

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND JUSTICE  
STANDING COMMITTEE**

**INQUIRY INTO COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES IN GOVERNMENT**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE TAKEN  
AT PERTH  
WEDNESDAY, 26 SEPTEMBER 2007**

**SESSION ONE**

**Members**

**Mr A.P. O’Gorman (Chairman)**  
**Ms K. Hodson-Thomas (Deputy Chairman)**  
**Mr S.R. Hill**  
**Mrs J. Hughes**  
**Dr G.G. Jacobs**

---

**Hearing commenced at 10.12 am****MARNEY, MR TIMOTHY MICHAEL****Under Treasurer, Department of Treasury and Finance,  
examined:**

**The CHAIRMAN:** This committee hearing is a proceeding of Parliament and warrants the same respect that proceedings in the house itself demand. Even though you are not required to give evidence on oath, any deliberate misleading of the committee may be regarded as a contempt of Parliament. Have you completed a “Details of Witness” form?

**Mr Marney:** I have.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Did you understand the notes at the bottom of the form?

**Mr Marney:** Absolutely.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Did you receive and read an information for witnesses briefing sheet regarding giving evidence before parliamentary committees?

**Mr Marney:** I have.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Do you have any questions relating to your appearance before the committee this morning?

**Mr Marney:** No.

**The CHAIRMAN:** You know what our inquiry is about; you obviously have the terms of reference. We have not had a submission from you, but would you like to make any opening comments before we start chucking questions at you?

**Mr Marney:** Yes. If I can provide some overall comment, I understand that the inquiry is into collaborative approaches in government and the various terms of “whole-of-government initiatives”, “joined-up government” and so on. In any governance model in which there are mutual accountabilities, it is an area of difficulty in delivering successfully and getting everyone aligned to one outcome across various governance structures. The public sector is a very large business, so to achieve that is no easy challenge. Legislatively, there is no provision specifically for the management or reporting of cross-government initiatives, which I think differs somewhat from models in, for example, the United Kingdom where there is legislative requirement, and that may be something worth looking at. I think we have actually undertaken to provide your research people with some background information on it. Having said that, the existing budgeting and reporting framework does provide for the articulation and monitoring of cross-government initiatives. In particular, probably the strongest component comes via section 41 of the Financial Management Act in the form of resource agreements, which are agreements between chief executives of departments, their responsible minister and the Treasurer. The parties are required to acknowledge that there are shared accountabilities for the pursuit and delivery of cross-government initiatives as part of that agreement process. That is one legislative requirement that enables an explicit articulation of accountability for whole-of-government initiatives. Associated with that resource agreement process are the individual performance agreements. Again, they are signed by the chief executive of the relevant agency, their line minister and the Premier in that case. The performance agreements explicitly identify upfront each year a range of cross-government outcomes that are sought, and that happens largely through the Department of the Premier and Cabinet in consultation with the Premier. For example, in my performance agreement there are a range of initiatives that go across a number of agencies for which I must be and will be held mutually accountable. They tend

to be focused on areas of reform in the public sector and public sector management issues broadly, rather than on specific initiatives. However, there is certainly that capacity in the performance agreements. I think it is probably fair to say that that capacity is underutilised in terms of articulating and monitoring those mutual accountabilities.

The budget papers also accommodate cross-agency initiatives, although not explicitly. There are various avenues within the budget paper reporting that provide scope to identify and articulate cross-government issues, but there is not a section within the format of the budget papers that says under item 72 “cross-government initiatives”; it is not explicitly drawn out. It tends to be hidden - not hidden; that is the wrong word - it tends to be encompassed in the detail within significant issues and trends as part of the narrative around that, but there is not necessarily an identification of a service as with the mainstream single accountability services that are identified in the tables in the budget papers. The capacity is there, but it is not a necessity.

The last component in which there is scope and which, again, is probably underutilised is that Treasurer’s instruction 903, which relates to annual reports, specifies that a performance management framework must include for the agency and any subsidiary or other bodies a statement of which services are being delivered jointly with other agencies and how the agency is contributing to other agencies’ government-desired outcomes. There is an explicit instruction in the Treasurer’s instructions, which comes under the Financial Management Act, which requires agencies to highlight and demonstrate their performance with respect to cross-government initiatives. Again, it is probably an element that is underutilised.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Tim, can you point to any one in particular, such as Aboriginal disadvantage or the counter-terrorism type stuff? Is there anything specific that we are doing at the moment that you can say that that is a complete across-government, joined-up approach for how we deal with an issue?

**Mr Marney:** There are probably a few that stand out. The shared land information platform is a very successful initiative and is pretty complex in that it requires a large number of agencies. It involves information technology systems and that tends to up the complexity substantially.

**The CHAIRMAN:** However, that agency became corporatised last year for it to be able to manage that. Is that necessary or can it still do it as part of government?

**Mr Marney:** No, it has been pursuing that initiative as lead agency of that initiative for a long period. The element that is cross-government relates to interactions with the Valuer-General’s office; planning and infrastructure, particularly the planning side; and the Department of Treasury and Finance through State Revenue. There is a large spread of this initiative across the sector, even right into the Department of Industry and Resources, which holds substantial land information as well, and the Department of Environment and Conservation.

**The CHAIRMAN:** And FESA.

**Mr Marney:** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** We have actually seen that through one of our previous inquiries on emergency management and how FESA interacts -

**Mr Marney:** Even the police. Part of their system’s platform is informed by SLIP. That has been quite a successful model.

Land supply and housing affordability issues are currently being considered and pursued across agencies, and we have numerous agencies in that space - the Department of Housing and Works, LandCorp and the various redevelopment authorities. They have social dimensions to them, so there are child protection and mental health dimensions. Indigenous services is an area that again impacts across all major service delivery agencies. Of the initiatives that we have seen in that area in recent times, probably the Gordon inquiry response stands out as the biggest single cross-

government initiative in that area and probably one of the biggest cross-government initiatives under this government. It had fairly substantial and wide-ranging implications for a number of agencies that require a very focused cooperation and collaborative approach, as well as tight monitoring of those mutual accountabilities. I think the achievement of that has been quite substantial, particularly through the collaboration on the ground in service delivery. If you have the opportunity to visit a multifunction police facility, for example, you will see that collaboration on the ground, which is essential. If you visit places such as Kalumburu or similar remote communities where a small number of service delivery people are present in the community, they necessarily interact substantially with each other because they are often dealing with the same individuals and the issues they are dealing with are so inextricably linked, whether it be education and health issues or corrective services and policing issues. You cannot separate them and we now have these officers in those communities sitting side by side.

[10.25 am]

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** We could look at the example of a multifunction police centre in Kalumburu. For instance, if a multifunction police centre were being set up, how would you make sure that all of the agencies involved had made sure that finances were in place to make it function? Is any mechanism in place to ensure that all the little pieces of the jigsaw puzzle can come together?

**Mr Marney:** Yes. I guess our job is to map the bits of the jigsaw and to make sure that people have neither under nor overestimated their financial requirements to make it work. If that is the decision of government and government wants to establish such a facility, we will go right through the resource requirements to ensure that it is a sustainable model. We will also go back to what has worked in the past and the resourcing that went with that as a benchmark.

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** Is that done through a committee function of the agencies that are coming together and is the information then fed to you?

**Mr Marney:** No, it is fed in individually by those agencies. We then bring that information together in-house and validate it.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Tim, can you tell us how that budget is managed? An example is a multifunction police centre involving health, education, the police and corrective services. Who would actually hold the budget for that facility?

**Mr Marney:** The actual operating budget would sit within the relevant agencies, so it would not be held in a central pool from which the agencies would draw. We identify the overall resource requirements and who should be on the receiving end of those resources, and dish it out as part of the budget process. It falls under the service items within the budget papers.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Do you have capacity to force an agency to contribute if it is not stumping up the right amount? Is it just an understanding or agreement?

**Mr Marney:** No, it would be an explicit approval through the expenditure review committee and government that X amount would be allocated to the achievement of that outcome.

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** In your view, would that be the most efficient way to handle the money?

**Mr Marney:** I think so, in so much as the CEOs of the agencies involved have direct accountability for the performance of that service. They would have accountability for the flow of the resource and the responsible expenditure of that resource. If we were to pool those funds and have people draw from that pool, the traditional accountability mechanisms of the executive of government and Parliament would be diminished under that model. It does not mean that we could not construct something, but at this point we do not have a better alternative. It is pretty important that you know who to ping if things go wrong.

**The CHAIRMAN:** One thing that has been suggested is that if the budget relating to a joint strategy rests with one stakeholder agency, there is a tendency to view that the initiative belongs to

that particular agency. Can you comment on that? Do you have any suggestions as to how we might do that better? Can we fund an outcome rather than individual agencies?

**Mr Marney:** I guess the preferred model is to fund each of the agencies that is involved explicitly for their component of the outcome and to specify that very clearly and have appropriate monitoring in place. Annual reporting is probably the most effective form of monitoring.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Does that not provide an opportunity to pass the buck? For example, an agency could say that it was another agency's fault that it did not work. It might say that it did its bit but the other agency did not do its bit.

**Mr Marney:** The question is not one of how to allocate the resources but how to enforce governance. That comes back to the ministerial structures that sit over cross-government initiatives, whether it be a subcommittee of cabinet that is particularly focused on a specific issue or a lead minister with a steering group of directors general. Those various models have applied. In my view, any of those models can work well. It is a question of the willingness of the people within the models and the extent to which they are held accountable that determines the success of any given mutual accountability model. Quite frankly, if I am not going to lose my job if I am not delivering on one of those mutual accountabilities but I am going to lose my job for non-delivery of my core accountabilities, then that is where my focus is going to be. That is just basic human nature. The success of the model really depends on the enforcement of accountability.

**Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS:** Are KPIs established to identify that mutual accountability or are you looking at that?

**Mr Marney:** That is what we seek. When initiatives are considered by government, that is always our focus in terms of our advice to government; that is, what will be achieved by whom through this initiative? Sometimes that falls together very clearly in a straightforward way and the degree to which the initiative is joined up is less complex. It may be an overarching strategy that has a number of dimensions to it but is not necessarily tightly interlinked as, for example, are some of the issues that you come across in justice and law and order where there are process and policy interactions because the two responsibilities are so tightly connected. Sometimes it is a matter of the initiatives being in the best interests of the separate agencies that are involved as well. I do not remember the term precisely, but I am pretty sure that it is along the lines of the regional justice agreement, which is a coordinated strategy, if you like, for dealing with the interactions of the police system, the justice system and the corrections system.

**Dr G.G. JACOBS:** Tim, I am particularly interested in the coordinated strategy and the whole collaborative approach. I refer to the lead pollution experience in Esperance, which involved the Department of Health, DOCEP, DEC and DPI. There was a deficiency of a collaborative approach. It is borne out in the inquiry that none of the agencies knew what any of the other agencies was about, such as DOCEP's responsibility to classify a dangerous good, the DEC's monitoring role, the DPI's operational practice of ports and the Department of Health's response to a public emergency. I do not believe that there was really enough knowledge or information. Moving forward, how do you think we can make that better? I used that scenario as an example. Being a practical person, I like to try to give an example of how we could make this work better. Would it involve information sharing between or knowledge of the processes within the departments? Does each agency need to know the legislative requirements of the other agencies as well as its own? Katie said that there are issues concerning accountability. What is each agency accountable for? Is this a culture thing? How do we change that? One department has its little patch here and another department has its little patch there but never the twain shall meet, until there is a poor outcome or a bad event and then everybody says, "I thought you did that" or "I thought that was you" and no-one really knew or had any knowledge about it. Sorry, this is a very long question. I am trying -

**The CHAIRMAN:** It is actually quite simple. You spoke about the police, corrective services and justice being interconnected. In the case of the Esperance lead issue, the agencies involved did not

tend to be connected. They should be connected, because if they had been connected, we probably would not have had the fallout that happened.

**Dr G.G. JACOBS:** You put it so well.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I can listen to you, you see. That is it.

**Mr Marney:** Can I get you to repeat the question, Dr Jacobs?

**Dr G.G. JACOBS:** He said it with such a straight face too!

**Mr Marney:** The key comes down to all agencies first understanding their individual accountability and the scope of their activities. What happened in Esperance might be a prime example of a situation in which an agency operated its scope to a certain point and, over time, that scope may have shifted. As needs arise and as priorities change, the boundaries of responsibility or delivery shift over time. Gaps open up between agencies and things fall through those gaps if there is not transparency around those shifts. To my mind, agencies need to very clearly articulate their service delivery objectives, outcomes and measurements, starting with the budget papers and ending with the annual report. That is a key component. That sets it down. To an extent it is a responsibility of Parliament to look at that and to say, "Hang on, the Department of Environment and Conservation is ending its scope of responsibility here yet the Department of Health is not picking that up - there isn't an overlap." Again, I think it comes down to what people are held accountable for in their day-to-day operations. Often in these sorts of circumstances we are talking about people in the middle of very large agencies who are probably not all that interested in the budget papers or in what they say, although I would be staggered to think that anyone would not be interested in budget papers. It probably lacks relevance to what they do on the ground day to day. The question is: how do we get interaction between people on the ground from different agencies day to day? I think that is largely a cultural issue. It is about what we as public sector leaders articulate as our expectation of people on the ground. In my case, my expectation of my people, whether they are in my senior executive team or they are my level 2 information officers, is that they work for the public service. It just so happens that they are part of the Department of Treasury and Finance. I do not think that that is a shared cultural perspective.

**Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS:** How do you change that cultural resistance to better accountability? I clearly see that you probably have expectations and set KPIs for your management team and that that filters down, but you obviously know of other agencies in which that does not happen. How do you actually change that?

**Mr Marney:** I think part of that comes down to whether the leadership wants to change, because ultimately the change falls in their hands, and whether the leadership is disposed to collaborative approaches. I have come across some very - pardon the pun - toxic arrangements or behavioural dispositions between leaders of public sector agencies, which you know will manifest in those gaps opening up.

Although the issues fall into my patch from a financial management and delivery of outcome perspective, from time to time you have to get people in and clunk their heads because it is not about fiefdoms; it is about the public service.

[10.40 am]

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** Just on the culture, let us go back to the example of Indigenous communities. On the poverty issue, we might have the health department and the police, but in order to fix those things, they may require Western Power, the Water Corporation and those types of agencies to improve some of the infrastructure on the ground. That may not be a priority of the particular agency at the particular time. If we have a large collaborative approach to an Indigenous community, how do we make it a priority of the Water Corporation, the electricity agency or any other government department to expend those funds in order for that to occur?

**Mr Marney:** One mechanism that we have used in recent years, and it has been only in the past few years, is to actually explicitly consider those issues as part of the budget process. Normally, the budget is what we call a bilateral discussion between the expenditure review committee and a line minister on their priorities. We introduced a multilateral set of discussions between the expenditure review committee and multiple ministers on a particular issue, whether it was Indigenous outcomes, climate change or counter-terrorism, which affects a number of separate ministers. Rather than considering the issues in isolation, we brought everyone's issues to the table at the same time so that you could identify those causal links, whether it be better environmental facilities such as drainage and sewerage, leading to better health outcomes and then to education outcomes and so on. You can see the spectrum and identify the key causal bits that we need to attack in this and then allocate the funds accordingly.

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** The funds are allocated and the ministers have come together and they go to their CEOs and say that this now becomes your priority. Is that enough for it to be put in place, or are there other processes that need to be done?

**Mr Marney:** It then flows from there into resource agreements, which is the formal accountability sign-off around delivery of those services, and the budget papers themselves and that flows into the annual report. It may be the case that if it is a particular area in which government is concerned about the collaborative delivery, or if, indeed, Treasury and Finance for some reason is concerned about the collaborative delivery of those issues, we will recommend to the expenditure review committee a number of review points through the year whereby one agency or a number of agencies will have to come back or submit to the expenditure review committee a status report. That may flow through to full committee for consideration and involve ministers coming in and chief executives being held accountable for their delivery, or it may be that everything is on track and it sits in Treasury and Finance and we review it and give it a tick and move on.

**The CHAIRMAN:** How do you bring agencies that are off-budget, such as Western Power and Water Corporation, into those?

**Mr Marney:** They are off-budget to the extent of their operating funds. Their capacity to raise debt to invest in their capital is on the total public sector debt balance sheet, so that is where we get them.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I knew you would have a way.

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** So it can work from the top down; that is interesting. It is just that quite often you will hit an agency that just did not have it in its plans. If we wanted underground power here, quite often it would say, "Yes, but that was not our priority; we actually wanted to put the underground power down here." You start to have these internal fights between what the agency had in mind and what government had in mind.

**Mr Marney:** Yes. I guess it is the friction between separate planning processes of agencies and where their service delivery priorities sit. This may come as a shock, but sometimes it is actually very difficult to get the public sector to fall into line with government's priority.

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** That was my concern.

**The CHAIRMAN:** You are not joking, are you?

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** Could there be a possibility of committee structures that actually bridge those gaps? Would that just be a waste of resources, or do you think that could perhaps be a way to bridge some of those difficulties?

**Mr Marney:** No, it is a way and we use that quite a bit. A lot of the review processes that you would witness from time to time, whether it is the Mahoney review into the justice system or the Reid review into the health system, are implemented through steering committee structures. For

example, in the Reid review, I am joint chair of the steering committee for the implementation of health reform, so there are those structures in place that involve a number of directors general.

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** Sorry to belabour it, but let us just say that we decided that there was to be sewerage and drainage in a remote community. Would the Treasury then say, “We’re going to put this many million dollars aside and that will be used for that only”, which would make those agencies undertake that work, or would that be put into their consolidated budget?

**Mr Marney:** Very few agencies have a consolidated capital expenditure budget that is not attached to specific projects. It will be allocated to a specific project in their budget. That project will be published as part of their forward capital works as part of the budget papers. It will be recorded in our systems as assigned to a particular project and then that project will be monitored over time.

**The CHAIRMAN:** You mentioned that, from your viewpoint, the process starts at the budget papers and ends up in the annual report. How well publicised or marketed are the budget papers at the agency? In my experience having worked at Curtin University, the budget papers were done in that department and we were all down at the bottom working away and fixing up the air conditioning and we did not have a clue what the budget papers said, so we really did not care whether we went over budget or under budget; it was not an issue to us. That is the fact of the matter. It is not an issue for the person on the ground who really does not see that.

**Mr Marney:** Nor should it be. A mid-level officer’s responsibility is to deliver services; it is not to manage the agency or entity involved. How it should translate is through, if you like, the cascade of planning processes into business plans, operational plans and individual plans for what everyone does in the organisation. For example, if I take Treasury and Finance, our submissions to the budget process are based around our business plans. The outcomes of those submissions, as well as ongoing expenditure of resources, are captured in our annual operational plans. The operational plans align one for one with my own performance agreement, so the things that I am held accountable for personally flow into the operational plans for the organisation as a whole. They are summarised in the resource agreement that I have with the Treasurer, and they then flow from operational plans right into individual performance plans. Every person in the Department of Treasury and Finance has a 12-month performance plan that links back to those higher objectives. They may not immediately see the snakes and ladders that lead to that higher objective, but that is certainly the intent, and their individual performance plan is formulated on that basis. That is how it should flow from an organisation perspective.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Can you tell us, in terms of Treasury, what is the difference between resourcing and funding, and how is resourcing of collaborative initiatives best achieved in your opinion?

**Mr Marney:** The difference between resourcing and funding? Resourcing is the level of dollars required to deliver a particular service or good. The funding of those dollars can be spread from various sources. Resourcing is the pool of money. Funding is where that pool of money comes from. It may be from internal revenues. It may be from consolidated revenues. It may be from cash at bank. There are various different sources of funds to provide a resource. Does that make sense? Part two?

**The CHAIRMAN:** How is resourcing of collaborative initiatives best achieved in your opinion?

**Mr Marney:** In terms of resourcing, I think through the expenditure review committee processes and through the consideration of whole-of-government issues, through multilateral settings; that is, by getting all the issues down in front of you at once so that you can actually see the interactions of the various elements of service delivery across agencies and then you can identify the priorities, the weak links in the chain to which you might need to provide additional resources, and you can look at the issue from a holistic perspective. I think that is how it works best.



**Mrs J. HUGHES:** We see that there are some cross-agency and collaborative approaches versus, say, a budgetary request to do things. For cost efficiency and better outcomes, are we doing it enough and would it be better for this government to look at a much broader collaborative approach? Would we be getting better bang for our buck basically in your view?

**Mr Marney:** It is hard to give you a yes or no answer on that.

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** Yes, I understand.

**Mr Marney:** It is case by case.

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** Are we getting better outcomes for the money expended on some of the things that we are doing with, for instance, remote communities, policing or health? Are we getting a better outcome, do you think?

**Mr Marney:** I think it does vary case by case, depending on the initiatives involved, the agencies involved, their cultural settings and their disposition in working with other agencies. Over time, it is difficult to compare like with like because of the machinery of government changes that have forced collaboration in different ways. It is hard to say that we are doing stuff better or worse than we were five years ago. What I would say, though, is that we can always do stuff better, and I think there are some areas in which greater accountability for collaboration would be useful.

**The CHAIRMAN:** More of a legislative framework for collaboration?

**Mr Marney:** There are accountability frameworks there now that are useable.

**The CHAIRMAN:** What about the one that has just been brought in?

**Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS:** Are you suggesting that Parliament is not actually working as it should?

**Mr Marney:** I will leave you to make the comparison yourself. If I can be frank, the estimates process should go to these issues.

**Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS:** Yes, it should, but it does not. As a member of the opposition, I get frustrated by the way we operate at estimates. It is probably inappropriate for me to be making these comments at this hearing, so I will just bite my tongue. However, it is very frustrating that we are not able to utilise that process to get the accountability out in the open so that the community ends up with a better outcome.

[10.55 am]

**Mr Marney:** In that space, I guess, I would be keen to hear from you on whether or not there are gaps in the presentation of information in the budget process in the budget papers because they are your papers; we provide them to facilitate Parliament's debate.

If there are elements of those papers that do not enable you to carry out that debate effectively or to the extent that you want, I would be keen for that feedback so that we can feed that into some work that we are doing at the moment so that we can better meet your needs.

**Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS:** From my perspective, I do not think that the process allows us enough opportunity or time between when we receive the budget papers and we meet for estimates to thoroughly look at the papers. We really only get about a week. It is a lot of material to digest. Obviously, opposition members each have portfolio responsibilities, so we focus on those.

**Mr Marney:** Surely that is all that you have to do that week!

**Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS:** Thanks, Tim; I will take that on board. I am obviously not managing my time.

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** You mentioned earlier that the information was listed under the significant trends and that we cannot find cross-pollinating agencies in a particular outcome; we have to search through the significant trends. If there were a way to isolate an outcome that involved four or five

agencies, we could start to link up a total project rather than just see a small piece of it. That might then create an opportunity for people to put through projects and to bring other agencies into projects because it would assist them in getting their projects up and functioning. I do not know whether the papers that we receive would define that.

**Mr Marney:** They define the outcomes and services in isolation. I do not think that there is an overall mapping of the interaction and outcomes anywhere in the papers. That may be something that we need to think about in terms of informing that process.

**The CHAIRMAN:** One thing about the budget papers is that they are formulated by financial people. The majority of people in government and Parliament are not financial people.

**Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS:** Only a couple of members have economics degrees. I do not even think that we have an accountant in the Parliament.

**The CHAIRMAN:** That is where it seems to fall down. We can sit there but we cannot pick the papers to pieces as financial people might be able to do. They could say, “Hang on, here you are saying this but there you are saying that. How does that meet up?”

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** I think parliamentarians are good at looking at a project and seeing an outcome for the community. That is probably where their strength lies, because that is where they are coming from.

**Mr Marney:** In essence, the question is not about the allocation of resources but about the delivery of outcomes. It is not a financial skills issue; it is a policy issue.

**Mrs J. HUGHES:** The pooling of that information would be great.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I believe that New South Wales has a state plan that incorporates both collaborative strategies or KPIs and a percentage of the budget into the various performance agreements of directors general. Do you know anything about that and the mechanisms that are involved? If you do, can you tell us what you know and how well it has been received across government?

**Mr Marney:** I am vaguely aware of it, but that is about it. This is a challenge that faces all jurisdictions. Many of the jurisdictions met last year as part of an ANZSOG conference. Fortunately, there was a fairly significant representation of OECD budget and finance committees in Australia at the time and we brought them together. The challenges that we are discussing are also faced by the UK, the Netherlands and Canada. It is a similar situation everywhere. I do not think that New South Wales has found the cure-all just yet.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Is anywhere in the world ahead of the rest?

**Mr Marney:** Unfortunately, the two days we spent discussing these issues ended up being pretty much group therapy, in so much as no-one had a definitive solution - we just had shared problems. I would not say that anywhere is particularly better than anywhere else. There are certainly overarching plans that inform the priorities, whether it be the New South Wales plan, the Alberta plan or our own variant, which is the “Better Planning: Better Futures” document of government. However, unless we get specific about deliverables and unless we measure and evaluate the performance of those deliverables, accountability will break down. The critical elements of collaborative, cross-government or joined-up government initiatives, as well as of single agency initiatives, are clarity about the overall desired outcomes, the setting of specific time lines and targets that need to be achieved, and the ongoing monitoring and evaluation of delivery against those time lines and targets. Unless those elements are in place, the outcomes will not be optimised.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Members, I am conscious of the time. Are there any other questions?

**Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS:** It has been very informative.

**Mr Marney:** It is always great to have the opportunity to chat with you as key stakeholders. I reinforce that the budget papers are your papers. We are keen to improve the user-friendly dimension of those papers.

**Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS:** Tim, I have been in the Parliament now for 11 years, which is longer than any other member here. That is a real shame.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Just about longer than all of us combined!

**Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS:** I remember that in my first couple of years, we were always given a summary of what was going on in our electorates. That does not happen now and has not happened for some time. I am sure that it is far too much work for agencies, but it was always really helpful to have that information.

**Mr Marney:** At the moment I think we only do that for capital projects. It is not done for ongoing initiatives.

**Ms K. HODSON-THOMAS:** Like maintenance and repairs?

**Mr Marney:** Yes.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Tim, we have to finish with you. Before we do, do you have anything that you would like to say that we have not yet covered?

**Mr Marney:** I think I just did that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Thanks for your attendance this morning and for giving evidence before the committee. A transcript of the hearing will be forwarded to you for the correction of minor errors. Please make those corrections and return the transcript to us within 10 days of receipt. If the transcript is not returned within this time, it will be deemed to be correct. Again, thanks very much for making yourself available this morning.

**Mr Marney:** Thank you. It is always a pleasure.

**Hearing concluded at 11.02 am**

---