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Executive Summary

Introduction
i. This report documents the findings and recommendations from the peer review of New Zealand’s Development Cooperation policies and procedures and the effectiveness of its application in Forum island countries under the aegis of the 2009 Forum Compact for Strengthening Development Coordination in the Pacific. This is the first of its kind for the Pacific – where a development partner has participated in a formal process of peer review undertaken by representatives from partner Forum Island countries and other development partners that benefit from and/or engage in its development cooperation programme.

ii. Pacific Forum Leaders have actively supported global effectiveness efforts by tailoring to the regional context through the 2007 Pacific Islands Forum Principles for Aid Effectiveness and the 2009 Cairns Compact for Strengthening Development Coordination in the Pacific (Forum Compact). The key objective of the Forum Compact is to drive more effective coordination of development resources from both Forum Island Countries and development partners, with the aim of achieving real progress against the Millennium Development Goals.

Peer Reviews
iii. A key deliverable of the 2009 Forum Compact was the implementation of country peer reviews. Country peer reviews, conducted by representatives from FICs and development partners and supported by the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS), have reviewed country systems including processes for development planning and budgeting, public financial management (PFM) and aid management.

iv. The concept of a peer review of development partners emerged from the 2012 Pacific Regional Aid Effectiveness Workshop and was affirmed at the 2012 Pacific Islands Countries – Development Partners meeting. New Zealand was willing to be the first development partner to be reviewed. PIFS prepared generic Terms of Reference (TORs) based on the peer review process developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC). New Zealand tailored the TORs, proposing the timing to align with an OECD DAC peer review in November 2014; nominated Kiribati as the case study country; proposed the scope of the peer review; the composition of the peer review team; and the process for finalisation of the peer review report and its recommendations.

New Zealand’s Development Cooperation Context
v. New Zealand’s International Development Policy Statement - Supporting Sustainable Development 2011 describes New Zealand’s mission as – “to support sustainable development in developing countries, in order to reduce poverty and to contribute to a more secure, equitable and prosperous world of sustainable economic development”. The Development Effectiveness Policy Statement and Action Plan 2014-2016 responds to this policy statement and the Global Partnership principles. A series of policies and plans operationalise these documents.

vi. New Zealand responds to its key geographic positioning in the Pacific by placing greatest priority on support for the Pacific Region in terms of its Official Development Assistance (ODA) allocation and a targeted approach to other parts of the world.

vii. For the period 2012/13 to 2014/15 New Zealand’s indicative allocations for development assistance through bilateral programs in the Pacific was $NZD638.1 million with a further $NZD154 million for Pacific Regional programmes, making a total contribution to bilateral and regional assistance of NZD792.1 million. The Pacific also benefits from New Zealand funding for multi lateral agencies, humanitarian support, partnerships and funds, scholarships and other generic programs.

Kiribati Development Cooperation Context
viii. The Kiribati Development Plan 2012 – 2015 provides the foundation for the development agenda in Kiribati. It provides a broad focus on human resource development, economic growth and poverty reduction, health, environment, governance and infrastructure. The 2010 Kiribati Country Peer Review report identified the need for improvements in planning and coordination, including the Government taking a lead role in donor coordination and to commit to public financial management reforms. The 2012 update found that while some work had been done to implement the recommendations of the 2010 review there was still some way to go.
The development landscape in Kiribati is relatively uncrowded - only New Zealand, Australia, Cuba and Taiwan have resident representation, though Japan, multilateral donors (UN) and both the Asia Development Bank and World Bank are active. In the year to October 2014 the total aid provided to Kiribati was AUD81,847,410 plus AUD6,834,121 in budget support. New Zealand’s contribution to the development budget was AUD11,003,113 and an additional AUD 1 million was provided through budget support making a total contribution of AUD 12,003,113.

**Scope of the Peer Review**

A key focus of the country peer review process has been on knowledge sharing and peer-to-peer learning, goals shared by the development partner peer review process. Specifically, the peer review aims to:

- Assess how effectively New Zealand’s development cooperation is coordinated in order to address the development needs of FICs;
- Foster mutual learning on effective development cooperation practice, innovation and coordination to improve both FIC and development partner policy and practice;
- Increase understanding by FICs and development partners of New Zealand’s development cooperation policies, strategies and procedures and its implementation;
- Identify recommendations for the improvement of New Zealand’s development cooperation with FICs; and
- Establish an agreed Implementation Plan with targets and indicators for review follow up and monitoring.

**Methodology**

The methodology for the peer review builds on the principles of ownership, inclusiveness and transparency and the lessons from the country peer reviews. Throughout the process the host development partner, peer review team and PIFS were expected to interact in a spirit of team collaboration, sharing information at all levels to facilitate a successful review5.

The review team spent one week in Wellington focusing on New Zealand’s policies and two days in Tarawa to explore the links between policy, practice and results in a FIC context. The Kiribati member of the review team was unable to participate in the Wellington phase but joined the review team in Tarawa.

The Forum Compact review was undertaken in parallel with the DAC Peer Review of New Zealand’s Development Cooperation. The Forum Compact review team drew on their prior knowledge of Kiribati and its development context and participated largely in joint sessions with the OECD DAC. Again, engaging with both government and non-government stakeholders was critical in compiling multi-stakeholder perspectives. The team was privileged to meet with the President of Kiribati, HE Anote Tong. (Kiribati consultations - Annex E.)

Both the review team and the OECD DAC prepared and presented separate aide memoires. The findings of both were consistent from consultations in Wellington and Tarawa.

This draft report draws on both the New Zealand consultations and Kiribati case study to show links between New Zealand policy and practice. It also draws on the experience of the review team with New Zealand’s aid programme. It aims to provide a balanced perspective, recognising the different stages and progress towards development effectiveness in Samoa and Kiribati (as country representative and case study country). Kiribati is still developing its aid policies and aid management practices; the other, Samoa, has well established aid management practices that support country leadership and ownership of development.

**Findings & Recommendations**

New Zealand is a committed and effective development partner that actively seeks to apply the principles of aid effectiveness in a pragmatic way considering the varying capabilities in different countries and contexts and the challenges of implementing projects of various kinds. The report provides a very detailed analysis against each of the focus areas and concludes:

- New Zealand has established a sound policy and operational basis for the delivery of its aid programme. This is evidenced by strong strategic and operational policies and plans.
- Through extensive organisational change, a new culture and ethos is emerging in MFAT that supports its policies and plans and encourages learning and innovation. New staff and integration with MFAT has added new skills and perspectives.
- The HLCs and the Joint Commitment for Development with Kiribati provide an opportunity

---


4 Kiribati Peer Review Report. 2010

to progress country leadership and ownership. It is important that both partners continue to engage in policy dialogue to ensure the primary focus of the agreements remain on partner country needs (rather than New Zealand priorities).

- In its willingness to assist partner countries New Zealand may ‘do the work’ for the country rather than facilitate the use of the partner country’s own systems. Development partners, like New Zealand, can and should play a ‘push’ role when there is little ‘pull’ from the country.

- New Zealand would benefit from greater inclusion of non-government organisations, civil society and other opinion leaders, including academics in New Zealand. These groups would bring a broader perspective and capacity that would enhance the good work already being done.

xv. The report identifies opportunities for New Zealand to support Forum Island Countries through capacity/institutional building initiatives as part of New Zealand’s development assistance. This re-emphasizes recommendations made in the Country Peer Review process. The report also identifies areas where New Zealand can support Forum Island Countries strengthen their leadership and ownership of the development agenda in their own countries.

Recommendations

xvi. The report provides a total of eighteen recommendations that respond to the detailed analysis of the focus areas. The development and resourcing of the Review Implementation Plan is integral to ensuring the utility of the Review process. New Zealand is encouraged to establish clear time bound and costed milestones in the development of the Implementation Plan and to work closely with the Secretariat in developing a monitoring and reporting approach for the Plan.
Introduction

1. This report documents the findings and recommendations from the peer review of New Zealand’s Development Cooperation policies and procedures and the effectiveness of its application in Forum island countries under the aegis of the 2009 Forum Compact for Strengthening Development Coordination in the Pacific. This is the first of its kind for the Pacific – where a development partner has participated in a formal process of peer review undertaken by representatives from partner Forum Island countries and other development partners that benefit from and/or engage in its development cooperation programme.

2. Findings and recommendations from this report will complement a range of other Forum Compact evidence based efforts, including the annual Synthesis Report on Development Partner Reporting and the annual “Tracking the Effectiveness of Development Efforts” report which consolidates all Forum Compact evidence based monitoring and reporting efforts and is tabled at the annual Forum Leaders’ meeting.

3. The review process reflects the commitment of all Pacific leaders and development partners to enhance coordination of development cooperation and improve the effectiveness of development efforts in the region in alignment with the global commitments arising out of Rome, Paris, Accra and Busan (see below).
Context

Development effectiveness context

4. Since 2003 the global aid effectiveness agenda has progressively moved from a focus on coordination and streamlining of activities (agreed at the High Level Forum on Harmonization in Rome) to the five principles of the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results and mutual accountability) to partnerships (through the 2008 Accra Agenda for Action). The focus on partnership was further developed at the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in 2011 in Busan. This meeting marked a turning point from aid effectiveness to development effectiveness: focusing on inclusiveness and ensuring that there was meaningful engagement of the private sector, civil society, parliamentarians, international organisations and foundations in the development process. The Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation focused the world on four principles for effective development co-operation: a) ownership by developing countries; b) results as a focus of development efforts; c) partnerships for inclusive development; and d) transparency and accountability.

5. In the Pacific, Leaders have actively supported global aid effectiveness efforts by tailoring the global agenda to the regional context. In 2007, the Pacific Islands Forum put together its own principles\(^6\) for aid effectiveness, based on those of the Paris Declaration. They refer to the importance of national leadership and governance, transparency in national planning, resource allocation and financial management, creating a sense of "ownership" of development and aid, measuring results and adopting a coordinated approach among government departments and donors\(^7\).

6. In 2009, Pacific Island Forum Leaders adopted the Cairns Compact for Strengthening Development Coordination in the Pacific (Forum Compact). This was in response to concerns that the Pacific region remained off track to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) despite high levels of development assistance over many years. The key objective of the Forum Compact is to drive more effective coordination of development resources from both Forum Island Countries (FICs) and development partners, with the aim of achieving real progress against the MDGs.

7. The Forum Compact sets out principles to guide key deliverables, including acknowledgment that country leadership and mutual accountability are fundamental to successful development outcomes. It also recognises the importance of the private sector, governance and improved infrastructure to development in the Pacific. The Forum Compact reinforced the need for close alignment of regional aid efforts with regional priorities\(^8\). The process for prioritisation is well set out in the recommendations of the subsequent review of the Pacific Plan in 2013.

8. As part of its contribution to the global aid effectiveness agenda, the Forum Compact has localised the global principles through "home-grown" processes that contribute to enhancing country leadership and ownership; mutual accountability and inclusive partnerships. The results of these contribute to global monitoring processes, providing representation at high level governance mechanisms and using Forum Compact evidence to inform the global debate on good practices around effective institutions and mutual accountability.

9. Much of this evidence is documented through the annual Pacific Regional MDGs Tracking Reports and the Tracking the Effectiveness of Development Efforts Reports. The 2014 reports show that Pacific development partners are showing more willingness to open themselves to scrutiny, improving alignment with FICs national priorities, harmonising processes with other development partners and a greater use of country systems through delivery of assistance through budget support based on mutually agreed policy based agreements. While gradual progress is being made, more effort is needed to increase and sustain the use of country systems by development partners and aid fragmentation remains a concern. Aid predictability is variable and there is slow but gradual progress of development partners to align priorities, aid delivery processes to suit Pacific conditions\(^9\) and country context.

10. At the 2012 Pacific Island Countries - Development Partners meeting it was agreed the Global Partnership commitments/indicators be included as part of the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for tracking development effectiveness efforts and progress at the regional and national levels.

---

\(^6\) The 2007 Pacific Principles for Aid Effectiveness was adopted by the Pacific Island Countries/Development Partners (PIC-Partners) Meeting
\(^7\) http://www.forumsec.org/pages.cfm/strategic-partnerships-coordination/
pacific-principles-on-aid-effectiveness/forum-compact/
\(^8\) Forum Communiqué Fourth Pacific Islands Forum Cairns Compact on Strengthening Development Coordination in the Pacific, August 2009
\(^9\) 2014 Tracking The Effectiveness Of Development Efforts In The Pacific Report. Page 8
Peer reviews

11. A key deliverable of the 2009 Forum Compact was the implementation of country peer reviews. Country peer reviews, conducted by representatives from FICs and development partners and supported by the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS), have reviewed country systems including processes for development planning and budgeting, public financial management (PFM) and aid management. To date, thirteen FICs have completed peer reviews and participated in associated follow up visits. The country peer review process respects country ownership and leadership, takes a balanced approach to what is working well and what could be improved and offers practical advice from other FICs. The peer reviews have made 173 recommendations across the thirteen FICs, the majority focusing on strengthening systems and capacities in national planning and aid management. Notably, most countries were advised ‘to establish and enforce clearer rules of engagement and expectations with their development partners through new and revised development cooperation policies’.

12. The concept of a peer review of development partners in the Pacific emerged from decisions of the 2012 Pacific Regional Aid Effectiveness Workshop (PRAEW). The workshop recommended that the peer review of development partners including the regional organisations would be an appropriate next step to follow on from country peer reviews. These arrangements would augur well for the principles of the Busan Global Partnership, particularly mutual accountability.

13. The proposal was further considered and confirmed at the 2012 Pacific Islands Countries - Development Partners meeting. New Zealand was willing to be the first development partner to be reviewed. PIFS developed generic Terms of Reference (TORs) based on the peer review process developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC). New Zealand tailored the TORs, proposing the timing (to align with an OECD DAC peer review in November 2014), the scope of the peer review, the composition of the peer review team and the process for finalisation of the peer review report and its recommendations.

New Zealand’s Development Cooperation context

14. New Zealand’s International Development Policy Statement - Supporting Sustainable Development 2011 describes New Zealand’s mission as – “to support sustainable development in developing countries, in order to reduce poverty and to contribute to a more secure, equitable and prosperous world of sustainable economic development”. New Zealand responds to its key geographic positioning in the Pacific by placing greatest priority on support for the Pacific Region in terms of its Official Development Assistance (ODA) allocation and a targeted approach to other parts of the world. The focus on the Pacific is because the region is New Zealand’s neighbourhood. New Zealand is also conscious that the Pacific is one of the regions most at risk of not achieving the Millennium Development Goals, and is where the country has a strong foundation of partnerships, cultural and historical links, and knowledge.

15. The Development Effectiveness Policy Statement and Action Plan 2014-2016 responds to the mission statement and the Global Partnership principles. It also reflects New Zealand’s commitment to international good practice demonstrated by their membership of the OECD and the DAC. The document commits New Zealand to: aligning its work with the priorities and policies of partner governments; strengthening its focus on results and building partner country capacities to achieve results; building and strengthening inclusive development partnerships; and improving the transparency and accountability of information sharing and reporting.

A series of policies and plans operationalise Policy Statement and Action Plan. New Zealand has also responded organisationally to support this mission by integrating its development cooperation programme into its foreign affairs and trade portfolio, through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT), to enhance ‘the manner in which development, trade, migration and security policies work together in the Pacific’.

16. New Zealand supports the Pacific through bilateral development assistance and funding to regional and multilateral agencies.

17. For the period 2012/13 to 2014/15 New Zealand’s indicative allocations for development assistance in the Pacific was $638.1 million bilateral, with a further...
$154 million for Pacific Regional programmes. The Pacific also benefits from funding for multilateral agencies, humanitarian support, partnerships and funds, scholarships and other generic programs.\(^{17}\)

18. New Zealand is a committed partner in the Pacific Region and actively supports the regional aid effectiveness agenda and governance processes. It is an active member of the Pacific Island Forum (PIF), diligently provides all data required for annual reporting purposes and actively participates in the country peer review process. It has played a key role in the Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations (PACER Plus) regional trade and economic integration agreement and supports financial literacy, financial inclusion, business mentoring and remittance initiatives through the Recognised Seasonal Employer (RSE) scheme.

19. New Zealand’s historical and cultural links with the Pacific region contributes to contextualising their partnerships approach and further adds to a unique and deepening development relationship with Pacific Island Countries.

Kiribati Development Cooperation context

20. New Zealand nominated Kiribati to be the case study country for its development partner peer review. The Kiribati Development Plan 2012 – 2015 (KDP) provides the foundation for the development agenda in Kiribati. It provides a broad focus on human resource development, economic growth and poverty reduction, health, environment, governance and infrastructure. A new KDP is to be developed in 2015. The 2010 Kiribati Country Peer Review report identified the need for improvements in planning and coordination, including the GoK taking a lead role in donor coordination and to commit to public financial management (PFM) reforms.\(^{18}\) The 2012 update found that while some work had been done to implement the recommendations of the 2010 review there was still some way to go. Kiribati was further encouraged to consider a policy framework for improved coordination and an appropriate implementation framework for the KDP including capacity and institutional building for better services delivery with support from its development partners.\(^{19}\)

21. The development partner landscape in Kiribati is relatively uncrowded. New Zealand, Australia, Cuba and Taiwan have resident representation. The United Nations is represented by several agencies, such as the World Health Organisation with a representative co-located with the Ministry of Health, and a joint presence office for UNICEF and UNFPA. The Japanese International Cooperation Agency office primarily covers the Japanese volunteer program. A locally contracted position in the Ministry of Finance is funded to help with the administration of European Union aid and to contribute to capacity development.\(^{21}\)

22. In 2013 the total aid provided to Kiribati was AUD 70,566,816. This reflects 40.1% of Kiribati’s total recurrent and development budget. New Zealand’s contribution was AUD 4,219,024. In the year to October 2014 the total aid provided to Kiribati was AUD 81,847,410 plus AUD 6,834,121 in budget support. New Zealand’s contribution to the development budget was AUD 11,003,113 and an additional AUD 1 million was provided through budget support by New Zealand making a total contribution of AUD 12,003,113.


\(^{18}\) Kiribati Peer Review Report. 2010

\(^{19}\) Kiribati Peer Review Update. 2012. Pages 1 – 2.

\(^{20}\) As above. Page 10.

\(^{21}\) Data provided by the Kiribati National Economic Planning Office on 5 December 2014.
Methodology

24. The methodology for the peer review builds on the principles of ownership, inclusiveness and transparency and the lessons from the country peer reviews. Throughout the process the host development partner, peer review team and PIFS were expected to interact in a spirit of team collaboration, sharing information at all levels to facilitate a successful review.23

25. Building on these principles, New Zealand worked with the PIFS to develop TORs for the review. New Zealand also proposed the selection of the review team from Samoa, Kiribati and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). (Brief biographies of the team are at Annex B.) The role of the review team was critical in sharing their knowledge and examples based on their own country’s and agencies’ engagement with the New Zealand Aid Programme.

26. A uniquely new approach taken was a parallel review process with the OECD DAC and the expectation that this would enable both formal and informal sharing of information and views by the two teams.24

27. The TORs identified ten focus areas for the review: a) policy and strategy alignment; b) coordination; c) alignment with national plans; d) predictability; e) use of partner systems; f) policy dialogue; g) innovation and good practice; h) knowledge sharing; i) monitoring and evaluation to achieve results and; j) use of technical advisors and assistance. The Review Team amalgamated several of the areas due to considerable overlap resulting in the seven areas discussed in Section 5.

28. The team reviewed a wide range of documents provided by New Zealand, Kiribati and the PIFS. They included New Zealand policy and strategy documents, the Kiribati Country Peer Review report and follow-up documents, the KDP, regional reports on aid effectiveness in the Pacific and the OECD DAC peer review guidelines. The team paid particular attention to the detailed documentation prepared by New Zealand for the OECD DAC review - Memorandum of New Zealand. The documents reviewed are listed at Annex C.

29. The team (minus the Kiribati member) participated in the mission to Wellington, New Zealand from 17 to 21 November 2014. Some sessions were jointly conducted with the OECD DAC team; others were specifically focussed on the Forum Compact peer review. Meetings were held with the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Hon Murray McCully MP, MFAT officials, representatives from civil society organisations (CSOs), academics, other parliamentarians, Pacific diplomatic representatives and members of the International Development Advisory and Selection Panel of the Partnerships for International Development Fund (Partnerships Fund). Engaging both government and non-government actors enabled the review team to receive comprehensive and multi-stakeholder perspectives of New Zealand’s aid programme. (Wellington consultations - Annex D)

30. In order to reflect and illustrate the links between policy, practice and results, the review team spent three days in Kiribati from 24 to 27 November 2015 where they were joined by the Kiribati team member. The team drew on their extensive prior knowledge of Kiribati and its development context and participated largely in joint sessions with the OECD DAC. Again, engaging with both government and non-government stakeholders was critical in compiling multi-stakeholder perspectives. The team was privileged to meet with the President of Kiribati, HE Anote Tong. (Kiribati consultations - Annex E.)

31. At the end of both missions to Wellington and Tarawa, the team prepared an aide memoire outlining its preliminary reflections on the link between New Zealand’s policy and its practice. Both aide memoires identified areas requiring further testing and/or investigation and both were presented to MFAT (Wellington) and the NZHC (Tarawa). The OECD DAC team was present at the Wellington presentation and subsequent discussion. The New Zealand High Commission in Kiribati provided a follow-up note ‘Feedback and clarifications on Forum Compact Aide Memoire – Kiribati Country Mission’.

32. The OECD DAC also prepared and presented separate aide memoires. There was relative consistency between Forum Compact and OECD DAC findings.

33. This draft report draws on both the New Zealand consultations and Kiribati case study to show links between New Zealand policy and practice. It also draws on the experience of the review team with New Zealand’s aid programme. It aims to provide a balanced perspective, recognising the different stages and progress towards development effectiveness in Samoa and Kiribati (as country representative and case study country). Kiribati is still developing its aid polices and aid management practices; Samoa, has well established aid management practices that support country leadership and ownership of development.

---

23 Generic TORs, Pages 7 and 8.
24 New Zealand Development Partner Peer Review TORs. Page 2.
Findings and Recommendations

Policy dialogue and strategy alignment

34. New Zealand sees development cooperation as a core pillar of its international engagement, forming an important component of its bilateral relationships with many countries. New Zealand’s International Development Policy Statement, Supporting Sustainable Development 2011 describes its commitment to ensuring a ‘whole-of-government (WOG) coherence that links political, security, climate change and development objectives, especially in fragile states. The document outlines New Zealand’s commitment to accelerating economic development in developing country partners by strengthening its working relationship with the private sector at home and abroad and supporting developing country efforts to engage in international trading arrangements, improve their business enabling environment and support investment in transport and renewable energy sources.

35. The policy commits to investing in: education and health in order to promote human development and support sustainable economic development; improving the resilience of countries to withstand disasters and emergencies; and promoting good governance and support for peace and security.

36. The Policy Statement also details New Zealand’s commitment to improving the effectiveness of aid by applying the Paris Declaration Principles, pursuing concrete, measurable development results, supporting large, longer-term, comprehensive initiatives and coordinating with other donors, especially Australia. New Zealand commits to the Cairns Compact on Strengthening Development Coordination in the Pacific, to aligning with partner country needs and to deliver its aid programme through enabling partnerships with governments, the private sector, multilateral and regional agencies.

37. The document sets out New Zealand’s approach to improving efficiency and value for money, enhancing accountability for results, integrating cross-cutting and thematic issues, increasing responsiveness and flexibility, ensuring consistency between the development assistance and foreign policy, focussing on New Zealand’s comparative advantage and working through partnerships.

Bilateral policy dialogue and strategy alignment

38. At country level, the foundation document for New Zealand’s bilateral dialogue in the Pacific is the Joint Commitment for Development (JCfD), a document signed by the New Zealand Minister of Foreign Affairs and the partner country counterpart. New Zealand’s High Commissioner or Head of Mission (HOM) is responsible for all policy dialogue in-country, including development assistance, and High-Level Consultations (HLCs) involving Wellington-based staff provide further opportunities for bilateral policy dialogue including on programme performance and focus. The JCfDs lay out commitments made by both partners, have a high degree of political ownership and are used for ongoing engagement at the political level. The value of the JCfD as a basis for policy dialogue is shaped by the degree of ownership by the partner country and the perceptions around how much the process is a joint process rather than a prescriptive one. Kiribati and Samoa offer two different perspectives.

39. The JCfD in Kiribati is grounded in the KDP. The Government of Kiribati (GoK) engaged New Zealand in the development of the current KDP (and will do so again in 2015 when a new KDP is prepared). The GoK confirmed that the policy dialogue around the JCfD was useful in coming to agreement about how New Zealand would direct its development assistance to support the KDP. The GoK is pragmatic about the impact of New Zealand’s own policy priorities on policy dialogue, advising that there is alignment of New Zealand to Kiribati’s interests with the current JCfD being heavily influenced by GoK priorities in areas of economic infrastructure, fisheries, urban development, water, sanitation, health and waste management. Kiribati accepts New Zealand’s priorities, seeking to establish where common interests and priorities lie, and these common interests are reflected in the JCfD.

40. Generally, Kiribati is aware of the sectors where development partners wish to work and approaches each accordingly. It was obvious from the discussions with GoK officials that the areas where New Zealand had expended significant efforts to develop and initiate implementation are supported by the government. Overall, the approach results in reasonable support for the KDP although gaps.
remain for priority projects. It is important to note the substantial development challenges faced in Kiribati.

41. Annual HLCs provide the opportunity to review relationships, effectiveness and focus of assistance at senior level and, if necessary, refresh the JCfD to reflect changing priorities and new investments. They are also opportunities for frank assessments of performance of the donor partner. The HOM engages with the GoK through regular dialogue. Discussions are wide ranging across all aspects of New Zealand’s interests in the country, including development assistance and progress on the policy objectives of the JCfD. The meetings also provide an opportunity for higher level monitoring of the development assistance programme. Detailed activity implementation and monitoring sits with the Deputy High Commissioner and his team. There are GoK sector coordination committees in the key sectors supported by development partners such as health, education, transport, labour and water and sanitation. The committees vary in effectiveness. Where they do work they offer a forum for policy dialogue as well as a means for monitoring progress in the sector. New Zealand is an active participant (and in some cases the driver) in sector coordination meetings. These processes contribute to the ongoing refinement of policy and New Zealand’s role in development in Kiribati. They also provide mechanisms to monitor progress and results.

42. In Samoa, New Zealand provides input into policy dialogue through a formal process and at different levels of engagement; namely at sector level and at national level during the development of the national development strategy and sector plans and throughout monitoring processes. Discussions on policy priorities in Samoa, based on the JCfD, are reviewed annually. The JCfD however in Samoa, could have been done better if it had commenced with policy dialogue around the shift in New Zealand’s own priorities.

43. While New Zealand conducted two separate missions to Samoa to discuss GoS priorities to inform the JCfD, including the need for civil society support given the extent of other donor support to that sector, the review identified ongoing GoS concern that there was a lack of opportunity to raise concerns, for example, around the focus on the private sector and the cessation of funding of non-government organisations (NGOs). Under the Partnership Fund, New Zealand does fund New Zealand NGOs working with local Samoan partner NGOs. While the resultant JCfD responds to GoS priorities, the proposed results framework was not acceptable initially to the GoS. Samoa would prefer results to be monitored using GoS’s own reporting systems such as the monitoring framework attached to the Strategy for the Development of Samoa. The endorsement of the results matrix was deferred until the GoS was able to assess and agree to the indicators provided. This ensured that the government had the opportunity to review feasibility and measurability of the indicators and obtain the commitment of the sectors involved to their achievement.
Regional policy dialogue and strategy alignment

44. New Zealand plays an active role in policy dialogue at the regional level to ensure its funding (including core funding) of regional organisations is well aligned with New Zealand’s own policy interests. New Zealand’s Regional Pacific Agencies Programme Strategic and Results Framework affirms its commitment to coherence across all New Zealand Government agencies working in the Pacific and to alignment of New Zealand’s priorities for development assistance. It also reflects its commitment to alignment with partner objectives and ownership, a focus on results, harmonisation and predictability.

45. Through their role on the governing council of regional bodies, New Zealand focuses on the effectiveness of the regional organisations to deliver and to be more accountable to FICs rather than their alignment with the Pacific agenda. It is the Review Team’s view that until there is an effective framework in place to support a regional approach, as proposed in the Pacific Framework for Regionalism (which commits PIF members to advance beyond regional cooperation towards deeper forms of regional integration and creates mechanisms to enable leaders to better prioritise issues), full alignment of New Zealand and regional priorities is unlikely.

46. New Zealand’s support of the Forum Compact, the Country Peer Reviews and this Development Partner Peer Review are concrete examples of its commitment to shared mutual accountability and responsibility at the regional level.

International policy dialogue and strategy alignment

47. New Zealand strongly advocates internationally, for attention to the challenges facing Small Island Developing States (SIDS) as evidenced by its support for international forums on SIDS. It is also evidenced by its recent successful bid for a position on the United Nations Security Council which emphasised the need for the United Nations to pay more attention to the interests of small states and emerging economies. New Zealand has committed to enhancing the voice of small states through its role on the Security Council and recognises the changing development landscape with the engagement of more development actors and affirms its commitments to the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation by:

- working with a wide range of partners to deliver on development objectives (including forming partnerships with private sector organisations, NGOs and research institutions to make use of New Zealand expertise and innovation)
- acknowledging the need for partner government ownership and alignment with partner government development needs and priorities (for example, New Zealand publishes information to the International Aid Transparency Initiative)
- being transparent, accountable and predictable in its funding (New Zealand provides information about current and projected expenditure to partners, other donors and the New Zealand public and provides Forward Aid Plans)
- focusing on results (by formalising results frameworks)
- supports country ownership and leadership of its development efforts while positioning its support within the context of New Zealand’s own priorities and ensures its assistance is aligned with country and regional priorities through the JCID and Strategic Frameworks for Development.
- The Review found the process is strongest when the Partner Country is firm about meeting its own priorities. New Zealand plays an active role in harmonization using different means, for example, in Kiribati much of this is carried out through informal processes with other development partners and the GoK. In Samoa the process is formalized through its Aid Coordination Policy and systems for implementation.
- New Zealand has a very strong focus on results. All programmes and activities have Results Frameworks and partners’ systems are used where possible and timely to gather data for monitoring and evaluation purposes. The Knowledge and Results Five Year Strategy 2013/14-2017/18 outlines how New Zealand intends to build an evidence based culture by measuring and reporting performance and using evidence to make decisions and develop strategy and policy. The plan includes the development of a dissemination and knowledge sharing programme and the development of processes to support quality evaluation, research and results data.
- New Zealand is committed to mutual accountability and transparency and is a member of the IATI. It is developing information systems and a website that make information
about the aid programme easily accessible.

- New Zealand is working towards the use of Partner Country systems by supporting peer reviews and the implementation of their recommendations (including providing technical assistance) and seeking to use country systems where they are confident the risk is manageable.

48. New Zealand’s commitment to partnerships is viewed by stakeholders to be mixed. It is evident that MFAT seeks to work closely with the private sector and other development partners at the regional, country and activity levels. However, in Wellington, CSOs no longer see themselves as partners in the development process – they see themselves as contractors. Nor do they see themselves as valued as they could be (or have been in the past) – either by MFAT or by the New Zealand public. CSO engagement with MFAT and the development agenda has improved somewhat since 2010 when the CSO strategy was revised as evidenced by the annual CSO survey undertaken by CID, but there is still room for improvement.

49. MFAT acknowledge the challenges, and value, of ensuring alignment between CSO and MFAT objectives, and, in the main, has been able to do so. CSOs are consulted at a range of levels and on a range of issues and information is regularly shared both formally and informally, when decisions have been made. At the same time CSOs have maintained good relationships with New Zealand staff at Post. MFAT advises that the changes to its manner of engagement with CSOs, including new results-based management and finance arrangements, ‘while not universally welcomed’, a number of key CSOs have acknowledged that this has resulted in stronger results focus, increased New Zealand intellectual capital as part of projects implemented by off-shore partners, increased partnering between New Zealand CSOs and the private sector and coherence.

50. Other opinion leaders consulted (primarily academics) indicated New Zealand had little involvement with the research sector and questioned the degree of evidence that underpinned New Zealand policy and practice. In an information paper prepared for the OECD DAC Peer Review, the group questioned the alignment of New Zealand’s aid policy with economic rather than development goals. They advised that all funding for development awareness and education has stopped and that external communications have grown steadily weaker. The group noted the positive commitment to policy coherence, the focus on the Pacific, maintenance of the three year funding cycles, the active engagement with the private sector and the clear results framework. The group suggested MFAT devise a robust research and evaluation strategy and to systematically integrate learnings into programming.

Recommendations

1. Two way policy dialogue should be the starting point for any agreements to ensure they genuinely reflect Partner Countries’ priorities and strengthen the agreed strategic fit between the priorities of both partner country and New Zealand

2. Where a Partner Country does not have the relevant frameworks in place, New Zealand is encouraged to continue to support their development. For example, in Kiribati, continue to support the implementation of a programmatic approach already under way to replace the current fragmented, project approach

3. New Zealand to support, and participate in, the implementation of the Pacific Framework for Regionalism to ensure New Zealand’s assistance in the region is aligned with the priorities and initiatives which are agreed through the Framework process

Alignment with national plans and predictability

51. New Zealand aligns its bilateral programme with country national priorities through the HLC process and the JCFD. The JCFD is supported by a Programme Strategic and Results Framework, a document that details the agreed goals, outcomes, priorities, partner contributions, international commitments and cross cutting issues, indicative budget and results. The effectiveness of this approach is dependent on the capacity of the partner country to negotiate support for its own priorities in line with its national plan, the degree of alignment of strategy within country and on New Zealand’s commitment to supporting partner country leadership.

52. In Kiribati, the annual HLC provided the opportunity for policy dialogue that informed the development of the JCFD. Furtherd GoK and Post discussions
(mostly informal) were conducted based on the KDP to finalise the JCfD. The GoK expressed a high level of satisfaction with the resultant agreement and its alignment with the KDP and also expressed satisfaction with the way New Zealand was implementing the agreement. The GoK was particularly impressed with how well New Zealand assists with implementation by organising projects ‘with everything sorted out’. It is apparent that New Zealand takes a proactive role in shaping projects (including the selection of implementing partners) and GoK is appreciative of this support. There was acknowledgement however by the GoK that they ought to take on a more proactive role in this regard so that there is meaningful engagement and their capacities built for better monitoring of activities towards sustainable development.

53. Kiribati continues to largely use a project approach to development, while gradually moving to the use of higher level modalities such as general budget support, with development partners, including New Zealand, selecting projects they would like to support through discussions with the GoK and other development partners. The National Economic Planning Office (NEPO) coordinates project proposals; the Development Coordination Committee decides which proposals will be implemented. When a priority project is unfunded the GoK approaches development partners to provide support. When funding is proposed for a project that is not considered a priority the GoK may decline the development partner’s proposal, or more pragmatically, the GoK may accept (thus moving away from identified priorities).

54. The 2010 Country Peer Review and 2012 follow-up encouraged Kiribati to take a stronger leadership role and to adopt a programmatic approach and encouraged development partners to support that process. New Zealand is particularly active in facilitating the water and sanitation sector committee and plans to take a more active role in waste management and the coordination of efforts in this sector. Additionally, New Zealand is supporting the GoK to move to a programmatic approach in the fisheries, energy, health and labour mobility sectors. The GoK acknowledged the added value of New Zealand’s knowledge of the local context and its capacity to contextualise New Zealand’s planning, design and implementation to reflect local capability and capacity.

55. The Review Team encourages New Zealand to continue focussing on supporting local ownership and leadership in Kiribati. While it is often easier, and more time efficient, to organise and assist in the absence of Government leadership, the country will not progress while development partners do their work for them. For example, the team is aware that it is usually more efficient for New Zealand to partially or fully carry out contracting on behalf of the GoK but believes that doing this type of work for the country constrains its capacity development. The fact that NEPO is headed by an expatriate should encourage the GoK to eventually take up these key responsibilities.

56. In Samoa, the JCfD reflects relevant priorities of the GoS as detailed in the country’s National Development Plan and sector plans. The Programme Strategic and Results Framework has been replaced with Samoa’s own sector plans and results framework and the GoS makes the decision about implementing partners after discussions with its development partners, including New Zealand, taking into account availability and cost.

57. Within the Pacific, New Zealand is a significant donor in Polynesia and the central Pacific and complements the work of other donors in Melanesia and Micronesia by focusing on areas of comparative advantage. New Zealand’s Forward Aid Plans which provide four year forward projections to countries and to regional and multilateral agencies, was viewed as a concrete example of good practice in ensuring predictability of assistance to partner countries. The predictability provided by the forward estimates is valued by both Kiribati and Samoa as it enables them to forward plan and programme more effectively.

**Recommendations**

4. New Zealand to strengthen policy dialogue with Partner Countries in the development and amendment of Country Strategies to ensure they reflect the priorities of the Partner Country and align with national development plans.

5. New Zealand to use the new Kiribati Development Plan to inform the development of New Zealand’s five year Kiribati Country Strategy

6. New Zealand to take a facilitative and incentivised approach to enhance Partner Government capacity (including recruitment and contracting) as requested by Partner Governments

7. New Zealand to share with other Development Partners their approach to developing forward aid plans as an example of good practice and in improving predictable aid flows.
Coordination

58. New Zealand’s policy statements, principles and operational plans support the principle of donor coordination and the harmonisation of development efforts.

59. The 2010 Kiribati Country Peer Review identified ongoing donor coordination constraints facing the GoK, particularly the NEPO, whose role includes development partner coordination. In 2012 the Peer Review Update found that some progress in coordination was occurring with support from several development partners.

60. New Zealand’s role in donor coordination and harmonisation was confirmed by the other in-country development partners and by the GoK. The main development partner coordination mechanism is the GoK Development Partners Roundtable held every two years. A review of the agenda and discussion notes of the 2014 Roundtable show a focus on Kiribati development issues and its progress against all six of the KDP priority sectors. The minutes show New Zealand was an active participant in discussions. While the Roundtables aim to strengthen coordination and coherence, records of discussions do not reflect any specific discussion on development partner coordination although there is a brief mention about the desire for provision of budget support as a means to provide flexibility in future aid programs. An Action Matrix was provided to show the gaps in project funding to assist donors to sector and development partner coordination. This is in addition to quarterly with development partners to discuss progress against all six of the KDP priority sectors.

61. Within the GoK, the National Development Coordination Committee is responsible for coordinating the implementation and monitoring of the KDP. At sector level, six government sector committees are supposed to coordinate the implementation of the six priority sectors of the KDP - development partners are members of those committees. The government has also established three key national committees to manage specific reforms on economic, public financial and state-owned enterprise reform. These committees operate with varying degrees of effectiveness (some sector committees do not function at all).

62. The example of New Zealand’s approach to supporting coordination in the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) sector, reflects a general approach to sector and development partner coordination in Kiribati. New Zealand is coming to the end of its 5-year funding cycle for its current WASH projects. To facilitate coordination with other donors and agencies that also have an interest in working in the WASH area, consultant engineers were engaged to undertake a situational analysis of the WASH landscape. That analysis was used as a reference and framework for an in-country mission involving stakeholders from GoK and key development partners (New Zealand, Australia, World Bank, Secretariat of the Pacific Community and UNICEF) to support a coordinated approach to the sector.

63. New Zealand is now working with the GoK, using the material developed during the mission, to ‘reinvigorate’ the Water and Sanitation Sector Coordination Committee. While this is a work in progress, it is supported by the GoK. New Zealand will be active participants on that committee along with other development partners, but envisage that it will be chaired by a senior GoK public servant with active participation from related GoK ministries and agencies.

64. Importantly, the GoK has not yet developed a national development cooperation policy. Development partners (particularly Australia and New Zealand) coordinate well amongst themselves (primarily through informal mechanisms) but the coordination process needs improvement at the government and development partner interface. Where feasible, development partners seek to harmonise (for example by nominating lead donors in sectors) but in the most part this is done through informal processes – Government is not leading the process. Coordination should improve with a shift to a more programmatic rather than project type approach, preferably with the government at the lead.

65. Without strong leadership from the GoK, development partners will be seen to be driving the development agenda. It is important that the focus of accountability and reporting of the sector committees and taskforces is primarily to the GoK and all stakeholders including the development partners. Again, the challenge for New Zealand is to support the GoK in the coordination process rather than to do it for them.

66. Samoa has an aid coordination policy that clearly defines the roles, responsibilities and engagement processes for development partners. The GoS meets quarterly with development partners to discuss policy, coordination and implementation (all are invited to contribute to the agenda). Development partners are also invited to participate in relevant sector coordination meetings. This is in addition to the annual development partner forum and informal processes such as diplomatic lunches. New Zealand fully participates in all of these activities. The GoS sets its own conditions for budget assistance and this has...
come about from the public sector management (PFM) reforms driven by the GoS and supported by technical assistance where needed. Samoa does not have lead donors in sectors – the GoS carries the lead role. Donors, including New Zealand, may have a ‘coordinating development partner’ role.

67. In both Kiribati and Samoa, New Zealand actively engages with other development partners to support coordination and harmonisation. They actively participate in, and support, sector coordination committees and seek agreements on lead/coordinating roles to reduce overlap within sectors. There is evidence of efforts to work cooperatively with other development partners on specific activities, for example, the recent Kiribati budget support coordinated response by the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and New Zealand. The Review Team’s concern with this support is that, while activities are proposed by the GoK and approved by the GoK Cabinet before being considered by donors, funding is being provided under World Bank conditions not GoK conditions and uses parallel processes.

68. New Zealand’s Use of Partner Government Public Financial Management Systems operational policy specifies how the aid programme will make decisions on the use, or not, of PFM systems. The principles affirm MFAT’s fiduciary responsibilities to the New Zealand taxpayer. The policy also states New Zealand: supports Partner Governments to build PFM capacity; upholds international commitments to use country systems (and to state the reasons for non-use); builds a spirit of partnership and local ownership; where relevant, provides predictable and reliable funding for budget support; harmonises with other donors; increases the use of programme-based approaches and invests in staff capability. The policy affirms that all programmes should aim to be ‘on plan’, ‘on budget’ and ‘on report’ whatever the modality and encourages the use of other donor assessment processes when possible to reduce the burden on the Partner Country.

69. The policy’s application in Kiribati shows that New Zealand is prepared to use higher level modalities such as general budget support even in challenging environments, through a multi-donor budget support operation. Although weaknesses and constraints in Kiribati’s PFM systems present risks, a decision to proceed was made on the basis of a strong GoK commitment to the reform agenda, the presence of a multi-donor operation which included extensive technical assistance, and the presence of a comprehensive PFM reform programme (led by ADB).

70. In Samoa, budget support was provided by New Zealand as performance linked aid as the country implemented PFM reforms including establishing appropriate institutional arrangements, developing policy frameworks and, most importantly, showing both political and official leadership and will. Selected reform actions from the Government’s own PFM reform roadmap formed part of the Joint Policy Action Matrix. Successful completion of those actions by GoS triggered the release of general budget support.

71. New Zealand’s practical approach takes into account the country’s awareness of its own PFM challenges and demonstrated commitment to reform. New Zealand aims to respond to each country and program in a contextualized manner demonstrating a more practical and responsive approach and commitment to reform.
Innovation, good practice and knowledge management

72. New Zealand seeks to maximise its development impact by focussing its efforts on those areas where it believes it has a comparative advantage, for example: fisheries, agriculture, renewable energy, tourism, education, and law and justice (including policing)\(^43\). New Zealand is also committed to ‘a practical and innovative approach to getting things done within respectful and trustful relationships’\(^43\) and working through partnerships that ‘leverage the strengths of different players’\(^44\).

73. The example of the Pacific Energy Summit, co-hosted by New Zealand with the European Union in 2013, was recognised as an innovative approach fostering good practice. New Zealand’s NZ$80 million investment has leveraged around NZ$635 million to fund more than forty renewable energy initiatives across thirteen countries\(^45\). Another is the trilateral cooperation involving China, Cook Islands and New Zealand. With the growing coordination challenges posed by emerging donors in the Pacific it would be useful if New Zealand were to make known to other development partners lessons learned and good practice from its engagement with China in the Cook Islands for replication elsewhere.

74. As well as integrating a commitment to innovation and good practice into policies and strategies, New Zealand has recruited new people into the organisation with new ideas and targeted skills sets. Another strategy has been the establishment of the Partnerships Fund, which aims to harness the expertise and innovation of New Zealand charitable, other not-for-profit, private sector and state sector organisations in the delivery of aid activities in developing countries\(^46\). The Panel has two functions - to advise the Minister on partner led activity and practice, including the private sector and to select projects for funding from the Partnership Fund. The Partnership Fund has only been operating for two years. A key challenge is attracting projects in smaller, less developed states.

75. The International Development Advisory and Selection Panel is another example of New Zealand’s commitment to adopting new approaches. The Panel has two functions - to advise the Minister on partner led activity and practice, including the private sector and to select projects for funding from the Partnership Fund. The Partnership Fund has only been operating for two years. A key challenge is attracting projects in smaller, less developed states.

76. As discussed in Paragraphs 44 and 45, the Review Team notes that apart from the Partnerships Fund, MFAT limits its involvement with New Zealand NGOs, civil society organisations and academia to funding several long-term NGO partnerships e.g. CID and VSA and NZ NGO funding under bilateral and thematic programmes. The team’s view is that these groups are well placed to contribute to innovation, good practice and knowledge sharing. Strengthening transparent and regular engagement and dialogue with the Non-State Actor groups in the development space would enhance New Zealand’s access to, and source of, new ideas and evidence based lessons.

77. New Zealand is committed to gathering the lessons and utilizing the learning from both monitoring and evaluation processes. The action plan to implement New Zealand’s Knowledge and Results Five Year Strategy 2013/14-2017/18 shows a commitment to building capacity within MFAT to gather, disseminate and apply knowledge to the aid programme. While much of the plan focuses on internal processes there is also a commitment to share with others, primarily through IATI and the MFAT website. Learning and continuous improvement is an underpinning process of the New Zealand Aid Programme Performance System which is also used to enhance management decision making and provide accountability to Parliament and taxpayers.

78. However, the collation and sharing of knowledge is still work in progress. Within MFAT, some information systems supporting knowledge management are still being refined or further developed. External to MFAT, support for knowledge sharing with governments and development partners, is encouraged. In Kiribati, development partners actively share their knowledge and experience through regular informal contact and the Post also meets regularly with the GoK. Similar processes apply in Samoa along with the formalised processes contained in its aid policy. This includes the development of an e-governance policy whereby all government ministries/agencies have developed websites for uploading all information for

\(^{44}\)As above. Page 3
79. New Zealand meets its annual reporting commitments to Forum members and development partners on development effectiveness in the Pacific. They demonstrate a strong commitment to transparency through their reporting and through active involvement in accountability mechanisms (for example, they were willing to be the first development partner to be reviewed under the Forum Compact peer review process and welcomed the OECD DAC review). By opening themselves to scrutiny New Zealand demonstrates a commendable openness and willingness to learn. New Zealand has actively supported, and participated in, the Forum Compact Country Peer Review process.

80. While New Zealand supports the Country Peer Review process, planned Government of Kiribati and New Zealand actions to support the recommendations of the Kiribati peer review are unclear. It is important that responsibility for implementing Country Peer Review recommendations sit firmly with the country and for development partners to actively provide support.

### Use of technical advisers

81. Wellington required time to provide statistics on the use of technical advisers in its programs and projects. Similarly, neither the Kiribati Post nor the GoK had numbers immediately available. This lack of immediate access to information raises the question of whether there are GoK and Post databases and information systems available that support the tracking of New Zealand development resources, specifically technical assistance.

82. Technical assistance is varied in its focus and modality. Information received suggests many advisers are sourced internally through contestable processes by either New Zealand or Kiribati depending on supply through Whole-of-Government arrangements. Some are sourced from New Zealand or Australia; others from Pacific Islands. Some supplement FIC’s staff positions and others work in capacity building roles as required by the partner government. The type and role of advisers varies based on country circumstances and need. At 5 December 2014, the numbers were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Total Expenditure (NZD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Pacific (inclusive of Kiribati and Samoa)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$12,006,626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83. Feedback on the value of New Zealand funded advisers is positive. There was no indication in any of the team’s discussions, or through the team’s experience, that New Zealand’s technical assistance was either excessive or irrelevant. Advisers for example, were used only when a country requested that form of assistance and after other avenues had been explored. TORs are developed jointly by the country and New Zealand and selection processes follow either country or New Zealand processes, depending on who will be the employing or contracting agency.

84. New Zealand supports countries who wish to use international recruitment on request particularly in areas where NZ offers a comparative advantage. The team notes that New Zealand may conduct all
aspects of recruitment (on request) for countries that do not undertake international recruitment on a regular basis. This is done in good faith – to assist the country and to ensure the adviser is sourced as quickly as possible. While the intent is positive, the result is that the country does not develop capacity. In situations where it is likely that such national capacity will be used again in the near term the team encourages New Zealand to facilitate and strongly advocate with partner countries, a more collaborative approach in the recruitment and identification of technical assistance, through developing an agreed approach based on capacity and gaps in countries’ systems.

85. The Review Team encourages the use of locally sourced and regional technical advisers. It also encourages support of country policies on the use of technical assistance where there is one in place. The Review Team also sees value in using FIC’s technical expertise, where available, for New Zealand’s own capacity building initiatives at Posts.

86. Technical assistance is closely linked to capacity development and sustainability. In Kiribati, several GoK senior staff raised concerns that when projects ended (funded by all development partners) there was often little evidence that GoK capacity had been developed. The Post advised that all New Zealand projects include a capacity development element, which vary according to the project but may include (among other strategies) working alongside a counterpart, working with NGOs (e.g. the Kiribati Healthy Families Association) or using MFAT’s own locally employed staff to engage with local communities on educational aspects.

87. Additionally, MFAT provides capacity development outside of projects (for example, New Zealand has recently funded two GoK interns to work in Kiribati’s UN office in New York for three months each). New Zealand does plan beyond projects so exit strategies are an important part of each project, for example, ensuring that maintenance programmes are in place for infrastructure-based projects. New Zealand recognises that in Kiribati, progress will come over a longer period of time, through sector-based engagement grounded in the country’s own development priorities of Kiribati and through Kiribati ownership.

88. In Samoa, New Zealand assists in capacity development through an in-country training program using both New Zealand based and locally based trainers, a training attachment scheme in New Zealand and provision of technical advisers in areas where it has a demonstrable comparative advantage such as tourism, customs and revenue systems and business development.

89. MFAT uses its Annual Report to monitor and report on progress, including that of its aid programme. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes sit within the broader New Zealand Aid Programme Performance System and support the Strategic Results Framework. The system includes: policy and direction setting; planning, design and target setting; and M&E and reporting at three levels (a) strategic (b) programme and sector, and (c) activity. Strategic evaluations are led by the Wellington based evaluation and research team. Twenty six programmes undergo an evaluation once every two programme strategy cycles (six to ten years). All activities to which New Zealand contributes NZ$10 million or more are evaluated either during implementation or after completion. Activities that provide organisational support (e.g. to regional agencies) and are subject to annual funding decisions are evaluated once in the period covering the organisation’s strategic or corporate plan or every five years. Guidelines are provided to support the evaluation process.

Monitoring and evaluation to achieve results

89. MFAT uses its Annual Report to monitor and report on progress, including that of its aid programme. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes sit within the broader New Zealand Aid Programme Performance System and support the Strategic Results Framework. The system includes: policy and direction setting; planning, design and target setting; and M&E and reporting at three levels (a) strategic (b) programme and sector, and (c) activity.

90. Strategic evaluations are led by the Wellington based evaluation and research team. Twenty six programmes undergo an evaluation once every two programme strategy cycles (six to ten years). All activities to which New Zealand contributes NZ$10 million or more are evaluated either during implementation or after completion. Activities that provide organisational support (e.g. to regional agencies) and are subject to annual funding decisions are evaluated once in the period covering the organisation’s strategic or corporate plan or every five years. Guidelines are provided to support the evaluation process.

---

49 Provided by MFAT - Wellington. The numbers refer to individuals who provided expertise or professional advice and were based in country for at least six months during the period 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2014. It does not include consultants contracted by New Zealand for activity design, activity evaluation and activity monitoring.
91. At country level, the JCfD provides the basis for monitoring of the country programme. With Kiribati, Annex Two of the JCfD details the M&E processes and involves: annual joint reviews of performance focusing on achievements, constraints, and the extent to which planned outputs have contributed to good outcomes and delivery of results in each of the JCfD priorities; regular Ministerial dialogues to review results, and consider any emerging priorities, while being mindful of the need to maintain focus and avoid excessive dispersal of the aid programme; and a Results Framework.\textsuperscript{51} The New Zealand HOM also meets weekly with the GoK to discuss progress and issues. This informal process underpins the more formal JCfD mechanisms. The Team noted that while the Kiribati Post is currently not managing any evaluations, they monitor implementation and are involved in all evaluations undertaken by New Zealand, including the MTC evaluation that was recently completed.

92. At activity level monitoring in Kiribati is also conducted through formal and informal processes - via hands on work by Post with limited (if any) involvement from the GoK. The Country Peer Review Update found that sector coordination mechanisms (that could play a key role in monitoring) were still relatively weak and that there was limited information sharing on aid related matters, and between programs, donors and ministries\textsuperscript{52}. It suggested that Kiribati would benefit from a more formalized approach to monitoring that involved the development of GoK’s capacity and coordination.

93. In Samoa, monitoring is carried out against the GoS’s own results frameworks to which the JCfD is closely aligned and progress and results are monitored through existing GoS systems (including the sector coordination committees).

94. New Zealand supports partner-led evaluations of New Zealand funded development interventions (for example, for activities supported by the Partnerships Fund) and involves partners in evaluation governance groups. Stakeholders affected by an evaluation are asked to contribute their views and their expertise forms an integral part of the evaluation process\textsuperscript{53}. Where FIC partners lead an evaluation, their evaluation systems are used. New Zealand works with partners, if needed, to ensure DAC evaluation quality standards apply to promote evaluation quality, utilisation and learning.\textsuperscript{54} The Evaluation Policy for the New Zealand Aid Programme provides guidance on evaluation criteria, quality assurance, governance, responding to evaluations and disseminating evaluations and reinforces New Zealand’s commitment to ensuring outcomes from evaluations are fed back to all those to whom they are relevant.\textsuperscript{55}

95. New Zealand has invested in strengthening its monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and Results Based Management (RBM) frameworks. The Review Team recognises the utility of the frameworks for supporting informed decision making and the linking of performance to financial allocations at both country and regional levels. New Zealand’s placement of its RBM framework with regional organisations (and related support) is a welcomed move. However, it was not clear if the RBM framework has been, and is, used as the basis for budget variations for some regional organisations.

96. The Review Team notes, and supports, the intent for a greater role for Posts in monitoring in conjunction with FICs involvement.

**Recommendations**

18. New Zealand to work with the GoK to support improved activity level monitoring that develops and facilitates the use of GoK processes and capacity for monitoring such as the sector coordination committees.
Conclusions

97. New Zealand is a committed and effective development partner that actively seeks to apply the principles of effective development cooperation, in a pragmatic way considering the varying capabilities in different countries and contexts, the development plans and aspirations of partners and the activities of other donors. Overall, the Review Team concludes:

- New Zealand has established a sound policy and operational basis for the delivery of its aid programme. The team notes the focus of New Zealand’s aid policy which is sustainable economic development including working with the private sector and notes the varying sectoral emphasis from country to country where there is the greatest potential for growth. The team was also interested to see the extent of application of the policy in situations where the local private sector is underdeveloped and how such situations facilitate the use of New Zealand’s private sector to implement projects.

- Through extensive organisational change, a new culture and ethos is emerging in MFAT that encourages learning and innovation. New staff and integration with MFAT has added new skills and perspectives at both headquarters and Post.

- The JCfD process provides an opportunity to progress country leadership and ownership, however it is important that both partners continue to engage in policy dialogue to ensure the primary focus of the JCfDs are on partner country needs (rather than New Zealand priorities).

- In its willingness to assist partner countries, in countries with capacity challenges such as Kiribati, New Zealand may ‘do the work’ for the country rather than facilitate the use of the partner country’s own systems. The team understands the challenges associated with using partner systems but stresses that until partner countries take full responsibility, development progress will be slow. Development partners, like New Zealand, can and should play a proactive and facilitatory role, especially where there is little ‘push’ from the country.

- New Zealand would benefit from greater inclusion of NGOs, CSOs and other opinion leaders across the policy dialogue and implementation spectrum of New Zealand’s assistance to the Pacific. These groups would bring a perspective and capacity that would enhance the good work already being done. In the case of Kiribati, these groups can provide significant contribution to meet the prevalent capacity gaps.

98. While this report identifies areas where FiCs should also act, particularly in relation to taking leadership and ownership of the development agenda in their own countries, it can only re-emphasize the recommendations made through the Country Peer Review process and encourages New Zealand to strongly support the countries in capacity/institutional building initiatives as part of their development assistance.

99. The development and resourcing of this Review’s Implementation Plan is integral to ensuring the utility of the Review process for New Zealand. New Zealand is encouraged to establish clear time bound and costed milestones in the development of the Implementation Plan and to work closely with the Secretariat in developing a monitoring and reporting approach for the Plan. The information from that reporting will contribute to the consolidated evidence and analysis across the Forum Compact processes that will form the annual Tracking Report on the Effectiveness of Development Efforts to Forum leaders.
Annex A: Terms of Reference

Forum Compact Development Partner Review of New Zealand’s Development Cooperation

Terms of Reference for the Review Team

Introduction

Following the successful completion of Forum Island Countries (FICs) peer reviews, the Pacific Islands Forum through the Forum Compact is extending the peer-to-peer review process to Development Partners.

The Development Partner review is an opportunity for Development Partners to both learn from, and share knowledge with, FICs and other Development Partners about effective development coordination.

A key focus of the Development Partner review is for Development Partners to gain greater insight into how well their policies, procedures and actions support FICs’ development efforts, and how these can be improved. It is also an opportunity for FICs to increase their understanding of Development Partner policies and procedures.

A generic Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Forum Compact Development Partners Peer Review has been approved by the PIFS in consultation with development partners and forum members, to guide the review of individual Development Partners.

New Zealand will host a Development Partner Review from 17 – 28 November 2014.

The Review is timed to be conducted in parallel with a DAC Peer Review of New Zealand’s development cooperation and it is intended that there be mutual learning between the two reviews including via some joint sessions.

This ToR details the specific Scope, Team and Outputs for the Forum Compact review of New Zealand’s development cooperation.

The Review will:

- Assess how effectively New Zealand’s development cooperation is coordinated in order to meet the development needs of FICs;
- Foster mutual learning on effective development cooperation practice, innovation and coordination to improve both FIC and Development Partner policy and practice;
- Increase understanding by FICs and Development Partners of New Zealand’s development cooperation policies, strategies and procedures and its implementation;
- Identify recommendations for the improvement of New Zealand’s development cooperation with FICs; and
- Establish an agreed Implementation Plan with targets and indicators for review follow up and monitoring.

Methodology

The review will consist of a programme of meetings and discussions in Wellington with representatives from MFAT, other relevant New Zealand Government departments and New Zealand civil society to provide a clear understanding of the approach that New Zealand applies in the management of the Aid Programme in the Pacific and the policy and strategy settings that guide this.

This will be followed by a programme of meetings and discussions in Tarawa to explore how the New Zealand Aid programme is applied in a FIC. While Kiribati will be used as the main case study for exploring the application of the New Zealand Aid Programme, members of the review team will also be expected to share knowledge and examples based on their experience of the New Zealand Aid programme as part of the review.

The review will adopt an open and participatory approach.

The review will be conducted in parallel with the OECD DAC Peer Review of New Zealand’s development cooperation. Separate programmes will be developed for each review with some joint sessions identified as appropriate. This approach will enable both formal and informal sharing of information and views by the two teams. Each review team will be responsible for ensuring the specific objectives of each review are addressed.
## Scope

### Objective and Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY and STRATEGY ALIGNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How New Zealand’s development policies and strategies align with international, regional and FICs’ development effectiveness commitments and frameworks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe how well NZ’s development cooperation policies, strategies and priorities enable NZ to deliver on international and Pacific development effectiveness principles and commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess how well NZ’s development cooperation priorities at regional, country and sector level align with priorities and needs of FICs including NZ engagement with regional agencies and how NZ regional programme funding relates and aligns with bilateral funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify opportunities for improved NZ alignment at regional and country levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COORDINATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well New Zealand uses, and contributes to strengthening the use of, FICs’ national and sector donor coordination mechanisms:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess the extent to which NZ uses FIC donor coordination mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess how well NZ contributes to the strengthening of FIC donor coordination mechanisms and encourages/supports other donors to use FIC donor coordination mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess how well NZ promotes and engages other development partners to improve coordination and harmonisation of effort and resources through: adopting common design and modalities for delivery of assistance, consensus on sector focus and support, appraisal and reporting frameworks and undertaking joint analytical work, missions and visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify opportunities for greater NZ use, or strengthening, of FIC national and sector donor coordination mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT WITH NATIONAL PLANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well New Zealand aligns development assistance with FICs’ national and sector development plans:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe how NZ makes decisions, including choice of implementing partner, to support FIC national and sector development plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess the extent to which New Zealand’s engagement with regional organisations encourages and supports them to address development needs identified in FIC national plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify opportunities for NZ to increase alignment with FICs’ national development planning systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICTABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well New Zealand provides firm financial commitments and forward estimates:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess how well NZ’s provision of forward estimates and commitments enable effective budget and forward planning by FICs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify opportunities for how NZ can increase the predictability of financial contributions to better support FICs’ national budgeting and planning systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE of PARTNER SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well New Zealand uses FICs’ public financial management (PFM) systems:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe how NZ makes decisions on the use, or not, of PFM systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify key factors that enable or prevent this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe how NZ has supported the implementation of PFM reform programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify further opportunities for NZ to increase the use of FICs’ financial management systems including strengthening of FIC public financial management systems and capacities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy Dialogue

How effectively New Zealand’s policy dialogue with FICs and development partners supports achievement of agreed development objectives:

- Describe NZ’s approach and procedures for bilateral policy dialogue with FICs and how well it facilitates agreement on development priorities and objectives.
- Describe how well NZ’s bilateral policy dialogue with FICs and other development partners helps to advance agreed policy objectives and identify key factors that enable or prevent this.
- Identify opportunities for improving bilateral dialogue to strengthen achievement of development priorities, objectives and results.

### Innovation and Good Practice

How well New Zealand promotes and sustains innovation and good practice in the implementation of priorities in key development sectors:

- Describe how NZ identifies key sectors for the delivery of innovative and/or good practice interventions.
- Assess the key role/s NZ plays to support innovation and good practice to deliver on identified priorities in key sectors.
- Assess how well NZ aligns the identification of priorities in key development sectors with expertise and capability to deliver innovative and good practice interventions.
- Identify opportunities for strengthening NZ’s approach to promoting and delivering innovative and good practice development results.

### Knowledge Sharing

How well New Zealand identifies good practice through knowledge sharing and uses this to inform changes to New Zealand’s development policy and processes and engages with FICs in these processes:

- Assess how well NZ has implemented recommendations from Forum Compact peer reviews and annual reporting to Forum members and development partners on development effectiveness in the Pacific.
- Assess how well NZ documents lessons identified and good practice.
- Assess how well NZ engages with FICs in these processes.
- Identify opportunities for both NZ and FICs to improve knowledge sharing and identification of good practice for stronger evidence-based development policy and practice.

### Monitoring and Evaluation to Achieve Results

How well New Zealand monitors and evaluates programmes to achieve results and engages with FICs in these processes:

- Describe how well NZ’s monitoring and evaluation processes support achievement of results.
- Assess how well NZ engages with FICs to establish mutually agreed monitoring and evaluation frameworks including the role of FICs.
- Identify opportunities for NZ and FICs to improve monitoring & evaluation of Programmes for stronger programme management and alignment of results.

### Use of Technical Advisors and Assistance

How well New Zealand identifies, selects and manages technical advisers in the design, management and evaluation of Activities:

- Assess the extent that NZ provides assistance by way of technical advisers/assistance and what factors inform decisions on the use of technical advisers/assistance.
- Assess how well NZ coordinates with FICs on identifying the need for, selecting and managing technical advisers and assistance.
- Assess how well NZ’s criteria for the identification and selection of technical advisors/assistance contribute to the delivery of positive outcomes in Activity design, management and evaluation.
- Assess strengths and gaps in how NZ manages technical advisors/assistance to achieve positive development outcomes.
- Identify opportunities for improving NZ’s identification, selection and management of technical advisors/assistance to achieve positive development outcomes including strengthening country capacities through knowledge transfer.
Management

MFAT will coordinate closely with the PIFS to manage the review.

PIFS will be responsible for:

- Confirming participation of the nominated Review Team FICs, development partner and host FIC;
- Facilitating agreement and finalisation of the Review ToR between New Zealand, the host FIC and Review Team;
- Finalising and confirming the Review Programme with the host FIC and Review Team;
- Preparing necessary background briefs and documentation for use of the Review team prior to the review drawing on: policy and procedures documentation received from New Zealand; Regional tracking and synthesis reports under the Forum Compact, FIC peer review reports; and global monitoring reports on effective development cooperation;
- Organising and managing travel and accommodation for the Review team;
- Via the PIFS representative in Tarawa, organising and managing logistical arrangements for Review Team meetings in Tarawa including key stakeholders, venues and transport to and from meetings;
- Preparing the draft review report in close consultation with the review team and New Zealand; and
- Facilitating finalisation of the Review Report and its publication for dissemination.

MFAT will be responsible for:

- Identifying and proposing Review team members and host FIC;
- Drafting the Review ToR in consultation with the PIFS;
- Drafting the Review Programme in consultation with the PIFS;
- Preparing and organising Review documentation;
- Organising and managing logistical arrangements for Review Team meetings in Wellington including key stakeholders, venues and transport to and from external MFAT meetings; and
- Providing logistical support to PIFS as needed via Post in Tarawa;
- Facilitating joint learning between the DAC Peer Review and the Forum Compact Development Partner Review teams.

Resourcing

The PIFS receives annual funding from a range of development partners, including New Zealand, to facilitate the implementation of the Forum Compact.

From their core budget PIFS will cover the costs of:

- Contracting a PIFS technical consultant;
- Travel, accommodation and in-country costs for two PIFS review team representatives; and
- Drafting and publication of review reports.

New Zealand will cover the costs of:

- Preparing, hosting and facilitating review meetings in Wellington and Tarawa; and
- Travel, accommodation and in-country costs for two FIC review team representatives.

Development partner review team representatives and any observers will cover their own costs.

Review Team

The Review Team will consist of:

- One Forum Compact Development Partner representative from Japan;
- One Forum Island Country representative each from Kiribati and Samoa;
- One representative from the Forum Secretariat; and
- One Technical consultant appointed by the Forum Secretariat.

Individual team members will be mutually agreed by the Forum Secretariat and New Zealand.

Review Dates and Locations

November 17 – 21  MFAT Head Office, Wellington, NZ
November 24 – 30  Host FIC, Tarawa, Kiribati

Outputs and Reporting

Key outputs from the review will be a Review Report with recommendations for the improvement of New Zealand’s development cooperation with FICs.

The Review Report will be prepared by the Review Team and agreed by New Zealand. It will document findings and recommendations.

On receipt of the Review Report, New Zealand will develop an Implementation Plan based on the recommendations identified in the Review Report and share with PIFS.

The Implementation Plan will provide the basis for follow-up and monitoring of progress against the recommendations.
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Mrs Peseta Noumea Simi (Assistant CEO Aid Coordination and Debt Management, Ministry of Finance, Government of Samoa).

Mrs Simi has had a wide-ranging career in foreign affairs and aid coordination/management including debt management in Samoa spanning three decades firstly in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade in 1988 and now in the Ministry of Finance following a realignment of government ministries in Samoa in 2003. She has served as the team leader on the country peer review teams for the Federated States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea and Niue, and as a member of the Pacific Plan Review team and the Secretariat of the South Pacific review team. As well she represented the Pacific on the steering committee of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation from 2012-2014 and is a current member of the Advisory Group of the UN’s Development Cooperation Forum. Mrs Simi holds a MBA (Management).

Dr Asif Chida (Regional Inclusive Growth and Private Sector, United Nations Development Program Pacific Centre).

Dr Chida has more than twenty years experience in thirty Small Islands Developing States in the Caribbean and the Pacific and was a member of the Federated States of Micronesia peer review team. He holds a Masters of Commerce in international trade and banking, a Masters of Philosophy (Commerce) with specialisation in rural banking and local economic development and a PhD (Commerce) with specialization in economics and corporate governance.

Mrs Tarsu Murdoch (former Secretary Communications, Transport & Tourism Development Government of Kiribati).

Ms. Murdoch has held senior positions in several Government ministries in Kiribati. She had been the Secretary for Environment, Lands & Agriculture Development and the Communications, Transport & Tourism Development when she retired in 2014.
## Annex C: Review Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt of New Zealand and Govt of Kiribati</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Joint Commitment for Development New Zealand – Kiribati.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Multilateral Agencies Programme Strategic and Results Framework 2012-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Multilateral Agencies Programme Strategic and Results Framework 2012 – 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>New Zealand Aid Programme Sector Priorities 2012 – 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NZAP Sector Priorities 2012-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Programme Management Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Strengthening the Integration of Cross-cutting Issues into the New Zealand Aid Programme – 3 Year Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Strengthening the Integration of Cross-cutting Issues into the New Zealand Aid Programme – 3 Year Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Knowledge and Results Five Year Strategy 2013/14-2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Knowledge and Results Five Year Strategy. 2013-14 to 2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Pacific Focus, Global Reach. New Zealand Aid Programme 2013 Year in Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Quality Standards for Activity Management 2014 - 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Use of Partner Government Public Financial Management Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Evaluation for the New Zealand Aid Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Foreign Affairs and Trade Aid Programme</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Memorandum of New Zealand – OECD DAC Peer Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Development Assistance Committee</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>New Zealand Peer Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Development Assistance Committee</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Peer Review Reference Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Peer Review of the Republic of Kiribati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Kiribati Peer Review Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex D: Wellington Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
<td>Hon Murray McCully</td>
<td>Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Hawke</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Fry</td>
<td>Director, DSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Nicolson</td>
<td>Director, PACDEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cecile Hillyer</td>
<td>Director, GLO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deb Collins</td>
<td>Director, PHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Burrell</td>
<td>Director, SED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathryn McBride</td>
<td>Deputy Director, FIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicky Trewern</td>
<td>Business Operations Manager, DS IDG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucy Duncan</td>
<td>Group Manager, STR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart Dymond</td>
<td>Divisional Manager, STR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pete Zwart</td>
<td>Deputy Director, PACDEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Howell</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Multilateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Pasikale</td>
<td>Deputy Director, SED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Murray</td>
<td>Deputy Director, SED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart Calman</td>
<td>Deputy Director, SED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sara Carley</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Development Effectiveness, DSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacque Dean</td>
<td>Deputy Director, PACDEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Cotgreave</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen Pearce</td>
<td>Deputy Director, GLO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brad McCartney</td>
<td>FIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mehaka Rountree</td>
<td>Principal Development Manager, Results and Performance Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vinayak Nagaraj</td>
<td>Principal Development Economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stan van der Syp</td>
<td>Development Manager, PHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Egan</td>
<td>Principal Development Manager, Policy, DSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jenny Wells</td>
<td>Development Manager, DSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Development Advisory and Selection Panel</td>
<td>Peter Kierly</td>
<td>(Acting) Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Major</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trevor Janes</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gill Geer</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Organisations</td>
<td>Wren Green</td>
<td>Director, Council for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adele Broadbent</td>
<td>Research and Communications Analyst, Council for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seth Lelu</td>
<td>World Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliza Raymond</td>
<td>Family Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Ulu</td>
<td>VSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luke Roughton</td>
<td>Oxfam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justine Hickey</td>
<td>Caritas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentarians</td>
<td>Lindsay Tisch</td>
<td>National Party, Member of Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade Select Committee (FADTC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex E: Tarawa Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government of Kiribati</td>
<td>H.E. Anote Tong</td>
<td>Te Beretitenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Teea Tira</td>
<td>Secretary to Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Batetaake Tatoa</td>
<td>Director of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Akka Rimon</td>
<td>Secretary for Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Bwaua Arobati</td>
<td>Desk Officer, Asia Pacific, MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Eriati Tauma</td>
<td>Secretary for Finance &amp; Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Jason Reynolds</td>
<td>Director, National Economic Planning Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Taiwan/ROC</td>
<td>HE Abraham Chu</td>
<td>Ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
<td>Mr Don Higgins</td>
<td>New Zealand High Commissioner to Kiribati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Peter Kemp</td>
<td>Deputy High Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Yvonne Tukotahi</td>
<td>Consul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Kate Cushing</td>
<td>Urban Development Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Australia</td>
<td>H.E. George Fraser</td>
<td>Australian High Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Cuba</td>
<td>Mr Michael Hunt</td>
<td>Deputy High Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANGO</td>
<td>Mr. Amon Timon</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati Family Health Association</td>
<td>Mrs. Norma Yeeting</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pacific Consulate Representatives
- Falefata Hele Ei Matatia, Samoa High Commission
- HE Mrs Joy Kere, Solomon Is High Commission
- Ms Tepaeru Herrmann, Cook Islands High Commission

Other opinion leaders
- Jonathon Boston, Institute of Public Policy
- Assoc Prof Graham Hassall, President United Nations Association of New Zealand
- John McKinnon, Victoria University
- John Overton, Victoria University
- Gerard Prinsen, Victoria and Massey Universities
- Regina Schyvens, Massey University
- Terence Wood, NZ Aid and Development Dialogues
- Joanna Spratt, NZ Aid and Development Dialogues
- Glenn Banks, Massey University
## Annex F: Implementation Plan Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsibility &amp; Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Dialogue &amp; Strategy Alignment</td>
<td>Two way policy dialogue should be the starting point for any agreements to ensure they genuinely reflect Partner Country’s priorities and strengthens the agreed strategic fit between the priorities of both partner country and New Zealand;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where a Partner Country does not have the relevant frameworks in place, New Zealand is encouraged to support their development. For example, continue to support the implementation of a programmatic approach in Kiribati to replace the current fragmented, project approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand is encouraged to support, and participate in, the implementation of the Pacific Framework for Regionalism to ensure New Zealand’s regional assistance is fully aligned with regional priorities. The FICs also have to demonstrate the rationale for their prioritisation for regional integration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand Country Strategies to reflect the priorities of the Partner Country identified through policy dialogue and in national development plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand’s five year Kiribati Country Strategy to be developed in 2015 in alignment with the new KDP process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand to take a facilitative and incentivised approach to enhance Partner Government capacity (including recruitment and contracting) rather than ‘doing it for them’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand to share with other Development Partners their approach to developing forward aid plans as an example of good practice and in improving predictable aid flows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination</strong></td>
<td>New Zealand to provide guidance to Post staff on processes to further facilitate country leadership in donor coordination, particularly through facilitating and advocating more formal coordination mechanisms anchored in a national development cooperation policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Partner Systems</strong></td>
<td>New Zealand to facilitate and advocate development partner assistance to Kiribati to develop and finalise a national development cooperation policy through the provision of appropriate technical and financial resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation, good practice and knowledge management</strong></td>
<td>New Zealand is encouraged to explore in collaboration with NGOs, CSOs and academia a more formal arrangement to ensure it taps into all available sources of development capacity and evidence based knowledge sharing and analysis, including research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand is encouraged to explore adjustments in the Partnership Fund modality to enhance its scope, ease of accessibility and country coverage, including the option of promoting the Partnership Fund through its in-country programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Kiribati, it is recommended that New Zealand continue to facilitate the use of sector coordination committees as the basis for communities of practice and knowledge sharing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand is encouraged to invest technical and financial capacity in regional knowledge sharing and learning efforts in areas of its comparative advantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Technical Advisers</td>
<td>New Zealand to facilitate and advocate for joint recruitment and contracting procedures in support of country capacity, particularly where these procedures are not fully developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand to continue to support the use of local and regional technical advisers and assistance, and work at both country and regional level to map when available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand to facilitate support in improving the information management systems of the National Economic Planning Office (NEPO) in tracking the number of and effectiveness of technical assistance and advisers towards capacity building and knowledge transfer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; evaluation to achieve results</td>
<td>GoK and the Post develop a joint formal monitoring strategy (that underpins the JCfD) to support activity level monitoring that facilitates more use of GoK processes such as the sector coordination committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>