

Sent 3/3/11

2528497

AID/OIA/11/FIS/3

**Rights to Information and Participatory Democracy Project in Nauru  
and Melanesia  
Pacific Centre for Public Integrity, Fiji**

**PROJECT REVIEW REPORT**

**Alison Gray  
Gray Matter Research Ltd  
2 December 2008**

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

## Table of contents

Acronyms and glossary of terms .....	1
Executive summary .....	2
Introduction.....	6
Purpose of the review .....	6
Method.....	7
Project background .....	9
Project descriptions and objectives .....	9
Staffing and administration.....	10
Project rationale.....	10
Findings and analysis.....	12
Project planning and design .....	12
Project management and implementation.....	15
Project achievements.....	20
Beneficiary satisfaction .....	25
Challenges and opportunities.....	26
Future of the project.....	28
Conclusions and recommendations .....	29
Annex 1    Terms of Reference for the Review.....	31
Annex 2    Itinerary for review consultations.....	42
Annex 3    Persons consulted .....	44
Annex 4    Information sheet and topic guide.....	46
Annex 5    Chronology of key project dates .....	49
Annex 6    Background material and papers reviewed .....	50
Annex 7    Project work plans.....	52

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

## Acronyms and glossary of terms

AVI	Australia Volunteers International
CHRI	Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
ECREA	Ecumenical Centre for Research, Education and Advocacy
ED	Executive Director
FCOSS	Fiji Council of Social Services
FOI	Freedom of Information
FPSI	Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International
FWRM	Fiji Women's Rights Movement
MAV	Media Association of Vanuatu
NIANGO	Nauru Island Association of non-Government Organisations
NIS	National Integrity Systems e.g. Audit Office, Electoral Commission
PCPI	Pacific Centre for Pacific Integrity
PCRC	Pacific Concerns Resources Centre
PIANGO	Pacific Islands Association of non-Government Organisations
PIFS	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
PPSG	Pacific Programme for Strengthening Governance (an NZAID programme)
RRRT	Regional Rights Resources Team
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
TI	Transparency International
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
VANGO	Vanuatu Association of Non-Governmental Organisations

## Executive summary

### Background

The Pacific Centre for Public Integrity (PCPI) is a regional campaign, advocacy and policy development organization registered in Fiji in 2004. It is governed by a Board comprised of regional representatives. A grant from AusAID enabled PCPI to rent office space, establish an office and pay for a Director for six months in 2005.

In January 2006 PCPI signed a funding agreement with NZAID to support the pilot of PCPI's Regional Governance Programme – *Rights to Information and Participatory Democracy in Melansia and Nauru*. NZAID agreed to provide project funding up to a maximum of NZ\$467,067 (including taxes) over a two year period February 2006 to 30 January 2008. The funding period was later extended to 30 June 2008. After a second extension to 30 September 2008, all funding ceased.

### Purpose of the review

This review of the pilot project is for accountability and learning purposes and to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities. The specific objectives are to:

- a) build knowledge and understanding of the project to date, including outcomes and impacts
- b) assess whether the strategies that PCPI and their partners have adopted to enhance the strengthening of governance through this project remain valid
- c) consider recommendations to inform decisions by NZAID and PCPI with regard to the future focus and development of the project, including support and resourcing.

### Method

The review was completed between October 20 and December 10 2008 by Alison Gray of Gray Matter Research Ltd, Wellington. Fieldwork took place in Fiji, Vanuatu and Nauru between October 27 and November 13 2008. Methods used were:

- a document and file review
- interviews with PCPI Board members and staff, and staff at NZAID
- interviews/consultations with development partners (some by telephone or email)
- interviews/consultations with relevant government agencies and regional and national civil society organisations and community groups in each of the three project countries
- assessment of the implementation and impact of project activities and the performance of project managers and beneficiaries.

The review had three major limitations. It was carried out after NZAID funding ceased so no activities were taking place. In 2008, the Executive Director (ED) left Fiji for security reasons and has been based in Wellington, New Zealand. All PCPI records are either in storage or in the care of the ED in Wellington. The reviewer was only able to access documents which were on NZAID files or the ED's computer. Some important stakeholders were not in country at the time of the fieldwork. All were contacted by phone or email but this is less satisfactory and produced less information than a face to face visit.

## Project description and objectives

Key objectives of the pilot project were to:

- support civil society groups initially in Nauru and Fiji to carry out civics education and awareness work on participatory democracy and governance
- work with government and civil society organisations (CSOs) to review and improve enabling legislation and policies that govern CSO bodies in Nauru
- support and encourage the development of Freedom of Information (FOI) legislation and the implementation of a leadership code of conduct in Nauru and Fiji
- work with key stakeholders to review and strengthen existing national integrity systems in Nauru.

Due to the difficulty of operating in Fiji after the coup, funding was shifted to support activities in Vanuatu at the end of 2007.

PCPI worked with a range of partners at national and regional levels. Activities included: awareness and training workshops, advocacy and media campaigns, a civil sector needs analysis in Nauru, input into draft legislation, consultation with government leaders and other stakeholders and support for CSO submissions.

## Key findings

### Project planning and design

The original project plan was ambitious, particularly for a small, new organisation with no regional track record. Planning to start work in two countries within two months of being granted funds was never realistic.

The project was in line with NZAID and regional priorities and with national priorities in Fiji. It was less well aligned with priorities in Nauru and subsequently Vanuatu.

PCPI developed good synergies with other regional organisations but was less successful at the national level, particularly in Nauru and Vanuatu.

Planning was soundly based in Fiji and was consultative in Vanuatu. The plan for Nauru was developed in consultation with some stakeholders in Nauru.

No monitoring or evaluation framework was developed.

An assumptions/risk analysis was completed as part of the log frame. Risk and assumptions were not distinguished and no management strategies were described.

### Project management and implementation

Implementing the work plan depended on having suitably qualified staff and administrative support. PCPI experienced delays in recruiting an experienced lawyer and does not have a lawyer on the staff at present.

Financial management and reporting was problematic throughout the project. PCPI relied on the services of a volunteer who did not have all the skills needed for the task. As a new funding partner, PCPI did not fully understand the NZAID acquittals and reporting system. It took considerable time on both parties' part for that to be resolved, particularly in relation

to variations. Approval of overspending on line items was an issue for NZAID; PCPI tended to take a broader view of the budget and did not seek such approvals.

Staff and time pressures at NZAID led to oversight of the need for budget approvals, and delays in giving feedback and preparing Letters of Variation.

PCPI entered into a funding arrangement for capacity building with NIANGO in Nauru. Capacity building is a PIANGO responsibility.

The Project Plan attached to the Funding Arrangement does not match the funding approved.

The Board actively supported the work of the ED but did not set strategic directions for the organisation. The decision to have regional Board members did not enhance PCPI's work.

### **Project achievements**

PCPI's was making promising progress in Fiji before the coup. It ran workshops with members of Parliament and the media on the Leadership Code and FOI, and participated in advocacy work alongside other organisations.

The work in Nauru had some successes, particularly through PCPI's partnerships with RRRT and ICNL, although PCPI faced challenges in working with the non-government sector. It worked with NIANGO to develop a Constitution and a Strategic Development Plan and ran a number of workshops with RRRT. PCPI carried out consultations on the need for CSO legislation on behalf of the Government which is yet to review the report.

In Vanuatu the government has directed MAV to draft FOI legislation for discussion. A number of agencies, prompted and supported by PCPI, contributed to bringing the FOI issue to this point.

As a pilot, the project has provided some valuable lessons as well as making some good gains in each country. It has highlighted the need to base such a project in a well-established organisation with sound governance and management structures, and enough capacity to deliver the work plan. Both budgetary and capacity constraints limited PCPI's ability to hire an appropriately qualified and experienced lawyer, a role which was integral to achieving the project's stated objectives and completing its work plan. Relying on volunteers is not a sustainable option and does not build the organisation's capacity. In retrospect, it might have been preferable to extend PCPI's partnership approach to include a more explicit arrangement for other NGOs to provide expertise in this area.

The pilot raised questions as to whether a separate organisation is needed to foster FOI and CSO legislation and promote civic awareness on these issues within the region. Participants agreed that the greatest need is in the area of strengthening CSO's capacity to advocate and that this is an area in which PCPI has expertise. Participants suggested four options for continuing this aspect of the work, with legal advice provided by existing organisations:

- PCPI remains as a registered organisation but staff are housed within another organisation.
- PCPI operates with a structure similar to ICNL, i.e. with minimal overheads, bringing in people on an as needs basis. Funding could be on a project by project basis.
- PCPI is disbanded with the ED carrying on her work as an individual consultant.

- PCPI continues as a separate organisation with its own office, governance and administrative structure. Most believed this would only be effective if the ED and staff were housed together.

The project has demonstrated that it takes time and patience to establish working relationships in countries where an organisation has no base. Each country is different and organisations with an advocacy focus need to work closely with NGOs and the government to design a work plan. They also need to be prepared to step back if projects do not have in-country "champions" with vision, drive and relationship building skills within the local context. This project was successful in all three countries in promoting interest in and awareness of governance issues. The follow through will ultimately need to be the responsibility of NGOs and the government within each country.

The project has been adversely affected by the coup in Fiji and the Interim Government's response to the ED's stance. This has shown the importance of an organisation like PCPI having a clear mandate to carry out activities for which it is not funded.

This review recommends that:

1. NZAID give no further funding to PCPI in the meantime.
2. NZAID encourages the PCPI ED and Board to explore the options set out above.
3. The PCPI Board and ED consider focusing on advocacy. Leaving the provision of technical advice to other organisations.

RELEASSED  
OFFICIAL INFORMATION

## Introduction

The Pacific Centre for Public Integrity (PCPI) was incorporated on 30 July 2004 as a company limited by liability and not for profit under the Fiji Companies Act. PCPI is a regional campaign, advocacy and policy development organization. It is governed by a Board comprised of regional representatives.

Prior to inception PCPI existed as a Good Governance Project with the Ecumenical Centre for Research, Education and Advocacy (ECEA). With ECREA's focus on social development, it was agreed it would be mutually beneficial to both PCPI and ECREA to have PCPI as a separate organisation. A grant from AusAID in 2005 enabled PCPI to rent office space, acquire basic office furniture, fittings and equipment, and pay for a director for six months.

PCPI's main objectives are to:

- promote good governance values and practices and to expose and address corruption, through research, public empowerment and advocacy
- work to improve accountability and transparency within the private and public sector, including civil society
- conduct investigative research into issues of public policy and provide information to all stakeholders with a view to exposing corruption and bad governance practices
- raise public awareness of the damaging effects of bad governance practices, and to promote a "zero tolerance" attitude towards corruption in Pacific states
- scrutinize and monitor the performance of key institutions and office holders in non-party political manner
- conduct policy research into good practices in governance and to work with stakeholders to achieve reforms
- build strategic partnerships with public and private actors at local, national and regional levels
- conduct workshops and informal education programmes.

In January 2006 PCPI signed a funding agreement with NZAID to support the pilot of PCPI's Regional Governance Programme – *Rights to Information and Participatory Democracy in Melanesia and Nauru*. NZAID agreed to provide project funding up to a maximum of NZ\$467,067 (including taxes) over a two year period February 2006 to 30 January 2008. The funding period was later extended first to 30 June 2008, with funding increased to \$532,112.60, and then to 30 September 2008, when all funding ceased.

### Purpose of the review

This review of the pilot project is for accountability and learning purposes and to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities. The aim is check that the overall direction of the project is still relevant and that development activities have met or are likely to meet the purposes for which the project was planned. The knowledge gained from the review will be used to improve policies, strategies and activities, and enhance programme design and performance, and development impact. The specific review objectives are to:



- d) build knowledge and understanding of the project to date, including outcomes and impacts
- e) assess whether the strategies that PCPI and their partners have adopted to enhance the strengthening of governance through this project remain valid
- f) consider recommendations to inform decisions by NZAID and PCPI with regard to the future focus and development of the project, including support and resourcing.

## Method

The review was completed between October 20 and December 10 2008 by Alison Gray of Gray Matter Research Ltd, Wellington. Fieldwork took place in Fiji, Vanuatu and Nauru between October 27 and November 13 2008. A timetable is attached as Annex 2.

Methods used for the review were:

- a document and file review
- interviews with PCPI Board members and staff
- interviews/consultations with development partners (some by telephone or email)
- interviews/consultations with relevant government agencies and regional and national civil society organisations and community groups in each of the three project countries
- assessment of the implementation and impact of project activities and the performance of project managers and beneficiaries.

A list of people consulted is included as Annex 3. The consultations provided information on:

- the nature and extent of engagement with PCPI
- their experience in relation to project management and implementation
- their views on the project's achievements and impact
- their assessment of challenges and opportunities and how these might be managed in the future.

A copy of the information sheet and topic guide in Annex 4 was sent in advance to most of those who were invited to give their views. Some received it at the start of the discussion and had time to read it before commenting. Participants were advised that they were only expected to comment on those aspects of the project with which they were familiar. All were invited to describe their experience with and knowledge of the PCPI project before answering the reviewer's questions. Notes from these consultations were analysed in terms of the research question and were used to complement and inform data drawn from documents.

A list of the documents reviewed is included as Annex 6. The documents provided information on:

- the origins and rationale of the PCPI pilot
- the intended outcomes of the PCPI pilot
- the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in PCPI
- stakeholder groups, including partners and beneficiaries, and their interests in PCPI
- how PCPI has been operationalised and managed since its launch
- financial aspects of the organisation

- monitoring and evaluation and risk analysis
- alignment with NZAID and national and regional priorities
- activities undertaken through the project.

Information was also gathered through informal conversations and by observation. This was particularly the case in Nauru where the reviewer stayed for six days because of flight schedules. This provided ample opportunity to see and understand the context in which the programme sought to operate.

### **Limitations of the review**

The review itself faced a number of challenges. It was undertaken after NZAID funding ceased, which meant that no project activities were being carried at the time of the review. No project activities have been undertaken in Fiji since the coup in December 2006 and the travel ban on PCPI's Director made it difficult to continue with some of the work planned in Nauru. As a result of these difficulties, PCPI shifted its focus from Nauru to Vanuatu during 2007, but delays on NZAID's part in varying the contract meant that work in Vanuatu did not officially commence until 2008.

In 2008, the Executive Director (ED) left Fiji for security reasons and is based in Wellington, New Zealand. All PCPI records are now either in storage or in the care of the ED in Wellington. The reviewer was only able to access documents which were on NZAID files or the ED's computer. The ED willingly provided what she had available. The original office in Fiji has been closed and the administrative assistant and remaining volunteer work restricted hours out of a single room in a shared office. They were unable to provide any documentation.

The other limitation, one that is very common in the Pacific, is that some important stakeholders were not in country at the time of the fieldwork. All were contacted by phone or email but this is less satisfactory and produced less information than a face to face visit.

The reviewer has made every effort to find documentary evidence to support assessments and recommendations. In some instances it has been necessary to rely on information gathered during consultations. Only information or opinions that were corroborated by more than one person have been used in the analysis.

## Project background

### Project descriptions and objectives

The *Rights to Information and Participatory Democracy in Melanesia and Nauru* Project aimed to promote the development of access to information tools as a means to encourage and strengthen civic participation in development and governance and ultimately as a means to promote better accountability and transparency within the machinery of government in the Pacific. The first two countries identified for the pilot were Nauru and Fiji. A list of the key dates for the project is included as Annex 5.

Key objectives of the pilot project were to:

- support civil society groups initially in Nauru and Fiji to carry out civics education and awareness work on participatory democracy and governance
- work with government and civil society organisations (CSOs) to review and improve enabling legislation and policies that govern CSO bodies in Nauru
- support and encourage the development of Freedom of Information (FOI) legislation and the implementation of a leadership code of conduct in Nauru and Fiji
- work with key stakeholders to review and strengthen existing national integrity systems in Nauru.

Due to the difficulty of operating in Fiji after the coup, funding was shifted to support activities in Vanuatu at the end of 2007.

The aim of the project in the short to medium term was to contribute to the adoption of principles, policies and mechanisms to promote and foster good governance practices, including zero tolerance of corruption, in Nauru and Fiji. The longer term (five to ten year) objective was to create a national and regional society that is self-regulating in that it actively safeguards and upholds the principles of good governance and democracy. PCPI's aim was to involve and include civil society and direct public participation in the process of government rehabilitation.

The tactics set out in the original plan were to:

- support the development of FOI legislation and the implementation of a Leadership Code of Conduct
- undertake civics education and awareness work with civil society groups on participatory democracy and governance
- work with government and CSOs to review and improve enabling legislation and policies that govern CSO bodies
- work with key stakeholders to review and strengthen existing national integrity systems, particularly Audit, Electoral Commission and Parliament.

To implement the project, PCPI sought to work with a range of partners at national and regional levels. PCPI approached Regional Rights Resources Team (RRRT) now formally associated with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI) and the UNDP Governance Program to be their main regional

partners. In Nauru, they also worked with NIANGO, the umbrella organization for NGOs. In Fiji, they worked through the existing NGO Election Education Group and with FWRM and PCRC. In Vanuatu, PCPI has worked with the Vanuatu Association of Non-Governmental Organisations (VANGO), Transparency International (TI) and the Media Association of Vanuatu (MAV). PCPI has also consulted with the International Centre for Non-Profit Legislation (ICNL) and worked with the Forum Secretariat which has now taken the lead in FOI work in the South Pacific.

The relevant parts of the **original work plan** are included in Appendix 7.

A new work plan was prepared for the final year of the project, July 2007-June 2008 to take account of (a) the end to activities in Fiji following the coup and (b) the findings of the CSO Needs Assessment carried out in Nauru in April 2006. This revealed that the civil society sector was not in a position to engage with PCPI on democracy and governance issues.

In Nauru, the period from 1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007 was devoted to building the capacity of the Nauru civil society sector, and in particular NIANGO, the umbrella body for NGOs in Nauru.

The **revised work plan** for July 2007 – June 2008 focused on instigating new activities in Vanuatu and picking up activities in Nauru that could not be completed in 2006. There was no longer an expectation that the FOI legislation would be passed or an Ombudsman's office established in Nauru during the project. The Ombudsman Speaking tour was no longer on the agenda, nor was the plan to develop an advocacy toolkit for CSOs on civic education and awareness. It is included in Appendix 7.

The brief history of the project attached to the Terms of reference as Annex A provides a fair description of the work undertaken by PCPI.

### **Staffing and administration**

PCPI did not begin the project with a fully functioning office with established financial, administrative and management systems; nor did it have the technical (legal) staff required to implement the work plan. Through the project, three full-time positions were established: the Executive Director (ED); a Legal Officer (this was filled first by a recent graduate and later by an AVI volunteer); and an administrative/campaign assistant (this position was subsequently split to create two positions). PCPI also had the services of a fully funded UNV Korean volunteer as Office Administrator. He was responsible for setting up the financial and administrative systems.

### **Project rationale**

The project began with a holistic view of governance, recognizing the need to strengthen the legislative and policy environment while at the same time increasing the awareness and understanding of communities and the public sector and seeking to develop a culture, values and incentives within societies that support good governance.

PCPI's regional strategy was to work with a low risk country where there was already a commitment to FOI, as a way to build support for FOI regionally. Fiji was considered politically ready and had a well developed CSO sector. The PCPI programme built on work that was already under way.

That was not the situation in Nauru. The programme there developed from a visit the ED made in 2005 while engaged on work for the Forum Secretariat relating to a Draft Leadership Code of Conduct. During that visit, some Members of Parliament expressed interest in passing a law for not-for-profit organizations and the coordinator of NIANGO expressed interest in a needs assessment for the sector. The first CSO needs assessment workshop in April 2006 identified the issues, and the rest of the Nauru CSO work was developed and agreed collectively by NIANGO and other CSO stakeholders.

RELEASED UNDER THE  
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

## Findings and analysis

### Project planning and design

Key points:

- The original project plan was ambitious, particularly for a small, new organisation with no regional track record. Planning to start work in two countries within two months of being granted funds, as set out in the work plan attached to the Funding Arrangement, was never realistic. PCPI also had high expectations for its work in Vanuatu.
- The project was in line with NZAID and regional priorities and with national priorities in Fiji. It was less well aligned with national priorities in Nauru and Vanuatu.
- PCPI developed good synergies with other regional organisations but was less successful in developing synergies at the national level, particularly in Nauru and Vanuatu, where local organisations other than NIANGO remained unclear about where PCPI fitted with other organisations working on similar topics<sup>1</sup>.
- Planning was soundly based in Fiji and was consultative in Vanuatu. The plan for Nauru was not well informed.
- No monitoring or evaluation framework was developed.
- An assumptions/risk analysis was completed as part of the log frame. Risk and assumptions were not distinguished and no management strategies were described.

#### Alignment with NZAID's priorities

The objectives and operating principles of the project were considered highly consistent with the PPSG Governance and Conflict Prevention Fund and contributed directly to priority objectives of PPSG and of NZAID as an agency. As well as contributing to strengthening governance, the project also sought to contribute to: protecting and promoting human rights; strengthening the capacity of civil society and government organizations to do that; strengthening civil society engagement in governance processes and enhancing participatory governance at all levels; and enhancing the transparency, accountability and equity of national governance processes.

Documents show that NZAID was aware that the project presented some risks due to PCPI's limited capacity and relative lack of regional experience and the political sensitivity of the issues involved, but was reassured by supportive feedback from proposed partner agencies and bilateral programme managers.

#### Alignment with national and regional priorities

The project was in line with regional priorities to improve governance, including access to information, in the South Pacific. However, the level of national commitment to FOI, civic

---

<sup>1</sup> The ED of PCPI notes that PCPI was the only outside NGO to have instigated project work in Nauru. Through PCPI involvement, RRRT was able to implement a project. According to the ED, the only local "formal" NGO in Nauru is NIANGO, and PCPI and its regional partners went to great length to explain its work to that organisation.

education on democracy and governance, developing legislation for the NGO sector, and strengthening NIS systems varied.

The work in Fiji was well aligned with national priorities. The then government was interested in passing an FOI Act and a Leadership Code of Conduct. The PCPI ED already had good connections with other agencies working in this area and was well placed to use these connections to promote and implement the PCPI focus on access to information. Apart from the unrealistic start date, the plan for work in Fiji was fair and achievable, given the strength of the CSO sector and the level of political awareness among the media and the general population. As discussed below, it came to a standstill once the military government took power.

The work in Nauru was informed by the constitutional review being undertaken by UNDP and by work on a Leadership Code of Conduct. While some MPs expressed interest in passing NGO legislation, there was no evidence that strengthening NIS or increasing civic awareness of democracy and governance was a priority for the non-government/civil sector. The aim of the CSO work in Nauru as originally supported by NIANGO was to strengthen and build capacity of the CSO sector in the area of governance so they would be in a better position to advocate for better governance. The subsequent project activities were developed in response to needs identified by NIANGO and the broader sector.

In Vanuatu, work was already under way in developing CSO legislation prior to PCPI's initiative. ICNL remains active in this area. Some work had also been done through TI in developing draft FOI legislation and undertaking civic education, but neither was a government priority. Reports and interviews indicate that it took some time for PCPI to find the appropriate niche and establish organisational links.

### **Synergies with other agencies**

The area in which PCPI chose to work is relatively crowded. CHRI has an FOI programme in the Pacific, targeted largely at governments. RRRT provides basic education in human rights at the local level. TI works to ensure that national integrity systems function effectively. UNDP Pacific Centre has a governance programme and ICNL specialises in drafting legislation for the not-for-profit sector. PCPI's objectives overlap to some extent with all of these agencies but PCPI's view is that no other agency specialises in Access to Information and Codes of Conduct. While PCPI did obtain the support of other regional organisations in principle, and an agreement to co-operate where practical and appropriate, interviews with representatives of NGOs and regional agencies show that delineations of territory did create some confusion on the ground.

In practice, the alignment between PCPI and other agencies appears to have been stronger at the regional level and in Fiji than in either Nauru or Vanuatu, where PCPI had no physical presence. Organisations like TI Vanuatu, for example, were unclear where PCPI fitted in alongside organisations like CHRI, and the relationship between PCPI and NIANGO quickly became strained. PCPI did work with RRRT in Nauru on the needs assessment, and RRRT has continued to run a programme there, even though PCPI's work in Nauru has stopped. PCPI has also facilitated sessions at numerous workshops in Fiji and in other countries alongside CHRI and with UNDP.

PCPI could not have completed its work programme without being able to draw on the legal and technical expertise of CHRI, UNDP Governance Programme and ICNL. The first lawyer appointed by PCPI was a recent graduate, who lacked experience in what is a highly technical area. The second was an Australian volunteer who was more experienced but not sufficiently versed in the area to provide legal advice or drafting input without back-up and support. She has since returned to Australia.

Despite agencies' agreement to work together, there were some instances where this did not happen. At the same time that PCPI was planning its national workshop in Fiji, UNDP was also planning a regional workshop, also in Fiji, following the traditional pattern of inviting a strictly limited number of representatives from each country<sup>2</sup> to take part. PCPI cancelled its own workshop to support the UNDP one, and while PCPI staff made some useful contacts, they were disappointed at losing an opportunity to implement one of their own strategies – i.e. to nurture a specific group of people and organisations to champion the cause for an FOI law in Fiji. Both workshops would have been funded directly or indirectly by NZAID, but the larger regional organisation took precedence over the smaller one, which to some extent undermined PCPI's work programme in Fiji.

#### **Country-based or regional design and management**

The project was conceived as a regional initiative but included more intensive involvement in each country than is often the case with regional programmes. PCPI personnel planned to work in each country with key stakeholders and local organisations rather than bringing one or two representatives from each country to a central workshop.

While this approach worked well in Fiji, which is the organization's home base, it was less successful in Nauru and Vanuatu. In Nauru, the NIANGO had little capacity to work with PCPI, while in Vanuatu there was some confusion at first over which was the appropriate organisation for PCPI to partner with. In all three countries, government relationships with the civil society/NGO sector needed to be taken into account. In Vanuatu, the government decided which organisation it would work with. In Nauru, arrangements for representatives from a visiting organisation depend on who sponsors the entry visa. If NIANGO is the sponsor then NIANGO wants to be the channel through which the organisation accesses the government, and vice versa. Unfortunately, the relationship between the government and NIANGO is strained and PCPI's wish to have independent access to both the government and NIANGO and NIANGO's failure to deliver on its commitments under the MOU led to a breakdown in the relationship with NIANGO.

#### **Planning and implementation strategies**

Planning was soundly based in Fiji but was inevitably less so in Nauru and Vanuatu, given the ED's relative lack of familiarity with the situation in those countries. The work plan for Vanuatu was developed after a scoping visit and in consultation with some NGOs but had to be revised later. The work plan for Nauru was developed in something of a vacuum, given that the CSO/NGO sector in Nauru is relatively undeveloped. For example, there are no issue-based NGOs and no independent service organisations and the ED of PCPI has described NIANGO as the only "formal NGO in Nauru, which makes its status as the Nauru Island Association of Non-Government Organisations somewhat ambiguous. The first report

---

<sup>2</sup> A second regional workshop was held in Honiara in July 2008. PCPI ED facilitated a session at this workshop.



on Nauru (May 2006) prepared by RRRT refers to a lack of information on Nauru, including being unable to locate a report on work done by the EU on the same topic in 1994.

No participants commented adversely on the implementation strategies – developing media campaigns, running training workshops and offering policy and legal advice. These are familiar techniques in the Pacific in this area, but participants noted that they are only effective when the timing and political and community context are right.

### **Monitoring and evaluation**

No monitoring and evaluation mechanisms were included in the project design, although a final version of a formative monitoring framework was to be provided to NZAID by the end of the fourth month of implementation. The ED fully intended to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework and attended a one-week course on the topic funded by NZAID, but with no follow up to the course, no in-house support and pressure from other demands, she never completed the framework.

### **Risk analysis**

A high level assumptions/risk analysis was prepared at the programme design stage. It does not distinguish between assumptions and risks and includes no mitigation or management strategies. The project has responded to some of the risks identified, which included resourcing, management, sustainability and the political climate, but in an ad hoc rather than a planned way.

For example, the assumptions/risks set out in the log frame recognized lack of capacity and resources to work on issues as a potential risk in Nauru but assumed that consensus could be reached on priority areas and that information from the needs assessment would lead to better understanding and informed participation from the CSOs. The assumption was that training would effectively support improved understanding, skills development and behavioural change. In the event, the needs analysis revealed a much more basic level of need. Organisations wanted operational support in the form of proposal writing and budget management courses, rather than conceptual information about democracy, governance and human rights. The risk analysis contained no strategies for coping with this situation, and PCPI decided to switch the proposed training into operational areas which were not their core business or part of the project.

In Vanuatu, PCPI appeared to be unfamiliar with the political context and had to adapt its plans after its initial efforts to work through TI were unsuccessful. The ED of PCPI notes that PCPI was aware of the strained relations between TI, the government and local NGOs, but knew that TI was the only organisation that had done work on FOI and through its president, who was on the PCPI board, had expressed interest in working collaboratively with PCPI. With support from TI, PCPI subsequently developed relations with VANGO and MAV, the two main groups that PCPI works with. PCPI maintains a good relationship with TI.

### **Project management and implementation**

Key points:

- Implementing the work plan depended on having suitably qualified staff and administrative support. PCPI experienced delays in recruiting an experienced lawyer. The position was filled by a volunteer when the local recent graduate left.

- In the financial area, PCPI relied on the services of a volunteer who did not have all the skills needed for the task. The quality of financial reporting reflects this. The ED took on this task in addition to her other responsibilities. There was no indication that any money was misspent or misappropriated.
- As a new funding partner, PCPI did not fully understand the NZAID acquittals and reporting system. Resolving issues took a long time, particularly in relation to variations.
- Approval of overspending on line items was an issue for NZAID; PCPI took a broader view of the budget and did not seek approvals in advance.
- Staff and time pressures at NZAID led to oversight of the need for budget approvals, and to delays in giving feedback and preparing Letters of Variation.
- PCPI entered into a funding arrangement for capacity building with NIANGO in Nauru. This was not appropriate given that capacity building is a PIANGO responsibility.
- The Project Plan attached to the Funding Arrangement did not match the funding approved.
- The Board actively supported the work of the ED but did not set strategic directions for the organisation. Most Board members had other responsibilities and were often not available. The decision to have regional Board members did not enhance PCPI's work.

### **Staffing**

Project implementation could not begin until the office was established. This took some time, and was not helped by two administrative/campaign assistants resigning within the first three months.

The need to appoint a Legal Officer also caused problems. This position was critical to implementing the project but because the organisation had no funding, there was no one in this position when the Funding Arrangement was signed. PCPI applied for a fully funded Legal Officer through Australia Volunteers International (AVI). Delays in this process led to further delays in implementing the project and at PCPI's request, NZAID agreed to PCPI hiring a local lawyer for a year, as long as the cost could be met from the agreed budget. A recent graduate was appointed in August 2006 and attended training in FOI and on the Code of Conduct legislation planned for Fiji. This lawyer left at the end of 2006. An AVI volunteer was recruited but did not arrive until July 2007. She remained with PCPI till August 2008 when it became too difficult to continue the work from the Fiji base without the ED. She ended her contract a year early and returned to Australia.

The ED noted that none of the staff, including the volunteers, had specific experience in advocacy or in the area of FOI and Codes of Leadership Conduct when they joined PCPI. The ED provided that training.

### **Financial management and reporting**

PCPI also faced challenges with its financial management and reporting. PCPI had the services of a Korean UN volunteer for two years as the Administration and Finance Officer.

While he was able to do normal ledger work, he did not have skills to develop organisational budgets, undertake financial projections or do financial reporting. The Treasurer on the Board offered to do the accounts but the ED preferred to have them done in the office.

By default, financial reporting became the responsibility of the ED. The volunteer placement finished in January 2008, and in April, the ED acknowledged that it was too difficult to manage the accounts and produce reports from her Wellington base. For the final six months, Ernst and Young in Fiji were contracted to produce financial reports. In retrospect, more use could have been made of the Treasurer who is a qualified accountant.

### **Financial reporting**

The first progress and financial report with acquittals for February - June 2006 was submitted on time on 6 July 2006. NZAID provided detailed and supportive feedback, acknowledging successes and strengths, identifying issues for further discussion and noting line items where further explanation of variance was needed. These explanations were given and the second tranche of funding was paid.

Three issues subsequently arose, leading to a retrospective budget approval and two Letters of Variation (LOV).

1. The first financial report included a revised budget for July 2006 - December 2006 and a budget for 2007. These were presented in two columns on the same page as the acquittals. No separate approval for the revisions or the 2007 budget was sought or given. Due to staff changes and other pressures, NZAID did not notice this oversight till July 2007, and the ED of PCPI assumed that approval had been given when the second lot of funding was paid. NZAID acknowledged that the revisions should have been the subject of a LOV and discussed presentation issues with PCPI.
2. PCPI's activities were severely affected by the coup on 5 December 2006 and in particular by the ED of PCPI's public opposition to the military government. (This activity was not part of the NZAID Funding Arrangement). In March 2007 it became impossible for PCPI to operate in Fiji, given the level of personal threat to the ED and the number of court cases in which the ED was engaged. The ED sought a variation to the contract to transfer unspent funds from project activities in Fiji to new activities in Vanuatu. LOV 1 agreeing to the transfer was signed in March, subject to an agreed work plan and budget being provided by July 2007. Technically, this meant that the preparatory trip undertaken by the ED of PCPI to inform the work plan was not covered by the LOV. NZAID again acknowledged that this was an oversight on their part and the matter was addressed in LOV 2 signed in December 2007.
3. PCPI submitted its second progress and financial report with acquittals for July 2006 - June 2007 on time, but they were not fully assessed by NZAID until the end of August. From NZAID's perspective, the acquittals report was unsatisfactory. It did not match the format of the Funding Arrangement and the variation in a number of items exceeded the 10% limit beyond which prior approval is needed. Similarly, the proposed budget for July 2007-June 2008 did not match the range of activities described in the accompanying report. From PCPI's perspective, the difficulties with reporting stemmed from a lack of accounting support within the organisation compounded by the extreme pressures surrounding the coup and the number of changes that had occurred in PCPI's activities

and focus during the reporting period. Some decisions were made in response to unexpected situations rather than through a process that gave time to seek prior approval from NZAID. A simple example was the decision of the NGO with whom PCPI shared an office to go, leaving PCPI with full responsibility for the rent. In a less stressful situation, PCPI could have advised NZAID of this situation much earlier, but it has to be acknowledged that seeking prior approval was not part of PCPI's financial management routine.

4. Delays in finalising the budget and preparing a LOV delayed PCPI's work in both Vanuatu and Nauru.

The Audit Report for the year to 31 December was unconditional. The auditors acknowledged the difficulties PCPI faced due to its relationship with the interim government and highlighted the need for back up plans.

A six-month report and acquittal due 31 January 2008 was not received. Information was included in a 12-month report/acquittal received in early August 2008. The report reveals the level of disruption caused by the ED's forced relocation. Accounting and bank charges were higher than anticipated as were telephone and internet use, postage/courier costs and airfares to Vanuatu. Difficulties in operating in Nauru were evidenced by the cancellation of a trip at the last minute with significant financial implications.

The relationship between spending on salaries and administration and direct programme activities mirrors the movements of the ED. For 2006, the audited accounts show that salaries and salary related costs made up roughly 36% of the budget, while direct programme costs came to around 42%. For the year 2007, salary costs rose to 57% of the budget, while direct programme costs fell to around 17%. The impact of the coup obviously had a flow on effect on activities and PCPI provided less value for NZAID money at that time. Activities picked up again in the first part of 2008, with spending closer in proportions to the first year.

#### **Other issues**

Two other issues arose during the review of financial and other reports. The first relates to the unusual situation of PCPI as a recipient of NZAID funding becoming a funder for NIANGO for basic capacity building, a role that usually belongs to PIANGO. PCPI discussed the proposal with NZAID who agreed to the arrangement, given that it was within existing funding limits. An MOU was prepared between PCPI and NIANGO, but the arrangement eventually foundered over what PCPI saw as a lack of timely and detailed acquittals and disagreement over obligations.

The second issue relates to the revised project proposal contained in the progress report for August 2006-June 2007, discussing the change in focus to Vanuatu. The proposal refers explicitly to the agreed Project Plan attached to the original Funding Arrangement. This describes proposed activities for Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands although at the outset funding was only granted for activities in Nauru and Fiji. The proposal assumes that the Plan's attachment to the Funding Arrangement implied approval of the activities themselves, should funding become available - *"The project activities for Vanuatu and Nauru, particularly on the FOI and Leadership Code of Conduct work, are not new activities. They were in the approved PCPI Project plan [that] was initially part of PCPI original*

Submission to NZAID... However, because PCPI was a new funding partner, NZAID only agreed to fund project work for Nauru and Fiji with options left open for Vanuatu and Solomon Islands later, based on PCPI performance" (pp16-17). There is no record of the Vanuatu and Solomon Island components being an option, but having them included in the plan is very confusing. It would have been much simpler if the Project Plan attached to the Funding Arrangement had actually matched the funding.

### **Role and effectiveness of Board**

PCPI has a large Board (13 members) of whom 10 are directors. The number of directors was increased from eight at the first AGM in August 2006. This was to allow for two positions to be reserved for regional directors. One regional director was based in Vanuatu and the other in the Federated States of Micronesia. PCPI did not have funds to bring the regional directors to Board meetings and business with them was usually conducted by video or phone conference or email. This reduced the effectiveness of their positions, and they acknowledged that neither has taken a particularly active role in PCPI affairs.

The AGM itself was attended by only four Board directors and the ED, just enough for a quorum. Most Board members had senior positions in other NGOs, often involving travel, and the ED acknowledged that it was difficult to get them to attend meetings or make decisions. At the AGM the ED recommended that the Board meet only three times a year rather than the four times required and that an Advisory Committee be established. As is the case with many small NGOs, the Chairperson and the ED agreed that they effectively ran the organisation with support from one or two other Board members.

After the coup in Fiji, it became more difficult to keep or recruit Board members. Some members of the Board took different positions in relation to the coup, with one resigning as a result. This led to the adoption of Confidentiality Agreements and a Statement of Declaration by staff and the Board of Directors. The Board also agreed that PCPI needed to have rules and guidelines on how it would work and who with, based on its mission, vision and values statements. Post-coup pressures also contributed to the resignation of the first Chairperson, Suliana Siwatibau. She was replaced by Lionel Gibson, Governance Manager at FSPI.

In July 2007, the ED initiated a strategic planning process at the Board's directive. This included the services of a "campaign development expert" and cost \$4,244. The result was a draft five-year Strategic Development Plan for adoption by the next AGM. Due to the post-coup situation and the fact that the ED is now based in Wellington, the AGM did not take place and the proposals in the Strategic Development Plan have been superseded by events. The ED has advised that the plan is no longer relevant and would need to be redone if PCPI continues to operate. It has not been sighted.

At a meeting in April 2008, the Board adopted a resolution to establish a PCPI office in Port Vila, Vanuatu, to serve as the main campaign office for regional work in Melanesia, with the Fiji office becoming a "country" office focusing entirely on advocacy work in Fiji. The minutes make no reference to how this office might be funded.

The audit report for December 2007 identified an issue of concern for the Board. It notes that the ED's contract does not expire till 1 July 2010, whereas the funding agreement between NZAID and PCPI was due to expire on 30 June 2008 (subsequently extended to 30

September 2008). If no further funds are available, the Board will not be able to honour the contract. The Administrative Assistant has a contract till April 2009, also well beyond the end of the Funding Arrangement.

While the Board has been actively supportive of the work of the ED and of her personally and has responded to issues as they arose, it does not appear to have been responsible for setting strategic directions for the organisation.

### **Relationship between PCPI and NZAID**

The relationship between PCPI and NZAID has been generally supportive, given the difficulties arising from the coup and the ED's firm stance against the interim government. (The reviewer was not privy to some NZAID papers relating to this period).

PCPI's lack of capacity in reporting was an issue for both organisations as was the need to change direction in Nauru and Vanuatu. NZAID responded positively to PCPI reports and provided fair and considered feedback, although not always in a timely fashion. Delays in contracting this review have caused problems for PCPI which has been unable to seek further funding. The ED was disappointed at NZAID's decision not to approve bridging funding. From NZAID's perspective, the annual report was received early August and the contract was to expire in September. A review of the financial acquittals provided with the annual report (July 07- July 08) indicated there had again been reallocation of funds within the budget without consultation/approval and the integrity of the accounts required further clarification. A decision was taken on the basis of the project to date, that offering bridging finance would compound the situation pending the review.

### **Communication and consultation among stakeholders**

The level of communication and consultation among stakeholders varied. The representative of CHRI, for example, was never clear exactly what activities were funded under the project, and ICNL staff were also unclear just what PCPI's focus was. The documents included no reference to the USP Governance Programme.

Among national partners, the relationship with NIANGO in Nauru became increasingly fraught, to the extent where the coordinator of NIANGO refused to meet with PCPI staff on their most recent visit. When she met with the reviewer she was critical of the level of communication between PCPI and NIANGO; the reverse was true for the ED of PCPI. The Government in Nauru was initially concerned about PCPI's alliance with NIANGO but was very satisfied with the consultation for the CSO legislation.

Communication with agencies in Vanuatu improved over the course of the project as the roles of the various players, including NGOs and the media, became clearer and PCPI willingly took a more low key approach.

In Fiji, prior to the coup, PCPI had positive relationships and good communication with parliamentarians, the media, civil society groups and regional partners.

## **Project achievements**

### **Outcomes**

The outcomes of the project were limited. In Fiji this was because the coup stalled the passing of the Leadership Code of Conduct and Freedom of Information Bill, which was

imminent. However, awareness has been raised among politicians, NGOs and the media, setting a sound basis for action should the situation change.

The main outcome in Nauru has been the ongoing work by RRRT in running an education programme on civil and human rights. Thirty people began this programme and 15 will complete it. Members of NGOs and the government are aware of the role of CSOs and of CSO legislation, but do not necessarily agree on how legislation should be introduced or what it should cover. The impact of the project in Nauru has been limited because of discord within the NGO sector and between NIANGO and the government. NIANGO now has a constitution as an outcome of the project but, there is some doubt as to whether it being followed. The Board does not meet regularly and senior government officials questioned whether the election of office holders was truly democratic.

In Vanuatu, the project had an impact on the debate about FOI legislation and prompted action by government and NGOs. The impact of the project was affected by the government's preference for one NGO (MAV) over another (TI) and by the desire for people in Vanuatu to manage their own relationships and progress in their own way.

## Outputs

### Fiji

Participants agreed that PCPI's work in Fiji was making promising progress before the coup intervened. It included workshops with Members of Parliament on the Leadership Code, workshops with the media and participation in advocacy work alongside other organisations culminating at the point where legislation was drafted and open to discussion. The following is a list of specific activities undertaken in Fiji.

1. PCPI conducted the Regional Rights to Information Workshop, 4-7 August 2006 jointly with UNDP, RRRT and CHRI. The latter two organizations provided technical training. This replaced the proposed national civil society workshop in the original PCPI work plan. Thirty-five participants from 13 countries attended. The contacts PCPI made there have led to an invitation for the ED to take part in workshops in 2009 in the Cook Islands and the Solomon Islands in association with CHRI.
2. PCPI partnered the Fiji Parliamentary Secretariat, RRRT and TI Fiji in running a training and awareness workshop on Governance and Leadership, 14-15 August 2006. It included discussion of FOI and the Standards of Leadership Code. Eighty percent of MPs attended.
3. PCPI ran a one-day workshop for the Fiji media on FOI, 19 August 2006. Training was provided by CHRI. Fifteen people attended.
4. PCPI prepared a submission on the Fiji Broadcasting Bill.
5. Between 20 and 30 November, PCPI, FWRM, TI and the Fiji Council of Social Services (FCOSS) provided a critique of the draft Fiji FOI and Standards of Leadership Code Bill and advocacy briefing packs, met with parliamentarians and received a letter from the then Prime Minister inviting them to meet to discuss their recommendations. The meeting did not take place due to the coup.

- b. On 30 January 2007 PCPI and PCRC jointly ran a National Public Forum for invited guests to discuss a return to democracy and economic issues. All the political leaders were invited and all but one attended. It was the first time since the coup that they had spoken together. The event was well attended and attracted wide media attention, although the second session was cut short by a bomb threat that proved to be a false alarm. Several of those interviewed saw the forum as an excellent example of PCPI and PCRC creating space for discussion of public integrity issues.
7. Work is ongoing between PCRC and the volunteer still working at PCPI to try to resurrect the People's Forum. (The volunteer's contract ends in December 2008)

### **Nauru**

The work in Nauru did have some successes, particularly through PCPI's partnerships with RRRT and ICNL, although it also faced major challenges in working with the non-government sector. The Government is actively considering introducing CSO legislation. Activities were as follows.

1. The Nauru CSO needs assessment and situational analysis was completed in partnership with RRRT in April 2006. RRRT ran the assessment, accompanied by PCPI staff.

The analysis identified a lack of understanding and awareness of human rights and democratic principles, the role of civil society and the function of governments. PCPI/RRRT concluded that the CSO sector was not in a position to engage in the current constitutional review process being led by UNDP. This led to a proposal by PCPI to replace the planned workshops on awareness raising and governance with workshops on budgetary analysis and writing proposals.

2. NIANGO Strategic Development Training Workshop, Tuesday 19 and Saturday 23 September 2006. The Capacity Building Officer of PIANGO also attended and ran a half day session on the role of PIANGO.

The workshop was attended by 60 people and led to the finalisation of a draft constitution for NIANGO, a draft framework for a NIANGO Strategic Development Plan and the establishment of a working group to assist the NIANGO Executive Committee in organising a special general meeting of the members to adopt the Constitution.

3. A CSO workshop on proposal writing was held on 20-21 September 2006 in association with NIANGO. Eighty people attended, as did representatives of AusAID and the Ministry of Finance Aid Unit.

4. PCPI and NIANGO facilitated a workshop on Constitutional Literacy Training, 26-29 September. The actual training was delivered by senior trainers from RRRT. Forty people attended and participants developed a detailed submission to the Constitutional Review Committee.

5. PCPI negotiated an MOU with NIANGO setting out PCPI's financial and technical support to NIANGO (\$A7000 for the Coordinator position plus \$A5000 for administrative support for two years). It also described the civic education activities that PCPI would hold jointly with NIANGO and NIANGO's commitments in terms of reporting and project outcomes.



PCPI purchased a computer and printer/fax/scanner for NIANGO and found temporary office space for the organisation.

6. In July 2008, PCPI in conjunction with the Department of Justice undertook a needs assessment to find out whether there was a need to develop policy and/or legislation to provide for the recognition and/or regulation of civil society organisations in Nauru. The assessment drew on advice from ICNL. The report concluded that there was widespread support for the development of a CSO policy or law in Nauru.

### Vanuatu

In Vanuatu the government has directed MAV to draft FOI legislation for discussion. A number of agencies, prompted and supported by PCPI, contributed to bringing the FOI issue to this point. PCPI activities were as follows.

1. In March 2007, PCPI supported TI and MAV in running information and consultation workshops with CSOs and the media.
2. PCPI supported representatives of TI and MAV in meetings with politicians, media and government officials from the Office of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Office of the Ombudsman.
3. In August 2007, PCPI drafted a policy paper on Access to information on behalf of MAV, an organisation which has no full-time staff. Considerable technical assistance was provided by CHRI and the legislative expert at UNDP Regional Centre. The paper was widely distributed.
4. In January 2008, PCPI facilitated a consultation on the draft paper with CSO and the media. The Government then advised that work on Access to Information should be led by MAV and CSOs.
5. In May, PCPI updated the discussion paper and prepared six lobbying briefs on critical components of an Access to Information Bill for Vanuatu, again with considerable technical assistance from CHRI and the legislative expert at UNDP Regional Centre.
6. PCPI participated in meetings alongside MAV, TI and VANGO with the Office of the Ombudsman, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Attorney General. It was agreed that MAV would develop a proposal for the Legal Officer at the Ombudsman Office (who has since left) to draft a bill for tabling in Parliament. PCPI was to seek funds for this contract on behalf of MAV. No funds have been found and the draft is still incomplete.

### Other

1. In July 2007, PCPI provided a two-hour training session on access to information to regional media attending the Regional CSO Forum in Tonga.
2. The ED attended the International Information Commissioners Conference in Wellington, New Zealand in November 2007. This was attended by Ombudsmen from the Pacific and led to an invitation to PCPI to assist in hosting a workshop for PNG and the Solomon Islands on Access to Information. (While this has not yet happened, CHRI is planning such a workshop early in 2009, to which the ED will contribute).

3. In November 2007, the Legal Officer attended the Commonwealth CSO Conference on Access to Information in Uganda, organised by CHRI. PCPI presented at a right to information workshop.
4. In 2008, the Legal Officer attended an NZAID-funded workshop organised by INCL on CSO Legislative frameworks for Pacific Island countries.
5. PCPI prepared a Draft Strategic Development Plan in August 2007.

#### **Quality and effectiveness of activities**

In Fiji, there was general agreement that the work in which PCPI was engaged alongside other organisations was progressing well. In fact a meeting had been arranged between the Prime Minister and NGO groups, including PCPI, to discuss their concerns about the proposed legislation. The military coup brought all project work to a standstill.

Immediately following the coup, the ED chose to take a public stand against the coup, focusing on the independence of the judiciary. This had a negative impact on the ED's personal life and on the operations and reputation of PCPI. It became risky for other organisations to be associated with PCPI and, with the exception of the National Forum organised with PCRC, most partnership activity stopped. None of this political activity was related to the project, but it made it impossible for PCPI to continue its work or to maintain a fully staffed office in Fiji. In retrospect the ED recognised that her decision to take a stand had negative implications for the organisation.

In Nauru, the programme began well with the support of RRRT, but efforts to work through NIANGO soon soured. NIANGO was established in 1992 but was largely inactive until 2006. As a result of the needs analysis undertaken by RRRT on behalf of PCPI (which the coordinator now describes as a RRRT project), PCPI was invited to help draft a constitution for NIANGO. Applications for the post of coordinator were called for, interviews were held and the previous coordinator was reappointed. Difficulties began when PCPI entered into a financial arrangement with NIANGO. The coordinator resented being beholden to PCPI and would have preferred to deal directly with NZAID. Eventually the relationship fell apart. PCPI shifted to working with the government and undertook a consultation in regard to the need for CSO legislation. The relationship between NIANGO and the government can best be described as strained and NIANGO took no part in that consultation.

Representatives of NIANGO have not visited Nauru since the workshop in 2006 but the coordinator of NIANGO remains the national liaison person with NIANGO. In 2006 NIANGO had nine paying members. They have since increased to 13. Nauru has no issues - based NGOs e.g. domestic violence or child abuse. Most NGOs are small organisations, sometimes with only a few members, and most relate to developing livelihoods, for example through permaculture.

The Vanuatu project began with an alignment with TI. This proved a problem as the Government wanted FOI work led by MAV. The first workshop run by PCPI in partnership with TI was poorly attended as other NGOs did not want to work with TI. PCPI realigned itself with MAV and VANGO and prepared a draft discussion paper on MSV's behalf with the support of CHRI and UNDP. (MAV has no permanent staff). The paper was widely distributed. Meetings with Government officials were effective, with PCPI taking a

supportive role. Those interviewed for the review indicated that while PCPI input was greatly appreciated at the outset, NGOs and particularly MAV feel the time has now come for the country to run its own project, with PCPI participating as appropriate and by invitation (e.g. contributing to workshops in coordination with other organisations).

### **Use of available resources**

On the whole, PCPI made good use of its available resources, particularly in Fiji. PCPI was in a difficult position, in that its work plan included offering legal advice and legislative input but it did not have enough resources to secure a suitably experienced lawyer to do this. The AVI lawyer did an excellent job given her experience and she undertook further training in the area, but her appointment was always going to be limited. She herself acknowledged that she needed support from lawyers within CHRI, ICNL and UNDP.

The salary for the ED was comparable to that for a lecturer with a PhD at USP, but some representatives of other NGOs thought that it was high for an NGO and for a pilot project under funding pressure.

### **Monitoring and evaluation**

No formal monitoring or evaluation has taken place but reports were completed after every major activity. These identified issues faced and lessons learned as well as achievements. The ED prepared reports for Board meetings as well as reports for NZAID.

### **Beneficiary satisfaction**

#### **Effectiveness of partnership approach**

Respondents in all three countries were positive about the contribution PCPI made as a catalyst to action. They described the ED as:

*Very helpful in galvanising people into action, making them aware that they have rights and what the issues are.*

*We always had NGOs, but she was very good at letting them know they had rights.*

*She has good energy, it was very useful.*

*They used all the appropriate processes for the consultation. It met our needs.*

As noted elsewhere, PCPI worked effectively with other partners in Fiji. Parliamentarians attending the FOI and Leadership Code of Conduct workshop asked to have more workshops on the same and related topics. In Vanuatu PCPI was effective in talking with MAV and encouraging them to be proactive.

Numerous participants described PCPI's effectiveness in reigniting interest in concepts relating to FOI but in Vanuatu NGOs encouraged PCPI to step back so that local organisations could work positively with their politicians and vice versa. In-country partners pointed out that they are there all the time and it is important for agencies coming in and out to cooperate and coordinate their activities. As one person said: "If you have guns firing from every quarter, the government senses disarray and feels it doesn't have to do anything".

In Nauru, the partnership arrangement was difficult. The timing of PCPI's first workshop was unfortunate given the constitutional reform process under way at the time. The current government saw PCPI's approach to possible CSO legislation as needlessly political and anti-government, whereas PCPI and RRRT saw themselves as responding to a request by NIANGO for a constitutional educational workshop.

It was only when the relationship between PCPI and NIANGO fell down that PCPI began working effectively with the government and undertook consultations on the need for CSO legislation. This was an example of a situation where a two-pronged approach aimed at both the non-government and government sectors did not work.

#### **Ongoing relevance of the project to its partners**

Both Nauru and Vanuatu governments are able to take their legislation forward without further input from PCPI. The government of Nauru believes that it has enough qualified people within the government who can draft legislation and who are able to call on ICNL, CRHI and the Forum Secretariat if need be. NIANGO however, would still like support to build the CSO sector so that it can advocate with the government. NIANGO's preferred model is to have that organisation as a strong unit with small organisations applying to NIANGO for funds. This would obviate the need for formal governance structures for numerous very small organisations in a small country. Vanuatu should also be able to proceed with help from the Forum Secretariat which is taking the lead in FOI legislation.

#### **Countries' use of the project**

Progress in Fiji has stalled but the material developed by PCPI and other organisations is available for when the situation changes. Vanuatu appreciated PCPI facilitating workshops in association with TI, MAV and VANGO and will progress the FOI Act as soon as possible. In Nauru, NIANGO has a constitution but it is unclear whether or not is being implemented. Participants thought that the workshops on proposal writing were useful (as were the ones run by the AusAID Project Management Team). The legislative needs consultation met a need that the government had and will inform the legislation.

#### **Alignment with the Pacific Aid Effectiveness Principles**

The project aligned with Principle One of the Pacific Aid Effectiveness Principles in that it sought to promote transparent national development and financial management system/mechanism. As a pilot, it did not fall within the scope of Principle Two which supports multi-year commitments by development partners and countries. It aligned well with Principles Three, Four, Five and Six but did not align with Principle Seven which requires the use of an agreed monitoring and evaluation framework.

#### **Challenges and opportunities**

The project faced three main challenges:

- establishing an office and training staff in advocacy
- responding to the coup in Fiji
- working on a regional basis.

1. Issues relating to establishing an office have been covered elsewhere in this report. PCPI met this challenge by recruiting volunteers and, when delays occurred in approving a volunteer to fill the legal position, recruiting a local lawyer, recently graduated from

New Zealand. Retaining and training staff was a problem and using volunteers is not a long-term option for capacity building.

The ED is widely recognised for her dynamism and strength in advocacy and in getting people interested in the issues, but participants agreed that she needed other expertise to back her up, including stronger legal support, and better financial and project management.

One lawyer suggested that PCPI could join the FOI Listserve available online. This allows members to exchange information give and receive advice and would provide PCPI with useful support.

2. The Fiji coup obviously interrupted PCPI's work. A number of those interviewed admired the way the ED responded but they all agreed that her response caused some problems for the organisation. While PCPI Board members supported her actions (those who did not, resigned), her high profile approach made other agencies wary and a number said that they were now reluctant to partner fully with PCPI because it did not have a strong enough public profile independently of the ED. Examples of comments were:

*People did not see PCPI as a political organisation – they saw Angie.*

*She tended to act as a one-woman army – she needed more support.*

On the positive side, PCPI used the space caused by the breakdown of work in Fiji to begin work in Vanuatu. This option was signalled in the original proposal.

3. Working in countries outside Fiji proved to be challenging. Representatives of other organisations recognised that it is difficult to do a regional project from Fiji, because of the need for long term input and follow up. In its final report, PCPI acknowledged the challenges it faced in building and maintaining relationships with key stakeholders and undertaking public and policy advocacy work. PCPI knew that such work depends on the political and public context and did adapt their response as the project progressed.

#### **Cross-cutting issues**

The project has been fully engaged with promoting human rights in the area of access to knowledge and participatory democracy, and in enhancing the accountability, transparency and equity of national integrity systems, as well as the ability of CSOs to both work with and challenge governments. These rights affect all groups, including men and women, young people, minority groups and people with disabilities. The impact of high level action on good governance will have a positive affect for all these groups.

The project did not have an explicit focus on gender quality and women's empowerment, but most of the regional and national organisations with whom PCPI worked were headed by women, including for example, the Fiji Women's Rights Movement. Women participated on an equal basis with men in the workshops in Fiji, Vanuatu and Nauru and had equal access to the information and resources provided. Information on activities was not reported by gender but this information could be documented if required.

In the longer term, a successful project on FOI, CSO legislation and transparent NIS will contribute to conflict prevention and peace building. The project had a strong focus on reducing corruption and on creating a balance between government and civil society.

The project did not have an explicit focus on environmental sustainability. However, a strong CSO sector, which would include environmental organisations, would be in a better position to promote environmental sustainability and ensure that governments took such issues into account.

Where information is available to both governments, NGOs and the private sector, with transparent decision making and access to redress, opportunities to address HIV/AIDS will increase.

## **Future of the project**

### **Options for future development**

It has been agreed that the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat will take the lead in FOI work in the region and that workshops will be run under PIFS and UNDP. The two organisations plan to have a regional meeting to identify who can work with whom and on what topics. PCPI could be part of that process.

Participants from partner and beneficiary organisations and from PCPI itself offered a number of options for continuing PCPI's work in the future:

1. PCPI to remain as a registered organisation but for any staff to be housed within another organisation that already has a governance and administrative structure and funding. Suggested organisations included CHRI, RRRT, TI, UNDP, FSPI and PIFS. It would be up to the ED and the Board to negotiate such an arrangement.
2. PCPI to operate with a structure similar to that of ICNL, carrying on work with minimal resources and bringing in people on an as needs basis. Funding could be on a project by project basis. PCPI could have a voluntary Advisory Board which would not have to meet the same governance requirements as an institutional Board.
3. PCPI to be disbanded with the ED carrying on her work as an individual consultant.
4. A donor to fund PCPI to continue as a separate organisation with its own office, governance and administrative structure. Participants believed that this would only be effective if the ED and the staff were housed together. Despite the difficulties, representatives of Fiji-based organisations thought that Fiji would be the logical choice because it is where other regional organisations are based, but given the ED's circumstances, that is unlikely to happen. The only other alternative would be to set up in Vanuatu but this would be expensive.

### **Future activities and the role of PCPI**

Representatives of NGOs identified a number of activities which could involve PCPI and particularly its ED (the only "permanent" staff member) in future.. These include civic education, developing a campaign to promote FOI legislation in communities, possibly in association with PIFS. PCPI might also be engaged in developing resource kits for community

advocacy, training trainers to work in provinces and rural areas or undertaking a stocktake of funding, projects and activities in the area of FOI and civic awareness on issues of democracy and governance.

## Conclusions and recommendations

As a pilot, the PCPI Rights to Information and Participatory Democracy in Nauru and Melanesia Project has provided some valuable lessons as well as making some good gains in each country.

### Gains made

This project was successful in all three countries in promoting interest in and awareness of governance issues. Draft legislation has been prepared in Fiji on FOI and Leadership Code of Conduct and the media is aware of issues FOI legislation is also being considered in Vanuatu while Nauru has done preliminary work on CSO legislation. Workshops for NGOs on basic human rights have been run in Nauru; workshops on FOI have been run in Fiji and Vanuatu.

### Lessons learned

- The project demonstrates that it is difficult for an organization that is not locally based and does not have staff familiar with local culture and politics to introduce and see through a project that in the end must be owned by the government and civil society sector of the receiving country.
- It takes time and patience to establish working relationships in countries where an organisation has no base. Each country is different and organisations with an advocacy focus need to work closely with NGOs and/or government to design a work plan. They also need to be prepared to step back if projects do not have in-country "champions" with vision, drive and relationship building skills within the local context.
- A country-based project on this issue would be preferable with strong regional input at the outset, reducing over time as each country's capacity and commitment increased.
- The ability of a regional advocacy organisation to work successfully with both government and the NGO sector on an issue depends on the organisation fully understanding the relationship between different members of the NGO community and the government. The experience in Nauru shows that it is not always reasonable to assume that a two-pronged approach is best.
- Organisations need to be clear what their roles and responsibilities are and be prepared to step back to allow other more appropriate organisations to step in when need be. For example, once the project identified that the civil sector in Nauru was not at a stage where it could benefit from PCPI's work, responsibility for capacity-building should have been handed over to PIANGO. (The ED notes that PCPI asked PIANGO to take over but was told they had neither the funds nor the capacity. The alternative in hindsight was that PCPI should have ended its project in Nauru after the April 2006 workshop.)

- A project with regional ambitions needs to be housed in a well-established organisation with sound governance and management structures, and enough capacity to deliver the work plan.
- Relying on volunteers for key positions is not a sustainable option and does not build the organisation's capacity. In retrospect, it might have been preferable to extend PCPI's partnership approach to include a more explicit arrangement for other NGOs to provide expertise in the area of legal advice. This would have made more resources available for advocacy and community education.
- NZAID needs to respond to reports in a timely fashion and ensure that contractual arrangements are adequate for the situation at hand.
- Reviews need to be carried out well before funding ends so that organisations are able to plan ahead.
- The project was adversely affected by the coup in Fiji and the Interim Government's response to the ED's stance. This has shown the importance of an organisation like PCPI having a clear mandate to carry out activities for which it is not funded.

#### **Future options**

The pilot has also raised questions as to whether a separate organisation is needed to foster FOI and CSO legislation and promote civic awareness on these issues within the region. Participants agreed that the greatest need is in the area of strengthening CSO's capacity to advocate and that this is an area in which PCPI has expertise. Participants suggested four options for continuing this aspect of the work, assuming that legal advice can be provided by existing organisations:

- PCPI remains as a registered organisation but staff are housed within another organisation.
- PCPI operates with a structure similar to ICNL, i.e. with minimal overheads, bringing in people on an as needs basis. Funding could be on a project by project basis.
- PCPI is disbanded with the ED carrying on her work as an individual consultant.
- PCPI continues as a separate organisation with its own office, governance and administrative structure. Most believed this would only be effective if the ED and staff were housed together.

#### **Recommendations**

This review recommends that:

4. NZAID give no further funding to PCPI in the meantime.
5. NZAID encourages the PCPI ED and Board to explore the options set out above.
6. The PCPI Board and ED consider focusing on advocacy, leaving the provision of technical advice to other organisations.



**Annex 1                    Terms of Reference for the Review  
of the Rights to Information and Participatory Democracy Project  
in Nauru and Melanesia  
managed by the Pacific Centre for Public Integrity**

**Background information**

The Pacific Centre for Public Integrity (PCPI) was incorporated on 30 July 2004 as a company limited by liability and not for profit under the Fiji Companies Act. PCPI is a regional campaign, advocacy and policy development organization. It is governed by a Board comprised of regional representatives. PCPI has three full time staff, including the Director. Prior to inception PCPI existed as a Good Governance Project with the Ecumenical Centre for Research, Education and Advocacy (ECREA). PCPI's business address is 21 Marion Street, Fiji.

PCPI's main objectives are to:

- Promote good governance values and practices and to expose and address corruption, through research, public empowerment and advocacy.
- Work to improve accountability and transparency within the private and public sector, including civil society.
- To conduct investigative research into issues of public policy and provide information to all stakeholders with a view to exposing corruption and bad governance practices.
- Raise public awareness of the damaging effects of bad governance practices, and to promote a "zero tolerance" attitude towards corruption in Pacific states.
- Scrutinize and monitor the performance of key institutions and office holders in non-party political manner.
- To conduct policy research into good practices in governance and to work with stakeholders to achieve reforms.
- To build strategic partnerships with public and private actors at local, national and regional levels.
- To conduct workshops and informal education programs

In January 2006 a funding agreement was signed with NZAID to support the pilot of PCPI's Regional Governance Programme – *Rights to Information and Participatory Democracy in Melanesia and Nauru* (the Project). NZAID agreed to provide Project funding up to a maximum of NZ\$467,067 (inclusive of taxes) over a two year period February 2006 to 30 January 2008.

The Project is aimed at promoting the development of access to information tools as a means to encourage and strengthen civic participation in development and governance and ultimately as a means to promote better accountability and transparency within the machinery of government in the Pacific. The first two countries identified for the pilot were Nauru and Fiji.

Key objectives of the Pilot Project were to:

- Support civil society groups initially in Nauru and Fiji to carry out civics education and awareness work on participatory democracy and governance. A summary of the history of the Project is attached at Annex A.
- Work with government and civil society organisations (CSOs) to Review and improve enabling legislation and policies that govern CSO bodies in Nauru.
- Support and encourage the development of Freedom of Information (FOI) legislation and the implementation of a leadership code of conduct in Nauru and Fiji.
- Work with key stakeholders to review and strengthen existing national integrity systems in Nauru.

### **Project Review**

NZAID jointly with PCPI now wishes to review this pilot Project both for accountability and learning purposes to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the Project activities. The Review will be a check that the overall direction of the Project is still relevant and that the development activities have or are likely to meet the purposes for which the Project was planned. The knowledge gained from the Review will be applied to improve policies, strategies and activities, to enhance programme design and performance and development impact. Both NZAID and PCPI wish to make best possible use of the information produced by the Review.

### **Purpose**

- g) To build knowledge and understanding of the Project to date, including outcomes and impacts.
- h) To assess whether the strategies that PCPI and their partners have adopted to enhance the strengthening of governance through this Project remain valid.
- i) To consider recommendations from the review to inform decisions by NZAID and PCPI with regard to the future focus and development of the Project, including support and resourcing.

### **Scope of the Review**

This Review will cover the Project period February 2006 to July 2008, and focus on Project activities undertaken in Fiji, Nauru and Vanuatu. The scope of the Review should consider the operating environment and report on the limitations placed on implementation over this period. A comprehensive Review may be difficult for Fiji work. Firstly no activities have been undertaken in Fiji since the coup in December 2006. Some key Fiji stakeholders that PCPI worked with in 2006 are no longer in the same position. In addition the travel ban on PCPI's Director made it difficult to continue with some of the work in Nauru. The delays on NZAID's part in varying the contract to allow PCPI to start work in Vanuatu instead of Fiji, meant that work did not commence there until 2008.

It is acknowledged that a single Review study is not usually sufficient to generate a knowledge base or provide comprehensive input into the policy and programme development process. Information

from other sources will also contribute to decisions. The aim is to systematically build cumulative knowledge about the effectiveness of development activities over time. The outcomes from this Review will contribute to knowledge building for this Project.

### **Review objectives and key questions**

The key questions for the Review are outlined below. If the consultant considers there are other questions that need to be explored they may be addressed with the prior approval of NZAID and PCPI Director and Board.

In considering responses to these questions the Review should focus on how the Project has impacted on the business and practice of the key partners and beneficiaries and whether there are measurable and tangible impacts. In this regard the Review should detail the short and medium term outcomes of this development activity. The Review should also consider what the wider, deeper and long-term impacts of this development activity are or might be. These may be positive or negative; primary or secondary; direct or indirect; intended or unintended.

#### **1. Was the Project well planned and designed?**

The consultant should assess:

- a) The level of alignment that exists between the objectives of this Project and NZAID's policies and objectives. (Reference NZAID's Policy Statement; Pacific Strategy; Pacific Programme for Strengthening Governance Strategic Framework 2006-8; and the Pacific Leadership Strategy)
- b) The extent that Project planning takes account of other agencies working on similar Projects, the alignment between these programmes, synergies and the relationship impact on Project outcomes.
- c) Strategies used by PCPI for planning and implementation and whether they still appropriate and valid.
- d) The relevance of programmes to national and regional priorities. (refer also 3.b)
- e) Whether country based Project design and management should be considered rather than, or to complement, the regional approach.
- f) Whether monitoring and evaluation mechanisms were included in the project design, and if so whether they have been effective. (refer also 5.g)
- g) Whether a risk analysis was included in the project design, and if so whether it has assisted effective project implementation and management.

#### **2. Has the Project been managed and implemented effectively?**

The consultant should assess:

a) The efficiency and effectiveness of Project management, including financial management, and reporting to stakeholders.

b) The effectiveness of the Board and appropriateness of their responses within the framework of the Project.

c) The structure and role definitions between the Board, the Director and staff.

d) The nature and effectiveness of the relationship between NZAID and PCPI.

e) Whether activities and expenditure was in line with the Project plan and budget, and whether any variations sought were valid.

f) The effectiveness of mechanisms in place, both formal and informal for internal and external communication, consultations and dialogue between project stakeholders.

g) The key management lessons from the Project.

3. What is the level of stakeholder/partners, and in particular beneficiary satisfaction with the Project?

The consultant should assess:

a) The effectiveness of the partnership approach in achieving Project outputs and outcomes.

b) The ongoing relevance of the Project to its partners.

c) Whether member countries are maximising the potential of available assistance from the Project and if not, how this could be improved.

d) The extent of the Project's alignment and harmonisation to regional and national priorities.

e) The extent of the Project's alignment with the Pacific Aid Effectiveness Principles.

4. What has the Project achieved?

The Review team should assess:

a) Relevance of the scope and purpose of the Project, and progress against agreed objectives and indicators.

b) Achievements of the project and the significance and strategic importance of these achievements.

c) How project beneficiaries have used the information and knowledge obtained through the Project activities.

d) The extent to which governance has improved among project beneficiaries.

e) Any emerging unintended outcomes, positive and negative

f) Quality and effectiveness of activities delivered under each Project component. Where it is too early to identify the tangible results, an assessment of the components' design and approach to implementation to date for achieving results should be made.

g) Whether available resources have been adequate, used efficiently and effectively, and targeted appropriately to the agreed activities and needs of members.

g) Whether monitoring and evaluation information and knowledge has been obtained under the project, systematically or informally. Whether monitoring data is stored, and in a format that can be added to and utilised for future planning

#### 5. What are the main challenges and opportunities associated with the Project?

The Review team should assess:

a) The main challenges and opportunities for the project to date, regionally and nationally.

b) How challenges have been addressed and opportunities capitalised on. Regional and national challenges and opportunities that can be foreseen for the future of the project and how these might be managed.

c) How the programme has addressed cross cutting issues including gender equality and women's empowerment, human rights, conflict prevention and peace building, environmental sustainability and addressing HIV/AIDs. Are there opportunities to enhance the project's contribution to these areas.

#### 6. Future of the Project

The consultant should assess:

a) Options that exist for the future development of the Project including sustainability, replication and growth

b) What future activities could be undertaken to strengthen governance with project beneficiaries, and what might be the role in this regard for PCPI. Consider this question also in regard to working in fragile states.

#### **Summary of Stakeholders**

This is a joint Review between NZAID, as key funder and PCPI, who will also assist with logistics as appropriate. NZAID and PCPI welcome the engagement of Project stakeholders to enhance the use of the findings and increase the effectiveness of the Review.

A list of stakeholders is attached at Annex B. The Reviewer should consult with stakeholders directly as appropriate, with reference to the Review work plan and methodology developed and agreed.

## Methodology

The Review should be undertaken jointly and collaboratively with relevant NZAID partners and stakeholders using processes that are sufficiently robust to manage any potential bias or conflict of interest. The consultant should take full account of the complexity of the environments in which the Project operates.

In the course of country visits, the consultant will interview a selection of the beneficiaries and stakeholders who have been involved in the Project. Review approaches including the use of participatory methods should be used where appropriate and feasible. An aim is to have a positive impact in the development of our partners' capacity for carrying out review and evaluation activities.

The Review's findings, conclusions and recommendations must be based on sound qualitative and quantitative evidence (noting sources) and presented in a balanced and transparent way.

The consultant will provide a brief plan (no more than five pages) for the Review that builds on the Terms of Reference and provides key detail about how the Review's objectives will be fulfilled. The Plan will include a schedule for the timing of country visits, the indicative schedule for focus groups and/or interviews with key informants; and the schedule as appropriate for collecting data.

The consultant will:

1. Attend a pre-Review briefing with NZAID and PCPI Director, either collectively or separately depending on availability.
2. Familiarise him/her self with relevant Project documentation prior to undertaking field visits to Fiji, Nauru and Vanuatu.
3. Conduct Interviews with PCPI Board Members, and relevant development partners, including AUSAID.
4. Undertake field work in the three Project countries Fiji, Nauru, Vanuatu. During the field work the consultant will as appropriate a) conduct focus group discussions with Project beneficiaries and key informants, including but not limited to representatives of relevant Project implementing agencies, relevant government agencies such as National Planning and Aid Coordination, development partners, regional and national civil society organisations and community groups; b) directly observe and assess implementation of Project activities and the performance of Project managers and beneficiaries; c) provide verbal feedback to stakeholders on preliminary results prior to leaving each country.
5. Meet with PCPI Director and NZAID (in person, or via teleconference call) to debrief within one week of submission of the draft Review report.

## Review Consultant

The Review will be undertaken by an NZAID approved contractor experienced in review and evaluation. The consultant will be selected on the basis of the following skills and experience:

- Experience in Project Review in developing countries, particularly with campaign and advocacy NGOs (25%)
- Technical expertise relevant to the Project, especially understanding the rights to information and participatory democracy and their application in a Pacific context. A policy and/or a legal background would be an advantage (25%)
- Understanding and knowledge of the issues involved in successfully operating an NGO in a Pacific Regional Context. (20%)
- Skills and experience in participatory and consultative approaches, facilitation and negotiation (10%)
- Problem solving and analytical abilities. Advanced verbal and written communication skills, especially report writing (10%)
- Understanding of the NZAID Policy Framework (10%)

### Timeframes

The Review will take place during August and September 2008. It is anticipated it will take 20-25 working days (depending on travel requirements for field visits), including background briefings, field work and preparation of final report. The time frame will be agreed in the Review work plan developed. An indicative time frame is as follows:

August 2008 select and appoint consultant

September 2008 assemble background information and reports;

tbc : consultant undertakes Review discussions and field work;

tbc : draft report submitted

tbc : final report submitted

### Review Report

The consultant is required to produce a detailed report that addresses the requirements of the terms of reference. The report should document all significant lessons learned and provide detailed recommendations for consideration by PCPI and NZAID. These recommendations should include any suggested changes to the objectives, scope and management of the Project.

The draft report should preferably be not more than 20 pages, and should be delivered within 14 days of returning from the field. The final report shall incorporate feedback received from PCPI and NZAID and be available two weeks after delivery of the draft report. The final report will need to be of a standard acceptable to NZAID and PCPI, and should be prepared in accordance with DAC Quality Standards for Evaluations.

### Review Follow up

As commissioner of the Review, NZAID is the legal owner of the findings. The final report will be presented to the NZAID Evaluation Committee, who will consider the Review's

Recommendations and future direction and support to the Project. Once the Evaluation Committee approves the final report for release a summary of the final report will be placed on the NZAID website. If requested, the full Review document will be made available to the public by NZAID. The PCPI Director will also present the Review report to her Board for formal acceptance and consideration of the recommendations and forward.

June 2008

RELEASED UNDER THE  
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT



## History of the Project

The following narrative is provided as background to the project. The review to confirm this is a fair summary of what has happened.

The Project began in February 2006 when NZAID transferred the first funding instalment of NZ\$125,000. PCPI was able to immediately begin the implementation of the first phase of the Project in Nauru and Fiji. Apart from the actual Project activities, PCPI was also able to undertake internal institutional resourcing of the organisation. In July, PCPI submitted its first progress report on its Fiji and Nauru activities and also provided a financial acquittals report. The second payment of NZ\$175,219.94 (FJ\$384,893.36) was paid in September 2007. (NZ\$250,000 was due but the programme was \$74,780.06 under spent.) All progress reports and financial acquittals will be made available to the consultant.

### Fiji

In Fiji, PCPI's advocacy work on both FOI and Leadership Codes sought to secure broad political support and also engage with key institutions such as the Military Forces, the Police and traditional indigenous institutions.

In August 2006, after the national elections, PCPI in collaboration with the Parliament Secretariat ran an information workshop for Members of Parliament. There was support from both government and opposition MPs for the legislation of a robust FOI law and leadership code of conduct. Following that workshop, PCPI continued to work with the Government and the Opposition in progressing the development of both draft legislations. Significantly, PM Qarase invited PCPI and its local NGO's partners to meet with him and his officials to discuss PCPI's proposed amendments to Bills on these issues that at that time were before a Cabinet drafting committee. This dialogue came to an end following the coup in December 2006.

Also in Fiji, though with a focus on regional actors, PCPI in collaboration with the UNDP Regional Centre, the Regional Rights Resource Team (RRRT) and the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI) ran a regional training workshop in 2006 for media and regional CSO's on access to information. This was part of building a constituency of targeted stakeholders who could advocate for access to information.

In the lead up to the Fiji Dec 2006 coup, PCPI was actively involved in media and political advocacy on democracy, governance and human rights in Fiji. This democracy and governance campaign was done also collectively with PCPI's Fiji partners.

As a result of PCPI's direct public democracy and human rights campaign, PCPI staff were threatened by the Fiji Military. The office had to be closed for two weeks. The Director had to go into hiding and was subject to a travel ban and unable to leave Fiji. As a result of this, the Director with full support from the PCPI Board instigated legal proceeding against the Military and the interim Attorney General, seeking relief from the court, preventing them from interfering with the Director and PCPI's work.

## Nauru

In Nauru, PCPI's initial work in 2006 focused on civil society capacity building and institutional strengthening on the assumption that delivery against the work programme required greater civil society capacity than existed at that time. PCPI in collaboration with RRRT and the Nauru Island Association of Non Government Organisations (NIANGO), undertook a needs assessment of the country's CSO sector. As a result of the recommendations of the report, PCPI provided direct technical, and limited financial, assistance to the development and strengthening of the NIANGO secretariat. A key element of this support was the assistance in the development of NIANGO's constitution, the recruitment of a full time coordinator, and assistance in helping secure office space for NIANGO. PCPI also provided office equipment and salary support for the NIANGO Coordinator during 2006.

During this period, and also in line with recommendations of the CSO needs assessment report, PCPI, the NIANGO secretariat and RRRT ran a number of training workshops for NIANGO's members on organisational governance and financial management, budget training and Project proposal writing. Training was also provided on human rights, democracy and governance, on request from NIANGO, to enable its members, and the broader public, to engage effectively on the Government's constitutional reform process underway at that time.

The period following PCPI's close work with NIANGO saw a stronger dialogue and engagement between NIANGO and other regional partners – notably RRRT, the Pacific Islands Association of NGOs (PIANGO) and the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (Non State Actor Liaison Officer). PCPI, after consultation with NIANGO, NZAID and PIANGO, agreed to refocus its work in Nauru away from CSO strengthening, back to specific activities in the original work plan.

## Vanuatu

Post the 2006 military coup PCPI was unable to continue Project activities in Fiji. Consequently in February 2007, PCPI sought a variation from NZAID to move the Rights to Information (RTI) Project focus from Fiji to Vanuatu and to change the focus of the work in Nauru (to undertaking a needs assessment on FOI and on working with the government to develop a CSO legislative framework). For various reasons, including pressure of work within NZAID and PCPI's lack of familiarity with NZAID's contracting requirements, this variation was not signed off until December 2007. This variation also extended the Project until July 2008.

Despite the absence of an agreed revised budget, required to undertake a full scope of work, PCPI began its preparatory work in Vanuatu in early 2007. This involved establishing partnerships with Transparency International's (TI) Vanuatu Chapter and the Media Association of Vanuatu (MAV), with particular focus on gaining their support for working towards a FOI law. At the end of March, PCPI travelled to Vanuatu for a scoping exercise. TI and MAV supported by PCPI ran workshops separately for both civil society (Vanuatu Association of NGOs (VANGO)) and the media. Along with members of TI and MAV, PCPI met

with key politicians; officials from the Office of the PM, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Office of the Ombudsman; NGO representatives; and media organisations.

Following these discussions, the Office of the Prime Minister requested that MAV develop a draft policy paper for government on Access to Information. PCPI was asked by MAV to develop the policy on their behalf. A draft policy was developed with technical assistance from the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, and the legislative adviser from the UNDP Regional Centre. The paper was sent to MAV in August 2007 to distribute to the media and CSO for their input. No further in country work was carried out in Vanuatu, until after the Letter of Variation was signed with NZAID in December 2007 and a further payment of NZ\$156,040.93 was made. At the end of January 2008, PCPI resumed its work on Access to Information and collaborated with MAV and VANGO on a consultation with CSOs and the media on the draft policy discussion paper. A copy of the paper was also sent to the PM's Office. VANGO is currently in the process of setting up a meeting for members of the CSO and media to meet with officials from the Office of the PM to discuss the paper and the way forward.

PCPI has now been paid NZ\$456,260.87. The funding agreement ends in July but NZAID will extend the agreement as PCPI has not yet spent the full amount granted.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

**Summary of Stakeholders**

**a) Partner agencies**

Regional Partners:

Regional Rights Resources Team (RRRT), Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative Program (CHRI), UNDP Regional Governance Program

Agencies with a similar focus e.g. Pacific Island Forum Secretariat, USP Governance Programme, International Centre for Non-Profit Law (ICNL), Transparency International.

Agencies whose work impacted on the Project. e.g. PIANGO and other agencies involved with CSO capacity building

National Partners:

Nauru: Nauru Islands Association of Non Governmental Organisations (NIANGO),

Vanuatu: Transparency Vanuatu, Vanuatu Islands Association of NGO's and Vanuatu Media Association Fiji:

Fiji Women's Rights Movement, ECREA, Partners in Community Development, Citizens Constitutional Forum (CCF) and Transparency Fiji.

**b) Project beneficiaries**

- The communities that the Project operated in Nauru: Nauru CSO Sector, Vanuatu: Vanuatu CSO Sector, Fiji: targeted civil society groups.
- Other beneficiaries: political groups, parliamentarians, media agencies, government agencies, traditional bodies, religious groups

**c) Implementing agencies**

- The PCPI Board. Where possible the evaluator should meet with Board members during field visits. Phone interviews should be arranged with those Board members not able to be contacted for face to face meetings.
- The PCPI management team and staff.

**Metable**

Activity	
Document review	20- 24 October 2008
Interviews with NZAID staff, PCPI Director and other stakeholders in Wellington	20-24 October 2008
Fieldwork in Fiji	27 October 2008
Interviews, group discussion, document review	28 – 30 October 2008
Fieldwork in Vanuatu      Travel	31 October 2008
Interviews, group discussion, document review	3 – 5 November 2008
Fieldwork in Nauru      Travel	6 November 2008
Interviews, focus groups, document review, report writing	7 November, 10-11 November 2008
Report writing	Draft completed 19 November 2008
	Debrief NZAID, PCPI Director 5 December 2008
	Final report completed 10 December 2008

RELEASSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

## Annex 3 Persons consulted

### WELLINGTON

Chris Day	Development Programme Manager, NZAID
Angie Heffernan	Project Director, PCPI, now resident in Wellington
David Robinson	International Centre for Non-Profit Law
Paul Browne	Transparency International

### FIJI

Dimitri Geidelberg	NZAID Manager (Regional), NZ High Commission, Suva
Claire Cronin	Pacific FOI contact at CHRI, based at RRRT, international partner
Charmaine Rodrigues	Legislative Expert, UNDP Pacific Centre, Regional partner
Tupou Vere	Executive Director, PCRC, Regional partner
Viri Buadromo	Executive Director, FWRM, National partner
Lionel Gibson	Chairperson, PCPI Board, c/ FSPI
Esther Suchit	Treasurer, PCPI Board, Fiji
Viriseta Rabutoka	Administrative Assistant, PCPI Office

### Vanuatu

John Claasen, Angela Hassan Sharp	NZAID, Vanuatu by telephone and email
Henry Vira	Executive Director, VANGO, partner and beneficiary
Harold Obed	Secretary, Media Association of Vanuatu, partner and beneficiary
Blandine Boulekone	Executive Director, Transparency International, partner and beneficiary
Heather Lini	Formerly Senior Legal Officer, Ombudsman Office, beneficiary

### NAURU

Julie Olsson	Co-ordinator, NIANGO, partner and beneficiary
Gemma Adam	Secretary, Treasurer NIANGO
Katy Le Roy	Parliamentary Counsel, formerly on Nauru Constitutional Review Commission
Douglas Andao	NIANGO Board, Aid Management Unit Nauru Government
Hon. Mathew Batsiua	Minister of Justice, Nauru Government
<b>Informal discussions</b>	
George Fraser	Australian Consul General, Nauru

Peter Hatfield	AusAID Manager, Nauru
Cathy Deane	Project Management Ltd, Aid Management Unit
Treasurer	Yaren District Committee

**Contacts by telephone and email**

Rebecca Spratt	NZAID, Honiara
Angela Hassan- Sharp	NZAID, Vanuatu
Tracey Pearce	Formerly Legal Officer, PCPI . now resident in Australia
Marie Noelle Patterson	PCPI Board member, ex-Transparency International (out of country at time of visit)

**Unsuccessful contacts by telephone and email**

Sandra Bernklau	Programme Manager, RRRT, Regional partner (In Wellington at time of visit)
Henry Ivarature	Legislative Advisor and CSO Liaison Officer, Forum Secretariat, Regional partner (out of country at time of visit)
Bakanebo Tamaroa	Executive Director, PIANGO, Regional partner (out of country at time of visit)
Suliana Siwatibau	Former Chair, PCPI Board (out of country at time of visit)
Marstella Jack	PCPI Board, FSM
Apolosi Bose	PCPI Board, Now Amnesty International , London (formerly with RRRT)

RELEASSED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

## **Annex 4 Information sheet and topic guide**

### **Review of Rights to Information and Participatory Democracy Project**

#### **- Pacific Centre for Public Integrity**

The Rights to Information and Participatory Democracy Project managed by the Pacific Centre for Public Integrity has been funded by NZAID. It is now being reviewed. The aims of the review are:

- to build knowledge and understanding of the Project to date, including outcomes and impacts
- assess whether the strategies that PCPI and their partners have adopted to enhance the strengthening of governance through this Project remain valid
- consider recommendations to inform decisions by NZAID and PCPI with regard to the future focus and development of the Project, including support and resourcing.

The review is being undertaken by Alison Gray, an independent consultant under contract to NZAID. It will gather information from a range of stakeholders, including:

Regional partners:

- Regional Rights Resources Team (RRRT), Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative Program (CHRI), UNDP Regional Governance Programme.
- Agencies with a similar focus e.g. Pacific Island Forum Secretariat, USP Governance Programme, International Centre for Non-Profit Law (ICNL), Transparency International.
- Agencies whose work impacted on the Project. e.g. PIANGO and other agencies involved with CSO capacity building.

National partners:

- Nauru: Nauru Islands Association of Non Governmental Organisations (NIANGO).
- Vanuatu: Transparency Vanuatu, Vanuatu Islands Association on NGO's and Vanuatu Media Association Fiji.
- Fiji Women's Rights Movement, ECREA, Partners in Community Development, Citizens Constitutional Forum (CCF) and Transparency Fiji.

Project beneficiaries:

- The communities that the Project operated in Nauru: Nauru CSO Sector, Vanuatu: Vanuatu CSO Sector, Fiji: targeted civil society groups.
- Other beneficiaries: political groups, parliamentarians, media agencies, government agencies, traditional bodies, religious groups.

Implementing agencies:

- The PCPI Board. Where possible the evaluator should meet with Board members during field visits. Phone interviews should be arranged with those Board members not able to be contacted for face to face meetings.
- The PCPI management team and staff.

The knowledge gained from the review will be applied to improve policies, strategies and activities and to inform future development. The report will focus on issues and individual stakeholders will not be named in the report without their consent.

### **Topic Guide**



Note: These are the questions that the reviewer has to answer. Only some will be relevant to you. Please feel free to comment only on those topics with which you are familiar

- Your background: Nature, extent and length of time of involvement in, association with or knowledge of PCPI and of the Rights to Information and Participatory Democracy Project.
- Relationship of PCPI to your organisation – general comments
- General views on PCPI and the Project.
- The Project: Was it well planned and designed?
  - Alignment between this and similar projects
  - Appropriate strategies for planning and implementation?
  - Relevant to national and regional policies?
  - Country-based or regional approach to project design and management?
  - Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms?
  - Risk analysis – designed and implemented?
- The Project: Was it managed and implemented effectively?
  - Efficient and effective management and reporting?
  - The effectiveness of the Board, structure, role definitions?
  - Effectiveness of mechanisms for communication, consultation and dialogue?
  - Activities and expenditure in line with the Project plan?
  - Key management lessons from the Project.
- Satisfaction: How satisfied are you with the Project?
  - Effectiveness of partnership approach in achieving outputs and outcomes
  - Ongoing relevance of the Project to you and other stakeholders
  - Are countries maximising the potential assistance from the Project?
- Achievements: What has the Project achieved?
  - Relevance of the scope and purpose of the Project, progress against objectives and indicators.
  - Achievements and significance of the Project.
  - How have beneficiaries used the information and knowledge gained through activities?
  - Extent to which governance has improved among beneficiaries?
  - Any emerging unintended outcomes, positive and negative?
  - Quality and effectiveness of Project activities.
  - Adequacy and effective use of available resources.
- Challenges and opportunities: What challenges are associated with the Project?
  - Main challenges and opportunities to date, nationally and regionally.
  - How challenges and opportunities have been addressed and capitalised on
  - Any future challenges and opportunities?
  - Issues and opportunities relating to gender equality and women's empowerment, human rights, conflict prevention and peace building; environmental sustainability, addressing HIV/AIDS.
- Future of the Project
  - Options for the Project in future – sustainability, replication, growth, management structures
  - Role of PCPI in activities designed to strengthen governance with project beneficiaries
  - Any other issues or comments?

Thank you for your time. I look forward to meeting with you.

Alison Gray

Gray Matter Research Ltd,  
PO Box 28 063,  
Wellington, New Zealand 6012  
Email: [graymatter@xtra.co.nz](mailto:graymatter@xtra.co.nz)  
Phone/ Fax: +64 4 4759406 Cell (+64) (0)21 250 2544

RELEASED UNDER THE  
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

## Annex 5 Chronology of key project dates

Date	Activity
2005	PCPI established
25 January 2006	Funding arrangement with NZAID signed
4-7 August, 2006	Contribution to Regional NGO FOI Workshop, Suva
14-15 August 2006	Fiji Parliamentary Workshop on leadership Code, Rights to Information and Bill of Rights
19 August 2006	Fiji National Workshop on Freedom of Information
19/ 23 September 2006	NIANGO Strategic Development Training Workshop, Nauru
20-21 September 2006	CSO Workshop on Project Proposal Writing, Nauru
26-29 September 2006	Constitutional Literacy Training Workshop, Nauru
20-30 November 2006	Advocacy work on Rights to information and Leadership Code in Fiji
5 December 2006	Military coup in Fiji
March 2007	Letter of Variation 1 signed permitting transfer of funds to activities in Vanuatu, dependent on work plan and budget Scoping visit to Vanuatu
8-15 July 2007	Legislative Needs Consultation, Nauru
14 December 2007	Letter of Variation 2 signed extending the funding period to 30 June 2008 and acceptance of budget and work plan for activities in Vanuatu
22 January 2008	Right to Information Workshop with NGOs, Vanuatu
26-30 May 2008	Visit to Vanuatu
31 July 2008	Letter of Variation 3 -NZAID Funding Arrangement extended to 30 September 2008
30 September 2008	NZAID funding ceased

## Annex 6 Background material and papers reviewed

<b>NZAID background papers</b>	
	NZAID Policy Statement
	NZAID Pacific Strategy
	NZAID Pacific Programme for Strengthening Governance Strategic Framework 2006-8
	NZAID Pacific Leadership Strategy
	NZAID Evaluation Policy Statement
	Evaluation Quality Standards – DAC Standards
<b>NZAID records</b>	
6 January 2006	Original Programme Activity Funding Authorisation
25 January 2006	Original Funding Arrangement, Project Plan and Budget
19 June 2006	Project Status Report: February- June 2006
10 July 2006	PCPI First Mid-Term Acquittals Report
27 July 2006	NZAID Feedback on Mid-Term Progress and Acquittals Report
25 September 2006	PCPI's Response to NZAID Comments
28 March 2007	Letter of Variation No. 1, transferring unspent funds to new activities in Vanuatu
2 July 2007	PCPI Financial Statements Year ended 31 December 2006
6 July 2007	Project Progress Report August 2006 - June 2007 Revised Project Proposal July 2007 – July 2008 Acquittal report July 2006-July 2007
14 December 2007	Letter of Variation No. 2, extending the funding period by 6 months to 30 June 2008; retrospectively approving the budgets for July 2006- June 2007 and July 2007 to June 2008 and replacing the existing workplan with a new plan for July 2007-2008
1 May 2008	Audit Closing Report for PCPI to 31 December 2007
July 2008	PCPI End of Project Report : July 2007 – July 2008
18 July 2008	PCPI Financial Statements Year ended 31 December 2007
31 July 2008	Letter of Variation No.3, extending the Arrangement to 30 September 2008 with associated changes in reporting dates

1 August 2008	Acquittal report July 2007-July 2008
1 September 2008	PCPI Bridging Budget October – December 2008
<b>Additional material provided by PCPI</b>	
14 July 2006	Minutes of meeting
24 August 2006	Minutes of PCPI AGM
2 May 2007	Executive Director's report
September 2007	Executive Director's report
21 April 2008	Executive Director's report
2 May 2008	Executive Director's report
<b>Country activity reports</b>	
May 2006	NIANGI/PCPI Situation Analysis Report on Civil Society in Nauru
	Proposal for PCPI/NIANGO NIANGO Capacity Building Workshop
? 2006	Minutes of first meeting between PCPI and NIANGO
July 2008	Civil Society in Nauru: Report to Government
22 January 2008	Vanuatu Right to Information Workshop with NGOs
25-30 May 2008	Report on Vanuatu visit
<b>Other documents</b>	
	Pacific Aid Effectiveness Principles

**Annex 7**

**Project work plans**

**First project work plan February 2006 – January 2008**

(dates are approximate)

	<b>Fiji</b>	<b>Nauru</b>
<b>2006</b> Feb – April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Awareness and training workshop on FOI for CSO/media</li> <li>-Provide case studies of best models and impact on corruption</li> <li>-Workshop with media/NGO/private sector on draft Leadership Code</li> <li>-Advocacy campaign with NGO Human Rights groups for extensive public consultations at sector committee level on Leadership Code (to June)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide case studies of best models and impact on corruption</li> <li>-Awareness workshop with media/CSO/private sector on role and function of National Integrity Services</li> <li>-Conduct a needs assessment survey with CSO on awareness and understanding of governance and democracy issues</li> </ul>
May-August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-CSO and Government consultation on FOI legislation</li> <li>-CSO submission to government on FOI</li> <li>-Provide drafting input and legal advice into drafting process</li> <li>-Speaking tour of FOI specialist and/or overseas Ombudsman</li> <li>-Legislation of FOI by Parliament</li> <li>-Legal input into draft bill and support for NGOs on sector submissions for Leadership Code</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Commission USP to undertake a review of Nauru Electoral Act through public consultations (to November)</li> <li>-Develop a public media campaign to educate on governance and democracy issues (over 12 months)</li> <li>-Provide in-house training on human rights, democracy and governance to MPs, Police and other key government institutions (May to November 2007)</li> <li>-Provide training to youth, church and women's groups to educate on governance and democracy issues (May to November 2007)</li> </ul>
September-December		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Facilitate and encourage technical and training support from external partners to strengthen NIS</li> <li>-Provide policy and legal advice to Parliament and NIS on reform</li> <li>-Develop an information advocacy toolkit for CSO and MPs on NIS reform issues</li> <li>-Develop an advocacy toolkit for CSOs on civic education and awareness</li> <li>-Draft report with recommendations to government and meeting with CSO and government</li> <li>-Provide legal drafting support to government on draft CSO bill</li> <li>-Support CSO submission to MPs on draft bill in Parliament</li> </ul>
<b>2007</b> January – April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Establishment of Ombudsman Office and Leadership Tribunal</li> </ul>	(Public media campaign, training ongoing)
May-August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Consultation with MPs on FOI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-CSO and Government consultation on</li> </ul>

		FOI legislation -Awareness and training workshop on FOI for CSO/media -Consultation with MPs on FOI
September-December		-CSO submission to government on FOI -Provide drafting input and legal advice into drafting process -Speaking tour of FOI specialist and/or overseas Ombudsman -Legislation of FOI by Parliament
2008 January-April		Establishment of Ombudsman Office and Leadership Tribunal

### Revised project work plan July 2007 - June 2008

(dates are approximate)

	Vanuatu	Nauru
2007 July-September	- Awareness and training workshop on FOI for CSO/media -CSO and Government consultation on FOI legislation	-Provide policy and legal advice to Parliament and NIS on reform
October-December	- Awareness and training workshop on FOI for CSO/media -CSO and Government consultation on FOI legislation -CSO submission to government on FOI -Public media campaign with TI in Leadership Code and sound leadership	-CSO and Government consultation on FOI legislation -Provide policy and legal advice to Parliament and NIS on reform
2008 January-April	-Awareness and training workshop on FOI for CSO/media -CSO and Government consultation on FOI legislation -Consultation with MPs on FOI -Provide drafting input and legal advice into drafting process -Legal support to Ombudsman Office for policy paper to Cabinet- draft amendment to Code and Ombudsman Act -Public media campaign with TI in Leadership Code and sound leadership -Legal input into draft bill and support for NGOs on sector submissions for Leadership Code -Awareness workshop with MPs on proposed draft amendment bill to Code and Ombudsman Act	- Awareness and training workshop on FOI and Leadership Code for CSO/media -Consultation with MPs on FOI -Awareness workshop with media/ CSO /private sector on role and function of National Integrity Services -Provide policy and legal advice to Parliament and NIS on reform -Undertake with NIANGO a legislative needs assessment for CSO legislation -Draft report with recommendations to be give to government and meeting with CSO and Government -Provide legal drafting support to government on draft CSO bill -Support CSO submission to MPs on draft bill in Parliament
May-June	- Awareness and training workshop on FOI for CSO/media	-CSO submission to government on FOI -Provide drafting input and legal advice

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-CSO and Government consultation on FOI legislation</li> <li>-Provide drafting input and legal advice into drafting process</li> <li>-Organise with Speaker of Parliament a Leadership Summit - review assessment report to be tabled</li> <li>-Legal support to Ombudsman Office for policy paper to Cabinet- draft amendment to Code and Ombudsman Act</li> <li>-Public media campaign with TI in Leadership Code and sound leadership</li> <li>-Legal input into draft bill and support for NGOs on sector submissions for Leadership Code</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>into drafting process</li> <li>-Provide policy and legal advice to Parliament and NIS on reform</li> <li>-Develop an information advocacy toolkit for CSO and MPs on NIS reform issues</li> <li>-Draft report with recommendations to be give to government and meeting with CSO and Government</li> <li>-Provide legal drafting support to government on draft CSO bill</li> <li>-Support CSO submission to MPs on draft bill in Parliament</li> </ul>
--	---	--

OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT  
 RELEASÉ UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT