

MFAT Management Response to Evaluation of the Tonga Police Development Programme

This template is for Activity Managers to describe the programme's response to an Activity evaluation. It should be reviewed by the Deputy Director or Development Counsellor, and approved by the Director within two months of the final Activity evaluation report being approved.

About this document

This document describes the programme's response to the evaluation.

Evaluation report title:	Tonga Police Development Programme Evaluation
File title of final pdf report:	INTD-50-5324 TPDP Evaluation Report_Final
GDM Link to final pdf report:	Tonga Police Development Programme Evaluation
GDM Link to final Word report:	Tonga Police Development Programme Evaluation
AMS Activity Number:	A11680
Activity Manager:	Jordan Green/Elena Procuta
Programme:	Tonga Programme
MFAT response approved by:	Matt Howell, Unit Manager
Approved date:	30 November 2016
Evaluation cost to MFAT:	\$44,719

Approval

Approval of the MFAT Management Response to Evaluation	
Approved by:	
Signature:	
	Matthew Howell, Unit Manager
Date:	26/01/17

MFAT Management Response

This table lists actions that MFAT will undertake in response to the findings, lessons and recommendations of the evaluation. Tonga Police, New Zealand Police and Australia Federal Police all developed management responses.

	Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
1.	All TPDP partners participate in an integrated planning session for the 2016-2017 cycle. The purpose of the planning session is primarily to ensure priority setting, and implementation and monitoring arrangements are coordinated and agreed across the four TPDP partners. A key outcome of the planning session is a single agreed work plan for the remainder of TPDP Phase 2 which links activities to the Tonga Police corporate plan and outlines all TPDP contributions (LTA, STA, training, attachments, etc.). The planning session should also discuss and agree arrangements for updating the Results Framework for the TPDP.	Agree. There is a strong argument for integrated planning and a single TPDP workplan to strengthen coordination of TPDP activities, against which progress is measured through integrated reporting. Having such a planning session will be undertaken during the Activity design refresh process. An updated, simple and measurable TPDP Results Framework is an expected output of this process.	All partners (MFAT, Tonga Police, NZ Police, AFP) (facilitated by the Technical Adviser (TA) undertaking the TPDP Activity redesign process)	August/ September 2016	
2.	TPDP planning for the 2016-2017 cycle include setting out with Tonga Police both its infrastructure and equipment priorities and identify where TPDP will contribute to those priorities for the remainder of Phase 2.	Agree. MFAT will request Tonga Police identify its infrastructure and equipment priorities, with estimated costs, for the remainder of the TPDP (that demonstrates relativity of expected benefits in comparison to the other three output areas).	Police Commissioner and Executive to advise its infrastructure and equipment priorities for the remainder of TPDP support. Through the MFAT design approval processes, MFAT to consider the comparative value of infrastructure costs in relation to the expected development gains and overall objectives of the TPDP.	August/ September 2016 January 2017 (once the design document has been endorsed by the TPDP governance committee)	

	Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
3.	The TPDP work closely with Tongatapu-based District Commanders to ensure their police officers view engaging with community policing systems and procedures as a core function of their work.	Agree. Review of current community engagement strategy needs to be carried out and for District Commanders to drive implementation of revised/new strategy with oversight by TP Executive.	Tonga Police Executive; NZP/AFP Advisers	Tonga Police to determine	
4.	The TPDP works with the Prevention Group and District Commanders to expand on prevention work, particularly with youth and schools.	Agree. Activities to start work on this has been incorporated in the TPDP 2016/17 workplan.	NZP/AFP Advisers	By June 2017	
5.	The TPDP expand its current capacity building approaches, including mentoring, to better meet Tonga Police's focus on leadership and organisational development.	Agree. MFAT's view is that there needs to be a more structured and systematic approach to all capacity development activities (core policing skills training through to leadership coaching and mentoring) undertaken through the TPDP, based on a costed skills/training needs analysis for all Tonga Police roles. Tonga Police expects the existing TPDP advisors to add value to the establishment of a leadership development framework (LDF) to build strong leaders within police and community. Part of which would be to establish a Training and Development Board to assist in identifying future leaders as well as a mentoring program to be delivered to all police districts with a focus on supporting police members to develop Personal/Career Development Plans and achieving career goals.	NZP/AFP Advisers, with Tonga Police Executive	Underway by June 2017	

	Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
6.	The TPDP address deficiencies in training-related assessment by: - capturing information regarding all training/attachments it has funded under Phase 2 and include in the TPDP Annual Reports. - undertaking an internal review/assessment of training and attachments provided thus far under TPDP Phase 2 to ascertain their effectiveness. - Police Training College staff undertaking follow-up assessments for all future training, with TPDP assisting with this analysis of the training assessments and including the analysis in TPDP Annual Reports. - considering recommendations from the KAP survey regarding training (further detail on these is included in Chapter 7 Recommendations).	Agree. As above. MFAT considers this important to guide all future capacity development activities undertaken through the TPDP. (The response would need to be cognisant of limitations with TPDP resourcing).	TPDP Programme Manager, with guidance from the NZP and AFP advisers	Under way by June 2017	
7.	The TPDP produce an annual report (as outlined in the design document) which includes an assessment of progress against the TPDP outputs (supported by qualitative and quantitative data), documents lessons learned, discusses challenges and reports on expenditure.	Agree. This is a contractual responsibility and minimum requirement for Tonga Police to articulate the achievements, risks and areas for improvement of the TPDP. This should be led by Tonga Police, with some guidance/input by NZ Police and AFP.	Police Commissioner TPDP Programme Manager (with short-term TA coaching assistance if needed)	June 2017	
8.	The TPDP re-confirm the purpose/role of each of the long-term adviser positions to ensure that core capability building needs of Tonga Police are being covered. This should include specific consideration of how each adviser will mentor and focus on skills transfer for the relevant TPDP project managers.	Agree. This is important to ensure that AFP and NZ Police LTA roles are complementary, build on the competencies and skills of the LTA, and match the training/PD needs, particularly for the Police Executive and TPDP Project Managers. This could be undertaken through the design refresh process.	All partners (MFAT, Tonga Police, NZ Police, AFP) through the design process	August/September 2016	

	Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
9.	Representatives from Tonga Police Executive continue to have input into selection of all long-term TPDP advisers. Depending on the circumstances for each implementing agency this input could be limited to commenting on selection criteria for TPDP advisers, or as wide as full participation in a selection committee.	Agree. MFAT sees merit in the Executive participating in selection of long-term advisors.	NZ Police, Police Executive	As arises	
10.	Over the next two years, there should be a focus on consolidation of gender equality gains made which will require TPDP to support: - targeted support to female officers in undertaking their duties through further training, including in areas that are non-administrative and are viewed as "core policing" such as criminal investigations, responding to calls, general "active duty" functions and forensics; - further training – from a range of providers, including civil society, on key gender issues not limited to domestic violence. Understanding of gender equality principles through further training and exposure would benefit the entire police force, and should be integrated into a range of training opportunities. - development and implementation of systems to monitor and report on the degree to which female officers are provided with the same opportunities and role responsibilities as male officers. - as part of the support to the performance management system, ensuring that gender equity is considered in all performance appraisals.	Agree. While progress has been made, there is an opportunity to build on the momentum through a purposive approach. The approach could be spelled out in the design refresh. The design should also delineate the responsibilities of the Police Commissioner/Tonga Police and the TPDP. A structured professional development/capacity development programme (discussed above) could capture the intent of these recommendations.	Police Commissioner and Executive AFP, NZ Police, MFAT, Tonga Police (through the design process)	August/September 2016	

	Recommendation	Response and Action (Agree, Partially Agree, Reject)	Responsibility	When	12 month progress
11.	The TPDP address the Phase 2 design recommendations for embedding gender-inclusive policies and practices by way of: ○ clear links to one or more of the programme outcomes ○ activities identified within the outputs ○ defined indicators and data sets for measurement (Appendix Seven includes a list of indicators that could be considered for inclusion in the RMT) ○ activities linked to gender which reach a range of Tonga Police staff (not just women) and which address attitudes and behaviour.	Agree. This should be covered through the design refresh process, but with specific actions.	All partners (MFAT, Tonga Police, NZ Police, AFP) through the design process	August/September 2016	
12.	The TPDP has demonstrated strong consideration of sustainability throughout its various activities. The following are some suggestions for enhancing existing efforts: ○ integrated, joint planning to ensure all TPDP inputs are aligned to support priority needs of Tonga Police. ○ better communication from TPDP to a broad audience within Tonga Police to ensure all stakeholders clearly understand expectations and arrangements for utilising and maintaining infrastructure and equipment. ○ TPDP reporting to comment on the success, or otherwise, of specific measures undertaken by TPDP to enhance sustainability.	Agree. Most of these points are covered above. MFAT want funding of infrastructure and equipment improvements to be accompanied by commitment and action to enforce expectations on use and maintenance of infrastructure and equipment.	TPDP governance committee (Programme Management Committee), Police Commissioner	Ongoing	
13.	An assessment of the extent to which expected recurrent costs have been incorporated in the Tonga Police budget.	Agree. Our understanding is that this has already commenced, but requires ongoing liaison and monitoring between the NZP and AFP advisers and the Tonga Police Executive.	Tonga Police Executive and NZP/AFP Advisers (and TPDP Programme Manager)	Ongoing, but with analysis discussed at the TPDP monthly meetings during the Government of Tonga budget processes	

Dissemination plan

The evaluation will be/has been shared with partner organisations, MFAT staff and other stakeholders in the following ways:

No.	Method of dissemination	Responsibility of	When
1	Evaluation report published on the MFAT website	Development Support Officer of the Evaluation Team (PDG DSE)	By 15 December 2016
2	Evaluation report distributed to: - Tonga Police - New Zealand Police - Australia Federal Police – Nuku'alofa - Australia Federal Police - Canberra	Activity Manager	June 2016
3	Adam Smith International (for the purpose of integrating findings into the strategic evaluation of New Zealand's development assistance to Tonga)	Activity Manager	June 2016

Report Release Checklist

Note: This checklist must be used for all evaluations that will be published in full on MFAT's website. Where the report has been commissioned by a partner organisation and is published on their website, MFAT should simply seek written permission from the partner to provide a link to the published evaluation from our website. Attach a copy of the partner's permission to this MFAT Response to Evaluation template in lieu of this Report Release Checklist.

NAME OF THE REPORT: TONGA POLICE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME EVALUATION

AUTHOR(S): STACEY TENNANT AND SANDRA BERNKLAU

REPORT MONTH AND YEAR: APRIL 2016

All evaluation reports should be able to be publicly released in accordance with the principle of availability (Section 5 of the Official Information Act (OIA)). However, this principle can be overridden if there is 'good reason' (as set out in the OIA) to withhold information. Use this checklist to help you decide if sections in the evaluation report should be withheld.

If any of the answers to these questions is 'yes' then:

- A hard copy of the report should be marked up with brackets around the information to be withheld, and the OIA section under which the information is to be withheld noted (refer to MFAT Style and Practice Guide OIA Requests)*
- The PDF copy of the report that is submitted to the Development Support Officer (DSE) for the library and public release will have the withheld information whited out and the reasons for withholding noted in the margins. The following note should be placed in the report: Certain information in this report has been withheld in accordance with the Official Information Act and the grounds for withholding, as at the time of publication, are noted in the margins.*

If you are unsure whether a good reason to withhold exists seek advice from the IDG staff member responsible for OIAs or the MFAT corporate legal team.

OIA Section 6 Conclusive Reasons: Are there words in the evaluation that are likely to:

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--|
| a) Prejudice the security or defence of NZ or NZ's international relations? | ☐ Yes | ☒ No |
| b) Prejudice the entrusting of information to the Government of NZ on a basis of confidence by (i) the Government of any other country or (ii) any international organisation? | ☐ Yes | ☒ No |
| c) Prejudice the maintenance of the law? | ☐ Yes | ☒ No |
| d) Endanger the safety of any person? | ☐ Yes | ☒ No |
| e) Damage seriously the NZ economy? | ☐ Yes | ☒ No |

OIA Section 7 Special Reasons: Are there words in the evaluation that are likely to:

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--|
| a) Prejudice the security or defence of the Cook Islands, Niue, Tokelau or the Ross Dependency? | ☐ Yes | ☒ No |
| b) Prejudice relations between the governments of NZ, and governments of the Cook Island and Niue? | ☐ Yes | ☒ No |
| c) Prejudice the international relations of the governments of the Cook Islands or Niue | ☐ Yes | ☒ No |

OIA Section 9 Other Reasons: Are there words in the evaluation that need to be withheld to:

(Note: There is need to balance Section 9 grounds for withholding against 'public interest considerations'. Consider the negative consequences from release, and whether or not these consequences are outweighed by the public interest in access to the information.)

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------|------|
| a) Protect the privacy of natural persons? | ☐ Yes | X No |
| b) Protect trade secrets and commercial positions? | ☐ Yes | X No |
| c) c)Protect information that is subject to an obligation of confidence where release of the information would be likely to i) prejudice the supply of similar information from the same source and it is in the public interest that such information should continue to be supplied or (ii) otherwise damage the public interest? | ☐ Yes | X No |
| d) Avoid prejudice to measures protecting the health or safety of members of the public? | ☐ Yes | X No |
| e) Avoid prejudice to the substantial economic interests of New Zealand? | ☐ Yes | X No |
| f) Avoid prejudice to measures that prevent or mitigate material loss to members of the public? | ☐ Yes | X No |

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|------|
| a) Maintain the constitutional conventions including the confidentiality of advice tendered by ministers and officials? | ☐ Yes | X No |
| b) Maintain effective conduct of public affairs through free and frank expressions of opinion and protection from improper pressure or harassment? | ☐ Yes | X No |
| c) Maintain legal professional privilege? | ☐ Yes | X No |
| d) Enable a minister department or organisation holding information to carry out commercial activities without prejudice or disadvantage? | ☐ Yes | X No |
| e) Enable a minister, department or organisation holding the information to carry on negotiations without prejudice or disadvantage? | ☐ Yes | X No |
| f) Prevent the disclosure or use of official information for improper gain or advantage? | ☐ Yes | X No |

Other Reason: Is there any other reason for withholding information?

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------|------|
| • If the answer is yes then seek advice from the IDG staff member responsible for OIA or the MFAT corporate legal team. | ☐ Yes | X No |
|---|------------------------------|------|

RECOMMENDATION

- ☐ Withhold selected parts, noting sections of the OIA applying to these in a copy of the report that is filed, and white-ed out in the copy of the report to be forwarded to the Development Support Officer (DSE) for public release and the library
- X Release entire report

Signed by Elena Procuta, Activity Manager

Signed by Matt Howell, Unit Manager

Date: Day/Month/Year

