced when working together with other agencies and what I have described as core business conflict?

Question eight asks agencies whether there is a connection between issues and impediments that interviewees identified for question five, and core business conflicts they identified in questions six and seven.

There was no clear difference between head office and regional office interviewees, between Federal and State agencies or relating to the focus of the agency.

Interviewees pointed out that agencies’ own processes and ways of operating limited the ability to think and act laterally, with a suggestion that agencies should forget KPIs for themselves and consider what needs or issues should be addressed in community. Another point that was made was that issues that arise are a reflection of management culture in agencies, with the exception of personalities being an issue.

Table 5.21 presents the findings from the analysis of the interview responses. With the exception of those who declined to comment or indicated they were unsure, the remaining interviewees indicated a connection. More than half the interviewees considered they were the same, linked or closely aligned. Three interviewees felt that one led to the other, with four interviewees who considered that they are connected at the functional/operational level. The comparison of core business conflicts with the issues supported this view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linked to some degree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closely aligned</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one leads the other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connection at a functional / operational core business level</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsure could be linked</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to comment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from interview data.

A comparison of identified issues and impediments and the fundamental and functional/operational core business conflicts identified in interview questions six and seven illustrates both linkages and areas that are exactly the same. The data used are the
key areas identified through the questions. The results of the comparison are presented below.

Areas common to issues and impediments and functional operational core business conflict:
- Duplication of activities
- Overlap of jurisdictional boundaries
- Decision-making
- Authority chains (power, authority & jurisdiction)
- Centralisation versus decentralisation
- Funding cycles mismatched
- Inflexibility of programs and funding
- Multiple reporting requirements
- Bureaucratic and onerous processes
- Differing reporting and accountability processes
- Agency focus on own KPIs
- Silo mentality in management
- Legislative issues
- Continuity of staff
- Lack of resources
- Funding constraints
- Organisation culture
- Organisation structure and silos

Findings from survey 8a, b and c covering factors that were the same or a sub-set of the above items from functional/operational core business conflicts indicated that strongest agreement was for inflexible program and funding criteria and funding cycles mismatched. However ‘decision-making’, ‘bureaucratic and onerous processes’, ‘differing reporting and accountability processes’, ‘agency focus on own KPIs’, and ‘organisation structure and silos’ had agreement from 50 per cent or more of respondents.

The areas which most respondents considered to have high impact were ‘inflexibility of program and funding’ and ‘decision-making’. Occurrence of the common areas was not seen as particularly frequent, although ‘inflexibility of program and funding criteria’ was considered to tend to occur frequently by 50 per cent of respondents.

The most significant factors were ‘agency strategic plan limitations’, which wasn’t an area raised in the issues and impediments. The other two areas which were significant were ‘programs and funding criteria are inflexible’; and ‘approval processes are lengthy’. These were both identified in the issues and impediments.

Areas common to issues and impediments and fundamental core business conflict:

There was only one link between issues and impediments and fundamental core business conflict, which related to legislative issues. Findings from survey 7a, b and c identified that fundamental core business conflict areas were not frequent and were hard to identify. Results indicated that there was a neutral view by 5 respondents regarding
level of agreement with different interpretation of Acts and regulations and a slight
tendency for the remaining respondents was to agree. The impact of this fundamental
core business conflict was considered high, but the occurrence was considered infrequent.

The relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs
working together
Implication for the research issue concerning the relationship of core business conflict to
issues and impediments affecting GAs working together, is that many issues are the same
and are predominantly functional/operational core business conflicts. They are also
practical issues. Issues that are linked to core business conflict tend to be the outcome
issues that stem from functional/operational issues such as decision-making limitations
slowing projects. The intangible issue ‘risk averse management’ was mentioned as a
functional/operational core business conflict.

5.6 Research issue 3 - Dominant core business conflicts

This section presents the findings regarding the dominant core business conflicts.

5.6.1 Interview and survey findings

Interview question 10 asked interviewees to identify the dominant core business
conflicts they experienced. Survey question 11a, b and c investigated in more depth the
most significant factors identified through analysis of the interviews.

Interview question 10 What would be the dominant issues and impediments or ‘core’
business conflicts experienced by your agency when working with other agencies in
projects?

In the main, respondents referred to functional/operational core business conflicts,
which were practical or outcomes issues. One exception was an interviewee who raised
the fundamental core business conflict of environment versus economic development.
The interviewee described these as ‘opposing driving philosophies.’ In addition,
respondents mentioned regulatory issues about land use and compliance, which could be
viewed as a fundamental core business conflicts, as they may have involved
philosophical differences.

Of the dominant issues and impediments identified, the top six included legislation;
program design; power, authority and jurisdiction; processes and systems; personnel
related; resources and information resources; and management structure and approaches.
There were two non-core business issues raised. These were ‘personalities’, and ‘political agendas and interference’.

There were no distinct differences between Head Office responses and Regional Offices, or between Federal and State agencies or in relation to the focus of the agency.

Legislation and regulations issues raised were about incompatibility of land use including regulatory issues and environmental impacts affecting sustainability. This was a direct regulatory conflict. There was also conflict due to the compliance requirements, arising from differing interpretation and application of regulations and legislation. The complexities of applying Acts and regulations were also highlighted.

Personnel issues raised concerned staff turnover and constantly dealing with people in acting roles, giving no consistency of staff in projects. In addition there were issues regarding the availability of staff with the appropriate skills to work in projects.

Management issues related to the capacity for flexibility in managing programs, silo mentality and risk aversion in senior management as well as differences between head office and regional office management practices.

Power, authority and jurisdictional boundaries theme was the largest theme area discussed and was complex. The most dominant factors related to decision-making. This included the limited ability for some agencies to make decisions locally and issues with some agencies having a head-office top-down approach. There were links with risk-averse management and lack of appropriately senior (authoritative) and skilled staff for decision-making involved in projects. These factors affected the approval processes, which often became lengthy, and also setting up and implementing projects. The authority behind projects and support from head office created difficulties too. In terms of jurisdictional boundaries, the previously raised issues of overlap and duplication of service was repeated.

In relation to program design, respondents strongly highlighted the problems caused by lack of flexibility in programs and funding criteria. This included the fact that programs and funding could not be adjusted to suit the timeframes required, and resources and funding available. Some agency funding was identified as quite restrictive. Funding cycles, where they existed, were often mismatched and made it difficult to
access a full range of funding for projects. This is particularly relevant for projects reliant for success on funds from different sources.

Interviewees highlighted that there was reluctance to commit resources due to the need to support agency’s own core business. A number of interviewees considered this an influential factor that affected levels of commitment from agencies, to projects.

Timeframe issues were divided into two areas. These were conflicting timeframes that occurred in projects and programs, and the impact of other factors that slowed down projects so that time frames could not be met. Factors affecting timeframes included decision-making, which made it difficult to achieve outcomes in the timeframes agreed. Additionally, the complexities in legislation and the application of regulations were contributing factors as certain areas of legislation involved concurrent approvals processes.

Processes and systems created conflicts. This stemmed from prescriptive and overly bureaucratic processes being applied. Lengthy approval processes were directly linked to decision-making and the theme of power, authority and approval were raised. Processes and systems that were in place also influenced the delivery of programs.

A number of other issues were raised to a lesser degree. Management issues related to the capacity for flexibility in managing programs, silo mentality and risk aversion in senior management. Issues relating to agency performance, communication, outcomes and deliverables and policy had minimal mention. Policy mismatch and policy philosophy differences between Federal and State agencies were mentioned.

Two other themes were cooperation and locational situation. Interviewees spoke about the importance of the level of cooperation amongst agencies at the local level to achieve regional outcomes. This linked to the second theme mentioned, regarding regions and remote areas that faced many issues and impediments to their growth and sustainability. These included population decline, skill shortages, and impacts from natural disasters such as flood and drought. Distance and isolation, as previously mentioned in other responses was highlighted again by a few interviewees. This factor, as an issue, meant there were infrastructure limitations, and issues of access to infrastructure and services faced by communities in areas of the regions. The
Government’s challenge, according to some respondents, was seen to be to ensure its ability to deliver services in the region equitably and within the boundaries of efficiency now demanded.

Figure 5.58 illustrates the key themes of dominant core business conflicts.

Figure 5.58
Bar graph showing the common themes involved in the most dominant core business conflicts

The top eight issues and impediments and core business conflict fell under the following themes legislation and regulation; program design; power, authority and jurisdiction; timeframes; processes and systems; personnel related; resources and information resources; management structure and approaches. Legislation has the widest range of comments in that theme.

Table 5.22 (page 339) illustrates the range of sub-groups in the themes that emerged from question 10. The shaded items were explored through the survey.
Table 5.22

The number of sub-groups in each theme and total number of responses to question 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>focus on core business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency charter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misinformation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on efficient use of gov. resources rather than outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlap of jurisdictions &amp; territories causing duplication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incompatibility of land use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Legislation &amp; regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory conflict &amp; issues</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Legislation &amp; regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict from application of regulations &amp; bureaucratic way they are enforced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Legislation &amp; regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal &amp; financial regulations constrain projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Legislation &amp; regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory complexity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Legislation &amp; regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional management style different to HO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silo mentality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varying levels of management commitment aligned with risk aversion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different cultures in organisations affects how Departments inter-relate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organisation structure &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency reluctance to contribute to other agency outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual attitudes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk aversion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff turnover</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Personnel related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff experience &amp; skills</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Personnel related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority behind projects, particularly need senior endorsement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited decision-making capacity locally</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head office centric and top down mentality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different levels of authority involved in projects across agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political issues &amp; influence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Political Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inflexibility of funding &amp; program criteria</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mismatched funding cycles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of time &amp; resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prescriptive &amp; bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approval process complex &amp; lengthy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource constraints</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reluctance to commit resources, already committed for agency core business</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reluctance to share information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy mismatch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.22 continues…
Table 5.22 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical differences between Federal and State policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differing reporting &amp; accountability requirements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflicting timeframes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delays &amp; slow decision-making affecting ability to keep to timeframes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from interview data for this research.

### Dominant core business conflicts

Implication for the research issue concerning the dominant core business conflicts is that they are predominantly from the functional/operational core business conflict area. The top eight include the functional/operational core business conflicts of: legislation; program design; power; authority and jurisdiction; timeframes; processes and systems; personnel related issues; resources and information resources; and management structure and approaches.

Non-core business issues were raised, being personalities and political factors, and reference to distance and location. Many of the factors raised, inter-relate, for example practical issues mentioned cause the outcomes issues. Examples are management approaches being influenced by power, authority and jurisdiction, which then affect program delivery and timeframes.

There are also issues arising caused by legislation issues, and instances of decision-making limitations relating to authority. Underpinning some of these areas are the different processes and systems designed to deliver individual agency core business, which are also influenced by power, authority and jurisdiction.

### Survey responses 11a, b, c

Survey questions 11a, b and c investigated the key issues and core business conflicts arising from analysis of interview question 10. The factors most commonly discussed are listed on below:

- Lack of program and funding flexibility
- Timeframes conflict or inability to meet timeframes
- Decision-making limitations locally
- Approval processes being lengthy
- Mismatched funding cycles
- Reluctance to commit resources, or resources already committed to core business
- No consistency of staff for projects
- Limitation in skills and knowledge amongst staff
- Regulatory conflicts
- Bureaucratic way regulations are applied

Overall there was a general level of agreement that the factors listed above were the most commonly occurring, with strongest agreement for ‘lack of funding flexibility’ (nine
respondents, one rating ‘one’); ‘funding cycles mismatched’ (nine respondents, three rating ‘one’), and ‘limitation in skills and knowledge amongst staff’ (nine respondents with three rating ‘one’). ‘Approval processes lengthy’ was rated neutral by 50 per cent of respondents (Refer Figure 5.59), whilst remaining respondents indicated agreement. ‘No consistency of staff for projects’, had an almost even opinion between agree and disagree, with a slight tendency to agree (Refer Figure 5.60 on page 342).

The level of impact was considered to generally tend to be high, with the factors rated by a higher number of respondents being ‘reluctance to commit resources or resources already committed to core business’ (11 respondents, two rating ‘five’); ‘no consistency of staff’ (11 respondents); ‘decision-making limited locally’ (10 respondents, one rating ‘five’), and ‘regulatory conflicts’ (10 respondents, three rating ‘five’). There was a high neutral view concerning ‘timeframes conflict or inability to meet timeframes’ and also for ‘lengthy approval processes’, (Refer Figures 5.61 page 342).

Opinion on rate of occurrence was predominantly that the factors being investigated were infrequent, with the exception of ‘no consistency of staff’, which had a high neutral rating (Refer Figure 5.62, page 343).

There was an almost even spread of opinion on the rate of occurrence of ‘reluctance to commit resources, or resources already committed to core business’, with only a slight tendency to consider these factors to occur infrequently (Refer Figure 5.63, page 343).

**Figure 5.59**

*Bar graph showing neutral response by 50 per cent of respondents regarding agreement that approval processes being lengthy*

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.59 shows the mode as ‘three’ being 50 per cent of respondents who held a
neutral view regarding ‘approval processes lengthy’ as a common core business conflict, however the remaining 50 per cent indicated strong agreement with five out of the eight respondents rating this ‘one’.

**Figure 5.60**  
*Bar graph showing opinion regarding no consistency of staff as a common core business conflict*

![Graph showing opinion regarding no consistency of staff as a common core business conflict](source: Developed for this research. Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.)

Figure 5.60 shows that there was an almost even opinion to agree or disagree that ‘no consistency of staff’ was a common core business conflict. However, two respondents rating ‘one’ indicates a slightly stronger tendency to agree with this factor.

**Figure 5.61**  
*Bar graph showing a high neutral view concerning the level of impact caused by timeframes conflicting, or inability to meet timeframes*

![Graph showing a high neutral view concerning the level of impact caused by timeframes conflicting, or inability to meet timeframes](source: Developed for this research. Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.)

Figure 5.61 shows high neutral opinion regarding impact on projects of ‘timeframes conflict, or inability to meet timeframes’.
Figure 5.62
*Bar graph showing high neutral opinion regarding rate of occurrence of no consistency of staff.*

![Bar graph showing high neutral opinion regarding rate of occurrence of no consistency of staff for projects](image)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data for this research

Figure 5.62 shows a high neutral opinion regarding the occurrence of ‘no consistency of staff’ as a common core business conflict. Of the remaining respondents, most indicate a tendency to consider this to occur frequently.

Figure 5.63
*Bar graph shows the opinion regarding the rate of occurrence of the issue ‘reluctance to commit resources or resources already committed to core business’*

![Bar graph showing the opinion regarding the rate of occurrence of the issue ‘reluctance to commit resources or resources already committed to core business’](image)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.63 shows there is an almost even opinion regarding the occurrence of the issue ‘reluctance to commit resources or resources already committed to core business’, however one respondent rated this ‘one’ indicating a slightly stronger tendency for consideration that this occurs infrequently.

Significant factors with 50 per cent or more respondents indicating tendency to agree/disagree, to consider the impact as high/low and the occurrence to tend to be never/always are shown in Table 5.23. A high level of neutrality is also shown, where this
occurs in relation to other rating. In relation to the research problem there are no significant factors (having agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence rating by 50 per cent or more respondents across all three areas).

Table 5.23
Significant core business conflicts from the dominant core business conflicts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of program and funding flexibility</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>1 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval processes being lengthy</td>
<td>8 agree</td>
<td>8 = 1 agreement</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatched funding cycles</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to commit resources, or resources already committed to core business</td>
<td>8 agree</td>
<td>2 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation in skills and knowledge amongst staff</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>3 – 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of program and funding flexibility</td>
<td>8 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making limitations locally</td>
<td>10 high</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval processes being lengthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatched funding cycles</td>
<td>8 high</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to commit resources, or resources already committed to core business</td>
<td>11 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No consistency of staff for projects</td>
<td>11 high</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation in skills and knowledge amongst staff</td>
<td>9 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory conflicts</td>
<td>10 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic way regulations are applied</td>
<td>9 high</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframes conflict or inability to meet timeframes</td>
<td>8 infrequent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No consistency of staff</td>
<td>Remaining opinion indicates frequent</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic way regulations are applied</td>
<td>8 infrequent</td>
<td>1 = 1 never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Dominant core business conflicts

Implication for the research issue concerning the dominant core business conflicts is that there were no ‘significant’ factors specifically in relation to the research issue itself, (having agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence rating by 50 per cent or more respondents across all three areas).

There is general agreement regarding the dominant factors identified from the interviews, and that their impacts were high, with the exception of the higher neutral response for ‘timeframes conflict or cannot be met’.

Surveys do not indicate that the occurrence of most factors is frequent. ‘Timeframes conflict or inability to meet timeframes’ had 50 per cent of respondents indicating this occurs infrequently, and ‘bureaucratic way regulations are applied’ had 50 per cent of respondents indicating this tended to occur frequently. ‘No consistency of staff’ attracted a high neutral opinion regarding occurrence, with the remaining respondents tending to consider occurrence for this factor as frequent.
5.7 Research issue 4 - The impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs relationships

Interview question nine investigates the impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs’ relationships. Findings are further explored through survey questions 9 a, b and c.

Interviewees had expressed the view that core business conflict affected community perceptions and opinion of Government. Regional development projects and other GAs’ joint initiatives depend upon good relationships with community, and very often on collaborative and partnership arrangements with community organizations and groups. With a potential to influence the effective development, implementation and achievement of outcomes of regional development projects and relationship with Government and Community, the comment regarding community perception of Government was investigated through survey 10a, b and c. The results are included as part of the findings for this research issue.

Information from interview question two and survey question 5 a, b and c is also summarized as additional findings relevant to research issue four.

5.7.1 Interview and survey findings

Impacts of issues, impediments and core business conflict on projects, their implementation and outcomes

Interview question 9 What effect do core business conflicts have on implementing projects and achieving project outcomes?

This question examines the impacts of issues and impediments and core business conflict on projects, their implementation and outcomes. The responses demonstrated the many linkages and flow-on effects amongst the different practical issues in functional/operational core business conflicts, resulting in outcomes issues that impacted on projects. The summary of responses which follows regularly refers to these linkages.

Interview responses showed that the main impact of core business conflict was on projects themselves and their outcomes and deliverables. The most common issue mentioned was that projects were slowed down or stopped and this impacted on achieving outcomes and deliverables in a timely fashion.
Various core business conflicts were used to explain an impact on project outcomes. Examples included explaining issues with the management structures, decision-making, onerous processes and systems that agencies used, which resulted in slowing down projects or halting them.

Reduction of outcomes was expressed in a variety of ways and was highlighted by almost half of the interviewees. Effects on outcomes included reduced quality, breadth, depth and value, as well as sometimes having to be amended and affecting how well objectives for projects were achieved.

Responses also involved discussions on the wider impacts and issues of core business conflict. For example, the flow-on effect from the impact on projects and their outcomes included affecting agencies’ relationships with each other, and consumed effort and resources to manage the difficulties the conflicts created. In addition, inability to deliver outcomes was seen to impact on agencies’ own performance and that of the Government, thereby creating a negative image of Government and agencies amongst community stakeholders.

The impact on relationships was mentioned by many interviewees as part of their response to the question. Although not specifically to do with the impact on the project and its outcomes, the impact of core business conflict on relationships (which ultimately would affect the implementation of projects) was strongly highlighted. ‘Frustration’ was the most commonly used expression to describe how staff felt. Negative relationships were seen to reduce agency willingness to cooperate, motivation and commitment amongst agencies working in the project. It was seen to sometimes result in withdrawal of support for the project by both agency and community stakeholders. There was also mention of longer term ramifications such as creating reluctance by agencies, to work together on future projects.

Interviewees indicated that management and/or agencies focused more on process than on outcomes. This was also seen as a Community perception of Government.

Delays to projects affected the timeframe in which to achieve outcomes and deliverables. This was an outcome issue in most instances, relating to decision-making or lengthy approval processes. Delays contributed to stakeholder frustration.

Efficiency and duplication were mentioned including wasting of time and resources to resolve issues. This impacted on the project as it redirected effort away from the project in
order to deal with conflicts. The redirection of effort was seen to interfere with the efficient delivery of the programs and projects, and in some instances, it was felt that the overall ‘cost’ of a project increased due to having to divert effort. Complex processes and program design were also seen to hinder efficient delivery of projects and ultimately their outcomes. Agencies also focused on their own KPIs, affecting the efficient delivery of the overall project.

Nine interviewees talked about the community perception of Government with comments regarding the Government as uncoordinated, wasting resources, not fulfilling its own priorities and concerned with process, not outcomes. As noted at the beginning of this section, whilst not a direct impact on projects and outcomes, this was selected for further investigation in survey question 10a, b and c.

Timeframes and failure to meet them was raised and was directly linked to factors that delay projects. Examples mentioned included slow decision-making and approvals; onerous bureaucratic processes; conflicting agency KPIs and differing systems and procedures.

Other general effects mentioned by interviewees were the linkage between core business conflict and their impacts, for example, the influence from lack of coordination of Government activity on the efficiency of the delivery of programs and projects. Interviewees suggested that this had budget implications arising from projects running over time adding. This was seen to add to the overall ‘cost’ of the project. Associated issues mentioned included having to adjust projects and difficulties fitting into funding cycles.

There were no specific detectable differences between the responses of head offices or regional offices, or in relation to the focus of agencies. However, one Federal agency raised the issue of conflict across levels of government. The main themes from the interview are shown in Figure 5.64 on page 348.
Figure 5.64

Bar graph showing themes relating to the impact of core business conflict on projects and project outcomes

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from interview data.

Figure 5.64 shows the dominant themes relating to the impact of core business conflict on projects and project outcomes. These extend beyond the impact specifically on the projects. The most dominant themes cover: project impact; outcomes and deliverables; relationships; efficiency and duplication; timeframes; cooperation; Government performance; and resources and information resources. Other themes are: management structure and culture; community and client benefit; community expectation; budget and finance; agency performance; processes and systems; power, authority and jurisdiction; communication; reporting and accountability; and organisational structure and culture. Relationships and outcomes and deliverables had the widest range of comments in those themes.

Table 5.24 on page 349 illustrates the range of sub-groups in the themes that emerged from question nine, as well as the total responses within a theme. The shaded items were explored in the survey 9a, b and c. As previously mentioned, aspects from the theme of ‘Government performance’ were also explored through the survey.
Table 5.24
The number of sub-groups in each theme and the total number of responses to question 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affects agency performance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects agencies own outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires negotiation to manage difficulties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication is time consuming to work through difficulties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community become the losers if projects fail</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community &amp; client benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community has different expectations to agencies about projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community expectations let down</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community has false expectations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal of support &amp; effort by stakeholders</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects willingness to cooperate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation is inefficient</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination across agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting delays affect efficiency of implementation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncoordinated gov effort</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Government performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government seen as wasting resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Government performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not achieve Gov. priorities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Government performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government concerned with process &amp; not outcomes &amp; benefits for community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Government performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on process not outcomes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on finance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass the buck philosophy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organisational structure &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces outcomes - quality, value &amp; breadth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed outcomes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require changed outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties can stimulate new solutions &amp; better outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not fulfil objectives completely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making is slow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy on lead agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget issues &amp; financial cycles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Process &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of processes make project management harder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create budget difficulties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Budget &amp; finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays may mean a project does not fit into financial year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Budget &amp; finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget impacts *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Budget &amp; finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration amongst stakeholders</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaming occurs in relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor relationships develop &amp; jeopardise future working together</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects regional relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative working relationships form</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays reporting &amp; accountability processes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects accountability if projects delayed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources &amp; time expended to resolve conflicts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources affecting inter-agency relationship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase overall ‘cost’ of project in terms of time, funds, personnel effort</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Project impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow down or stops project</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Project impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeopardises future project participation by agency partners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in timeframes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differing processes &amp; systems slow projects &amp; affect timeframes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extends timeframes in order to achieve deliverables</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from interview data.
The impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs’ relationships

Implication for the research issue concerning the impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs’ relationships is that projects are slowed down, delayed or even stopped.

Outcomes and deliverables are seriously impacted, with reduced quality, breadth and depth, and sometimes affecting the achievement of project objectives. Outcomes, deliverables and achieving objectives are part of agency performance and contribute to the government’s overall performance. A consequence from the project and outcome impact therefore was seen to be community not benefitting as much as it could, community perception that the Government was not coordinated and wasting resources.

Although the question was seeking impact on projects, a large number of respondents indicated that a major impact was on relationships, which were negatively affected. The deterioration in relationships affected interest in cooperating both within the current project and potentially for future project and could result in withdrawal of support and reduction in motivation by stakeholders. Frustration was a key description for the feelings staff felt.

Negative impact on projects and outcomes therefore has far reaching effects in the region, including limiting benefit to community, reducing effective working relationships amongst agencies and wasting resources.

Survey 9a, b and c

Survey question 9a, b and c investigated the most common impacts of core business conflict on project implementation and outcomes, as identified from analysis of data from responses to interview question nine. The most dominant impacts investigated are:

- Reduces outcomes
- Slows down or stops projects
- Creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated
- Implementation is inefficient
- Resources and time wasted on resolving issues
- Withdrawal of support and effort by some stakeholders
- Increase in overall ‘cost’ of the project (time, funds and personnel effort)

Overall, there is a general tendency to agree that the impacts listed above affect project implementation and outcomes. The lowest agreement is for ‘increase in the overall cost of projects’, which has almost 50 per cent of respondents indicating a neutral position (refer Figure 5.65 page 351). The highest level of agreement is for ‘difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframe’ (12 respondents, one rating ‘one’) and ‘resources and time wasted on resolving issues’ (10 respondents, four rating ‘one’). One respondent rated complete agreement for all.
One agency declined to rate the level of impact. However, in general, if the factors being examined occurred, there is a tendency to consider the impact on project implementation and outcomes as high. One respondent considered they were all low and one agency returned a neutral response for all. The areas identified with the highest impact were: ‘creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated’ (12 respondents, one rating ‘five’); ‘withdrawal of support and consequently effort, by some stakeholders’ (11 respondents, four rating ‘five’); ‘implementation is inefficient’ (11 respondents, three rating ‘five’); and ‘slows down or stops projects’ (11 respondents, one rating ‘five’). Six respondents indicated a neutral response for ‘increase in overall cost of projects’, the highest neutral rating of all factors (refer Figure 5.66 page 352).

One respondent declined to rate the level of occurrence, except for the first factor ‘reduces outcomes’ for which they returned a neutral response. Generally, opinion regarding occurrence of the factors were mixed. The areas rated with a strong tendency to be frequent were: ‘creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated’ (10 respondents, one rating ‘five’) and ‘slows down or stops projects’ (nine respondents). ‘Reduces outcomes’ attracted a neutral rating of 6, but amongst the remaining respondents there is a tendency to consider this to occur frequently (refer Figure 5.67, page 352). Two effects were rated as infrequent, being ‘resources and time wasted on resolving issues’ and ‘increase the overall ‘cost’ of the project (time, funds and personnel effort) (refer Figures 5.68 and 5.69 page 353).

Figure 5.65
Bar graph indicating neutral opinion regarding core business conflict impact on projects being to increase overall ‘cost’ of the project

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.65 shows that almost 50 per cent of respondents held a neutral opinion
regarding core business conflict impacting on projects by ‘increasing overall ‘cost’ of the project (funds, time and personnel). Amongst the remaining respondents, there was a strong tendency to agree with this impact.

*Figure 5.66*

**Bar graph indicating level of neutral response to core business conflict impact on projects being to increase overall ‘cost’ of the project**

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.66 shows the neutral response of ‘three’ to the impact of core business conflict on projects being to increase the overall ‘cost’ of the project. The neutral position shares the mode with respondent rating of ‘four’. Of remaining respondents there is a tendency to consider the impact of core business conflict increasing the overall ‘cost’ of projects, to be high.

*Figure 5.67*

**Bar graph showing neutral response to the level of occurrence of the impact of core business conflict on project implementation and outcomes as reducing outcomes**

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.67 showing the mode of ‘three’, a neutral response to the occurrence of the
the impact of core business conflict on project implementation and outcomes as ‘reducing outcomes’. Of the remaining respondents, there was a tendency to consider the occurrence to be frequent.

**Figure 5.68**

*Bar graph showing level of occurrence of the influence of the impact of core business conflict on project implementation and outcomes as resources and time wasted resolving issues*

![Bar graph showing level of occurrence of the influence of the impact of core business conflict on project implementation and outcomes as resources and time wasted resolving issues](image)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data

Figure 5.68 showing that the level of occurrence of resources and time wasted on resolving issues from core business conflict, which tends to be considered low.

**Figure 5.69**

*Bar graph showing level of occurrence of core business conflict impact on project implementation and outcomes as increase in the overall ‘cost’ (funds, time, personnel)*

![Bar graph showing level of occurrence of core business conflict impact on project implementation and outcomes as increase in the overall ‘cost’ (funds, time, personnel)](image)

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data

Figure 5.69 shows that the level of occurrence of core business conflict impacting on
project implementation and outcomes by increasing the overall ‘cost’ (funds, time and personnel) is considered low.

Significant factors with 50 per cent or more respondents indicating a tendency to agree/disagree, consider the impact high/low or the occurrence tending to be never/always are shown in the Table 5.25. The most significant factors relating to the research issue are shaded (having agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence rating by 50 per cent or more respondents across all three areas).

Table 5.25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduces outcomes</td>
<td>8 agree</td>
<td>1 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slows down or stops project</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>2 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated</td>
<td>12 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation is inefficient</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>4 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and time wasted on resolving issues</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>4 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal of support &amp; consequently, effort, by some stakeholders</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>4 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the overall ‘cost’ of the project (time, funds and personnel effort)</td>
<td>6 agree</td>
<td>2 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slows down or stops project</td>
<td>11 high</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated</td>
<td>12 high</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation is inefficient</td>
<td>11 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and time wasted on resolving issues</td>
<td>10 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal of support &amp; consequently, effort, by some stakeholders</td>
<td>11 high</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the overall ‘cost’ of the project (time, funds and personnel effort)</td>
<td>7 high</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduces outcomes</td>
<td>6 always</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slows down or stops project</td>
<td>9 always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated</td>
<td>10 always</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation is inefficient</td>
<td>8 always</td>
<td>1 = 5 always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data

The most significant factors relating to the research issue are that core business conflict ‘slows down or stops projects’; ‘creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated’; and that ‘implementation is inefficient’.
The impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs’ relationships

Implication for the research issue concerning the impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs’ relationships is that there is general agreement and consideration that impact is high for: reduces outcomes; slows/stops projects; difficulty achieving deliverables in timeframes; inefficient implementation; time and resources wasted on resolving issues; withdrawal of stakeholder support; and increase in overall ‘cost’ of project.

Opinion on level of occurrence was mixed. Wasting time and resources to resolve issues and increasing overall ‘cost’ of projects were both considered to occur infrequently.

Most significant factors relating to the research issue were slowing/stopping projects, difficulty achieving deliverables in timeframes and inefficient implementation.

As the discussion in the interview question nine illustrated, there are links and flow-on impacts from issues arising from core business conflict. The research issue significant factors mentioned above are all outcome issues caused by core business conflict practical issues.

Does core business conflict affect the Community’s perception of Government?

Survey 10a, b and c

This question investigates the view that core business conflict affects the image of Government and Community perception of Government. The factors selected for investigation were identified following analysis of data gathered from interview question nine. Core business conflict was seen to encourage the perception of Government by Community as:

- uncoordinated
- wasting resources
- failing to fulfil its own priorities
- concerned with process, not outcomes & benefits to community

One respondent declined to respond to all parts of this question. Amongst other respondents, there was a tendency to agree with two areas seen to affect the Government image in the Community. These were ‘Government seen to be uncoordinated (eight respondents, one rating ‘one’ ) and ‘Government seen to be wasting resources (eight respondents, one rating ‘five’ . Opinion on ‘Government seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities’ was almost evenly distributed between agree and disagree, but there was a slightly stronger tendency to
disagree (refer Figure 5.70). There was also disagreement on ‘Government seen to be concerned with process not outcomes’ (Refer Figure 5.71 on page 357).

There was a general tendency to consider the impact of these factors on the image of government to be reasonably high, with the exception of one respondent who tended to disagree, scoring ‘two’ for all factors. The highest impact was seen to be potentially from ‘government seen to be wasting resources’ (11 respondents, four rating ‘five’) and ‘government seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities’ (10 respondents, four rating ‘five’).

From an individual respondent perspective, three respondents had a neutral response to the first three factors and one respondent considered all factors to occur infrequently. However, opinion was not strong regarding the frequency of occurrence, as illustrated in Figures 5.72, 5.73, 5.74 and 5.75 on pages 357-359). Respondents tended to consider that ‘Government seen to be uncoordinated’ and ‘Government seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities’ also being considered to occur frequently. Respondents tended to consider that ‘Government seen to be more concerned with process than outcomes’ occurred infrequently, and also a slightly greater tendency to consider ‘Government seen to be wasting resources’ to occur infrequently.

Five respondents indicated a neutral view regarding ‘government seen to be uncoordinated’ and ‘government seen as wasting resources’.

Figure 5.70

**Bar graph showing core business conflict affecting the image of Government which is seen to be failing to fulfill its own priorities**

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data

Figure 5.70 shows that there is an almost even spread of opinion across agreement,
a neutral position at ‘three’ and disagreement regarding the image of Government being seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities. However, there is a slightly stronger tendency to disagree.

Figure 5.71  
**Bar graph showing core business conflict affecting the image of Government being seen to be concerned with process not outcomes and benefits**

[Bar graph showing core business conflict affecting the image of Government being seen to be concerned with process not outcomes and benefits]

Source: Developed for this research.  
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data

Figure 5.71 shows respondent tendency to disagree that core business conflicts affect the Government’s image – with Government being seen to be concerned with process not outcomes and benefits.

Figure 5.72  
**Bar graph showing rate of occurrence of core business conflict creating an image of Government as uncoordinated**

[Bar graph showing rate of occurrence of core business conflict creating an image of Government as uncoordinated]

Source: Developed for this research.  
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data

Figure 5.72 shows there is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of the view that core business conflict creates an image of Government as uncoordinated occurs frequently.
Figure 5.73  
**Bar graph showing rate of occurrence of core business conflict creating an image of Government as being seen to waste resources**

Source: Developed for this research.  
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data

Figure 5.73 shows that there is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence to be infrequent, of core business conflict affecting the image of Government as being seen to be wasting resources.

Figure 5.74  
**Bar graph showing rate of occurrence of core business conflict creating an image of Government being seen to be failing to fulfill its own priorities.**

Source: Developed for this research.  
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data

Figure 5.74 shows a slightly stronger tendency for respondents to consider the rate of occurrence to be frequent, of core business conflict affecting the image of Government as being seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities.
Figure 5.75

Bar graph showing rate of occurrence of core business conflict creating an image of Government as being seen to be concerned more with process than outcomes and benefits

Figure 5.75 shows a tendency for respondents to consider the rate of occurrence to be infrequent, of core business conflict affecting the image of Government as being seen to be more concerned with process than outcomes and benefits.

Significant factors with 50 per cent or more respondents indicating a tendency to agree/disagree, consider the impact high/low or the occurrence tending to be never/always are shown in the Table 5.26. There are no significant factors relating to the research issue which have agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence rating by 50 per cent or more respondents across all three areas.

Table 5.26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government is seen to be uncoordinated</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>1 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is seen to be wasting resources</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>1 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</td>
<td>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</td>
<td>High level neutrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is seen to be uncoordinated</td>
<td>9 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is seen to be wasting resources</td>
<td>11 high</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities</td>
<td>10 high</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is seen to be concerned with process, not outcomes &amp; benefits to community</td>
<td>8 high</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data
The impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs’ relationships

Implication for the research issue concerning the impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs’ relationships is that there are views that core business conflict affects the image of Government within Community. This is indirectly related to the research issue due to the fact that regional development is strongly dependent upon Government and Community working collaboratively or in partnership.

Community view of Government as uncoordinated, wasting resources, not fulfilling its own priorities or being more concerned about process and not outcomes and benefits to community will affect regional development projects and joint initiatives that require engagement and support from Community.

Survey findings indicate that respondents agreed with two of the four areas identified, being ‘Government seen as uncoordinated’ and ‘Government seen as wasting resources’. The impact from all four areas was considered high; however there was only limited support for frequent occurrence of ‘Government seen as uncoordinated’ and ‘Government seen to be failing to fulfill its own priorities.

Confirmation of core business conflict as a major impact on agency relationships

Interview question 2 and survey 5a, b and c

As described in the analysis of interview question two, interviewees found it hard to separate the impact of core business conflict on GA relationships, from the impact on projects. Relationships were seen to be degraded, leading to loss of trust and ability to negotiate, creating frustration, poor communication, reluctance to share information, and tending to make agencies focus on their own KPIs and benefits from projects.

The survey investigated further the following main effects of core business conflict from the interview analysis:

- Degrades quality & effectiveness of relationships
- Reduces desire to cooperate & collaborate
- Results in poor communication
- Encourages agencies to focus on their own benefit only from projects
- Reduces ability to negotiate
- Creates reluctance to share information

Survey respondents indicated agreement that these factors were the main effects on agency relationships and that the impacts were high. However opinion was mixed regarding level of occurrence. Fifty per cent of respondents were neutral regarding ‘Reduce ability to
negotiate’. ‘Reduces the desire to cooperate and collaborate’ was considered to occur infrequently. ‘Results in poor communication’ attracted the most number of respondents indicating this occurred frequently, which together with ‘degrades relationships’ were significant factors in relation to the research issue. Respondents considered the remaining three factors to tend to occur frequently.

The impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs’ relationships

PROJECTS:
Projects are slowed/stopped, outcomes and deliverables are reduced in quality, breadth and depth and may not be delivered within timeframes. Implementation of projects is inefficient, affected by timeframes and time and resources used to resolve issues.
Survey findings indicated that the most significant factors were that projects were slowed/stopped, difficulties were created to achieve deliverables in timeframes and implementation of projects was inefficient. The significant factors are outcome issues arising from the practical issues of core business conflict such as decision-making authority, processes and systems, reporting and accountability differences.
Core business conflict impacts were also seen to affect the Community image of Government, which indirectly would affect the collaborative relationships involved in regional development projects. Core business conflict was seen to create an image of Government as uncoordinated, wasting resources, failing to fulfill its own priorities and more concerned with process than outcomes and benefits for Community. The survey explored the negative image of Government and identified that these views would have a high impact, but were not considered to occur frequently, in the main. There was agreement regarding Government seen as uncoordinated and wasting resources as effects of core business conflict.

RELATIONSHIPS:
Relationships were seen to be degraded, with loss of trust and ability to negotiate, resulting in poor communication, reluctance to cooperate and share information. Frustration was commonly felt. Agencies would then tend to focus on their own KPIs and benefits. Results of the survey found that respondents agreed these were the main effects on relationships and that the impacts of these effects were high. The most significant impacts on relationships as were that they were degraded and resulted in poor communication.

5.8 Research issue 5 - Processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediment and core business conflict

Interview questions 13, 14, 15 and 17 focus on identifying the processes and practices that can assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediments and core business conflict when working together. Findings from the interviews are further explored in survey questions 13a, b and c and 14a and b.
The presentation of results in section 5.8.1 commences with a summary of approaches to managing or overcoming issues, impediments and core business conflicts drawn from the suggestions of research participants. These have been divided into two kinds – practical, and intangible and attitudinal.

Following the summary of approaches, data from interview question 13 is presented. Question 13 asks interviewees to identify actions they have undertaken to address issues, impediments and core business conflicts. Results for survey question 13a, b and c, which investigates key findings from interview question 13, are then provided.

Analysis of interview questions 14 and 15 follows. Interview question 14 asks interviewees to evaluate how successful the activities outlined in interview question 13 had been. Interview question 15 asks interviewees what factors that cause core business conflict, should be included in the process model. Further investigation of the findings from interview question 15 occurs through survey question 14a and b, with the results being presented following interview question 15. The results highlight the factors to be included in the process model and evaluate their potential to reduce or manage core business conflict.

Interview question 16 was an information-seeking question regarding agencies’ application of ecologically sustainable development (ESD) principles. This was done to determine whether there was sufficient commitment or acknowledgement of these principles amongst agencies to justify asking if ESD principles should be incorporated into the process model. Results of this question are presented after survey question 14a and b results. The final interview question number 17 concludes section 5.8.1 and presents the results of investigating the value of using ESD principles to reduce core business conflict.

A conclusion to the chapter is provided in section 5.9.

5.8.1 Interview and survey findings

Approaches to managing core business conflict can be sorted into two areas: practical; and intangible and attitudinal. The items listed below are a summary compiled from the interviews and surveys.

**Practical elements**
- roles and responsibilities
- tasks and determining who does what and when
- a communication protocol
- funding sources, amounts, cycles and a funding schedule
- agency capacity to participate and support

**Intangible and attitudinal**
- demonstrating respect for agencies’ point of view
- open communication
- building trust and honesty
- creating a culture of collaboration and cooperation
- generating a feeling of mutuality
Practical elements
- dealing with issues up front, including legislative ones
- resources and shortfalls
- agency KPIs attainable in project
- mechanisms to share information
- Common goals and objectives
- reporting requirements
- decision-making capacity and process for approvals
- Staffing needs matched with staffing availability and expertise
- Authority for the project
- Legislation that applies and its impacts
- Information needs and sources

Intangible and attitudinal
- fostering a willingness to share information
- motivation
- Leadership and management style that encourages cooperation and good relationships
- flexibility and openness to new ways of working
- Innovative philosophy
- Positivity
- ‘Can-do’ attitude
- Mutual respect for agencies and individuals

Two important aspects of the intangible and attitudinal areas are relationships and communication. Fostering good relationships was seen as of paramount importance, supported by and enabling good, honest and open communication, negotiation and consultation. This was considered beneficial when needing to discuss and resolve issues and to support effective working relationships. The importance of relationships and communication was constantly reflected in interview discussions and survey responses.

Strategies to overcome issues, impediments and core business conflicts

Interview question 13 In the projects to which you have referred during this interview, what was done to overcome the issues and impediments core business conflict that occurred?

This question asks what interviewees did to overcome issues, impediments or core business conflict in the joint projects they had referred to in their responses to previous questions. The purpose was to ascertain possible activities and options that could be incorporated into the process model that would assist in managing or overcoming the issues, impediments and core business conflicts.

Responses to this question focused on project design and relationships and communication. Practices were aimed at ensuring mutual benefit for each stakeholder agency, clarity of roles and responsibility; respecting each other’s positions, needs and views; and using negotiation and consultation to maintain positive communication. A key objective was to foster a spirit of cooperation and collaboration.

There were no differences between Federal and State responses or evident in responses relating to agency focus. Two regional staff suggested using political influence to overcome issues, although this was not considered a preferred option. Regional areas also dominated in
the discussion about demonstrating respect when working together. Head offices identified having the more formal arrangements like a Memorandum of Understanding, and Partnership Agreements in place that could clearly define roles.

Communication was seen as very important to manage relationships both amongst agencies at the ‘grass root level’ directly involved in the project, but also within each individual agency. This was upwards communication channels to Directors-General and Ministers, as well as across relevant units within each agency. Good communication was seen as an integral part of developing good relationships and working successfully together in projects. Communication included agencies educating one another about each other’s perspectives and needs, and establishing an agreed conflict resolution process. Regular meetings and keeping stakeholders informed, holding discussions, regularly consulting and being respectful of one another’s viewpoints were communication practices that were valued. There were suggestions that a communication strategy should be developed to keep people informed and support regular feedback. The effectiveness of communication was seen as a responsibility of the lead agency/agencies to set up. Negotiation and facilitation formed part of good communication practices. Interviewees indicated that the art of negotiation and facilitation were important skills when working together.

Effective relationship management was noted as extremely important and was directly linked to good communication. Interviewees indicated that relationships were based on trust; respect for different views, acknowledgement of individual agency corporate culture, responsibilities and ‘must do’s’ by other stakeholder agencies; cooperation; sharing of information, and professionalism. As mentioned as part of communication, relationship management required regular discussion and consultation amongst all stakeholders. Interviewees suggested issues should be worked through, prior to commencing the project, with regular consultation as the project progresses.

A number of interviewees suggested simple actions to support development of good relationships, such as serving good refreshments, allowing time for networking, remembering to thank participants for their support and efforts, and acknowledging agency efforts in other forums.

Many interviewees stated that poor relationships could lead to agencies wishing to ‘back down’ or ‘give in’ for the sake of the project, when conflicts occurred. This was
considered a negative way to achieve an outcome, as it was likely to affect future working relationships amongst the agencies concerned, and for the current project would cause a drop in motivation and commitment from stakeholders. Interviewees generally felt good relationships engendered a cooperative working relationship, which was open and flexible, with agencies often prepared to work outside the box to get things to work for the mutual benefit of all stakeholder partners.

Project design, as indicated earlier, was a dominant factor, with respondents indicating that to inform project design, the following should occur: identifying and clarifying roles, responsibilities, agency focus and benefit; resources required; developing a funding schedule; identifying capabilities required; agreeing on timeframes; identifying resources available; and establishing agreed reporting and accountability procedures. Undertaking these activities would assist in accommodating different agency resourcing capabilities and incorporate agency KPIs and outcomes, where possible. Interviewees suggested it was important that agency buy-in was captured early in the project’s development. Interviewees recommended ensuring all stakeholders agencies supported project objectives and outcomes and agreed they were achievable. Interviewees also stated that assessing what resources and activities were required, and agreeing on who was going to do what could help in avoiding duplication and shortfalls in resources/ and expertise.

As noted earlier, the use of formalised arrangements for projects, such as Memorandum of Understanding and partnership agreements, were recommended by some interviewees. Such mechanisms provided clarity for each agency, of roles and responsibilities and expected contribution and actions. In disputes or when issues arose, the formal arrangements could provide a point of reference to develop solutions.

‘Respect’ was regularly mentioned and included accommodating agency needs, respect for agency views and core business objectives and agency ‘must dos’ when developing projects. In addition it was thought important to listen and learn about other agencies’ perspectives, which could be taking into account in project design.

In terms of handling conflict, interviewees felt that early identification of issues, including legislative issues should occur so that agencies could negotiate solutions and incorporate them in the project design if possible. Interviewees suggested there was also
considerable benefit in discussing and clarifying participating agencies’ legislative responsibilities applicable to the project.

Mutuality and agency benefit was linked to relationships and communication. Responses included finding commonalities amongst agencies for their KPIs and other complementarities and building these into the projects. Interviewees considered that this could assist in ensuring that each agency gained a benefit from participation in a project and could encourage leveraging from each other. Agreement on how the outcomes could be reported also related to mutuality, so that kudos and agency performance outcomes were shared and acknowledged.

Processes and systems included many activities involved under other headings, for example: establishing a process to manage issues and conflicts up front, to which all stakeholder agencies agree; setting out ground rules for operation; developing a funding schedule; and agreed reporting formats and schedules. Developing these processes and systems required agencies to be flexible and facilitate managing upwards. Flexibility was considered to involve things like ‘tweaking’ project/program details to have the best fit for the operational environment in the region, and to achieve the required/desired project outcomes that agencies’ and community needed. Several interviewees suggested applying WOG processes and systems of delivery, because under these arrangements all agencies were expected to have commitment.

There were suggestions that in extreme cases, the use of senior management or a Minister to apply pressure for other agencies to comply/support or act was possible. However, this was seen as a negative action and not conducive to building good relationships.

Interviewees indicated that establishing the authority behind the project was important, for example Ministerial, Director-General endorsement, or a WOG initiative. It was suggested that this also helped to determine the levels of flexibility possible in project design and implementation, and the level of pressure that could be applied to gain support across agencies and within agencies. Additionally it was important to determine the decision-making capacity for agencies at the local level, as this could create delays and problems if an agency was centralised.

The key theme areas from the interviews are presented in bar graph 5.76 on page 367.
**Figure 5.76**

*Key themes from interview on approaches and practices adopted to manage core business conflict and issues and impediments*

![Chart showing agency actions to overcome issue, impediments & core business conflicts](chart_image)

**Source:** Developed for this research.

The themes include: project design; relationships; communication; power, authority and jurisdiction; mutuality and complementarity; legislation and regulation; political; agency benefit; processes and systems; agency performance; timeframes; and resources and information resources. Project design had the widest range of comments in that theme.

Table 5.27 presents the sub-groups in each theme and the total responses to each theme from interview question 13.

**Table 5.27**

*Number of sub-groups in each theme and total responses to question 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Put in place opportunities &amp; arrangements that agencies cannot turn down</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>agency benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure all agencies get something out of project – fulfill a KPI, gain benefit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>agency benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate agency KPIs in outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate each other and advocate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.27 continues…
Table 5.27 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hold discussions regarding the project in its design phase</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply art of negotiation and facilitation skills</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult fully and regularly meet regularly</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on communication protocols to cover amongst stakeholders and Ministers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort out legislative &amp; regulatory issues up front if possible</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify legislation &amp; regulations that apply</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate leverage from project by agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify mutual KPIs &amp; align with them if possible</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and work with complementarities &amp; common ground</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use ministerial influence to get things to happen</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage political support/ministerial approval early</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify authority for the project</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify decision-making capacity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify appropriate agency reps from across jurisdictions, especially where multiple regions for one agency involved</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop processes &amp; systems to solve issues</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on processes &amp; systems to run project</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope projects to suit agency requirements, capacity &amp; resources</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain agreement on role &amp; responsibilities (who does what by when)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp;/or build in outcomes to suit agencies' KPIs or general focus</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set ground rules &amp; processes for co-reporting/accountability</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set clear &amp; achievable goals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set funding schedule</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU/partnerships/WOG</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify lead &amp; their role &amp; responsibilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify problems in projects, work out solutions together</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share information</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate good relationships</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate respect for other agencies -views, ideas etc.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect different work cultures &amp; practices</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept agencies’ KPIs &amp; core business needs &amp; ‘must do’s’</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain understanding of other agency perspectives</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure realistic timeframes to suit different agencies’ funding &amp; operational processes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on timeframes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from interview data.
Processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediment and core business conflict

The implication for the research issue regarding the processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediments and core business conflict consist of practical, and intangible and attitudinal factors. The most dominant themes noted were: project design and relationships and communication, which are closely linked to one another.

Effective relationships are based on good communication, with participants demonstrating respect for different agency viewpoints, needs and ‘must do’s’. Developing a communication strategy for stakeholders and within agencies’ own organizations was identified.

Project design, incorporating agreed processes and systems, for example to manage resources, funds, reporting and accountability, conflict resolution was suggested. In addition there were strong views that agency buy-in through accommodating agency KPIs and ensuring benefit from the project was necessary, thus it was important to seek areas of mutuality and complementarity. Equally important was to ensure that agencies accepted and understood the roles and responsibilities and were clear about who did what, by when. Identification of problems and issues, including legislative issues, followed by stakeholder agencies collaboratively developing solutions and management strategies was considered important.

Authority for the project and decision-making capacity also needed to be clarified, as this could influence timeframes, and flexibility for project design and implementation.

Survey 13 a, b and c

This question investigates the most commonly mentioned factors from interview question 13, which are:

- Cultivate good relationships
- Demonstrate respect for other agencies’ point of view
- Agree on communication protocols, within agencies, amongst stakeholders and with Ministers.
- Practise the arts of negotiation and facilitation
- Identify and build on areas of commonality
- Ensure each participating agency can fulfil KPIs or gain benefit
- Clarity authority of project or program (Minister, DG, WOG or Community)
- Identify and deal with legislative issues
- Identify key requirements and capacity of agencies to contribute to objectives and develop the project based on these
- Gain agreement of who does what, by when and include in the project plan
- Use political influence to make things happen

Generally, there was agreement that the most common practises identified by interviewees were successful in managing or overcoming core business conflict and issues and impediments. One respondent completely agreed with all suggestions. Two respondents disagreed with the last factor – ‘use political influence to make things happen’.
happen’ and one respondent disagreed with ‘ensure each participating agency can fulfil KPIs or gain benefit’. There was very strong agreement for:

- ‘Demonstrate respect for other agencies’ point of view (15 respondents, five rating ‘one’)
- ‘Gain agreement about who does what, by when and include in the project plan’ (14 respondents, nine rating ‘one’)
- ‘Cultivate good relationships’ (14 respondents, seven rating ‘one’)
- ‘Practise the arts of negotiation and facilitation’ (14 respondents, six rating ‘one’)
- ‘Clarify authority of project or program (Minister, DG, WOG or Community)’ (13 respondents, seven rating ‘one’)
- Identify key requirements and capacity of agencies to contribute to objectives and develop projects based on these’ (13 respondents, five rating ‘one’)

The lowest level of agreement was for the ‘use of political influence to make things happen’ (refer to Figure 5.77).

Figure 5.77
Bar graph showing spread of opinion regarding use of political influence to manage or overcome core business conflict

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.77 illustrates the spread of opinion regarding the use of political influence to overcome core business conflict, with a slightly stronger tendency to agree.

The impact on reducing core business conflict from applying the practices being explored through the survey was generally considered to be high, with most practices
considered to have a high impact by the majority of respondents. The factors with the strongest tendency to consider the impact to be high were:

- ‘Clarify authority of project or program (Minister, DG, WOG or Community)’ (15 respondents, seven rating ‘five’)
- ‘Identify and deal with legislative issues’ (15 respondents, four rating ‘five’)
- ‘Identify key requirements and capacity of agencies to contribute to objectives and develop projects based on these’ (15 respondents, four rating ‘five’)
- ‘Ensure each participating agency can fulfil KPIs and gain benefit’ (14 respondents, seven rating ‘five’)
- ‘Gain agreement about who does what, by when and include in the project plan’ (14 respondents, seven rating ‘five’)
- Cultivate good relationships (14 respondents, six rating ‘five’)

Two practices each attracted a rating of ‘one’ by one respondent, for low impact (Refer Figures 5.77 on page 370, and Figure 5.78). Whilst having a stronger tendency to consider the impact high, ‘use political influence to make things happen’, indicates that there were also some respondents who considered the impact to be low (refer Figure 5.80 on page 372).

Figure 5.78

Bar graph showing respondent opinion regarding the impact of applying the practice of cultivating good relationships to reduce core business conflict

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.78 shows that two respondents considered that the cultivation of good relationships would tend to have a low impact on reducing core business conflict.
Figure 5.79

Bar graph showing respondent opinion regarding the impact of applying demonstrated respect for agencies’ point of view to reduce core business conflict

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.79 shows that two respondents considered that demonstrating respect for agencies’ point of view to reduce core business conflict would have a low impact.

Figure 5.80

Bar graph showing respondent opinion to the impact of applying political influence to reduce core business conflict

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: compiled from analysis of survey data

Figure 5.80 shows that four respondents considered the impact of applying political influence to reduce core business conflict to be low; however the overall tendency was considered to be high.

Responses to rate of occurrence demonstrated a higher level of neutral responses than there had been for rating of level of ‘agreement’ and ‘impact’. The slightly higher neutral ratings were for ‘cultivate good relationships’, ‘demonstrate respect for other
agencies’ point of view’, ‘agree on communication protocols, within agencies, amongst stakeholders and with Ministers’, ‘identify and deal with legislative issues’, ‘identify key requirements and capacity of agencies to contribute to objectives and develop the project based on these’, and ‘use political influence to make things happen’.

The highest tendency to consider the level of occurrence to be frequent was for:
- ‘Cultivate good relationships’ (10 respondents, four rating ‘five’), although this attracted five neutral ratings (refer Figure 5.81)
- ‘Practise the arts of negotiation and facilitation’ (10 respondents, seven rating ‘five’)
- ‘Clarify authority of project or program (Minister, DG, WOG or Community)’ (nine respondents)

Two areas were considered to occur less frequently, being ‘identify key requirements and capacity of agencies to contribute to objectives and develop projects based on these’ (Refer Figure 5.82 on page 374), and ‘use of political influence to make things happen’ (refer Figure 5.83 on page 374).

Figure 5.81
Bar graph showing the opinion regarding the rate of occurrence of the practice of cultivation of good relationships to reduce core business conflict

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.81 shows a strong tendency to consider the practice of cultivation of good relationships to be high as a way to reduce core business conflict; however five respondents rated this neutral.
Figure 5.82

Bar graph showing the opinion regarding the rate of occurrence of the practice of identifying key requirements and agency capacity to contribute to project objectives & develop projects based on these

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.82 shows that there is a slightly stronger tendency for respondents to consider the rate of occurrence to be less frequent, of identifying key requirements and agency capacity to contribute to project objectives and developing projects based on these. The bar graph also illustrates the fact that the mode is shared between ‘two’ and the neutral rating of ‘three’ by six respondents.

Figure 5.83

Bar graph showing the opinion regarding the rate of occurrence of applying political influence to reduce core business conflict

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.83 shows that there is a stronger tendency for respondents to consider that the occurrence is infrequent, of applying political influence as a practice to overcome core business conflict. Five respondents also rated this neutrally at ‘three’.
Significant factors with 50 per cent or more respondents indicating tendency to agree/disagree, consider the impact as high/low and occurrence tending to be never/always are shown in Table 5.28. Higher levels of neutrality are also shown. The most significant factors relating to the research problem are shaded (having agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence rating by 50 per cent or more respondents across all three areas).

**Table 5.28**

**Significant responses relating to processes and practices applied by agencies to manage core business conflict**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate good relationships</td>
<td>14 Agree</td>
<td>7 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate respect for other agencies’ point of view</td>
<td>15 Agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on communication protocols, within agencies, amongst stakeholders &amp; with Ministers</td>
<td>12 Agree</td>
<td>6 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practise the arts of negotiation &amp; facilitation</td>
<td>14 Agree</td>
<td>6 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp; build on areas of commonality</td>
<td>12 Agree</td>
<td>6 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure each participating agency can fulfil a KPI or gain a benefit</td>
<td>11 Agree</td>
<td>6 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify authority of project or program (i.e. Minister, DG, WOG initiative, community)</td>
<td>13 Agree</td>
<td>7 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp; deal with any legislation issues</td>
<td>12 Agree</td>
<td>4 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify key requirements for each agency &amp; capacity to contribute to project objectives &amp; develop project based on these</td>
<td>13 Agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain agreement who does what, by when &amp; then include in project plan</td>
<td>14 Agree</td>
<td>9 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to consider impact high/low</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = low 5 = high</th>
<th>High level neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate good relationships</td>
<td>14 High</td>
<td>6=5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate respect for other agencies’ point of view</td>
<td>13 High</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on communication protocols, within agencies, amongst stakeholders &amp; with Ministers</td>
<td>12 High</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practise the arts of negotiation &amp; facilitation</td>
<td>13 High</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp; build on areas of commonality</td>
<td>13 High</td>
<td>6 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure each participating agency can fulfil a KPI or gain a benefit</td>
<td>14 High</td>
<td>7 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify authority of project or program (i.e. Minister, DG, WOG initiative, community)</td>
<td>15 High</td>
<td>7 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp; deal with any legislation issues</td>
<td>15 High</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify key requirements for each agency &amp; capacity to contribute to project objectives &amp; develop project based on these</td>
<td>15 High</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain agreement who does what, by when &amp; then include in project plan</td>
<td>14 High</td>
<td>7 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use political influence to make things happen</td>
<td>11 High</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occurrence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to consider occurrence never/always</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = never 5 = always</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate good relationships</td>
<td>10 frequent</td>
<td>4 = 5 always</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.28 continues…
Table 5.28 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>No of respondents tending to consider occurrence</th>
<th>No of respondents rating 1 = never 5 = always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate respect for other agencies’ point of view</td>
<td>8 frequent</td>
<td>3 = 5 always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on communication protocols, within agencies, amongst stakeholders &amp; with Ministers</td>
<td>7 frequent</td>
<td>2 = 5 always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practise the arts of negotiation &amp; facilitation</td>
<td>10 frequent</td>
<td>2 = 5 always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp; build on areas of commonality</td>
<td>8 frequent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify authority of project or program (i.e. Minister, DG, WOG initiative, community)</td>
<td>9 frequent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp; deal with any legislation issues</td>
<td>6 frequent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify key requirements for each agency &amp; capacity to contribute to project objectives &amp; develop project based on these</td>
<td>6 frequent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain agreement who does what, by when &amp; then include in project plan</td>
<td>8 frequent</td>
<td>3 = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use political influence to make things happen</td>
<td>7 infrequent</td>
<td>1 = 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: compiled from analysis of survey data.

The most significant factors in relation to the research problem are: cultivating good relationships; demonstrating respect for other agency’s point of view; agree on communication protocols; practice the arts of negotiation and facilitation; identify and build on commonality; clarify the authority of the project; and gain agreement on who does what, by when and include in the project plan.

There was agreement that most practices were successful in managing core business conflict and most were considered to have a high impact on reducing core business conflict.

**Processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediment and core business conflict**

The implication for the research issue regarding the processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediments and core business conflict are that the most significant practices are: ‘cultivate good relationships’; ‘demonstrate respect for other agencies’ point of view’; ‘practice the art of negotiation and facilitation’; ‘ensure each participating agency can fulfill a KPI or gain benefit’; ‘identify and build on areas of commonality’; ‘clarify authority of project or program (Minister, DG or WOG or community)’; and ‘gain agreement on who does what, by when and then include in the project plan’.

The practices are a combination of practical activities to undertake and incorporate into the project design and to enhance communication and relationships, as well as intangible and attitudinal elements relating to respect (for agencies’ points of view, responsibilities and needs) and flexibility.

Frequent occurrence was higher for ‘cultivate good relationships’; ‘practice the arts of negotiation and facilitation’; ‘clarify authority’ for the project.

Occurrence of applying political influence was considered infrequent.

Ensuring agencies have capacity to contribute to projects and objectives, and developing projects based on capacity was considered to occur infrequently, and also had a high neutral opinion.
Investigation of the level of success of approaches adopted by agencies to deal with core business conflict, and issues and impediments when working together

**Interview question 14.** How successful were the efforts to address the issues and impediments or core business conflict?

This question asks agencies to evaluate how successful the practices and activities discussed in question 13, are in managing or overcoming the issues and core business conflicts.

Overall, interviewees felt that the processes and practices they adopted to overcome issues and impediments and core business conflict were successful, with 22 describing the processes as ‘good’, ‘very good’, ‘successful’, ‘very successful’. Two interviewees indicated that response was slow initially. Three interviewees felt that this area was not actually about processes to overcome issues, but about the people involved and how well they worked together.

There was little difference between Federal, State and Local Government agencies. However, Federal agencies tended to refer to ways in which everything could be brought together, to ‘document who does what, when and where’, to have ‘rules of engagement defined’ and the development of a mechanism so that jointly funded projects contain ‘financial contractual reporting arrangements’.

The quality of relationships was seen as central to how well things worked. It was inferred in statements such as ‘hard initially’ ‘beneficial in building relationships to deal with things cooperatively’, ‘improved over time and with other projects’, and ‘working with the same people over a long period of time’. The responses suggested that successful engagement of agencies and completion of projects is seen as important to building relationships and conversely, the quality of relationships influenced how successful these approaches were. There was reference to the turnover of staff damaging the strength of good relationships.

Interviewees highlighted the fact that just as much depended upon the personalities involved and commitment from the ‘team’ of stakeholders, as was
determined by the relationships and any approaches adopted to manage issues and core business conflict.

**Processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediment and core business conflict**

The implication for the research issue regarding the processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediments and core business conflict is that generally the approaches and practices developed or adopted were successful, with a couple of interviewees indicating results were slow initially. Three interviewees were of the opinion that approaches and practices adopted were not really relevant, but that the quality, capabilities of the team of participants involved in the projects and how well they worked together was the more influential factor to reducing or managing issues and impediments and core business conflict.

Good relationships were seen to be very important. The impact of personalities and level of commitment of the team of stakeholders are seen to contribute to the quality of relationships.

**Factors for inclusion in the process model**

**Interview question 15** What factors that create core business conflict should I include to be addressed in the process model that I will develop as a result of this research?

The question asks interviewees to identify the factors that should be addressed in the process model in order to reduce or manage core business conflict?

In terms of specific agency focus, location or level (Federal, State, Local) it is noted that authority and decision-making concerns were primarily from regional areas, with the exception of one head office. All four Local Governments highlighted legislative and regulatory issues. Reporting and accountability was predominantly spoken about by head office locations, with only one regional location raising it. Identifying issues up front and negotiating resolutions was suggested by Federal agencies only.

One respondent did not think developing a process model would be useful as agencies needed to change the way they worked together, for such a process to be successful. A second respondent highlighted that so much depended upon the level of interest individuals and agencies had in the project, and the priorities of potential participants.
Processes and systems (including reporting and accountability procedures) were considered a useful inclusion in relation to implementing the project. Respondents also felt that the operational processes and systems needed to be agreed and set up. It was suggested that mechanisms would vary for reporting and accountability and agreed processes should be set in place to reduce duplication and redundancy. It was also felt important to clarify decision-making and approval processes, which is linked to power, authority and jurisdiction. Other processes and systems would include funding and processes to access funding, particular if funds were from multiple agencies.

Power, authority and jurisdiction had a number of dimensions to it that interviewees considered useful to incorporate in the process model. The main area related to the level of authority that the project had, for implementation. It was stated that this could be useful to encourage agencies’ support. Gaining senior staff and ministerial authority provided the best leverage to encourage stakeholder agencies to participate and to work at overcoming issues. Documenting agencies’ approval processes was also considered useful.

Decision-making is also part of power, authority and jurisdiction. Limited local decision-making could cause considerable delays in projects. It was necessary to understand what capacity each agency had for local decision-making as this would affect timeframes. In addition, interviewees indicated there was a need to identify the lead agency/ies and their role and responsibilities.

Interviewees suggested that identification of both financial resources and staff expertise were included. Earlier responses by interviewees had highlighted limited skill levels and lack of consistency of staff in regions, thus identification of resources available may be a response to this concern.

As part of identifying financial resources, sources of funding, having appropriate mechanisms in place to coordinate funding applications with cycles and then managing the accountability responsibilities were some of the areas that were mentioned.

Interviewees felt it was important to identify issues up front and engage in consultation and negotiations for effective ways to manage or address them. The most important issues were felt to relate to legislative and regulatory issues, which have been
raised in previous question responses. Issues have included concurrency and timeframe implications. Interviewees considered this question from two angles - identifying what Acts and regulations would apply to the project, and issues that could occur from their application in the project. This would facilitate developing a course of action to deal with any issues.

Roles, responsibilities, resources and timeframes are all linked. Interviewees were keen to see the main framework for project implementation clearly defined up front. This would ensure that there were no unreal expectations of agencies. It would help to identify gaps and refine the scope and parameters of the project to suit available resources and expertise. Agencies needed to be clear about the expectation attached to their commitment. Ensuring that the key requirements were addressed and that there was capacity for agencies to contribute to the project was seen as important. Resource considerations mentioned earlier would help to clarify this.

Agreeing on a timeframe and creating a timeline of actions, outcomes and deliverables was also suggested. Timeframes were also linked to determining who did what, by when.

In previous discussions, the need to support agencies achieving their own KPIs to encourage buy-in and commitment was identified. It was repeated in response to question 15. Interviewees indicated that incorporating agency KPIs or some benefit from the project strengthened commitment.

Linked to agency benefit was encouraging participant agencies to think from the same base and identify similar or the same objectives or goals. Interviewees were of the view that identifying mutuality and complementarity would support effort to ensure all stakeholder agencies got some benefit from participating in a project.

Communication has been identified as a very important factor throughout this investigation. Responses to question 15 further endorsed the importance of good communication. Interviewees suggested protocols and effective mechanisms for good communication were established to engage stakeholder agencies, maintain awareness of project progress, and consistency of messages going to Ministers, as well as facilitating the management of any issues that occurred.
Managing relationships was not explicitly identified, however the value of good relationships was evident in the philosophies expressed. Interviewees highlighted the need to encourage respect for agency views; to accommodate agencies needs and perspectives; to establish good communication; and focus on making engagement and meetings productive and pleasant experiences for participants.

Three interviewees highlighted the importance of project design and implementation from the community’s perspective and the need to assess community capacity for running projects (if projects are generated by community).

Policy considerations were not strongly evident in discussion, but five interviewees indicated that policy considerations needed to be taken into account in relation to the project.

Other factors to be incorporated into the process model included adopting approaches that may already serve to support agencies working together, for example using a WOG approach, working through the Regional Managers’ Network group and using established networks to collaborate with participants from stakeholder agencies.

One practical suggestion was having a WOG data entry point where all agencies could go to access information on and contribute to, the record keeping and reports for project on which they were collaboratively working. The themes that are covered in this discussion are presented in Figure 5.84.
The most dominant theme evident in Figure 5.84 is project design. Other major themes include power, authority and jurisdiction; communication; reporting and accountability; legislation and regulations; resources and information resources; timeframes; personnel; mutuality and complementarity; and agency benefit. Project design has the widest range of comments in that theme.

Table 5.29 shows the sub-groups that occurred in each theme and the total number of responses in each theme.

Table 5.29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication protocols amongst agencies &amp; to the Minister</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up communication process within agencies &amp; across agencies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed protocols for informing Ministers to ensure consistency of information</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use consultation to identify issues &amp; negotiate solutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify community needs &amp; expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community &amp; clients</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.29 continues…
Table 5.29 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply a community benefit test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community &amp; clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify legislation that applies &amp; where it applies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address legislative or other regulatory issues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate agency KPIs in projects where possible</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Agency Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish common goals, outcomes &amp; deliverables to benefit agencies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mutual benefit, complementarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage people to think from same base, share perspectives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mutual benefit, complementarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expertise available</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expertise required</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take account of staffing limitations in time and skill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document &amp; agree policies &amp; principles of project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead or leads identified for the project</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Power authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get projects endorsed/instigated by minister/DG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making capacity of each agency</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority behind project implementation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the rules for engagement, the process to be followed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish operational procedures for meetings, exchange of information, etc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up formal arrangements where possible, such as Agreements and Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture all the approval processes required</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include other approaches cited by respondents e.g. Using managers’ network forum, WOG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review funding needs &amp; sources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding contribution from each agency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding cycles, criteria &amp; staging of funding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up a process to monitor project progress</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify issues &amp; develop solutions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate project continuously to ensure agencies are performing &amp; obtaining what they want from project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify agency capacity - what can and cannot be done</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure agencies are clear about commitment level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalise arrangements to clearly define agency roles, responsibilities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set out key tasks of who does what and how and when</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop practices that demonstrate inter-agency respect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.29 continues…
Table 5.29 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address the reporting requirements for each agency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and accountability simplified as much as possible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree &amp; clarify process for reporting &amp; accountability, including funding accountability</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify resource shortfalls &amp; options to fill them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Resources and information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify information resources available</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Resources and information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify information required</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Resources and information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a process for joint funding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree timing for outcomes and deliverables</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set an agreed timeline for implementation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe agreed, including accommodating factors that can affect it</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from interview data.

**Processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediment and core business conflict**

The implication for the research issue regarding the processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediments and core business conflict is that the most dominant practice concerns the design of projects, which incorporates many factors from other theme areas such as processes and systems, communication, timeframes, reporting and accountability, power, authority and jurisdiction.

Examples of the range of activities from the related themes are: using formal approaches such as Agreements and established networks; identifying funding needs and sources and putting in place mechanisms for joint funding; identifying other resources (staffing, skills, information) required; agreeing on operational and monitoring procedures; identifying issues early and developing agreed resolution processes; clearly defining the ‘rules of engagement’ being the roles, responsibilities and who does what, by when; building in mutual benefit and agreeing on timeframes and deliverables.

It was important to also identify the authority for the project, which determines flexibility and encouragement for agencies to support projects, and decision-making capacities of participating agencies.

Establishing communication protocols were also deemed very useful, to support working effectively together. The protocol would cover internal agency communication, as well as ministerial and stakeholder communications.

Other factors that were considered worth incorporating were building on commonalities and joint goals and objectives (mutuality), as well as ensuring agencies could gain benefit from their participation in projects.
Survey 14 a, and b

Survey question 14a and b investigates whether the listed factors identified from interview question 15 are of value for inclusion in the process model to be designed as a result of the research. The survey investigates respondent level of agreement and the views concerning level of impact the factors are likely to have on reducing or managing core business conflict. The key areas that emerged from the interviews were:

- Reporting requirements for each agency
- Decision-making capacity
- Funding contribution from agencies
- Funding cycles and staging (where this occurs)
- Lead agent identification
- Approval processes that apply
- Authority of project (e.g. Minister, DG, WOG, MOU, Formal Partnership)
- Staff availability & time commitment
- Staff expertise required & available
- Timeline for implementation
- KPIs that project could fulfil for each agency
- Legislation that will apply
- Legislation issues
- Communication protocols covering within agencies, across agencies & to Ministers to ensure consistency of information
- Common goals identified across agencies relating to project
- Agency roles and responsibilities
- Key tasks to be done, by whom and by when
- Information needs and their source
- Resources available for project & any shortfalls
- ESD value of project*

* ESD has been included as a result of interview findings for interview question 16, however applying ESD principles was not mentioned specifically in interview question 15.

One respondent declined to complete this question at all, believing that the issues and impediments that occurred just have to be managed. They also expressed the view that it was the quality and capacity for management of the stakeholder team, for the project, that would determine how well issues, impediments and core business conflicts were reduced or managed.

There was strong agreement that all the factors listed would be useful, with the exception of one respondent. This respondent did not really agree with the last eight items on the list. There was a possibility that the respondent had placed their ‘x’ in the wrong part of the scale. The highest number of rating ‘one’ was for ‘common goals identified across agencies relating to the project’, by seven respondents (Refer Figure 5.85 on page 386). Strongest agreement was for:

- ‘agency roles and responsibilities’ (14 respondents, six rating ‘one’)
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- ‘key tasks to be done by whom and by when’ (14 respondents, six rating ‘one’)
- ‘identifying the lead agent’ (14 respondents, six rating ‘one’)
- ‘decision-making capacity of each agency’ (14 respondents, three rating ‘one’)
- ‘staff availability and time commitment’ (14, three rating ‘one’)
- ‘authority of the project (e.g. Minister, DG, WOG, MoU)’ (14, two rating ‘one’)

The lowest level of agreement was for ‘KPIs that the project could fulfil for agencies (10, three rating ‘one”).

In relation to the impact the factors and activities listed may have on reducing or managing core business conflict, one respondent rated everything neutral or ‘three’. Amongst the remaining 15 responses, the factors considered to have the highest impact were:

- Staff availability and time commitment (14 respondents, five rating ‘five’)
- Staff expertise required and available (14 respondents, five rating ‘five’)
- Roles and responsibilities (13 respondents, two rating ‘five’)

The factor seen as having the lowest impact was ‘reporting requirements for each agency’. Six respondents indicated a tendency for this to be high, with only two rating ‘five’. Six also rated this neutral (refer Figure 5.86 page 387). The other factor with a notable neutral rating was ‘Funding cycles and stages (where this applies)’, which was rated neutral by five respondents (refer Figure 5.87 page 387).

*Figure 5.85*

*Bar graph showing the level of agreement of including in the process model, common goals for each agency*

Source: Developed for this research
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.85 shows the highest level rating of ‘one’ for agreement regarding
including common goals for each agency in the process model.

Figure 5.86
**Bar graph showing the high neutral opinion regarding the impact that including reporting requirements for each agency would have on reducing core business conflict**

Source: Developed for this research
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.86 shows a high neutral opinion regarding the impact on reducing core business conflict, of including reporting requirements for each agency. The mode was ‘three’, and amongst the remaining responses there was a tendency to consider the impact to be high.

Figure 5.87
**Bar graph showing high neutral opinion regarding the impact on reducing core business conflict of including funding cycles and stages**

Source: Developed for this research
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

With the mode of ‘three’, Figure 5.87 shows a high level of neutral opinion regarding the impact on reducing core business conflict, of including funding cycles and stages.
(where this applies). Of the remaining responses, there is a tendency to consider the impact to be high.

The view concerning the inclusion of Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD) principles shows 11 respondents indicated a tendency to agree, ‘five’ rating ‘one’. Two respondents tended to disagree with one indicating a ‘five’. In terms of impact, eight respondents considered the impact tended to be high and four indicated it tended to be low (Refer to figures 5.88 and 5.89).

**Figure 5.88**
*Bar graph showing respondent rating for including ESD value of the project in the process model*

![Bar graph showing respondent rating for including ESD value of the project in the process model](image)

Source: Developed for this research
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.88 shows a tendency to agree with including ESD value of the project in the process model, but also reflects some dissenting and some neutral opinion.

**Figure 5.89**
*Bar graph showing opinion regarding the level of impact on reducing core business conflict of including ESD value of projects in the process model*

![Bar graph showing opinion regarding the level of impact on reducing core business conflict of including ESD value of projects in the process model](image)

Source: Developed for this research
Source: Compiled from analysis of survey data.

Figure 5.89 indicates a tendency to consider the impact to be high
of including ESD value of projects in the process model. As with Figure 5.88, the results also reflect the views expressed in interview question 17.

Significant factors with 50 per cent or more respondents indicating tendency to agree/disagree, considering the impact as high/low and occurrence tending to be never/always are shown in Table 5.30. Higher levels of neutrality are also shown. The most significant factors relating to the research problem are shaded (having agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence rating by 50 per cent or more respondents across all three areas).

Table 5.30

**Significant responses relating to processes and practices applied by agencies to manage core business conflict**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting requirements for each agency</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td>2 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making capacity</td>
<td>14 agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding contribution from agencies</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding cycles and staging (where this occurs)</td>
<td>12 agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead agent identification</td>
<td>14 agree</td>
<td>6 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval processes that apply</td>
<td>9 agree</td>
<td>4 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority of project (e.g. Minister, DG, WOG, MOU, Formal Partnership)</td>
<td>14 agree</td>
<td>2 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff availability &amp; time commitment</td>
<td>14 agree</td>
<td>4 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expertise required &amp; available</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline for implementation</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPIs that project could fulfil for each agency</td>
<td>10 agree</td>
<td>3 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation that will apply</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
<td>1 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation issues</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
<td>1 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication protocols covering within agencies, across agencies &amp; to Ministers to ensure consistency of information</td>
<td>12 agree</td>
<td>6 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common goals identified across agencies relating to project</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
<td>7 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>14 agree</td>
<td>6 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key tasks to be done, by whom and by when</td>
<td>14 agree</td>
<td>6 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information needs and their source</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources available for project &amp; any shortfalls</td>
<td>13 agree</td>
<td>6 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD value of project</td>
<td>11 agree</td>
<td>5 = 1 agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting requirements for each agency</td>
<td>6 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making capacity</td>
<td>10 high</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding contribution from agencies</td>
<td>9 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding cycles and staging (where this occurs)</td>
<td>7 high</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead agent identification</td>
<td>12 high</td>
<td>7 = high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval processes that apply</td>
<td>12 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority of project (e.g. Minister, DG, WOG, MOU, Formal Partnership)</td>
<td>11 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff availability &amp; time commitment</td>
<td>14 high</td>
<td>5 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.30 continues…
Table 5.30 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>No. of respondents tending to agree/disagree</th>
<th>No. of respondents rating 1 = agreement 5 = disagreement</th>
<th>High level neutrality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff expertise required &amp; available</td>
<td>14 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline for implementation</td>
<td>11 high</td>
<td>1 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPIs that project could fulfil for each agency</td>
<td>9 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation that will apply</td>
<td>12 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation issues</td>
<td>12 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication protocols covering within agencies, across agencies &amp; to Ministers to ensure consistency of information</td>
<td>12 high</td>
<td>4 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common goals identified across agencies relating to project</td>
<td>12 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>13 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key tasks to be done, by whom and by when</td>
<td>12 high</td>
<td>3 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information needs and their source</td>
<td>10 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources available for project &amp; any shortfalls</td>
<td>9 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD value of project</td>
<td>8 high</td>
<td>2 = 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: compiled from survey data for this research

With the exception of ‘reporting requirements for each agency’ and ‘funding cycles and staging’, all other factors are significant in relation to the research issue.

Processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediment and core business conflict

The implication for the research issue regarding the processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediments and core business conflict is that there was agreement that all the factors identified as dominant from interview question 15 were useful for inclusion in the process model.

From a research issue perspective, all the factors were ‘significant’, with the exception of ‘reporting requirements for each agency’ and ‘funding cycles and staging’.

The process model would benefit from being designed to incorporate a mechanism to clearly capture the factors that can assist in shaping a project that will attract strong support and commitment, enhance relationships, and adopt processes and practices that enable to project and its outcomes to be achieved with minimal impact from core business conflict. This means the process model should also accommodate the identification of issues, and the formation of procedures to facilitate collaborative strategies to resolve or manage the issues.

Investigating whether ESD principles are a useful mechanism to manage core business conflict?

**Interview question 16** How does your agency apply ESD principles?

Only 3 interviewees indicated that they had a formal way of applying ESD
principles. Twenty two indicated that their agencies applied ESD principles informally. One interviewee stated ESD principles did not feature in their agency’s considerations and five interviewees indicated that ESD principles were at the core of everything they did. Table 5.31 includes the results and respondent profile.

Table 5.31
Summary of interviewees’ responses regarding how their agency applied ESD principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>respondent profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 of these were environmental focused agencies and one was economic and environmental. They also included 2 regional locations and one head office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Full mix of agency foci and location and levels of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not done at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Economic and social focused agency in a head office location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpins everything done by the agency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 economic and environmental focused agencies and one economic and social focused agency. The locations were a mix between regional and head office.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from interview data.

**Interview question 17** How could ESD principles be used to reduce core business conflict?

This question explores whether agencies consider the application of Ecologically Sustainable Development principles (ESD) to be of benefit in the process model. Figure 5.90 presents the views of the interviewees.

*Figure 5.90*
Bar graph illustrating interviewee opinion regarding on whether ESD principles could be used to reduce core business conflict

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from interview data.

Figure 5.90 shows that 12 respondents felt that it could be useful. Ten
interviewees felt it would have limited use. Five respondents declined to comment, two indicated that it was important to include and two suggested it was of no use.

There were no differences evident in responses relating to level of government, respondent location or agency focus.

Respondents that thought it should be included gave different reasons for doing so, for example: ‘to consider the broader impact on regions’; ‘assists decision-making’; ‘defines project outcomes’. However, views were varied regarding its practicality and usefulness, as illustrated in the comments documented below:

- A number of respondents indicated that there should be a standardisation of the interpretation
- There was a fear that some agencies may use it as a barrier rather than a balancing mechanism for viewing overall benefit and impact of projects
- It was also felt there would be limitations to the usefulness and ability to be operationalised, due the nature of some projects
- Some respondents considered that inclusion of ESD principles would overtly display what was involved in this type of consideration and make it more meaningful at the coal face, encouraging stakeholders to take a more holistic view of projects
- It was pointed out that there are mechanisms already in place through the consultation process that must be followed when working with other agencies (this was more in relation to policy)
- Some suggested that the mechanism of WOG already takes ESD into account
- One respondent referred to the Cabinet Handbook and consultation process and project management by Russell Higgins 'Clarifying the Exchange'
- There was a view that the ability to apply ESD principles was influenced by the degree to which agencies are required to share power in a project. The level of conflict that occurs is also affected by the mandatory versus the discretionary capabilities that exist in agencies
- There was a view that Ministerial Portfolio Statements drive Agencies' activities
- Other interviewees stated that the word 'sustainability' was used differently by their agency
• One interviewee indicated that when agencies applied these principles, it would be more effective if they were applied right across an agency, rather than being confined to one area of it.

**Processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediment and core business conflict**

The implication for the research issue regarding the processes and practices that assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediments and core business conflict is that there is a general view that inclusion of ESD principles in the process model was useful, or at least of limited use.

Five respondents declined to comment or didn’t have a view and two respondents considered the inclusion would be of no use. The survey results reflected similar opinions.

### 5.9 Summary and conclusions

The research results provide information on the nature of core business conflict and show that functional/operational core business conflict is most common. It was also found that functional/operational core business conflict fell into three categories – practical issues, outcomes issues and intangible issues, and that these were interlinked and cross-linked with one another.

The research uncovered views about difficulties between economic-focused agencies and environmental-focused agencies; the value of complementarity in reducing core business conflict, and a few of its negative effect; and also identified a Community view of Government - as uncoordinated, wasting resources, failing to achieve its own priorities and focused on process more than outcome, that could occur because of core business conflict.

Research has shown that issues and impediments are linked to, or in some cases are the same, as core business conflict and identified common core business conflicts, although the rate of occurrence varied.

The research identified what the impacts of core business conflict were on projects, joint initiatives and GA relationships, which were seen to be quite serious. Projects could be slowed down or stopped and outcomes were reduced in quality, breadth and depth. In addition, GA relationships and communication were negatively impacted, for example reducing desire to cooperate, share information and negotiate.
Lastly the research identified activities and practices that were generally agreed by respondents to be successful in managing or overcoming core business conflict that they experienced. Further, the research has gathered information regarding the factors, practices and activities for inclusion in a practical tool to assist GAs in their joint projects and initiatives, and whether to include ESD principles.

Having presented the results of the research in this chapter, the final chapter, chapter 6, discusses the findings in relation to the individual research issues that emerged from the literature investigation and previous research. Chapter 6 then presents the conclusion to the research problem, discusses and presents an outline of the proposed process model. The findings are then examined in the context of the wider body of knowledge – Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development, and the contribution to knowledge is outlined.

The final part of the chapter examines the implications for theory, policy and practice as well as methodology. As the research was exploratory, the findings have raised a number of areas that are worthy of future research. The chapter concludes by identifying these areas.
6.1 Introduction

Chapter 5 analysed the data from the primary research activities of interview and survey. Chapter 6 discusses the research findings for each research issue and in relation to the literature review and previous research. Chapter 6 also identifies how this research has contributed to knowledge in the field of investigation, identifies implications for theory, policy, practice and methodology and suggests areas for future research.

Section 6.2 presents the research findings for each individual research issue under separate sub-sections, and discusses these in relation to the extant research and literature. Each research issue commences with a summary of the research findings.

Section 6.2.1 deals with the first research issue – the nature of core business conflict. This research issue is a foundation to the research, which explores a new area of investigation. This is due to the fact that no other literature was uncovered dealing specifically with GA core business conflict.

The literature review had uncovered issues and impediments to agencies working together contained in the reports and reviews. Section 6.2.2 discusses the second research issue - the relationships between core business conflicts and issues and impediments to agencies working together.

Section 6.2.3 looks at the findings for the third research issue - the dominant core business conflicts, and considers these in relation to the most commonly expressed issues and impediments in the extant research.

The impact on projects and relationships was not specifically explored in any of the literature or research, however within some of the issues and impediments identified in reviews and reports, some impacts were evident. Section 6.2.4 covers results for the fourth research issue - the impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives, and GAs’ relationships, and compares the research findings to these references.
Section 6.2.5 presents the findings from the fifth and last research issue – processes and practices that can assist agencies to manage issues and impediments and core business conflict that could be included in a process model. The section includes additional data on what research participants considered should be included in the process model developed as a result of the research, and the potential use of ecologically sustainable development (ESD) principles. Findings are discussed in relation to information extracted from the extant research, which was contained in the ‘learnings’, management approaches described, and recommendations made in the reviews and studies. To provide a general overview of the relationship between the extant literature and the research, Table 6.1 (page 397-398) lists each research issue, the degree to which the extant literature and research addressed the issue, and outlines the key findings from this investigation.

Section 6.3 presents the contribution to knowledge made by the research and section 6.4 looks at the implications of research findings, for developing the process model. The process model outline is presented at the end of the section. The design draws on both research outcomes and the extant literature.

Section 6.5 explores the implications for theory, policy and practice relating to Government and governance, public sector management practices, and regional development.

The strengths of the research and additional limitations discovered during the research process are presented in section 6.6, and the implications for methodology with the use of the ‘winnow and hone’ approach are discussed in section 6.7.

Section 6.8, presents the recommendations for further research to build on this newly investigated area and the chapter closes with section 6.9, which presents some concluding remarks on the benefit of and key strategies for managing the impact of potential core business conflict when GAs work together n regional development (or other joint initiatives). An outline of the chapter is in Figure 6.1 (page 397).
Table 6.1 documents for each research issue, the degree to which the extant literature and research addressed the issue and outlines the key factors discovered through the research.

**Table 6.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH ISSUES</th>
<th>EXTANT LITERATURE &amp; RESEARCH</th>
<th>KEY FACTORS FROM RESEARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>The nature of core business conflict</strong></td>
<td>● No research uncovered on this specific topic.</td>
<td><strong>Nature of core business conflict identified:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● The closest content matter dealt with issues and impediments to GAs working together,</td>
<td>● factors &amp; elements that constitute core business conflict;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identified through project reviews and evaluations.</td>
<td>● level of impact &amp; frequency of occurrence of most frequent factors,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● There was limited reference in some reviews and studies to the fact that agency</td>
<td>elements &amp; issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structures, systems and procedures were designed to suit the agency’s role and</td>
<td>● fundamental core business conflicts, not common or considered frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibility, not for collaboration.</td>
<td>● functional/operational core business conflicts are the most common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● conflicting views regarding the prevalence of core business conflict, the impact &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>occurrence, between agencies with an economic focus &amp; ones with an environmental focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● positive &amp; negative views about core business complementarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● non-core business factors that cause conflict, the most dominant beings political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>influence &amp; personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● core business conflict involves practical issues, outcomes issues and intangible issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 continues…
Table 6.1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH ISSUES</th>
<th>EXTANT LITERATURE &amp; RESEARCH</th>
<th>KEY FACTORS FROM RESEARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs working together</td>
<td>• No research was uncovered relating to this issue • The extant research and literature uncovered issues and impediments working together. It is evident that some are similar to, or the same as core business conflict, or the result of core business conflict as defined by this investigation.</td>
<td>Core business conflict relationship with issues and impediments: • identified as linked to, and in some instances as the same, as the issues and impediments • areas of commonality identified between issues and impediments in extant literature and research and core business conflict factors. • functional operational core business conflict is the main area for core business conflict issues and impediments • issues and impediments also fall into three categories: practical issues; outcomes issues, and intangible factors, some of which are not related to core business conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The dominant core business conflicts</td>
<td>• No research on this topic specifically • Extant research drew on common issues and impediments to develop frameworks, tools and models</td>
<td>Dominant core business conflicts: • Predominantly functional operational core business conflict • Only two fundamental core business conflict areas raised – different philosophies &amp; regulatory interpretation • Non-core business conflict issues mentioned as being common too – most common being political &amp; personality factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The impact of core business conflict on regional development projects and other joint initiatives, and GAs’ working relationships</td>
<td>• The literature did not explore this area specifically • The literature, through reviews and studies contained some reference to effects on relationships • Some descriptions of issues and impediments were about effects on projects</td>
<td>Impact of core business conflict on projects and relationships • affected projects (stop or delay), outcomes (reduced or changed) and timeframes (difficulty achieving milestones &amp; deliverables on time) • affected relationships, communication and cooperation with potential to affect future joint initiatives in the future • affected Community view of Government – uncoordinated, wasting resources, not fulfilling own priorities and process not outcomes focused, particularly relevant in projects reliant on a good relationship with community for achieving outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Processes and practices that can assist agencies to manage issues and impediments and core business conflict, that could be included in the process model</td>
<td>• The literature contained descriptions of approaches and solutions, as well as Learnings • Some of the studies involved developing tools &amp; frameworks checklists, guidelines &amp; structures.</td>
<td>Processes and practices to assist agencies manage or overcome issues &amp; impediments &amp; core business conflict • identified and confirmed processes and factors to be incorporated into the process model • identified that ESD principles may be a useful inclusion, but uncovered the views that they are hard to apply and that there are differences in interpretations • concurred with quite a number of the factors, recommendations and guideline topics in the extant literature • Provided a list of processes and practices that participants had used • Identified that processes and practices that had been used were generally successful • Identified a list of processes and practices that participants agreed would be useful to include in the process model • Identified the importance of the quality &amp; capability of project team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview and survey data collected for the research.
Source: Comparison of key findings for research issues compared to extant literature and research findings.

6.2 Conclusions about research issues

This section presents and discusses the research finding in relation to the extant research and literature. Each research issue is dealt with separately and includes a summary of the research findings followed by a discussion of the extant literature and research and a conclusion.
6.2.1 The nature of core business conflict

Introduction

The literature investigation did not identify agency core business conflict as a specific influence on GAs working together; however the literature did make indirect references to the topic. Vincent (1999) noted when examining WOG activity in New South Wales, that there was a tension between WOG and internal agency normal work, because the WOG activity was not part of agencies’ normal operations. Vincent also noted that the agency structures, legislative frameworks, operational frameworks and administrative convenience and tradition were barriers to collaboration, as they were constructed to fulfill agency purpose.

The Natural Resource Management case study in the Management Advisory Committee (2004) report identified one of the issues of working collaboratively as being the risk of losing individual departmental priorities or desired outcomes, which stem from the departmental core business. The statement highlights the reluctance to move away from departmental priorities to joint priorities and outcomes.

In the Institute of Public Administration of Australia (2002) study, three case studies identified core business conflict difficulties. The Regional Coordination Program for New South Wales noted the need to use regional managers’ coordination groups to coordinate activities, as some agencies didn’t view projects as core business; some agencies held the view that integration was an add-on to core business (Community Renewal in Queensland); others considered that core business would dominate in collaborative projects if the project was seen as ‘additional’ to normal business (Safer Western Australia project).

In section 3.4.2 which deals with process and practices adopted to manage issues and conflicts when agencies work together, some of the papers prepared included reference to core business conflict-type issues. For example, the Office of Public Service Merit and Equity (2004) identified that there were different and competing priorities amongst agencies; that tension may exist between seamless government projects and agency core business; and officers were working as representatives of their agency, not as cross-agency personnel. The paper also noted that the culture and work patterns of agencies are not congruent with working seamlessly.

A second paper by the Office of the Public Service Commission (2007) makes further reference to core business conflict, which includes the fact that regional managers see working
collaboratively as additional to normal work; collaboration is not related to the core business of the division; there is a lack of funding for collaborative work; collaborative activities detract from agency outcomes; no effective mechanisms for multi-agency initiatives and strategic planning for agencies is undertaken to fulfill the agency needs, in isolation, so poor coordination across agencies and narrow focus results.

In summary, it is acknowledged that core business creates difficulties, but there is no investigation into why or how core business is a barrier, beyond the observations noted above.

**Summary of research findings and extant literature and research**

Table 6.2 lists the key findings regarding the nature of core business conflict. The shaded headings group the findings into topic areas that were investigated and are discussed following the Table.

**Table 6.2**

*Summary of the key findings regarding the nature of core business conflict*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict and complementarity of core business</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confirmation that GAs experience conflict with one another.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic and environmental focused agencies were most nominated as sources of conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agencies also experienced complementarity of core business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic and environmental agencies were notable in identifying complementarity of core business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complementarity of core business had mostly positive effects on agency relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complementarity can reduce core business conflict, or the effect of it and the level of occurrence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive effects of complementarity on agency relationships included improving relationships, cooperation, collaboration, communication and willingness to share information. It was easier to negotiate, and supported mutuality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complementarity was also seen as having a negative impact as it could create overlap and duplication, as well as difficulties in claiming outcomes. However the level of impact was seen as low and the occurrence infrequent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic and environmental focused agency conflict was not considered a fundamental core business conflict, but the impact was considered high. Rate of occurrence was not considered frequent when considered as a fundamental core business conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on GA relationships of core business conflict &amp; complementarity of core business</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Core business conflict affect on GA relationships was that it degraded the relationship, affected communication, reduced ability to negotiate, made agencies focus on their own KPI and reduced willingness to share information and cooperate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor communication was the most significant effect of core business conflict on agency relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced ability to negotiate and lack of desire to cooperate were considered to occur infrequently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complementarity emerged as potentially an important basis upon which to build, due to the positive influence noted on many of the effects caused by core business conflict (relationships, communication, and cooperation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A related aspect of complementarity was the nomination of differing interpretations of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity, as a fundamental core business conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The fundamental core business conflict regarding differing interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business was not strongly supported, however if it occurred the impact was considered to be high, although occurrence was considered infrequent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 continues…
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community view of government</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Core business conflict occurring was seen to affect Community view of Government - as uncoordinated, wasting resources, not fulfilling their own priorities and focused on process not outcomes and benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greatest level of agreement was for government seen as uncoordinated and wasting resources. Highest impact was considered to be from government seen to be wasting resources and failing to fulfill its own priorities. Occurrence tended to be frequent for government seen as uncoordinated and failing to fulfill its own priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opposing views were evident regarding whole-of-Government approach being a mechanism to reduce conflict and encourage synergy and also was seen as not reducing conflict, but causing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fundamental core business conflict</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fundamental core business was not considered common and was hard to identify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fundamental core business conflict factors identified covered interpretation of Acts and regulations; difference between philosophy and ideology; issues relating to power, authority and jurisdiction; different interpretation of key roles in agencies with complementarity of core business; and economic versus environmental focused agency conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There was agreement that philosophical/ideological differences occurred, but some neutrality regarding impact and occurrence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There was disagreement with economic versus environmental conflict and different interpretation of roles as fundamental core business conflicts, however the impact if they occurred was considered high, although occurrence infrequent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highest impact rating was for economic versus environmental fundamental core business conflict and different interpretations of Acts and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There was a neutral view regarding agreement for different interpretations of Acts and regulations as a fundamental core business conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional/operational core business conflict</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Functional/operational core business conflict was the most common type of core business conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key themes involved in functional/operational core business conflict are power, authority and jurisdiction; reporting and accountability; processes and systems; timeframes; program design; and agency performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The survey explored internal structures; agencies focusing on own KPIs; resource limitations affecting commitment levels; strategic plan constraints; inflexible programs &amp; funding criteria; funding &amp; funding cycles mismatch; limitations in local decision-making; reporting &amp; accountability is onerous &amp; different across agencies; lengthy approval processes; timeframes to deliver; staff availability, skills &amp; experiences; and duplication &amp; overlap of services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There was general agreement that the functional/operational core business conflicts identified were experienced &amp; that the impact was high, except for in relation to reporting &amp; accountability, &amp; overlap &amp; duplication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The most significant factors were agency strategic plan limitations for new projects or discretionary funding, program funding &amp; criteria inflexibility &amp; lengthy approval processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff skills &amp; experience attracted a higher neutral rating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Level of occurrence varied with some factors attracting a high neutral rating – agencies focusing on KPIs &amp; timeframes to achieve outcomes &amp; deliverables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Functional/operational core business conflict can be divided into practical issues (e.g. differences in reporting &amp; accountability procedures), outcomes issues (e.g. delays due to limited decision-making of some agencies at a local level), and intangible issues (agency culture).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Head offices tended to highlight functional/operational core business conflicts relating to jurisdiction, corporate style, funding, reporting &amp; accountability, and fulfilling KPIs. Regional offices tended to highlight staff issues, funding cycles &amp; constraints, &amp; head office decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead agent &amp; core business conflict</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The position of lead agent &amp; whether this role experienced more or less conflict covered three main topic areas – level of commitment, level of authority &amp; responsibilities of a lead agent. Two different points of view were evident – lead agents experienced more conflict due to the nature of their role &amp; motivation to drive the project; alternatively lead agencies experienced less conflict as it was their responsibility to reduce or avoid conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Five agencies did not consider the role of lead agent to affect level of conflict that was experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It was considered that the lead agent role should be included in the process model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-core business conflict factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-core business conflict factors were identified, the most dominant being political issues &amp; personality issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other non-core business issues related to distance, locational factors, demographics, management style &amp; resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There was general agreement with the factors identified as non-core business conflicts, with political factors considered to have the highest impact. There was variation in the views concerning the impact of other factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It was agreed that personalities caused conflict &amp; had a high impact, but there was a high neutral response regarding the frequency of occurrence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The most significant non-core business factors related to ministerial influence/interference, &amp; different political parties at the three levels of government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview and survey data.

**Discussion – Conflict and complementarity**

Research confirmed there was conflict amongst agencies, that agencies also had core business complementarity, that economic and environmental focused agencies were most nominated as sources of conflict, and experienced conflict with one another. Economic and environmental focused agency conflict was not strongly supported as a fundamental core business conflict, although the impact was considered to be high if it occurred. However the view was that occurrence in the experience of the respondents, was low.

As identified in the introduction, the literature did not investigate core business conflict, but did contain indirect references. In relation to the economic versus environment conflict, the literature research covering the evolution of the three discipline areas identified some of the contributing factors to economic versus environmental focused agency conflict. In the Government and governance section (in chapter 3, section 3.2.1, page 88 - 89) drivers of change such as sustainability were identified by Dore and Woodhill (1999), Davis and Weller (2001), Sorenson (2000) and Crowley and Coffey (2007) that would create the need to address economic, social and environmental tensions to achieve sustainability. Sustainability pressures, combined with the economic challenges and impact on regions identified by Taylor and Garlick in Higgins and Zagorski (eds.) (1989) (in chapter 3, page 111 and 112) may well have contributed to the economic and environmental conflict issues and at the same time strengthened the linkages between the two areas.

As a driver of change in Government, the economic/environment and sustainability tensions are evident in the approaches to regional development. In section 3.2.3, since the mid 1990s there was effort to address the regional and social disparities and the tensions of economic and environmental policies, through whole-of-government programs like the ‘Regional Solutions’ program that embraced a more holistic approach.
The extant literature, reviews and reports also contained evidence of this environmental/economic conflict. An example is the Cape York Peninsula Land Use System (CYPLUS) project reported in the Greening Australia report by Dore and Woodhill (1999). The project itself was confronted with the challenges of improving communities’ economic performance and environmental management. The challenge was greater particularly because the region contained a World Heritage listed site. The project report by Howlett (1996) in Dale and Bellamy (1998) and cited by Dore and Woodhill (1999) referred to a philosophical division between a development-oriented bureaucratic agency and the preferences of the regional task force, which would comprise of both government and non-government representatives.

From the research findings, complementarity of core business occurred amongst agencies, including those with an economic or environmental focus. Complementarity was found to have a positive influence on agencies’ relationships, improving relationships, supporting good communication, negotiation and willingness to share information and cooperate. Complementarity was also seen to reduce core business conflict, its impacts and occurrence. However a few respondents noted some negative effects being, overlap and duplication of activities, and creating difficulties claiming outcomes. There was limited support for these negative aspects, with the impact of them viewed as low and occurrence as infrequent. The fundamental core business conflict factor identified concerning ‘different interpretations of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business’ was not strongly supported either, occurred infrequently, but could have a high impact if it occurred.

The literature review did not identify complementarity of core business as a factor directly. However there were examples of acknowledgement of the value of having mutual benefits. In the Institute of Public Administration Australia (2002) study the need for recognition of mutual advantage was noted as a key success factor. The Victorian Public Service Authority (2007) also identified as a success factor, the recognition of mutual benefits and outcomes. Fulop’s and Brenan’s 1997 study of regional economic development organizations and the ‘Sustainable Regions project’ a case study in the Management Advisory Committee (2004) report, identified the importance of shared vision and goals.

Whole-of-Government (WOG) initiatives are potentially an area where complementarity could have a positive influence as a building block upon which to base project activities. This view was reflected in both the Management Advisory Committee
(2004) report and Institute of Public Administration Australia (2002) study. However, the Australian Greenhouse case study from the Management and Advisory Committee report (2004) indicated that WOG work was not the core interest of many agencies. The ‘Sustainable Regions Program’ from the same report identified that there was a difference between WOG accountabilities and internal accountability, with Portfolio Budget Statements not enabling delivery of WOG outcomes. In addition, there was a need for better understanding as to how WOG fits into everyday work.

**Conclusion**

The literature review did not investigate core business conflict, except in an indirect way, neither did the literature cover core business complementarity. The research had therefore explored an area not investigated in the literature.

The research identified that one area of core business conflict appeared to be between economic and environmental focused agencies, although further investigation through survey did not find this significant or commonly occurring, there was acknowledgement that the impact could be high if it did occur.

The literature on evolution of Government and governance and regional development policy, clearly identified the tension of economic versus environmental factors as a driver and influence for changes in Government and governance and regional development.

The literature identified mutuality as a useful tool to facilitate GAs working together, rather than complementarity of core business. This represents seeking linkages, rather than actually acknowledging a complementarity. Despite the different perspectives, both literature and research findings are strongly indicative of the power of having complementarity or commonalities to positively affect GAs’ relationships.

**Discussion – Impact on GAs’ relationships of core business conflict and complementarity of core business**

The research identified that GA core business conflict degraded relationships, caused poor communications including reducing the ability to negotiate, encouraged agencies to focus on their own KPIs and reduced desire to cooperate and share information. Poor communication was the most significant effect. Of note was the high neutrality of 50 percent of respondents in the survey to rate the occurrence of ‘reduces the ability to negotiate’. Reluctance to rate this may be attributed to the fact that officers are committed to the project being implemented and achieving outcomes. This may also explain why ‘reduces desire to
cooperate and collaborate’ was actually rated as occurring less frequently due to the imperative of agencies to work together to deliver outcomes for joint projects.

As noted earlier, complementarity of core business was seen as enhancing relationships, creating improved communication and willingness to share information, as well as encouraging cooperation, which are almost the antithesis of the negative effect of core business conflict.

The impact on GAs’ relationships of core business conflict, as a new area of investigation, was not covered in the literature review. As previously stated, inquiry and findings regarding complementarity of core business was not in the extant literature, except indirectly in relation to mutuality (Institute of Public Administration 2002; Management and Advisory Committee 2004). However, particular negative impacts of core business conflict mentioned above – creating relationship and communication issues were raised in a number of studies and reviews.

Relationship issues were mentioned by Fulop and Wiggers de Vries (1997), Fulop and Brennan (1997), the ‘Goodna Services Integration’ project from the Management and Advisory Committee (2004) report, and the CYPLUS study (Dore & Woodhill 1999).

Relationship quality and effectiveness was regularly mentioned as being important to build and manage. For example, Bishop et al. (2006) discussing the ‘Engaged Government’ project, highlighted issues associated with how to collaborate and the relationship factors involved. Also from the ‘Engaged Government’ project in a commentary paper by Loechel, Lawrence and Cheshire (2005) the importance of building trust, reciprocity, goodwill, and having flexibility and being able to compromise was noted. These areas are key aspects of managing relationships. Vincent (1999) identified relationship management as an important staff skill. In the Natural Resource Management team case study in the Management Advisory Committee study (2004), one of the learnings identified was the importance of interpersonal relationships. The Australian Public Service Commission ‘State of the Service Report 2006-2007’ had building relationships as a high priority to be addressed with other agencies to facilitate working together in WOG initiatives.

In section 3.4.2 (pages 184-197) investigating approaches and practices that have been adopted or that are designed to manage core business conflict, there were references to relationships (Office of Public Service Merit and Equity 2004), including the fact that it takes time to develop good relationships.
Communication issues were identified by Dore and Woodhill (1999) in the CYPLUS study, and Fulop and Brennan (1997), and concerned communication both across government and within agencies. The Morgan Disney and Associates et al. report to the Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination (2006) regarding the COAG Trial Evaluations exhibited a number of relationship and communication issues relating to cultural differences and respect, and highlighted the importance of building relationships. In the Institute of Public Administration study (2004) the Safer Western Australia project case study involved multiple committees and agencies creating relationship and communication issues and challenges.

The REDO study by Fulop and Brenan (1997) identified relationships, and communication, including across Government, as well as cooperation issues. These factors were also mentioned as important to assist regional stakeholders working together. The Management Advisory Committee (2004) Goodna case study and the Morgan Disney & Associates et al. COAG Indigenous trial case studies (2006) both documented issues and learnings mentioning relationships and communication.

‘Agencies focusing on their own KPIs’ is evident in the Office of Public Service Commission (2007) paper three on service delivery challenges where it was noted some agency managers were unwilling to support collaboration if it didn’t relate to core business.

**Conclusion**

The literature review did not uncover specific investigation into GAs’ core business conflict impact on relationships and contained only indirect reference to complementarity of core business (mutuality) as a positive factor. The literature did however identify issues relating to relationships and communication and their importance as a key success factor.

The research has shown that core business conflict is acknowledged as a factor that affects GA relationships when working together, that complementarity of core business has predominantly a positive effect on agency relationships, which also plays a part as a tool for reducing core business conflict, its impact and occurrence.

**Discussion – Community view of Government**

An opinion that was expressed during the interviews and was further explored in the surveys concerned the impact of core business conflict on the Community’s view of Government. Research participants stated that the Government was seen as uncoordinated, wasting resources, not fulfilling their own priorities and focused on process not outcomes and benefits to Community.
Whilst there was no single view seen as significant in relation to the research problem, the views that Government is uncoordinated and is seen to be wasting resources attracted the highest level of agreement. The highest impact was considered to be from ‘government being seen to be wasting resources’ and ‘failing to fulfill its own priorities’. Opinion was not strong regarding, however respondents had a tendency to consider ‘government seen to be uncoordinated’ and ‘failing to fulfill its own priorities’ as occurring with some frequency.

In the literature review there is evidence of the powerful influence of public opinion regarding government and the growing importance of good Government/Community relationships to address regional development issues, Keating, in Davis and Keating (eds.) (2000) and Dore and Woodhill (1999) identified as a driver of change, the changes in public expectations of Government; challenges to traditional political structures and ideologies, and the growing influence of civil and social capital.

The literature review also showed that poor public opinion of Government is an issue affecting Government and governance. The issue has been explored by many writers, arising from the growing citizen disenchantment with Government and increased expectations of government service. Some examples noted in the literature are Davis in Davis and Weller (2001), Nye cited in Davis and Weller (2001), and studies by Verba (1963), Noris (1999), Papadakis (1999), cited by McAllister and Wanna in Davis & Weller (2001).

In section 3.2.3 (pages 104-131) on regional development the social, economic and environmental issues faced by communities were seen as contributing to the disenchantment. Examples of issues are: unemployment; industry rationalization; regional decline; inflation; globalization and opening up of Australia’s economy through deregulation; and floating the Australian dollar. (Pritchard & McManus 2000 (eds.); Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003; Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003; Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989).

The issues mentioned above resulted in a constant shift of regional development policy including centralized/decentralized approaches, growth centre development, regional industry policies, rural adjustment policies, employment programs, and regional renewal projects, (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003, Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). Changes eventually led to a regional development approach where Government embraced the facilitation and partnership approach, which is the basis of regional development activities in 2009. Public opinion of Government therefore has potential to have considerable
impact on regional development activities due to the joint community and government roles that are now central to regional development activities.

Greater scrutiny of Government by the public is possible due to changes in policy and public sector management practices that have strengthened public accountability, particularly following the Coombs Report (1976). Section 3.2.2 (Table 3.1 page 100-101) outlines the changes that have taken place including changes in customer service delivery, community consultation, information dissemination, equity and accessibility of services and information to community and the shift to join public and private sector partnership for service delivery. Maintaining responsiveness to Community and a positive Community view of Government has and will continue to influence public sector management policies and practices.

Greater public involvement in and scrutiny of Government is evident in regional development projects and joint government initiatives, delivered in a context where public view of Government is an important factor and influence upon relationships between State and Civil society. Studies and reviews relating to regional development contain evidence of issues relating to public opinion of Government. For example, Fulop and Brennan (1997) identified that stakeholder and respondents indicated a loss of faith in Government, and a view that Government was not supporting its own programs. Lack of government support for its own programs was also expressed as a view by Community, in the CYPLUS report (Dore & Woodhill 1999). This could be seen as Government ‘failing to fulfill its own priorities’ as expressed by research participants.

The ‘Goodna Services Integration’ case study from the Management Advisory Committee report (2004) had to deal with Community skepticism from previous failures relating to Government activity and the fact that as a project that began centrally but involved the efforts of local agencies, participants experienced poor coordination of government. Acknowledgement of poor coordination in regional development was identified in the ‘Regional Australia Summit Report’ (2000) resulting in the ‘Framework for Cooperation’ across levels of Government being set up to improve coordination.

**Conclusion**

Both the research and the literature concur on government seen as uncoordinated and it is also evident from the literature that Community view of Government is an influential factor on policy development and in public sector management. The literature does not attribute the changing view of Community towards Government to core business conflict, but to
externalities and changes in public policy. However the research has indicated that core business conflict may also be a contributing factor, particularly in the way it affects projects and community perceptions of Government. Community’s negative opinion of Government could therefore reduce community engagement and involvement in joint initiatives.

**Discussion – Fundamental core business conflict**

Fundamental core business conflict was hard for agencies to identify, with many interviewees indicating no experience of this type of conflict, as defined for the research. Areas that were identified included ‘philosophical/ideological differences’; ‘economic/environmental focused agency philosophical clashes’; ‘conflict in interpretation of Acts and regulations’; and ‘conflict in interpretation of key roles, particularly for agencies with complementarity of core business’.

Survey did not find strong agreement with these areas and none were significant, although there was a *slightly* stronger tendency to agree with ‘philosophical/ideological conflict, than to disagree. There was a tendency to disagree with economic and environmental philosophical conflict’ and the ‘different interpretations of key roles of agencies with core business complementarity’. The environment and economic conflict was rated the highest for impact if it occurred; however occurrence was considered infrequent.

In section 3.2.1 and 3.2.3 the literature looking at the evolution of Government and governance and regional development contained evidence of fundamental core business conflict amongst agencies in discussions regarding sustainability (Davis & Weller 2001; Dore & Woodhill 1999). Competing priorities for Government to manage, such as efficiency and effectiveness, and social equity (Argy 2004; Davis & Keating (eds.) 2000; Gerritsen in Pritchard & McManus (eds.) 2000, p123) are also philosophical conflicts. These tensions create an internal challenge for agencies working in the field of social justice and equity, such as joint service delivery projects, and those focused on efficiency and effectiveness. If efficiency and effectiveness predominate in other agencies’ philosophy and way of doing business, then at the operational level in regional and other joint projects, there is potential for fundamental core business conflict with agencies that have strong social justice and equity focus and outcomes.

The balancing of economic, social and environmental elements in sustainable regional development (Dore & Woodhill 1999), reflected by Sorenson (2000), also creates an
environment in which agencies may experience fundamental core business conflict – potentially of a philosophical/ideological or economic versus environmental nature.

Another cause of potential fundamental core business conflict relates to federalism and Commonwealth and State Government relationships as explored by Vardon (2007), Hollander and Patapan (2007) and the Management Advisory Committee (2004), for example conflict relating to national versus state priorities. In addition, levels of government contribute to fundamental conflict over jurisdictional authority and responsibility amongst Federal and State agencies working together.

Regional development programs and projects are developed and implemented in a complex environment. This environment includes the impact of government policies and programs on regions as well as impacts from externalities such as globalisation and industry rationalization (Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003; Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003; Ash Amin cited in Rainnie 2002; Vipond in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). Section 3.2.3 presents examples of regional development programs and activities that involved three levels of government and were applying policies that had potential to conflict. Examples are those focused on economic growth against those addressing social and welfare issues, or driven by concern for the environment and sustainability. The philosophies and responsibilities of participating agencies and the differing perspectives across levels of government could lead to fundamental core business conflict.

An increase in WOG activities has been one response to the increasing complexity of issues faced by Government (Management and Advisory Committee 2004; Institute of Public Administration 2002). Whole-of-Government projects and initiatives, and development of joined-up service delivery initiatives tend to be responding to cross-cutting initiatives that affect multiple-agency outcomes and deliverables, and often have political and high level authority. Fundamental core business conflicts may be less likely in these projects, due to the responsibility of the project participants to achieve the WOG outcomes.

Fundamental core business conflict was not specifically identified in the literature, but was evident in issues identified. For example, the CYPLUS (report on stage 1 by Howlett 1996, contained in Dale & Bellamy 1998 and cited in Dore and Woodhill 1999) identified unresolved philosophical division between a development-oriented bureaucracy in State agencies and preferences of the regional task force, which included other agency representatives. The Goodna case study from the Management Advisory Committee report (2004) identified that there was a tension created by different agency approaches to problems.
Although not specifically stating a philosophical conflict, the difficulties in this area may have stemmed from different perspectives of individuals on the philosophy of their agencies regarding how to solve problems. The estate generation – community renewal project (Arthurson 2003) identified an issue that could create fundamental core business conflict. This was the role of public institutions in social integration and conflict of efficiency, effectiveness and social justice. One of the case studies in the Institute of Public Administration report (2002), Safer Western Australia was faced with regulatory and statutory issues that may have led to fundamental core business conflicts relating to interpretation of Acts and regulations.

**Conclusion**

The literature contained in chapter 3’s section 3.2.1 and 3.2.3, the evolution section for Government and governance and regional development, illustrates how externalities, drivers of change, policies and regional development programs focused on specific economic or social outcomes had potential to create fundamental core business conflicts when agencies worked together. The literature reports and reviews contained examples of fundamental core business conflict, but they were not identified as such in the literature.

The research findings indicated that this type of conflict was hard for participants to identify and appeared to occur infrequently. This is unexpected, given that the literature covering Government and Governance and regional development identified a number of fundamental conflicts that exist. These were due to policies and programs developed in response to externalities and drivers of change, and the competing priorities that exist in regional development.

The research did identify the following conflict areas: ‘economic versus environmental’; ‘ideological/philosophical’; ‘interpretation of Acts and regulations’; and ‘differing interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business’. However, none of these conflicts were significant in terms of the research problem, and findings did not indicate that these areas occurred regularly, although respondents considered impact from them could be high, if they occurred.

Research therefore suggests that fundamental core business conflict is not common and does not feature strongly in addressing the research problem. This is despite the fact that some fundamental core business conflicts were identified, and the context in which GAs work
together has drivers and policies that have potential to cause fundamental core business conflict.

**Discussion - Functional/operational core business conflict**

Research found functional/operational core business conflicts were more common and much easier to identify as they related to practical factors such as the differing processes and systems used to deliver GAs’ core business. Examples of these factors are program design and funding criteria, decision-making arrangements, and reporting and accountability procedures. The top six functional/operational core business conflict areas raised in the interviews fell under the themes of: power, authority and jurisdiction; reporting and accountability; processes and systems; timeframes, program design; and agency performance.

What was evident in the discussion was that many factors were inter-related and there was a cascade effect through the activities of an agency that could impact on processes and practices that GAs use when working together (and that subsequently caused core business conflicts). Figure 6.2 illustrates this cascading effect, showing how an issue with power, authority and jurisdiction shapes other processes and practices elsewhere in the organisation.

*Figure 6.2*

**Cascading influence of key themes of functional operational core business conflict**

---

Source: Developed for this research
Chapter 6

The survey explored dominant factors mentioned within the themes, which were: ‘internal structures’; ‘agencies focusing on their own KPIs’; ‘resource limitations affecting commitment levels’; strategic plan constraints allowing little room for new projects or discretionary budget’; inflexible program funding criteria’; ‘onerous reporting and accountability and differences across agencies’; ‘lengthy approval processes’; ‘timeframes to deliver/achieve outcomes’; ‘staff availability and skills’; and ‘duplication and overlap of services’.

There was agreement by respondents regarding the above-mentioned factors, impact was considered high, with the exception of ‘reporting and accountability’. For this factor, there was equal opinion regarding impact. For ‘overlap and duplication’, there was only a slight tendency for agreement.

The most significant factors concerned ‘agency strategic plans allowing little room for new projects or discretionary budget’, ‘program funding criteria inflexibility’, and ‘lengthy approval processes’. There was a high neutral rating for the occurrence of ‘agencies focusing on their own KPIs’ and ‘timeframes to achieve deliverables’. If these factors were frequent, there would be potential negative implications for Government relating to Community views as noted earlier.

The research identified three groups of issues. These were: practical issues (for example different reporting and accountability processes and systems); outcomes issues arising from practical issues (for example delays due to limited decision-making capacity locally); and intangible issues such as agency culture.

There were differences between head office and regional office responses. Head offices tended to highlight overlap of jurisdiction, corporate style, funding, reporting and accountability, and fulfilling KPIs, possibly reflecting the head office ‘overseeing role’. Regional offices tended to highlight issues such as staffing, funding cycles and constraints, and head office decision-making. The difference between head office and regional offices may be due to the fact that basic and practical things such as staffing and gaining timely decisions, affected project implementation and thus the regional offices of agencies’ capacity to deliver to their Community.

Agency focus showed differences too. Reporting and accountability were comments that came predominantly from agencies with an economic and social focus. These two areas tend to have political interest relating to employment/ jobs growth and social justice and equity. Local Governments commented on program design and flexibility as an issue. This
possibly reflects the difficulties they have with their role in regional development, and the limited resources available to support their role.

The literature exploring the evolution of Government and governance in section 3.2.1 of chapter 3 outlined some contextual influences on public sector management practices that could result in functional/operational core business conflict. Keating and Weller in Davis and Weller (2001) noted that with the increased complexity of issues facing Government, and expanding government roles and responsibilities, accountability became more of an issue, which led to various policies and practices to enable agencies to report on the outcomes and achievements in delivering core business, and account for expenditure. The Coombs Report (1976) had considerable influence on the changes developed, with systems set up to improve efficiency, accountability and transparency.

Section 3.2.2 in chapter 3 covers the changes that were embraced to fulfill reporting and accountability requirements, adhere to financial management requirements and ensure transparency and accountability to the public. The changes affected how agencies kept records, developed strategic and unit business plans (identified as an issue in the research), managed staff performance, managed and reported on outcomes and budget, structured themselves and developed delegation and decision-making policies and processes (Verspaandonk, revised by Holland 2003; Davis & Rhodes in Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000).

Each agency develops agency-specific processes and systems to deliver their core business and manage their responsibilities to suit their own structure and function. From both the research findings and the literature, the differences across agencies would appear to have contributed to core business conflict and difficulties when agencies try to work together. Public sector management changes also created cultural changes, for example the culture evident in risk-aversion amongst senior staff, and the strong focus on agency KPIs to deliver on agency performance outcomes. This is possibly due to senior officers’ contractual employment arrangements, a changed noted by Gallop (2007), that could contribute to reluctance to make decisions and difficulties when working together.

The literature also highlights that fiscal stringency due to the economic issues influenced public sector management practices, and created pressure for efficiency (Management Advisory Committee 2004; Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003; Institute of Public Administration 2002; Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000). Agencies responded with efficiency measures such as tied budget allocations for specific performance outcomes and
reduction of discretionary funding, which could be a contributing factor to funding resource difficulties when working together.

Core business conflict was not investigated in the literature, however the reviews and studies identified many issues and impediments and learnings reflecting areas that were also identified in the research, inferring a strong connection between the two areas. Some examples of literature references and the issues that are of a functional/operational nature are set out below:

- The REDO reviews by Fulop and Wiggers de Vries (1997) and Fulop and Brennan (1997) cited complex reporting and accountability and funding, as well as factors relating to centralized/decentralised management and implementation of projects. This is from the perspective of an organization dealing with government agencies.

- The CYPLUS project (Dore & Woodhill 1999) mentioned timeframes, institutional culture, institutional arrangements, and information and data management as issues. Inadequately skilled staff was also an issue, although this is not a core business conflict in itself.

- Bishop et al (2006) in the ‘Engaged Government’ study noted bureaucratisation and departmentalism; lack of integration of systems; structure and nature of bureaucratic decision-making; and centralization versus decentralization issues. Another difficulty was getting decision-makers to the table and being sure they had the authority to make decisions. The projects that were the subject of the study all required engagement and consultation with Community, thus these issues incorporate Community perspectives.

- Vincent’s (1999) review of the New South Wales WOG projects referred to agencies’ structures and legislative frameworks being for administrative convenience (and would include functional/operational elements), and not to support working collaboratively. In addition, Vincent also noted that budget and financial management systems were set up for internal agency use, not WOG activity. Vincent’s points are indicative of the significant factor noted in this research that there were ‘limitations of agencies’ strategic plans leaving little room for new projects or discretionary budget.’

- The summary of the Management Advisory Committee (2004) report content (before the case studies), explains that the public service operates in a complex environment and the report aimed to examine information, processes and practices to assist agency flexibility and responsiveness. This encompassed policy development, integration of programs and implementation and service delivery as part of WOG delivery. In compiling the findings, the report examined functional/operational aspects of agency practices – structures and
processes, information management and infrastructure, and the budget and accountability framework. The Report looked at each of the areas in turn and identified the kinds of activities or processes that should be undertaken to address the issues that occurred in those areas. Case study examples from the report follow.

- The Natural Resource Management case study identified organizational cultures and different systems for personnel and financial management across the two agencies involved, as causing difficulties.

- The Australian Greenhouse Office case study referred to difficulties with financial accountability models and processes, also the processes for decision-making and policy making. Learnings noted the need to balance administrative difficulties of reporting structure in the WOG approach.

- The Goodna case study, with its very strong community focus and involvement, referred to the different agency organization cultures, problems with different reporting and accountability, little flexibility to pool resources, and difficulties due to staff being from different agency structures.

- The ‘Sustainable Regions Program’ case study noted that inflexibility of programs was an issue, as was time taken to assess projects.

In section 3.4.2, which is focused on identifying approaches and practices to assist in managing core business conflict, the Office of Public Sector Merit and Equity (2004) and Office of Public Service Commission (2007) documented a large number of factors that are similar to the functional/operational core business conflicts identified in the research. For example:

- inability to agree on purpose, goal and outcomes
- silo mentality
- lack of budget allocation for collaborative activities
- the managing for outcomes budget system emphasis that limits programs
- agency-centred management practices
- strategic planning undertaken in isolation from other agencies
- differences in values and culture that are reinforced by budget and accountability processes
- overlap and duplication of functions
- no support within agency internal structures
- the need to conform to the external accountability mechanisms that are legislative and statutory
- the culture and work patterns of officers
- delays in coordinating funding

The Institute of Public Administration (2002) study concluded that in order to facilitate working together there was a need to make changes to structural, bureaucratic, political
and internal agency operations, despite agencies maintaining their specialized area of operation. Case studies in the study support this need:

- The Centrelink study noted difficulties with integration and information technology.
- Services Tasmania stated that there was limited integration of services, but that systems and accountability were separate.
- In the Safer Western Australia case study the different delegations and accountability across agencies was a problem. Funding difficulties were experienced, stemming from lack of support for funding at the budget level and there was reluctance to work outside individual jurisdiction areas.
- The South Australia Working Together case study involved formalizing working together through an Agreement, but this did not eliminate functional/operational difficulties. These were highlighted by the fact that each sector had its own structure, decision-making processes that made it difficult to manage the legal aspects of the arrangement. There was also inflexibility in funding agreements and problems with bureaucratic systems generally.

**Conclusion**

The literature did not investigate or identify specifically, functional/operational core business conflicts. However there were plenty of examples in the reviews and studies of these types of conflicts, such as difficulties relating to reporting and accountability, funding, agencies having different structures and processes that were hard to integrate, and differences in delegations and decision-making capacity. These issues were similar to those identified in the research where the top six functional/operational core business conflict areas raised in the interviews fell under the themes of: power, authority and jurisdiction (which includes decision-making); reporting and accountability; processes and systems; timeframes, program design; and agency performance.

The literature also presented a number of influences that could have contributed to the functional/operational core business conflicts uncovered by the research and evident in the literature reviews and studies in section 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 covering the evolution of Government and governance and public sector management practices. Influences included the drivers for increased accountability and efficiency arising from the complexity of issues and the expanded role of Government in response to the issues, and increasing fiscal stringency.
These factors contributed to the subsequent governance and public sector management policies and practice changes that were developed.

The research found that functional/operational core business conflict was easy to identify and a common occurrence. This type of core business conflict covered practical issues, outcomes issues (caused by practical issues), and included reference to intangible factors like agency culture. There were some commonalities with the issues raised in the literature, evident in the factors explored through the surveys, examples being internal structures, inflexible program funding criteria; onerous reporting and accountability and differences across agencies; lengthy approval processes, and timeframes to deliver/achieve outcomes.

The most significant functional/operational core business conflicts involved agency strategic plan constraints, inflexibility of funding criteria and lengthy approvals processes. Strategic planning is directly linked to public sector management policies and practices to ensure efficiency and accountability. The other two significant factors are evidence of the individuality of design of agencies’ own structures and systems.

It would appear that from both the literature and research findings, the structures, processes and systems set up by agencies, shaped by public sector management practices and the governance environment in which they operate to deliver their core business are a source of conflict when agencies work together. The research demonstrates a strong link between issues and impediments and core business conflict.

**Discussion – lead agent and core business conflict**

The research was investigating whether being a lead agent meant more or less experience of core business conflict and also whether the lead agent role should be included in the process model. Results were inconclusive regarding the level of core business conflict experienced. Commitment, authority and lead agent’s role featured in the discussion, which resulted in two perspectives being expressed. One perspective was that the lead agent may experience more conflict due to their role in managing the project and their commitment arising from their lead role. Interviewees indicated that the level of authority they held was important. The second was that the lead may experience less conflict due to greater commitment and motivation to achieve outcomes, with a vested interest in project success, thus avoiding or effectively managing conflict was important. There was also a view that level of conflict was not about being the lead agent, but about the quality of the team of people
involved and how well they worked together and managed the project. Research results also supported including the lead agent in the process model.

The literature reviews and studies contained references to leadership, rather than lead agent role. For example in the CYPLUS case study (Dore & Woodhill 1999), the Australian Greenhouse Study and Sustainable Regions Program case studies (Management Advisory Committee 2004) leadership and leadership style were seen as key success factors. The Institute of Public Administration study (2002) noted that leadership was important, and also ensuring that the lead agency had sufficient authority and appropriate responsibility to ensure an integrated approach worked. Case studies in the report mentioning leadership were Centrelink, New South Wales Regional Coordination, and Community Renewal in Queensland.

Leadership, including high level leadership, shared leadership and the importance of developing leadership capabilities are present in the literature providing information on processes and practices adopted by agencies to address core business conflict. The Management Advisory Committee (2005) ‘Working Together’ guide providing key points regarding considerations of the role and focus of a lead agency. The Office of Public Service Commission (2007) ‘Service delivery challenges’ research paper three identified having a lead agent as one of five collaborative service delivery frameworks, with the view that the lead is the coordinator of the service delivery. The Office of Public Service Merit and Equity (2004) ‘Seamless Government’ document includes a section on leadership, examining why it is necessary, how leaders of the initiative may be chosen and the need to determine what the leadership responsibilities entail. The section also mentions some of the challenges.

**Conclusion**

Research findings were inconclusive regarding whether a lead agency experiences more or less core business conflict. Commitment, authority and responsibilities of lead agent were discussed within the context of managing conflict. The interview discussion uncovered a view that a more influential factor on level of conflict experienced, was the quality and capability of the team managing the project and how well they worked together, not relating to the lead agent. It is suggested that earlier findings regarding the importance of good relationships and communication are important components of an effective team. The research also asked whether the lead agency role should be incorporated into the process model, and this was supported.
The literature had limited reference to lead agency role, but rather identified that leadership was important. This was both at a senior management level as well as within the project working team, and included shared leadership. Processes and practices outlined in literature also included ensuring effective leadership as a success factor, and identifying the lead agent as part of the governance structure.

Lead agency role and responsibility is part of the ‘governance framework’ and was the subject of guidelines and discussion in the Management Advisory Committee report (2004) and Office of Public Service Commission (2007).

In terms of the research problem, the research and literature are indicative of the need to have effective and capable leadership, and this would be whether there was a lead agency role, shared leadership or a team. Additionally high level leadership within an agency was also considered important for joint initiatives.

**Discussion – non-core business conflict factors**

Conflict when agencies work together is not confined to GA core business, interagency barriers as identified in the literature, or purely related to agencies’ own structure, policies, management practices, procedures and systems. To gain a broader view of conflict factors, other causes of conflict were investigated in the research.

Research results indicated that the most common non-core business conflicts were related to politics and personalities. The political theme included political and ministerial interference, political agendas, and differing political parties at the various levels of Government. All Federal agencies mentioned political influences, possibly reflecting the higher level and political focus that many of their activities involved. Personalities covered things like ego, control and authoritarianism, risk aversion, and turf protection. Federal agencies mentioned local situational factors as an influence. This may be because regional locational characteristics are part of the ‘intelligence’ gathered to support the case for federal intervention.

Other factors included distance and level of isolation, locational factors (drought, declining economy), demographics (unemployment, ageing population), staff skill levels, community expectations, management style, and resources.

Surveys found there was general agreement that these areas were commonly experienced, with political factors seen as having the highest impact, followed by personalities...
and distance and level of isolation. Personalities attracted a higher neutral response in relation to rate of occurrence. This could be reflecting a reluctance to highlight that there are individuals in the region who may constitute a problem. The most significant non-core business factors were ministerial influence/interference and different political parties at three levels of government. Respondents demonstrated high levels of agreement, considered the impact to be high and the occurrence to be frequent.

As the literature was not investigating GA core business conflict, non-core business conflict issues did not feature as a separate category of issues or impediments. However, there were references to some similar areas, for example political issues, GA staff skills and community expectations and locational factors affecting regional governance and regional development.

Politicization was noted in the ‘Engaged Government’ project (Bishop et al. 2006), Stage 1 review of CYPLUS by Howlett (1996) in Dale & Bellamy and cited by Dore and Woodhill (1999), and the review of the regional economic development organizations (Fulop and Brennan 1997).

A number of the literature studies and case studies involved community engagement as a key part of a project - the CYPLUS case study (Dore & Woodhill 1999), the COAG Trial report (November 2006), and the ‘Goodna Services Integration’ (Management and Advisory Committee 2004). A common issue identified in these projects was poor GA staff skills (in dealing with culturally sensitive issues for example).

Issues with community expectations occurred in the CYPLUS, COAG Trial, and regional development organization review. The ‘Growing Victoria Together’ case study and the ‘Community Renewal’ in Queensland case study from the Institute of Public Administration Australia study (2002) identified difficulties responding to differing and competing community expectations.

An area that was mentioned in the literature, but was not highlighted in the interviews concerned the limitations of information and communication technology. This was from a technical and capacity sense, and was an issue raised in a shared service delivery case study in the Centrelink Service Tasmania case study in the Institute of Public Administration study (2002). The Public Service Commission ‘State of the Service 2006-2007’ report identified information communication technology (ICT) as being a priority issue that needed to be
addressed. This was in relation to inter-operability, technical platforms, sharing information, and protocols to support WOG activity. Information sharing issues raised in the research were more about reluctance to share information.

The politicization of regional issues and needs is a familiar scenario to public servants, but is not included as part of the research. However, the extant literature provides some indication of the influences that contribute to an environment that has fostered greater political and ministerial influence and interference in agency core business.

Influences include the changed role of Government, citizen dissatisfaction and the relationship between citizen and the state, accountability and the changed relationship between Ministers and the public service. Considine cited in Crowley and Coffey (2007) noted that the role of Government has changed to one of steering, partnering and devolving authority. The approach to regional development, for example, reflects this shift, with a greater focus on Government working with Community to address regional development issues and opportunities. This creates a potential need for political influence/interference to ensure that government policies are implemented and government priorities are addressed.

Citizen dissatisfaction mentioned earlier (Davis in Davis & Weller 2001; also Nye 1997 cited in Davis & Weller 2001; Verba 1963, Norris 1999, Papadakis 1999 cited in McAllister & Wanna in Davis & Weller 2001), has led to a greater Government focus on policies to improve client servicing, efficiency and accountability. Closer public scrutiny of government and engagement with government in response to this dissatisfaction may also tend to increase ministerial involvement in agencies’ activities, in response to constituent pressures.

Community view of Government has already been identified as potentially being influenced by core business conflict (page 406-409). There is therefore a link with ‘community expectations’ identified as a non-core business area of conflict. The research found the level of occurrence for ‘community expectations’ was divided between respondents who considered a tendency for it to occur frequently and those who considered it to be infrequent. The difference in view reflects respondents’ experience and the nature of projects in which they were involved including the level of community engagement and public profile of the project.

Increasing community participation in Government and bottom-up driven projects mean that failure to manage community expectations has potentially serious consequences on projects. The CYPLUS review (Dore & Woodhill 1999) and ‘Goodna Services Integration’
project (Management Advisory Committee 2004) experienced issues concerning the consequences of failing to manage community expectations – poor relationships and lack of trust.

The relationship between the Government and public service noted by Clarke and Corbett (1999) as most evident in the Whitlam years, resulted in Ministers desiring advisors in agencies with sympathetic understanding of their party. Ministers have since strengthened private offices, reorganised portfolios, abolished departments and created new ones. The influence and authority of Ministerial intervention was noted as a tool for supporting joint initiatives. The research identified that ministerial intervention could be used to coerce reluctant agencies. In the literature, key success factors and approaches used included gaining ministerial endorsement to strengthen the authority for an initiative, for example in the ‘Community Renewal’, ‘Safer Western Australia’ and ‘Growing Victoria Together’ projects in the Management Advisory Committee (2004) report. Ministers also engage senior public servants that are most appropriate to their needs and political philosophy. The closer relationship between agencies and Ministers enables greater involvement and capacity to intervene in, as well as to influence, agency core business, policy and program design.

Locational factors and their implication in terms of capacity for Community and regions to participate in regional governance were highlighted by Lawrence (2004). Lawrence points out there is a growing focus on self-help, bottom-up activities involving community engagement in governance and multi-level partnerships and devolved decision-making. However, Community capacity and resources may present challenges to this approach.

**Conclusion**

The research explored conflict in the wider sense, investigating non-core business related factors that caused conflict. Findings were that the most prevalent were political or personality-related. Other factors were location-related, community expectations of agencies and projects, staff skills, management style and resources.

The literature and research have identified many similar non-core business conflict issues. These issues add to the difficulties of GAs working together and tend to be factors over which GAs have no control, but that have to be taken into account and managed.

The literature did not examine this area specifically, but contained examples of similar non-core business related factors, including politics, staff skills and community expectation and locational influence in regional governance. Community expectation referred to the
broader aspect of community expectations of government in the Government and governance section, and specific community views about agencies and the Government, in the case of projects.

Information and communication technology issues relating to both capacity and technical issues were raised in the literature, but not the research. Information technology has changed the way GAs communicate and deliver services. Information technology and capacity for inter-operability was identified in the literature as needing improvement to enable agencies to work collaboratively (Management Advisory Committee 2004; Institute of Public Administration 2002).

The literature covering the evolution of Government and governance contained reference to a range of factors that could have contributed to issues relating to political influence and interference and community expectations. These influences included the changed role of Government, citizen dissatisfaction and the relationship between citizen and the state, and accountability (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001; Putnam 1995 cited in Davis & Weller 2001; Bishop & Davis 2001 cited in Crowley & Coffey 2007).

Conflict when agencies work together is therefore caused by more than core business conflict. Agencies management of this type of conflict and the issues it causes will be influenced by the individual agencies’ core business and the way that it is delivered.

6.2.2 The relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs working together

This section looks at two areas. Firstly the findings from the research and literature review regarding issues and impediments experienced when GAs work together are presented. Secondly, the relationship between core business conflict to issues and impediments is then explored. This includes looking at research findings on participant opinion of the relationship and a comparison between issues and impediments identified and core business conflict.

Summary of research findings and extant literature and research

Table 6.3 lists the key findings from the research regarding the relationship of core business conflict to the issues and impediments affecting GAs working together. The shaded topic areas are the focus of discussions following the Table.
Table 6.3
Summary of the key finding regarding the relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments affecting GAs working together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISSUES AND IMPEDIMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The issues and impediments could be classified as practical issues, outcomes issues and intangible issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the issues were practical issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The top ten themes were power, authority and jurisdiction; program design; agency performance; organizational structure and culture; outcomes and deliverables; reporting and accountability; personnel; management structures and approaches; legislation and regulation; and Government and agency performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the key themes inter-related, for example organizational culture affects management practices and design and implementation of operational processes; power, authority and jurisdiction affects local capacity for decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New public sector management practices were seen to influence management style and organizational culture, including the strong focus on efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative responsibilities of GAs contribute to issues experienced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a view that projects initiated from Community posed other difficulties such as community engagement and fitting a project to agency plans, with the strategic plans seen as a barrier to bottom-up projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys investigated political issues; personality difficulties; decision-making limitations; jurisdictional boundary overlaps and gaps; performance and KPIs; differing &amp; multiple reporting &amp; accountability; onerous bureaucratic processes; project delays; duplication of activities; community expectations unfulfilled; uncoordinated agency activity; mismatch funding cycles; inflexibility of funding &amp; program criteria; legislative timeframes &amp; concurrency; ‘poorer’ agencies’ resource limitations; lack of staff continuity; risk-avers management; and internal agency silo structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatest agreement was for political, personality, decision-making and project delays. Highest impacts were from personality, decision-making, community expectations and risk-averse management and most frequent in occurrence were political, personality and decision-making issues. There was a slightly stronger tendency to disagree that limited resources from poorer agencies was an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most significant factors were political issues, personality difficulties, project delays, decision-making risk-averse management and internal agency silos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CORE BUSINESS CONFLICT AND ISSUES AND IMPEDIMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineteen of the interviewees considered issues and impediments and core business conflict as the same, linked to some degree or closely aligned, with four more considering them to be linked at the functional/operational level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common areas between core business conflict and issues and impediments relating to functional/operational core business activities included duplication of activities; overlap of boundaries; decision-making; authority; centralised versus decentralized agencies; funding; program inflexibility; bureaucratic processes; reporting and accountability; focus on KPIs; silos; legislation; staff continuity; resource limitations; organizational structure, including silos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common areas between core business conflict and issues were fundamental core business related particularly to legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common intangible areas included organisational culture and risk-averse management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two non-core business issues were common – personalities and politics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview and survey data.

**Discussion – issues and impediments**

Research found that the top ten themes into which issues and impediments fell included: ‘power, authority and jurisdiction’; ‘program design’; ‘agency performance’; ‘organizational structure and culture’; ‘outcomes and deliverables’; ‘reporting and accountability’; ‘personnel (particularly inconsistency of staff)’; ‘management structures and approaches’; ‘legislation and regulation’; and ‘Government and agency performance’.

Additional research findings were that Public sector management practices and policies in response to pressures for efficiency, effectiveness and equity of access to services were
seen to affect management style and practices and organizational structures and processes. Legislative responsibilities of GAs involved in projects created issues and impediments, according to some agencies. Issues with legislation affected/dictated timeframes and could create ‘conditional’ arrangements for project progress.

The issues and impediments, like functional/operational core business conflicts, can be divided into practical issues, outcomes issues and intangible issues, with practical issues being the most prevalent. Practical issues covered areas such as limited decision-making capacity; jurisdictional boundary overlaps and gaps; performance measures and KPIs; and different and multiple reporting and accountability requirements. Outcomes issues included factors such as project delays; community expectations not fulfilled; uncoordinated agency activities; poor cooperation and collaboration; and inability to deliver outcomes and deliverables in timeframes. Intangible factors included risk-averse management and personality difficulties.

The surveys investigated 18 factors from within the dominant themes. Highest agreement was for ‘political issues’, highest impact was for ‘personality difficulties’ and strongest support for frequent occurrence was ‘political issues’. There was a slight tendency to disagree with ‘Limited resources from poorer agencies’. Significant factors were found to be: ‘political issues’; ‘personality difficulties’; ‘local decision-making limited’; ‘project delays’; ‘risk-averse management’; and ‘internal agency silos’. Political-specific issues are not related to core business conflict. Decision-making capacity and internal agency silos are practical issues, other areas are outcomes issues and intangible issues.

The research had a number of areas that had high neutral responses. In relation to impact these included: ‘mismatched funding cycles; ‘rigid performance measures’ and ‘demands to fulfill own KPIs’; and ‘limited resources available from poorer agencies’. For rate of occurrence, issues with high neutral response were: ‘onerous bureaucratic processes’, ‘legislative timeframes and concurrency; jurisdictional overlap and gaps’; and ‘rigid performance measures and demand to fulfill KPI’. These higher levels of neutral rating for impact could be seen as indicative that although there was agreement these issues occurred, there was lack of experience of them occurring and thus inability to rate them. Alternatively it could be indicative that respondents were reluctant to make a judgment about colleagues and agencies in their regions with whom they work. Similar arguments could apply to the neutral rating for occurrence.

What was apparent in the discussion was that many issues were inter-related or caused an issue. Table 6.4 (page 428) is a matrix that aims to demonstrate some of the links and
inter-relationship. Many of the issues and impediments concern public sector management practices and relate to aspects of Government and governance (jurisdictional boundaries, legislative responsibilities).
Table 6.4

Inter-relationship and linkages across issues, impediments

| Numbers reflect numbered items listed below | Rigid performance measures & demand to fulfill KPIs | Limited decision-making locally | Jurisdictional boundaries and overlaps | Different & multiple reporting & accountability requirements | Duplication of activities | Mismatched funding cycles | Inflexibility in funding & program criteria | Legislative timeframes & concurrency | Limited resources from poorer agencies | Staff inconsistency | Internal agency structure | Project delays | Unfilled community expectations | Bureaucratic processes | Timeframe blow out | Poor communication | Risk averse management | Lack of cooperation & collaboration | Authoritarian management approach | Authoritarian management culture |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| PRACTICAL                                   |                                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 1. Rigid performance measures and demand to fulfill KPIs |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 2. Limited decision-making locally          |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 3. Jurisdictional boundaries and overlaps     |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 4. Different and multiple reporting and accountability requirements |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 5. Duplication of activities                 |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 6. Mismatched funding cycles                 |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 7. Inflexibility in funding and program criteria |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 8. Legislative timeframes and concurrency    |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 9. Limited resources from poorer agencies    |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 10. Staff inconsistency                      |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 11. Internal agency structure                |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| OUTCOMES                                    |                                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 12. Project delays                           |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 13. Community expectations unfulfilled       |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 14. Onerous bureaucratic processes           |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 15. Timeframe blow out                       |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 16. Poor communication                       |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 17. Risk averse management                   |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 18. Lack of cooperation and collaboration    |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| INTANGIBLE                                  |                                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 19. Personalities                           |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 20. Authoritarian management approach        |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |
| 21. Organizational culture                   |                                  |                                 |                                       |                                                             |                        |                      |                             |                             |                                    |                 |                             |                |                           |                 |                           |                 |                             |                           |                             |

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview and survey data.

Shaded squares indicate a link to, inter-dependency or influence upon another area. Not all connections are shaded, as the Table is merely to provide some examples of the connections.
The literature reviews, reports and studies captured a broad spectrum of issues and impediments, many of which are similar to ones identified by research participants. These issues can also be grouped into practical, outcomes and intangible issues. Some examples and details of issues of key groupings are listed below:

- **Agency culture** – differences, leadership influence, historical,
- **Agency programs** – inflexible, prescriptive
- **Agency autonomy** – loss when working together
- **Centralised agencies versus decentralized** agencies – affecting decision-making
- **Collaboration** – no real understanding of what it entails or what the limitations are
- **Commitment** – varies in participants and within agencies
- **Communication** – poor to community about the project (purpose, progress), within agencies and across agencies, reluctance to share information
- **Community engagement** – poor, dominated by government, insensitive
- **Community view** – skepticism, loss of faith in Government
- **Coordination** – issues with centrally driven projects, across agencies, within agencies – silo effect, across multiple community groups
- **Different systems** for personnel/HR systems, financial delegation and processes
- **Efficiency and effectiveness** versus social justice
- **Funding** – lack of funding, managing and reporting, inflexibility, lack of budget allocation for collaborative activities; managing for outcomes budget system limits program flexibility
- **Goals, objectives and outcomes** – sharing/claiming, national versus local, manageability
- **Government performance** – not supporting its own initiatives
- **Information and data management** – across agencies, compatibility, costs, inter-operability mechanism
- **Internal agency conflict** - lack of understanding by head office of regional situation, lack of support from senior management at head office
- **Jurisdictional boundaries/responsibilities** – lack of alignment, duplication, reluctance to work outside jurisdiction
- **Leadership** – senior and political, community capacity
- **Logistical** issues of joint service delivery, locations, resources
- **Management culture** – related to agency culture and influencing approach and professional ethos, reinforced by budget and accountability processes
- **Management practices** – agency-centred, authoritarian
- **Machinery of Government changes** – break continuity, waste resources, political cycles too short
- **Monitoring and evaluation** – different approaches and needs, traditional methods unsuitable
- **Operational differences** – process and systems, practices,
- **Planning** - processes not well related to implementation, dissonance between high level bureaucratic/political decision-making and lower level planning, strategic planning undertaken from individual agency perspective only, in isolation from other agencies
- **Priorities** – different between state/local, federal/state/local, different in agencies
- **Policy and service delivery** difficulties (internal agency conflict), incompatibility of policies
- **Political** - politicisation of project, political shifts, political will and agendas
- **Power relations** in emerging multi-level modes of governing
- **Purchaser/provider** issues
Regional decision-making – limited capacity, varied across departments, process for joint decision-making
Regulation and Acts – interpretation and complexity
Relationships – quality, time to build them, lack of trust, frustration, vary in quality, affected by personalities, between government and non-government, poor history
Reporting and accountability – multiple reporting, accountability to government and community, Financial Management and Accountability Act 1997, different accountability models, difference between internal and external accountability in WOG
Resources – dedicated staff, pooled funds or designated funds, WOG resource intensive, resource limitations
Staff – availability, consistency, skills, burn-out, personalities
Systems incompatible with working together - Legislative frameworks, systems and structures, financial arrangements not suited to working collaboratively
Timeframes in which to achieve things, slowness to achieve outcomes
Voluntaristic approach to engaged government, not a model
WOG – not fit into normal work, an ‘addition’, not a priority, agency structures and systems not designed for WOG activity

Conclusion
Issues and impediments identified through the research involved practical, outcome and intangible issues, with politics and personalities (non-core business related issues) featuring quite strongly. The high level of neutral opinion regarding impact and occurrence could be influenced by the fact that respondents had not experienced those factors, or reflect a caution regarding judging colleagues with whom they had worked.

The issues and impediments in the literature contained many similar factors to the core business conflict elements identified through the research. The literature factors could also be divided into practical, outcomes and intangible issues.

Discussion – relationship between core business conflict and issues and impediments

The research asked interviewees to comment on what connection there was between core business conflict and issues and impediments. Nineteen of the interviewees considered issues and impediments and core business conflict as the same, linked to some degree or closely aligned, with four more considering them to be linked at the functional/operational level. There was evidence of practical issues leading to outcomes issues in the responses by three interviewees who indicated that one leads to the other (issues and impediments lead to core business conflicts). Many of the issues were functional/operational issues. Three of the interviewees were unsure and two declined to comment. Research findings therefore indicate that issues and impediments are the same, or linked.
Comparison of the information gathered on issues and impediments, and fundamental and functional/operational core business during the research investigation, identifies the following common areas:

- Duplication of activities
- Overlap of jurisdictional boundaries
- Decision-making
- Authority chains (power, authority and jurisdiction)
- Centralisation versus decentralisation
- Funding cycles mismatched
- Inflexibility of Programs and funding
- Multiple reporting requirements
- Bureaucratic and onerous processes
- Differing reporting and accountability processes
- Agency focus on own KPIs
- Silo mentality in management
- Legislative issues
- Continuity of staff
- Lack of resources
- Funding constraints
- Organisation culture
- Organisation structure and silos

Areas common to fundamental core business conflict and issues and impediments noted through the interviews were: economic and environmental philosophical conflict and legislative related issues.

The literature did not examine the relationship of core business conflict to issues and impediments. However, as previously mentioned, there were commonalities between issues and impediments identified in the literature and those identified in the research. As noted above, the research had also found conflicts between the issues and impediments and core business conflict which participants identified from their own experience.

There were areas and factors in the literature issues and impediments that were not identified in the research. Examples are:

- Challenges to achieving a customer service focus
- Community engagement issues, such as government driving the agenda and making decisions; poor communication to community;
- mixed messages to Community from different areas of government
- lack of coordination by government in regional development projects
- national blanket policy does not appropriate to individual regions
- Ministers’ responsibilities reflect organizational and legislative structures and heads of agencies have contractual arrangement with Ministers not a consumer group or community
- Join up for program delivery but not policy development
- Delivering federal programs at a regional level
- Capacity for joint decision-making by agencies
- Community capacity improvement to understand government and processes
- Sensitivity of issues involved in the project
- Need for different evaluation process
- Resource coordination from different agencies
- Cooperation levels varied
- Time taken for assessment of projects for funding
- Seen as a Federal government driven initiative, not community or region
A closer look at the items listed above reflects the fact that the literature intent was to study and review projects to gather information on issues, barriers and learnings to inform the development of frameworks and strategies to improve agencies ability to work together. Engagement and management of stakeholders are key aspects of a number of the issues noted, and for some projects community engagement was a key component. This research investigation focusing on core business conflict, and is therefore from a different perspective. It draws on the views and experiences of officers involved in joint GA initiatives. Projects and local collaboration provides the experience upon which the research participants drew.

**Conclusion**

The research shows that there is a close relationship between issues and impediments and core business conflict. Almost 71 percent (22) considered they were the same, linked closely aligned, or one led to the other. The latter possibly refers to the ‘outcomes issues’ category described in the research analysis. The close linkages and concurrency are evident when issues and impediments and core business conflict are compounded.

There are commonalities between issues and impediments in the literature research issues and impediments and core business conflict. There is strong evidence that supports the relationship and linkages.

The literature also identified issues and impediments that were not raised in the research. This is due to the focus of the literature being to review and report on WOG projects and programs, or to capture information to inform the development of frameworks and strategies to assist agencies to working together. The research, on the other hand, focuses on core business conflict specifically, and is directed at operational officers and draws on their experience and views.

### 6.2.3 Dominant core business conflicts

This section presents research findings regarding the dominant core business conflicts. Discussion relating to the dominant core business conflict in relation to the literature follows Table 6.5 (page 433) summarising the key finding of the research.

**Summary of research findings and extant research and literature**

Table 6.5 (page 433) presents a summary of the key findings relating to dominant core business conflicts. Discussion of the findings follows the Table.
Table 6.5
Summary of the key finding regarding the dominant core business conflicts affecting GAs working together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant core business conflicts were mostly from the functional/operational core business conflict area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most are practical or outcomes issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were two reference to fundamental core business conflict, one being economic and environmental focused agency conflict, described as ‘opposing driving philosophies’, and the second referring to legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The top six dominant themes were: legislation, program design, power, authority and jurisdiction; processes and systems; personnel related; resources and information resources; and management structures and approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two non-core business factors were also mentioned – politics and personalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power, authority and jurisdiction was the largest theme discussed, with many areas associated with it including decision-making; top-down management approach affecting approval processes, project implementation and timeframes and individual agency processes and systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant factors explored in the survey were: lack of program funding and flexibility; conflicting timeframes or inability to meet timeframes; decision-making limitations; lengthy approval processes; mismatch funding cycles; reluctance to commit resources or already committed to core business; inconsistent staff; limited staff skills and knowledge; regulatory conflicts and bureaucratic application of regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongest agreement was for lack of funding flexibility, mismatched funding cycles, limited staff knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest impact was for reluctance to commit resources due to being already committed to core business; no consistency of staff; decision-making limited locally and regulatory conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of occurrence was that generally most of the factors identified were infrequent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No factors were significant with agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence having been rated across all three areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview and survey data.

Discussion

The dominant issues and impediments and core business conflicts identified by the interviewees were mostly functional/operational core business conflicts that were practical or outcomes issues. There was limited reference to factors that were of a more fundamental core business conflict nature, which was the economic versus environment conflict and regulatory issues relating to land use.

The top six themes were ‘legislation’; ‘program design’; ‘power, authority and jurisdiction’; ‘processes and systems’; ‘personnel related’; ‘resource and information resources’; and ‘management structure and approaches’. Two dominant non-core business issues were mentioned, being politics and personalities. ‘Power, authority and jurisdiction’ was the largest theme discussed. This theme contains many inter-related areas such as decision-making, top-down management affecting approval processes, which also affects project implementation and timeframes.

The survey explored dominant factors within the themes, including ‘lack of program funding and flexibility’; ‘conflicting timeframes or inability to meet timeframes’; ‘decision-making limitations’; ‘lengthy approval processes’, ‘mismatched funding cycle’s; ‘agencies
reluctant to commit resources, or resources already committed to core business’; ‘no consistency of staff’; ‘limitations in skills and knowledge amongst staff’; ‘regulatory conflicts’ and ‘the bureaucratic way regulations are applied’.

There was general agreement that the factors being investigated were the most dominant, with strongest agreement for ‘lack of funding flexibility’, ‘limitation in skills and knowledge amongst staff’ and ‘funding cycles mismatched’. Impact was generally considered high for most of the factors, with ‘reluctance to commit resources or resources already committed to core business being rated by the most respondents as having a high impact. The factors attracting the greatest number of respondents in agreement and considering that the impact was high are related to personnel and funding. Both of these factors are key components to being able to effectively deliver projects.

There was a high neutral response to ‘timeframes conflict or inability to meet timeframes’ and ‘lengthy approval processes’. Most factors were rated as occurring infrequently with the exception of ‘no consistency of staff’, which had a high neutral rating. Opinion regarding ‘reluctance to commit resources or resources already committed’ was almost evenly spread regarding occurrence. No factors were significant enough to have agreement, high impact and considered to occur frequently.

Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 in the literature dealing with Government and governance and public sector management practices, document influences and changes in both areas that will have contributed to making dominant the identified issues and impediments and core business conflicts. Contributing factors include the role of legislation influencing agency activity, budget allocation and structure; broader Government responsibilities and role; and changing public sector management practices in response to a need to be efficient, responsive and accountable (Halligan in Aulich, Halligan & Nutley (eds.) 2001; Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000; Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001; Davis & Rhodes in Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000).

The responsibility of Government is still based on the laws passed by parliament and funds voted/allocated by parliament for declared purposes, (Keating & Davis in Davis & Weller 2001). Acts and Regulations underpin a number of agencies’ roles and must be applied by agencies, possibly contributing to regulatory conflicts and issues (depending on the nature of the legislation). Defined budget allocations, combined with the strategic planning, business planning and financial reporting and accountability, and managing for outcomes undertaken by agencies outlined in section 3.2.2 of chapter 3, dictate agency priorities, shape
management practices, KPIs, influence program design and restrict the way funds are spent. Research has shown that these are all areas that contributed to dominant core business conflicts.

The changing role of Government to one which is consultative, transparent, accountable and responsive (Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003) has been a strong influence upon changes to public sector management practices. However, responsibilities amongst government departments still reflect traditional government functions (Keating & Davis in Davis & Weller 2001). These functions are reflected in the power, authority and jurisdiction area, encouraging agencies to stick to their core responsibilities, and determining the decision-making arrangements within an agency.

The Management Advisory Committee report (2004), the review of the New South Wales collaborative projects by Vincent (1999), the Department of Families report compiled to design the guidelines for staff (2002) and the Institute of Public Administration Australia study (2002) all sought common and dominant issues and themes, upon which to base recommendations. This information contributed to determining some of the key barriers to GAs working on WOG and joint service delivery initiatives. Findings in the reports and studies informed the development of frameworks, strategies and mechanisms to improve agency capacity to work together.

A list of the dominant issues has been compiled from analysis of the information from the reports from the literature mentioned above, and the project and program reviews in the literature:

- Reporting and accountability
- Budget and financial process, systems and accountability
- Agency culture
- Differing agency structures and approaches
- Decision-making capabilities and authority
- Information, data management and ICT
- Funding and program inflexibility
- Resourcing issues
- Relationships
- Internal agency conflict
- Community engagement and managing community relationships
- Political issues
- Working across levels of Government
- Risk management

Many of these are similar to the dominant factors or theme areas in the research, strengthening the case supporting these factors as being the most dominant. The research did identify timeframes (conflicting or inability to meet timeframes), whereas the literature did not. Reluctance to commit resources due to the priority that resources are expended on
agency core business was raised by interviewees. This issue did not feature as a dominant factor in the literature.

The literature referred to community engagement and managing community relationships. Although this was mentioned in the research responses, it was not a dominant factor. This is most likely due to the previously mentioned difference in focus of the literature and this research. An extract of examples from the literature of similar common issues is presented below:

- The CYPLUS case study (Dore & Woodhill 1999) identified the bureaucratic way regulations were applied. Legislative difficulties were also noted by Vincent (1999) where agency structures and legislative frameworks reflect administrative convenience or tradition. This is echoed by Bishop et al. (2006) who noted that legislation and statutory frameworks restricted what agencies can do.

- Program design issues relating to funding, accountability and inflexibility of program and funding criteria was evident in the Institute of Public Administration Australia (2002) case study on ‘South Australia Working Together’, ‘Safer Western Australia’ and the Management Advisory Committee (2004) case study on ‘Sustainable Regions’.

- ‘Power, authority and jurisdictional boundaries’ encompass a complex range of issues. The dominant factor however, was the capacity for local decision-making. This relates to two areas, the centralized/decentralized status of agencies and the organizational structure and culture of agencies. Both areas influence management approaches, and determine authority hierarchies that affect decision-making. Issues relating to authority also included authority behind projects and gaining higher level commitment and endorsement from senior officers in an agency or from head office. Many of the studies and reports highlighted factors that are part of power, authority and jurisdiction:
  - CYPLUS (Dore & Woodhill 1999) raised capacity for regional decision-making in community driven processes.
  - Bishop et al. (2006) identified that from a public policy framework perspective issues existed relating to working collaboratively and to whether agencies were centralized or decentralized, as well as difficulties of getting the right decision-makers to the table.
  - Loechel, Lawrence and Cheshire (2005) in a commentary paper about the ‘Engaged Government’ project noted the power relations within emerging multi-level modes of governing
- ‘Safer Western Australia’, a case study in the Institute of Public Administration Australia (2002) indicated there was a reluctance to work outside bureaucratic jurisdiction
- Department of Families (2002) ‘Handbook for integrated governance’ noted decision-making as an issue. The approach and solution recommended was to ensure that decision-making capacity for agencies was identified and that there were agreed processes for decision-making

- Personnel issues featured non-core business factors including personalities, people’s attitudes and staff skills in a number of the studies evident in CYPLUS (Dore & Woodhill 1999); the COAG Pilot ((Morgan Disney & Associates Pty Ltd et al. November 2006); New South Wales Regional Coordination Institute of Public Administration Australia (2002).

- Skill needs for working together, are recognized in the extant research (Management Advisory Committee 2004 report; New South Wales review by Vincent 1999; Department of Families Handbook 2002). The Indigenous projects CYPLUS (Dore & Woodhill 1999) and the COAG Pilot ((Morgan Disney & Associates Pty Ltd et al November 2006) both identified staff skills as lacking amongst government agencies, in relation to working with Indigenous communities.

- Inflexibility of funding and programs was raised by the case studies ‘Sustainable Regions’ and the ‘Goodna Services Integration’ projects in the Management Advisory Committee (2004). The latter was in relation to inflexibility to pool funds. Vincent (1999) hinted at inflexibility in the New South Wales review by indicating that agency structures, financial accountability and budgets reflected individual agency needs, and therefore presumably are not easy to adapt to respond to additional needs.

**Conclusion**

The research identified that the dominant core business conflicts were mostly functional/operational core business conflicts and practical or outcomes issues. The dominant factors were associated with legislation; program design; power, authority and jurisdiction (the largest category); personnel related; resource and information resources; and management structure and approaches.

The survey explored specific areas within these themes and results indicated that in general there was agreement with the factors. Strongest indication of agreement was for
funding cycles mismatched and limitations in skills and knowledge of staff. These factors pose personnel and funding challenges in joint initiatives, both of which are fundamental to successfully implementing projects. The highest rated factors for impact were also related to funding and personnel, being ‘reluctance to commit resources or resources already committed’, and ‘no consistency of staff’. Ratings for occurrence tended to indicate that most factors occurred infrequently. No factors were significant rated with agreement, high impact and occurring frequently across all three areas.

There were two areas of the literature review relevant to this research question. Firstly the literature covering the evolution of Government and governance and public sector management practices. The second are includes the reviews and reports looking at issues and impediments when GAs work together, and process and practices to address issues and impediments.

Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 in the literature review discusses changes that could have contributed to the dominant core business conflicts. Contributing factors identified include the role of legislation influencing agency activity, budget allocation and structure; broader Government responsibilities and role; and changing public sector management practices in response to a need to be efficient, responsive and accountable.

Section 3.4 of the literature review investigating processes and practices to address core business conflict identified common issues in order to develop frameworks and strategies. This information, combined and analysed with information from the reviews and reports in section 3.3 provides a list of the most dominant factors. Many of these are similar to those identified through the research. Two areas that differed were: the research had identified timeframes as a common factor and the literature contained factors relating to community engagement. The latter was raised in the research, but not to the same extent. This is due to the nature of the projects and the fact that the research was investigating difficulties between agencies, and not with all stakeholders.

The research findings combined with literature findings confirm the most dominant issues and core business conflicts are reporting and accountability, financial-related issues, and authority and decision-making. These issues are indicative that WOG and collaboration challenge structures and mechanisms for funding arrangements, accountability and how to report on joint initiatives, and resolving the decision-making problem.
6.2.4 The impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs’ relationships

This section covers the research findings about the impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs’ relationships. It draws on material from section 6.2.2, which covered the nature of core business conflict. Information is drawn from results relating to Community opinion of Government and impact of conflict on GAs’ relationships. A Table summarizing the research findings is presented first. Research findings and the literature are discussed under the topics in the shaded headings in the Table.

Summary of research findings and extant literature and research

Table 6.6 lists the findings of the research regarding the impact of core business conflict on regional development projects, joint initiatives and GAs’ relationships. The Table is followed by discussion topics from the shaded headings in Table 6.6.

Table 6.6
Summary of the key finding regarding the impact of core business conflicts on regional development, joint initiatives and GAs relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECTS AND JOINT INITIATIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The top eight themes for impact of core business conflict were project impact; outcomes and deliverables; relationships; efficiency and duplication; timeframes; cooperation; government performance and resources and information management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main factors examined through the survey were: reduces outcomes; slows down or stops projects; creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in timeframes; implementation is inefficient; resources and time are wasted on resolving issues; withdrawal of support and effort by some stakeholders; and increase in the overall ‘cost’ of project in time, money and personnel effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest agreement was for difficulties achieving deliverables in timeframes and resources and time wasted on resolving issues. Generally impact was considered high, particularly difficulties achieving deliverables, withdrawal of support, implementation inefficient and slowing or stopping of projects. Most frequent was difficulties achieving deliverables and slowing or stopping projects. Infrequent effects were resources and time wasted on resolving issues and increasing of overall ‘cost’ of project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The factors explored were all outcomes issues as a result of practical issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main impact on projects is that they are slowed down or stopped; outcomes and deliverables are reduced in quality, breadth and depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most significant areas were slowing or stopping projects; creating difficulties achieving deliverables and project implementation being inefficient.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6 continues…
Table 6.6. continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY OPINION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With outcomes and deliverables affected, Government and agency performance and Community view of Government is influenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community does not benefit as much from Government activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews identified that Community views Government as uncoordinated, wasting resources, failing to fulfill its own priorities, and concerned with process not outcomes and benefit to community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys indicated that there was agreement for Community view of Government as being uncoordinated and seen to be wasting resources. In relation to fulfilling its own priorities, opinion was almost evenly distributed, but with a slightly stronger tendency to disagree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, impact was considered high if community held these views, with the highest impact being seen to be for Government seen to be wasting resources and failing to fulfill its own priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents tended to consider Government seen to be uncoordinated and failing to fulfill its own priorities as frequent and Government seen to be wasting resources as infrequent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPACT ON RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact on relationships was raised in responses about impact on projects. A previous question had asked about the impact of core business conflict on agency relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships are degraded, resulting in poor communication, reluctance to cooperate and collaborate and share information, reduced ability to negotiate and agencies tending to focus on their own KPIs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor relationships may also cause agencies to withdraw support or have limited commitment and be reluctant to participate in future projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration was a common descriptor for the impact on relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The survey confirmed that the effects noted above were the main impacts on GAs’ relationships and that the impacts were high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses regarding rate of occurrence indicated a mixed response. Areas identified with a slightly stronger tendency to be frequent were creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in timeframes allocated and slows down or stops projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings tending to indicate infrequent occurrence were for resources and time wasted resolving issues, and increase in the overall ‘cost’ of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most significant impact was ‘results in poor communication’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.

Source: Compiled from analysis of interview and survey data.

**Discussion – Projects and joint initiatives**

The impact of core business conflict on projects and joint initiatives were practical and outcomes issues. Many of the factors are linked or are flow-on effects from one another. For example a factor that slowed down a project, could cause timeframe issues, affect the efficiency of project implementation, the delivery of outcomes and therefore impact on government performance.

Discussion covered practical issues such as management structures, limited decision-making capacity and onerous processes and systems. The impact on projects was also linked with the impact on relationships, with frustration being a common description for how officers felt. Participants suggested that this could lead to a loss of commitment.

Direct impacts on projects identified through the interview included reduction in outcomes (breadth, quality), and sometimes resulted in objectives and outcomes having to be changed, with communities as the losers. Projects could also be delayed, slowed down or
Conflict was seen to affect the efficiency of delivery of projects too. This occurred because resources and time had to be devoted to dealing with conflicts. There could be budget implications from projects with cost blow-outs or inability to fit into the financial year, as planned. A key concern regarding timeframes was that deliverables could not be achieved in the timeframes.

The top eight themes identified by the research were: ‘project outcomes and deliverables’; ‘relationships’; ‘efficiency and duplication’; ‘timeframe’s; ‘cooperation’; ‘government performance’ and ‘resources and information management’.

The survey explored factors from within the key themes, being that core business conflict reduces project outcomes, slows down or stops projects, creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in timeframes, makes project implementation inefficient, resources and time are wasted on resolving issues, results in withdrawal of support and effort by some stakeholders, and lastly, increases the overall ‘cost’ of project (time, money and personnel effort).

Highest agreement was for ‘difficulties achieving deliverables in timeframes’, and ‘resources and time wasted on resolving issues’. Generally impact was considered high, with the highest impact associated with ‘difficulties achieving deliverables’; ‘withdrawal of support and effort by some stakeholders’; ‘project implementation inefficient’; and ‘slowing or stopping of projects’.

Strongest tendency to consider the occurrence frequent was for ‘difficulties achieving deliverables’, and ‘slowing or stopping projects’. Two effects were considered infrequent being, ‘resources and time wasted on resolving issues’, and ‘increase in the overall ‘cost’ of a project’. It is possible that time taken to resolve issues would only be considered frequent, if the outcome was lack of resolution.

The most significant effects are that core business conflict slows down or stops projects, creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated, and project implementation is inefficient. In terms of reporting and accountability, all three factors are crucial and are key components of agency performance.

Regional development projects involve multiple agencies and the effects of core business conflict on projects as identified above, could have a negative impact on regional development project implementation and outcomes, and consequently reduce the benefit to regional communities and detract from the return on investment of government funds and effort.
Projects and programs are mechanisms through which the Government delivers its policy objectives. The complexity of the governance environment and commitment to improved service delivery has increased the number of WOG projects and joint service delivery arrangements, a fact identified by both the Institute of Public Administration study (2002) and the Management Advisory Committee Report (2004). A WOG approach is also increasingly being used to address regional development issues, including the use of cooperative frameworks across levels of Government.

What is evident from the literature is that the environment in which Government now operates influences the nature of projects and programs delivered and also contributes to the core business conflicts that may occur in joint initiatives. Figure 3.5 in chapter 3 page 132 illustrates the broad range of influences. For example, the literature contains information on changes in regional development policy, governance and public sector management practices to be more efficient and effective. The changes have altered the intent and objectives of projects, how they are funded and delivered, how they are implemented, the range of stakeholders involved and the formal and informal arrangements of collaboration amongst stakeholders. These changes also affect levels of core business conflict.

Four main aspects of the Government’s operational environment are seen to be contributing to the design and use of projects and programs and contributing to core business conflict – complexity of issues; pressures from policy directions required to address social, economic and environmental issues; public sector management practices to make Government more efficient, effective, accountable and responsive; and the regional development environment.

Firstly, the literature identified the increasing complexity of issues with which Government has had to deal (Keating in Davis & Keating (eds.) 2000; Australian Public Service Commission 2003) including many competing priorities of a social, economic and environmental nature (Sorenson 2000; Crowley & Coffey 2007). This has been occurring within an environment where society was also becoming more pluralistic and complex (Argy 2004, Australian Public Service Commission 2003). Agencies, in developing projects and joint initiatives must take into account the complex environment, competing priorities, fiscal stringency and Community expectations. Agencies themselves will adopt priorities that may compete with other agencies’ priorities.
Secondly, these pressures have led to a range of policy directions focusing on economic, social and environmental issues, as well as addressing equity, accessibility, client servicing, and efficiency (Argy 2004; Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001; Davis & Keating (eds.) 2000; Papadakis & Young cited in Davis & Keating (eds.) 2000). Policies adopted included economic policies to open up the Australian economy, federal fiscal equalization, polices responding to regional disparity, to foster efficiency and competitiveness; and to drive urban, rural, regional and city renewal to address social and economic issues (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003; Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003; Taylor & Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). With the growing concern regarding environmental issues, policies have also been developed that are to address sustainability and environmental issues (Crowley & Coffey 2007; Davis & Weller (eds.) 2000; Sorenson 2000).

Policies shape agency core business strategic plans, performance measure and outcomes. Policies also influence programs and projects developed to deliver agency core business in response to policy directives. Examples of projects in response to regional development policy are the ‘Country Centres’ project, ‘Better Cities’ Program, Rural Communities’ Program, ‘Networking the Nation’, Regional Solutions’ program and ‘Sustainable Regions’ program (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003). More recently, the Rudd Government has adopted a nation-building approach through a focus on infrastructure for the regions. This has been further refined as a policy and incorporated into the ‘Economic Stimulus Plan’ (Australian Government 2009) to address impacts on Australia from the global financial crisis.

Thirdly, the impact of public sector management practice changes since the Coombs Report of 1976, combined with the changing governance, societal and economic environment, has created agencies that have adopted new private sector management practices with a strong focus on efficiency and accountability. These practices affect how agencies plan and carry out their business, contract and outsource services, require agencies to be more consultative, and involve engagement and partnering with Community. This activity occurs within an environment where community expectations are high, with accountability not only to Ministers and the Government, but also to Community.

Lastly, the social, economic and environmental issues and the Government’s subsequent policies in response to these factors have had considerable impact on regions. Some regions have experienced growth and prosperity; others are declining (Taylor &
Garlick in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). Successful economic outcomes from policies have had social costs (Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003).

Taylor and Garlick in Higgins and Zagorski (eds.) (1989) highlighted some of the influences on regions including economic fluctuations; industry structural adjustment; concern regarding security; income, employment growth, urban congestions, rural recession and environmental issues. Globalisation and regionalization have contributed to regional disparities and highlighted the policy conflict between equity and efficiency (Gerritsen in Pritchard & McManus (eds.) 2000, p. 123) and in relation to regional development, for example coastal versus inland regions; regional centres versus country towns; infrastructure investment versus services (Sorenson 2000). Regions are therefore both subject to the impacts from externalities that create complex challenges for regional communities, as well as having competing priorities to be addressed.

The impact of issues and impediments and difficulties on projects was not separately investigated in any of the literature reviews or reports. However, the issues that were raised are indicative, through the cause and effect relationship, of likely impacts on projects. For example, issues associated with decision-making or regulatory difficulties, resources and funding difficulties. These elements, and others mentioned previously are likely to have slowed projects, created timeframe challenges, affected outcomes and levels of commitment amongst stakeholders.

**Conclusion**

The literature reviews and reports did not investigate the impact of conflict on projects, being focused on seeking issues and impediments to agencies working together, or evaluating projects, which included capturing learnings and key success factors to inform developing mechanism to improve GAs’ working together.

In an indirect manner, it is suggested that impacts on projects could be deduced from the issues and impediments identified in the reviews and reports. For example projects being slowed or delayed, reduction in stakeholder commitment and difficulties with timeframe to achieve deliverables.

In sections 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 of the literature review covering the evolution of Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development there was information that illustrated the changes and drivers that affect project and program design, delivery and accountability. Drivers and changes fell into four areas: complexity of
issues; pressures from policy directions required to address social, economic and environmental issues; public sector management practices to make Government more efficient, effective, accountable and responsive; and the regional development environment. The literature also identified that there had been an increase in WOG projects in response to the increased complexity of issues confronting Government today.

The research specifically investigated the impact of core business conflict on projects, with the main impacts being ‘slowing down or stopping projects’; ‘affecting timeframes to achieve outcomes and deliverables; making ‘project implementation inefficient’; and ‘reducing outcomes’ (breadth and depth). Flow on effects that could occur were the ‘withdrawal of support by some stakeholders’ and an ‘increase in the overall ‘costs’ of the project’ in terms of time, people and budget.

The most significant impacts were ‘slowing down or stopping projects’, ‘creating difficulties achieving deliverables in timeframes allocated’ and ‘inefficient project implementation’. These impacts have potential to affect agency and Government performance and capacity to deliver on Government priorities or policy objectives, and reduction in benefit to community from the projects.

The research has therefore identified that there is a ‘cost’ to Government and Community, from GA core business conflict. Given that projects and programs are a mechanism through which the Government achieves policy outcomes, identifying and instigating mitigation practices for the negative impacts of GA core business conflict provides an opportunity for Government to enhance its performance and achieve improved outcomes for Community.

**Discussion – Government and community opinion**

The effect of core business conflict on Community view of Government arose in the discussion regarding impacts on relationships and projects. Government was viewed as uncoordinated, wasting resources, not fulfilling its own priorities and concerned more with process than outcomes and benefits. These views were considered in section 6.2.1 as part of the research issue investigating the nature of core business conflict. The findings were that no views were considered significant although individually there were views with which respondents agreed, identified as having a high impact, or occurred often. The results relating to agreement, impact and occurrence are repeated below, for reference in this section.
There was agreement for Community view of Government as being uncoordinated, and seen to be wasting resources, with opinion almost evenly distributed regarding agreement about government failing to fulfill its own priorities, with a slightly stronger tendency to disagree. The views were considered to have a high impact, if they were held by Community, with the highest impact being seen to be for Government seen to be wasting resources and failing to fulfill its own priorities.

Government being seen to be uncoordinated and failing to fulfill its own priorities was considered to tend to occur frequently, whilst Government being seen to be more concerned with process not outcomes was considered to occur infrequently.

As discussed in section 6.2.1 (page 399), the literature review identified public opinion and expectations of Government, and disenchantment with Government, as drivers of change in Government (Davis in Davis & Weller 2001; Nye cited in Davies & Weller 2001; and studies by Verba 1963, Noris 1999, Papdakis 1999, cited by McAllister & Wanna in Davis & Weller 2001). These views and opinions affected public sector management reform stemming particularly from the 1976 Coombs report. Changes were to strengthen public accountability, and Government efficiency and responsiveness as outlined by Verspaandonk revised by Holland (2003), and also mentioned by Clark and Corbett (1999), Davis and Rhodes in Keating, Wanna and Weller (eds.) (2000) and O'Flynn (2007). The changes have meant greater involvement with Community, through consultation and collaborative partnerships.

Within the regional development context, changes and challenges faced by Government led to policies and practices whereby Government embraced a facilitation and partnership approach (BTRE 2003, Taylor & Garlic in Higgins & Zagorski (eds.) 1989). As highlighted previously, the engagement of Community and private sector in partnerships and collaborative activities means that poor opinion of Government could jeopardize these relationships.

Earlier discussion of this topic identified that reviews and reports uncovered evidence of Community and stakeholder negative opinion of Government and its performance (Fulop, Wiggers de Vries 1997; Fulop & Brennan 1997; the CYPLUS report by Dore & Woodhill 1999; ‘Goodna Services Integration’ case study in Management Advisory Committee 2004). Some examples are provided below:
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- The REDO reviews (Fulop & Brennan 1997) identified loss of faith in government and the opinion that resources were wasted (which would have included wastefulness by other stakeholders too).

- The CYPLUS project (Dore & Woodhill 1999) illustrated how community views of Government affected the progress of the project. There were many issues due to the complexity and sensitivity aspects of the project. The project did take longer than expected and there was community dissatisfaction and loss of trust in Government.

- Garlick and Taylor in Higgins and Zagorsky (eds.) (1989) mentioned that an unpublished report on the ‘Country Centres’ project indicated the project failed to fulfill community expectations.

- The ‘Goodna Services Integration’ case study (Management Advisory Committee 2004) was heavily reliant on relationships with the broader community and non-government organizations. Previous attempts and work by Government in the community had not been very successful. The community was therefore initially skeptical about this project. This demonstrates the longer-term effect of failing to achieve outcomes in the past.

- As Vincent (1999) cited elsewhere in this document notes, WOG and collaborative projects are outside the normal operations of an agency. They require time, resources and effort to develop project-specific frameworks, groups and processes to aid the implementation. It is suggested that in some instances this occurs during implementation as a result of issues occurring. As indicated earlier, interview and survey findings in this research mention that resources and time are required to manage issues and impediments.

- The ‘Sustainable Regions’ Project (Management Advisory Committee 2004) stated that there were practical impediments to being responsive. This suggests that time was lost in addressing these impediments that detracted from the project’s implementation.

- The Management Advisory Committee (2004) case studies are all strongly reliant on successfully engaging and in some cases servicing community, and are therefore dependent upon forming and maintaining good relationships. The areas targeted for WOG are what the Committee describe as ‘wicked problems’ that ‘defy jurisdictional boundaries and resist bureaucratic routines’ (p10). In other words, they are not minor and simple, but complex. They are also applicable to Australia, and not State or Local Government specific. Such projects cannot afford to be derailed or to have depleted outcomes.
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Conclusion

Research identified that core business conflict negatively affects the community view of Government. The literature identified that public opinion and dissatisfaction were drivers of change in the Government and public sector management arenas. Regional development approaches involving greater participation by Community and private sector in partnerships and collaborative activities is based on good relationships. Poor Community view of Government could jeopardize collaborative efforts and potentially also the outcomes and benefits to Community and regions from these efforts.

The research has therefore highlighted that core business conflict has the potential to influence the Community view of Government, with negative flow-on effects on project outcomes and community benefit.

Discussion – Impact on relationships

The literature did not include an investigation into the impact of issues and impediments or conflict on GA relationships, thus this is a new focus area for investigation.

In section 6.2.1, the impact of conflict or GA relationships formed part of the investigation into the nature of core business conflict. Findings are briefly summarized here.

Core business conflict degraded relationships, caused poor communication, reduced the ability to negotiate, encouraged agencies to focus on their own KPIs and reduced the desire to cooperate and share information. The most significant impact was poor communication. Findings suggested that the high neutral ratings regarding level of occurrence for reduction in the ability negotiate, and the view that the desire to cooperate is reduced was considered to occur infrequently may be due to the fact that agencies would be reluctant to indicate that effort wasn’t focused on implementing the project and achieving its outcomes.

As previously noted in section 6.2.1, the literature, whilst not exploring GA’s relationships or factors that affected them, uncovered information about issues indicative of similar effects. Relationships and relationship quality and effectiveness are evident in the reports by Fulop and Wiggers de Vries (1997), Fulop and Brenan (1997), the Management and Advisory Committee (2004) case study on the ‘Goodna Services Integration’ project, Bishop et al. (2006), Loechel, Lawrence and Cheshire (2005) and the CYPLUS study (Dore & Woodhill 1999). Suspicion, loss of trust or need to gain trust, were amongst the issues described relating to relationships.
As a key influence on capacity for GAs to work together, the importance of good relationships is highlighted in the Australian Public Service Commission ‘State of the Service Report 2006-2007’ to facilitate WOG initiatives and also in the State Services Authority paper on the Victorian Approach to joined-up government (November 2007) and the Office of Public Sector Merit and Equity (2004) paper. This is echoed in some of the key success factors in the case studies and reports for example in the Management and Advisory Committee (2004) case study on the ‘Goodna Services Integration’ project; COAG Trial Evaluation November 2006 report by Morgan and Disney and Associates Pty Ltd. Good relationships are highly valued and crucial in collaborative GA activity and the indication from both the research and the literature is that relationships can be damaged in the course of working together.

The literature reviews and case studies also raise issues relating to communication, cooperation levels, agencies focusing on their own KPIs, particularly in the case of WOG activities, which are seen as outside core business. The literature identified these as issues, with limited connection to these issues being the outcome of another issue.

Examples of literature case studies and reports raising issues associated with the areas noted above include: Fulop and Brennan (1997) referring to poor communication across government and the importance of cooperation; Dore & Woodhill (1999) concerning the importance of good communication and generating a spirit of cooperation; Vincent (1999) highlighting that WOG activities are seen as additional to core business, also echoed in the Australian Greenhouse Office case study from the Management Advisory Committee study (2004). Cooperation levels were seen to vary or be an issue in the Management Advisory Committee study (2004) ‘Sustainable Regions Program’ case study and in the Institute of Public Administration study (2002) case study of ‘South Australia Working Together’ where relationships can affect the level of cooperation.

Conclusion

The impact of core business conflict was not covered in the literature due to the nature of the investigations and reports, thus the research is focusing on a new area. The literature however did highlight the importance of relationships and also documented problems with relationships as issues and impediments to working together. The literature did not particularly identify that relationships, focus on KPIs, cooperation or communication were the consequence of other issues.
The research identified that core business conflict degraded relationships, caused poor communication, reduced the ability to negotiate, encouraged agencies to focus on their own KPIs and reduced the desire to cooperate and share information. The most significant impact was ‘poor communication’. The findings suggest that once relationships are degraded, other areas deteriorate (communication, ability to negotiate), with the possible reaction being to make agencies focus on their own KPIs rather than the project, and be reluctant to cooperate.

Relationships are identified in the literature as being important to GAs working together, a fact supported by the research. The impact of core business conflict on relationships has the potential to disrupt the progress of projects and effect its outcomes.

Overall in relation to this research issue, the impacts of core business conflict appear to have considerable potential to affect Government and agencies achieving outcomes and fulfilling priorities. In addition there is potential for enduring damage to occur when community image of government is negatively impacted, and agency relationships are damaged. This can jeopardise support for and willingness to participate in future projects.

Regional development is dependent upon GAs working together, in partnership with community stakeholders. This collaborative and cooperative environment is driven by the challenges for sustainable regional development arising from globalization and technology and the growing regional disparity and rural decline, (Higgins & Zagorsky (eds.) 1989; Sorenson 2000; McManus & Pritchard (eds.) 2000; Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003).

Further influence and changes that require GAs to work together include drought, the economic structural change to new knowledge-based industries building on intellectual capacity (Beer, Maude & Pritchard 2003), and a regional policy that relies on bottom-up and community driven activities (Regional Australia Summit 1999).

The impacts on relationships and projects outlined in this section therefore have serious implications for collaboration and partnerships in regional development – the main approach to regional development. Impacts also have the potential to detract from achieving fulsome and timely outcomes from joint regional development initiatives and future support from agencies.
6.2.5 Processes and practices that can assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediment and core business conflict

The final research issue is aimed at capturing information that can inform the design of the process model. Findings are compared with the information from the literature review. This enables a comprehensive list of activities to be compiled and assists in identifying gaps, overlaps and unique factors.

Summary of research findings and extant literature and research

Table 6.7 summarises the research findings regarding the processes and practices that can assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediments and core business conflict. Findings are grouped under shaded headings, which are used for discussion following the Table.

Table 6.7
Summary of the key finding regarding process and practices that can assist agencies to manage or overcome issues and impediments and core business conflicts when working together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY RESPONDENTS AND LEVEL OF SUCCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes and practices involve practical activities and efforts to address intangible and attitudinal factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview responses focused on project design and relationships and communication and ensuring mutual benefit with a goal to foster cooperation and collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most dominant themes apparent in respondents’ own actions were related to: project design, relationships, and communication, the latter two are linked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional areas strongly advocated demonstrating respect for each other and head offices mentioned having formal arrangements such as Memorandum of Understanding and formal Agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project design incorporated capturing all the key information prior to implementation, covering such things as identifying roles and responsibilities; agency focus and benefit; resources required; funding schedule; timeframes; reporting and accountability processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective relationships are based on good communication and therefore demonstration of respect, gaining trust and consideration of other agencies’ point of view was noted as important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication referred to both within agencies as well as across agencies. Communication strategies such as regular consultation, developing communication strategies and practicing the arts of negotiation and facilitation were cited. Communication also included educating one another about agency roles and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing the authority for the project and the decision-making capacity in the group was also important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early identification of problems and working through solutions was considered very useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple strategies included making meetings enjoyable and positive and acknowledging participant contribution and achievements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The survey investigated: cultivating relationship; demonstration of respect of other points of view; communication protocols; use of negotiation and facilitation; identifying and building on areas of commonality; agency capacity to fulfill KPI or gain benefit; authority for the project; identify and deal with legislative issues; identifying requirements to fulfill objectives &amp; agency capacity; agreement on who does what, by when; use of political influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was agreement with all areas, except for two respondents disagreed with the use of political influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The highest agreement was for demonstrating respect for other agencies’ points of view. The highest impact was seen to be from clarifying the authority of the project and the most frequent was cultivating good relationships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 6.7 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY RESPONDENTS AND LEVEL OF SUCCESS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most significant factors were: demonstrating respect for other agencies’ point of view; agree on communication protocols; practice the art of negotiation and facilitation; ensure agency can fulfill KPI or gain benefit; clarify authority; and gain agreement on who does what, by when.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall agencies felt these practices were successful with 22 describing them as ‘good’ ‘very good’, ‘successful’ and ‘very successful’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The view was expressed that the success was not about the processes, but about the quality and capability of the team involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal agencies tended to talk about control and management aspect such as documenting who did what, or defining rules of engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good relationships were seen as fundamental to success, however developing good relationship took time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USE OF ECOLOGICALLY SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES (ESD)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four respondents considered it important to include ESD. Twelve respondents felt it would be useful and ten considered it would have some limited use. Four didn’t know or declined to comment and two thought it would be no use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the survey, most participants supported the use of ESD principles in the process model, with the exception of two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact from using ESD principles in reducing core business conflict was considered generally to be high with four respondents who considered it low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACTORS TO INCLUDE IN THE PROCESS MODEL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including authority and decision-making capacity was noted primarily by regional respondents, with the exception of one head office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Governments highlighted legislative and regulatory issues, Head offices were the main locations to talk about reporting and accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships were not specifically identified, but the importance of activities and approaches to support good relationships was evident in the philosophies of responses such as encouraging respect for each other, accommodating agencies needs, focusing on making the engagement positive, productive and pleasant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy considerations had limited mention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was reference to using a WOG approach, despite earlier statements from some agencies inferring this didn’t necessarily assist working together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One respondent did not think developing a process model was useful concurring with a second respondent’s view that it was the quality of the leadership and team involved n the project that was more important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most dominant themes were project design, power, authority and jurisdiction; communication; reporting and accountability; legislation and regulations; resources and information resources; personnel; mutuality and agency benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AREAS STRONGLY SUPPORTED FOR INCLUSION IN THE PROCESS MODEL ARE LISTED BELOW:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Processes and systems included reporting and accountability as agencies all had different requirements and this resulted in duplication and redundancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Power, authority and jurisdiction referred to the authority of the project, with senior staff support and political support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decision-making as part of power, authority and jurisdiction needed to be clarified to suit timeframes. Also the lead agency and their role and responsibility should be documented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Financial resources, sources, coordination and managing accountability were identified for inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Roles and responsibilities of all agency stakeholders needed to be clarified, who does what, by when.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identifying outcomes and deliverables that could fulfill agency KPIs or priorities, seeking mutual benefit was mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Creating the supportive attitudes for collaboration, through good communication and relationships development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveys investigated the most dominant factors, being; reporting, decision-making, funding, lead agency, approval processes, authority for the project, staff availability and expertise, timelines, legislation applying and issues, communication protocols, common goals agency roles and responsibilities, key tasks to be done by whom and by when, information needs and source, resources required and shortfalls, ESD involved. |

One respondent declined to rate the survey. 

Table 6.7 continues…
Table 6.7 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS TO INCLUDE IN THE PROCESS MODEL CONTINUED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was strong agreement that all factors would be useful, with highest rating of ‘one’ for ‘common goals identified across agencies relating to the project’. Strongest agreement was for ‘agency roles and responsibilities’, ‘key tasks to be done by whom and by when’, ‘identifying the lead’, ‘decision-making capacity of each agency’, ‘staff availability and time commitment’, and the ‘authority for the project’. Lowest agreement was ‘KPIs that the project fulfils for agencies’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest impacting factors were ‘staff availability and time commitment’, ‘staff expertise required and available’, and ‘roles and responsibilities’. Lowest impact was for ‘reporting requirements for each agency’. Higher neutral rating was for including ‘funding cycles and stages’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents considered that ESD principles should be included and that impact could be high. A small number disagreed (two) and four considered the impact tended to be low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, significant factors were reporting requirements for each agency, decision-making capacity, funding contribution from agencies, funding cycles and staging, approval processes, authority for the project, staff availability and time commitment, staff expertise required and available, timeline for implementation, KPIs that the project could fulfill for each agency, legislation that applies, communication protocols, common goals, agency roles and responsibilities, information needs and source, resources needs and shortfalls and the ESD value of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.

Source: Compiled from analysis of interview and survey data.

**Discussion – Actions undertaken by respondents and the level of success**

Research findings were that responses fell into two categories: tangible and practical activities, and intangible and attitudinal approaches. Tangible factors included processes and practical things to develop or include in the process model and a project management plan. Many of these reflect functional/operational core business conflict areas. The intangible areas are associated with behavioural and attitudinal elements. These contribute to building and maintaining relationships with trust and honesty, and rely on effective leadership and management styles, generating enthusiasm and commitment, and demonstrating respect. The intent was therefore to develop processes and tools to facilitate GAs working together, as well as to create an environment conducive to cooperation.

The most dominant themes related to project design, and relationships and communication. Regional areas advocated demonstrating respect for each other; head offices mentioned having formal arrangements in place such as a Memorandum of Understanding. Two regional staff suggested using political influence. Federal agencies were more interested in how the project was pulled together, for example the structures used and ‘rules of engagement’. This could be reflecting the type of role that federal agencies adopt when overseeing the implementation of federal regional development projects.

Project design related to capturing all the key information such as roles and responsibilities, agency focus and benefit, resources required, funding sources and scheduling, timeframes and reporting and accountability processes. This would be part of the ‘joint
planning’ which was recommended in several of the literature case studies. Activities that would assist communication, encourage positive attitudes such as respect, trust and acknowledgement of other agencies’ views and perspectives were considered important. Communication was both for internal agency communication and external communication with other agencies, Ministers and stakeholders.

Other areas that participants suggested were documented were the authority of the project, the decision-making capacity amongst GA stakeholders, and undertaking early identification of issues to enable working through solutions.

The survey investigated the most dominant areas in the themes, which included ‘cultivating relationships’; ‘demonstration of respect of other points of view’; ‘communication protocols; ‘use of negotiation and facilitation’; ‘identifying and building on areas of commonality’; ‘agency capacity to fulfill KPIs or gain benefit’; ‘authority for the project’; ‘identifying and dealing with legislative issues’; ‘Identifying requirements to fulfill objectives and agency capacity’; agreement on who does what, by when’; and ‘use of political influence’.

Highest agreement was for demonstrating respect, with the highest impacting factor being to clarify the authority for the project, and the most frequently occurring factor was cultivating good relationship. These factors indicate important characteristics of successfully working together – respect; the power of having the right level of authority to act and implement/drive the project, and cultivating relationships. Cultivating relationships was the most commonly practiced strategy to assist in working together.

Significant factors were demonstrating respect for other agencies’ point of view; agreeing on communication protocols; practicing the art of negotiation and facilitation; ensuring agencies can fulfill KPIs or gain benefit from the project; clarifying authority; and gaining agreement on who does what, by when. The list below is a composite summary of the main approaches and practices identified through the surveys and interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tangible practical elements</th>
<th>Intangible and attitudinal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree and document the roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>demonstrating respect for agencies’ point of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree and document tasks and determining who does what and when</td>
<td>open communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a communication protocol</td>
<td>building trust and honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying funding sources, amounts, cycles and a developing a funding schedule</td>
<td>creating a culture of collaboration and cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capturing agency capacity to participate and support the project</td>
<td>generating a feeling of mutuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and dealing with issues up front, including legislative ones</td>
<td>fostering a willingness to share information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Tangible practical elements continued**

- Identifying resource needs and short falls
- Ensuring that some agency KPIs attainable in project
- Developing a mechanisms to share information
- Agreeing on common goals and objectives
- Developing agreed reporting procedures to meet each agency’s requirements
- Identify and document decision-making capacity and process for approvals
- Identify Staff needs and match with availability and expertise
- Identify the Authority for the project
- Identify Legislation that applies and the impacts
- Agreeing on timeframes
- Consider the use of formal arrangements such as MoUs
- Developing processes systems for reporting, accountability, decision-making, budget management
- Ensure senior staff and political support
- Identify information needs and sources
- Identify lead agent/s

**Intangible and attitudinal continued**

- Motivation
- Leadership and management style encouraging cooperation and good relationships
- flexibility and openness to new ways of working
- Innovative
- Positivity and ‘can do’ attitude
- Making working together pleasant

It is suggested that the ‘how’ of achieving the intangible areas would form part of building relationships and be dependent upon good communication. This would certainly reflect the views expressed in the interviews, which were that much depended upon management and the quality of relationships of the team involved. Table 6.8 is a representative sample of actions and issues to illustrate how specific activities recommended for inclusion in the process model could address issues that have been highlighted through the research.

**Table 6.8**

*Actions to address core business conflict and target outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES OR APPROACHES</th>
<th>ISSUE ADDRESSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp; negotiate processes &amp; systems to be put in place</td>
<td>Resolves multiple &amp; conflicting GA processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp; try to accommodate agency needs</td>
<td>Facilitates agency engagement ; reduces conflict with core business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify agency capacity. Ensure contribution to project reflects this</td>
<td>Reduces risk of over-committing agencies &amp; conflict from lack of delivery on commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify tasks. Negotiate who will do what, by when</td>
<td>Reduces confusion about what is done; improves coordination and efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate roles &amp; responsibilities</td>
<td>Reduces conflict arising from GA not being clear about expectations &amp; responsibilities or having unrealistic/incorrect role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify jurisdictional boundaries involved</td>
<td>Reduce duplication &amp; overlap; helps agencies plan resource needs &amp; sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and build on areas of commonality</td>
<td>Encourage commitment; mutual benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope project to fulfill agency KPIs where possible</td>
<td>Encourage commitment; reduce conflict with core business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify authority of project</td>
<td>Clearly indicates the level of expectation up the line; encourages commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp; deal with legislative issues</td>
<td>Reduce timeframe issues; enables impact &amp; timing to be understood in the context of project planning &amp; implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; agree reporting and accountability process &amp; schedule</td>
<td>Accommodate agency reporting &amp; accountability needs; reduce duplication &amp; redundancy in reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify funding sources &amp; cycles if this applies &amp; develop funding schedule</td>
<td>Ensures project can be resourced; addresses mismatch funding cycles;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8 continues
Table 6.8 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES OR APPROACHES</th>
<th>ISSUE ADDRESSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use political influence (non-core business related)</td>
<td>Pressure on reluctant agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make meetings pleasurable (intangible – building relationships, collegiality &amp; commitment)</td>
<td>Reduce conflict; enhance relationships, keeps people informed of progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate respect for agency view point (intangible – but through taking agency needs, KPIs into account)</td>
<td>Enhance relationships; facilitate collaboration &amp; cooperation; encourage positive attitudes; build strong foundation for future work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on communication protocols</td>
<td>Good communication; enhance relationships; motivate agencies; strengthen commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice the art of negotiation &amp; facilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of interview and survey data findings.

Following the identification of what was done to manage or avoid core business conflict, participants were asked to evaluate the success of the chosen approaches and practices. Seventy percent indicated the results were good, very successful or successful. Two interviewees stated the response was slow at first.

Information in the literature regarding processes and approaches to manage issues and impediments comes from two sources. One is from section 3.3.1 covering the processes, approaches and practices captured from analysis of project reviews and case studies in reports. The second source is from sections 3.4.1 looking specifically at literature covering processes and approaches and section 3.4.2, which presents the tools and guidelines developed to assist agencies to work in joined-up and WOG initiatives.

In analyzing the processes, practices and frameworks set up, it is evident that many of the issues and solutions to address them are the same as those identified through the research, for example establishing and documenting the roles and responsibilities of each agency is recommended in the CYPLUS report (Dore & Woodhill 1999), Australian Natural Resource Management case study (Management Advisory Committee 2004), State Services Authority paper (November 2007) and Office of Public Service Merit and Equity paper (2004).

Seeking mutuality, commonalities and complementarity to strengthen agencies’ stake in the projects and increasing level of agency commitment was recommended in: Bishop et al. (2006), ‘Goodna Services Integration’ case study (Management Advisory Committee 2004), Australian Public Service Commission ‘State of the Service Report 2006-2007’. Measures to address reporting and accountability requirements and processes are included in Dore and Woodhill (1999), Bishop et al. (2006), Office of Public Service Merit and Equity (2004).

Concurrent with research findings, the establishment of agreed processes, systems and protocols, was also identified in Vincent (1999), Australian Government Natural Resource Management, a Management Advisory Committee (2004) case study, Australian Public
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The Institute of Public Administration Australia study (2002) summarised the key learnings that support the recommended areas for consideration. Recommendations about approaches to adopt are divided into service delivery integration; integration around programs; integration around Partnership Agreements; and WOG integration. The paper also indicates that there are different levels at which the integration occurs and this affects what may be done. There is the Government level where leadership (authority) is important, policy, resource and stakeholder consultation commitment; at senior management level where public policy, program development capacity and flexibility of policy are important; at the program management level program management and flexibility of policy and programs are highlighted; at the service delivery level the need for authority to act, capacity to implement policy and programs, and adequate resources for the processes and implementation of services were noted.

In summary, the study indicates that the following areas are important to address: authority and support from senior staff; capitalization on technology; protocols and tools for effective and sustainable effort; skills in middle management; flexibility in programs; identifying outcomes and benefits for the long term that off-set costs. The study also suggests a move from single agency appropriation of funds to pooled budgets (this is seen as a fundamental shift from current practice); performance appraisals at all levels that reward collaborative work; and the need to create ownership and mutuality amongst stakeholders.

Table 6.9 (page 458) compares a selection of examples of approaches and practices from the research and literature, identifying approaches and practices that are concurrent, raised more strongly in the research compared to the literature, and noted in the literature only.
Table 6.9

Examples of approaches and practices from research and literature that are the same, research specific, and literature specific

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research and literature commonalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and accountability, reporting schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed outcomes and deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal arrangements (MoU, Agreements, Partnerships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship cultivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding sources, accountability, decision-making, funding schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior officer/Ministerial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring agency benefit (mutuality, include some Agency KPIs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint goals, objectives and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource needs, sources and gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build business case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering leadership, and developing leadership skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research areas represented more strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify agency capacity to support project (staff, funds, time, expertise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD principles applied to project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information needs and sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and build on commonality for project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call on political influence to make things happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate and advocate across agencies about another’s roles, responsibilities and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of all agencies’ contribution to and achievement of outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating pleasant and positive environment for meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify legislation and regulation that applies, implications of legislation and any issues and impacts that will have to be managed, including concurrency of legislation and impacts on timeframes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk identification for individual agencies and for WOG/joint initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and data management and setting up interoperability of systems, permissions to share information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A measurement and modeling strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance frameworks at State and regional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation into agency strategic and business planning processes, KPIs concerning working collaboratively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a policy framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements for shared staff set up between agencies and mechanisms to integrate HR systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing learnings from joint activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools developed from reports and reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled by comparing literature and the research findings on approaches and practices that are the same, are specific to the research or specific to the literature.

Due to the nature of the literature reviewed, formalized WOG initiatives are more prominent. The perspective is more about reviewing the initiatives or to analyse findings to develop guidelines and tools. The research, on the other hand, investigated the experience and opinions of participants regarding core business conflict. This was specifically at the operational/implementation level, from a variety of projects and joint initiatives (some of which were formal WOG projects) in which participants and their agencies had been involved. The topic of investigation and the methodology also focused participants’ thinking on
considering core business conflict (as defined in the research investigation), and what was done to specifically address the conflict. These different perspectives have influenced the selection of processes and practices mentioned, with the literature raising higher level strategies such as risk and policy, while the research contained a focus on approaches that are at the operational and implementation level.

The most dominant areas raised in the literature related to governance and governance structures and frameworks being in place; agreeing shared visions, goals and objectives; clarifying and setting up reporting and accountability processes; joint planning of the initiative; funding arrangements; decision-making arrangements; identifying data and information and associated arrangements for information sharing and IT protocols; setting out the rules of interaction including the roles, responsibilities and processes and systems to be used.

The literature contained key success factors, the most dominant of these were leadership, common goals and objectives, clearly defining roles and responsibilities, authority of the project, relationship quality and strength, funding and adequate resourcing and communication. There were some intangible factors relating to being creative and gaining and maintaining commitment.

Reference to ‘governance’ structures or frameworks, often incorporating the establishment of overarching groups of higher authority to which the operational project group/s reported, was more often mentioned in the literature than in the research. The overarching groups liaised with Ministers and Cabinet and also delegated activities and responsibilities to those implementing the projects. The structure and membership of the groups were project specific. Examples of reviews and case studies referring to governance include Bishop et al. (2006); ‘Greenhouse Office’ and ‘Sustainable Regions Program’ case studies in the Management Advisory Committee report (2004); Arthurson (2004) highlighted developing overarching groups to coordinate projects; NSW Regional Coordination, ‘Community Renewal’, ‘Safer WA’, ‘Growing Victoria Together’ case studies in the Institute of Public Administration Australia study (2002); and the Victorian State Services Authority paper (2007). This view was also prominent in the Management Advisory Committee report (2004), which contained a section dedicated to finding structures and frameworks to suit the task.

Risk management in WOG and collaborative projects was not mentioned directly as an issue in the research, however concern over responsibilities, accountability and negative
image of Government by Community could be considered to be indications of perceived risks. The literature article by the Victorian Auditor General’s office ‘Managing risk across the public sector: Toward good practice Inter-agency Risks – Joined-up Government’ identified the risk as being complex, for GA involved in collaborative and joint initiatives. Whilst Memorandum of Understanding or formal Agreements could help to recognise and address risk, the Authority considered that risk identification and management should be part of collaborative activities. This would enable agencies to understand one another’s risks and the development of policies and guidelines to address the risk.

The literature in section 3.4.2 focused on studies and reports that had resulted in the development of tools to assist GAs working together. This was not a feature of the research investigation, which had only asked about the processes and practices applied/experienced by respondents that were focused on managing or overcoming issues and core business conflicts.

Tools that were developed included generalist checklists and guidelines, and frameworks or models for use during project development, implementation and evaluation. The Management Advisory Committee report (2004) developed guidelines to consider WOG projects from the perspective of assessing the issue and developing a business case to work together; identifying suitable frameworks and structures; addressing culture and attitude – things to consider; strategies and approaches to manage information; developing a budget and accountability framework; and managing contacts outside the public service. The Guidelines were predominantly focused on larger WOG issues, at the Federal level.

The Australian Government has also developed frameworks, policies and guidelines to facilitate GAs working together and integrating services, on the National Service Improvement Framework (2008). The framework assists in identifying and developing collaborative service projects.

The Australian Public Service Commission has produced a ‘Working Together’ guide, which contains information on best practice. The Office of Public Service Merit and Equity (2004) ‘Seamless Government – Improving the outcomes for Queenslanders now…and in the future’ provides guidelines on working together. These cover topics such as alignment with government priorities, developing a common purpose, leadership, good governance structures, building good relationships, enhancing learning and capacity, and resourcing. Each section then examines how these areas could be addressed and raises the challenges that may be experienced.
The Handbook for Integrated Government prepared by the Department of Families (2002) contains a manager’s checklist to evaluate whether to be involved in joint initiatives, and provides proformas for an MoU, network protocol, as well as giving project and case study examples, an employment checklist and staff skill checklist.

Oliver’s (2005) paper on the Role of Government Coordination in Civic Engagement: Experience of Queensland, Australia’ relating to the Engaged Government project outlines tools developed to assist in bringing stakeholders (including Community stakeholders) together to move from a non-collaborative state to a collaborative state. There is also a tool to assess the issue/s being addressed, and a collaboration, monitoring and evaluation framework.

What was evident in both the research and the literature was that each project had unique characteristics that required innovative and creative solutions and that, in the case of the literature, informed the design of tools, checklists, guidelines and frameworks. What is absent is a mechanism that captures the comprehensive information to support development of the creative and innovative solutions to develop the most appropriate project design and supporting systems and procedures. This research aims to fill this gap.

**Conclusion**

The research and literature contained many concurrent approaches and practices to address issues and conflict that occurs when GAs work together. The approaches and practices are practical and operational-focused addressing functional/operational core business conflicts. Others deal with intangible and attitudinal areas. Differences in processes and practices between research and literature stems from the fact that the nature of the literature, being project reviews, reports, and studies to develop guidelines and frameworks took a higher level perspective, whereas the research perspective was more obviously at the operational and implementation level.

The research findings were that project design, relationships and communication were the dominant themes of the practices and approaches. The literature had a greater focus on higher level elements such as policy and governance structures, and community engagement mechanisms, particularly concerning the formalized WOG initiatives.

The most significant approaches and practices uncovered by the research were ‘demonstrating respect for other agency’s point of view’, ‘agreeing on communication protocols, ‘practicing the art of negotiation and facilitation’, ‘ensuring agencies can fulfill
KPIs or gain benefit, ‘clarifying the authority of the project and ‘gaining agreement on who does what by when’.

The most dominant areas identified in the literature were governance arrangements; reporting and accountability; data and information gathering, sharing and associated information technology protocols; joint planning; identifying shared vision, goals and objectives; decision-making arrangements; funding; and setting up processes and systems to enable working together.

Authority for the project and for decision-making featured strongly in both literature and research.

Unlike the research, the literature did not cover an evaluation of how successful various processes and practices. The research findings suggested that generally processes and practices developed or adopted to address issues and conflicts were successful, sometimes taking time to achieve success.

The literature identified key success factors, with the most dominant being common goals and objectives; leadership, adequate resourcing; clearly defining roles and responsibilities, quality of relationships and authority for the project. With the exception of ‘leadership’, the key success factors are incorporated in both literature and research processes and practices.

The higher level and overarching elements like risk, policy and governance frameworks in the literature are indicative that to address the research problem involves two levels of action – one at the strategic level dealing with policy and guidelines, and one at the practical and operational level. The tools, guidelines, frameworks and checklists developed through the literature inquiries are mechanisms to address the high level issues and facilitate the lower level processes and practices. The research findings however, point to the need for a mechanism to support lower level activities.

**Discussion – Use of Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD) principles**

The research explored the value of incorporating ecologically sustainable development (ESD) principles as part of the process model. Twenty four respondents indicated support for its inclusion, although some of these respondents considered it had limited use (ten). However, there were concerns about its interpretation and it being used as a barrier by some agencies. One participant suggested it was of no use and five were unsure or didn’t comment.
The use of ESD or triple bottom line (TBL) was not mentioned by respondents as a mechanism that had been used.

The literature had very little about the application of ESD principles as a tool or process to be applied, with the exception of the Institute of Public Administration Australia study (2002) as an example of a mechanism to integrate activities, and the ‘Growing Victoria Together’ project, which is in two literature articles (Adams & Wiseman 2003; Institute of Public Administration Australia study 2002). ‘Growing Victoria Together’ is based on the TBL and has been structured so that this approach is incorporated into agency core business.

**Conclusion**

The research and the literature are indicative that ESD principles are a tool that is and can be used to assist agencies consider projects from a wider perspective than their own agency’s, but effectiveness in achieving improved agency collaboration for WOG and other joint initiatives has not been established. The research identified concern over interpretations, and possible use of ESD as a barrier, are indicative of the lack of clarity on how to use the principles. ‘Growing Victoria Together’ is an on-going project, yet to be fully evaluated, thus the application of TBL has not been evaluated.

**Discussion – Factors to include in the process model**

The research identified that authority and decision-making concerns were primarily from regional agency participants, with the exception of one head office participant. Concern with decision-making could reflect the influence of whether an agency is centralised or decentralised. As resources in terms of time and staff are scarce, authority of the project would be an important measure regarding whether an agency becomes involved. It could also be used to encourage support if high level authority exists.

All four Local Governments highlighted legislative and regulatory issues. One reason for this could be that as the third tier of Government, Local Government is subject to legislative impacts of other layers. Local Governments have also been given responsibilities to apply regulations relating to elements of legislation. An example is the role for Local Government in environmental protection in relation to industry activity.

Reporting and accountability was predominantly raised by head office locations, with only one regional office raising it. This may be due to the ‘overseeing’ role head office has, and reporting and accountability in relation to the Director-General and Minister. Federal agencies noted that identification of issues up front was useful.
Chapter 6

The most dominant theme in the discussion related to ‘project design’, evidence of the prevalence of practical and functional/operational core business conflicts identified. The other key themes were: ‘power, authority and jurisdiction’; ‘communication’; ‘reporting and accountability’; ‘legislation and regulations’; ‘resources and information resources’, ‘timeframes’;’ personnel’; ‘mutuality and complementarity’; and lastly ‘agency benefit’.

Participants considered that the process model should include setting up processes and systems for reporting and accountability to reduce duplication and redundancy; clarifying authority and decision-making capacities amongst agency stakeholders (linked to power, authority and jurisdiction); identifying the lead/s agency/ies; funding sources and schedules; particularly if sources involved multiple agencies; and consideration of communication protocols. It was suggested that the model should also include determining timeframes and timelines; resources and their source; roles and responsibilities of all agencies; project parameters; identifying KPIs and other mutual benefits from participation.

One respondent was of the view that a process model was not useful to reduce core business conflict, echoing the opinion expressed in other questions by a few participants, that the quality and skills of the team working together was more important.

The survey findings regarding the most commonly mentioned areas from within the themes included: ‘reporting and accountability; ‘decision-making’; f’undin’g; ‘lead agency identification; ‘approval processes; ‘authority for project’; ‘staff availability, time and expertise’; ‘timelines’; ‘KPIs for each agency; ‘legislation that applies and legislation issues’; ‘communication protocols’; ‘common goals; ‘agency roles and responsibilities; ‘key tasks to be done by whom and by when; ‘information needs and sources; ‘resources available and shortfalls’; and ‘use of ESD values’ of the project.

There was strong agreement all factors investigated would be useful to include in the process model, with strongest agreement for noting ‘agency role and responsibilities’; ‘key tasks to be done by whom and by when’; ‘identifying the lead agent’; ‘decision-making capacity of each agency; and ‘authority of the project’. Respondents considered the highest impact on reducing core business conflict were ‘identifying staff availability and time commitment’ and ‘roles and responsibilities of agencies’. This represents resources for implementation as well as ensuring all GA stakeholders are clear on their commitment and responsibilities.
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Conclusion

Research findings regarding what to include in the process model clearly identify gathering, assessing information on functional/operational factors that could cause conflict, facilitating development of solutions. Findings also indicate that this information should be used to guide project design and as a basis for development of processes and systems.

The literature identified higher level factors and also offered recommendations, frameworks and guidelines that are useful reference sources for officers at the operational level. The research has contributed further information regarding functional/operational lower level factors and demonstrated a need to connect the higher and lower level tools and approaches.

6.2.6 Implications for the research problem

The research problem is:

*Government Department Core Business - Managing the impact of potential core business conflicts on regional development projects and programs*

Implications for the research problem fall into four areas: the first is about shifting the overall policies and related procedures to be ‘collaboration friendly’ through policy development and new practices. The second is to instigate changes to public sector management practices to adopt collaboration-friendly processes and systems, based on the premise that collaboration and inter-operability is part of the standard activities of agencies, rather than an additional activity. The third area is that regional development is a WOG responsibility, comprising economic, social, environmental and infrastructure elements that are linked or co-dependent. Australia is the sum of its regions, large and small, thus regional development is the basis for developing Australia. The final area concerns staff capabilities to work collaboratively in a governance environment addressing complexities, cross-cutting issues and co-dependencies of agencies to fulfill their own performance outcomes and to address Government priorities.

The four areas are discussed below. The implications for policy and practice across the three related discipline areas (Government and governance, public sector management and regional development) are discussed in section 6.5.
The research has confirmed that GA core business is the source of some of the issues, impediments and core business conflict, which occur when GAs are working together. Chapter 3, section 3.2 covering the evolution of Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development includes the drivers and changes affecting these three discipline areas, and highlights some of the flow-on influences shaping agency core business that can contribute to core business conflicts with other agencies. One of the implications of this for managing the impact of potential core business conflict is that when Government, public sector management or regional development priorities and policies are developed, there is a need to consider the possible impacts on the capacity for agencies to work together. In other words, part of policy and priority development should consider and incorporate processes and recommendations to enable collaboration.

The research findings also demonstrated that the functional/operational area of core business creates the greatest difficulty. In addition, the factors involved are both practical and intangible. Whether an issue is a practical or an intangible factor, influences the approach for managing the impact. For example, there is benefit in each individual collaborating agency reviewing its functional/operational areas to assess the suitability of the processes and systems for collaboration, when assessing or designing joint projects. This activity would form part of the process model in preparation for working together. The purpose would be to agree on the ‘rules of engagement’, the governance structures and the administrative processes and systems. Both research and literature identified that these factors needed to be addressed.

In relation to the intangible factors such as attitude and agency culture, the implications are that systemic and policy changes are required at a higher level. Over time this could foster cultural change. This is a longer term approach; however, to manage potential impacts in the short term, agencies could adopt practices and philosophies that both accommodate agency cultural differences and manage less cooperative attitudes. The research had a focus on the short term management and relationship enhancing activities, whilst the literature looked at the higher level policy and governance framework areas for accountability and reporting in joint initiatives and considered actions that could support cultural change.

The research found that core business conflict has quite serious impacts on projects. Projects were delayed or stopped, the outcomes reduced, resources wasted, projects inefficiently delivered and sometimes resulting in agencies focusing on their own KPIs and the image of Government in Community being negatively impacted. There is therefore a strong imperative to develop effective ways for reducing or better managing the impact of
core business conflicts. This imperative is based on the fact that in the literature (section 3.2) efficiency and effectiveness are key influences on Government achieving outcomes and that have contributed to the adoption of particular public sector management approaches. In addition, regional development policies and approaches are about working collaboratively with community. For this reason, if Community has a poor image of Government, this could have a detrimental influence on Government collaborations with Community.

The literature has already identified that WOG and collaboration needs to be incorporated into agency corporate plans, be included as an agency performance measure and be recognized in staff performance – in other words integrating collaborative activities, whether informal or formal, as a core business function. Currently, as Vincent (1999) points out, WOG and joint activities are outside the normal parameters of agency systems and modus operandi.

Both literature and research identified the need for leadership, communication and relationship management skills. This is indicative that part of managing the impact of core business conflict and other issues and impediments when agencies are working together, is the provision of training to develop appropriate skills.

The research has contributed to a greater understanding of the nature of issues, impediments and conflicts confronting agencies as they work together. The literature contains useful information about processes, guidelines and tools that can be used. The literature studies also gathered valuable information about the higher level issues and solutions such as governance structures, financial appropriation and accountability, and policy related areas.

The research findings highlighted the links and domino effect creating further issues arising from core business conflicts, suggesting that an integrated and holistic approach is required to deal with core business conflict. This would support the ability to address the practical cause, rather than the impact issue. For example practical problems like decision-making capacity, can lead to delays in projects, create frustration and affect relationships. Addressing decision-making capacity and incorporating this in timeframes would assist in avoiding the other outcomes issues such as failure to deliver outcomes in timeframes.

Despite the comprehensive range of tools, guidelines and practices developed, used or recommended, there is no holistic approach integrating them into a cohesive process to prepare, plan, implement, monitor and review joint initiatives. Neither is there a strong mandate in Government about how to work together. Section 6.4 outlines a mechanism to facilitate how to work together, building on the findings of both the literature and the research.
6.3 Contribution to knowledge

Introduction

This section examines the research’s contribution to knowledge and expansion of current knowledge. Section 6.3.1 presents the contribution to knowledge, and commences with Table 6.10, a summary of the contribution and justification for the claim. The contributions are discussed following the Table.

Section 6.3.2 presents the expansion to current knowledge. The section also commences with a Table (Table 6.11) that summarises and justifies the expansion of current knowledge, and is followed by a discussion of the contributions.

6.3.1 New knowledge

Table 6.10 summarises and justifies the contribution to knowledge from the research findings on core business conflict, which is a new area of investigation. Contributions of new knowledge concern the nature of core business conflict; the most common core business conflicts; the impact of core business conflict on projects and GA relationships; influences on core business conflict arising from Government and Governance and public sector management practices; and the impact of core business conflict on regional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRIBUTION OF NEW KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>JUSTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about core business conflict, as a significant conflict factor when agencies are working together.</td>
<td>Extant research literature identifies issues and impediments to GAs working together, not core business conflict, with an indirect reference to agencies’ not having processes and systems designed to work together, or collaboration considered to be outside core business activity. Core business conflict is therefore a new area of investigation and will contribute new knowledge about difficulties faced when GAs work together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about the nature of core business conflict</td>
<td>As core business conflict has not been identified in research and literature, there is no knowledge about the nature of core business conflict, thus all the information about core the nature of core business conflict is new information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most common core business conflicts</td>
<td>As a new area, there is no knowledge pertaining to the most common core business conflicts. Instead, the literature contains information on common issues and impediments, for the purpose of developing guidelines, frameworks and tools to manage the issues and overcome barrier. New information includes the most common core business conflict are from the functional/operational core business conflict area and relate to legislation; program design; power, authority and jurisdiction; processes and systems, resources and information resources; and management structure and approaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.10 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRIBUTION OF NEW KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>JUSTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● The impact of core business conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- on GA relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- on the implementation and outcomes of regional development projects and other joint government initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- core business conflict affect on the Community/Government relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The extant literature contained evidence of impacts of issues and impediments in describing some issues and impediments themselves. This was gathered during the research to develop guidelines, tools and framework. However there was no specific investigation regarding the impact on projects and GA relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The research has particularly investigated the impact on projects and GA relationships of core business conflict, providing new information regarding the extent of impact on projects and GA relationships and possible implications for future joint initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The extant literature identified issues and impediments that could lead to Community feeling let down by Government, and also in exploring the evolution of the three discipline areas associated with the field of investigation, literature highlighted community disenchantment and increasing negative relationships as a driver of change. However, there was no linkage with GA core business or core business conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Research found that core business conflicts can cause negative Community opinion of Government, thus jeopardize future WOG or joined-up initiatives and affect the Community/Government engagement and collaborations for regional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Core business conflict is a contributing factor to Community’s image of Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Public sector management practices and government and governance policies as causes/contributors to core business conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Core business conflict is a new area for investigation. The nature of core business conflict uncovered the fact that functional/operational core business conflicts are the most common. Many of these conflicts relate directly to public sector management practices and are influenced by Government and governance policies. No research and literature identified the contribution of public sector management practices and Government and governance in core business conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The impact of core business conflict on regional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Core business conflict is a new area for investigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● No literature or research was uncovered in the related area of issues and impediments concerning the impact on or implications for regional development arising from the impact on project implementation and outcomes and GA relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research.
Source: Compiled from analysis of research findings and comparison with current knowledge to isolate new knowledge.

**Discussion – GA core business as a conflict factor when agencies work together**

No literature or research was uncovered that explored agency core business conflict when GAs worked together. There was literature in a related field that looked at the issues and impediments to GAs working together, where there was indirect reference to core business for example. The literature, comprising reviews and reports, noted that working together was outside GAs’ normal working environment and that their processes and systems were not set up for collaboration (Vincent 1999).

In addition, there were literature studies specifically focused on researching and evaluating WOG, joined-up and joint initiatives to identify the common issues and impediments are related areas, (Management Advisory Committee 2004; Institute of Public Administration 2002). The purpose was to identify what was required to improve agency capacity to work effectively in WOG projects, which also resulted in the development of guidelines, checklists, frameworks and tools. The research topic has therefore been investigating a new perspective of a well-known problem and building knowledge about the new influence - the nature of core business conflict.
From both the interview information and the literature research on Government and governance, it is clear that Government sets priorities for GAs to achieve, establishes agencies and delegates agency roles and responsibility that focus on addressing Government priorities, thus determining agency core business. Core business, through machinery of Government changes may be altered, as a result of a portfolio area being added or removed. Government also allocates agency budgets, determines policy positions and gives agencies legislative responsibilities, where necessary.

The priority of an agency is to deliver on its core business responsibility and achieve the associated outcomes for Government that addresses the priorities. Therefore, when working together, the agencies’ own priorities and outcomes may dominate, creating difficulties in joint initiatives.

Agencies also structure themselves to most effectively fulfill their responsibilities, and develop strategic plans and internal business plans with KPIs that contribute to fulfilling performance outcomes. Based on public sector management practices, agencies develop internal policies to guide the design and delivery products, services and programs to deliver on core business outcomes, and to direct their internal processes to manage resources and fulfill accountability requirements.

The strong focus of Government on efficiency, effectiveness, accountability and transparency has led to public sector management practice changes, and has included the adoption of private sector management practices by GAs. The practices shape the design and implementation of agency internal processes and systems, which focus on achieving the most effective and efficient delivery of agency core business and associated outcomes. As Vincent (1999) indicated, agencies develop processes and systems to suit their own needs. These systems are not developed with collaboration in mind. They are developed from the perspective of a single isolated agency activity (Office of the Public Service Commission 2007). The literature therefore has some indication the focus by GAs on delivery of core business can create challenges when GAs work together, but has not explored the reason for these difficulties.

Having investigated this topic, the research contributes new knowledge to the information about difficulties GAs experience when working together relating to core business. The research confirmed that core business was a source of conflict amongst GAs when working together, and that core business conflict was also a significant issue when
agencies work together. The research findings identified functional/operational core business conflicts as the most prevalent. This area concerns the internal processes and systems designed to suit agencies own needs to deliver their core business, as discussed above.

The significance of the influence of core business relates to the fact that the research identified that GA conflict is particularly evident in relation to agency strategic plans. These were identified by research participants as the most significant factor in core business conflict. Strategic plans set out agency priorities and core business performance outcomes and guide agency decision-making and funding allocation. Decision-making and funding were commonly raised as core business conflict issues by respondents.

Discussion – The nature of core business conflict

As a new field of investigation in the area associated with issues and impediments when agencies work together, the research contributed new knowledge about the nature of core business conflict. Research investigated two perspectives of core business conflict – fundamental (philosophical) core business conflict and functional/operational core business conflict. A summary of the new knowledge regarding the nature of core business conflict is presented below:

- Functional/operational core business conflicts are the most common.
- The most significant functional/operational core business conflicts (respondents agreed, considered impact high and occurrence frequent), were: agency strategic plans allow little room for new projects or discretionary budget; inflexible programs and funding criteria; and lengthy approval processes.
- Fundamental core business conflict appears to be limited, with one factor regularly appearing in a number of discussions - the conflict between environmental and economic focused agencies.
- Other fundamental core business conflict areas mentioned included different interpretations of Acts and regulations; philosophical/ideological differences; and different interpretation of key roles by agencies with complementarity of core business.
- Functional/operational core business conflicts can be divided into three categories – practical issues, outcomes issues (caused by practical issues), and intangible issues such as agency culture, and risk-averse management.
- Core business conflict involves factors that are inter-related and have a cascading impact within an agency.
Agencies have complementarity of core business which was identified as a positive influence on reducing core business conflict, its impact and rate of occurrence.

Although there was limited support and infrequent occurrence, complementarity was also considered to possibly have negative effects such as creating conflict through duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes, and contributing to the fundamental core business conflict of differences in interpretation of key roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business.

Core business conflict affects agencies’ relationships by degrading the relationships; causing poor communication (the most significant factor) including reducing capacity to negotiate; and reducing willingness to cooperate, and to share information.

Complementarity of core business on the other hand, tended to positively influence relationships, and communication was easier, including negotiating, and there was greater desire to cooperate and share information and leverage off each other.

Core business conflicts negatively impacted on project implementation and outcomes by reducing outcomes, delaying or stopping projects, increasing costs, extending timeframes; using resources and time to resolve conflicts; causing inefficient project delivery; and affecting the community view of and relationship with Government.

Core business conflict was considered to have long-term impacts on future projects in regions, by making agencies reluctant to work together.

These findings have implications for policy, public sector management practices and regional development that are discussed in section 6.5 and 6.6.

Discussion – the most common core business conflicts

The literature collected and analysed information regarding issues and impediments when agencies worked in WOG projects as part of studies focused on developing ways to improve GAs collaborative activities (Management Advisory Committee 2004, Institute of Public Administration 2002). A number of the factors, as well as the practices and processes that were set up to address the factors, were common to many case studies, informing the development of recommendations, good practice guidelines, checklist, frameworks and tools to assist GAs working together. However as stated earlier, core business conflict was not the subject of investigation, therefore the research findings about the most common core business conflicts, contribute new information about this area of investigation.
Interviews contributed to this new knowledge through providing rich data that highlighted the linkages and inter-relatedness of core business conflicts, not present in the literature. Interview findings in the research identified that for the common core business conflicts the top five dominant themes were: legislation; program design; power, authority and jurisdiction; processes and systems; and personnel related.

The research explored the most commonly mentioned factors from the interview themes through surveys, to find out about the level of agreement, perceived impact and rate of occurrence of the factors. The factors, which were both practical issues as well as outcomes issues, were:

- program and funding flexibility
- timeframes
- decision-making limitations
- lengthy approval processes
- mismatched funding cycles
- reluctance to commit resources, resources already committed
- staff inconsistency and skills
- regulatory conflicts
- bureaucratic application of regulations

These most common factors reflect the higher level issues and recommendations from the literature, for example in relation to funding and accountability structures and processes needing to be established, however they involve practical lower operational level issues not considered in the literature. The survey information also captured new information about perceived impact and rate of occurrence of these factors, based on the experience of respondents.

Research found that whilst there was agreement that the above-mentioned factors were the most common and that the impacts could be high, level of occurrence amongst the respondent’s experience was not high. The strongest agreement was for program and funding inflexibility, funding cycles mismatched and staff inconsistency and skills. Greatest impact was considered to be from reluctance to commit resources or resources already committed to core business, no consistency of staff and decision-making being limited.

The interviews provided rich information regarding the common core business conflicts and some causal linkages not captured previously. The research indicated that funding constraints reduce the scope of projects and can result from agencies not having discretionary funds, reluctance to commit funds, particularly if agencies have had poor experiences in the past or have competing core business priorities. Some programs and funding are delivered in cycles and projects reliant on funds from multiple sources may face
challenges fitting a project to funding cycles. Inflexibility of funding criteria may mean a project cannot access funds.

Timeframe difficulties mentioned included both competing or conflicting timeframes, as well as difficulties achieving outcomes in allocated timeframes due to the project being delayed. Interview discussions further enhanced knowledge about the cause and effect linkages of this particular core business conflict. Respondents indicated delays could arise because of decision-making limitations as a result of some agencies being more centralized. Limited decision-making capacity falls within the theme of power, authority and jurisdiction. This theme also includes the internal structure that determines delegations through the management hierarchy. Another consequence noted from issues in decision-making and the delegation structures was lengthy approval processes.

Staffing issues such as inconsistency of staff due to ‘acting’ roles, and lack of skills, were seen to affect the efficiency and consistency of project progress. Regulatory issues sometimes caused delays as well as frustration, particularly when there was lack of agreement on interpretations and application of Acts and regulations.

The research findings contribute to new knowledge concerning the most common core business conflicts identified by those at the operational level. The findings also illustrate that a practical core business conflict can cause impact issues.

**Discussion – Impacts of core business conflict**

No literature was uncovered that specifically investigated the impact of core business conflict, or issues and impediments, on projects and agency relationships. There was evidence of some impacts, though not labeled as such, in some of the issues noted in case studies and project reviews, as well as in the studies looking at how to improve GA collaborative activities covered in section 3.3 of chapter 3. Some examples of impacts were: difficulties with decision-making, poor coordination across agencies creating duplication, and difficulties sourcing funds.

Impacts uncovered by the research included projects being slowed down or stopped; outcomes reduced in quality, breadth and depth; agencies tending to focus on their own KPIs; inefficient implementation of projects; and timeframes affected for delivery of outcomes. There was a view that there was an increase in the overall ‘cost’ of the project in time, personnel effort and money.
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The most dominant themes from the interviews were: direct impact on projects; outcomes and deliverables; relationships; efficiency and duplication; timeframes; cooperation; Government performance; and resources and information resources. The survey investigated the most common impacts on projects within the themes, which were:

- Reduces outcomes
- Slows down or stops projects
- Creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated
- Implementation is inefficient
- Resources and time wasted on resolving issues
- Withdrawal of support and effort by some stakeholders
- Increase in overall ‘cost’ of the project (time, funds and personnel effort)

New information uncovered concerned greater depth of understanding about the factors for which there was highest agreement, considered to have a high impact and occur with frequency, according to the respondent group.

Respondents generally agreed the impacts noted above were the most common, with strongest agreement for difficulties achieving deliverables, and lowest level of agreement for wasting time and resources on resolving issues. Impact from the issues was generally considered high, the highest impact considered to be from difficulties to achieve deliverables. Occurrence was not generally frequent, however difficulties with achieving deliverables and slowing down or stopping projects were noted as tending to be frequent. Increasing overall ‘cost’ was not strongly supported.

The most significant issues were slowing or stopping projects, difficulties achieving deliverables in timeframes and project implementation being inefficient. All three of these factors have potential to seriously affect projects, underpinning the need to be able to manage impacts and consequences of core business conflict.

An additional impact from core business conflict discovered through the interviews was that core business conflict could affect the Community view of Government. Interviewees indicated views were that Government was uncoordinated, wasted resources, failed to deliver on its own priorities and was more concerned with process rather than outcomes and community benefit. The research investigated this issue further through the surveys.

Government viewed as uncoordinated and wasting resources attracted greatest number of respondents indicating tendency to agree. There was a tendency to disagree with Government failing to deliver on its own priorities and being concerned with process not outcomes. Impact for all areas was considered potentially to be high, but occurrence was not rated as frequent.
Although not frequently experienced by respondents, the research findings indicated that core business conflict can negatively affect Government/Community relationships. Government/Community relationships difficulties and the importance of managing Community view of Government did not appear in the literature, which was concerned with transparency, efficiency, accountability, and service delivery, as well as processes to improve engagement with Community in joint initiatives.

As noted earlier in this chapter, the literature on Government and governance had identified public and community disenchantment, as a driver of change in Government (Davis in Davis & Weller 2001; Keating in Davis & Keating (eds.) 2000). The current regional development approach and other areas such as Disaster and Emergency Management are based on activities involving partnerships and collaboration between Community and Government. The philosophy of regional development is to encourage a bottom-up and partnership approach, to address community needs and issues. If Community has a poor image of Government, it has the potential to affect the quality and effectiveness of engagement with Community to work collaboratively and achieve regional development outcomes. Research has therefore uncovered new information about a negative influence on Community/Government relationships that is caused by the outcomes of core business conflict.

The literature identified relationships as being an important factor to manage difficulties when GAs work together (Australian Public Service Commission Report 2007; Management Advisory Committee 2004; Institute of Public Administration 2002), but there was no exploration into what affected relationships. Case studies do provide some examples of impacts to relationships with the mention of poor communication, lack of trust, and suspicion.

Impact on GA relationships has not been explored before, thus the research findings contribute new knowledge. Research participants noted that core business conflict degraded relationships, resulted in poor communication (the most significant factor), reduced ability to negotiate, caused reluctance to share information and cooperate, and could lead to agencies focusing on their own agency benefit. Interviewees highlighted long term impacts arising from negative experiences such as agencies being reluctant to work collaboratively in the future.

Relationship, communication, cooperative and supportive attitudes are fundamental to successfully working together, thus core business conflict impacts on GA relationships could
be serious. The potential consequences of core business conflict are a risk to Government. The risk includes Government failing to deliver the quality and timely outcomes intended; Community forming a poor image of Government that could impact on the quality of Community/Government consultation and productiveness of Government/Community partnerships; and inefficient use of resources and implementation of projects or services. These risks could contribute to difficulties fulfilling Government priorities and damage relationships in a way that would have potential long term impact on future Government/Community collaboration in regional development.

**Discussion - Government and governance and public sector management practices contribute to core business conflict**

The literature contains evidence that public sector management practices and Government and governance policy have influenced GA core business and the processes and systems adopted to deliver core business. The changes in Government and governance has been in response to the increasing complexity of issues faced by Government; changed Community expectations; competing and conflicting priorities; technology; changes in society and relationship between State and civil society; pressure to address sustainability and climate change; and globalisation. These factors and many others have been noted by writers such as Crowley and Coffey (2007), Argy (2004), Keating in Davis & Keating (eds.) (2000), Davis in Davis & Weller (2001), and Sorenson (2000).

The research uncovered new information regarding the influences on GA core business conflict from Government, governance and public sector management practices. Findings showed that the majority of core business conflict is functional/operational core business conflict, which is the area that has been shaped by public sector management practices. Functional/operational processes and practices reflect the Government and governance demands for efficiency, effectiveness and accountability. Research identified that the functional/operational core business conflicts make it difficult for agencies to work together, for example to coordinate and integrate processes and systems, share information, access funds, and adapt their own reporting and accountability processes for joint initiatives.

Of particular interest was that one of the most significant factors of functional/operational core business conflict was the limitation of GA strategic plans, which reduce the capacity for agencies to be responsive and embrace new projects or have access to discretionary funds. Part of the reason for this may be because the focus of the strategic plan
is on the agency delivering its core business outcomes. The strategic plan and associated management for outcomes influence the reporting and accountability requirements of an agency and determine how the budget is expended, both of which are agency-focused, not joint initiative focused.

Despite the rhetoric present in the recommendations from the Management Advisory Committee (2004) report and in the Institute of Public Administration study (2002) about incorporation of collaboration with other agencies into agency corporate and business plans, the research findings indicate that this may need to occur in a more fundamental way to foster flexibility and a shift in agency culture. Policy and practice implications of the research in section 6.5 explore how this may occur.

Discussion - The impact of core business conflict on regional development

The literature did not cover the impacts of issues and impediments when GAs work together on regional development, or on projects and relationships. However, there was evidence of the impacts from the issues that were identified, for example in the ‘Sustainable Regions Program’ case study from the Management Advisory Committee report (2004) regarding the time taken to process project funding applications and in the Institute of Public Administration (2002) ‘South Australia Working Together’ case study, which noted each sector had its own structures, and decision-making processes that created tensions.

The research specifically investigated the impact of core business conflict on agencies involved in regional development, and the projects in which they were involved. The research has contributed new knowledge regarding potential impacts on regional development arising from GA core business conflict. For example there is the impact on GAs relationships as identified earlier, showing that relationships are degraded and communication affected by core business conflict, resulting in reduced ability to negotiate, cooperate and a tendency for agencies to focus on their own KPIs.

Regional development, (as defined for this research), is the cumulative outcome of multiple agency activities dealing with economic, social, environmental and infrastructure elements that contribute to regional development. Regional development is thus dependent upon GAs working effectively together and good relationships are a key foundation for successful collaboration.

Research also found that core business conflict when GAs worked together could affect Community/Government relationships creating a negative view of Government.
Regional development policy encourages bottom-up initiatives, and draws on Community consultation, engagement and partnership. The most recent focus of nation-building regional infrastructure development under the Rudd Government still relies on Community input to identify priorities and needs. If Communities develop a negative view of Government as a result of effects of core business conflict, the result could negatively impact Community/Government collaboration, consultation and partnerships for regional development.

The research has found that the impacts on projects, from core business conflict included delaying or stopping projects, reducing outcome quality, breadth and depth and perhaps preventing them being delivered on time; implementation of projects was inefficient; timeframes were affected and time would have to be taken to resolve issues. The most significant of the impacts were: ‘projects were delayed or stoppe’d’; ‘difficulties achieving deliverables in timeframes’; and ‘implementation of projects was inefficient’. These factors represent quite significant impacts on regional development projects, outcomes and benefit to community.

Regional development involves both proactive activities to drive development, as well as implementing policies and programs to address impacts on regions. One example could be programs to enhance community capacity to manage negative impacts such as rural economic decline, or to address equity of access to services. The latter relies on Government capacity to be responsive to regional needs. Research has identified that core business conflict impacts on projects and GA relationships in ways that can interfere with the efficiency of project implementation, Government responsiveness, or affect the regional development project outcomes.

6.3.2 Expansion of current knowledge

Table 6.11 (page 480) summarises the expansion of current knowledge as a result of the research and justifies the contribution. Knowledge areas expanded include: issues and impediments and core business conflicts – relationship and linkages; joined-up, integrated government and WOG processes and practices; tools, processes and practices to facilitate GAs working together; and external factors that cause GAs difficulties when working together.
Table 6.11  
Expansion of current knowledge and justification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPANSION OF CURRENT KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>JUSTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Issues and impediments and core business conflicts – relationship and linkages | • Literature and literature research explored the issues, impediments and barriers faced by GAs when working together in joined-up WOG and integrated activities. Some studies then used findings to develop guidelines, make recommendations and design tools to improve capacity for collaboration.  
• Research into core business conflict is a new area of investigation, which included the relationship between core business conflicts and issues and impediments (the related area). Research findings contribute to current knowledge concerning issues and impediments. Findings are that:  
  - core business conflict and issues and impediments can be the same or similar  
  - core business conflict and issues and impediments can be causally linked, such as a practical core business conflict issue causing an outcome issue.  
  - many issues and impediments identified in the literature and research link particularly to the functional/operational core business conflicts regarding processes, systems, policies and practices used to deliver an agency’s core business.  
  - The extant research identified issues and impediments when GAs work together, but did not identify any inter-relationship or cascading impact which compounds the difficulties faced by agencies.  
  - The research uncovered additional information regarding these inter-linkages and cause and effect relationship. |
| • joined-up, integrated and WOG processes, practices and barriers | • Extant literature and research investigated joined-up, integrated and WOG drivers, policies and practices through research studies involving case studies and project reviews. Some of the literature identified processes and practices, barriers and issues affecting GAs working together in these types of initiatives. Research findings add to this current knowledge about the processes and practices and barriers. Findings are that:  
  - Core business conflict is definitely a factor in the barriers and issues  
  - The functional/operational processes and systems in place that support GAs carrying out their day-to-day delivery of core business, are primarily the problem when GAs work together  
  - Difficulties faced by GAs occur at two levels. Core business conflict issues mostly concerned with challenges at a lower operational level, whereas the majority of the literature investigation identified factors related to the higher level elements such as risk, governance, frameworks for coordination and funding appropriation arrangements. |
| • Tools, frameworks, processes and practices to support GAs working effectively together | • The extant research and literature contains guidelines, checklists and procedures that can assist agencies working together. The literature also contains recommendations such as ensuring that agency corporate plans incorporate WOG and collaborative activities or that governance structures such as Taskforces or Inter-departmental committees are set up for certain types of project situation and task.  
• This research adds to this knowledge by:  
  - identifying the commonalities between issues and impediments and core business conflict, and similarities in many of the strategies and actions undertaken to manage core business conflict  
  - identifying that unique frameworks and approaches are developed in response to project-specific issues, supporting the literature view that working collaboratively requires innovative and creative solutions to problems  
  - highlighting the need to develop a process to integrate higher level frameworks and tools to lower level approaches to deal with core business conflict and issues and impediments at an operational level when implementing projects. |
| • External factors that cause issues, impediments and conflict when GAs work together | • Literature has focused on resolving difficulties between GAs with tools, guidelines, checklists and recommendations for policy and governance practices when agencies are working collaboratively, particularly in WOG and ‘joined-a’ initiatives.  
• Research has expanded knowledge and highlighted some of the significant external factors, not related to core business, and the identified public sector management policies and practices that cause conflict when GAs work together. The most significant are political-related, personality-related and locational characteristics, for example geographic or demographics. |

Source: Developed for this research
Source: Compiled from analysis of research findings and comparison with literature findings to identify contribution to current knowledge.

Discussion – Relationship and linkages in issues and impediments and core business conflicts

Considerable investigation has been undertaken to find out about the issues and barriers to GAs working effectively in WOG and joined-up government initiatives, with two key studies being most notable - the Management Advisory Committee report (2004) and the Institute of Public Administration study (2002). Other literature reviewing and reporting on joint projects also contained information on issues and impediments, learnings and key success factors. However, as indicated in section 6.3.1 GA core business conflict did not
feature in the literature and is a new area of investigation associated with the difficulties agencies experience when working collaboratively.

In the process of investigating core business conflict, further information has now been gathered, which contributes to understanding the difficulties faced by GAs working together. This additional information concerns the relationship between core business and issues and impediments and causal and inter-dependency links that exist.

The research identified that core business conflict is linked to, causes, or in some cases, is the same as many of the issues and impediments identified through the research. Comparison of issues and impediments in the literature with the issues and impediments and core business conflicts identified in the research, found that many concurred, thus indicating that core business conflict is an unrecognized feature of the issues and impediments identified in the literature. Additionally, many of the issues and impediments are in fact, predominantly functional/operational core business conflicts.

Information gathered through the interviews has provided rich data that has contributed to identifying linkages and inter-dependencies within core business conflicts and issues and impediments. For example, a practical functional/operational core business conflict can often create a core business conflict outcome issue, such as limited local decision-making capacity, which then causes project delays. This could be due to authority and delegation hierarchies in an agency structure designed to deliver its core business.

An example of inter-dependency is the capacity for an agency to contribute funds to a project, which is dependent upon access to funds within a budget. Funds may be limited or not available because of being already allocated to agency priorities to deliver core business outcomes.

What became evident from the interview discussions from a public sector management perspective was the internal structure and authority hierarchy of an agency, its portfolio role and responsibility (including any legislative responsibilities) and budget allocation influences on the lower level policy, procedures and systems that are put in place. This is a ‘cascade effect’ down through the agency. These inter-dependencies and cascading influences may also impact on capacity to solve issues when working together at a lower level, or influence the effective communication with a high level governance structure that may be established to oversee a project or program.
Discussion - joined-up, integrated government and WOG processes and practices

The literature and research identified the drivers and needs for joined-up, integrated and WOG approaches. The literature also investigated processes and practices that were adopted to facilitate agencies working together, through case studies and project reviews, as well as drawing on literature from overseas. (Management Advisory Committee 2004, Office of Public Service Merit and Equity 2003; Department of Families (Qld) 2002; Institute of Public Administration Australia 2002). As a result there are ‘best practice’ guidelines, checklists, tools, and frameworks available as a resource for agencies when involved in WOG initiatives.

The research has expanded the information already accumulated by the literature studies and project reviews, demonstrating that core business conflict is definitely a factor contributing to issues and impediments and a barrier when GAs work together. Research findings also indicated that the functional/operational activities of an agency delivering its core business are key factors in limiting the capacity for agencies to collaborate effectively. The processes and practices that are part of functional/operational core business conflict are central to an agency carrying out agency core business, and thus are not likely to be replaced by other processes and systems for the purposes of working together. Instead agencies are likely to try to maintain their own systems. However, it was also noted that in some instances agencies developed innovative solutions to address the problems faced in coordinating or integrating agency specific processes and systems.

Research findings suggest that there are two levels at which GAs experience difficulties when working collaboratively. Functional/operational core business conflicts primarily concern difficulties at the practical operational level. Some of these reflect the second and higher level issues that were the predominant focus of the literature. These included for example, the frameworks and structures for governance, budget appropriation and accountability mechanism, and having Ministerial and high level endorsement and coordination.

Discussion - Tools, frameworks, processes and practices to support GAs working effectively together

The extant research and literature identified through the case studies and project reviews, key issues, barriers and factors that needed to be considered or addressed when agencies work
together. This information was used to develop documents that provided ‘best practice’
guidelines, checklists, proforma, recommended structures and frameworks, and tools to assist
GAs work more effectively together.

Challenges being addressed were generally systems related, technical, cultural,
governance and accountability, policy, financial appropriation and legislative. The Australian
Public Service Commission ‘State of the Service 2006-2007’ report highlighted areas that still
need considerable work to enhance inter-agency collaboration capacity. Although much has
changed in the governance and public sector management practices area, this report undertook
surveys that indicated senior officers did not share the view that many of the mechanism in
place were easy to apply, for example WOG financial and accountability needs.

The research findings identified four areas that are indicative of changes that would be
necessary to apply to processes and systems, to facilitate GAs working together. Firstly,
research findings regarding the inter-relatedness and cascading effects of core business
conflict indicates a need to identify core business conflict issues that are the foundation of
other difficulties. An example would be the authority delegations within an agency’s structure,
as this affects many other aspects of an agency’s own internal workings.

Secondly, the cause and effect relationships of practical core business conflict issues
creating outcomes core business conflict issues. An example is the decision-making capacity
locally and the likely timeframes required to seek approval for actions and spending that can
cause delays and difficulties with timeframe to achieve outcomes and deliverables.

The third area concerns the importance of flexibility and capacity to modify and
generate creative solutions based on the processes and systems agencies must use. The
process model arising from the research is a mechanism to support the development of a
creative solution. Lastly there is a need to connect the higher level solutions and approaches
evident in the literature, to the operational ‘grass roots’ level of project implementation in a
region.

Research findings are indicative that a holistic approach would be beneficial, to
managing the problems experienced when GAs work together. The proposed comprehensive
and holistic approach can draw on both literature higher level tools and frameworks and the
lower level research findings to construct a process model. The intent will be to integrate both
the higher and lower levels, provide information and assessment processes to facilitate
developing project-specific solutions and management strategies.
Chapter 6

Discussion - External factors that cause issues, impediments and conflict when GAs work together

The literature, by nature of its intent, did not investigate external factors that would contribute to issues and impediments or create barriers when agencies worked together. The research, however, investigated this area as part of compiling a comprehensive picture of contributing elements to GAs conflict and difficulties when working together. The research identified political and personality factors as the top two non-core business or GA-related elements. Additional factors included demographics, the tyranny of distance and locational characteristics. In view of the influence of these non-core business related factors, there is merit in incorporating them for consideration in the process model.

Conclusion

The research contributes new knowledge and expands current knowledge to the difficulties faced by GAs when working together in WOG; joined-up’ and other collaborative activities as noted below:

**New knowledge:**
- Core business conflict, as a significant conflict factor when agencies are working together.
- Knowledge about the nature of core business conflict
- The most common core business conflicts
- The impact of core business conflict
  - on GA relationships
  - on the implementation and outcomes of regional development projects and other joint government initiatives
  - core business conflict affect on the Community/Government relationships
- Public sector management practices and government and governance policies as causes/contributors to core business conflict.
- The impact of core business conflict on regional development

**Current knowledge is expanded in the following areas**
- Issues and impediments and core business conflicts – relationship and linkages
- joined-up, integrated and WOG processes, practices and barriers
- Tools, frameworks, processes and practices to support GAs working effectively together
- External factors that cause issues, impediments and conflict when GAs work together
6.4 Designing the process model

Implications regarding addressing the research problem emerge from the findings of the research. A greater understanding of core business conflict has been built through the research influencing considerations in the design of the process model. Key learnings are that core business conflict:

- is linked to or the same as many issues and impediments already identified
- has cascade effect within an agency and involves inter-dependencies amongst processes and systems
- involves practical issues that lead to outcomes issues of a core business conflict nature
- is mostly functional/operational core business conflict, so relates to the processes and systems, as well as the policies and procedures to deliver core business
- occurs at two levels, a higher level, evident in the literature covering aspects such as governance and financial accountability, and the lower level, relating to operational practicalities when GAs are working together.

The intent of the process model is to facilitate a holistic and practical approach to manage core business conflict when agencies are working together in regional development project or other joint government initiatives. The process model is a mechanism to enable innovative solutions to GAs’ difficulties when working together. The model design is to assist GAs to collaboratively plan and develop strategies to anticipate, resolve or manage core business conflict elements and other issues arising from the joint engagement. The process model will also combine learning from research and literature and integrate both levels of approaches (as referred to in the final point above).

Some implications from literature and research

Generally, as identified in both the research and the literature, the public service does not have the culture nor the inter-operability of processes and systems to facilitate working together, as a standard part of their operational ‘tool box’. However, public service officers increasingly have to work with other agencies and in cross-cutting teams within their own agency. Working together occurs at different levels:

- strategic (high level policy group; overarching taskforce or Inter-departmental committee, special group formed as a result of ministerial directive)
- Agency level with an individual agency or several agencies identifying issues requiring inter-departmental collaboration to resolve the issues (CEO level)
- at a regional or officer level, identification of need to work collaboratively with other agencies
- community driven approach agency or agencies to address an issues or opportunity

The appropriation and accountability structures are not considered sufficiently flexible to accommodate joint initiatives with ease, according senior officers consulted for the ‘State of the Service Report’ 2006-2007. In addition, Australia has three levels of Government, all with responsibility to regional development, that compound the difficulties faced by GAs when working together. It was evident from the interviews that acknowledgement of the perspectives of the three levels of Government is important in designing and implementing regional development projects and programs. The interviews demonstrated that there are different views across levels of Government regarding core business conflicts and the factors involved.

Whilst there has been considerable public sector management practice reform since the Coombs report (1976), public sector administration reform encompasses some broad areas that all GAs embrace. However the culture, core business outcomes and the nature of the Acts and regulations GAs are delegated to apply/adhere to, and the products and services they provide mean that these general reforms are individually and uniquely shaped to suit an individual GA’s purpose.

**Survey – most significant factors for consideration in the process model**

Surveys successfully highlighted most significant factors that are important to consider in the design of the process model. They are:

- **Affect on agency relationship** – results in poor communication
- **Complementarity of GA core business** – supports quality and effective relationships; encourages cooperation and collaboration; communication is easier; information sharing occurs; GAs work towards mutual benefit and leverage off each other; and ability to negotiate improves
- **Functional/operational core business conflicts** – agency strategic plans allow little room for new projects or discretionary budget; approval processes are lengthy; programs and funding criteria are inflexible
Non-core business factors that cause difficulties – Ministerial influence and interference; different political parties at the three levels of Government;

Issues and impediments to GAs working together – political issues (agendas, interference, party difference); personality difficulties; decision-making limitations locally; project delays; risk-averse management; internal agency silos

Dominant core business conflicts – non were significant due to the fact that occurrence (in the experience of the respondents) was not frequent, but those with which respondents agreed and considered would have high impact included lack of program funding; decision-making limitations locally; reluctance to commit resources or resources already committed to core business had a high number of respondents agree and consider the impact to be high

Impact on projects - slows down or stops projects; creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated; implementation is inefficient

Community view of Government – no area significant, but Government seen to be uncoordinated and wasting resources attracted high number of respondents agreeing and considering the impact to be high

Processes and practices to manage core business conflict – key factors included cultivating good relationships; demonstrating respect for other agencies’ points of view; agreeing on communication protocols within agencies, amongst stakeholders and with Ministers; practicing the arts of negotiation and facilitation; identifying and building on areas of commonality; ensuring each participating agency can fulfill a KPI or gain benefit; clarifying authority for the project (Minister, WOG initiative, single agency, community); and gaining agreement on who does what, by when and including this in the project plan

Processes and practices to include in the process model – decision-making capacity; funding contribution from each agency; funding cycles and staging (where applicable); approval processes that apply; authority for project (Minister, DG, WOG, MoU, Formal Partnership); staff availability and time commitment; timeline for implementation; KPIs that project could fulfill for each agency; legislation that applies and any issues associated with applying legislation; communication protocols within agencies, across agencies, to Ministers, and other stakeholders; common goals relating to project; agency roles and
responsibilities; key tasks to be done, by whom and by when; information needs and their sources; resources available and any shortfalls; ESD value of project

Both research and literature indicate that there are many common approaches and practices adopted to manage difficulties faced by GAs working together, as well as project-specific solutions that reflect the project intent, and stakeholder interests within a local context. Community engagement featured in a number of the literature studies and reports. This research has concentrated on investigating issues associated with GAs difficulties working together due to commitment to their core business, however community engagement will be incorporated as an area to be considered in the process model.

The following points from both the research and the extant literature are drawn out to provide guidance for the design of the process model. The intention is to result in a process model that will:

- apply to the development of projects, as well as the assessment of projects that may be presented to GAs by community or another agency
- identify the authority of the project and its scale and objectives from a WOG perspective (this can help to inform whether formal arrangements must be in place to enable appropriate level of governance and accountability)
- assess whether the project requires a formal arrangement from a WOG perspective, or looser reference group, to enable the appropriate level of governance and accountability
- assess the issue/opportunity and proposed project/action in relation to political and community influences and expectations
- incorporate a comprehensive initial scan and assessment of potential conflicts, issues and impediments, and take into account the cascade impacts and inter-relations of the items identified to inform priority and key target areas for development of strategies to address them
- progress in stages covering gathering information, designing structures, strategies and processes, developing the project outline, and finally actions for the implementation and monitoring tool
- include intangible aspects of core business conflict in the underpinning principles to the process model
refer to and incorporate into the process model the ‘best practice’ guidelines and checklists in the extant research and literature, and any future tools developed

include the use of ESD principles as a tool to encourage consideration of other agencies’ priorities and responsibility.

6.4.1 Process model outline

The process model design draws on the research, reviews and literature from chapter 3 as well as the findings from the research. The process model is divided into stages, but comprises two main parts:

- Project and Stakeholder Assessment (PASA), and
- Responsibility, Action, Monitoring and Review Tool (RAMART).

The process model applies to the following situations of collaboration:

- Assessment of an issue/opportunity for which GA collaboration may be required
- Development of a project by an agency (requiring other agency involvement or support)
- Collaborative development of a project by all agencies delegated to work together, or choosing to work collaboratively on an issue, need or opportunity
- Review of a project by GAs involved in the project as part of consultation and refinement or prior to commencing implementation. This would be of a project already scoped by one agency in the collaboration, or that is presented from Community.

Figure 6.3 (page 490) presents the outline of the process model, showing the two parts and the key stages and notes the source of reference for tools, ‘best practice’ guidelines, checklists, frameworks and structures already developed.

Appendix 10 contains the tools and checklists
**Figure 6.3**

**Process model outline**

**Stage 1**

**Preliminary pre-project/program preparation**

This step may be missed if the delegation is that a project or program is to be developed & implemented collaboratively. Proceed to Stage 2, step 2.

**Step 1**

Issue/opportunity assessment – refer to checklist Appendix 10 & reference material

**Stage 2**

**PASA**

Project & Stakeholder Analysis

Unless there is an already scoped project, the objectives of the project/program need to be determined as this will guide other analysis & discussion to inform project design.

**Step 2**

Project assessment - Refer to checklist in Appendix 10 and reference material

Step 3

Stakeholder assessment - Refer checklist in Appendix 10

**Stage 3**

**RAMART**

Responsibility, Action, Monitoring & Review tool

This is the project/program design phase where the findings from step 2 & 3 are incorporated into the design. The aim is to clearly articulate what is involved, who is responsible for what, by when & anticipated or known difficulties there are & how they may be addressed. This can be produced in Excel or a spreadsheet.

**Step 4**

Responsibility & Action
Refer Appendix 10 for program checklist & word document headings

Step 5

Monitor
Refer Appendix 10 for Excel example

Step 6

Review
Refer Appendix 10 for review example

Source: Developed for this research

**Tools & reference material**

MAC study 2004
IPAA study 2002
Qld Office of Public Service Merit & Equity
Australian Public Service
ICASA from Engaged Government
Dept. Families handbook

**Tools & reference material**

Mac 2004
IPAA 2002
Qld Office of Public Service Merit & Equity
Australian Public Service
ICASA from Engaged Government
Dept. Families handbook

**Tools & reference material**

Mac 2004
IPAA 2002
Qld Office of Public Service Merit & Equity
Australian Public Service
ICASA from Engaged Government
Dept. Families handbook

**Tools & reference material**

Mac 2004
IPAA 2002
Qld Office of Public Service Merit & Equity
Australian Public Service
ICASA from Engaged Government
Dept. Families handbook
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6.5 Implications for theory, policy and practice

The theoretical implications involve three discipline areas of regional development (the focus), Government and governance and public sector management practices. Figure 6.4 is the theoretical framework developed in Chapter 3, which has been modified to include a summary of the theoretical implications of the research.

Figure 6.4
Theoretical framework for the literature and research review

Research findings
Implications for theory, policy and practice
- Nature of core business conflict
- Impact on agency relationship & projects
- Impact on regional development
- Significant component of issues & impediments
- Key influence in WOG, ‘joined-up & integrated initiative
- Inter-related & cascading impact within agencies
- Predominantly functional/operational core business conflict – how agencies deliver core business
- Impact on Government/Community relationships
- Benefit from holistic solution
- Core business conflict comprises practical, ‘outcomes’ & intangible issues
- Implications for strategic planning, public sector management practices & governance frameworks

Source: Developed for this research
1. **The blue and yellow circles** represent the literature review of chapter 3, covered in sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 including a very brief overview of the evolution of Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development (blue circle). Section 3.3 covers reviews and research literature on regional development projects and initiatives, and joined-up, integrated and WOG programs and initiatives to identify the issues and impediments to agencies working together. Section 3.4 provides information on some suggested approaches, frameworks and guidelines to manage the issues and impediments to working together. Section 3.3 and 3.4 are represented by the yellow circle and are the previous research in the field.

2. **The red circle** represents the research problem area - difficulties GAs have when working together.

3. **The purple circle** represents the boundaries for this research – research confined to Australia and focusing on regional development.

4. **The green circle** represents the research gaps identified and examined through the research, being no extant literature uncovered that deals specifically with the topic of core business conflict; no understanding of the nature of core business conflict or dominant core business conflicts; no understanding of linkages between issues and impediments identified in the literature and core business conflict; and lastly no practical, holistic process to incorporate literature processes and systems developed to assist agencies working together at the operational level.

5. **Research findings – implications for theory, policy and practice** (pink box) implications for theory, policy and practice from the research findings are presented under individual discipline areas in the orange boxes. These implications are discussed in sections 6.5.1, 6.5.2 and 6.5.3.

### 6.5.1 Governance

**Introduction**

The research findings have implications for the theory of governance relating to:

- the governance framework where agencies operate as discrete entities, rather than in a coordinated and integrated manner
- the current interpretation of WOG being as a mechanism to work together on difficult and cross cutting issues
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- Government priorities
- Federalism, and centralisation versus decentralisation in the governance framework

The implications for governance theory and research findings have policy and practice implications. Policy areas affected include:
- Appropriation and financial accountability
- Regional governance and authority
- Development of a WOG policy based on the core principles of coordination, integration, collaboration and inter-operability
- Development of a whole-of-government-impact-assessment (WOGIA) process applied when GAs are developing programs and projects

Implications for practice are:
- Agency adoption of new interpretation of WOG as principles for strategic and business plans
- Re-alignment of Ministerial portfolio statements to have a major component based on collaborative activities and joint outcomes as a more efficient use of resources

The term ‘collaboration’ is used in its broadest sense, which does not mean only working on joint initiatives and having joint outcomes. Collaboration is a means of ensuring coordination and integration through maintaining communication and consultation to build awareness and synergy across agencies, as well as engaging in teamwork, partnerships, linkages, and alliances. The theory, policy and practice implications within the governance framework are discussed in greater detail below.

**Governance theoretical implications - Governance framework and WOG**

Currently, the governance framework contains the discrete and separate traditional agency providers of specific products, services and programs within a Weberian system of Government (Keating & Weller in Davis & Weller 2001).

The traditional separations and disconnection of GA activities remain. This is despite the increasing pressure to deal with cross-cutting issues noted by studies such as the Management Advisory Committee report (2004) and Institute of Public Administration (2002), and the development of a set of overarching Government priorities to which agencies contribute. The result is that core business priorities and performance outcomes continue to
be determined from the perspective of the agency, and not based on the context of an integrated and coordinated WOG governance approach.

The ‘Growing Victoria Together’ initiative examined in a number of articles reviewed in the literature provides ample evidence as to the lengthy and complex challenges of facilitating specialist agencies and processes to coordinate, integrate and collaborate within a traditional Government and governance structure that is based on single agency activities and outcomes.

The current WOG approach generally refers to specific cross-cutting issues that require a WOG approach as a mechanism for bringing together the agency-specific expertise to address the issue. The research findings suggest that a shift in perspective of the theory of WOG and the framework of governance involving a different interpretation of WOG (to mean a Government that works in a coordinated, integrated and collaborative manner), may lessen core business conflict. This would be by reducing the dominance of core business as a singular and isolated agency activity and outcomes, and promote core business activities and outcomes as part of a holistic WOG delivery.

The theoretical shift as outlined above is to one where Government and governance activities are based on being WOG outcomes achieved through the coordinated, integrated and collaborative activities of GAs. Coordination, integration and collaboration would therefore be the underpinning principles for the governance framework.

Of relevance to the argument concerning changing the meaning of WOG as a key part of the governance framework, is the research findings that indicated an important aspect of GA buy-in and commitment to joint initiatives was agency benefit. The power of complementarity of core business for enabling good relationships and reducing core business conflict was strongly evident. Complementarity and mutuality were also identified in the literature as an important contributor to enhancing the capacity to work together. With the current interpretation of WOG, there are limitations to building complementarity because the current governance theory is based on the premise of singular agencies, not on a holistic concept of WOG.

**Governance theoretical implications - Government priorities**

Currently, the Government develops priorities for action and agencies report on those seen as relevant to roles and responsibilities and subsequent core business performance measures. It is rare to see agencies including in their performance outcomes the benefits and
synergies of the agency’s activities upon other agencies, or acknowledging other agencies’ contribution to achieving outcomes. Regional development outcomes are the result of the outcomes from most agencies, indicative that regional development is a WOG priority in itself.

**Governance theoretical implications - power, authority, decision-making and centralisation versus decentralisation**

An issue that emerged in the research concerned the difficulties caused by agencies that had a more centralised approach and internal governance process, compared to those that were decentralised and had strong regional autonomy. This issue stems from the theme of power, authority and jurisdiction, and relates particularly to decision-making capacity and financial delegations at a local level. Additionally, the level of Government (Federal or State) combined with being centralised, although not explicitly stated in research findings, is potentially an additional compounding factor. This view is based on the literature relating to the federalism and relationships between levels of government discussions by Dore and Woodhill (1999) and Hollander and Patapan (2007).

The core business conflict of decision-making can have a serious impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of program and project delivery, predominantly associated with delays. For this reason, there would be benefit in a governance structure that ensured that agencies had appropriate levels of authority and decision-making capacity within regions.

The centralisation/decentralisation of agencies has been a common and changing feature of governance previously noted in chapter 3 in section 3.2.1. The research supports decentralisation and an empowered regional governance structure.

**Policy implications – appropriation and accountability**

Appropriation frameworks and reporting and accountability requirements are two policy areas that would require review to support a governance shift to WOG. Current WOG activities are developed to address specific problems, and are thus not a traditional way for GAs to carry out normal business. The current appropriation rationale and framework, viewed as being flexible enough to adapt to resourcing for specific WOG projects, has already been identified as actually not being seen as particularly flexible, by senior officers of agencies(survey findings from the ‘State of the Service Report 2006-2007’).
Applying the proposed new interpretation for WOG, would require review of appropriation and reporting and accountability to support the new WOG approach, which would contain considerably more joint outcomes. At present, appropriation, and reporting and accountability requirements are structured generally to be more suited to an individual agency perspective. This includes Ministers’ accountabilities and estimates hearings, which also relate to individual agencies within a portfolio. A revised policy would incorporate WOG integrated, coordinated and collaborative activity reporting as part of mainstream requirements, of equal importance to individual agency reporting.

Policy implications - Regional governance

The research found that local decision-making and authority varied across agencies, thus contributing to core business conflict, and delays in projects when higher approvals must be sought or local staff do not have appropriate authority. A possible improvement to regional governance performance would be policy changes relating to decentralisation and ensuring a sufficient level of authority exists amongst agencies to support working collaboratively at a regional level.

Policy implications - Whole-of-Government policy

Currently WOG approaches are used for what the Management Advisory Committee (2004) refers to as ‘wicked’ problems – those that are cross-cutting and complex. The policy implication from the research indicates that a policy based on the revised interpretation of WOG would be useful.

If this was considered, the broader policy would be that the new WOG perspective was the foundation underpinning all policies. The intent would be to foster GAs to develop their core business activities and outcomes, linked to and integrated with other GAs. This broader perspective of WOG would therefore support the shift in the theory for governance to one based on integration, coordination and collaboration as key outcomes in delivering Government priorities.

The policy could include the application of a whole-of-government-impact-assessment (WOGIA). Inter-agency consultation is currently part of the policy or program development process. The WOGIA process would mean that other agencies’ perspectives are part of the scoped policy or project, rather than developing the policy or program first, and then seeking agency views in a consultation process, after the fact. The process would include
consideration of the positive, negative, and synergistic effects on other agencies’ activities, and also encourage identification of direct linkages and leverage opportunities.

**Practice – new approach to strategic planning**

A number of implications for practice arise, stemming from a shift in the theory of governance and policy to support coordinated, integrated and collaborative WOG activities and programs. For example agencies could position their own activities and programs within the revised WOG context.

The research identified agency strategic plans as limiting capacity to work collaboratively. This is because they focus on singular agency core business outcomes and performance measures. To strengthen the coordination, integration and collaboration amongst agencies, GAs strategic plans and performance outcomes for staff could be based on the principles of coordination, integration and collaboration with a key component being how the individual expertise of the agency inter-linked with other agencies’ activities. Building and developing inter-agency leverage and linkages would thus become a fundamental part of individual agency planning. Ecologically Sustainable Development principles and/or application of the suggested WOGIA process previously mentioned could be used to assist scoping this broader philosophy of WOG into core business and performance outcomes. In addition, strategic partnerships and inter-dependency with other agencies’ activities could be identified and incorporated into agency plans. Budget allocation could take collaborative activities into account.

**Practice – CEO and WOG strategic intent**

Agency CEOs already meet to discuss cross-cutting issues and for WOG initiatives. However, to translate strategic plans into integrated and supported actions, agency heads would also need to discuss together the WOG components of their strategic plans, for example inter-dependency outcomes, mutual leverage and benefit, or impact of key initiatives on other agencies.

Other implications for practise may also be in the approach for developing and delivering Government priorities for community. Under a revised philosophy of WOG, priorities would be scoped not in terms of discrete priorities, but of interlinked priorities. This would include Ministerial portfolio statements identifying and incorporating cross-portfolio
issues and inter-dependencies, and presenting their budget statements with a key component being the efficient use of funds through collaborative activities, providing coordinated, integrated and improved outcomes for Community.

6.5.2 Public sector management

Introduction

Efficiency, effectiveness, transparency and responsiveness are key principles that have guided public sector management theory, policy and practices. The main implication of research findings for public sector management concerns consideration of also adopting the new core principles of coordination, integration, collaboration and interoperability. There is evidence that agencies are working more collaboratively (Briggs 2005), for example in the increased formation of networks and partnerships, and developing shared outcomes for projects. However, the adoption of these principles has the potential to facilitate coordination, integration and collaboration to become the common approach.

Adopting the principles also influences policy and practice in the public sector, requiring public sector management policy changes to support the broader interpretation of WOG. In a similar way, changes in practice would place a stronger emphasis on coordination, integration and collaboration with other agencies in agencies’ strategic plans.

These implications are discussed in more detail below.

Establishment of core principles for inter-operability, coordination, integration and collaboration

As noted in the literature review, Beer, Maude and Pritchard (2003) describe Government as having become consultative, accountable, and responsive, and adopting approaches to steer, partner and devolve authority (Considine 2005 cited in Crowley & Coffey 2007). Government changes are aimed at achieving greater efficiency, transparency and accountability (Davis & Rhodes in Keating, Wanna & Weller (eds.) 2000), and include using private sector management practices. Some examples of these practices are: corporate and business planning, managing for outcomes, performance management, contractual employment, and modern budgeting practices.

The research identified that a large proportion of core business conflict is functional/operational core business conflict, and that public sector management practices are
the basis on which many of the functional/operational factors are shaped. The literature noted that processes and systems developed by GAs are designed so that they become unique to each agency, despite using the same fundamental public sector management practices.

The previous section dealing with theoretical, policy and practice implications for Government and particularly adjustments to governance suggested the adoption of foundation principles of coordination, integration and collaboration to underpin agency activities. These principles were to support a theoretical shift from applying a WOG approach as a special activity, to one where Government operates in a WOG fashion as the ‘norm’. Government priorities and outcomes are based on collaboration and partnerships.

Public sector management practices, adopted for the delivery of core business would need to reflect these principles. The implications are therefore that the core principles of public sector management include the principles of inter-operability, coordination, integration and collaboration. Inter-operability has been added due to the dominant role that information and communication technology plays in how GAs do business, communicate, store, analyse and share information.

Efficiency and effectiveness are both a driver and the intent of many of the public sector management practices. With the evidence from the research that core business conflict reduces efficiency and effectiveness, the adoption of these suggested core principles has potential to improve agency efficiency and effectiveness for project and program delivery.

The Australian Public Service Commission report ‘State of the Service 2006-2007’ has noted that there is a shift in practice already underway by suggesting there is a change from GAs working in silos to a greater focus on networks and partnerships, managing across agencies, reduction of specific agency reporting, and sharing information. Briggs (2005) also highlighted elements of the shift indicating that WOG was originally pursued through organisational restructuring and machinery of government changes, but is now more about culture, capabilities and relationships. Briggs states that it is also not just about working across portfolios and agencies, but also about integrating policy and programs, including having shared outcomes. This view supports the WOGIA concept proposed earlier.

It could be argued that based on the research findings, and despite the shift in perspective noted in the literature, the imperative is still not strong enough to support agency inter-operability, collaboration and coordination. A key example from the research is that
agency strategic plans were found to be a strong inhibitor to collaboration. This is despite the fact that many agencies identify collaboration with other agencies as an activity, within their strategic plans. The focus is on their core business, from their agency perspective and set under the Government priorities to which their core business contributes.

GAs have embraced new public sector management practices focused on efficiency, effectiveness, transparency and accountability. In the same way, a revised public sector management theory and recommended practices based on core principles of inter-operability, collaboration and coordination could influence the translation of statements about collaboration into firm actions in current strategic plans, and the design of internal processes and practices that enhance capacity for GA coordination, collaboration and interoperability.

Policy

As was demonstrated in chapter 3, the revised Figure 3.5 on page 132, Government and governance influences public sector management practices and both areas influence regional development policy and actions. The shift in the WOG perspective in Government and governance would influence public sector management practices policy. Examples of policy areas affected include reporting and accountability frameworks and processes, and current policy guiding agencies planning processes, strategic and unit business plans, and performance measures.

The literature identified that incorporation of working collaboratively into performance measures would foster a change in agency culture (Management Advisory Committee 2004; Institute of Public Administration 2002). The suggested changes to a revised interpretation of WOG and the adoption of the guiding principles of inter-operability, coordination, integration and collaboration and application of WOGIA to planning and policy, would reinforce and support performance measures relating to collaboration. It may even assist in creating agency cultural change over time.

Practice

To support changes in theory and policy, GAs may engage with one another at the strategic and business planning levels on items requiring linkages and alliances during their planning processes. The proposed WOGIA process would encourage inter-agency
communication to identify synergies and leverage and then to develop the initiatives and supporting mechanisms to achieve the synergies and leverage.

The research uncovered the cascade effect of key factors such as authority structures in an agency influencing processes and systems, reporting requirements and delegations. Research also showed there was a causal relationship between some core business conflicts. The policy changes discussed above have potential to reduce the causal relationships that exist in core business conflict. Adoption of the proposed core principles would shape the development of GA practices and procedures to deliver their core business. This would encourage the creation of systems and procedures that would be more conducive to collaborative activities.

The application of the new core principles would change the strategic and agency unit business planning practices, and include discussion with other agencies. Currently there are a few agencies that appear to undertake some discussion, but generally strategic and business plans do not incorporate cross-agency objectives and outcomes and do not involve collaboration with other agencies when they are being developed. Applying the proposed principles would mean agencies would meet to discuss key alliances, co-dependencies, synergies and leverage, and would formulate joint objectives and outcomes to incorporate into each agency’s strategic plan.

High level mapping of inter-agency inter-dependencies to deliver outcomes and to determine potential collaboration could inform strategic planning and consideration for appropriation arrangements and reportable outcomes. Outcomes and deliverables could therefore include benefit to other agencies, as well as an agency’s own core business.

The research identified funding difficulties relating to mismatched funding cycles and inflexible criteria. Agency strategic plans (already identified as a barrier to working together), determine budget and dictate level of flexibility in funding arrangements. This infers a need to include in budgets, and funds allocated for inter-agency and WOG work. The changes would also be captured in agency strategic plans and reflected in the performance indicators.

Strategic plans capture the high level structure and key functions of agencies to deliver programs and services. Budgets are allocated accordingly, dictating how the agency will expend its financial and other resources to achieve its core business outcomes. Management for outcomes is one of the key public sector management strategies now in place to deliver on these plans. Despite there being central to the Public Service Act 1999, a core function of
senior officers to be to ‘promote co-operation with other Agencies’ (page 35 (2) (b)) cited by Management Advisory Committee (2004, p48), the translation of this into linkage and integration (where relevant) of agency strategic plans and agency performance outcomes) is slow. There is little room for flexibility to be ‘responsive’ to undertake or become involved in new projects that emerge.

6.5.3 Regional Development

Introduction

Australian regional development has, until the 1990s, been dominated by a focus on settlement, infrastructure and nation building in the early years, and then primarily regional economic development (based on information from Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003). As noted in chapter 3, section 3.2.3 this view has since broadened, with greater consideration of the various component parts of regional development (economic, social, environmental and infrastructure). This is evident for example, in the previous Howard Government’s program for ‘Sustainable Regions Program’ having a place-based focus that encompassed more than economic development.

The change has been driven by pressures on regions from increasingly complex issues and competing priorities, relating to growth and decline, sustainability, climate change and the impacts and opportunities of globalisation. Regional challenges mean that multiple agencies and all three levels of Government are involved in addressing regional development issues. Agencies have to work together to coordinate, integrate and collaborate to achieve regional development outcomes and address regional development issues. This suggests that regional development is one of those ‘wicked’ problems (Management Advisory Committee 2004) requiring WOG approaches.

The regional development philosophy that has been adopted also reflects the changes in the relationship between State and Civil society, being based on consultation and engagement and partnership with Community and the private sector.

The literature noted governance processes, public sector management practices and agency role to deliver core business outcomes as not being designed to support GAs working together. The research explored this observation, finding that core business conflict is a key barrier to working together affecting government and agency performance by impacting on the delivery of programs and projects, impacting on agency relationships thus reducing
cooperation, and also impacting on the Community /Government relationship by creating a negative image of Government.

Research findings suggest the need to revisit and revise regional development theory, policy and practices to enable GAs to work collaboratively to improve efficiency and effectiveness in programs and projects, and to deliver coordinated, integrated regional development outcomes. Changes would be to re-position regional development as a WOG key priority outcome, and embed regional development in agencies’ core business. This would mean that each agency’s core business outcomes are couched in terms of contribution to regional development.

The repositioning of regional development as a strategic and WOG priority would change the view of the role of Government in regional development as one of ‘facilitator’ (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003), to one of ‘enabler and facilitator’.

The following discussion examines the theory, policy and practice implications of the research and these possible changes in more detail.

Regional development definition and theory revisited

Holistic regional development involves the cumulative effects and influence of economic, social, environmental and infrastructure elements and is thus a sum of the outcomes of Government, rather than a separate area delegated to a few agencies. It is also the cumulative activity of three levels of Government. Implications of the research for regional development theory relate to the previously proposed governance changes to a framework embracing a new interpretation of WOG. As outlined in section 6.5.2, WOG refers to Government and governance based on the principles of coordination, integration and collaboration. It includes enabling GAs to have sufficient authority in regional governance to carry out regional development policy and to deliver projects and programs. Regional development would therefore be a strategic level WOG priority to which all agencies contribute in some way.

Carrying this concept to the agency level, this translates into regional development being adopted as a priority in each agency and to which each agency’s own core business outcomes contribute. As an embedded part of core business, regional development could strengthen GA core business complementarity, as an area of mutuality with other agencies.

The research found complementarity of core business reduced core business conflict and fostered good relationships amongst GAs. In addition, greater mutuality would result
through regional development as a common focus and basis for agency coordination, integration and collaboration.

In the Government’s current regional development approach, there is recognition that multiple agencies are involved, and that it is a priority for all three levels of government. However, if agency strategic plans are examined, few mention their activities in the context of regional development, and certainly do not note regional development as a priority for the agency. This is with the exception of agencies delegated with regional development as a responsibility.

**Theory of the role of Government in regional development**

The Government’s current role in regional development has been described as ‘facilitation’ (Bureau of Transport and Regional Economics 2003) and includes the philosophy of encouraging Communities to undertake self-help action to address regional development issues or opportunities. It also involves Government engaging with private sector and Community organizations as ‘partners’ to work on regional development issues.

The re-positioning of regional development would change the Government role from ‘facilitator’ to ‘enabler and facilitator’. The enabling role is the GAs’ contribution to regional development, through their core business outcomes – for example roads, telecommunications infrastructure, education and training facilities, and industrial precinct developments.

**Regional development policy**

The research implies formulating a WOG regional development policy, founded on a holistic, integrated and coordinated approach to regional development. This is because the nature of regional development involves multiple agencies delivering their core business outcomes.

Research found that core business conflict interferes with the ability to efficiently deliver projects and programs to Community, reduced outcomes and also affected the Community view of Government. The latter is important due to the fact that Community and private sector are key stakeholders in regional development and are ‘partners’ with Government.

The proposed WOG policy would re-position regional development as a strategic Government outcome and embed it as a core business outcome for most agencies, with governance policy changes supporting decentralization, and modifications to appropriation and financial accountability arrangements.
Regional development practice

As noted earlier, core business conflict interferes with GAs working together, affects the efficient delivery of programs or project outcomes and damages GA relationships. Optimum regional development outcomes are dependent upon GAs’ capacity to effectively integrate, coordinate and collaborate. The nature of regional development means there are inter-dependencies across agencies to achieving regional development outcomes. For example, provision of housing needs sufficient and appropriate land, trunk infrastructure, transport connections and other facilities to support a community. Sufficient housing affects the capacity to attract and retain a labour force. Sufficient and appropriately located industrial land and proximity to transport and distribution routes strongly influences the capacity to attract business and industry and provide employment opportunities.

Although GAs are increasingly working through reference groups, alliances and networks, the research findings would suggest this approach should be the basis for GAs working together in regional development. The embedding of regional development as a core business outcome for most agencies, and its incorporation into GAs’ strategic and business plans would include identifying alliances and partners and developing collaborative activities. In addition, outcomes would be documented as both agency-specific as well as WOG regional development priority outcomes. Adjustment to practice would also include the application of the WOGIA process when GAs design their projects and programs. The WOGIA process would serve as a mechanism to position an agency’s activities within the WOG context for regional development and build the necessary linkages with other agencies.

6.6 Limitations

Delimitations are noted in chapter one, section 1.7(page 22) and limitations are noted in Chapter 4 in the context of the methodology and its application.

Limitations mentioned in this section are noted as a result of analysis and discussion of the research. There were a reduced number of respondents to the survey. The original methodology was based on being able to confirm the dominant factors identified through the interviews, by surveying the same participants, and asking them to rate their level of agreement or disagreement with the factor. With only 50 percent of the intended participants able to respond, the strength of confirmation between interview and survey is reduced. The rich data gathered from the interviews counteracts to a small degree the lack of confirmation,
because there were multiple references to some of the major issues like limited decision-making and the importance of relationships. Additionally, the high level of commonality between issues and impediments and core business conflict mentioned by participants strengthened the significance of the factors in the research context. The survey’s intent was to hone the interview findings by exploring additional dimensions (level of impact and rate of occurrence) of the factors investigated. The reduced number of responses means that the honing process was not as precise as it could have been.

Information about GAs, their portfolio, name and roles and responsibilities have constantly changed during the research period. The names and shifts in portfolio do not affect results and conclusions about the difficulties that GAs face relating to core business conflict.

6.7 Implications for methodology

The winnow and hone methodology design for this research is similar to some mixed methodologies, which involve an initial inquiry to gather data that is then explored in more depth through another method of inquiry. Different participants are usually used. The winnow and hone methodology uses the same participants in order to refine information on the topic of investigation, and using subjects who were already familiar with the topic of investigation, reducing the risk of different interpretation of base concepts and terms affecting responses. The data being explored resulted from analysis of interview data.

The implications for methodology are that the survey process applied following an interview is not only an instrument to ‘triangulate’ but to further refine dimensions of the factors being explored. The ‘winnow and hone’ design, instruments used and the process applied to distil and analyse data has achieved the desired outcome of successfully captured rich data for a preliminary exploration of a new area of investigation and then refining this data through a second research investigation.

The winnow and hone methodology is a variation on mixed methodological approaches that would be of benefit when exploring a new area of research. The design incorporates a number of steps and tools that contribute to providing broad data that is then examined in more depth. This is often a challenge when conducting qualitative research in a new field. These are briefly described below.

The interviews provided extremely rich information to ‘winnow’, by sorting the information into themes, or most common answers. Grouping responses into themes and then creating sub-groups of comments relating to each theme was a successful way to identify the
dominant topics within a theme that could be explored in the survey. It also enabled finding out the theme areas that had the widest range of comments or sub-groupings, demonstrating the different facets of a single theme. Power, authority and jurisdiction is an example of a theme which regularly rated as having the largest number of sub-groups (topic areas) discussed under it. The methodology included counting the number of participant comments about a sub-group topic, which enabled selection of the most common topic within the theme for further investigation. An example would be power, authority and jurisdiction as a theme, under which a commonly discussed view related to local decision-making capacity.

A shortcoming of selecting dominant topics was that some were lengthy and involved multiple elements, which made some of the survey statements quite complex. Whilst these could have been broken down into simple statements, this would remove the linkages and rationale that participants provided. An example is ‘staff availability, including the fact that many agencies have staff in ‘acting’ roles’. This statement was common and presents two aspects about staffing, but participants viewed them as connected.

The ‘honing’ process was designed to investigate in more depth, the key factors identified through the interviews. Surveys explored three aspects of the factor: agreement or disagreement, high or low impact of the factor and frequency of occurrence of the factor. This assisted in determining factors of greatest significance. The survey approach therefore provided some confirmation/disconfirmation of interview findings, but other information that contributes to the knowledge about the research topic.

6.8 Implications for further research

As a new area of investigation employing a qualitative and exploratory research methodology, much has been learned from the research that provides the foundation for further research. The research methodology enabled the uncovering of information that has built an understanding of the nature of core business conflict and its impact, and highlighted the many variables involved. Further research can build on these finding and contribute to developing a theory of the role of GA core business conflict in creating barriers for collaboration and WOG approaches.

Further research into specific aspects uncovered in core business conflicts or its impact would improve the development of Government, governance and public sector management policies and approaches to strengthen WOG responsiveness and efficiency. Additional research may also identify further linkages and causal relationships amongst the three
discipline areas that are the basis of this inquiry – Government and governance, public sector management practices and regional development. Further research could inform additional policy and practice amendments by focusing on some of the variables. With the value of further investigation in mind, the following areas are suggested for further research:

- Investigation of core business conflict in other countries.
- Determining whether GA core business conflict is influenced by the system of governance that is in place – a comparative study with other countries
- A comparative study of core business conflict across Australia’s states
- What is the ‘cost’ in a qualitative and quantitative sense, of core business conflict to Government?
- What is the ‘cost’ of core business conflict to regional development outcomes?
- Explore further the rate of occurrence of core business conflict (given that the sample from this research of survey respondents was reduced)
- Investigate the role of agency strategic plans in creating barriers to working together to inform the development of guidelines based on the principles of integration, coordination and collaboration with a view to developing strategic planning guidelines
- Investigate the effects of incorporating regional development outcomes as a core business performance measure for most agencies, on reducing core business conflict and increasing GA collaboration
- Investigate the role and impact of the dominant theme of power, authority and jurisdiction as it relates to decision-making, as a barrier to regional development and identify implications for new regional governance arrangements
- Investigate the potential impact of the principles of integration, coordination and collaboration on enhancing Government and governance efficiency, effectiveness and transparency, including implications for public sector management practice and policy
- What is the impact of public sector management practices on GAs capacity for collaboration?
- Literature identified that agencies design their processes and systems in isolation and to suit their own purpose – investigate the impact of adopting the principles of coordination, integration, collaboration and inter-operability as the basis for all GAs to design internal systems and procedures
Investigate the cause and effect relationships of practical and outcomes issues, and use the findings to refine management approaches to reduce core business conflict.

Investigate significant variables in core business conflict and implication on the effectiveness and efficiency of government service delivery to community, for example:
- Funding difficulties and accountability
- Role of centralisation versus decentralization of agency organisation and the affect on capacity for GAs responsiveness and pro-activity in regional development
- Reporting frameworks
- GA strategic planning can as a tool to facilitate collaboration and capacity for responsiveness
- The application of ESD in regional development projects – investigating options for effective application

6.9 Concluding remarks

The research has clearly demonstrated that core business and GA dedication to its delivery is the source of conflict when agencies work together and a barrier to regional development project implementation. The research has shown that the resulting impacts of core business conflict affect the community image of government, the efficiency of delivery of projects and programs and GA relationships.

Due to the nature of regional development, as the sum of outcomes from multiple agencies, combined with the activity of Community, private sector and market forces, the research findings illustrate the issues faced by agencies working in regional development. Findings also highlight the need to both address core business conflict and to position regional development as a WOG strategic priority.

Benefits to addressing the research problem

The main benefits of addressing the research problem are to improve the performance and outcomes of GAs in fulfilling Government priorities, and improve efficiency and effectiveness. The following are noted as some of the key benefits:
- Improving agency relationships by reducing and managing core business conflict
- Enhancing the efficient delivery of programs, products and service and outcome to community through reduction in time and resources to resolve core business conflict
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- Strengthening agency mutuality, complementarity and benefit, potentially improving commitment and support to work together and reducing core business conflict
- Enhancing the image of Government as coordinated, integrated and working together to deliver outcomes for Community
- Improving communication amongst agencies (which also enhances relationships)
- Improving regional development program and project outcomes by reducing and managing core business conflict, (identified as having serious impact on projects/programs and their outcomes).

Points to be acknowledged

However, in concluding this research the following is acknowledged that:

- no models or processes put in place can detract from the importance of individual project/program team quality and management capabilities
- not everything is ‘integrated or requires a WOG approach, however acknowledgment that every activity and outcome from an individual agency, whether it is a road, a school, opening up of industrial land, protection of an area, building of a hospital (for example), has an impact or influence on other agencies’ outcomes and their potential to achieve outcomes
- Core business conflict and issues and impediments when agencies work together are not the only source of conflict. Other significant influences and barriers related to political, personalities, and locational characteristics have to be managed

Key issues affecting resolution of the research problem

Key issues identified in research of particular relevance to resolving the research problem are:

- Functional/operational core business conflicts are directly related to the public sector management practices adopted by agencies to deliver core business – hence the need to review these processes and practices and adopt the core principles of coordination, integration, collaboration and inter-operability
- Building relationships and engaging with community and the private sector to achieve Government outcomes is affected by the Community perception of Government, and core business conflict has been shown to negatively affect these perceptions
- Core business is seen as a separate and discrete activity by agencies, with delivery of their own outcomes to address Government priorities – hence the need to review WOG
approaches not being just for ‘wicked and cross-cutting problems’ but as the basis to work

- Core business conflict is exacerbated by agency view that working together is an addition to delivering core business- hence the need to embed working together through the core principles of integration, coordination and collaboration
- Regional development is dependent upon GAs integrating, coordinating, cooperating and collaborating – hence the need to present GAs’ core business outcomes as regional development outcomes
- Evidence of cascade and cause and effect relationships of core business conflict – hence the need to develop a management process that could identify issues and their potential implications to enable strategies to be negotiated to address them
- Separation of issues into a higher and lower level – hence the reference to the frameworks and structures developed in the literature and the process model connecting the two levels through reference to the tools, guidelines and frameworks developed to address higher level issues
- Intangible issues such as agency and management culture including risk aversion, also identified in the literature – hence including in the process model recognition and taking account of these factors in designing projects and programs
- Importance of relationships and communication – hence the need to design a process model that could foster good communication and relationships by acknowledging agency priorities, needs and agency differences, and encouraging discussion from each agency’s perspective
- The importance of complementarity and mutuality as a strong foundation to work together and encourage cooperation and commitment, also identified in the literature – hence the theory, policy and practice suggestions aimed at enhancing complementarity and mutuality, and the use of a process model design, which actively seeks to identify and foster mutual benefit
- Inter-dependencies of agencies – hence the value in adopting a WOGIA.

**Key implications for regional development**

In relation to regional development, the research has highlighted the need for:
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- Recognition that due to the broad range and cross-cutting nature of issues in regional development, it is a ‘wicked problem’ thus supporting the elevation of regional development to be a strategic WOG priority

- Regional development as the sum of outcomes from GA delivery of core business, combined with private sector, Community and market forces is positioned as a WOG strategic priority (irrespective of the party in power) and embedded in agencies’ core business

Enhancing the process model

A number of key high level and operational factors have emerged from the research that would enhance implementation of the process model and improve GA capacity to work together. High level factors included:

- Review of WOG philosophy and approach to embed coordination, inter-operability, integration and collaboration as underpinning principles
- Incorporating regional development as a WOG responsibility and an outcome for all agencies
- Review framework for appropriation of funds and accountability
- Review regional governance and the need to ensure that GAs have sufficient regional delegation to carry out collaborative projects
- Policy review to support the WOG philosophy and changed approach perspective
- Review of Ministerial statements to reflect changed perspective of WOG philosophy, fostering a greater commitment to work together
- Continued improvement of ICT inter-operability, including standards and protocols to facilitate GAs working together, greater access to information
- Consideration of application of a WOGIA approach to policy, planning and project design

Operational factors included:

- Taking account of the findings of the research and literature review regarding issues, impediments and core business conflict when GAs work together
- Developing agreed solutions to areas where agencies’ processes and systems to deliver core business do not easily integrate or conflict with what needs to be set up
- Use of high level structures and frameworks to guide development of operational activities
• Setting up project/program monitoring and review, that take account of issues and impediments identified
• Identifying factors that could affect timeframes and gaining agreement about managing these potential impacts.
• Clearly understanding legislative and regulatory impacts so that the project plan can accommodate these and anticipate issues
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APPENDIX 1

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interviewee details:

Head Office       Regional Office       Management       Management & Field       Field

1. With which other GAs does your agency’s core business conflict?
2. What effect does core business conflict have, when the agencies concerned are working together?
3. With which agencies does your agency’s core business concur or complement?
4. What effect does having concurrent or complementary core business between agencies have, when these agencies are working together?
5. Think of some projects in which your agency has been involved with multiple agencies – what issues and impediments arose during those projects?
6. Please outline any examples of fundamental core business conflict whilst working with other agencies in joint projects.
7. Please outline any examples of functional/operational core business conflict that has occurred whilst working with other agencies in joint projects.
8. What connection is there between the issues and impediments that your agency has experienced when working together with other agencies and what I have described as core business conflict?
9. What effect do core business conflicts have on implementing projects and achieving project outcomes?
10. What would be the dominant issues and impediments or ‘core’ business conflicts experienced by your agency when working with other agencies in projects?
11. How does being the lead agent affect the level and type of core business conflict compared to just being a participant in a project?
12. What other factors, not related to core business conflict, may cause issues and impediments to agencies working together?
13. In the projects to which you have referred during this interview, what was done to overcome the issues and impediments/ core business conflict that occurred?
14. How successful were the efforts to address the issues and impediments or core business conflict?
15. What factors that create core business conflict should I include to be addressed in the process model that I will develop as a result of this research?
16. How does your agency apply ESD principles?
17. How could ESD principles be used to reduce core business conflict?
APPENDIX 2
ATTITUDDINAL SURVEY

PLEASE COMPLETE THE SHADED AREA USING AN ‘X’:

Please place an ‘X’ beside the focus of your agency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL</th>
<th>ECONOMIC/SOCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC/ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td>SOCIAL/ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please place an ‘X’ beside the description of your role:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT &amp; FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please place an ‘X’ beside which ever applies to your location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAD OFFICE</th>
<th>REGIONAL OFFICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TO NOTE:

- The information from the interviews has been analysed and the key themes extracted and placed in the attitudinal survey that you are about to answer.
- Use the regional development projects in which your agency and you have been involved, as a frame of reference upon which to base your response.
- Please remember the definition of regional development for this research is very broad. All of the agencies approached for this research play have been chosen because it is considered that they contribute to regional development, as outlined by the definition. (See attached definition).
- There are no right or wrong answers.
- Each question covers three areas:
  - Agreement with a statement regarding an individual or listed set of factors
  - Rating of the level of impact or usefulness of an individual or listed set of factors
  - Indication of frequency of occurrence of an individual or listed set of factors
- Responses will be analysed to confirm:
  - The nature of and key factors involved in core business conflict, when agencies work together in regional development projects.
  - Other factors that create issues and impediments (i.e. non-core business factors), when agencies work together in regional development projects.
  - Whether complementarity of agency core business influences the occurrence of core business conflict.
  - Whether agencies with a specifically economic or environmental focus are most likely to experience core business conflict.
  - The effect of core business conflict on agencies’ relationships when working together in regional development projects.
  - The effect of core business conflicts on the implementation and outcomes of the regional development projects.
  - The type of approaches used to manage or overcome core business conflict or other issues and impediments.
  - The key factors that should be included in the design of the model ‘process’ being designed to reduce and/or manage core business conflict, as a result of this investigation.

HOW TO COMPLETE THE SURVEY

1. Please read the information and then indicate with an ‘x’ any where in the number cell (from 1-5) that corresponds with your rating for your response in each of the three sub sections of ‘Agreement’, ‘Impact’ and ‘Occurrence’. Where there is a list of factors, please indicate the rating for each factor. Examples are provided on the next page.
2. The survey takes between 30-40 minutes, depending upon your reading speed and speed with which you type and use ‘Word’.
3. If you have any questions, either email me or contact me on my mobile on 0418 677 901.
4. On completion of the survey, please email it to: xxxx (researcher’s email provided).
Thank you for your willingness to participate and subsequently the time you gave to contribute to my research.

### EXAMPLES ONLY

#### Single item

**AGREEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the level of agreement on the scale of 1-5 with the statement: *Hot weather makes drivers more aggressive*.

#### Multiple listings

**AGREEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the level of agreement on the scale of 1-5 with the statement: *The following listed driver actions are those of an aggressive driver*.

- Honking the horn
- Tailgating
- Rude gestures
- Pushing in
- Swerving threateningly towards a vehicle
- Ramming

Please indicate the level of impact on the likelihood of the listed aggressive driving acts on causing an accident.

Please indicate the rate of occurrence of the listed driver actions, particularly in hot weather.

Please indicate the rate of occurrence of driver aggression of hot weather.

Please indicate the level of impact on driver aggression during hot weather.
### AGREEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Please indicate the level of agreement on the scale of 1-5 with the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statement that: 'Agencies with an economic or environmental responsibility and core business are more likely to experience 'core business conflict&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of impact on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency working relationships, of core business conflict between agencies with an economic core business and an environmental core business focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the rate of occurrence of core business conflict likely between agencies with an economic core business focus and ones with an environmental core business focus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statement that: 'Agencies with complementarity or close linkages of core business experience less core business conflict.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of impact of core business conflict on agency working relationships amongst agencies with complementarity or close linkages of core business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the rate of occurrence of core business conflict likely to occur amongst agencies together that have complementarity or close linkages of core business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Please indicate the level of agreement on the scale of 1-5 with the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statement that: 'Complementarity creates overlap, duplication of services and difficulties for agencies to claim outcomes from joint projects and leads to core business conflict&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of impact of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complementarity in creating overlap, duplication and difficulties for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agencies to claim outcomes due to close alignment of core business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Please indicate the level of occurrence of overlap, duplication and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficulties for agencies to claim outcomes in joint projects due to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close alignment of core business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREEMENT</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the statement that <em>each of the listed issues and impediments occur amongst agencies when working together in regional development projects</em></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political issues (agendas, interference, differences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making limitations locally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional boundary overlaps, gaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid performance measures &amp; demand to fulfil KPIs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differing &amp; often multiple reporting &amp; accountability requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onerous bureaucratic processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project delays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community expectation not fulfilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncoordinated agency activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding cycles mismatched</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexibility of funding criteria &amp; programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative timeframes and/or concurrency requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources from ‘poorer’ agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff constantly changing due to ‘acting’ roles, no continuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk averse management causing blockages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal agency silos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AGREEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate on the scale of 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCURRENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate on the scale of 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5a. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the statement:

*The factors listed below are the main influences of core business conflict on the relationships of agencies working together*:

- Degrades quality & effectiveness of relationships
- Reduces desire to cooperate & collaborate
- Results in poor communication
- Encourages agencies to focus on their own benefit only from projects
- Reduces ability to negotiate
- Creates reluctance to share information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5b. What is the level of impact of each of the effect factors listed to the left, on agency relationships when working together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 5c. What is the level of occurrence of each of the effect factors listed to the left on agency relationships when working together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6a. Please indicate with an 'X' below the number on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the statement:

*Complementarity of agency core business enhances agency working relationships in the ways listed below, when agencies are working together*:

- Supports quality and effective relationships
- Encourages cooperation & collaboration
- Communication is easier
- Information sharing occurs
- Work towards mutual benefits from project & leverage off each other
- Improves ability to negotiate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6b. What is the level of impact that each of the effects of complementarity listed on the left has on agency relationships when working together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 6c. What is the rate of occurrence of each of the effects listed to the left that arise from agency complementarity, when agencies work together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREEMENT</td>
<td>AGRE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>OCCURRENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the statement: 'The fundamental core business conflicts listed below occur when agencies work together'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. What is the level of impact that the fundamental core business conflicts listed to the left have on agency relationships when working together?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. What is the level of occurrence of the fundamental core business conflicts listed to the left, when agencies are working together?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical/ideological differences generally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic focused agencies clash with environmental focused agencies due to fundamental differences of values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict in interpretation of Acts &amp; regulations in order to fulfil core business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differing interpretation of key roles and objectives amongst agencies with core business complementarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>OCCURRENCE</td>
<td>AGREEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8a. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the statement that 'The functional/operational core business conflicts listed below occur when agencies work together.'

8b. What is the level of impact of the functional/operational core business conflicts listed to the left, on agency working relationships?

8c. What is the rate of occurrence of the functional/operational core business conflicts when agencies work together on projects?

Conflict due to internal structures i.e. the spread and responsibilities of different internal units, agencies may have to deal with several different areas of one department.

Each agency focuses on fulfilling their own KPIs.

Reluctance to make commitments due to limitations of resources (funds and people already committed to deliver core business).

Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects or discretionary budgets.

Programs and funding criteria are inflexible.

Funding cycles are mismatched.

Decision-making is limited at the local level (i.e. central control).

Approval processes are lengthy.

Reporting and accountability to numerous & different across agencies.

Timeframes for achieving outcomes/milestones.

Staff availability, including the fact that many agencies have staff in acting roles.

Staff skills and experience relating to regional needs.

Duplication and overlap of services, particularly with agencies that have similar programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9a. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the statement that ‘Core business conflict affects project implementation and outcomes in the ways listed below’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b. What is the level of impact of the effects of core business conflict as listed to the left, on project implementation and outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c. What is the rate of occurrence of the impacts of core business conflict listed to the left, on project implementation and outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slows down or stops project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation is inefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and time wasted on resolving issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal of support &amp; consequently, effort, by some stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the overall “cost” of the project (time, funds and personnel effort)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the statement that ‘Core business conflict affects the image of the government in the ways listed below’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b. What is the level of impact on the overall image of Government, as listed to the left?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c. What is the rate of occurrence of the effects on the Government’s image listed to the left, where agencies are working together in projects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is seen to be uncoordinated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is seen to be wasting resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government is seen to be concerned with process, not outcomes &amp; benefits to community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREEMENT</td>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>OCCURRENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the statement that ‘The core business conflicts listed below are the most commonly occurring’</td>
<td>Please indicate the scale of 1-5</td>
<td>Please indicate on the scale of 1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of program/funding flexibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframes conflict or can’t be met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making cannot be done locally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval process is lengthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding cycles are mismatched</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to commit resources (already committed for own core business delivery)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No consistency of staff in projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation in skills and knowledge in staff involved in projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory conflicts occur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic way that regulations are applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREEMENT</td>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>OCCURRENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the statement that ‘The non-core business conflict issues and impediments listed below affect agencies working together’</td>
<td>Please indicate the scale of 1-5</td>
<td>Please indicate on the scale of 1-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial influence/interference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political agendas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different political parties at the 3 levels of Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management style (e.g., authoritarian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource limitations within community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local situational environment (e.g., drought, racial issues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distance & level of isolation
Community expectation of government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13a. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the statement that ‘The practices listed below would be successful in managing or overcoming core business conflict’

13b. What is the anticipated level of impact that the practices listed to the left would have on reducing or managing core business conflict when agencies are working together in projects?

13c. How often have the practices listed to the left been experienced when working together with other agencies in projects?

Cultivate good relationships
Demonstrate respect for other agencies’ point of view
Agree on communication protocols, within agencies, amongst stakeholders & with Ministers
Practise the arts of negotiation & facilitation
Identify & build on areas of commonality
Ensure each participating agency can fulfil a KPI or gain a benefit
Clarify authority of project or program (i.e. Minister, DG, WOG initiative, community)
Identify & deal with any legislation issues
Identify key requirements for each agency & capacity to contribute to project objectives & develop project based on these
Gain agreement who does what, by when & then include in project plan
Use political influence to make things happen
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14a. Please indicate on the scale of 1-5, the level of agreement with the statement that ‘The listed items or factors would have value being included in the 'process' model being designed as a result of this research’</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b. What is the level of impact that the items or factors listed to the left may have on reducing or managing core business conflict, if incorporated into the process model?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting requirements for each agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding contribution from agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding cycles and staging (where this occurs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead agent identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval processes that apply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority of project (e.g. Minister, DG, WOG, MOU, Formal Partnership)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff availability &amp; time commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expertise required &amp; available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline for implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPIs that project could fulfil for each agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation that will apply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication protocols covering within agencies, across agencies &amp; to Ministers to ensure consistency of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common goals identified across agencies relating to project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key tasks to be done, by whom and by when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information needs and their source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources available for project &amp; any shortfalls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD value of project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3
FORM LETTER

Mr Paul Fennelly
Director-General
Department of State Development and Innovation
PO Box 15168
City East
Brisbane Qld 4002

Dear Mr Fennelly

Request for permission to undertake PhD research in your agency

Personal introduction
My name is Chloe Rodgers-Bell and I am currently undertaking a PhD with Southern Cross University. Details of my supervisor and the University School through which I am studying are contained in Attachment A.

Permission request
This letter is a request for permission to undertake research activities in your agency, as part of my PhD studies. The research is exploring the nature of issues and impediments to Government Departments and Agencies working together. I am therefore requesting permission to undertake interviews and follow-up surveys with staff in both Head Office and in two regional areas around Mount Isa and Bundaberg. For some Government Departments, particularly in the Australian Government, this would include Canberra and any office located in Brisbane. These Departments are unlikely to have offices in the target regions.

Outline of research – Ethics Approval Number ECN-05-54
The research investigates a factor that impacts on the effectiveness of Government Agencies (GAs) working together in any joint initiatives, with a focus on those relating to regional development. To ensure a cross section of contribution to regional development across economic, social and environmental areas, a wide range of agencies have been targeted.

It is acknowledged that other researchers and a number of Government reports have identified elements relating to this issue. This research, however, is examining the problem from a new perspective. This perspective relates to the role that GA ‘core’ business plays in creating conflict amongst GAs working together, where it generally manifests as issues and impediments. Attachment B provides more detail regarding the research.

Research output and outcomes

The output of the research is a ‘process’ model known as the Project and Stakeholder Assessment-Responsibility Action Monitoring and Review Tool (PASARAMART). The PASARAMART includes:
- a planning tool to assist in the design of projects and to facilitate the inclusion of multiple GA core business objectives and key performance indicators in projects;
- a project management and monitoring tool for use during implementation of joint GA projects;
- an evaluation tool to assess potential GA core business conflict in projects that have already been developed; and
- a risk management tool to allow planning for the inter-agency conflicts that do arise due to the necessary commitment of GAs to their individual core business.

The model will be constructed in Excel. A website will be set up so that the model can be made freely available to Departments (source to be acknowledged). The ‘process’ model can either be used in its current form, or modified to suit an agency’s specific situation.

The main outcome of the research is its potential to assist GAs to work more effectively together. This is of considerable importance due to the fact that GAs are increasingly involved in working together. This can be as joint service providers or to develop and implement projects that are addressing problems and fulfilling needs in community and being addressed using a whole-of-government approach.

**Research benefit**
Research benefits therefore include:
- Improved management or reconciliation of the impacts of issues and impediments arising from GA ‘core’ business conflict when working together;
- Potential to achieve improved outcomes from joint projects through more effective management of core business conflict; and
- Contribution to knowledge regarding the role of ‘core’ business conflict as a major contributor to issues and impediments experienced by GAs when working together.

**Resource implications of participation**
The resource implications are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Impact on agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>3 (one from head office and two regional staff, one from each region under investigation – where this is applicable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time commitment</td>
<td>Interview – one hour (face to face)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey – one hour (electronic or mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL TIME 2 hours, if there is no focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds required from agency</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Risk and confidentiality**
No person, project or agency will be identified. Information to be recorded on interview and survey sheets includes:
- Core business of the GA i.e. whether primarily economic, social, environmental or (No agency name);
• Staff member status and location – i.e. the label of ‘management’ or ‘field staff’ and ‘head
office’ or ‘regional office’;
• Projects examples will not be named, but referred to as ‘a project in which your agency was
involved’;
• No personal details of participants are required.

All information is to be aggregated, thus Departments will not be identified individually. The
University will hold the interview and survey information in a secure place, for five years, as
required by the Human Ethics Committee. After this period of time the information will be
destroyed. Copies of the interview and survey questions are contained in Attachment C.

Use of the information
The results of the research are part of the research thesis submitted for examination. It will be
held as an electronic PhD thesis, as a hard copy by the university library for use by other
researchers and placed on the previously mentioned website together with the ‘process’ model.

Response to this letter
Please complete the form (Attachment D) indicating your response to this letter by the 15 July
2005. Participation is voluntary. If permission is granted for the research to take place within
your Department, please also nominate appropriate personnel and their contact details in Head
Office and the two regional locations that would include Mount Isa and Bundaberg areas. A
stamped, addressed envelope is provided for your response.

If you have any concerns or questions, please contact me on mobile 0418 677 901, or email me at
phderb@hotmail.com. Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Chloe Rodgers-Bell
Encls.
APPENDIX 4
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I have read the information provided, and agree to participate in this study. I am over the age of 18 years.

Name of Subject: ........................................................................................................................

Signature of Subject: ................................................................. Date: ............................

Name of Witness (who shall be independent of the project)

Signature of the Witness: ............................................................ Date: ............................

I certify that the terms of the form have been verbally explained to the subject, that the subject appears to understand the terms prior to signing the form, and that proper arrangements have been made for an interpreter where English is not the subject's first language. I asked the subject if she/he needed to discuss the project with an independent person before signing and she/he declined (or has done so).

Signature of the researcher: ........................................................... Date: ............................
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**APPENDIX 5**

**RESEARCH QUESTION**

*Government Department Core Business – managing the impact of potential conflicts on regional development projects and programs*

What is this research about?

This research is investigating two areas:

- The nature of Government Agencies' (GA) ‘core’ business conflict when working together in regional development projects and other joint initiatives; and
- Information that will contribute to the design of a ‘process’ model that can be used to manage or reconcile ‘core’ business conflict, and which incorporates the Project and Stakeholder Assessment (PASA), and the Responsibility, Action, Monitoring and Review Tool (RAMART). As part of the ‘process’ model. The PASARAMART tool will be made freely available to agencies when designing or running joint projects.

### KEY DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. ‘Core business’** | A GA’s ‘core’ business is the role and responsibility delegated to a GA by Government. The ‘core’ business involves two key elements. These are:  
- Fundamental core business; and  
- Functional/operational core business activities. |
| **2. Fundamental core business** | The fundamental element of ‘core’ business is centred on the GA role and responsibility, as delegated by Government and is generally evident in the Vision and Mission statements of the GAs and the underlying ‘philosophy’ applied in carrying out their ‘core’ business. |
| **3. Functional/operational core business** | The functional/operational core business activities are those activities that are developed specifically by the GA in order to deliver on core business outcomes. These include, but may not be limited to:  
- Internal structure (often into Divisions or units) of a GA to concentrate staff and resources into key areas that will deliver on core business  
- Strategic plan  
- Unit or Divisional business plans  
- Budget bids  
- Budget allocation for projects, programs and staffing  
- Staff allocation  
- Programs and associated grants/funds  
- Projects  
- Staff teams  
- Data and information collection, collation and use and the systems used to manage these (agent-specific software for example). |
<p>| <strong>4. ‘Core’ business conflict</strong> | This is the conflict that occurs amongst GAs when working together. It can be caused by either or both fundamental and functional/operational ‘core’ business factors. |
| <strong>5. Fundamental ‘core’ business conflict</strong> | An example scenario that demonstrates fundamental ‘core’ business conflict would be the conflict arising from the construction of a tourist resort which is an economic development on a foreshore. This fulfills a GA economic ‘core’ business objective associated with economic development, as it increases regional employment and economic output for a region; however it impacts on the environment, including the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>removal of some vegetation, for its construction and operation. This is in direct conflict with the GA with a ‘core’ business to protect the environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Functional/operational ‘core’ business conflict

A project instigated by a community to achieve economic development that is also dependent upon the support and contribution of a number of GAs. Whilst all stakeholder GAs are supportive and have willingly joined the project group, a number of GAs appear to be less than cooperative or contributing to the project due to the fact that, for example:
- *It is not a project associated with a KPI in the agency*
- *Funds from their budget are already otherwise allocated*
- *Staffing tasks and responsibilities are already mapped out*
- *Decisions required to be made have to be referred to the Director-General or Minister before some of the GAs can commit funds and other resources*

7. Regional development

‘The intentional and focused activities of regional stakeholders to achieve sustainable development. These activities are directed at a sub-national area identified by a range of criteria and address both issues and opportunities. The activities develop soft and hard infrastructure, harness and improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural resource. The aim is to achieve sustainable regional development and build regional resilience, security and liveability. Examples of outcomes include providing soft and hard infrastructure; strengthening and diversifying the regional economy; building social capital and community resilience; and enhancing regional lifestyle, security, amenity and competitive advantage.’

Activities associated with regional development include (but are not limited to):
- *Improving the skill base in a region*
- *Developing infrastructure – both hard and soft (done by government or private enterprise or a public/private partnership)*
- *Attracting investment*
- *Expanding the markets, including exports of regional industries*
- *Strengthening regional industry performance*
- *Increasing innovation of products and service and technology uptake*
- *Developing community capacity*
- *Improving the environmental management*
- *Developing responsible and efficient resource use*
- *Developing sustainable natural resource practices*
- *Diversifying the economy Enhancing the quality of life, including housing, lifestyle and leisure amenities*
- *Increasing the level of income*
- *Improving communication and access to information*
- *Establishing appropriate services and infrastructure to ensure public and industry safety and security*
APPENDIX 6
THEMES FROM INTERVIEWS

Accountability, performance reporting
Agency benefit
Agency performance (against core business and KPIs, against government priorities and image in eyes of community)
Budget and finance
Communication
Community and clients (benefit and perceptions)
Community expectation
Commitment
Cooperation and collaboration
Efficiency and duplication
Government performance (achieving priorities, image in eyes of community)
Location issues
Legislation and regulation
Management structures and approaches
Mutuality and complementarity including leverage off each other
Organisational structure and culture
Outcomes and deliverables
Personnel related
Philosophical core business conflict
Policy
Political issues and influence
Power, authority and jurisdiction
Processes and systems
Project design
Project impact
Program design
Relationships
Resources and information resources
Timeframes
WOG culture and approach
APPENDIX 7

KEY THEMES EXTRACTED FROM THE INTERVIEW PROCESS - DETAILS

Accountability, performance reporting

This is a ‘multiple master’ issue and is shaped by individual agency culture and structure. This area involves internal reporting, accountability and performance evaluation. It also includes reporting for the Minister and Government as required by particular Acts and regulations and supporting transparency and clarity for public scrutiny. This theme is complicated where WOG agendas and projects are running, as such initiatives demand GA commitment, but can create conflict with GA’s own agenda and outcomes.

In terms of performance, most GAs acknowledged that Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) dominated their action, decisions, resource allocation and interest in or willingness to commit to projects. An interesting issue raised by some respondents was the fact that in WOG situations the WOG agenda sometimes clashes with an agency agenda and creates internal conflict.

The process model will include gathering details of these requirements for each agency involved so that they could be accommodated in the project design.

Agency benefit

Included in this area is consideration of activities from the point of view of supporting individual agency’s own core business and KPIs or enhancing their ability to deliver on these and assisting in Agency implementation of any Acts or Regulations. This area also includes adding to agency capacity to deliver products and services to its clients. Difficulties identified by respondents occurred if agency does not get much benefit, resulting in a reluctance to support projects or commit resources.

The process model will include ensuring that agencies benefit from the project, through identification of benefits or scoping projects to ensure agency benefit.

Agency performance (against core business and KPIs, against government priorities and image in eyes of community)

This concerns fulfilment of KPIs and key priorities, high level of client satisfaction, improved accessibility by clients to agency services, fulfilling government priorities, delivering on project outcomes. Some respondents indicated that duplication
and overlap affects performance and capacity to claim outcomes. Delegated authority and vision and mission of agencies direct their performance outcomes. This area is a source of philosophical conflict, although respondents tended to consider more the KPIs than any true philosophical difference.

In cases of mutuality and agencies working well, respondents felt that agency performance was enhanced. Some respondents felt that mutuality caused problems, but there was little support for this view.

Overall, agency performance in joint initiatives is highly dependent upon good relationships and the underpinning good communication platform.

In terms of agency performance in the community’s eyes, it is whether agencies deliver on projects, are coordinated, deliver on government priorities and work effectively.

The process model should trigger documenting agency KPIs that could be fulfilled by the project.

**Budget and finance**

This relates to budget implications and financial reporting requirements and delegations, which are also under reporting and accountability. Budget implications can occur if projects go over time, or mismatched funding cycles mean projects are not well financially resourced. Financial reporting and accountability differs amongst agencies as do delegations, which can influence approval to provide funding contributions.

The process model will include steps to assess budget, financial reporting requirements and delegations and encourage the development of a funding schedule, if applicable.

**Communication**

This is a fundamental area for working together and was a major theme. Communication relies on IT and personal relationships. It involves several levels of communication and can be both an internal (within agency) and external (with other agencies and community) issue. Communication also refers to ministerial communication and Government. Internal communication issues arise as a result of the ‘silo’ mentality and lack of cross-unit communication in an agency. Respondents also indicated that part of successfully working together does involve understanding the roles and responsibilities of each other, which relies on this being clearly communicated in a positive way – educating one another about one’s own agency organisation, processes and priorities. Good communication includes accessibility to and sharing of information. It also relies
on the quality of staff having good communication skills for negotiation and conflict resolution. This is influenced by agency culture, politics, agency power and authority in the public arena. Good communication is strongly linked to relationships and involves words like ‘open’, ‘trust’, ‘respect’. Another aspect of communication mentioned by respondents was to clients and the representation of government roles and actions in delivering services or participating in a project.

The process model is to include developing a communication protocol.

Community and Clients (benefit and perceptions)

This area deals specifically with the outcomes for and relationship between GAs and community or clients. In instances where there are shared clients respondents indicated there could be confusion and frustration amongst community and clients. In projects that were client or community derived, GAs ability or inability to participate and support due to core business conflict was identified as a source of frustration for community beneficiaries. However, in some situations, joint initiatives and WOG focus for service delivery could be seen vary positively when agencies worked well together. In these instances it was often under a formal arrangement. This contributes to the overall image of government that community has. Several respondents indicated that when projects are scoped by agencies they should always consider the project in terms of the community perspective. Respondents who supported mutuality because it helped agencies work well together also indicated the community benefit from this aspect.

The process model tool will encourage consideration of project from community perspective to inform project design.

Community expectation

This theme relates to projects generated by community, WOG initiatives that have been widely publicised, where a number of GAs are involved in a joint service delivery project, or for a joint project that has overlapping areas of responsibility. In the case of the last example, Community becomes disillusioned if there is duplication, such as requests for the same information, but in a different format from different agencies. Customers/clients or community groups can be confused when confronted with choice of service providers or unclear about what individual agencies provide, thereby assuming an agency provides a service or information that they do not, in fact have. Respondents indicated that the image of individual agencies and the cohesion of ‘government’ can be
jeopardised by these situations. The area of community expectation links with the political influence theme, as community or project stakeholders may use political influence positively or negative to deal with these situations. Community expectations can also be negative, arising from a poor history or ‘track record’ of being involved with GAs.

The process model is to include noting community expectations and encouraging agencies to develop strategies to manage expectations.

**Commitment**

This relates to limited agency staff commitment as well an overall agency’s commitment. This can be due to resourcing issues, lack of support within the hierarchy, lack of benefit to the agency being asked to participate and frustration experienced if projects are delayed or decisions are not made in timely fashion.

This is an intangible aspect that needs to be considered in the practical actions identified in the process model to address the factors that lead to loss of commitment or strengthen commitment – decision-making, lack of clarity of role, project delays, and project design of outcomes that incorporate agency KPIs to gain ‘buy-in’.

**Cooperation and collaboration**

Cooperation involves actions such as sharing information and resources, supporting decisions, negotiating outcomes for mutual benefit. Cooperation results from good relationships and effective communication. If relationships are poor there is less willingness to cooperate and work together and behaviour can resort to restricting agency activity to jurisdictional boundaries and agency’s own area of responsibility. Cooperation is reliant on good communication too, thus effective communication mechanism need to be in place.

The process model should incorporate steps and activities that enhance relationships and communication, thus gaining cooperation and collaboration.

**Efficiency and duplication**

The way in which GAs have divided Queensland and where they locate regional offices to provide regional services can result in dealing with more than one regional office of the same agency within a single project. Duplication tends to occur when GAs have complementarities of core business or offer very similar services, programs and information. Duplication can also occur when agencies’ boundaries overlap and they also
offer similar services; however this situation can also lead to gaps in service provision or agency responsibility for an issue.

It was felt to be beneficial to overall outcomes and efficiency if duplication and gaps regarding agency activity/responsibility in relation to a project was considered in the process model.

**Government performance (achieving priorities, image in eyes of community)**

This area is strongly linked to agency performance. Respondents identified that if agencies lacked cooperation and coordination, the image of the government was affected. This was also seen to affect project outcomes and deliverables and therefore government’s own performance against its priorities. WOG approaches, if operating well, were considered to create a positive image to community. Another important area raised, relating to this heading concerned GAs’ responsibility to uphold their responsibilities in relation to Acts. Fulfilling this responsibility can cause conflict. There are links with overlap and duplication under ‘efficiency and effectiveness’, creating negative image government efficiency if duplication or overlaps occur.

Community image of government could therefore be that it is uncoordinated, wasteful, doesn’t fulfill its own priorities or focuses on processes not benefits. Difficulties in projects that are the result of conflict, delays in decisions or involve being overly bureaucratic about processes also affect Community perception of Government and its performance.

The process model will include triggers to discuss performance measures and monitoring and the tool for project implementation and monitoring is the area where Government performance can be monitored, as well as in the evaluation process.

**Location issues**

These covered issues such as distance, physical geography, demographics, environmental issues (drought), other social or economic issues such as racial tensions, cultural issues or economic downturn and unemployment. Whilst this was not a strong non-core business factor, there would be some projects where these elements would influence project scope, resourcing and design.

The process model, in capturing influences that may have an influence on project design can incorporate reference to the ‘local situational characteristics’.
Legislation and regulation

Legislation requirements from multiple GAs involved in projects can pose problems due to concurrency requirements, direct legislative conflict and ‘grey’ areas that emerge as legislation is applied within projects, resulting in unique legislative combination situations. This can result in an agency having no clear mandate to undertake activities. Legislation also affects/dictates timeframes for projects and can create ‘conditional’ situations or constrain an agency’s capacity to act. Another interesting point raised by a few respondents was that agencies that have legislative powers and those that do not tend to have an authority/subservient relationship in projects.

There were two aspects of legislation and regulation raised by respondents that they considered should be incorporated into the process model and management tool being developed from this research. These are noting what Acts and regulations apply to the particular project or initiative and which agency oversees the implementation, and then the documenting of any issues that might occur, including regulatory timeframes that might apply.

Management structures and approaches

This theme involves management practices relating to business planning, performance management and evaluation (managing for outcomes, balanced score card business planning, performance evaluations), the management of programs and funds and the degree of flexibility of this management, and policy development.

Management structures and approaches also link with relationships, as management develop hierarchies of authority and decision chains, delegate and generally can either be a strong force to support and drive projects, or a blockage.

Risk aversion was mentioned by many agencies, in connection with the contractual arrangement for employment of senior staff and/or relationship with Minister. A risk-averse manager and one focused on their own agency’s KPIs and priorities to deliver to government can hinder agencies working together on projects that fall outside usual business. Management structures also reflect agency structures and are linked to power, authority and jurisdiction, particularly for financial delegation and decision-making.
There was a view that WOG of is different and respondents felt that gaining CEO support was important in such projects. A number also referred to appealing to senior management as a tool to deal with conflict. Funding and budget decisions are also part of management decisions in developing an agency’s business plan and this was seen as another area that could impact on agency participation and contribution of funds to projects. Old and new style of management and flexibility of management were also noted by some respondents.

Management can reflect personality issues if a manager is authoritarian or a micro-manager.

**Understanding the decision-making capabilities and authority is to be included in the process model. However, approaches to management have influences that cannot be accommodated through a process model, such as personality.**

**Mutuality and complementarity**

This refers to common goals, aims, objectives and closely aligned missions and visions for community outcomes. Respondents indicated that one of the mechanisms to overcome issues is to find and build on commonalities. Mutuality was seen to lead to better outcomes for community and clients if agencies were working together. Respondents also pointed out that agencies with mutuality could gain leverage off each other, respond more easily to WOG and find that joint activities were able to contribute to their own KPIs. Mutuality or complementarity also improved the government image in community. However there was an opposing view which felt this status could create competition to claim outcomes, confusion with clients who may be serviced by multiple agencies and some degree of overlap of servicing.

Consideration of mutuality and finding joint benefits considered of value to include in the process model and management tool being developed as a result of this research.

**Organisational structure and culture**

This theme includes the internal structure of organisations which create difficulties for interface for example, the internal units and departments, often not aware of one another’s activities or being delegated opposing responsibilities, commonly known as the ‘silo’ mentality. This can then create internal agency conflict and duplication of effort. Another area concerns organisational culture which influences hierarchical structures and relationship, which in turn affect decision-making and risk-taking.
Organisational culture is related to management style and longevity of particular systems, procedures and traditions in an agency. It also determines, as some respondents pointed out, the relationship that agencies have with each other. The organisational culture also determines the adoption/interpretation of public sector reforms and shapes the internal systems and procedures that are the subject of functional/operational core business conflict.

For inclusion into the process model and management tool from this research, it was suggested that decision-making structure and the level of local authority available should be documented. However in terms of agency culture, this is an intangible attitudinal factor that cannot be changed, but must be accommodated.

Outcomes and deliverables

This theme links to agency performance, but is separate due to the fact that it also relates to the outcomes and deliverables from projects and initiatives that are for client and community benefit. Respondents identified that delays in projects due to decision-making problems, approvals, funding application rounds etc affect these areas, as does any conflict along the way. This can result in community/client frustration or confusion and also outcomes or deliverable being behind schedule and not as ‘fulsome’. Generally it was felt that core business conflict has a negative effect on projects and that in some instances this would drive agencies to changing outcomes and project scopes. Impact on any WOG initiatives would be far more reaching, due to the fact that this approach is used for major issues.

It was considered by respondents that clear outcomes and deliverables must be agreed in the project planning stage, therefore this should be included in the process model and management tool.

Personnel related

This theme includes aspects that are non-core business issues, but have links to core business conflict through management. It includes personality issues that may relate to particular management styles, desire for kudos, power plays; poor personnel skills and loss of skilled staff from regions. It could also include: inappropriately skilled staff for the tasks required in projects or lacking regional knowledge; the influence of career structure and motivation within the Public Service, which makes staff risk-averse, driven to achieve at any cost or have a ‘marking time’ attitude.
Another aspect of this area, mentioned by eight respondents included the fact that many staff are in ‘acting roles’ and therefore are unwilling or unable to make decisions. This means that as staff keep changing, there is poor continuity of knowledge for the project, and loss of corporate knowledge from regions. An opposite view regarding the movement of staff included the fact that longstanding staff in a region may have been ‘captured’ by key influential members of community and other agencies and therefore do not jeopardise these relationships. Risks identified that impact on relationships included ageing public service staff demographics, succession planning and the general reduction of staff levels in the public sector.

The process model does cannot address the issues with staff consistency, or ‘captured’ staff. This means that staff involved in joint projects need to have the awareness, skills and capacity to manage the impacts of these issues, on the project implementation.

**Philosophical core business conflict**

Response included reference to economic core business focus versus an environmental core business focus. However survey material did not strongly support this as occurring often. Fundamental core business conflict was also seen to possibly include interpretation of Acts and regulations (in the purist sense), and basic philosophical/ideological differences or differences in interpretation of roles amongst agencies with complementarity of core business.

The process model is to include assessing the project and agency views from a fundamental core business perspective.

**Policy**

This topic covered discussion about policy difficulties, where there may be conflicting policies, or competing policies. In addition, there was the view that collaborative ventures may have policy implications regarding working together. Agencies also raised the need for policy considerations in program design.

The process model can include assessment of projects for policy implications that are cross-agency, as well as individual agencies’ own policies.

**Political issues and influence**

This theme concerns the affect of politics and political interference/influence on project implementation and whole-of-government projects and the problems caused by having different party representation across levels of Government. The theme also
includes political agendas and political power plays that can adversely or constructively affect projects and their outcomes. Respondents identified it as the most dominant non-core business conflict. It was also identified as a mechanism through which some agencies coerced other agencies into performing in projects.

The process model is to include consideration of external influences on projects. It would appear that awareness of the impact of this factor and building in management processes into projects and initiatives would be worthwhile, despite it not being related to core business conflict directly. Additionally, gaining political endorsement is seen as providing imprimatur to drive projects, thus being important to seek ministerial support and endorsement.

Power, Authority and jurisdiction

This theme concerns three areas. The first relates to the power of the Minister within Parliament and relates to how their colleagues view them and how much influence they have on decisions, budget approval and policy endorsement within Parliament. The second area is the hierarchical structures within an agency, and delegation and authority arrangements. This includes whether the GA is centralised or de-centralised and has a strong influence on capacity of regionally located staff to make decisions, generate projects and make commitments, and approve expenditure.

The third area concerns the level of authority which is attached to the project or initiative being jointly undertaken. Respondents indicated that it was important to have support for projects within senior management as well as Ministerial endorsement. Power and authority plays a role in how a project progresses and management of any issue/conflicts that arise. Agencies seen as more ‘powerful’ due to size, Minister and ranking within Government can pressure smaller, less influential agencies, or override them. Power, authority and jurisdiction also relates to the internal relationships within an agency. Mechanisms such as MoU’s and WOG special partnerships were seen as useful by some respondents to create and endorse agencies authority to act.

Jurisdiction refers to portfolio responsibilities as well as geographic area. Included as an issue in this area, is the overlap of jurisdictions that could create client confusion, gaps and conflict amongst agencies. This included some agencies having the same client base. Jurisdiction responsibility could also result in conflict arising from turf protection, as well as agencies retreating to jurisdictional boundaries to avoid
commitment or reduce participation. Another interesting element that was raised was the perception by some respondents that some agencies had ministers that lacked real power to do things.

The process model needs to include identifying the authority of the project, decision-making capacity, agency jurisdicitional boundaries and responsibilities.

**Processes and systems**

The areas captured under this theme equate to the functional/operational core business conflict and include decision-making structures, reporting and accountability requirements and procedures, budget allocation, business planning and strategic plans determining agency KPIs and how they will be delivered and recorded. The theme also covers bureaucratic processes and systems to comply with Public Service Act and Financial Accountability Acts, design of and management processes for programs, funds and funding cycles (where they are applied), policies and policy development processes, internal consultation and communication and systems in place for human resource management.

These areas have all been identified as causing some degree of difficulty when GAs work together. Expressions such as ‘inflexible’, ‘rigid’, ‘delays in gaining approvals or decisions’ are descriptors of some of the impacts of the functional/operational core business conflict area. This area is linked to the management and organisational culture area.

This area is to be included in the process model. This will enable identifying individual agency practices and needs to assist in developing mutually agreed processes and systems or integrated processes and systems to deliver the joint initiative.

**Project design**

This theme relates particularly to considering how to manage or overcome issues, impediments and core business conflict when GAs work together in regional development projects. It involves such things as defining project outlines (objectives, outcomes, roles and responsibilities of agencies involved, deliverables, stakeholders, timeframes, budget, who does what and when).

Project design also includes things like setting up MoUs, formal partnerships or charters; ensuring that agencies have a ‘stake’ in the project through fulfilling some of their own KPIs; establishing clear achievable common goals, objectives and outcomes;
identifying issues up front; looking for mutuality and leverage; clearly defining tasks; inclusion of a communication protocol and any other processes and systems that can facilitate working together.

It was considered by respondents that these areas needed be agreed and clearly articulated. The ‘process’ model will focus on capturing this information both at the project assessment phase and in the responsibility and action matrix.

**Project impact**

This refers to specific impacts on projects, most notably delays, stopping them or jeopardizing future project participation/support by agencies as a result of core business conflict. Impacts are often as a result of functional/operational core business conflict factors such as decision-making capacity, authority, program design and funding inflexibility, reporting and accountability requirements.

**Program design**

The design of programs is done by individual agencies according to their core business focus, performance outcomes, policies and procedures, priorities and KPIs on which they deliver. This is influenced in turn by the processes and systems in place to manage the programs. Some agencies have funding ‘rounds’ and others have continuous funding, to suit their particular purposes and objectives for their programs. Eligibility criteria for programs and funding support are included in this theme. Respondents indicated that program inflexibility and mismatched funding cycles, for instance, contributed to core business conflict.

The process model is to incorporate program design consideration from two perspectives – assessing programs that may be available to support the delivery of a project; and the development of a joint program. Key considerations would include funding and program criteria.

**Relationships**

This theme is associated with management styles, communication, personalities, power and authority. It is a ‘soft’ but fundamental basis upon which agencies build to work together. It is influenced by the pressures for individuals to fulfill agency performance criteria and is easily damaged by any difficulties, issues or failures that are faced when agencies work together. Descriptive words for the impact on relationship of core business conflicts include ‘strained’, ‘frustration’, ‘lack of trust’, ‘tension’. This
creates defensive behaviour and attitudes, ‘laying blame’, uncooperative behaviour and retreat to agency boundaries of operation or focus on agency KPIs only. Respondents indicated that poor relationships affected overall performance and outcomes and could mean an agency resorts to authority to resolve issues.

The relationship between lead and non-lead agency is also important, ensuring that there is demonstration of respect and taking account of other agencies’ needs.

Included in the theme were the positive influences on relationships when agencies worked well together. Relationships were described as ‘easy’, ‘productive’, ‘open’, ‘trusting’, ‘respectful’. Activities such as negotiation were easier and communication was much better. People were keen to cooperate and support each other and consulted frequently. Good relationships can be longstanding and support future work together, poor ones can mean that in the future agencies decline or have limited support for projects. Because of the importance and broad reaching impact of inter-GA relationships, this was seen as a key focus for any strategies or approaches to address core business conflict by many respondents. This is an intangible area. Agency leadership and management skills are major influences on the quality and durability of relationships.

**Resources and information resources**

This theme relates to the ability to allocate resources (people, funds and equipment) and is directly linked to the GA strategic plan and managing for outcomes or balanced score card approach. Budgets and resource allocations fall out of these plans. Some agencies are less well resourced or have very limited discretionary resources to access. This means that whilst they may support projects and joint initiatives, they cannot provide any or many resources. In relation to resource shortfalls, this could be limited funds, or lack of skilled or available staff.

The theme also relates to the type of information/data that agencies have that could be useful to other agencies and the ability to share this information. IT communication platforms and accessibility is a subset of this element. Resources and information sharing is linked with management style, agency policy on IT and sharing information, program design and communication.

This area is important to incorporate into the process model. This would include identifying what resources were required; sources; shortfalls; protocols for sharing.
**Timeframes**

This area became a theme as it was so regularly part of general discussion of the many impacts of core business conflict and the issues that had been faced by agencies when working together. Reporting requirements and budgets are directed by timeframe requirements to fit with agency operational and Financial Management Act requirements as well as with political timeframes for Cabinet and budget bids. Election commitments have reporting requirements also. Projects may involve consultants or contractors and therefore require milestone fulfilment before payments can be made. Managing these issues in joint projects that are jointly funded can be extremely complex. Timeframes keep things moving and move towards outcomes, thus factors that affect them can jeopardise the project and funds. Many respondents highlighted slowing of projects and inability to meet timeframes as issues they had faced as consequences of conflict. Inability to keep to timeframes also affects government image in the community.

The process model will include timeframes - both to set parameters of the project life to completion, as well as consideration of factors that may affect timeframes, such as concurrency in legislation or waiting for approval.

**WOG Culture and Approach**

This relates to agencies that generally work on WOG initiatives determined by government to be undertaken with a WOG approach. It can include such things as MoUs, formal partnership agreements, charter for action etc. Some agencies felt that this could offer some framework for working together.

The process model to will refer to guidelines, tools, processes and frameworks developed as part of improving agencies working together in WOG initiatives.
APPENDIX 8
INTERVIEW DATA ANALYSIS AND COMMENTS

Q 1 With which other GAs does your agency’s core business conflict?

MAIN POINTS
1. Agencies with most conflict nominated are those responsible for environment and economic development, or a combination
2. There were 18 common agencies between the ones that cause conflict and the ones seen to be complementary or have concurrency of core business.
3. A total of 23 agencies were listed as creating conflict with other agencies. These covered 12 Federal and 10 State and 1 Local Government. 4 non government agencies were mentioned also. The level of conflict is greater amongst State agencies.

Key themes
When viewing the top four agencies that are sources of conflict they cover economic and environmental areas.

Need to investigate how real this is. Survey question 1a, b, c.
Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding conflict between agencies:

- A particular internal sub-division with another Minister - has a clear mandate which provides some authority to drive through conflicts. As this agency plays a central agency role in planning and development frameworks and strategy development so linked to other agencies' activities.
- People in different agencies don't necessarily see linkages between agencies in the projects.
- Greater focus on performance indicators rather than process.
- Need to consider the impact of policy on regional development efforts.
- Conflict between State and Commonwealth Governments is also strong.
- Conflicts exist regarding legislation and employment programs amongst different agencies responsible for employment and training outcomes.
- Example given of a particular program being considered which a multi-agency program, but there is can still be core business conflict over elements from time to time.
- Allocation of funds and programs occurs by portfolio, not region. It would be interesting to see if this changed the approach of agencies.
- Issues can emerge as a result of some Departments having funding based on specific times and others have rolling funding applications.
- Most situations involve economic versus environmental factors.
- It is important for each agency to acknowledge the core business of other agencies and accommodate their interests in joint work.
- Agencies that have an essentially positive role have no real conflict with other agencies. We are not regulatory
- To overcome conflicts, there has been close linkage and discussion with these agencies to address the risk
- However, conflicts often occur due to an Act being in place that requires an agency to carry out certain duties.

Q2 What effect does core business conflict have, when the agencies concerned are working together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE GROUPINGS</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments related to this grouping</th>
<th>THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on own agency benefit &amp; KPIs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor coordination &amp; limited synergy between agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low motivation to be committed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduces ability to negotiate, become defensive, withdraw to jurisdictional position</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community poor view of Government - uncoordinated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community and clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholder/client confusion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>community and clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reluctance to share information</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of cooperation or desire to cooperate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duplication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOG approach not necessarily effective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOG approach can be effective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Management structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE GROUPINGS</td>
<td>Number of respondents comments related to this grouping</td>
<td>THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior management block progress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slowing down of projects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>outcomes and deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affects outcomes and results</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>outcomes and deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delineation of responsibility issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hierarchical authority applied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retreat to jurisdictional role only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputes over power &amp; authority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seek alternative ways to achieve outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>processes and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts and regulation issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degraded relationships</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defense of roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of trust and openness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reluctance to provide resources or funds</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Resources and information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste resources to overcome conflict</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Resources and information resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Effect of core business conflict on agencies working together

**MAIN POINTS**

1. Respondents found it difficult to divorce ‘impact on relationship when working together’ from impact on the project, therefore many described impacts on the project, such as project delays, reduced outcomes.
2. Top areas mentioned include:
a. Poor relationships  
b. Poor communication  
c. Agency performance -Focus on own core business and KPI fulfilment  
d. Lack of cooperation  
e. Reluctance to share information  
f. Reduction in the ability to negotiate

3. Conflicting opinion on WOG approach which is not seen to reduce conflict in any way on the one hand, but is seen to help focus agencies on project on the other.
4. Indirectly these things affect the working relationship by making it harder to work together and achieve desired outcomes that satisfy each agencies needs.
5. There was no significant difference amongst agencies with different core business focus.
6. There was no real difference between the Head Office and Regional Office responses.
7. Federal agencies appeared to demonstrate a broader view regarding link to good policy, social impact of programs, and overall impact of programs in their discussions.

Investigate key areas in survey. 5a, b, c

KEY THEMES

Relationships - The most dominant theme is the impact on the quality of the relationships amongst the agencies with descriptions such as strained relationships, reluctance to support, limits spirit of cooperation, ‘them and us’ feeling, creating tension and conflict, frustration with each other and defensiveness of staff attitude. This situation then required time and effort to manage these strained relationships.

Cooperation – Respondents indicated they find other agencies less eager to cooperate, share information, provide funding or expertise resources, hide behind ‘jurisdictional boundaries’, resort to ‘passive agreement’ and feeling there is no real engagement, limited engagement in a project.

Communication – Respondents mentioned several levels of communication including lack of understanding amongst agencies of each other’s roles and responsibilities and associated KPIs, argument or debate in projects and internal communication resulting in lack of support from senior staff, limited ability to negotiate.

Mutuality and own agency benefit - Respondents indicated this in statements relating to the fact that agencies concentrate on their own KPIs, concentrate on their own agency core business, and that outcomes are not as satisfactory, with little experience of synergies between agencies.

Community and clients– agencies felt that clients could be frustrated and confused.

Government performance - seen to be poor and uncoordinated. WOG approaches not seen as necessarily lessening the conflict. Respondents indicated that by the nature of roles and responsibilities, as delegated by Government and constrained by Acts and Regulations that have to be applied, conflict will occur. Agencies are expected to uphold their responsibilities in relation to Acts.

Agency performance – in terms of efficiency and effectiveness, some agencies identified that there was duplication and double handing of clients, slowing of projects. 8 respondents raised the need to address own KPIs and core business.
Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding the influence of conflict between agencies on their relationships:

- Requires that there are good relationships so that issues can be discussed.
- Projects often involve a trade-off of economic and environmental areas.
- Reference made to the public sector changes that resulted in the distinction between core and non-core business and the outsourcing of non-core business. This also includes the user pays and cost recovery philosophy. A fundamental problem with this has been the shifting of costs and risk to business, causing undue pressure on business.
- Agencies generally accept that they work for one government.
- Efforts are made to accommodate one another's needs generally.
- There is a need to understand other agencies' goals and objectives.
- Developing good relationships is important
- Agency is faced with a philosophical bind which relates not just to its jurisdictional responsibilities, but also key principles are seen to be at stake. More mature staff often manage this better.
- It is important to see things from other agencies' perspectives.
- Even assessing impact on agencies up front doesn't necessarily highlight everything that could affect the agency.
- Sometimes this can lead to personalisation of the role and tunnel vision relating to core business.
- Usually need to come to an agreed position to move forward and pressure of project timeframes force this, sometimes additionally complicated by Ministerial interference.
- Can result in avoiding including agencies that regularly produce blockages.
- Example provided of a responsibility passed to State level, which wasn’t actioned, so when the Federal level came in to progress it, there was resistance and suspicion.
- Sometimes things are driven by Minister's political agendas.
- Minister currently determines local planning; now State also has an interest in this area relating to industrial land and may want to encourage industrial land away from where LGAs may have wanted it to be for their community.
Question 3 With which agencies does your agency’s core business concur or complement?

MAIN POINTS
1. Agencies that have a lot of nominations for complementarity of core business cover the spectrum of agency core business looking at the nominations from DPI&F to DSD.
2. There were 24 agencies cited, reference to Local Government Association of Queensland (LGAQ), Office of Urban Management (OUM) and Regional Managers’ Coordination Network.
3. 9 were Federal Agencies and 15 State or Local Government.
4. There were 18 common agencies between those that cause conflict and those that have complementarity of concurrency of core business.
5. There were 3 new agencies included in this list that were not mentioned in the conflict area at both Federal and State level.
6. There was no real difference between the agencies nominations at a head office level compared to a regional level.
7. Federal agencies considered the impact from the point of view that the projects in which they were involved cut right across government and were often WOG.

KEY THEMES
1. WOG initiatives seen to encourage synergy and working across agencies.
2. A number of agencies indicated that due to the nature of issues occurring in the regions, they were always brought to the table as being a stakeholder. These were agencies with economic, social and environmental focus.
3. Local Governments highlighted the need to interact with many agencies.

Will explore through the survey as to whether complementarity reduces core business conflict. 2a, b, c

Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding concurrence of complementarity between agencies:
Activities of the policy unit incorporate strong consultation practices with other agencies and this assists in building good relationships. Small business is exceedingly important to the Australian economy.

Tend to work together on specific issues stemming from an agency, central agencies or from national or state agendas. Issues tend to require a multiple agency response.

No-go zones aren't apparent until implementing the project.

Projects like 'BluePrint for the Bush', Natural Resource Management groups, focus groups for drought relating to the Vegetation Management Act require working together and forming of good working partnerships.

Through COAG there is support for WOG structure for better service delivery to the indigenous communities that includes addressing all the issues that are involved, health, skills, employment.

Tend to work together on specific issues stemming from an agency, or from the national or state area. Issues tend to require a multiple agency response.

The agency is very often represented on most committees due its role and responsibilities. This means that agencies need to bring our agency to the table to discuss things.

Interestingly enough some of these agencies are also those with whom conflict has occurred.

The focus on road safety links this agency with QT and Police.

Good working relationships results as much as anything from the devolution of responsibility to carry out certain activities on behalf of EPA. This can create a resourcing issue as greater responsibilities and activities are required.

This organisation has put together a Health Plan and has a Community Health Committee.

Q4 What effect does having concurrent or complementary core business between agencies have, when these agencies are working together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE GROUPINGS</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments in the groupings</th>
<th>THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enables quality relationships</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive environment to work together</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater awareness, understanding and respect for each other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong, effective relationship</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better benefits to community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>community and clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication across agency and within departments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond quicker to project needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project moves faster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>efficiency and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easier to achieve goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can equally report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can be a problem for claiming outcomes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage of funding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>cooperation and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be more productive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>cooperation and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing resources and information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>cooperation and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages cooperation and collaboration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cooperation and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work towards shared goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>cooperation and collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MAIN POINTS**

1. Respondents combined talking about the positive influence on relationships when working together in combination (as with Q1), with the impacts this has on the project.

2. Three agencies did not see complementarity as necessarily positive due to the fact that there would be competition amongst agencies to claim outcomes. This could complicate both internal and external relationships and reporting and possibly create duplication or overlap of jurisdiction that may result in consumer/customer/community confusion.
3. More regional offices (9) compared to head office highlighted cooperation (5)
4. An equal number of Federal and State agencies spoke of cooperation.
5. Federal agencies referred to WOG initiatives (which were mentioned by only one State agency) and COAG priorities.
6. Words like trust, honesty, and respect were used relating to relationships and communication.
7. The top areas of benefit were:
   a. Relationships
   b. Cooperation and collaboration, including information sharing
   c. Communication
   d. Mutuality, complementarity and agency benefit

Worth exploring the view that complementarity causes problems. 3a, b, c
Will confirm the main areas of benefit in survey in 2a,b,c,
Will explore through survey that complementarity assists good relationships 6a,b,c

KEY THEMES

Relationships- Respondents indicated that relationships were smoother, more cordial and open, more productive, positive and therefore created other benefits. These included negotiating any conflicts, using shared objectives etc. as a basis, and generally agencies demonstrating greater commitment to projects and desire to cooperate.

Cooperation – Respondents indicated that good relationships led to greater commitment to work collaboratively, ease of and desire for sharing of information, efforts to ensure equal benefit from projects, less resources used to manage conflict, sharing staff expertise across agencies, encouraging quicker response to projects needs. Complementarity also was seen to encourage strategic partnerships or the development of formal partnerships and commitment to work together. Agencies may also be prepared to work outside their core business for the overall project benefit and benefit to their agency as a result of complementarities. Greater cooperation stemmed also from shared goals.

Communication - Respondents indicated that communication amongst agencies was better and more open, with greater understanding of what each agency role and responsibility was in relation to the project, improved capacity to negotiate differences. External communication to community, of image of the role of Government was also improved.

Mutuality, complementarity and agency benefit – Respondents indicated that complementarity enhanced the mutual benefit of the agencies working together as they could more easily contribute to their own core business and KPIs through the common purpose or complementary roles. They could also gain leverage off each other and it was easier to respond to WOG initiatives with such linkages. In addition agencies have the opportunity to equally report outcomes (comment at odds with the agencies that feel there would be competition)

Community and clients- Respondents indicated that complementarity improved outcomes with agencies working well and more efficiently together, thus community benefited. In addition, the perception of government working as one was seen to be important. It was also indicated that it should result in better public policy design and implementation. There was no mention in Q1 of the negative image of government arising from this conflict.
Government performance and efficiency – enhances the image of the Government, which is seen as cohesive and effectively working together to deliver on government priorities and commitments; more effective use of tax payers money.

Agency performance – seen to result in greater performance and productivity, better outcomes, projects being completed quicker

In terms of public sector management objectives of efficiency, effectiveness and accountability, concurrence of core business appears to make this easier.

Program and project benefit/Community client benefit

Respondents indicated that programs and the community would benefit from greater flexibility.

Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding the influence of complementarity on relationships amongst agencies working together.

- Example given relating to two agencies that had dual responsibility for an element of a project and this required careful negotiation using complementarity to support discussions etc.
- Important to work at achieving workable outcomes for all, as the people you are working with, you will come across again in other projects. Australia and individual states are really quite small, so you are likely to deal with the same people in the future, even if you move agencies.
- Intellectual property is vested in the crown.
- The agency is very often represented on most committees due to impacts upon or use of natural resources. This means that agencies need to bring our agency to the table to discuss things.
- The joint agency Team recognises the differences between the two key agencies, but work to deliver a united message
- Community doesn't always understand what WOG means
- Productivity Commission report regarding Indigenous WOG response (2003) to overcome Indigenous disadvantage. Includes key indicators against which all agencies are to perform.
- Having concurrent or similar philosophies generally makes it easier to work together.
- At the coal face relationship is good, but there can be difficulties ensuring that all are shooting at the same target.
- Conflict can still occur, for example the way something like housing infrastructure is viewed - a place for people to have a home, with social value, rather than as an asset.
- Expertise and resources in this organisation are used in a sub-contractual way by other agencies - more of a partnership agreement approach.

Q5 Think of some projects in which your agency has been involved with multiple agencies – what issues and impediments arose during those projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on fulfilling KPIs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid performance measures</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of WOG versus need to fulfill State agencies’ own KPI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</td>
<td>Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays in project</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to re-negotiate project outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays on achieving outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about delivering on own agency outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community expectation unfulfilled</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community &amp; client benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community let down by slowness or limitations in project outcomes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community &amp; client benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralised agencies not in touch with regional needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community &amp; client benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to cooperate or collaborate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cooperate &amp; collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to share information</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cooperate &amp; collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of services, particularly to shared clients</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of activities and previous efforts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects don't fit neatly in jurisdictional boundaries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited decision-making locally</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boundary overlaps and gaps</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies unwilling to work outside jurisdictional boundaries creating gaps</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues stemming from centralized and decentralized agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community view of government as uncoordinated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Government performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncoordinated agency activities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Government performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation can be restrictive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation timeframes and concurrence</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silo mentality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk averse management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management culture authoritarian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management capability limited</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Management structures &amp; approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational culture creates barriers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organisational structure &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal organization structure in silos</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Organisational structure &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and structure of organizations doesn’t encourage working together</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organisational structure &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal conflicts affect projects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organisational structure &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff skill levels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff availability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting roles interrupt continuity of staffing in projects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political interference &amp; point scoring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Groups | Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings | Themes
--- | --- | ---
Political agendas | 8 | Political
State versus Federal politics | 3 | Political
Some agencies’ processes are complex & slow things | 5 | Processes and systems
Agencies differ in processes for spending money | 4 | Processes and systems
Onerous and bureaucratic processes | 11 | Processes and systems
Different processes used by agencies complicate things, e.g. contracting | 3 | Processes and systems
Inflexibility of funding criteria | 8 | Program design
Inflexibility in program eligibility criteria | 8 | Program design
Programs don’t fit community need very well | 2 | Program design
Funding cycles are mismatched | 9 | Program design
Limited flexibility outside of own agency core business | 1 | Reporting and accountability
Reporting and accountability requirements differ | 6 | Reporting and accountability
Have to use multiple reporting & accountability processes | 7 | Reporting and accountability
Conflict over reporting and accountability processes | 2 | Reporting and accountability
Ministerial reporting can complicate reporting needs | 2 | Reporting and accountability
Limited resources available | 4 | Resources & information resources
Poorer agencies unable to commit funding resources, so provide only in-kind support | 8 | Resources & information resources
Timeframe blow out due to delays | 3 | Timeframes
Competing timeframes | 4 | timeframes

MAIN POINTS
1. Many of the key themes actually inter-relate or exist in slightly different forms under other headings, for example organisation culture is demonstrated through the
management structure and practices; policies and the processes for policy development reflect organisational structure, culture, management and program and funding design.

2. Two areas of conflict or impediments were provided by respondents that are non-core business related. They are ‘personality difficulties’ and ‘political issues’ including ‘political agendas’ and ‘political interference’. Interviewees also mentioned political point scoring by local Members through the use of agencies’ outcomes and deliverables and generally politicising agencies’ activities. One agency indicated that managing the political aspects take up considerable resources and dictate/restrict actions and ultimately achievable outcomes.

3. A number of responses mentioned the influence of public sector management practices and principles on management style, and the values and organisational culture that help to shape how an agency is structured and runs. This includes the need to be efficient, effective and to provide accountable and equitable in services.

4. The themes attracting the most discussion included:
   a. Program design (inflexibility of funding and eligibility criteria, mismatched funding cycles)
   b. Legislation (timeframes, concurrency, other issues)
   c. Project delays
   d. Organisation structure & culture (organisational silos, internal structuring)
   e. Personnel related (staffing availability and consistency due to acting roles; personalities)
   f. Management (risk aversion, silo mentality, authority and capability)
   g. Power, authority and jurisdiction (specifically decision-making and jurisdictional boundary overlaps)
   h. Personalities
   i. Efficiency (overlaps, gaps and duplication)
   j. Processes and systems (bureaucratic processes)
   k. Accountability and reporting (differing and multiple reporting and accountability)
   l. Agency performance (seen as uncoordinated, rigid performance measures and demand to fulfil KPIs)
   m. Political issues (agendas, interference, different parties at different levels of government)
   n. Resources (particularly limitations from poorer agencies)
   o. Community expectations (particularly in relation to being unfulfilled)

5. Project delays are an outcome of core business conflict, stemming from areas such as decision-making capacity, approval processes, and funding cycles. However in terms of meeting milestones and timeframes and fulfilling KPIs, this was identified as a fairly important issue faced.

6. There were a few issues mentioned in relation to timeframes. These centred on being able to achieve outcomes within timeframes. This was reflected in other comments relating to projects that were slowed down or where there were competing timeframes. The impact of distance and remoteness on time required to travel and coordinate projects was also raised. Timeframes are linked to decision-making and levels of authority also.
7. Power, authority and jurisdiction encompassed a broad range of issues including projects not fitting into jurisdictional boundaries and regional offices unwilling to work outside their boundaries.

8. Timeframes – particularly competing timeframes for agencies to deliver on their own priorities was mentioned and difficulties arising when other issues slow progress of projects.

9. The timeframe issues led to concerns regarding achieving outcomes and deliverables and are therefore an example of a consequence of an issue.

10. Resourcing, staff and funding was raised as an issue. Part of the difficulty is that agencies commit their resources to achieving their own outcomes. Poorer agencies are often not able to contribute resources.

11. Cooperation and collaboration suffer as a result of issues experienced.

12. A number of areas are worthy of exploration through the survey. Some have already arisen in responses to previous questions 5, 6 and 7. These are the most dominant within each group and are listed below:
   - Political issues (agendas, interference, party difference)
   - Personality difficulties
   - Decision-making limitations locally
   - Jurisdictional boundary overlaps & gaps
   - Rigid performance measures & demand to fulfill own KPIs
   - Differing & often multiple reporting & accountability requirements
   - Onerous bureaucratic processes
   - Project delays
   - Duplication of activities
   - Community expectations not fulfilled
   - Uncoordinated agency activity
   - Funding cycles mismatch
   - Inflexibility of funding criteria & programs
   - Legislative timeframes &/or concurrency requirements
   - Limited resources from ‘poorer’ agencies
   - Staff constantly changing due to ‘acting’ roles, no continuity
   - Risk averse management
   - Internal agency silos

13. Except where mentioned in the key themes, there were no real distinct differences between Head Office responses and Regional Office, or in relation to level of government or agency focus.

**KEY THEMES**

**Program design** - Key areas in program design related to limitations in flexibility in funding and eligibility criteria, but also included reference to the difficulties that different funding cycles created in trying to coordinate funding applications for projects. This area links to processes and systems.

**Legislation** – Legislation requirements from multiple GAs involved in projects can pose problems due to concurrency requirements, conflict and ‘grey’ areas that emerge as legislation is applied within projects creating unique combination situations in which legislation is applied. Legislation also affects/dictates timeframes for projects and can create ‘conditional’ situations.

**Organisational structure and culture** – organisational culture and structure were seen to affect values, policy and relationships. Internal structure tended to create difficulties
because this sometimes meant an agency had to deal with several different units in a department. Some of these conflicted with each other. This theme also involved the ‘silo’ effect that occurs in some agencies and is linked to management culture. An outcome example was difficulty gaining support within an agency, across units.

**Government performance/agency performance** - Government performance was seen to be affected by the issues experienced due to a perception that it was ‘uncoordinated’ in the way it worked. Agencies also mentioned that the rigid performance measures and demand to focus on KPIs meant that agencies did not always fully commit or had limited commitment to projects outside their core business.

**Power, authority and jurisdiction** – jurisdictional boundaries and responsibilities and gaps were mentioned. In addition the issues associated with decision-making authority locally creating time frame problems were common, particularly with centralized agencies. A key area of power and authority relates to centralised versus decentralized agencies with the comment that centralised agencies lack regional knowledge. Another influence was the impact from lacking senior authority to support projects.

**Personnel related** – the issues raised relating to this area included concern over the skills of some staff in regions, lack of regional knowledge at head office and the difficulty of keeping staff so that corporate knowledge is constantly lost. There seemed to be a major issue with lack of consistency of staff in projects, due to ‘acting’ roles.

**Agency performance** – the top nomination for this related to agencies being focused on their own KPIs and core business. Other issues relating to this area included agency need for kudos and recognition of outcomes, issues associated with WOG activities.

**Management** – In the management structure and approaches theme, risk aversion was a key issue, followed by silo mentality and authoritarian approaches. The culture of the agency was seen to influence management approaches as much as individual personalities.

**Efficiency and duplication** – this is linked to the power, authority and jurisdiction. Duplication from overlapping jurisdiction and shared clients was mentioned. Confusion amongst clients was considered an issue where two agencies have the same client group.

**Processes and systems** – Onerous bureaucratic processes were highlighted. This area links with implementing programs, gaining approval and the different reporting and accountability processes. Additional views were that agencies differed in their processes and systems and this caused problems.

**Political influence** – This does not relate to core business conflict, but political influence and interference was raised by some agencies.

**Resources and information resources** – resources and access to funds were raised as issues, particularly ‘poorer’ agencies’ ability to contribute to projects. Their contribution tended to be ‘in kind’.

**Community expectations** - This area was of concern for social and economic focused agencies particularly. The point was made that community expectations were not fulfilled sometimes.

**Cooperation and collaboration** – difficulties experienced affect ability and willingness to cooperate and collaborate. An outcome can be reluctance to share information.

**Reporting and accountability** - Agencies mentioned multiple reporting needs and particularly the difficulties created by different reporting and accountability expectations and processes. Reporting and accountability was commented on more by head offices and by agencies with an economic or economic and social focus.
**Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding general issues and impediments experienced by agencies when working with other agencies:**

- Many of the projects are derived and driven from the community which makes the situation different. They don’t fit into already developed agency business plans and thus allocated resources.
- During an infrastructure audit, access to information was difficult and then the accuracy of the information was of concern.
- Different agencies see things from a different perspective.
- Tends to be pragmatic approach on the part of a particular agency. Could be that there isn't appropriate level of skill or knowledge, as some areas do involve specialist knowledge.
- Strategic vision and commitment by some levels of management is limiting. May see value only if program contributes to areas of value to them.
- From a client's perspective, it is about understanding the impediments that exist and communicating these to the higher levels in the agencies involved in projects.
- Two environmental officers are employed who investigate potential impacts so that issues can be dealt with early.
- May sometimes have Native Title issues to be considered.
- Examples given relating to legislation and individual agency responsibility such as Native Title.
- Second example related to ability to negotiate locally, not necessarily understood by some agencies' Head Office outlook.
- Example provided of an agency that is crucial to providing a service, but is slow to provide infrastructure due to resourcing issues.

Survey investigation of dominant issues and impediments listed that are experienced when working together as question 4a, b and c

**Q6 Please outline any examples of fundamental core business conflict whilst working with other agencies in joint projects.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clash of service delivery related philosophy/ideology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Philosophical core business conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow or purist interpretation of own core business and area of responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Philosophical core business conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General philosophical/ideological differences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philosophical core business conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative powers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Legislation and regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative interpretations for core business and conflict arising in order to fulfill core business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Legislation and regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative responsibility shapes core business and focus of decisions creating conflict</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Legislation and regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic versus environmental focus influencing decisions and values</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Economic versus environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on own core business, seen as only legitimate focus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional overlap with agencies that have complementarity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher level focus on agency’s own individual jurisdictional responsibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response groupings | Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings | Theme
--- | --- | ---
Power through legislative role creating conflict | 2 | Power, authority and jurisdiction
Different interpretation of key roles & objectives in agencies with core business complementarity | 4 | Power, authority and jurisdiction

### MAIN POINTS
1. This area of conflict was difficult for respondents to provide examples.
2. Twelve respondents indicated that they did not experience core business conflict.
3. Fundamental core business conflict related to two main areas – legislation and the philosophical/ideological issues relating to economic philosophy and values versus environmental philosophy and values. The spread of all three levels of government and regional and head office was present in these two main areas.
4. There was greater regional and state agency focus on the philosophical core business conflicts raised.
5. Federal agencies, with the exception of one did not feel that ‘Fundament core business conflict’ occurred.
6. There were no outstanding differences between Head Office and Regional Office respondents.
7. Overall there was a clash of ideologies, whether in relation to core business, interpretation of acts or service delivery.

### KEY THEMES
**Economic versus environmental** – the philosophies and values associated with these two areas were essentially seen to be completely linked but usually conflicting in their intention, interpretation and application. This conflict is linked to core business philosophy and interpretation of responsibility at core business level.
Power, authority and jurisdiction – there was some issue identified relating to complementarity where agencies had similar core business intentions, creating overlap, difficulties with jurisdictional responsibilities. This is closely linked with philosophical core business conflict and agency’s interpretation of their core business. This could be further examined through the survey process.

Agency performance – some respondents indicated that agencies were driven to focusing only on their own core business and when the interpretation was narrow and exclusive this created conflict

Philosophical core business conflict – differences in interpretation of core business then affecting roles, responsibilities

Legislation – The legislative requirements that agencies are given responsibility to enforce and the powers they hold create a power/subservient situation amongst agencies. Legislatory responsibilities of agencies are fundamental to those agencies modus operandi and seen as indubitable.

Areas to be investigated through the survey will be philosophical and ideological differences, economic versus environmental clashes, legislation, particularly the interpretation and application of Acts and regulations to fulfill core business and lastly the complementarity issue raised above. To be explored in survey 1a,b,c; 2a,b,c; 3a,b,c; 7a,b,c

Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding

- Relates to the differences of focus i.e. delivery for Government and Minister and delivery for clients - this is more likely to cause a problem
- Overall responsibility is positive and concerns a government priority
- This area's way of doing business is through funding cycles and this tends to dictate how projects occur.
- Important to identify what you can do together, not what you can’t do.
- Relationships are built and outcomes are achieved by focusing on the positives and what can be done. Often areas of core business conflict can fade away as relationships and understanding improve.
- Tends to be pragmatic approach on the part of a particular agency.
- Could be that there isn't appropriate level of skill or knowledge, as some areas do involve specialist knowledge.
- This situation that has been outlined as an example also involved a particular management style that created additional difficulties - other agency saw an area where they had legitimacy and saw other input as a threat.
- An example of a project outlined illustrated the fundamental philosophy of two agencies are from very different perspectives and thus influence what is wanted for an outcome.
- There is the problem for some areas of responsibility as there is no power behind that responsibility. This makes it difficult to enforce actions that fulfill the responsibility.
- Conflict between State and Commonwealth can be a problem, especially when legislation is different and service delivery approach is different.
- Project outlined indicated the mismatch between what the project was to deliver for one agency and the expectation of what it was to deliver from the other joint agency.
Some agencies focus more on people outcomes where as others focus on material or dollar outcomes.

- Policy direction by Minister can change and dictates much of what an agency then has to deliver.
- Recent internal structural changes and changes in other agencies create some difficulty philosophically. This is then influences by WOG service delivery arrangements.
- Example provided relating to a specific land use designation to solve a problem that was occurring in a community and ended up having to invest quite a sum of money due to regulatory requirements applied by another agency.
- Pseudo govt. organisation can, by the nature of its position of importance with government and function in the region, mean that it may expect assistance, support etc. for proposals.

Q7 Please outline any examples of functional/operational core business conflict that has occurred whilst working with other agencies in joint projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agency focus only on own core business to deliver on their own KPI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference in targets for each agency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level of openness or defensiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ministerial communication needs &amp; issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication &amp; overlap</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication amongst agencies serving same clients &amp; with similar programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies' strategic plans leave little room for discretionary participation &amp; financial support of projects</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Management structures and approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silo mentality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Management structures and approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporate culture &amp; style,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organisation structure &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal structures &amp; procedures meaning agencies may have to deal with different areas within one agency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Organisation structure &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff availability due to constant staff change including many 'acting' roles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Personnel related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no succession planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personnel related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff skills &amp; experience &amp; ability to address regional needs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Personnel related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy differences &amp; clashes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external political pressure to fulfill a Ministerial expectation or commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Political issues &amp; influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval processes are lengthy causing delays</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference between operational level &amp; senior management in level of support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differing decision-making procedures and levels amongst agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centralisation versus decentralisation affecting capacity for decision-making at the local level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local decision-making limited</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency turf protection for decision-making</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response groupings</td>
<td>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jurisdictional boundaries &amp; cross-overs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different delegation between commonwealth &amp; state</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding cycles mismatched</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of flexibility in processes &amp; systems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different processes &amp; systems creating</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interdependency of funding arrangements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of flexibility in programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program design with different criteria, including for funding</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple &amp; repetitive reporting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountability is dominant driver for some agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different and onerous reporting requirements &amp; timeframes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding complexities and fiscal requirements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centralised reporting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reluctant to give commitment due to limitations in resources and funds as funds committed to own core business outcomes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources generally</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding resources available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties with timeframes and milestones</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframes unrealistic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timeframes for achieving outcomes &amp; milestones</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concurrent timeframes hard to manage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Functional Operational Core Business conflict

- **Political Issues**: 45 comments
- **Policy**: 40 comments
- **Legislation & Regulation**: 35 comments
- **Communication**: 30 comments
- **Management structures & approaches**: 25 comments
- **Efficiency & duplication**: 20 comments
- **Organisational structure & culture**: 15 comments
- **Personnel related**: 10 comments
- **Resources & information resources**: 5 comments
- **Agency performance**: 0 comments
- **Program design**: 0 comments
- **Timeframes**: 0 comments
- **Reporting & accountability**: 0 comments
- **Power, authority & jurisdiction**: 0 comments

**Number counted**: Total number of responses from interviewees

**Number of response groupings**: that fall into this theme
MAIN POINTS

1. Power and authority and jurisdiction affecting decision-making, approval delegations and jurisdictional boundaries are seen as a key cause for functional operational core business conflict. This is followed by conflicts occurring relating to reporting and accountability, which are linked.
2. Different processes and systems amongst agencies for delivering core business, financial management and approvals were also seen as creating conflict.
3. Other areas identified are linked to how an agency delivers their core business and involve program design, KPIs, allocation of resources, including staff.
4. Intangible areas which influence how operational functions are carried out include organisational and management culture.
5. Communication practices and responsibility for legislation and regulations also influenced likelihood of core business conflict.
6. Essentially topics raised were the same between Head Office and Regional Office. Some of the differences are listed below:
   a. **Head office** respondents highlighted overlap of jurisdiction, commitment at operational level that is not supported upwards in the agency, corporate style, financial systems differ, program design, agency commitment to delivering on KPI in core business, accountability, funding contingent on others providing funding too.
   b. **Regional** respondents highlighted decision-making, funding cycles and level, no succession planning for staffing, staff shortages, head office making decisions that are not related to regional situation and needs.
7. Reporting and accountability was strongly dominated by agencies with an economic and social focus.
8. Local government were dominant in comments regarding program design.
9. The most common functional operational issues are:
   a) Power and authority, particularly decision-making aspects
   b) Reporting and accountability with lengthy approval
   c) Agency focusing on own KPI fulfilment
   d) Internal structures and agency culture
   e) Management structures and approaches
   f) Processes and systems covering budgeting, funding arrangements such as co-funding, funding cycles being mismatched, differing financial and approval systems
   g) Personnel related issues – staff skills, availability and staff in ‘acting roles’
   h) Duplication and overlap
   i) Program and funding inflexibility

KEY THEMES

**Organisation structure and culture** - corporate culture and style of doing business was identified by respondents as part of the functional/operational core business conflict and included level of openness, defensiveness and willingness to cooperate. Structure issues raised concerned organisational ‘silos’.

**Efficiency and duplication** – were highlighted in relation to jurisdictional overlaps, including boundaries, and agencies that had similar core business and shared clients.
Management - targets and KPIs that must be met to fulfil the departmental operational plan and goals, the way this is enforced as well as the design and management of programs and funding were provided as management related core business conflict areas. There was regular reference to the inflexibility of programs and funding arrangements associated with management and not much willingness to work across government. Silo mentality and management culture was also mentioned.

Processes and systems - this area covers budgeting for funding availability and co-funding arrangements as well as cyclical funding, which was seen as creating problems due to a mismatch of funding cycles. There were also differing financial systems and approval processes. Limited flexibility and internal organisational structures and ‘silos’ were also mentioned.

Program design – interviewees noted inflexibility of programs and funding criteria as an issue.

Policy – policy issues relating to regulatory conflicts.

Reporting and accountability – interviewees highlighted onerous and different reporting systems. The influence of centralised versus de-centralised agencies affected how complex and onerous reporting was. The different financial reporting requirements amongst agencies were raised, which made joint reporting difficult.

Power, authority and jurisdiction - This was a key source of conflict and relates to different organisational control i.e. centralised versus decentralised and the hierarchical structure and powers that control decision-making and capacity to commit to projects. Decision-making capacity was a commonly mentioned side-effect. It also included issues relating to authority and capacity for regional staff to make decisions. Within this ability to commit to projects was the issue of regional staff committing to projects that were not necessarily supported within their own organisational hierarchy. The issues relating to decentralisation versus centralisation spilled over to ability to commit resources.

Resources - This included funding resources and budget allocation and staff available for projects. It also included reluctance to commit resources due to agencies having committed resources for their own core business.

Political influence – this area did not have the high profile achieved in Q5, being mentioned by only one agency, due to the fact that it sits outside the parameters of the question.

Personnel related (personalities, skills, career motivation) - movement of staff, no succession planning, loss of staff and expertise arising from ageing of experienced staff, and concern for staff skills. The reduction in staff numbers was also mentioned.

Efficiency and duplication - This theme is related to the ‘power, authority and jurisdiction’ theme and was identified as leading to some duplication. The issues of differing boundaries led to the complexity of dealing with several regional offices of the same agency.

Community expectation – this topic was not raised as it was not pertinent to the question asked.

Agency performance- the agencies’ individual focus on fulfilling their own KPIs and struggles with timeframe pressures to deliver outcomes were noted. Respondents also highlighted reluctance by some agencies to step outside their jurisdictional area in the region.

Timeframes were discussed in relation to approval processes, delays in decision-making affecting timeframes and ability to fulfil the timeframes for projects due to the impacts of delays.
Legislation - this was only mentioned in passing relating to its link with policy.
Inter-agency relationship - was not part of this question
Communication – was not part of this question.

Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding functional/operational core business conflict

- Evaluation of a project is important, prior to delivery.
- Directors in this agency should have greater delegated powers for management of grant programs and funds.
- Priorities change along the way that influence how decisions are made and what is supported. It is important to get things agreed at both operational and policy levels.
- Sometimes individuals perceive themselves to have the capacity to make decisions, when in fact they may not, so need to always test the level of authority.
- Important to note this does not affect outside perception of the program. These factors are internal operational factors that are dealt with and will be continuously improved.
- This agency tends to have an easier decision-making process so that makes it attractive to constantly involve in committees.
- The funding area can also work as a plus in that agencies are not seeking to leverage funding from each other, which enhances the pool of funds available to community.
- Work with DSDTI to identify issues and resolve these with developers
- Example provided where this agency is responsible for an area, which also involves multiple agencies’ responsibilities for different elements of the area. Often means that agencies have to apply conflicting regulations.
- Example provided of a grant from DLGPSR for particular infrastructure
- Example given where the agency has to make a commitment before a budget has been allocated and approved
- Community expectations become an issue when things take a long time.
- The structure of the organisation has created internal tensions relating to areas of responsibility.

Further exploration through survey 8a, b, c into the main areas identified in yellow covering internal structure, KPI, resourcing, programs, funding, decision-making, approval processes, reporting and accountability, timeframes, personnel issues and duplication and overlap.

Q8 What connection is there between the issues and impediments that your agency has experienced when working together with other agencies and what I have described as core business conflict?

MAIN POINTS
- Three agencies were not sure if there was a link and one agency felt they were not related.
- Mostly there were degrees of linkage identified.
- Seven agencies considered them the same.
There was no clear difference between Head Office and Regional Office responses or between Federal and State agencies.

**DETAILS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closely aligned</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsure could be linked</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linked to some degree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite similar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one leads the other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at functional operational level exist</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other comments providing some contextual background thinking regarding whether there is a link between core business conflict and issues and impediments affecting agency relationships when working together

- The constraints of Agencies' own processes and ways of operating stops the ability to think and act laterally. Perhaps we need to forget the KPIs and consider what is required to address the need or issue.
- Need to focus on what can be done, rather than what can't be done, and how shared resources and effort can achieve much more than each agency just doing their own thing in isolation.
- They are a reflection of the management culture in an agency, with the exception of the role of personalities.

A comparison of identified issues and impediments and the fundamental and functional/operational core business conflicts identified illustrates a linkage and therefore this will not be explored through the survey.

**Q9 What effect do core business conflicts have on implementing projects and achieving project outcomes?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affects agency performance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects agencies own outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires negotiation to manage difficulties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication is time consuming to work through difficulties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community become the losers if projects fail</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community &amp; client benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community has different expectations to agencies about projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community expectations let down</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community has false expectations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal of support &amp; effort by stakeholders</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects willingness to cooperate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation is inefficient</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of coordination across agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting delays affect efficiency of implementation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncoordinated gov effort</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Government performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government seen as wasting resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Government performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not achieve Gov. priorities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Government performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government concerned with process &amp; not outcomes &amp; benefits for community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Government performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management structure &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Groupings</td>
<td>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on process not outcomes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on finance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass the buck philosophy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organisational structure &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces outcomes - quality, value &amp; breadth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed outcomes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require changed outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties can stimulate new solutions &amp; better outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t fulfill objectives completely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making is slow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy on lead agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget issues &amp; financial cycles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Process &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of processes make project management harder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create budget difficulties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Budget &amp; finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays may mean a project does not fit into financial year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Budget &amp; finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget impacts *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Budget &amp; finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration amongst stakeholders</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaming occurs in relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor relationships develop &amp; jeopardise future working together</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects regional relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative working relationships form</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays reporting &amp; accountability processes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects accountability if projects delayed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources &amp; time expended to resolve conflicts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources affecting inter-agency relationship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase overall &quot;cost&quot; of project in terms of time, funds, personnel effort</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Project impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow down or stops project</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Project impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeopardises future project participation by agency partners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in timeframes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differing processes &amp; systems slow projects &amp; affect timeframes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extends timeframes in order to achieve deliverables</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effect of core business conflict on projects and project outcomes

Organisational structure & culture
Reporting & accountability
Communication
Power, authority & jurisdiction
Processes & systems
Agency performance
Budget & finance
Community expectation
Community & client benefit
Management structure & culture
Resources & information resources
Government performance
Cooperation
Efficiency & duplication
Outcomes & deliverables
Project impact

Themes relating to impact on projects of core business conflict

Number counted

Number of response groupings that fall into this theme
Total number of responses from interviewees

MAIN POINTS

1. The ‘cause and effect’ of core business conflict impact on projects and their implementation is obvious, with links from project impact, to outcomes and deliverables, affecting relationships and levels of cooperation, causing delays and inability to achieve within timeframes.

2. The major impacts of core business conflict were on projects themselves and their outcomes and deliverables.

3. Although not specifically to do with the impact on the project and its outcomes, the impact of core business conflict on relationships (which ultimately would affect the implementation of projects) was strongly highlighted, with ‘frustration’ being cited most commonly. Bad experiences when working together could sour local relationships. This was seen to create flow-on effects such as reduced willingness to cooperate, and sometimes resulted in withdrawal of support from stakeholders, both agencies and community, for the project.

4. The impact on Government performance was mentioned. Whilst not directly related to the impact on the project and its outcomes, its importance in influencing effective Government and community partnerships and collaboration in regional development would suggest it is worth investigating.

5. The impacts of core business conflicts on projects that have been mentioned demonstrate the inter-linkages between issues and their consequences creating outcome issues.

6. Outcomes and deliverables were seen to be seriously affected resulting in overall quality, breadth and fulfilment of outcomes being depleted. Respondents also stated that delays and changes to outcomes had to occur. A few interviewees indicated that
as a result of negotiating through difficult projects, better outcomes could be achieved.

7. Projects being slowed down or stopped was the most highlighted impact. Slowing down and ceasing projects links directly to achievement of outcomes and timeframe issues.

8. The overall cost of projects in time, resources, and government investment was highlighted as being potentially increased by core business conflicts.

9. Inability to achieve outcomes and deliverables in timeframes, as well as impact on budgets within the commitment for the financial year was seen as an impact of core business conflict.

10. Another key effect noted was the influence on community perception of government performance as being uncoordinated, wasting resources, not fulfilling priorities and focused on processes not outcomes.

11. Efficiency and duplication and budget issues were also mentioned, with inefficiency of implementation or delivery of programs and projects arising from lack of coordination, budget implications from running over time, adjusting projects and difficulty fitting into funding cycles.

12. Only a Federal agency raised the issue of conflict across levels of government.

13. There was no specific detectable difference between the responses of Head Office and those of Regional Offices.

14. A number of agencies pointed out that the community is the loser if projects are poorly implemented and outcomes and benefits not fully achieved.

15. Key areas to be considered for investigation in the survey are impacts on:
   a. Outcomes and deliverables
   b. Projects
   c. Timeframes
   d. Resource
   e. Commitment and support
   f. ‘cost’ – time, funds, personnel

**KEY THEMES**

**Relationship** - core business conflict is seen to affect relationships of stakeholders, creating frustration and negativity which ultimately is seen to impact on desire for cooperation and willingness to work together. It is also considered to affect agencies’ willingness to commit resources in future. However, it is not directly associated with the impact on project implementation and outcomes, but is an influence. Poor relationships also affect communication and cooperation.

**Cooperation** linked to relationships, timeframe blow-outs, frustration in achieving progress in projects and time taken to negotiate through difficulties. These effects can reduce stakeholder (GAs and community) commitment. This was seen as fairly serious as it could lead to a withdrawal of support for the project and for future projects.

**Community expectation** - projects that had to be scoped in particular way sometimes did not fit community expectations, or community had different expectations as to what agencies could or would do and issues in implementing projects tended to exacerbate this. Community’s image of agencies could then become negative.

**Efficiency and duplication** – delays, conflict and time take to resolve conflicts; agencies focusing on their own objectives and KPIs was seen to create poor coordination of activity, thus affecting the efficiency of delivery or implementation of programs and
projects within specified timeframes. Duplication of effort and the slow bureaucratic processes required for reporting and accountability were seen as reducing the efficiency, as there was a risk that more effort went into reporting and maintaining upwards information or ministerial information, than was expended on actually running the project.

**Government performance** - There are a number of different aspects to this topic which included a perception of a lack of coordination across agencies by community, limited achievement of government priorities resulting in a negative image in the community. It was pointed out that some agencies had a strong focus on process rather than outcomes. This was not directly related to the implementation of projects and outcomes, but was more the judgement of the government based on the consequences of issues on project implementation and outcomes.

**Outcomes and deliverables** – Core business conflict was seen by quite a large number of interviewees to have a major effect on the quality, breadth and value of outcomes and deliverables, causing delays, not properly fulfilling the objectives of the project, in effect reducing the outcomes. In addition outcomes and deliverables were affected by delays in having to amend outcomes or compromise on some, resulting in modified projects. The view from some interviewees was that having to deal with problems and manage difficulties in projects added to the ‘cost’ of the project in the broader sense. A positive view was expresses regarding the fact that skilfully negotiating through difficulties and developing solutions could also result in better outcomes than anticipated.

**Communication** – difficulties impacting on the project progress meant that communication had to be carefully managed, often involving negotiation and compromise. This was time consuming and seen as time and resource wasting.

**Management structure and approaches** – management focus on process, not outcomes can slow projects and was voiced as an issue by a number of agencies.

**Timeframes** - Failure to adhere to project or program timeframes was seen to be caused through project delays and slowness arising from slow decision-making, and managing various conflicts created by funding, resources, conflicting KPIs and different systems and procedures. Achieving milestones and deliverables in the agreed timeframes was therefore very difficult, thus complicating both the stakeholder relationships and causing problems internally for individual agencies when projects ran over time.

**Finance and budget** – comments relating to budget implications of project timeframe overrun, slowness and delays of project implementation appear in several areas, and are complicated by projects that have to fit into specific funding cycles. Timeframe blow out, use of resources to resolve conflicts contributed to overall ‘cost’ of project.

*Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding the effect that core business conflict has on the implementation and outcomes of projects*

- It is hard for an agency to walk away from a compromise especially if that compromise is agreed in the presence of other agencies. Agency provided an example of this relating to Wide Bay 2020.
- The level of priority of project is directly related to its relevance to an agency’s core business and this affects how agencies respond to the issues and impediments experienced.
- LGAs have vastly increased responsibilities and limited resources, which can be a challenge when expected to participate/support projects.
• The Policy area of this agency has trial regions with a senior champion and the aim is to develop formal structures to cut red tape in such situations as core business conflict.
• This depends upon the program and how much it is funded by the Government. Projects that rely heavily on government funding will be jeopardised, but those with little or no government funding are not.
• Cost estimates made and then the lag from the time they are made to implementation is so long, costs go up.

Worth investigating perception of government performance in the survey 10a,b,c, Investigate further the following areas: outcomes, impact on project, affect on deliverables and timeframe, implications of resources used to overcome difficulties, efficiency of implementation, impact on agency support and effort, and project ‘costs’ 9a,b,c

Q10 What would be the dominant issues and impediments or ‘core’ business conflicts experienced by your agency when working with other agencies in projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>focus on core business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency charter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misinformation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus on efficient use of gov. resources rather than outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlap of jurisdictions &amp; territories causing duplication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incompatibility of land use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Legislation &amp; regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory conflict &amp; issues</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Legislation &amp; regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflict from application of regulations &amp; bureaucratic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Legislation &amp; regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way they are enforced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal &amp; financial regulations constrain projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Legislation &amp; regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulatory complexity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Legislation &amp; regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional management style different to HO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silo mentality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varying levels of management commitment aligned with risk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management structure &amp; approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different cultures in organisations affects how Departments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organisation structure &amp; culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inter-relate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency reluctance to contribute to other agency outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outcomes &amp; deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual attitudes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk aversion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff turnover</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Personnel related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff experience &amp; skills</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Personnel related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority behind projects, particularly need senior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endorsement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response groupings</td>
<td>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited decision-making capacity locally</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head office centric and top down mentality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different levels of authority involved in projects across agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Power, authority &amp; jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political issues &amp; influence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Political Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inflexibility of funding &amp; program criteria</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mismatched funding cycles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of time &amp; resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prescriptive &amp; bureaucratic processes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approval process complex &amp; lengthy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource constraints</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reluctance to commit resources, already committed for agency core business</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited resources available</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reluctance to share information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Resources &amp; information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy mismatch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical differences between Federal and State policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differing reporting &amp; accountability requirements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conflicting timeframes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delays &amp; slow decision-making affecting ability to keep to timeframes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAIN POINTS

1. Of the dominant issues and impediments identified, the top eight include the functional/operational core business conflicts of: legislation; program design; power; authority and jurisdiction; timeframes; processes and systems; personnel
related issues; resources and information resources; and management structure and approaches.

2. Respondents generally referred to the functional operational core business conflicts. One interviewee raised the fundamental core business conflict of environment versus economic development. The interviewee described this as ‘opposing driving philosophies’, indicating it occurred particularly between Federal and State agencies.

3. The non-core business issues that dominated included personalities and the issues caused by political agendas/interference.

4. No distinct differences between Head Office responses and Regional Offices, or between Federal and State agencies was evident.

KEY THEMES

Legislation and regulations – interviewees raised issues of incompatibility of land use including regulatory issues and environmental impacts affecting sustainability. This was a direct regulatory conflict. There was also conflict due to the compliance requirements, as well from the way that the interpretation and application of regulations and legislation, which was considered to be bureaucratic. The complexities of applying Acts and regulations were also highlighted and seen as a stumbling block.

Management structures and approaches – management issues related to the capacity for flexibility in managing programs, silo mentality and risk aversion in senior management as well as differences between head office and regional office management practices.

Personality – This is a non-core business conflict relating to difficult personalities and including people’s attitudes and risk aversion.

Personnel related - Two main functional/operational core business conflicts were identified relating to Staff. The first was staff turnover and constantly dealing with people in ‘acting’ roles, giving no consistency of staff in projects. The second involved availability of staff with the appropriate skills.

Power, authority and jurisdictional boundaries – this was the largest theme area discussed and is a complex area. The most dominant factor mentioned related to decision-making. This included the limited ability for some agencies to make decisions locally and head-office top-down approach being taken by some agencies. There were links with risk-averse management and lack of appropriately senior and skilled staff in regions for decision-making. Consequently approval processes were lengthy, which caused problems in setting up and implementing projects. The authority behind projects and support from head office was also raised as sometimes creating difficulties. In terms of jurisdictional boundaries, the previously raised issues of overlap and duplication were mentioned.

Political influence was mentioned, but is not a core business conflict.

Program design – respondents strongly highlighted the problems caused by lack of flexibility in programs and funding criteria. This included the fact that programs and funding could not be adjusted to suit the time, resources and funding available. Some agency funding was quite restrictive. Funding cycles, where they existed, were often mismatched and made it difficult to access a full range of funding for a project, particularly for projects reliant on funds from different sources.
**Processes and systems** – issues related to prescriptive and overly bureaucratic processes that were applied. Of particular relevance were lengthy and complex approval processes, which were linked to power, authority and jurisdiction.

**Agency performance, communication, outcomes and deliverables and policy** had minimal mention. The first three were affected by other issues, impediments and core business conflicts. Policy issues related to a mismatch of policy perspectives amongst agencies and differences in policy philosophy between federal and state agencies.

**Resources and information resources** – this area featured the reluctance to commit resources due to the need to support an agency’s own core business as its dominant factor. A number of agencies also considered this an influential factor that affected levels of commitment from agencies, to projects. The theme also refers to the reluctance to share information resources.

**Timeframes** – this theme could be divided into two areas, conflicting timeframes occurring in projects and programs, and other issues that delayed projects. Other issues included slow decision-making, which made it difficult to achieve outcomes in the timeframes agreed. Additionally, the complexities in legislation and the application of regulations were also a contributing factor to affecting timeframes.

**Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding the dominant issues or core business conflict experienced**

- An important factors is the degree of cooperation agencies have, that dictate what an agency will deliver
- Regions and remote areas are facing many issues and impediments such as population decline, skill shortages, and impacts from natural phenomena like drought or flood. These things challenges ability to deliver services. There are also infrastructure limitations, issues of equity of access to infrastructure and services
- Difficulties occur further up the hierarchy, particularly for those with career aspirations and risk aversion.
- The situation exists where State agencies request funds, creating a kind of 'parent/child' relationship. Australia is very top heavy with Government in relation to the population size.
- Example provided relating to combination of Cultural, environmental and regulatory interpretations.
- Issue in having no regional presence really.

**Will explore key areas such as lack of program/funding flexibility, timeframe issues, decision-making difficulties, approval processes, funding cycles mismatching, reluctance to commit resources, no consistency of staff, limitations in skill and knowledge of staff, regulatory conflicts and the bureaucratic way regulations are applied. This will be done in 11a,b,c**

**Q11** How does being the lead agent affect the level and type of core business conflict compared to just being a participant in a project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Grouping of viewpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vested interest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Greater commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value project more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Greater commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response groupings</td>
<td>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</td>
<td>Grouping of viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lead responsible for managing project, people etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship &amp; motivation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lead responsible for managing project, people etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure take account of other agencies' policies &amp; needs and that participants' benefit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lead responsible for managing project, people etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead's responsibility is to sort out problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lead's responsibility is to sort out problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal support to direct project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Legitimacy to direct &amp; dominate other agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy to encourage agencies' compliance with project needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Legitimacy to direct &amp; dominate other agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use power &amp; authority to overcome issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Legitimacy to direct &amp; dominate other agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Override others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Legitimacy to direct &amp; dominate other agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has autonomy for direction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Legitimacy to direct &amp; dominate other agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Less commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power to drive through conflict</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Less conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict in making other agencies perform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>More conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>More conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent on other agencies for success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reliance on others to make project work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior staff support &amp; image of Dept. with peers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior staff support &amp; image of Dept. with peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subservient role</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Subservient &amp; supportive of lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support role</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Subservient &amp; supportive of lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 MAIN POINTS

- The dominating topic discussions centred on commitment, authority, a lead agent’s responsibilities.
- The Lead was seen to have greater commitment and motivation to achieve outcomes, due to their vested interest in the project.
- It was also stated that the Lead’s responsibility was to sort out problems.
- Of great influence was the Lead’s legitimacy to undertake certain actions to ensure project outcomes were achieved and this included using their position of power and authority to overcome issues. Their role, whilst seen to be responsible for managing people, relationships, funds and outcomes, was also one of directing/coercing other agencies.
- There was an interesting split of opinion that indicated that being a Lead agent meant less conflict due to the power to drive through conflict and it was to the Lead’s advantage to reduce conflict as it would jeopardise the project. The opposing view was that a Lead was likely to face more conflict, by the nature of the task to coordinate a project with multiple stakeholders and manage people and resources.
- Non-lead agencies were seen to fall into two roles – a subservient role to the Lead having to comply with requests, and a support role to the Lead, to assist in achieving project outcomes. There was a view that non-lead agencies may sometimes be less committed as their needs and issues could be overridden. Non-lead agencies were
seen to be passive, subservient and more likely to be overruled in any issue resolution.

- There were five respondents that held the view that being the Lead or just a participating agency was not the key factor, but that everything hinged on the quality of the team and the management skill of the lead agency, including their commitment to constantly consult with other parties and their capability to direct a project team. Three of these agencies were Commonwealth agencies.

KEY THEMES

**Power, authority** – lead agency can use this to their advantage. It is Important for lead to have the appropriate level of authority.

**Subservience** - Non-lead seen as acquiescent and subservient to the demands and pressures of the lead.

**Commitment and motivation** – seen to be greater if a lead agent due to role and responsibility and vested interest in success.

*Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding whether there is a difference in core business conflict depending upon whether one is the lead agency or support agency*

- A lot depends upon the level of commitment there is from agencies involved.
- The Coordinator General has an overarching role in many issues.
- All agencies will be concerned about being able to deliver on their KPIs.
- It is important to ensure that all project participants have something they can promote about what they achieved from the project.
- Equal partnerships and contractual arrangements assist in managing likely conflicts, as agencies have signed up to agree to particular activities.
- Reciprocity amongst agencies involved is important as is being able to create ownership and work out differences in areas of individual agencies responsibilities.
- An example provided relating to the existence of an MOU between the responding agency and another. The MOU clearly indicated a 'lead ' role for the other agency, but this has not been fully accepted and followed through. This is indicative of a reluctance to acknowledge and fulfill an agreed responsibility. Issue also relates to the fact that one agency's commercial activity is impacted upon by the other agency cost sharing arrangements arising from the MOU.

**Responses did not indicate either way strongly, highlighting that the conflict that may occur and how it was managed may differ according to the agency dealing with it. The fact that five agencies mentioned that the quality of team and management were more influential is worth noting.**

Importance of identifying the Lead agent will be explored in the survey question 14a5,b5 to determine whether there is value in ensuring this is included in the tool due to the differing views regarding experiencing more or less conflict and managing conflict.

**Q12** What other factors, not related to core business conflict, may cause issues and impediments to agencies working together?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>govt response to community mismatch with community needs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>community expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations regarding what government will do</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochialism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>local attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ownership of projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>local attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personalities generally</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ego &amp; desire for kudos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personalities career focus therefore risk averse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Personalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive &amp; authoritarian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>management style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old fashioned management style</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Management style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unable to be strategic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>management style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political influence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>political factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial interference &amp; political agendas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>political factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differing political parties at the various levels of government</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>political factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local politics &amp; lobby groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>political factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politicising of issues &amp; client needs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>political factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political capability of DGs and Ministers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>political factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic changes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>exogenous influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>war</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>exogenous influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>exogenous influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought, economic downturn</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Local situational environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/cultural issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local situational environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact from natural disasters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>natural disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>staff competency(skills &amp; experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retention of skilled &amp; experienced staff &amp; turnover levels</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>staff competency(skills &amp; experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community resource limitations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>media influence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>media influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demographics affect regional projects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff changes cause loss of corporate knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>loss of corporate knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance affecting meeting &amp; links with head office</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>tyranny of distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance &amp; isolation or remoteness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>tyranny of distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff changes from reorganisation &amp; also new areas with whom to deal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>departmental reorganisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk aversion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>organisational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way of conducting business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>organisational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past experience of dealing with agency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>agency image &amp; standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standing amongst peer agency - value, power therefore respect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>agency image &amp; standing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAIN POINTS
1. The most dominant theme is Politics. This included political and ministerial interference, political influence, differing political parties at the various levels of Government, politicisation of client needs, demands of ministers, political capabilities of Ministers and DGs and local politics and lobby groups. All Federal agencies mentioned political influences.
2. The second most dominant theme concerned personalities including ego, career motivations and risk aversion and a large general reference to personalities.
3. A third area worth noting related to the impact of distance and remoteness on ability to work together. This included individual comments regarding timeframes for decision-making, time taken for travel between coordinating agencies, and lack of understanding of ‘local’ situation from people in head office.
4. It was also noticeable that Federal agencies seem to identify factors from a broad spectrum such as impacts of natural disasters, drought and climate, and economic downturns.
5. Other elements mentioned included media, demographic issues, the lack of suitably skilled staff or the retention of such expertise in the regions, local attitudes and parochialism.
6. Additional key areas included the constant changing of staff, loss of corporate knowledge and skills from the region.

In the survey, explore further political elements (ministerial influence, differing political parties across levels of government etc.), personality, management style,
resource limitations in community, local situations, demographics, distance and isolation, and community expectation of government.

12a, b, c

KEY THEMES

Political factors – Political influence, interference, agendas and the strength of both Directors-General and Ministers were seen as strong influences upon whether there were issues and impediments to working together. Whilst this was generally focused on State and Federal levels, local politics were also acknowledged. The different political parties involved at the different levels of government were also seen as an issue.

Personalities – There general statements made regarding ‘personalities’, possibly inferring that people can be easy or hard to work with in joint initiatives. Ego and career oriented persons (also described as risk averse) were also mentioned.

Tyranny of distance – Distance was seen as an isolating factor, one which caused difficulties to meet together, liaise with head office and also levels of remoteness generally had other associated factors which could affect staffing, access to expertise, the nature of services and communications available. Distance and location link to another set of influences that were noted. These included situational factors such as drought, and limited access to services.

Community expectations – community expectations of government were highlighted, including the mismatch between what Government wanted to achieve and what the community needed or wanted.

Staff - an interesting factor highlighted was the lack of skill and experience amongst staff in regions, as well as difficulty retaining skilled staff. Although this was not explicitly linked to distance and remoteness, these could affect staff decisions to leave.

Demographics – the demographics of the region were seen to play a role in creating difficulties, examples including low incomes, low skills, ageing population etc. creating a challenging environment in which to achieve outcomes.

Management styles – this could also be linked with personalities, but authoritarian and aggressive, protective of their ‘turf’, wanting ownership and control. Risk aversion is linked to management style.

Organisational structure and culture - differing styles and corporate history affect inter-agency relationships. No clear mandate in Government about how to inter-relate and cooperate. Constant re-shuffling of departments, both internally and externally was also mentioned by three agencies.

Impact of natural disasters – mentioned by four agencies and how such events interfered with achieving goals and outcomes and working in regions.

Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding

- Always have to be careful of managing community expectations - a balance between maintaining enthusiasm, support and involvement and not creating a dependency on funding
- It is often important to try and separate policy position from personal opinion. This is best achieved by getting stuff out to a wider cross government audience e.g. before central and other agencies.
- Queensland needs to develop strategies to decentralise from SEQ.
- No real understanding in distant regional offices or head office of how ‘big’ outback Queensland is and how distance and remoteness affects the cost of doing business. Many agencies have been withdrawing staff from these areas, compounding the problems that communities face with reduced services.

- No real understanding in distant regional offices or head office of how ‘big’ outback Queensland is and how distance and remoteness affects the cost of doing business. Many agencies have been withdrawing staff from these areas, compounding the problems that communities face with reduced services.

**Q13** In the projects to which you have referred during this interview, what was done to overcome the issues and impediments and core business conflict that occurred?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Put in place opportunities &amp; arrangements that agencies cannot turn down</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>agency benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure all agencies get something out of project – fulfill a KPI, gain benefit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>agency benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate agency KPIs in outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Agency performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate each other and advocate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold discussions regarding the project in its design phase</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply art of negotiation and facilitation skills</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult fully and regularly and meet regularly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on communication protocols to cover amongst stakeholders and Ministers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Communication,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort out legislative &amp; regulatory issues up front if possible</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Legislation &amp; regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify legislation &amp; regulations that apply</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Legislation &amp; regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate leverage from project by agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mutuality &amp; complementarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify mutual KPIs &amp; align with them if possible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mutuality &amp; complementarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and work with complementarities &amp; common ground</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mutuality &amp; complementarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use ministerial influence to get things to happen</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage political support/ministerial approval early</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify authority for the project</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify decision-making capacity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify appropriate agency reps from across jurisdictions, especially where multiple regions for one agency involved</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop processes &amp; systems to solve issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on processes &amp; systems to run project</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope projects to suit agency requirements, capacity &amp; resources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain agreement on role &amp; responsibilities (who does what by when)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify &amp;/or build in outcomes to suit agencies' KPIs or general focus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set ground rules &amp; processes for co-reporting/accountability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set clear &amp; achievable goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set funding schedule</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response groupings</td>
<td>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU/ partnerships/WOG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify lead &amp; their role &amp; responsibilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify problems in projects, work out solutions together</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Resources and information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate good relationships</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate respect for other agencies -views, ideas etc.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect different work cultures &amp; practices</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept agencies’ KPIs &amp; core business needs &amp; ‘must do’s’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain understanding of other agency perspectives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure realistic timeframes to suit different agencies’ funding &amp; operational processes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on timeframes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>timeframes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAIN POINTS**

1. Responses to this question focused on project design, relationships and communication. The following factors are linked: ensuring mutual benefit for each stakeholder agency, clarity of roles and responsibility; respecting other’s positions, needs and views; and using negotiation and consultation. A key objective was to foster a spirit of cooperation and collaboration.

2. At a practical level it was about clearly defining agency roles, responsibilities, funding and timeframes, and scoping projects to match capacity and resources, and to ensure agency benefit. Building on mutuality was seen as useful.

3. Top six areas covered:
4. There were no real differences between Federal and State responses or agency focus. Two regional staff suggested using political influence to overcome issues, although this was not to be considered a preferred option. Regional areas also dominated in the discussion about demonstrating respect. Head offices identified having the more formal arrangements like MoU, partnerships and Agreements in place as well as clearly defining roles. There was no difference regarding the focus of the agencies.

KEY THEMES
Communication - was seen as very important to manage relationships both amongst agencies at the ‘grass root level’ directly involved in the project, but also within each individual agency upwards to Directors-General and Ministers, as well as across relevant units within each agency. It includes educating one another about one’s own agency perspective and needs, sharing information, holding discussions and respectfully consulting each other, including meeting regularly. It was suggested that a communication strategy is developed to keep people informed and support regular feedback. Good communication is an integral part of developing good relationships. It was highlighted that the effectiveness of communication is a responsibility of the lead agency/agencies to set up. An extension of communication includes the art of negotiation and facilitation which was identified as important to be applied when working together.

Relationships – This is considered extremely important and is directly linked to good communication. Interviewees indicated that relationships are based on trust; respect for different views and corporate culture, and also respect for the responsibilities of stakeholder agencies to deliver on their core business; cooperation; sharing of information, and professionalism. Part of relationship management requires regular discussion and consultation across all stakeholders – i.e. good communication practices. It was suggested that this needed to be staged so that issues could be worked through, prior to commencing the project.

Some agencies suggested simple things to support development of good relationships, such as serving good refreshments and allowing time for networking and remembering to thank participants.

In extreme situations, there were suggestions that parties might ‘back down’ or ‘give in’ for the sake of the project, when conflicts occur. This was seen as a negative way to achieve an outcome as it would be likely to affect future working relationships amongst the agencies concerned. Good relationships engender a cooperative working relationship, which is open and flexible, with agencies often prepared to work outside the box to get things to work for the mutual benefit of all stakeholder partners.

An important contributor to building relationships concerns agency respect of views and agency core business objectives and acceptance of agency ‘must dos’ when developing projects. It was also about listening and learning about other agencies’ perspectives and taking these into account.
Legislation and regulation – It was felt that it was important to identify legislative issues as early as possible so that agencies could accommodate requirements or negotiate solutions. Anticipating issues and being proactive about engaging relevant agencies in early discussions was seen as beneficial. Interviewees indicated there was considerable benefit to discussing and clarifying legislative interpretations and responsibilities under each relevant agency’s legislation, as it would apply in the project.

Mutuality and Complementarity and Agency benefit – these two areas are linked to relationships and communication and involve finding commonalities amongst agencies and their KPIs and the complementarities. It was considered important that all agencies would gain benefit from participating in the project. It was suggested that agencies could be encouraged to leverage from each other. It also requires agreeing how the outcomes can be reported so that kudos and agency performance outcomes are shared and acknowledged. Three agencies suggested putting in place opportunities and arrangements in a project which made it hard for agencies to turn down.

Political influence - use of senior management or Minister to apply pressure for other agencies to comply/support or act. This was seen as a negative action in the main, but one which could be followed if necessary.

Power, authority and jurisdiction – the authority behind the project was seen as most important in this respect i.e. Ministerial, Director-General endorsement or WOG initiative. This would then determine level of support and engagement, level of flexibility to adjust the project, and the level of pressure that could be applied to get things done. In addition, it was important to identify the decision-making capacity of those involved as this could create delays and problems if an agency was centralised.

Processes and systems – This was not one of the top areas discussed. However it covered a range of suggestions. These included establishing a process to manage issues and conflicts up front, to which all stakeholder agencies agree and also agreeing on the processes and systems to run the project. Flexibility is seen as important and links to negotiation and managing upwards within agencies. This is to facilitate ‘tweaking’ project/program details to have the best fit for the operational environment in the region, and to achieve the required/desired project outcomes. Several agencies suggested applying WOG processes and systems of delivery, because all agencies are then expected to have commitment. One agency also suggested that when good relationships are built, people are more prepared to work outside their normal operational boundaries.

Project design – ensuring that the project design takes account of other agencies’ roles, responsibilities and KPIs and then draws on what each agency can bring to the project. This would highlight duplication and shortfalls in resources/expertise.

In designing projects respondents indicated the importance of identifying and clarifying roles, responsibilities, resources required, a funding schedule, capabilities to be applied, timeframes and other resources, reporting and accountability procedures, prior to designing the project. This provides for accommodating different resourcing capabilities and incorporating as much as possible KPIs and outcomes for agencies that contribute to their own objectives, where possible. It is important the agency buy-in is captured early in the project’s development. It was also seen to be important to establish the objectives and outcomes from the project and checking that all agency stakeholders support them and that they are achievable. Identifying problems and working out solutions together was also noted as a useful practice.
A linked area is the suggestion by a few agencies to use formalised arrangements such as Memorandum of Understanding and partnership agreements, which can ensure clarity of roles and responsibilities and expected contribution and actions.

**Resources and information resources** – Some interviewees stated that identifying information resource needs and sources and ensuring that agencies were prepared to share crucial information was important.

**Timeframes** – Interviewees indicated that it was important to ensure timeframes set were realistic and could be fulfilled by agencies, thus agreement on timeframes should be a priority.

**Other comments providing some contextual ‘background thinking’ regarding processes and practices adopted to overcome issues and impediments and core business conflict when agencies work together**

- Sometimes there has been request to comply or request to change legislation to overcome difficulties.
- Make sure other agencies can identify and promote their success in the project.
- In relation to a particular project, as the agency could bring funds to the project that would assist other agencies deliver outcomes, this provided impetus to overcome some difficulties.
- Within the agency there are solution brokers to assist with difficulties.
- Be prepared to commit extra resources if other stakeholder agencies cannot provide them.

**Areas to be explored through the survey include relationships, respect, communication, negotiation, mutuality and agency benefit, authority, roles and responsibilities, political influence, agency capacity. 13a, b,c**

**Q14 How successful were the efforts to address the issues and impediments or core business conflict?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail of evaluation of success</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very successful</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generally successful</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varies according to people and projects</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initially hard, but gets easier</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more dependent upon quality of leadership, team involved &amp; quality of agency working relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAIN POINTS**

1. Overall, agencies felt that the processes and practices they adopted to overcome issues and impediments and core business conflict were successful, with 22 describing the processes as ‘good’, ‘very good’, ‘successful’, ‘very successful’.
2. 2 indicated that response was slow initially.
3. Three agencies felt that this area was not actually about processes to overcome issues, but about the people involved and how they worked together.
4. There were no particular differences between Head Office or Regional Office responses or between Federal and State agency responses.
5. Federal agencies tended to refer to ways in which everything could be brought together referred to as ‘document who does what and where’, ‘rules of engagement to be defined’ and the development of a processes & systems so that jointly funded projects contain ‘financial contractual reporting arrangements’.

**KEY THEMES**

**Relationships** – the quality of relationships was seen as central to how well things worked. It was inferred in statements such as ‘hard initially’ ‘beneficial in building relationships to deal with thing cooperatively’, ‘improved over time and with other projects’ ‘ working with the same people over a long period of time’. This suggests that successful engagement of agencies and completion of projects is seen as important to building relationships. The adoption of methods of approach that facilitate this is important. Three agencies actually indicated that it was relationships rather than any approach to address conflicts that mattered. There was reference to the turnover of staff damaging the strength of good relationships.

**Management and commitment of team** – interviewees highlighted the fact that much depended upon the personalities involved and commitment from the ‘team’ of stakeholders, as much as the relationships and any approaches adopted to manage issues and core business conflict.

**Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding**

- An important part of all of this process is to develop community capacity. (Federal agency)

**Confirmation of the approaches is contained in survey 13a, b, and c**

**Q15** What factors that create core business conflict should I include to be addressed in the process model that I will develop as a result of this research?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response groupings</th>
<th>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication protocols amongst agencies &amp; to the Minister</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up communication process within agencies &amp; across agencies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed protocols for informing Ministers to ensure consistency of information</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use consultation to identify issues &amp; negotiate solutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify community needs &amp; expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community &amp; clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply a community benefit test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community &amp; clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify legislation that applies &amp; where it applies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address legislative or other regulatory issues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate agency KPIS in projects where possible</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Agency Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish common goals, outcomes &amp; deliverables to benefit agencies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mutuality, complementarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage people to think from same base, share perspectives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mutuality, complementarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expertise available</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expertise required</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response groupings</td>
<td>Number of respondents comments falling into these groupings</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take account of staffing limitations in time and skill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document &amp; agree policies &amp; principles of project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead or leads identified for the project</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Power, authority and jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get projects endorsed/instigated by minister/DG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making capacity of each agency</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority behind project implementation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Power, authority, jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the rules for engagement, the process to be followed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish operational procedures for meetings, exchange of information, etc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up formal arrangements where possible, such as Agreements and Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Processes &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture all the approval processes required</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Processes and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include other approaches cited by respondents e.g. Using managers' network forum, WOG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review funding needs &amp; sources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding contribution from each agency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding cycles, criteria &amp; staging of funding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up a process to monitor project progress</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify issues &amp; develop solutions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate project continuously to ensure agencies are performing &amp; obtaining what they want from project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify agency capacity - what can and can't be done</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure agencies are clear about commitment level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalise arrangements to clearly define agency roles, responsibilities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set out key tasks of who does what and how and when</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Project design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop practices that demonstrate inter-agency respect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the reporting requirements for each agency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and accountability simplified as much as possible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree &amp; clarify process for reporting &amp; accountability, including funding accountability</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reporting &amp; accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify resource shortfalls &amp; options to fill them</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Resources and information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify information resources available</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Resources and information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify information required</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Resources and information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a process for joint funding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree timing for outcomes and deliverables</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set an agreed timeline for implementation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe agreed, including accommodating factors that can affect it</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAIN POINTS

1. The main area that was identified as needing to be clearly defined and agreed upon to reduce core business conflict relates to project design, and is linked to processes and systems set up for implementation. Project design includes practical factors such as roles and responsibilities; determining outcomes and deliverables that enable agencies to gain benefit or achieve KPIs; sources of funding a staff resources, reporting and accountability; identifying the lead agent/agencies.

2. To achieve buy-in from agencies and commitment, respondents identified agency mutuality and benefit. It was felt that if this could be identified, it contributed to ‘capturing support’ and ‘providing a strong reason’ to participate. This area includes finding common goals and including, where possible, agency’s KPIs or objectives from Government priorities.

3. Communication was also identified as an important factor to be addressed in the process model. This supports the fact that communication is fundamental to good relationships and the kind of working relationships that have been mentioned in other parts of the interview process. Communication covers within agencies as well as across-agencies and with Ministers. It includes being able to consult and negotiate also.

4. Identifying legislation that applied and any regulatory issues were also highlighted as requiring incorporation into the process model as these areas offer little room to negotiate.

5. Funding issues were also seen as being useful to discuss, including funding cycles, and arrangements for multiple funding sources for projects. Agencies that provide funds would need to account for them and may have a greater stake in a project than agencies that do not contribute funds.

6. Authority behind the project was seen to be important, whether from a Minister, DG and other Senior Staff, WOG initiative, formal Agreement or Partnership or
an MOU. The level of authority was seen to influence how hard agencies would work at overcoming issues. It was also part of decision-making.

7. It was important that there was up front documenting of issues and the process that would apply to manage conflicts and objections.

8. It was also felt that the budgeting and financial arrangements and management processes needed to be agreed and set up.

9. Other factors raised included agency capacity to participate and contribute resources, agency relationship covering the Lead and participatory agencies and the level of commitment and buy in involved.

10. In terms of specific agency focus, location or level (federal, state, local) it is noted that authority concerns were primarily from regional areas, with the exception of one head office location; all four local governments highlighted legislative and regulatory issues; reporting and accountability was predominantly spoken about by head office locations, with only one regional location raising it. Identifying issues up front was raised by Federal agencies only.

11. One respondent did not think developing a process model would be useful as agencies need to change the way they work together for such a process to be successful. A second respondent highlighted that so much depended upon level of interest of individuals and agencies have in the project and the priorities of potential participants.

Will include who is the Lead agency in the survey to determine whether this is seen as important and also a question about use of ESD.

KEY THEMES

Processes and systems- included reporting and accountability procedures in relation to implementing the project. Respondents felt that the operational processes and systems needed to be agreed and set up. This includes identifying the different reporting and accountability needs of agencies. It was suggested that mechanisms would vary for reporting and accountability and agreed processes should be set in place to reduce duplication and redundancy. It was also felt important to clarify decision-making and approval processes (links to power, authority and jurisdiction). Other processes and systems would include funding and processes to access funding, particular if funds were from multiple agencies.

Power, authority and jurisdiction – The main area relates to the level of authority that the project has for implementation, as this can be useful to encourage agencies’ support. Gaining senior staff and ministerial authority provided the best leverage to encourage stakeholder agencies to participate and to work at overcoming issues. Decision-making is part of this area and was identified as an important element to take into account. Limited local decision-making may cause considerable delays in projects. It is necessary to understand what capacity each agency has for local decision-making as this will affect timeframes. In addition, approval processes for each agency need to be identified. Interviewees indicated there is a need to identify the lead agency.

Resources – this referred to both financial resources and staff expertise and information resources. There have been previous mentions of limited skill levels and lack of consistency of staff in regions. Concurring with this, staff expertise and ability to be committed to projects were the two main factors mentioned that should be taken into account.
In terms of financial resources, sources of funding, having appropriate mechanisms in place to coordinate funding applications with cycles and then manage the accountability responsibilities were some of the areas that were mentioned.

**Relationships** – although this was not explicitly identified, the value of good relationships came through in the philosophies expressed in seeking to demonstrate respect for agency views, accommodating agencies needs and perspectives, establishing good communication and focusing on making engagement and meetings productive and pleasant experiences for participants.

**Legislative and regulatory issues** – have been discussed under other questions, including concurrency and timeframe implications. In response to this question it is considered from two angles. The first concerns identifying what Acts and regulations would apply to the project. Secondly to discuss what issues there may be arising from their application in the project in order to develop a course of action to deal with any issues.

**Project design** – is seen as an important part of reducing or managing core business conflict. Interviewees suggested roles, responsibilities, resources and timeframes were agreed and added to the project design. Respondents were keen to see the main framework for project implementation clearly defined up front. This would ensure that there were no unreal expectations of agencies. It would help to identify gaps and refine the scope and parameters of the project to suit available resources and expertise. Agencies needed to be clear about the expectation attached to their commitment. Indeed making sure that the key requirements and capacity of agencies to contribute to the project was seen as fairly important. Resource considerations dealt with earlier would also be incorporated. Funding process, formal arrangements for working together and progress monitoring are also suggested for inclusion in the project design.

**Timeframes** - included ensuring that agencies agreed to timeframes and the deliverable and outcomes that were achieved – an agreed timeline for action. Timeframes are also part of the overall clarification of who does what by when.

**Agency performance.** - In previous discussions the need to support agencies achieving their own KPIs to encourage buy in and commitment was also identified in response to this question. This included ensuring incorporating agency KPIs if possible. This is part of facilitating agency mutuality and benefit.

**Communication** – This area has been identified as important throughout this investigation and continued to be considered important. Protocols and effective mechanisms for good communication were seen as important to engage stakeholder agencies, maintain awareness of project progress, maintain consistent messages going to Ministers and managing any issues that occurred up through agencies. Interviewees felt it was important to identify issues up front and engage in consultation and negotiations for effective ways to manage or address them.

**Community expectation** - three agencies highlighted the importance of project design and implementation from the community’s perspective and the need to assess community capacity for running projects (if projects are generated by community).

**Mutuality and complementarity** – getting people to think from the same base and identify similar or the same objectives or goals is seen to be a useful activity. This would support effort to ensure all stakeholder agencies got some benefit from participating in a project. (Refer to roles, responsibilities, tasks, outcomes and timeframes).

**Policy**– respondents indicated that policy needed to be considered, and agreed upon, as it applied in the project
Alternative approaches – interviewees suggested using already established mechanism available to support agencies working together. They include using a WOG strategy, working through the Regional Managers’ Network group and using established networks to draw in participants from stakeholder agencies.

One practical suggestion was having a WOG data entry point where all agencies could go to access information on and contribute to the record keeping and reports for the projects where they were working together.

Other comments providing some contextual’ background thinking’ regarding the causal factors relating to ‘core business conflict’ that need to be taken into account in the design of the ‘process model’

- Suggestion of a government entry point/portal where data and information can be provided relating to a project
- Managers at higher levels have different levels of self awareness
- Community and industry are keen to influence what agency does.
- Possible that rotation of staff from region to head office and vice versa would ensure that an overarching viewpoint can be achieved when staff are involved in projects.
- Some programs delivered by each agency sit outside the program that is the joint initiative, yet have linkages, or desire to do so. This creates ‘exceptions’ at the local level, as they are not necessarily approaching activities as per the regional plans.
- If looking for money, need to identify agencies that have it and the person to contact and start a dialogue
- Example provided of three agencies focused on a common goal (Road safety).
- Need to think of legislation as it cuts across the project at different points.

Explore in the survey, reporting and accountability, decision-making, funding contribution and cycles, approval processes, resources, staff availability and capability, authority for the project, timelines, KPIs, common goals and mutuality, legislation, communication, agency roles and responsibilities and activities, information needs. Also worth including using ESD principles. 14a,b,c

Q17 How could ESD principles be used to reduce core business conflict?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion as to whether ESD principles could be used to reduce core business conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinion
MAIN POINTS
1. 12 agencies felt that it could be useful, but that there would be limitations due the nature of the project. There was a view that it would build on the consultation process that is supposed to be occurring anyway, but would have limits in being operationalised.
2. One agency felt it was important to include, and one agency felt it was of no use.
3. A secondary outcome of including ESD principles mentioned by a number of agencies relates to the fact that inclusion of ESD principles would overtly display what was involved in this type of consideration and make it more meaningful at the coal face, encouraging stakeholders to take a more holistic view of projects.
4. No specific difference between Federal and State agency responses or Head Office and Regional Office responses.

KEY THEMES
Useful - 12 agencies considered that it would be useful to include ESD principles, but had different reasons for why this would be the case, for example ‘to consider impact on regions’, ‘assist in decision-making’, ‘defining project outcomes’. Some agencies placed caveats on its use such as ‘standardising the interpretation’, not allowing agencies to use it as a barrier, but as a balance mechanism’, ‘not making it prescriptive in nature’.
Reduce core business conflict – four agencies felt that it could reduce core business conflict as it would improve thinking across different agency areas of responsibility and also to identify issues that could occur in any of the three areas as the project is implemented.
Limited use – 10 agencies indicated there was some value, but that application would be difficult and limited due to things such as different interpretations and lack of understanding of its meaning by some agency staff.
Probably not very effective due to difficulties applying ESD – two agencies felt that it would be too hard to apply and was of no use
Other - other comments included:
- there are mechanisms already in place through the consultation process that must be followed when working with other agencies;
- the mechanism of WOG takes this into account

Other comments providing some contextual background thinking regarding
- One agency referred to the Cabinet Handbook and consultation process and project management by Russell Higgins 'Clarifying the Exchange',
- Influenced by the degree to which agencies are required to share power in a project Level of conflict that occurs is also affected by the mandatory versus the discretionary capabilities that exist in agencies. Ministerial Portfolio Statements drive Agencies' activities.
- RPAC model, SE2026 plan which has been legislated - this will enforce the need to work together.
- Prospects for the rural and remote areas mean that tourism is being developed in response to difficulties in agriculture. In the future the restrictions on water licences will restrict the potential for regions to expand agricultural activity.
• Need to look at where community wants to be in the future, in relation to the agency's responsibilities; not always concurrence on this. Useful not to have too many people involved in projects as that makes it easier to develop a team.
• Worth investigating the 'Size, Shape and Sustainability' concept.
• The word 'sustainability' is used differently by this agency.
• When agencies apply these principles, it would be more effective if they are applied right across an agency, rather than being confined to one area of it.
APPENDIX 9
SURVEY ANALYSIS – SCORES, BAR GRAPHS AND ANALYSIS

1 Respondent spread Agreement, Impact, Occurrence relating to respondent with an economic or environmental responsibility and core business conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a.

Agencies with economic or environmental focus more likely to experience core business conflict

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that respondent with an economic or environmental focus are likely to experience core business conflict. (8 respondents, 2 rating 1). Two respondents fully agreed and one agency disagreed.
The mode was 3 with 50 percent of respondents choosing 3, a neutral or undecided position. Of the other respondents, more respondent tended to favour the impact as relatively high. One respondent considered the impact high. One respondent rated the impact as low:

The rate of occurrence of core business conflict likely between respondent with an economic core business focus and ones with an environmental core business focus

The mode is shared between 2 and 3. 3 is neutral or undecided. The remaining respondents indicate a tendency to consider that the rate of occurrence tends to be frequent, with 6 respondent scoring 2.

**SUMMARY**

There was a tendency to agree that respondent with an economic or environmental responsibility and core business were more likely to experience core business conflict than respondent that did not have this focus. The impact was considered to be high if it occurs, however 50 percent of respondents were neutral in response to this statement. In terms of occurrence, there was a tendency to consider it occurred with some degree of frequency from 6 respondents. However, this was off-set by the fact that 6 respondents were neutral. In general, Support for the view that economic and environmental respondent are more likely to experience conflict is not strong. There were no significance in responses relating to respondent role, agency focus or location in responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mode is 2. There is quite a strong tendency to agree with the statement that respondent with complementarity of core business experience less core business conflict than those without complementarity. (11 respondents, 5 scored 1). Five respondents agreed.

The level of impact on core business conflict if agencies have complementarity or linkages in core business

The mode is 2; Overall there is a tendency to consider that the level of impact of core business conflict on respondent with complementarity or concurrency of core business would be low, (7 respondents, 2 scoring 1). Two considered the impact low. One respondent indicated that the impact would be high.
The mode is 4. Respondents indicate that the level of occurrence of core business conflict is lower for respondents with complementarity of core business. Fifty percent of respondents indicated that it did not occur frequently. (8 respondents, 1 scoring 5).

**SUMMARY**

Overall there is consideration that respondents with complementarity are less likely to experience core business conflict than those that do not have complementarity. Rating indicated that the impact from core business conflict would be low if core business is complementary and the view was the tendency for occurrence of core business conflict would not be frequent.

### 3 Respondent spread relating to Agreement, Impact and Occurrence of complementarity of agency core business creating overlap and core business conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agreement that complementarity of agency core business creates overlap and duplication, difficulties claiming outcomes and leads to core business conflict

The mode is 2 with 50% of respondents choosing this rating, indicating a tendency to agree. 6 respondents scored higher than 3 indicating a tendency to disagree that complementarity creates overlap, duplication and difficulties for respondent to claim outcomes. One respondent disagreed completely:

Level of impact that complementarity of agency core business creates overlap, duplication, difficulties claiming outcomes and leads to core business conflict

The mode is 2. With 9 respondent lower than the neutral score of 3 and 6 higher than the score of 3. There is a tendency to consider that the impact to be low of complementarity creating duplication, difficulties for respondent claiming outcomes and causing core business conflict. One agency saw it as low and one saw it as high.

Level of occurrence of complementarity of core business conflict creating overlap, duplication, difficulties claiming outcomes and leading to core business conflict

The mode is 3 thus indicating a level of indecision or neutrality. However, from those respondents that indicated a position, there is a tendency to consider the level of occurrence is less frequent (5 respondents).
SUMMARY
Overall there was a general tendency to agree that complementarity of core business could create duplication of services, difficulties in claiming outcomes and lead to core business conflict. However, the impact that complementarity of core business creating overlap, duplication and difficulties for respondent to claim outcomes was generally considered low. The occurrence of overlap and duplication and difficulties claiming outcomes, due to complementarity of core business was less frequent. However 50 percent of respondents were neutral.
4a Respondent spread for Agreement regarding issues listed occurring when respondent work together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4.01</th>
<th>4.02</th>
<th>4.03</th>
<th>4.04</th>
<th>4.05</th>
<th>4.06</th>
<th>4.07</th>
<th>4.08</th>
<th>4.09</th>
<th>4.10</th>
<th>4.11</th>
<th>4.12</th>
<th>4.13</th>
<th>4.14</th>
<th>4.15</th>
<th>4.16</th>
<th>4.17</th>
<th>4.18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4.01</th>
<th>4.02</th>
<th>4.03</th>
<th>4.04</th>
<th>4.05</th>
<th>4.06</th>
<th>4.07</th>
<th>4.08</th>
<th>4.09</th>
<th>4.10</th>
<th>4.11</th>
<th>4.12</th>
<th>4.13</th>
<th>4.14</th>
<th>4.15</th>
<th>4.16</th>
<th>4.17</th>
<th>4.18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.01</th>
<th>4.02</th>
<th>4.03</th>
<th>4.04</th>
<th>4.05</th>
<th>4.06</th>
<th>4.07</th>
<th>4.08</th>
<th>4.09</th>
<th>4.10</th>
<th>4.11</th>
<th>4.12</th>
<th>4.13</th>
<th>4.14</th>
<th>4.15</th>
<th>4.16</th>
<th>4.17</th>
<th>4.18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occurrence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4a1

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree with political issues affecting respondent working together in regional development projects. (13 respondents, 2 rating 1).

4a2

The mode is 2. There is strong tendency to agree that personality issues occur amongst respondent when working together in regional development projects. (11 respondents).

4a3

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that limited decision-making capability locally occurs amongst respondent when working together in regional development projects. (13 respondents, 2 rating 1)

Three respondents agreed.
4a4

**Jurisdictional boundary overlaps and gaps issues**

The mode is 3, indicating mostly a neutral position. (7 respondents). However amongst remaining respondents, there is a tendency to disagree that jurisdictional boundaries and overlaps occur when respondent are working together in regional development projects. (6 respondents, 1 rating 5). Two respondents agreed completely:

4a5

**Performance and KPI issues**

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that rigid performance measures and demands to fulfil KPIs occur amongst respondent working together in regional development projects. (10 respondents, 3 rating 1). One respondent disagreed.

4a6

**Multiple reporting and accountability issues**

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that differing and often multiple reporting and accountability requirements occur amongst respondent working together in regional development projects. (9 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent disagreed.
4a7

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that onerous and bureaucratic processes occur amongst respondent working together in regional development projects. (11 respondents, 4 rating 1). Four respondents agreed completely.

4a8

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that project delays occur amongst respondent working together in regional development projects. (11 respondents, 3 rating 1).

4a9

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that duplication of activities occurs when respondent work together in regional development projects. (10 respondents, 1 rating 1) One respondent disagreed.
The mode is shared between 2 and 3. Despite the neutral position of 5 respondents, there is a tendency to agree that community expectations not being fulfilled occurs when respondent work together in regional development projects. (8 respondents, 3 rating 5). One respondent disagreed.

The mode is shared between 2 and 3. However there is a slightly stronger tendency to agree that uncoordinated agency activity occurs when respondent are working together in regional development projects. (7 respondents, 3 rating 1). Two respondents disagreed.

The mode is 3 indicating respondent neutrality. (8 respondents or 50%). For respondents that did not indicate a neutral position, there is a slight tendency to agree that the mismatch of funding cycles occurs when respondent work together in regional development projects. (5 respondents, 1 rating 1
The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that inflexibility in funding criteria and programs is an issue and occurs when respondent work together in regional development projects. (10 respondents, 4 rating 1).

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that legislative timeframes and concurrency requirements occur as issues amongst respondent working together in regional development. (7 respondents, 1 rating 1). However there are 5 respondents that are neutral.

The mode is 4. The opinion regarding agreement or disagreement relating to limited resources from 'poorer agency is almost equal, with slightly greater tendency to disagree. (7 respondents, 2 rating 5).
The mode is 2. There is a stronger tendency to agree that staff constantly changing due to ‘acting roles’ occurs as an issue amongst respondent working together in regional development projects. (10 respondents, 3 rating 1). Three respondents completely agreed.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree with the occurrence of risk averse management causing blockages amongst respondent working together in regional development projects. (8 respondents, 3 rating 1).

One respondent completely disagreed and three respondents completely agreed.

The mode is 1. There is strong agreement that internal silos occur as issues when respondent work together in regional development projects. (8 respondents, 5 rating 1). One respondent completely disagreed and five respondents completely agreed.
4b1

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the impact is high from political issues as an impediment to respondent working together in regional development projects. (8 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two respondents considered the impact low and two respondents considered the impact high.

4b2

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the impact is fairly high from personality difficulties amongst respondent working together in regional development projects. (11 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent considered the impact high.

4b3

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact to be high arising from limited local decision-making ability. (10 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two respondents considered the impact to be high.
4b4

Jurisdictional boundaries & overlaps

The mode is 3 indicating neutrality. (7 respondents). However in remaining respondents, there is a slightly greater tendency to consider the impact from jurisdictional boundaries and overlaps to be high due to one respondent rating this high.

4b5

Rigid performance measures & demand to fulfil KPIs

The mode is 3 indicating neutrality for most responders. (6 respondents) However amongst the remaining respondents there is a tendency to consider the impact to be low, of rigid performance measures and demand to fulfil own KPIs amongst respondent working together in regional development projects. (6 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent rated this low.

4b6

Differing & multiple reporting & accountability

The mode is 3, indicating neutrality. (6 respondents). There was a slight tendency to consider the impact high from multiple reporting and accountability requirements for respondent to be high. (5 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this high.
The mode is 3 indicating neutrality (6 respondents). In remaining respondents, there is a strong tendency to consider the impact from onerous bureaucratic processes to be high when respondent work together in regional development projects. (9 respondents, 4 rating 5).

The mode is 4. Fifty percent of respondents showed a tendency to consider that the impact of project delays to tend to be high when respondent are working together in regional development. (8 respondents).

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the impact of duplication of activities is high when respondent are working together in regional development. (7 respondents, 1 rating 5). Two respondents rated it lo and one rated it high.
Community expectations not fulfilled

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact of community expectations not being fulfilled to be high, when respondent are working together in regional development projects. (10 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two respondents rated this high.

Uncoordinated agency activity

The mode is shared between 2 and 4. However, there is a tendency to consider the impact of uncoordinated agency activity to be high when respondent work together in regional development projects. (7 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two rated this high.

Funding cycles mismatched

The mode is 3, indicating neutrality. However amongst remaining respondents there is a tendency to consider the impact of mismatched funding cycles to be low when respondent are working together in regional development, with one respondent rating this low.
The mode is 4. There is a reasonably strong tendency to consider the impact to be high resulting from inflexibility of funding criteria and programs when respondent are working together in regional development projects. (9 respondents, 2 rating 5). One respondent rated this low and two respondents rated this high.

The mode is 4 indicating a tendency to consider the impact of legislative timeframes and concurrency is high when respondent are working together in regional development projects. This is by 50% of respondents. (8 respondents).

The mode is 3 indicating neutrality. (6 respondents). From the remaining respondents, there is a tendency to consider the impact to be low arising from limited resources available from poorer respondent when
respondent are working together in regional development projects. Two respondents rated this low and one rated it high.

4b16

![Staff changes due to 'acting' roles](chart)

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the impact of staff changes due to acting roles as high when respondent work together in regional development projects. (8 respondents, 3 rating 5). Five respondents rated this high.

4b17

![Risk averse management](chart)

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider that the impact of risk-averse management is high when respondent work together in regional development projects. (10 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this high.

4b18

![Internal agency silos](chart)

The mode is 4. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider the impact of internal agency silos to be high when respondent work together in regional development projects. (9 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two respondents rated this high.
4c1

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider that the occurrence of political issues (agendas, interference etc.) is frequent. (11 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this always.

4c2

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider that the occurrence of personality issues when respondent work together in regional development projects is frequent. (10 respondents).

4c3

The mode is 4. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider the occurrence of decision-making limitations when respondent work together being frequent. (9 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this always.
The mode is 3, indicating neutrality. (6 respondents). The remaining respondents indicated a stronger tendency to consider that the occurrence of jurisdictional boundaries gaps and overlaps was frequent. (6 respondents). One respondent rated this always.

The mode is 3 indicating neutrality (7 respondents). The remaining respondents indicated a slight tendency to consider rigid performance measures and demand to fulfil KPIs to occur infrequently. (5 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent rated this never.

The mode is 4. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider the differing and multiple reporting and accountability requirements to occur frequently. (7 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated never and one respondent rated always.
The mode is 3 indicating neutrality. This is by 50% of respondents. (8 respondents). Of the remaining respondents, there is a tendency to consider that onerous and bureaucratic processes occur frequently, with two respondents rating this always.

The mode is 4. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider that project delays occur frequently when respondent work together in regional development projects. One respondent rated always.

The mode is 8. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider the occurrence of duplication of activities to be infrequent. (8 respondents).
The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider that the occurrence of community expectations not being fulfilled occurs frequently. (7 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this always.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider that uncoordinated agency activity occurs frequently. (7 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this always.

The mode is shared between 2 and 3. There is a slightly stronger tendency to consider that mismatched funding cycles occur less frequently. (6 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent rated this never and one rated this always.
The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider that the inflexibility of funding criteria and programs occurs frequently. (7 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this always.

The mode is 3 with 50% of respondents indicating neutrality. (8 respondents). Opinion is split between frequent and less frequent in remaining respondents.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider that 'limited resources from 'poorer’ agencies' to support projects is infrequent. (8 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent rated never:
The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider that staff changes due to ‘acting’ roles occur frequently when respondent work together in regional development projects. (7 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two respondents rated this always.

4c17

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider that the occurrence of risk averse management is frequent when respondent are working together. (8 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this always.

4c18

The mode is 2. There is a quite a strong tendency to consider that issues with internal agency silos occur frequently when respondent are working together in regional development projects. (8 respondents, 3 rating 5). Three rated this always.
SUMMARY
With the exception of two issues, generally respondents agreed that each of the listed impediments and issues occurred when respondent worked together. One respondent rated them all 1. This respondent was in management in a regional office with an agency that had an economic and environmental focus. The two areas with which respondents indicated a tendency to disagree were jurisdictional boundaries and overlaps, and limited resources from ‘poorer’ respondent. The strongest agreement was for political factors such as agendas, interference and political differences; personality and decision-making. Fifty percent of respondents rated mismatch funding cycles neutrally at three.

Most of the listed issues and impediments respondents rated as tending to have a high impact, with the highest factors being personality difficulties; limited decision-making locally; community expectations; and risk averse management. Two respondents considered most areas not to have a high impact. Areas with lower rating of impact included: ‘rigid performance measures’ and ‘demand to fulfil KPIs’; ‘duplication of activities’; ‘mismatch of funding cycles’ and ‘limitations to access resources from ‘poorer’ agencies’.

Responses varied in relation to the level of occurrence of the factors, with the most frequent being political issues; personality difficulties; and project delays. Onerous bureaucracy and legislative timeframes and concurrency had higher neutral ratings.

The most significant factors in relation to the research problem are ‘political issues, agendas, interference, and party differences’; ‘personality difficulties’; ‘decision-making limitations’; ‘project delays’; ‘risk-averse management’; and ‘internal agency silos’.

Q 5 Influences of core business conflict on relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.01</th>
<th>5.02</th>
<th>5.03</th>
<th>5.04</th>
<th>5.05</th>
<th>5.06</th>
<th>5.01</th>
<th>5.02</th>
<th>5.03</th>
<th>5.04</th>
<th>5.05</th>
<th>5.06</th>
<th>5.01</th>
<th>5.02</th>
<th>5.03</th>
<th>5.04</th>
<th>5.05</th>
<th>5.06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Occur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that degradation and loss of effectiveness of relationships is one of the main influences of core business conflict on the relationship of respondent working together. (8 respondents with 2 scoring 1). Five indicated a tendency to disagree with this view, but no one completely disagreed.

The mode is 2. There is a quite a strong tendency to agree that a reduction in cooperation is one of the influences of core business conflict on relationships of respondent when working together. (9 respondents with 2 rating 1). One respondent disagreed completely and two agreed completely.

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that poor communication is one of the influences of core business conflict when respondent work together. (11 respondents, with 3 scoring 1). Three respondents agreed completely.
Agencies focus on own benefit

The mode is 2. There is quite a strong tendency to agree with respondent focusing on their own benefit being one of the influences of core business conflict when respondent work together. (11 respondents, 5 of whom scored 1). Only one respondent totally disagreed and five completely agreed.

Reduce ability to negotiate

The mode is shared between 2 and 3. Fifty percent demonstrate a general tendency to agree. The other 50 percent comprise 5 respondents in a neutral position of 3, and a three rating four towards disagreement.

Reluctance to share information
The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that there is a reluctance to share information as an influence of core business conflict on respondent working relationships. (10 respondents, 3 rating 1). Three respondents totally agreed.

5b1

![Impact level of degrading quality of relationship](image)

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider that the impact of degraded quality and effectiveness of relationships amongst respondent working together to be high. One respondent rated this high.

5b2

![Impact level reduction of cooperation](image)

The mode is 4. Nine out of the 16 respondents had a tendency to consider the impact of reduction in cooperation was high. One respondent considered impact to be low.

5b3

![Impact level of poor communication](image)

The mode is 4. There is a stronger tendency to consider that the impact of poor communication is high. (10 respondents with 3 rating it 5). There was no suggestion that the impact of poor communication was low. Six respondents indicated a neutral response rating three.
The mode is 3 and 4. Whilst overall there is a tendency for respondents to consider that the impact from respondent focusing on their own benefit is high, (9 respondents with 4 scoring 4), five respondents are neutral, rating 3. Four respondents rated this high.

The mode is 4. The majority of respondents indicated a tendency to consider the impact of a reduced ability to negotiate is high. (11 respondents) One considered the impact low and one considered the impact high.
The mode is 4. Fifty percent of respondents considered the impact of reluctance to share information to be high (8, 1 rating 5). One respondent indicated that the impact was low and one indicated it was high.

5c1

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the occurrence of degraded relationships is frequent (8 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent indicated it was high.

5c2

The mode is 2. There is a tendency that respondents consider the lack of desire to cooperate to occur infrequently (8 respondents). Two respondents indicated that it always occurs.

5c3

The mode is 4. There is a tendency for respondents to consider the level of occurrence of poor communication occurs frequently (9 respondents with 1 scoring 5). One respondent indicated that it occurs always.
The mode is shared between 2 and 3. There is a tendency to consider that respondent focusing on their own benefit from a project occurs frequently (6 respondents, 3 rating 5). Five respondents were neutral; scoring three and three respondents rated this always.

The mode is 3, with 50 percent rating 3. There is a tendency in the remaining respondents to consider the occurrence of reduced ability to negotiate to be frequent. (5 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this always.

The mode is 3; however there is a tendency from the remaining respondents to indicate that the level of occurrence of reluctance to share information was frequent (5 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this always.
SUMMARY
There is general agreement of the selected factors having an influence on agency relationships.

Strongest agreement existed for respondents ‘focusing on their own benefit’ with 11 respondent tending to agree and 5 of these totally agreeing. ‘Poor communication’ had agreement from 11 with 3 respondents scoring it 1. There was a tendency to agree regarding ‘reluctance to share information’ from 10 respondents, with 3 scoring 1.

In general, the selected factors were considered to have a high impact. One agency was neutral on all. In terms of impact 11 respondents identified the ‘reduced ability to negotiate’ as tending to be high with 1 respondent rating it high. 10 respondents rated ‘poor communication’ impact as tending to be high. 1 respondent scored it high.

Impact of ‘respondents focusing on their own benefit’ was considered to tend towards high, with 4 respondents scoring it 5. However 5 scored it neutral. ‘Degraded and less effective relationships’, ‘respondents focusing on their own benefit’ and sharing of information were noticeable in that 5 or more respondents were undecided.

Responses were not strongly supportive of frequency of occurrence. In relation to level of occurrence, ‘poor communication’ had the highest number (9), of respondents identifying it as occurring more frequently with 1 rating it 5. ‘Respondents focusing on their own benefit’ was also identified as occurring more frequently by 6 respondents, 3 of whom rated it 5. However, 5 rated it neutral.

There was a strong neutral position by 8 respondents regarding the occurrence of ‘reduced ability to negotiate’. An interesting evaluation relating to rate of occurrence concerned ‘reduced cooperation’. It was considered to occur less often and was the only factor rated as occurring less often.

‘Poor communication,’ ‘focusing on agency own benefit’ and ‘reduced cooperation’ are the influences that most respondents supported. Poor communication’ is seen as having the greatest impact by the higher proportion of respondents. ‘Respondent focusing on their own benefit’ is the most common occurrence. This illustrates the strong commitment to deliver on core business.

‘Results in poor communication’ and ‘degrades relationships’ were the significant factors specifically in relation to the research problem. Significant negative views showing 50 percent rating occurrence as not frequent were for ‘reduces cooperation and collaboration’, and for ‘reduces the ability to negotiate’
Q 6 Effects of complementarity of core business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mode is 2. Fifty percent of respondents nominated this value. There is a fairly strong tendency to agree that complementarity of agency core business supports quality and effectiveness of relationships. One respondent completely agreed.
Complementarity of agencies’ core business encourages cooperation & collaboration

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that complementarity of agency core business encourages cooperation and collaboration. (11 respondents, 2 scoring 1). Two respondents completely agreed.

Complementarity of agencies’ core business makes communication easier

The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that complementarity of agency core business makes communication easier. (15 respondents, 3 scoring 1) One agency tended to disagree. Three completely agreed.
Complementarity of agencies’ core business facilitates information sharing

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that complementarity of agency core business facilitates information sharing (13 respondents, 3 scoring 1). One respondent tended to disagree and three completely agreed.

Complementarity of agencies’ core business helps agencies to work towards mutual benefit and leverage off each other

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that complementarity of agency core business helps respondent to work towards mutual benefit and leverage off each other. (13 respondents, 2 scoring 1) Two completely agreed.
Complementarity of agencies’ core business improves the ability to negotiate

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency for respondent to agree that complementarity of agency core business improves the ability to negotiate. (13 respondents, 2 rating 1). Two completely agreed.

The impact of complementarity of agencies’ core business on the quality and effectiveness of relationships

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency for respondent to consider complementarity of agency core business has quite a high impact on quality and effectiveness of relationships. (10 respondents, 2 rating 5) One respondent considered the impact low, two considered it high.

The impact of complementarity of agencies’ core business on encouraging cooperation and collaboration

The mode is 4. There is a tendency for more than 50 percent (9 respondents, 2 rating 5) to consider that the impact of complementarity of agency core business on encouraging cooperation and collaboration is quite high. One rated it low. Two rated it high.
The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency for respondent to consider the impact of complementarity of agency core business on making communication easier to be high, (11 respondents, 3 rating it 5). Three rated this high.

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact of complementarity of agency core business on information sharing to be high. (12 respondents, 3 rating it 5). Three rated this high.

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency for respondent to consider the impact of complementarity of agency core business on working towards mutual benefit and leverage to be high. (11 respondents, 3 rating it 5). Three rated this high.
The impact of complementarity of agencies’ core business on improving the ability to negotiate

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency amongst respondent to consider the impact of complementarity of agency core business on improving the ability to negotiate to be high. (12 respondents, 1 rating it 5). One rated this high.

The rate of occurrence of complementarity of agencies’ core business influencing the quality and effectiveness of relationships

The mode is 4. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of the complementarity of agency core business influencing the quality and effectiveness of relationships as being frequent. (9 respondents, 1 scoring 5). Six respondents rated this 3, indicating neutrality. One indicated this was always.

The rate of occurrence of complementarity of agencies’ core business conflict influencing cooperation and collaboration

The mode is 4. There is a tendency for respondent to consider that the rate of occurrence of complementarity of agency core business conflict influencing cooperation and collaboration is frequent. (11 respondents, 2 rating this 5). Two respondent indicated always.
The rate of occurrence of complementarity of agencies’ core business making communication easier.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency for respondents to consider the rate of occurrence to be frequent, of complementarity of agency core business making communication easier. (11 respondents, 1 scoring 5). One agency indicated always.

The rate of occurrence of complementarity of agencies’ core business influencing information sharing.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency for respondent to consider the rate of occurrence to be frequent, of complementarity of respondent core business influencing information sharing. (10 respondents, 2 rating this 5). Two respondents rated this always.

The rate of occurrence of complementarity of agencies’ core business influencing working towards mutual benefit and leverage.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence as high, of complementarity of agency core business influencing working towards mutual benefit and leverage (10 respondents, 2 rating
this 5). However, it is notable that four respondent consider that the rate of occurrence is infrequent. This would be the highest score for the negative across all the areas considered. Two respondents rated this always.

6c6

The rate of occurrence of complementarity of agencies’ core business influencing the ability to negotiate

The mode is 4. There is quite a strong tendency for respondent to consider the rate of occurrence to tend to be frequent, of complementarity of agency core business influencing the ability to negotiate. (11 respondents, 1 rating 5) One respondent rated this always.

**SUMMARY**

Generally respondents agreed that complementarity of agency core business supported ‘easier communication’ (15 respondents), facilitated information sharing, helped to ‘develop mutual benefit’ and ‘leveraging’ and ‘improved the ability to negotiate’ (13 respondents in each case). There wasn’t as strong agreement for supporting ‘quality and effective relationships’ (10 respondents).

Generally respondents considered the impact of complementarity to be fairly high on ‘making communication easier’ (11 respondents); encouraging information sharing (12 respondents) and supporting ‘mutual benefit and leverage’. The lowest scored area was ‘cooperation and collaboration’.

Generally the surveys indicated that that two areas had a higher rate of occurrence of the complementarity of agency core business affecting or influencing them. The first was ‘cooperation and collaboration’ (11 respondents), and the second, ‘easier communication’ (11 respondents).

Survey question 6a, b and c findings highlighted that complementarity of agency core business facilitated ‘easier communication’, ‘information sharing’, ‘mutual benefit and leverage’ and ‘assisted negotiation’. Of these areas ‘information sharing’, ‘communication and mutual benefit and leverage’ were seen to experience the greatest impact from complementarity. Lastly the most frequent rate of occurrence of areas influenced by complementarity included ‘cooperation and collaboration’ and ‘communication’ (11 respondents in each case).

All areas were significant in terms of the research problem.
The mode is 2. There is a tendency for respondents to agree that the fundamental core business conflict relating to philosophical/ideological conflict occurs (7 respondents, 1 rating it 1). One respondent did not agree and one agreed completely.
7a2

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to disagree that the economic/environment conflict occurs as part of fundamental core business conflict. (9 respondents, 1 rating 5). Two respondents totally agreed completely and one disagreed completely.

7a3

The mode is 3. 5 respondents chose the neutral position. There was almost an equal distribution either side of the neutral position (6 respondents tended to agree, 5 tended to disagree). Two respondents rated completely agree and one respondent rated disagree.

7a4

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to disagree with the fundamental core business conflict relating to differing interpretation of key roles amongst respondent with complementarity of core business. (9 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent agreed completely and one disagreed completely.
**7b1**

The mode is 3, indicating neutrality. 6 respondents chose this rating. However, amongst the remaining respondents there was a tendency to consider that the impact from philosophical/ideological conflicts would be high. (6 respondents, 2 rating it 5). Two respondents rated this high.

**7b2**

The mode is 4. There is a stronger tendency to consider that the impact from the economic/environmental fundamental core business conflict would be high. (11 respondents, 4 rating it 5). Four rated this high.

**7b3**

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider that the impact of the interpretation of Acts and regulations as a fundamental core business conflict would be high. (11 respondents, 2 rating it 5). Two rated this high.
The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the impact of differing interpretations of roles amongst respondent with complementarity of core business as a fundamental core business conflict, to be high. 1 respondent felt this was low. Of note was that no respondents chose a neutral position.

The mode is 3 indicating a neutral position by six respondents. Opinion is then evenly split regarding the level of occurrence of philosophical/ideological conflicts as a fundamental core business conflict. One respondent indicated never and one indicated always.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider the level of occurrence of economic/environment conflict to be low. (8 respondents).
The mode is 2. There is a stronger tendency to consider the level of occurrence of fundamental core business conflict through interpretation of Acts and regulations as low. (9 respondents, 2 rating 1). Two respondents rated this as never occurring. Two respondents rated this as always occurring.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider the level of occurrence of fundamental core business conflict relating to differing interpretation of key roles amongst respondent with complementarity of core business, to be low. One (10 respondents, 1 rating 1).

SUMMARY

Survey questions 7a, b and c looked at four areas of potential fundamental core business conflict. These are dominant categories captured from the interview discussions. However, it should be noted that interviewees indicated limited experience of fundamental core business conflict. The categories are ‘philosophical/ideological conflict’; ‘economic versus environmental focus agency clash’; ‘conflict in interpretation of Acts and regulations’; and the ‘different interpretation of key roles and objectives by agency that had complementary core business’.

There was not a strong agreement for ‘philosophical/ideological fundamental core business conflict’, nor a strong view regarding its level of impact if it occurs. Level of occurrence was inconclusive with a balanced spread between never and always across a neutral position held by 6 respondents.

There was a definite disagreement regarding economic versus environmental conflict as a fundamental core business conflict; however respondents’ view was that if it occurred, its impact was considered to be high. The level of occurrence was considered to not be often.

There was only a slightly stronger level of agreement of fundamental core business conflict based on ‘differing interpretations of Acts and regulations’ and 5 respondents rated this neutral. Respondents consider the impact to tend to be high if it occurred, but considered occurrence infrequent.

There was strong disagreement regarding the fundamental core business conflict arising from ‘differing interpretation of roles by respondent with complimentarity of core business’. Respondents generally considered that if this occurred, the impact would tend to be high. Respondents generally considered the rate of occurrence was infrequent.
No results are significant specifically for the research problem, which would include 50 percent of respondents having agreement, and considering impact to be high and occurrence to tend to be frequent.
8a1

Functional operational core business conflict - due to internal structures (spread of responsibilities of internal units meaning agencies may have to deal with several units)

The mode is 2. There is a general tendency to agree that internal structures are a source of functional operational core business conflict. (9 respondents, 3 rating 1). Three respondents completely agreed.

8a2

Functional operational core business conflict - agency focus on own KPI

The mode is 2. There is quite a strong tendency to agree that agency focus on their own KPIs is a functional operational core business conflict. (9 respondents, 4 rating 1). One agency completely disagreed and four agencies completely agreed.

8a3

Functional operational core business conflict - reluctance to commit due to limitations of resources

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that reluctance to commit resources due to resource limitations in agencies is a functional operational core business conflict. (11 respondents, 4 rating 1). Four respondents agreed completely.
The mode is 2. There is quite a strong tendency to agree that strategic plans of agencies limit ability to undertake new projects or provide discretionary funding is a functional operational core business conflict. (10 respondents, 2 rating 1). One respondent completely disagreed and four completely agreed.

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that inflexible funding and program criteria is a functional operational core business conflict. (11 respondents, 2 rating 1). One respondent completely disagreed and two completely agree.

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that mismatched funding cycles are a functional operational core business conflict. (10 respondents, 3 rating 1). One respondent completely disagreed and three completely agree.
The mode is 2. There is a fairly strong tendency to agree that limited capacity for local decision-making is a functional operational core business conflict. (9 respondents, 4 rating 1). One respondent completely disagreed and four completely agreed.

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that lengthy approval processes are a functional operational core business conflict. (10 respondents, 4 rating 1). Four respondents completely agreed.

The mode is 1. There is a strong tendency to agree that onerous reporting and accountability is a functional operational core business conflict. (9 respondents, 5 rating 1). One respondent disagreed and five completely agreed.
Functional operational core business conflict - timeframes for achieving milestones & outcomes

The mode is 2. There is a fairly strong tendency to agree that timeframes for milestones and outcomes are a functional operational core business conflict. (9 respondents, 3 rating 1). Four respondents rated neutral at three. Three respondents completely agreed.

Functional operational core business conflict - staff availability, including issue of acting roles

The mode is 4. There is still a slight tendency to agree that staff availability and the issue of acting roles is a functional/operational core business conflict. (6 respondents, 2 rating 1). Two respondents completely agreed.

Functional operational core business conflict - staff skills & experience relating to regional needs

The mode is shared between 2 and 3. Five respondents were neutral. However there is still a tendency to agree that staff skills and experience relating to regional needs is a functional operational core business issue. (7 respondents, 2 rating 1) One agency completely disagreed and two completely agreed.
Functional operational core business conflict - duplication & overlap, particularly agencies with similar programs

The mode is 4. There is almost equal spread of opinion that duplication and overlap, particularly with respondent with similar programs, is a functional operational core business conflict. There is a slight tendency to agree. (6 respondents, 4 rating 1). Four respondents completely agreed and one completely disagreed.

Functional operational core business conflict - due to internal structures (spread of responsibilities of internal units meaning agencies may have to deal with several units)

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the level of impact of internal structures creating conflict is fairly high. (8 respondents, 1 rating 5). One agency indicated the impact would be low and one indicated the impact would be high.

Functional operational core business conflict - level of impact from agencies focusing on their own KPIs

The mode is shared between 2 and 4. Four respondents also rated a 3, indicating neutrality. There was a slight tendency to consider the level of impact from agencies focusing on their own KPIs on their relationships as fairly high. (6 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent considered it high.
The mode is 4. There was a greater tendency to rate the impact of reluctance to commit resources due to resource limitations as fairly high, with one indicating that the impact would be low. (8 respondents, 1 rating a 5). One considered it low and one considered it high.

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the level of impact as fairly high, relating to limitations of agency strategic plans to enable support for project and provision of funds. (12 respondents). No respondent rated a just low or high.

The mode is 4. There is tendency to consider the impact to be fairly high, from inflexibility of programs and funding criteria. (9 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated the impact low and one rated this high.
The mode is 4, with a tendency to consider the impact to be fairly high, from mismatched funding cycles. (8 respondents, 3 rating a 5). One respondent rated the impact as low and three rated it as high.

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider that the impact to be fairly high, from limited decision-making capacity locally (11 respondents, 2 rating 5). One respondent considered the impact to be low and two considered it high.

The mode is 4. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider the impact to be fairly high, from lengthy approval processes. (9 respondents, 3 rating a 5). Two respondents considered it low and three considered it high.
There is no clear view as to whether the level of impact from onerous and different reporting and accountability requirements is high or low. Opinions are shared equally for low and high impact and also a neutral position.

The mode is 4. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider the impact as fairly high, from difficulty with timeframes for achieving outcomes and milestones. (10 respondents, 2 rating a 5). Two considered this high.

The mode was 4. There is a stronger tendency to consider the impact as high relating to staff availability and staff changes occurring, due to ‘acting’ roles. (9 respondents). One respondent did not rate this.
The mode was 4. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider the impact as fairly high, of staff skills and experience being able to relate to regional needs. (8 respondents). The strength of the tendency is diluted by the fact that 5 respondents were neutral in their choice and one respondent did not rate this.

There is a slightly greater tendency to consider the impact fairly high in relation to duplication and overlap of services, particularly with respondent having similar programs. (6 respondents, 2 rating 5). One respondent did not rate this. Two rated this high and one rated this low.

The mode is 4. There is a slightly greater tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of conflict due to internal structures of respondent to occur frequently. (7 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent did not rate this.
The mode is shared between 3 and 4. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of each agency focusing on their own KPIs to occur frequently. (7 respondents, 1 rating a 5). However, 6 rated this neutral. One respondent did not rate this and one rated this as always.

The mode is 3. This indicates neutrality amongst almost 50 percent of respondents. Amongst the remaining respondents, there is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of the reluctance of respondent to make commitments due to limitations of resources, as frequent. One respondent did not rate this and one rated this as always.

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the occurrence for agency strategic plans to restrict ability to take on new projects or provide discretionary budget to be frequent. (12 respondents, 1 rating a 5). One respondent did not rate this and one rated this always.
The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the occurrence for conflict arising from the inflexibility of program and funding criteria to be frequent. (8 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent did not rate this, one rated it never and one rated it always.

The mode is 4. However the opinion is almost equally split between considering the occurrence of conflict due to mismatched funding cycles to be infrequent (5 respondents, 1 rating 1) and frequent (7 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent did not rate this, one rated it never and one rated it always.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence to be frequent, of conflict over limited capacity for local decision-making. (7 respondents, 2 rating a 5) to be frequent. One respondent did not rate this and two respondents rated this always.
The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of lengthy approval processes. (8 respondents, 2 rating a 5) to be frequent. One respondent did not rate this. Two respondents rated this always.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the frequency of occurrence of onerous and different reporting and accountability needs across respondent to be frequent. (8 respondents, 3 rating a 5). One respondent did not rate this. One respondent rated this never and three rated this always.

The mode is 3. Despite 6 respondents indicating a neutral position, there is still a tendency to consider that occurrence of conflict caused by inability to achieve timeframes thus affecting outcomes and milestones. (7 respondents, 2 rating a 5) to be frequent. One respondent did not rate this and two indicated always.
The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the occurrence of conflict due to limitations to staff availability and staff in ‘acting’ roles to be frequent (10 respondents). One respondent did not rate this.

There is an equal opinion regarding the rate of occurrence of conflict due to staff skills and experience relating to regional needs spread across tendency to consider the occurrence infrequent and frequent, with the same number of respondents rating this neutral. One respondent did not rate this.

The mode is 2. There is a slightly stronger tendency to consider that the occurrence is infrequent, of conflict due to duplication and overlap of services, particularly between respondent with similar programs (7 respondents, with 5 respondents, 2 rating 5 for frequent occurrence). One respondent did not rate this. Two respondents rated this always.
SUMMARY

Overall, respondents indicated agreement with the dominant functional/operational core business conflicts identified through the interview process occurred when respondent worked together. ‘Overlap and duplication, particularly respondent with complementarity of core business, had an equal number of respondents supporting agreement and disagreement, but still a tendency to agree due to four respondents rating 1. The largest number of respondents agreed with ‘Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects and discretionary budget’ (12 respondents, four rating ‘one’), with ‘onerous and different reporting and accounting’ attracting the highest number rating one for agreement (5 respondents). Staff skills and experience attracted a high neutral rating by five respondents.

Generally, respondents indicated that the impact of these factors, when they occurred, was high. However, ‘Reporting and accountability is onerous and differs across agencies’ attracted equal number indicating impact tending to be high or low. ‘Overlap and duplication, particularly amongst respondent with similar programs and services’ had only a slightly stronger tendency to consider impact high as the mode extended equally across rating two, three and four.

The level of occurrence, however, did not contain a similar convergence of views. ‘Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects and discretionary budget’ attracted the greatest number of respondents rating the occurrence as frequent (12, with one rating ‘five’). Higher neutral ratings were made for some factors, including ‘Reluctance to make commitments due to limitation of resources’ (seven rated this neutral), and ‘respondent focus on own KPIs’ and ‘timeframes to achieve outcomes and milestones both having six respondents rate them neutrally. More respondents indicated a tendency for ‘duplication and overlap of services, particularly respondent with similar programs and services’ to occur less frequently, but there was a slightly greater tendency to consider this to occur frequently due to two respondents rating this five or ‘always’.

The most significant factors relating to the research issue that are functional/operational core business conflicts relate to ‘Agency strategic plan allows little room for new projects or discretionary budget’, ‘program and funding criteria are inflexible’, and ‘approval processes are lengthy’. Staff problems are obviously an issue (availability, acting roles and capabilities), but respondents appear ambivalent about rating skills and experience limitations as demonstrated by neutral ratings.
Q9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9.01</th>
<th>9.02</th>
<th>9.03</th>
<th>9.04</th>
<th>9.05</th>
<th>9.06</th>
<th>9.07</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Occur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9a1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that core business conflict reduces outcomes in projects. (8 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent agreed completely and one disagreed completely.

9a2

The mode is 2. There is a stronger tendency to agree that core business conflict slows down or stops projects. Two respondents agreed.
Core business conflict affect project implementation & outcomes - creating difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframe allocated

The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that core business conflict affects achieving timeframes in projects. (12 respondents, 3 rating 1) Three respondents completely agreed.

Core business conflict affect project implementation & outcomes - inefficient implementation

The mode is shared between 2 and 3. Five respondents rated this neutral. However amongst the remaining respondents there is still a fairly strong tendency to agree that core business conflict causes inefficient implementation of projects. (9 respondents, 4 rating 1). Four respondents agreed.

Core business conflict affect project implementation & outcomes - resources/time wasted resolving issues

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that core business conflict affects project implementation by causing resources and time to be wasted to resolve issues. (10 respondents, 4 rating 1). Four respondents completely agreed and one completely disagreed.
The mode is 3, the neutral position. However almost 50% of the other respondents indicate a tendency to agree that core business conflict can affect projects through respondent withdrawing support and effort. (9 respondents, 4 rating 1). Four respondents agreed.

The mode is 3, the neutral position with almost 50% of respondents taking this view. However, in the remaining respondents there is a tendency to agree that core business conflict can increase the overall ‘cost’ of projects (time, funds, personnel). (6 respondents, 2 rating 1). Two respondents agreed.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the impact of core business conflict on projects to be higher, from reduced outcomes. (7 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent considered it high.
The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact to be higher from core business conflict causing projects to slow down or stop. (11 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent considered it high and one considered it low.

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact of core business conflict on projects relating to ability to achieve timeframes to be high. (12 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent considered it high.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider that the impact of core business conflict on projects of implementation inefficiencies is higher. (11 respondents, 3 rating it 5). Three respondents considered it high.
The mode is 4. The impact of is considered to tend toward high for resource/time wasting to resolve issues in projects. (10 respondents, 3 rating 5). Three respondents rated this high.

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to rate the impact as high of withdrawal of support and effort on projects. (11 respondents, 4 rating 5). Four respondents rated this high and one rated it low.

The mode is shared between 3 and 4. 3 is neutral (6 respondents). However amongst the remaining respondents there is a slightly stronger tendency to consider the impact of increase in overall ‘cost’ (people, funds, time) to be high on projects. (7 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this high and one rated it low.
The mode is 3 and indicates neutrality. However there is a slightly stronger tendency to consider the occurrence to be frequent, of reduced outcomes due to core business conflict. One respondent rated this always.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to rate the occurrence of slowed or stopped projects as frequent. (9 respondents). One respondent declined to rate this.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the occurrence of inability to meet timeframes on project outcomes as being frequent. (10 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated it always. One respondent declined to rate this.
The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of inefficient implementation to be frequent. (8 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this always. One respondent declined to rate this.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of core business conflict on project outcomes to be limited, in relation to resources/time wasted to resolve issues. (6 respondents). One respondent declined to rate this.

The mode is shared between 3 and 4. There is an equal number of respondents indicating more and less frequent, with a slightly stronger view that it is less frequent, due to one respondent rating this one. One respondent rated this never. One respondent declined to rate this.
The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of core business conflict to be limited, that results in increased ‘cost’ (funds, time, personnel). (7 respondents, 2 rating 1). Two respondents rated this as never. Two respondents rated this as always. One respondent declined to rate this.

**SUMMARY**

Overall, there is a general tendency to agree that the impacts listed above affect project implementation and outcomes. The lowest agreement is for ‘increase in the overall cost of projects’, which has almost 50 percent of respondents indicating a neutral position. The highest level of agreement is for ‘difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframe’ (12 respondents, one rating ‘one’) and ‘resources and time wasted on resolving issues’ (10 respondents, four rating ‘one’). One respondent rated complete agreement for all.

One agency declined to rate the level of impact. However, in general, if the factors being examined occurred, there is a tendency to consider the impact on project implementation and outcomes as high. One respondent considered they were all low and one agency returned a neutral response for all. The areas identified with the highest impact were: ‘creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated’ (12 respondents, one rating ‘five’); ‘withdrawal of support and consequently effort, by some stakeholders’ (11 respondents, four rating ‘five’); ‘implementation is inefficient’ (11 respondents, three rating ‘five’); and ‘slows down or stops projects’ (11 respondents, one rating ‘five’). Six respondents indicated a neutral response for ‘increase in overall cost of projects’, the highest neutral rating of all factors.

One respondent declined to rate the level of occurrence, except for the first factor ‘reduces outcomes’ for which they returned a neutral response. Generally, opinion regarding occurrence of the factors were mixed. The areas rated with a strong tendency to be frequent were: ‘creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated’ (10 respondents, one rating ‘five’) and ‘slows down or stops projects’ (nine respondents). ‘Reduces outcomes’ attracted a neutral rating of 6, but amongst the remaining respondents there is a tendency to consider this to occur frequently. Two effects were rated as infrequent, being ‘resources and time wasted on resolving issues’ and ‘increase the overall ‘cost’ of the project (time, funds and personnel effort).

The most significant factors relating to the research issue are that core business conflict ‘slows down or stops projects’; ‘creates difficulties to achieve deliverables in the timeframes allocated’; and that ‘implementation is inefficient’.
Core business conflict affects the image of the Government

- Government seen to be uncoordinated

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that core business conflict affects the image of Government, which is seen to be uncoordinated. (8 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent disagreed completely, three agreed completely and one respondent declined to rate this question.
Core business conflict affects the image of the Government - Government seen to be wasting resources

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that core business conflict affects the image of Government which is seen to be wasting resources. (9 respondents, 3 rating 5). Three respondents agreed and three respondents disagreed. One respondent declined to rate this question.

Core business conflict affects the image of the Government - Government seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities

The mode is shared across agree, neutral and disagree. (4 agree completely, 4 rated neutral, 4 disagree completely) This is unique in this survey! However, there is a tendency to disagree that core business conflict affects the image of Government, which is seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities. (6 respondents, 4 rating 5). Four respondents agree. Four respondents disagree. One respondent declined to rate this question.

Core business conflict affects the image of the Government - Government seen to be concerned with process, not outcomes & benefits

The mode is shared between 2 and 3. There is a tendency to disagree that the core business conflict affects the image of Government, which is seen to be concerned with processes, not outcomes. (6 respondents, 3 rating 5). Three respondents disagreed completely. One respondent agreed completely.
Core business conflict affects the image of Government - level of impact if Government seen to be uncoordinated

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the impact if Government is considered to be uncoordinated is high. (9 respondents, 3 rating 5). Three respondents rated this low and three respondents rated this high.

Core business conflict affects the image of Government - level of impact if Government seen to be wasting resources

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact of Government seen to be wasting resources as high. (11, 4 rating it 5). One respondent rated it low. Four respondents rated it high.

Core business conflict affects the image of Government - level of impact if government seen to be failing to fulfill its own priorities

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact of government seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities to be high. (10 respondents 4 rating 5). Four rated this high.
Core business conflict affects the image of Government - level of impact if Government seen to be concerned more with process than outcomes and benefits

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the impact of Government seen to be concerned more with process than outcomes and benefits to be high. (8 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated it high and one respondent rated it low.

Core business conflict affects the image of Government - rate of occurrence of Government seen to be uncoordinated

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the occurrence of Government seen to be uncoordinated to be always. (6 respondents). However 2 respondents have rated this never.

Core business conflict affects the image of Government - rate of occurrence of Government seen to be wasting resources

The mode is shared between 3 and 4. Five respondents rated this neutral. Respondent numbers are shared equally across less frequent, neutral and frequent. However, there is a slight tendency to consider the occurrence of Government seen to be wasting resources to be less frequent as one respondent rated this as never.
Core business conflict affects the image of Government - rate of occurrence that Government seen to be failing to fulfill its own priorities

The mode is shared between four and two. There is a slight tendency to consider the occurrence of the Government being seen as failing to fulfil its own priorities to be frequent (6 respondents, 1 rating 5) due to one respondent rating this always.

Core business conflict affects the image of Government - rate of occurrence of Government seen to be concerned more with process than outcomes and benefits

The mode is 2. There is a stronger tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of Government seen to be concerned more with process than outcomes and benefits occurs less frequently. (7 respondents).

SUMMARY

There was a tendency to agree with two areas seen to affect the Government image in the Community. These were ‘Government seen to be uncoordinated (eight respondents, one rating ‘one’) and ‘Government seen to be wasting resources (eight respondents, one rating ‘five’). Opinion on ‘Government seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities’ was almost evenly distributed between agree and disagree, but there was a slightly stronger tendency to disagree. There was also disagreement on ‘Government seen to be concerned with process not outcomes’.

There was a general tendency to consider the impact of these factors on the image of government to be reasonably high, with the exception of one respondent who tended to disagree, scoring ‘two’ for all factors. The highest impact was seen to be potentially from ‘government seen to be wasting resources’ (11 respondents, four rating ‘five’) and ‘government seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities’ (10 respondents, four rating ‘five’).

From an individual respondent perspective, three respondents had a neutral response to the first three factors and one respondent considered all factors to occur infrequently. However, opinion was not strong regarding the frequency of occurrence. Respondents tended to consider that ‘Government seen to be uncoordinated’ and ‘Government seen to be failing to fulfil its own priorities’ also being considered to occur frequently. Respondents tended to consider that ‘Government seen to be more concerned with process than outcomes’ occurred infrequently, and also a slightly greater tendency to consider ‘Government seen to be
wasting resources’ to occur infrequently. Five respondents indicated a neutral view regarding ‘government seen to be uncoordinated’ and ‘government seen as wasting resources’.

There were no significant factors in relation to the research problem.
**Q11 Common core business conflicts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11.01</th>
<th>11.02</th>
<th>11.03</th>
<th>11.04</th>
<th>11.05</th>
<th>11.06</th>
<th>11.07</th>
<th>11.08</th>
<th>11.09</th>
<th>11.10</th>
<th>11.02</th>
<th>11.03</th>
<th>11.04</th>
<th>11.05</th>
<th>11.06</th>
<th>11.07</th>
<th>11.08</th>
<th>11.09</th>
<th>11.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occurrence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11.01</th>
<th>11.02</th>
<th>11.03</th>
<th>11.04</th>
<th>11.05</th>
<th>11.06</th>
<th>11.07</th>
<th>11.08</th>
<th>11.09</th>
<th>11.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11a1

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that lack of program funding and flexibility is a common core business conflict. (9 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent completely agreed and one disagreed completely.

11a2

The mode is 2. There is a slightly greater tendency to agree that timeframes conflicting or being unable to be met is a common core business conflict. (6 respondents) Two respondents completely disagreed.

11a3

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that limited ability for local decision-making is a common core business conflict. (9 respondents 1 rating 1). One respondent completely agreed and two respondents completely disagreed.
The mode is 3, with 50% being undecided. (8 respondents). However, of the remaining respondents, 50% also indicated a tendency to agree that approval processes being lengthy was a common core business conflict. (8 respondents). Five completely agreed.

The mode is 2, with a general tendency for respondents to agree that mismatched funding cycles are a common core business conflict. (9 respondents, 3 rating 1). Three respondents completely agreed.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that reluctance to commit resources or resources already having been committed is a common core business conflict. (8 respondents, 2 rating 1). Two respondents agreed completely and two disagreed completely.
The mode is 4. The opinion is divided between agreement and disagreement. However 2 respondents completely agreed and one respondent completely disagreed.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that limited skills and knowledge of staff is a common core business conflict. (9 respondents). Three respondents completely agreed. One respondent did not rate this.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to agree that regulatory conflicts are a common core business conflict. (7 respondents) Two respondents agreed completely. One respondent completely disagreed. One respondent did not rate this.
The mode is both 2 and 4. Opinion is equal regarding whether bureaucratic application of regulations is a common core business conflict. One respondent agreed, One respondent disagreed. One respondent did not rate this.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to view the impact of lack of program funding and flexibility as high (7 respondents). One respondent rated this low. Two respondents rated this high.
The mode is 3, the neutral rating (Seven respondents). The remaining respondents indicated a tendency to consider the level of impact of conflict of or inability to meet timeframes to be high. One respondent scored this low:

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the level of impact of limited local decision-making to be high. (10 respondents). 1 respondent rated this high. Two respondents rated this low:

The mode is shared between 3 and 4. There is a tendency to consider the impact of lengthy approval processes to be high. (7 respondents). The same number rated this 3. One respondent rated it high.
The mode is 4. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider that the level of impact of mismatched funding cycles is high. (8 respondents). One respondent rated this low.

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the level of impact of reluctance to commit resources or resources being otherwise committed as a fairly high impact. (11 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two respondents rated this high. Two respondents rated this low.
The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact of lack of consistency of staff to be high. (11 respondents). One respondent rated this low.

The mode is 4. There is a reasonably strong tendency to consider the impact of limited skills and knowledge of staff to be high. (9 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two respondents rated this high.

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact of regulatory conflicts to be high. (10 respondents, 3 rating 5). Three respondents rated this high. One respondent rated this low.
The mode is 4. There is a reasonably strong tendency to consider the level of impact of bureaucratic application of regulations to be high. (9 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent rated this high and one rated low.

The mode is shared between 2 and 3. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of lack of program funding or flexibility to be less frequent. (6 respondents, 1 rating 1) One rated this as never, and one as always.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of timeframe conflicts or inability to meet timeframes as less frequent. (8 respondents).
The mode is 4. There is a slightly greater tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of limited local decision-making capacity to occur frequently than to be infrequent. (7 respondents as against xis respondents). One respondent declined to rate this statement.

The mode is shared between 2 and 3. The number of respondents indicating more and less frequent rate of occurrence is the same. However the tendency is to consider the rate of occurrence of lengthy approval processes to be frequent due to a two respondents rating this always. One respondent declined to rate this statement.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of mismatched funding cycles to be infrequent. (7 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent rated this never. One respondent rated this always.
One respondent declined to rate this statement.

11c6

The mode is shared between 2 and 4. There is a slight tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of reluctance to commit resources or having resources already committed to be low. (6 respondents). One respondent rated this never. One respondent declined to rate this statement.

11c7

The mode is 3, which is a neutral position. Almost 50% of respondents chose this. (7 respondents). Of the remaining respondents there is a tendency to consider that the rate of occurrence of no consistency in staff for projects is more frequent. (6 respondents). One respondent rated this always. One respondent declined to rate this statement.
The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence of limited skills and knowledge of staff to be infrequent. One respondent rated it always. One respondent declined to rate this statement.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider the occurrence of regulatory conflicts to be infrequent. (7 respondents, 1 rating 1). However, five respondents had a neutral position in rating 3. One respondent rated this never. One respondent declined to rate this statement.

The mode is 2. Just over 50% of respondents consider that the occurrence of the bureaucratic way regulations are applied is less frequent. (8 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent rated this never. One respondent declined to rate this statement.
Overall there was a general level of agreement that the factors listed above were the most commonly occurring, with strongest agreement for ‘lack of funding flexibility’ (nine respondents, one rating ‘one’); ‘funding cycles mismatched’ (nine respondents, three rating ‘one’), and ‘limitation in skills and knowledge amongst staff’ (nine respondents with three rating ‘one’). ‘Approval processes lengthy’ was rated neutral by 50 percent of respondents, whilst remaining respondents indicated agreement. ‘No consistency of staff for projects’, had an almost even opinion between agree and disagree, with a slight tendency to agree.

The level of impact was considered to generally tend to be high, with the factors rated by a higher number of respondents being ‘reluctance to commit resources or resources already committed to core business’ (11 respondents, two rating ‘five’); ‘no consistency of staff’ (11 respondents); ‘decision-making limited locally’ (10 respondents, one rating ‘five’), and ‘regulatory conflicts’ (10 respondents, three rating ‘five’). There was a high neutral view concerning ‘timeframes conflict or inability to meet timeframes’ and also for ‘lengthy approval processes’.

Opinion on rate of occurrence was predominantly that the factors being investigated were infrequent, with the exception of ‘no consistency of staff’, which had a high neutral rating.

There was an almost even spread of opinion on the rate of occurrence of ‘reluctance to commit resources, or resources already committed to core business’, with only a slight tendency to consider these factors to occur infrequently.

In relation to the research problem there are no significant factors (having agreement, high impact and frequent occurrence rating by 50 percent or more respondents across all three areas).
### Q12 non-core business conflict areas

|   | 12.01 | 12.02 | 12.03 | 12.04 | 12.05 | 12.06 | 12.07 | 12.08 | 12.09 | 12.10 | 12.01 | 12.02 | 12.03 | 12.04 | 12.05 | 12.06 | 12.07 | 12.08 | 12.09 | 12.10 |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Agree | 3     | 2     | 1     | 3     | 4     | 1     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 3     | 2     | 4     | 3     | 1     | 2     | 2     | 3     | 2     | 2     | 3     |
|      | 4     | 1     | 1     | 1     | 2     | 1     | 2     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 4     | 3     | 5     | 4     |
|      | 4     | 1     | 2     | 4     | 1     | 1     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 4     | 2     | 4     | 4     | 2     | 4     | 2     | 4     |
|      | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     |
|      | 2     | 4     | 2     | 4     | 4     | 2     | 4     | 2     | 4     | 5     | 4     | 2     | 4     | 3     | 4     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 4     | 2     |
|      | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 3     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 4     | 5     | 4     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     |
|      | 5     | 2     | 3     | 1     | 1     | 1     | 1     | 1     | 1     | 1     | 2     | 1     | 3     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 4     | 5     | 3     | 3     |
|      | 2     | 2     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 2     | 4     | 1     | 2     | 2     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 2     | 3     | 2     | 4     |
|      | 2     | 2     | 2     | 4     | 3     | 4     | 3     | 4     | 2     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 2     | 3     | 2     | 4     |
|      | 2     | 2     | 2     | 4     | 4     | 3     | 3     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     |
|      | 3     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 2     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 4     |
|      | 4     | 1     | 1     | 3     | 5     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 2     | 1     | 1     | 4     | 5     | 5     | 4     | 1     | 3     | 5     | 4     | 2     |
|      | 2     | 2     | 4     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 1     | 4     | 3     | 3     | 1     | 1     | 3     |
|      | 1     | 1     | 1     | 1     | 2     | 3     | 3     | 2     | 2     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 4     | 3     | 3     | 4     | 4     | 4     |
|      | 2     | 2     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 2     | 1     | 3     | 1     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 4     | 5     | 5     | 4     | 5     | 4     | 5     | 5     |
|      | 2     | 2     | 2     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 2     | 3     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 4     | 4     | 3     | 3     | 3     | 4     | 3     | 4     | 3     |

### Occurrence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12.01</th>
<th>12.02</th>
<th>12.03</th>
<th>12.04</th>
<th>12.05</th>
<th>12.06</th>
<th>12.07</th>
<th>12.08</th>
<th>12.09</th>
<th>12.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree with the non-core business issues of politics, political influence and ministerial interference affecting agencies working together. (10 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent agreed completely. One respondent disagreed completely.

The mode is 2. There is strong agreement that political agendas are a non-core business issue and impediment to agencies working together. (14 respondents, 3 rated 1). Three respondents completely agreed.

The mode is 2. With 14 of the 16 respondents indicating complete agreement, 6 of whom totally agreed, there is a very strong tendency to agree that different political parties at the three levels of Government is a non-core business issues and impediment to agencies working together. (14 respondents, 6 rating 1).
The mode is 2. With 10 out of the 16 respondents indicating agreement, there is a strong tendency to agree that personality difficulties are a non-core business issue and impediment to agencies working together. (10 respondents, 3 rating 1). Five respondents rated this 3, indicating neutrality.

The mode is 4. The opinion is evenly spread with six respondents indicating agreement and six, disagreement. This is regarding whether management style is a non-core business issues and impediment to agencies working together. Due to two respondents rating 'one' for complete agreement, there tendency is to agree.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider resource limitations in the community as a non-core business issue and impediment to agencies working together. (9 respondents, 4 rating 1). Four respondents completely agreed.
The mode is 2. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider that the local situational environment is a non-core business issue and impediment to agencies working together. (10 respondents, 4 rating 1). Four respondents agreed completely and one disagreed completely.

The mode is 2. There is a fairly strong tendency to agree that demographics are a non-core business issue and impediment to agencies working together. (9 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent completely agreed and one completely disagreed.

The mode is 2. There is a fairly strong tendency to agree that distance and level of isolation is a non-core business issue and impediment affecting agencies working together. Two respondents agreed completely and one disagreed completely.
The mode is 2. There is a slightly stronger tendency to support the fact that community expectation of government is a non-core business issue and impediment affecting agencies working together. (7 respondents, 2 rating 1). Two respondents completely agreed. One respondent completely disagreed.

The mode is 4. The level of impact of ministerial influence on agency relationships is considered to be high. (14 respondents, 3 rating 5). 3 respondents selected high.

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider that the level of impact to be high of political agendas on agency relationships when working together. Six respondents indicated that it was high.
The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to agree that the level of impact is high on agency relationships when working together, from having different political parties at the different levels of government. (13 respondents, 6 rating 5). Six rated it high Two respondents rated the impact as low:

The mode is 4. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact to be fairly high, of personality difficulties on agency relationships when working together. (11 respondents, 3 rating 5). Three rated this high.

The mode is 2, however there is a slightly stronger tendency to consider the impact to be fairly high from management styles, on agency relationships when working together. (7 respondents, 3 rating 5) Three respondents considered it high and one respondent considered it low.
The mode is 3, however there is a tendency to consider the impact as fairly high, of resource limitations within a community when respondent are working together. (7 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two respondents rated this high.

The mode is 2. The number of respondents is equal between low and high, with a very slight tendency to consider the impact to be high of the non-core business situational environment on agency working relationships due to the fact that 2 respondents rated high and only 1 rated low.

There is a slightly greater tendency to consider the non-core business impact to be low when agencies are working together, of demographics in a region affecting. This is due to a rating of 'one' by one respondent. (6 respondents, 1 rating 1) Five respondents rated this neutral at three. One respondent indicated impact to be low:
The mode is 4. There is a reasonably strong tendency to consider that the impact to be high, of the non-core business issue of distance and isolation affecting agency relationships when working together. (10 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two respondents rated high and one rated low.

The mode is 4. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider that the impact is high on respondent working together, of community expectations of government affecting relationships. (8 respondents, 1 rating 5) One respondent rated the impact as high.

The mode is 4. The rate of occurrence of Ministerial influence as a non-core business issue is considered to tend to occur frequently. (9 respondents, 1 rating 5). One respondent indicates it always occurs.
The mode is 4. However there tendency is to consider that the rate of occurrence of political agendas occurs frequently. (7 respondents)

The mode is 4. There is a fairly strong tendency to consider occurrence of the influence of having different political parties at three levels of government occurs more often. One respondent indicated it occurred always and two respondents indicated it never occurred.

The mode is 3. Fifty percent of respondents were neutral. However, there is still a tendency to consider personality difficulties occurred frequently. (5 respondents, 1 rating 5). One rated this always.
The mode is 2. There is a stronger tendency to consider that the influence of management styles occurs infrequently as a non-core business issue or impediment. (8 respondents). One respondent considered it occurred always.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider that the occurrence is frequently of resource limitations in community affecting agencies working together. (6 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two respondents consider it to occur always.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider that the occurrence of the influence of local environment on respondent working together occurs infrequently (7 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent rated this never and two rated this always.
The mode is 2. There is a stronger tendency to consider the occurrence to be infrequent of the influence of demographics as an issue for respondent working together.

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider that distance and isolation to occur infrequently as an issue when agencies work together. (8 respondents). One respondent indicated that it is always an issue.

The mode is shared between 2 and 4. Opinion is then evenly spread regarding the rate of occurrence of the influence of community expectation as an issue when agencies work together. One respondent indicated it never occurs and one indicated that it always occurs.
SUMMARY

Overall there was general agreement that the non-core business issues listed above affect agencies working together. ‘Different political parties at three levels of government’ (14 respondents, six rating ‘one’) and ‘Political agendas’ (14 respondents, three rating ‘one’) attracted the highest number of respondents, with the former also having the highest number of respondents rating ‘one’. The factor with the weakest agreement was ‘Management style’, (six respondents, two rating ‘one’), which had only a slightly stronger tendency to agree. There were an even number of respondents either side of the neutral three, but two rated ‘one’ (agree) and only one rated ‘five’ (disagree).

Impact was considered highest for ‘Ministerial interference/influence’. The impact of ‘Political agendas’ and ‘different political parties at three levels of Government’ were also considered high, and both also had a high number of respondents rating ‘five’. ‘Resource limitations in community’ had a higher neutral rating than other ratings.

The opinion on rate of occurrence was diverse. ‘Ministerial influence’, ‘political agendas’ and ‘Different political parties at three levels of Government’ were rated as tending to occur frequently, with the ‘political party’ factor being the one attracting the larger number of responses. ‘Management style’, ‘Resource limitations in community’, ‘local situation’, ‘demographics’ and ‘distance and isolation’ were generally considered to occur infrequently. ‘Personality’ issues attracted a high neutral rating for occurrence by 50 percent of respondents.

Opinion was only slightly in favour of high impact for ‘Local situational environment’, as both high and low impact attracted the same number of responses, with two respondents rating five and one respondent rating one.

Opinion regarding demographic issues was inconclusive. Opinion was spread across a tendency to consider the impact high, neutral choice and tendency to consider impact to be low. However there was a slightly stronger tendency to consider the impact to tend to be low, with the rating of ‘one’ by one respondent.

The most significant factors relating to the research problem are ‘ministerial influence/interference’; ‘different political parties at the three levels of government’. Factors attracting higher neutral responses regarding impact are ‘Resource limitations in community’ and ‘Demographics’, and in rate of occurrence, ‘Personality’.
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Survey 13a, b and c

13a1

The mode is shared between 1 and 2. There is an extremely strong agreement that cultivating good relationships is a successful factor in managing core business conflict. (14 respondents, 7 rating 1). Seven respondents rated complete agreement.

13a2

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that demonstrating respect for each agency’s point of view is a successful factor in managing core business conflict. (15 respondents 5 rating 1). Five respondents completely agreed.

13a3

The mode is shared between 1 and 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that agreeing on communication protocols amongst stakeholders, to Ministers etc. is a successful factor in managing core business conflict. (12 respondents, 6 rating 1). Six respondents completely agreed. Two respondents indicated some disagreement.
The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that practicing the art of negotiation and facilitation is a successful factor in managing core business conflict. (14 respondents, 6 rating 1). Six respondents completely agreed.

The mode is shared between 1 and 2. There is a very strong agreement that identifying and building on areas of commonality is a successful factor in managing core business conflict. (12 respondents, 6 rating 1). Six respondents completely agreed and one tended to disagree.

The mode is 1. There is strong agreement that to support participating agencies’ ability to fulfill KPIs is a successful factor in managing core business conflict. (11 respondents, 5 rating 1). Six respondents agreed completely and one disagreed completely.
The mode is 1 with seven respondents rating complete agreement. There is a very strong tendency to agree that clarifying the authority of the project is a successful factor in managing core business conflict. (13 respondents, 17 rating 1).

The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that identifying and dealing with legislative issues is a successful factor in managing core business conflict. (12 respondents, 4 rating 1). Four respondents completely agreed. One respondent tended to disagree.

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that identifying project requirements and agency capacity to contribute to project objectives is a successful factor in managing core business conflict. (13 respondents, 5 rating 1). Five respondents completely agreed, with one tending to disagree.
13a10

The mode is 1. There tendency to agree is very strong, that arranging who does what, by when in the project plan is a successful factor in managing core business conflict. (14 respondents, 9 rating 1). 9 respondents completely agreed, with one tending to disagree.

13a11

The mode is 1. Opinion is spread between agreement and disagreement in terms of number of respondents. (6 respondents). However due to five respondents rating 1, there is a slight level of agreement that using political influence is a successful factor in managing core business conflict. Five respondents agreed completely and two disagreed completely.

13b1

The mode is 4. The anticipated level of impact in developing good relationships is considered very high, on managing core business conflict. (14 respondents, 5 rating 5). Five respondents rated this high and one rated it low.
The mode is 4. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact on managing core business conflict, of applying demonstrated respect for agency points of view as very high. (13 respondents, 4 rating 5). Four respondents rated this high and one rated it low.

The mode is 8. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact on managing core business conflict, to be high, of applying agreed communication protocols. (12 respondents, 4 rating 5). Four respondents rated this high.

The mode is 4. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact on managing core business conflict to be very high, of applying negotiation and facilitation skills. (13 respondents, 3 rating 5). Three respondents rated this high, with one tending to consider the impact to be low.
The mode is 4. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact on managing core business conflict to be very high, of building on areas of commonality. (13 respondents, 6 rating 5). Six respondents rated this high and one respondent tended to rate it lower.

The mode is shared between 4 and 5. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact to be high on managing core business conflict, of ensuring agencies’ KPIs can be fulfilled. (14 respondents, 7 rating 5). Seven respondents rated this high, with two respondents tending to consider the impact to be low and social focus.

The mode is 4. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact to be high, on managing core business conflict, of clarifying the authority for the project. (15 respondents, 7 rating 5). Seven respondents rated this high and one respondent tended to consider the impact to be low.
The mode is 4. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact to be high, on managing core business conflict, of dealing with legislative issues up front. (15 respondents, 4 rating 5). Four respondents rated this high.

The mode is 4. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact to be high, on managing core business conflict, of identifying the project requirements and agency capacity to contribute to project objectives in the project plan. (15 respondents, 4 rating 5). Four respondents rated this high.

The mode is shared between 4 and 5. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact to be high, on managing core business conflict, of determining who does what and by when. (14 respondents, 7 rating 5). Seven respondents rated this high.
The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the impact to be high, on managing core business conflict, of applying political influence. (11 respondents, 4 rating 5). Four respondents rated this high and one respondent rated this low.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence to be frequent of the cultivation of good relationships as a way of managing core business. (10 respondents, 5 rating 5). Five respondents rated this always and five were neutral, rating a 'three'.

The mode is 3. This is a neutral response. There is a tendency to consider the rate of occurrence to be frequent, of applying respect for other agencies’ view points. (8 respondents, 3 rating 5). Three respondents rated this always.
The mode is 3, a neutral rating. However in the remaining respondents, there is a tendency to consider occurrence to be frequent of applying agreed communication protocols in managing core business conflict. (7 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two respondents rated this always.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the occurrence frequent in managing core business conflict, by applying negotiation and facilitation skills. (10 respondents, 2 rating 5). Two respondents rated this always and three rated this as tending to be infrequent.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the occurrence to be fairly frequent of building on areas of commonality for projects. (8 respondents).
The mode is 2. The opinion in terms of numbers of respondents is equal between occurrence being frequent or infrequent. However there is a slightly stronger tendency to consider this occurrence slightly more frequent due to one respondent rating this always.

The mode is 4. There is a tendency to consider the occurrence to be frequent of clarifying the authority for the project. (9 respondents.)

The mode is 4. There is a slight tendency to consider the occurrence to be frequent in managing core business conflict, of dealing with the legislative issues up front. (6 respondents). However five respondents each rated this neutral and also as infrequent.
13c9

Rate of occurrence of identifying key requirements & capacity of agencies to contribute to project objectives & develop project based on these

The mode is shared between 2 and 3. Three is a neutral position. Of the remaining respondents there is a tendency to consider the occurrence infrequent of identifying project requirements and agency capacity to contribute to projects. On respondent considered this to occur always.

13c10

Rate of occurrence of agreeing who does what, by when

The mode is 4. There is a stronger tendency to consider the occurrence more frequent in managing core business conflict, of agreeing who does what, by when. (8 respondents, 3 rating 5). Three respondents rated always.

13c11

Rate of occurrence of applying political influence

The mode is 2. There is a tendency to consider the occurrence less frequent in managing core business conflict, by applying political influence. (7 respondents, 1 rating 1). One respondent rated never and one respondent rated always.
SUMMARY

Generally, there was agreement that the most common practises identified by interviewees were successful in managing or overcoming core business conflict and issues and impediments. One respondent completely agreed with all suggestions. Two respondents disagreed with the last factor – ‘use political influence to make things happen’ and one respondent disagreed with ‘ensure each participating agency can fulfil KPIs or gain benefit’. There was very strong agreement was for:

- ‘Demonstrate respect for other agencies’ point of view (15 respondents, five rating ‘one’)
- ‘Gain agreement about who does what, by when and include in the project plan’ (14 respondents, nine rating ‘one’)
- ‘Cultivate good relationships’ (14 respondents, seven rating ‘one’)
- ‘Practise the arts of negotiation and facilitation’ (14 respondents, six rating ‘one’)
- ‘Clarify authority of project or program (Minister, DG, WOG or Community)’ (13 respondents seven rating ‘one’)
- Identify key requirements and capacity of agencies to contribute to objectives and develop projects based on these’ (13 respondents, five rating ‘one’)

The lowest level of agreement was for the ‘use of political influence to make things happen’.

The impact on reducing core business conflict from applying the practices being explored through the survey was generally considered to be high, with most practices considered to have a high impact by the majority of respondents. The factors with the strongest tendency to consider the impact to be high were:

- ‘Clarify authority of project or program (Minister, DG, WOG or Community)’ (15 respondents, seven rating ‘five’)
- ‘Identify and deal with legislative issues’ (15 respondents, four rating ‘five’)
- Identify key requirements and capacity of agencies to contribute to objectives and develop projects based on these’ (15 respondents, four rating ‘five’)
- ‘Ensure each participating agency can fulfil KPIs and gain benefit’ (14 respondents, seven rating ‘five’)
- ‘Gain agreement about who does what, by when and include in the project plan’ (14 respondents, seven rating ‘five’)
- Cultivate good relationships (14 respondents six rating ‘five’)

Two practices each attracted a rating of ‘one’ by one respondent, for low impact. Whilst having a stronger tendency to consider the impact high, ‘use political influence to make things happen’, indicates that there were also some respondents who considered the impact to be low.

Responses to rate of occurrence demonstrated a higher level of neutral responses than there had been for rating of level of ‘agreement’ and ‘impact’. The slightly higher neutral ratings were for ‘cultivate good relationships’, ‘demonstrate respect for other agencies’ point of view’, ‘agree on communication protocols, within agencies, amongst stakeholders and with Ministers’, ‘identify and deal with legislative issues’, ‘identify key requirements and capacity of agencies to contribute to objectives and develop the project based on these’, and ‘use political influence to make things happen’.

The highest tendency to consider the level of occurrence to be frequent was for:

- ‘Cultivate good relationships’ (10 respondents, four rating ‘five’), although this attracted five neutral ratings (refer Figure 5.81)
- ‘Practise the arts of negotiation and facilitation’ (10 respondents, seven rating ‘five’)
- ‘Clarify authority of project or program (Minister, DG, WOG or Community)’ (nine respondents)

Two areas were considered to occur less frequently, being ‘identify key requirements and capacity of agencies to contribute to objectives and develop projects based on these’, and ‘use of political influence to make things happen’.

The most significant factors in relation to the research problem are: cultivating good relationships; demonstrating respect for other agency’s point of view; agree on communication protocols; practice the arts of negotiation and facilitation; identify and build on commonality; clarify the authority of the project; and gain agreement on who does what, by when and include in the project plan.

There was agreement that most practices were successful in managing core business conflict and most were considered to have a high impact on reducing core business conflict.
One respondent did not rate these questions.

Q14 Items to be included in ‘process’ model

| Agree | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Impact | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

*Our respondent did not rate these questions.*
Survey 14a, b and c

14a1

The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that reporting requirement for each agency is included in the 'process' model. (11 respondents, 2 rating 1). Two respondents rated complete agreement.

14a2

The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that decision-making and capacity for each stakeholder be included in the process model. Three respondents completely agreed, with one respondent tending to disagree.

14a3

The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that funding contributions of respondent be include in the process model. Three respondents agreed completely.
The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that funding cycles are included in the process model. Five respondents agreed completely and one respondent tended to disagree.

The mode is 2. There is a strong agreement for including the lead agent in the process model. Six respondents completely agreed and one respondent tended to disagree.

The mode is 2. There is a very strong agreement that approval processes are included in the process model. Four respondents agreed completely.
The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree to include the authority of the project in the process model. Two respondents totally agreed and one respondent tended to disagree.

The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that staff availability and commitment is included in the process model. Three respondents agreed completely:

The mode is 2. There is a very strong agreement that staff expertise required and available be included in the process model. Five respondents agreed completely.
The mode is 2. There is a very strong agreement that timelines for implementation is included in the process model. Three respondents agreed completely.

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that KPIs the project fulfils for each agency are included in the process model. Three respondents agreed completely and one respondent tended to disagree.

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that noting legislation that applies is included in the process model. There were two respondents that indicated a tendency to disagree and one respondent completely agreed.
The mode is 2. There was a very strong agreement that legislation issues be included in the process model. One respondent agreed completely and one respondent disagreed completely.

The mode is 1 and 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree. Six respondents agreed completely and one respondent tended to disagree.

The mode is 1. There is a very strong tendency to agree that common goals for each agency are included in the process model. Seven respondents agreed completely and one respondent tended to disagree.
The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that agency roles and responsibilities are included in the process model. Six respondents agreed completely and one respondent tended to disagree.

The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that key tasks to be done by when and by who is included in the process model. Six respondents agreed completely and one respondent disagreed completely.

The mode is 2. There is a strong tendency to agree that information needs and their source are included in the process model. Five respondents completely agreed and one respondent disagreed.
The mode is 2. There is a very strong tendency to agree that resources available and any shortfalls are included in the process model. Six respondents agreed completely and one respondent disagreed completely.

The mode is 2. There is a strong agreement that the ESD value of the project be included in the process model. Two respondents disagreed with one disagreeing completely. Five respondents agreed completely.

The mode is three, a neutral position. Amongst remaining respondents there is a tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict, of incorporating agency reporting requirements in the process model. (6 respondents, 2 rating 5) Two respondents rated high and two rated low.
The mode is four. There is a tendency to consider the impact of including decision-making in the ‘process’ model to be high in reducing core business conflict. (Ten respondents, four rating 5). Four respondents rated this high and one rated it low.

The mode is four. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict, of including funding contribution from agencies in the process model. (Nine respondents, three rating ‘five’) Three respondents considered this high.

The mode is three, a neutral response. Amongst remaining respondents there is a tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict, of including funding cycles and stages in the process model. (Seven respondents, four rating this ‘five’). Four respondents considered it high.
Impact on reducing core business conflict by including noting lead agent

The mode is five. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact high of reducing core business conflict by including noting lead agent in the process model (12 respondents, seven rating ‘five’). Seven rated this high.

Impact on reducing core business conflict by including approval processes for each agency

The mode is four. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict, of including approval processes of each agency in the process model. (12 respondents, three rating ‘five’). Three respondents rated this high.

Impact on reducing core business conflict by including Authority of project (Minnister, DG etc.)

The mode is four. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict, of including the authority of the project in the process model. (11 respondents, two rating ‘five’). Two rated this high and one respondent tended to consider the impact to be low.
The mode is four. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict, by including staff availability and time commitment in the process model. (14 respondents, five rating ‘five’). Five respondents rated this high.

The mode is four. There is a very strong tendency for respondents to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict, by including staff expertise required and available in the process model. (14 respondents, three rating ‘five’). Three respondents considered the impact high.

The mode is four. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict, by including timelines for implementation in the process model. (11 respondents, one rating ‘five’). One respondent considered this high. Two respondents showed a tendency to consider the impact to be low.
The mode is four. There is a tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict, by including KPIs that the project fulfills for each agency in the project design. (Nine respondents, three rating ‘five’). Three respondents rated this high and three considered the impact to tend to be low.

The mode is nine. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict, by including legislation that will apply in the process model. (12 respondents, three rating ‘five’). Three respondents rated this high.

The mode is four. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict, by including legislation issues in the process model. (12 respondents, three rating ‘five’). Three respondents rated this high.
The mode is four. There is very strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict by including communication protocols in the process model (12 respondents, four rating ‘five’). Four respondents rated this high.

The mode is four. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict, by including common goals identified by each agency, in the process model (12 respondents, two rating ‘five’). Two respondents rated this high.

The mode is four. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict by including agency roles and responsibilities in the process model (13 respondents, three rating ‘five’). Three rated this high.
Impact on reducing core business conflict by including key tasks to be done, by whom & by when

The mode is four. There is a very strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict by including key tasks to be done by and by when in the process model (12 respondents, three rating ‘five’). Three rated this high.

Impact on reducing core business conflict by including information needs & their source

The mode is four. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict by including information needs and their source in the process model. (Ten respondents, two rating ‘five’). Two respondents rated this high. One respondent indicated a tendency to consider the impact to be low.

Impact on reducing core business conflict by including resources available & any shortfalls

The mode is four. There is a strong tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict by including resources available and any shortfalls in the process model. (Nine respondents, two rating ‘five’). Two respondents rated the impact high. Two respondents tended to consider the impact tended to be low.
Impact on reducing core business conflict by including ESD value of project

The mode is four. There is a tendency to consider the impact high in reducing core business conflict by including ESD value of the project in the process model. (Eight respondents, two rating 'five'). Two respondents considered the impact high, one considered it to be low. Overall there were four respondents that tended to consider the impact to be low.

SUMMARY

One respondent declined to complete this question at all, believing that the issues and impediments that occurred just have to be managed. They also expressed the view that it was the quality and capacity for management of the stakeholder team, for the project, that would determine how well issues, impediments and core business conflicts were reduced or managed.

There was strong agreement that all the factors listed would be useful, with the exception of one respondent. This respondent did not really agree with the last eight items on the list. There was a possibility that the respondent had placed their ‘x’ in the wrong part of the scale. The highest number of rating ‘one’ was for ‘common goals identified across agencies relating to the project’, by seven respondents. Strongest agreement was for:
- ‘agency roles and responsibilities’ (14 respondents, six rating ‘one’)
- ‘key tasks to be done by whom and by when’ (14 respondents, six rating ‘one’)
- ‘identifying the lead agent’ (14 respondents, six rating ‘one’)
- ‘decision-making capacity of each agency’ (14 respondents, three rating ‘one’)
- ‘staff availability and time commitment’ (14, three rating ‘one’)
- ‘authority of the project (e.g. Minister, DG, WOG, MoU)’ (14, two rating ‘one’)

The lowest level of agreement was for ‘KPIs that the project could fulfil for agencies (10, three rating ‘one’).

In relation to the impact the factors and activities listed may have on reducing or managing core business conflict, one respondent rated everything neutral or ‘three’. Amongst the remaining 15 responses, the factors considered to have the highest impact were:
- Staff availability and time commitment (14 respondents, five rating ‘five’)
- Staff expertise required and available (14 respondents, five rating ‘five’)
- Roles and responsibilities (13 respondents, two rating ‘five’)

The factor seen as having the lowest impact was ‘reporting requirements for each agency’. Six respondents indicated a tendency for this to be high, with only two rating ‘five’. Six also rated this neutral.

The other factor with a notable neutral rating was ‘Funding cycles and stages (where this applies)’, which was rated neutral by five respondents.

With the exception of ‘lead agent identification’, ‘reporting requirements for each agency’ and ‘funding cycles and staging’, all other factors are significant in relation to the research issue.
APPENDIX 10
PROCESS MODEL STEPS AND TOOLS

STAGE 1
Preparation
STEP 1 Issue/opportunity assessment

- Issues or opportunity identified requiring agencies to work together. This may come from Cabinet, Minister, another agency, within own agency or Community.
- This preparation assessment can be used when preparing to undertake a project or program development within an agency, as part of a whole-of-government-assessment process.
- Undertake an assessment of the issue, opportunity or proposed project (Refer checklist 1 and reference tools).
- If a project is already developed, proceed to Stage 2.

STAGE 2
Project and stakeholder analysis (PASA)
STEP 2 Project assessment (Refer checklist 2 and reference tools)
STEP 3 Stakeholder assessment (Refer checklist 3 and reference tools)

STAGE 3
Responsibility and Actions
STEP 4 Project details, design based on findings from STAGE 2. This can be recorded in an Excel format or using the word document template.
STEP 5 Monitoring spreadsheet
STEP 6 Review spreadsheet or word document template.

Explanation of activities in the stages and steps

- **Stage 1** comprises activities to understand the issue or opportunity from the perspective of the level and type of collaboration that may be appropriate.
- **Step 1** would not apply if a project was already scoped, or there was a Ministerial or high level direction that a program or project is to be developed.
- Activity would commence at Stage 2 if a project is already scoped and needs to be assessed, or the directive has been received that a project or program will be collaboratively developed.
- **Step 2 and 3** assess the project and the stakeholders involved. This information can be used in the project planning, or can inform discussion to make adjustments to an established project.
- **Step 4** involves the project/program design or amendment. The project details can be recorded using the project Word document or the Excel spreadsheet templates. This documents all aspects of the project.
- If the project or program has to be amended as a result of the assessments, the project amendments would be made by the proponent.
- **Step 5** is the design of a monitoring spreadsheet in Excel. This will record the key activities, by whom and by when, outcomes and deliverables, payments or submissions for funding, and areas that are contingent on something else occurring first.
- This monitoring tool would be used at meetings to discuss and update and plan the progress of the project or program. Issues can be recorded and reasons for changes to the project, timeframes or deliverables. This provides a record of the project/program and can provide information for reports.
- **Step 6** is the review. As part of Stage 3, the project/program will be reviewed. If tools such as a survey of participants in the project/program team are used this would be included in the project design.

**Reference tools:**

Institute of Public Administration (2002)
Oliver, P. ‘Role of Government Coordination in Civic Engagement Engage Government (2005)
Ideal Collaborative Model
Office of the Public Service Commission (2007)
## Checklist 1

### Issue/Opportunity assessment – ask the questions or undertake the suggested activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discuss and determine a conclusion on the following:</th>
<th>Comment which may include response details, Yes/ No or ‘completed’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETE RESPONSES TO DETERMINE WHETHER TO PROGRESS THE ISSUES OR OPPORTUNITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What level of authority to act is there in relation to the issue/opportunity? (e.g. Individual agency, D-G/Secretary of agencies group, Taskforce, Minister, Cabinet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the priority of the issue related to one or more Government priorities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the issue/opportunity one which cuts across the core business outcomes of multiple agencies and thus the solution is therefore likely to fit into the KPI outcomes of these agencies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the benefits to Government of addressing the issue/opportunity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate the risk addressing or not addressing the issue/opportunity – to Government and community. This will determine the imperative for action</td>
<td>Addressing – low, medium or high Not addressing – low, medium or high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there support from agency stakeholders to address the issue collaboratively?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the scope and scale of project/program required to address the issue require collaboration? (key elements such as objectives, geographic coverage, beneficiaries or those affected by the activity, multiple issues etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a need for formal arrangements between collaborators? (MoU, Partnership Agreement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will a formal arrangement across agencies stakeholders be required to access funds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision – Will this progress as a collaborative activity?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES FOR PRE ASSESSMENT BELOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the implications for other agencies/levels of government, of acting on this issue/opportunity? (WOGIA approach)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are funds likely to be available for action/projects undertaken to address the issue/opportunity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the best governance structure to enable efficient reporting and implementation, (in keeping with the authority for the project)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline the reporting relationships within governance framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the known constraints (regulatory, Community capacity, finance, locational issues)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What expertise is required?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other stakeholders likely to be involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is community consultation required?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the timeframe and scale of community consultation that would be require?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oliver, P. ‘Role of Government Coordination in Civic Engagement Engage Government (2005)
Ideal Collaborative Model
### Checklist 2 Project Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item to be considered</th>
<th>Evaluated &amp; documented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the authority of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Government priorities does it address?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will it impact on regions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the nature of the Political support?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there senior officer support?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there support from other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is/are the Lead agency/ies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of the lead agency/ies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the Key objectives (joint and for individual agencies who will be involved)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What formal arrangements are appropriate? (MoU, Partnerships Agreement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Legislation applies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there Legislation issues and what is the implication for the project of the Legislation’s application? (timeframes, concurrency, approval with criteria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Funds are required?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the Funding sources and amounts? (need to capture each agency’s contribution amount, or other arrangements such as a draw-down or pooled funds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For agencies not contributing financially, what is their in-kind contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type of funding accountability needs to be in place?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which agency will keep records of expenditure?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the timeframes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the knowledge and data resource requirements?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reporting and accountability must be done? external and to fulfill individual agency internal needs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a need for shared ICT capacity to implement the project/program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes to the above, what arrangements will this involve, or will there be some other collaborative arrangement to facilitate information sharing? (indicate timeframes if this will take time to arrange)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What reporting and accountability must occur within agencies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Policies are affected or involved from each participating agency’s perspective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any policy issues and how will they be managed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the locational influences (demographics, drought, disaster, geographic etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will locational influences be managed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What objectives and outcomes are required?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What KPIs does the program/project fulfil for each agency involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the boundary and parameters of the project/program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the risk to WOG?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will the risks be addressed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What risks are there to each agency in the collaboration?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can each agency adequately address their own perceived risks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What evaluation measures are required?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will the measures be applied and by which agency?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a Community expectation associated with this project/action/ program and if so, what is it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has there been any media coverage of the proposed project/program which has created expectation in the community?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are the other Stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role and responsibility for each non-government stakeholder?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What communication protocols need to be in place (for agencies implementing the project, to the public, to Minister, and for each agency’s own internal needs)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Community engagement/consultation/participation be required?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How and when will the community engagement take place?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the benefit and impact on community of the proposed program/project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What benefits and, impacts are there on other agencies (WOGIA approach)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What links, synergies and leverage exist with other agencies’ current activities or projects and how will these be maximised?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Checklist 3 Stakeholder Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item to be considered</th>
<th>Agreed/need discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the Stakeholder roles and responsibilities and is there capacity to undertake them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What formal arrangements are being set up and who is involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are goals and objectives achievable by stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the level of stakeholder support?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What contribution to stakeholder KPIs and priorities or can the project be shaped to include some?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the limitations of stakeholder contribution or participation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the linkages or leverage opportunities with stakeholder strategies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the linkages or leverage opportunities with external strategies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the funding contribution amounts for each contributor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the funding criteria and constraints?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there is a shortfall in funding, how much is it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will be done to address the shortage of funds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What information and data provision is required and who can provide it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What protocols do stakeholders have for sharing information or data &amp; do these need to be further negotiated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the Data and information sharing constraints constraints?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Inter-operability of ICT systems are in place and what has to be developed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other ICT issues are there?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the decision-making capacity locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the Budget delegation locally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is each internal agency reporting needs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are each Ministerial reporting needs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can there be joint reporting possibility and if so, agree on the format?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What risk tis there to individual agency in the collaboration?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will stakeholders manage to risk relating to their agency?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Governance framework do agencies support?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What issues (if any are there with a proposed Governance framework and own agency operations and line of authority ?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would be each agency’s Director or DG role and responsibility?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What agency regional office capacity is there to be involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are staff available?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there appropriate Staff skills available?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What boundary implications (gaps, overlaps) are there and will this mean liaising with multiple regional offices of one agency?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there other internal units with which agencies must liaise in their own agency and how will this be done (internal coordinating group, email updates etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the operational issues for individual agencies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the operational issues have a cascade impact – i.e. no local capacity for decision-making resulting in delays for approvals, accessing finance (which will need to be factors into the project/program planning and timeframe etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the individual agency relationship with community (are they a service provider, information only, regulator etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How might this influence an agency’s approach?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which agency would lead the Community engagement role?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What agency/ies should be the lead for the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there co-dependencies across agencies or linkages e.g. common legislation, agency policies, service outlets, shared minister to factored into managing the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will these co-dependencies affect the collaboration of agencies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the implications for the program/project for each agency, both positive and negative?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Checklist 4  Project/Program Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item to be considered</th>
<th>Addressed and documented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose, objectives and outcomes (including joint and individual agency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary and parameters of the project, including limitations that may exist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project profile and community expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government priorities addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation that applies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any issues with legislation and the implications, and how they will be managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior officer support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds required, their source and how any shortfall will be addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding schedule if this is relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe for the project or program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestones – what they are, delivered by when and by whom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders and role or interest in the project/program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead agent/agencies and roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and responsibilities of all non-government participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPIs or priorities that this project/program addresses for agency participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance structure agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting framework and any agreed proforma to be used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and accountability processes and who will be responsible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency to manage project/program funds and reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and data resources required and their source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in knowledge or data and how this will be addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT platforms and interoperability required and how this will be addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies involved or affected by the project or program, and how effects are managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locational factors that need to be taken into account – distance, remoteness, geographical locations, communication, cultural, economic climate etc. and how they are managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-dependencies across agencies to achieve outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff expertise required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External expertise to be accessed and how this will be managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks in the collaboration and how they will be managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks to government in doing or not doing the project/program and how these will be managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication strategy within project team, within agencies, to community and Ministers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media management and protocols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community benefit from the project or program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measures to be used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation tools to be used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review details and timing schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project/program headings

Project title
Purpose – objectives and desired outcomes
Government priorities addressed
Project authority
Project parameters (coverage, geographic/client)
Project support (political, senior officers, community)
Community benefit or impact
Legislation
Legislation issues, their impact and management
Stakeholders (roles, responsibilities and interest)
Lead agency/ies
Table summarising key tasks and by whom
Table summarising milestones and dates of deliverables
Table summarising funding points (if relevant)
KPIS or priorities fulfilled for participating agencies
Project timeframe
Governance framework
Reporting and accountability framework and processes
Reporting schedule
Resources required
Budget (source, whether ‘rounds’, pooled)
Financial accountability processes and responsibilities
WOG risk of doing or not doing the project/program and how this is addressed
Individual agency risk – the responsibility of an individual agency (brief details can be provided as to how agencies address their risks)
Collaboration risks and how these are addressed
Knowledge and data sources required and how acquired
Details of any information sharing protocols Gaps in knowledge and data and how they are addressed
ICT platforms and interoperability arrangements, including privacy policy
Policies involved or affected
Locational factors that influence the implementation – geography, culture, remoteness, economy etc.
Communication strategy – project participants, to community, to Ministers and within own agencies

Meeting schedule

Meeting secretariat role

Records and management arrangements

Community consultation process and schedule

Media management including protocols for announcements

Project or program measures (individual agency and/or joint for whole project/program)

Monitoring performance (schedule of reviews and assessments during implementation for progress)

Final evaluation/review - what will be evaluated and by whom, tools used e.g. surveys, and statement regarding access to final review by who and by when
Monitoring Example

This would be an Excel spreadsheet recording:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Actions to address issues</th>
<th>Review/evaluation/milestone comment</th>
<th>Contingent upon (regulatory approvals, funding, a decision being made etc.)</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>Status On track, delayed, completed, not started, cancelled</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Information for report (key achievements or issues. It would be useful to place in here information that all agencies will use in reports to retain consistency)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key tasks (each one would be copied from project design. Outcomes, review points, payments etc relevant also recorded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome or deliverable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent upon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent upon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome or deliverable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This record would be refreshed at every meeting, therefore the use of a computer to record proceedings at the meeting is recommended, rather than doing this after the meeting.
Review Example

This can be set up as an Excel spreadsheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review area &amp;/or measurable or milestone</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>comment</th>
<th>Key achievement</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL REVIEW/REPORT CONTENT**

A short Final Review would be a word document providing comment on:

- Project outline and intent
- Fulfilment of objectives and delivering on government priorities
- Key achievements
- Outcomes and deliverables
- Learnings
- Risk management
- Budget

More detailed review would include evaluation of the following:

- Project timeliness
- Project outcomes and deliverables in relation to the objectives and goals of the project or program
- Efficiency of implementation (evaluating processes and systems set up to manage and report on the project/program, funds, and meet timeframes and milestones)
- Evaluation of the contribution to government priorities and individual agency KPIs or priorities
- Evaluation of community benefit
- Evaluation of operational arrangements (meetings, record keeping, consultation procedures and records, communication, financial management and reporting, media management, community consultation and/or relationship management)
- Highlight any issues
- Note key success factors
- Recommendations for future activities
- Learnings
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