

**Report:
Evaluation of the Public
Administration Sector Plan
(PASP) (2013-2018)**

April 2019



Declaration

This work was carried out under the auspices of, and funded by, the Samoa Governance Support Programme. The Samoa Governance Support Programme is supported by the Australian Government and implemented by Adam Smith International.

Adam Smith
International

This publication has been funded by the Australian Government through the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. The views expressed in this publication are the author's alone and are not necessarily the views of the Australian Government.

Table of contents

List of abbreviations and acronyms.....	4
Definitions.....	5
Executive Summary.....	9
1. Introduction.....	17
1.1 Public Administration Reform in Samoa.....	17
1.2 Background.....	17
1.3 Key features of the PASP 2013/14 – 2107/18	
2. The Evaluation.....	18
2.1 Purpose and objective of the evaluation.....	19
2.2 Scope of the evaluation.....	20
2.3 Limitations of the evaluation.....	20
2.4 Evaluation approach and methodology.....	20
2.5 Evaluation standards.....	21
3. Findings.....	21
3.1 Progress as per PASP 2013 – 2018 goals.....	21
3.1 Progress as per PASP Goals.....	24
3.1.1 Core elements of PASP 2013 – 2018.....	24
3.1.2 Assessment of the PASP 2013 – 2018 against its goals.....	24
3.1.2.1 Improvement of the quality of public administration service delivery.....	24
3.1.2.2 Improvement of human resource capabilities.....	27
3.1.2.3 Improvement of public administration integrity and culture.....	29
3.2 Findings against the SMERF criteria.....	30
3.2.1 Relevance.....	30
3.2.2 Efficiency.....	31
3.2.3 Effectiveness.....	32
3.2.4 Impact.....	34
3.2.5 Sustainability.....	35
3.2.6 Cross cutting issues: Gender, disability and climate change and disaster risk management.....	36
4. Key challenges to the implementation of PASP 2013/14 – 2017/18.....	39
5. Emerging issues.....	40
6. Review of Public Administration reforms since 1990s.....	43
7. Recommendations.....	43
8. Conclusion.....	46

Annexes

1. Assessment of public sector reforms introduced since the 1990s
2. PASP revised M&E framework
3. List of questions for the consultations
4. List of bodies Considered to be part of the PS
5. List of relevant legislation
6. List of persons interviewed
7. List of documents reviewed
8. List of Public Administration sector bodies
9. Suggested criteria for assessing participation in sector planning
10. References

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACEO	Assistant Chief Executive Officer
ADB	Asia Development Bank
AGO	Attorney General's Office
AO	Audit Office
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
GOS	Government of Samoa
HRM	Human Resource Management
IPAM	Institute of Public Administration and Management
MAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
MCIL	Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Labour
MCIT	Ministry of Communications and Information Technology
MESC	Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture
MFAT	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
MFR	Ministry for Revenue
MJCA	Ministry of Justice and Courts Administration
MNRE	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
MOF	Ministry of Finance
MOH	Ministry of Health
MPMC	Ministry of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
MWCSD	Ministry Women, Community and Social Development
MWTI	Ministry of Works, Transport and Infrastructure
NPM	New Public Management
SDS	The Strategy for the Development of Samoa 2016/2017 – 2019/2010.
OEC	Office of the Electoral Commission
OOTR	Office of the Regulator
PA	Public Administration
PAR	Public Administration Reform
PASSC	Public Administration Sector Steering Committee
PASCD	Public Administration Sector Coordination Division
PASP	Public Administration Sector Plan
PFM	Public Finance Management
PICs	Pacific island countries
PSBOA	Public Service Board of Appeal
PS	Public service
PSC	Public Service Commission
PSR	Public Sector Reform
PTL	Program Team Leader
R&S	Recruitment and selection
SBS	Samoa Bureau of Statistics
SLRC	Samoa Law Reform Commission
SOE	State-owned Enterprise
SPS	Samoa Public Service
STSC	Samoa Training and Scholarships Committee
SWAp	Sector Wide Approach
WOG	Whole of Government

Definitions

Unless otherwise indicated, all definitions are taken from the Samoa Monitoring Evaluation Reporting Framework (2015 Edition).

Activities

Actions taken, or work performed through which inputs such as funds, technical assistance, and other types of resources are mobilized to produce specific outputs that in turn lead to intermediate outcomes and eventually “end of SP” outcomes.

Capacity building

Capacity building refers to “the process of developing competencies and capabilities in individuals, groups, organisations, sectors or countries which will lead to sustained and self-generating performance improvement”.

Constitutional authorities

This category of public bodies comprises the following institutions: The Office of the Attorney General; the Audit Office; the Office of the Ombudsman; the Public Service Commission and the office of the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.

Effectiveness

A measure of the extent to which a program, project or initiative has attained, or is expected to attain, its relevant objectives efficiently.

Efficiency

The notion of getting the highest value out of program or project resources (The SMERF Manual).

Evaluability

Extent to which an intervention or program/intervention can be evaluated validly and reliably.

Evaluation

A process of information collection that tends to focus on the impact of activities - defined as the systematic investigation of the merit or “worth”. The term evaluation in the sector planning context encompasses periodic assessment of the SP or program through a set of applied research techniques to generate systematic information that can help improve performance.

Findings

Factual statements based on evidence from one or more evaluations.

Goal

The higher-order objective to which a program is intended to contribute.

Impact

A change in the condition of biophysical, social, economic and/or institutional assets/circumstances. An impact may be positive or negative, primary or secondary, short term or long term, direct or indirect, and/or intended or unintended.

Indicator

A quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable basis for assessing achievement, change or performance. It is a unit of information measured over time that can help answer questions.

Input

The cash and in-kind expenditures to deliver outputs to the initial (and sometimes final) user.

Intermediate outcomes

Planned changes in organisations and people in areas such as skills, knowledge, access to information, confidence, motivation, individual and group or organisational practice/policy change.

Legacy

The enduring consequences of past investments, policies or actions that can be captured and/or bequeathed.

Outcomes

Changes in practices, policy and social, economic and environmental circumstances that result from the influence of the activities and outputs on the targeted group. Outcomes can be social, economic and/or environmental, expected and unexpected, intended or unintended. Described in the past tense.

Outputs

Results of the inputs/activities that can be adopted or are inputs into achievement of intermediate outcomes; these may be intended or unintended and can be a by-product. A result of project activity e.g. certified individuals as a result of a training activity.

Public administration

Public administration refers to (UNDP 2003: p. 2).

1. The aggregate machinery (policies, rules, procedures, systems, organizational structures, personnel, etc.) funded by the state budget and in charge of the management and direction of the affairs of the executive government, and its interaction with other stakeholders in the state, society and external environment.
2. The management and implementation of the whole set of government activities dealing with the implementation of laws, regulations and decisions of the government and the management related to the provision of public services.

Public sector reform

Public sector reform may be viewed as a series of three things:

- (i) a deliberate plan to change public bureaucracies;
- (ii) synonymous with innovation, which is the injection of new ideas and new people in a new combination of tasks and relationships into the policy and administrative process; and
- (iii) coping with the uncertainties and rapid changes taking place in the organizational environment (Caiden and Sundaram:2004).

Public sector reform seeks to introduce innovations in terms of modernization, transformation, and professionalism for the improvement of institutions and processes. It involves an effort to fix the problems of the public sector, such as:

- (i) overextension – attempting to do too much with too few resources;
- (ii) poor organization;
- (iii) irrational decision-making processes;
- (iv) mismanagement of staff;
- (v) weak accountability;
- (vi) poorly designed public programmes; and
- (vii) poorly delivered public services (Schacter 2000; O’Neil 2007).

It must have carefully defined goals and a strategy to attain these goals. Its aim of is to see remarkable improvement in the public service (PS) outputs, such as more effective and responsive service delivery.

Public service

Under Samoa’s Public Service Act,¹ the Samoa PS comprises the management and staff of ministries, constitutional bodies, statutory bodies and state-owned enterprises that are funded by the state (as opposed to being for profit business organizations).² A list of entities considered to be part of the Samoa PS is in **Annex 4**.

Public sector

The public sector consists of governments and all publicly-controlled or publicly-funded agencies, enterprises, and other entities that deliver public programs, goods, or services. It is not, however, always clear which organizations should be included under that umbrella. Therefore, it is necessary to identify specific criteria to help define the boundaries. The concept of public sector is broader than simply that of core government and may overlap with the not-for-profit or private sectors.

For the purposes of this discussion, the public sector consists of an expanding ring of organizations, with a core government (consisting of a governing body with a defined territorial authority that include all ministries, departments or branches of the government that are integral parts of the structure, and are accountable to and report directly to the central authority - the legislature, cabinet, or executive head.) at the centre, followed by agencies (public organizations that are clearly a part of the government and deliver public programs, goods, or services, but that exist as separate organizations in their own right - possibly as legal entities - and operate with a partial degree of operational independence and are often, but not necessarily, headed by a board of directors, commission, or other appointed body) and public enterprises.³

Sector Wide Approach to Planning (SWAp)

The defining characteristics of a SWAP are that all significant public funding for the sector supports a single sector policy and expenditure programme, under government leadership, adopting common approaches across the sector, and progressing towards relying on government procedures to disburse and account for all public expenditure, however funded. The working definition focuses on the intended direction of change rather than just the current attainment (Foster and Mackintosh-Walker 2001).

¹ Act No. 14, 2004.

² Article 20 (a).

³ These are agencies that deliver public programs, goods, or services, but operate independently of government and often have their own sources of revenue in addition to direct public funding. They also may compete in private markets and may make profits. However, in most cases the government is the major shareholder, and these enterprises partly follow the acts and regulations that govern the core government.

Stakeholders

Agencies, organisations, institutions, entities, groups and individuals who influence or who are directly or indirectly influenced or affected by a project or programme can be defined as stakeholders.

Strategy

Broadly stated means of deploying resources to achieve outcomes and goals.

State-owned enterprises

State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) are those corporate entities recognised by national law where, for various reasons, the state exercises control. SOEs often combine commercial and non-commercial objectives. The ownership arrangements and the governance structures vary across countries and sectors. The State could exercise control either by being the ultimate beneficiary owner of the majority of voting shares or through other means. Examples of an equivalent degree of control include cases where legal stipulations or corporate articles of association ensure continued State control over an enterprise or its board of directors in which it holds a minority stake (OECD 2015). SOEs can therefore include; the following categories: companies fully owned by public authorities; corporations where public authorities have a majority share; and entities where public authorities retain a minority share but have special statutory powers. Samoa's public sector includes 31 SOEs. These 31 entities are classified either Public Trading Bodies (23 in number, listed in **Annex 4**) and Public Beneficial Bodies (8 in number).⁴ Public Beneficial Bodies are part of the PS.

Statutory bodies

There are 4 statutory bodies established under Samoa Law: These are: The Samoa Law Reform Commission; the Office of the Electoral Commission; the Bureau of Statistics and the Office of the Regulator.⁵

Whole of Government Approach

“Whole-of-Government perspective” in relation to policy analysis and assessment means critically examining and appraising individual Ministry initiatives and proposals not only from the Ministry's portfolio interests but also, beyond that, from the totality of objectives that apply to, and are shared by all, across Government. This means, for example, that in terms of “development” it is not enough, when submitting investment proposals, simply to highlight projected positive contributions to growth in Samoa's total economic worth or Gross National Product or in per capita income, and to employment creation and export earnings. As emphasized in both the SDS and PASP, it is development embracing its total aspects, including economic, social, cultural, ethical, environmental, and equity considerations. In other words, development that contributes to improving the quality of life of the people and policies to ensure that opportunities and benefits are equitably spread throughout the country and to all sections of the population. So, the overall emphasis in this comprehensive and collective approach to policy-making is on thorough consideration of all the issues involved from a broad perspective, wide-ranging consultations with all relevant stakeholders, and central focus in the recommendations and advice on the national good and the most effective use of the nation's resources to achieve policy objectives (Definition taken from Cabinet Handbook, Government of Samoa).

⁴ Public Bodies (Performance and Accountability) Act 2001 (Samoa), S. 1.

⁵ These bodies are established by the Law Reform Commission Act 2008, the Electoral Act 1963, the Statistics Act 2015 and the Telecommunications Act 2005.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. INTRODUCTION

The PASP is government's principal mechanism for continuing reforms of the PS. The PASP is also the primary policy framework for enhancing the contribution of the public administration sector to national development in line with the SDS. PASP 2013/14 - 2017/2018 aimed to address major problems facing the PS, including weak "whole of government approaches"; weak capacity for policy making, unsatisfactory coordination of public administration policy, acute skills shortages in technical skills, weaknesses in HRM system, deficit in managerial capabilities, absence of evidence based policy making, unsatisfactory service delivery, and the need to improve integrity and accountability at all levels of the public administration sector.

The PASP had 3 goals: To improve the quality of Public Administration Service Delivery; to improve Human Resources Capabilities and to improve Public Administration Integrity and Culture. The 5 anticipated outcomes of the plan were: efficient and effective public service delivery; improved client confidence in public service; enhanced human resource capacities; enhanced human resource management practices; ethical and accountable public administration sector. The plan had 10 strategies and 29 activities. Following a 2016 stocktake of the plan, the number of activities of the plan were reduced to 19, and the number of strategies was reduced to 8.

2. THE EVALUATION.

This evaluation is primarily about learning. Learning about how an intervention has been implemented and the reasons for its failure or success provides useful information for decision making about priorities, program design and deployment of resources. The objective of the evaluation is to gauge the extent to which the goals and sector outcomes set out in the PASP (2013-2018) have been achieved. The intent of the Sector Steering Committee is that the assessment of the state of the public service and the review of the PASP (2013-2018) shall inform the development of a new strategic plan for the public administration sector.

As required by the TOR, the evaluation has: Assessed the extent to which the goals and sector outcomes set out in the PASP (2013-2018) have been achieved; conducted an assessment of the reforms of the public sector that Samoa has implemented since the 1990s; shared lessons that might be of use for future planning; made recommendations on a planning procedure to produce the next sector plan; proposed governance arrangements (responsibilities and commensurate authority) to oversee its implementation and to provide for accountability and proposed new financing arrangements for the PASP.

The limitations of the evaluation included the following: time constraints, limited access to non-managerial staff; PS staff in non-managerial positions, consultations organised by the PSC that did not give adequate attention to seeking the views of service beneficiaries and other private citizens, strained state of relations between PSC and sector entities and culture within the PS of avoiding facing up to problems for fear of offending stakeholders.

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the approach and methodology proposed in the inception report. The evaluation examined the overall quality of implementation by applying the SMERF criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, and mainstreaming of gender, disability and, climate change and disaster risk management.

3. KEY CHALLENGES AND OBSTACLES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018

The implementation of PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 was constrained by several factors, including: Skills shortage; weak capacity for policy development and planning (including development of MTEFs); absence of buy-in by most of the other stakeholder entities; resources constraints; problems relating to “Data collection and availability” (meaning weak capacity for M&E); lack of adequate knowledge about or absence of commitment to sector planning approach among sector entities; limited communication between the Sector Coordination team and implementing agencies, and limited reporting in terms of implementation progress; lack of risk management plans developed prior to implementation to address unexpected challenges or results; changes in organizational priorities as a result of a shift in strategic direction led or directed by either management or Cabinet; delays caused by slow administrative decision making and lack of clarity concerning responsibility for coordination of public administration policy.

These challenges are documented in the annual and End of Term reviews of the plan (Public Service Commission. 2016(a); Public Service Commission. 2016(b) and Public Service Commission 2018: pp. 33 - 34).

4. FINDINGS

The evaluation assessed progress on implementation of PASP 2013-2018 as per PASP goals as well as per the Samoa Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (SMERF).

4.1 Assessment of Progress as per PASP goals.

4.1.1 Goal 1: Improve the quality of Public Administration Service Delivery.

There were 5 strategies and 12 activities under Goal 1. Only 5 of the 12 activities were completed. The M&E Framework for the plan had 2 performance indicators to track progress in achieving the outcomes of Goal 1:

- (a) **Indicator 1:** Score for government effectiveness for Samoa in the World Bank Governance indicators increases.

The PASP 2018 End of Term and Post Implementation report draws attention to the rise in Samoa’s percentile ranking on government effectiveness under the World Bank Governance indicators (WGI) from 73 in 2011 to 55th ranking in 2017 as evidence that this indicator was achieved.

A measure of over-all government effectiveness such as the WGIs reflects the performance of many institutions, in and outside of the public administration sector. Bearing in mind the fact that most public administration sector entities have not integrated the PASP into their respective corporate plans, it is not possible to establish a link between the PASP’s activities and Samoa’s improved ratings on government effectiveness.

- (b) **Indicator 2:** Annual increase by 5 % of citizen satisfaction of government service delivery.

This indicator was expected to be tracked through surveys of citizen satisfaction with government service delivery. Only one survey was conducted. The survey was not well-designed and professionally. The SBS takes the position that the survey was not a credible, professionally designed

and conducted survey of perceptions and attitudes on government service delivery. In any event, the survey did not report an increase in citizen satisfaction with government service delivery. It may safely be concluded that reporting on the plan did not generate any evidence of improvement in public administration service delivery.

The evaluation concludes that there is little evidence to suggest that the plan contributed to the achievement of the outcomes of **Goal 1**.

4.1.2 Goal: Improve Human Resource Capabilities.

Five (5) activities were planned under this goal.

The M&E Framework for the plan had 3 performance indicators to track progress in achieving the outcomes of **Goal 2**:

Indicator 1: Increase in number of human resource management reports submitted.

Indicator 2: Personnel cost as % of current expenditure.

Indicator 3: PASP annual sector review report.

The plan's end of term and post implementation report holds up the achievement of the three indicators under this goal (**increase in number** of human resource management **reports** submitted, **personnel costs** as % of current expenditure, and **submission** PASP annual sector **review reports**) as progress towards achievement of the outcomes identified under this goal. The three indicators were not appropriate tools for measuring progress in improvement of human resources capacities or effectiveness of HRM systems within the PS. There are several ways of measuring the effectiveness of HRM systems. One approach would be to use Key **Performance Indicators** (KPIs). An alternative approach would be to use the World Bank's Actionable Governance Indicators (AGIs). The impact of capacity building in the PS could also be measured by tracking inputs or outputs and in the individual budgets of agencies. The plan has not contributed to progress towards the outcomes of this goal because (a) None of the activities planned in this goal were achieved. (b) The plan's M&E framework was not an appropriate tool for measuring the intended outcomes under this goal (3) it is not possible to establish a link between the activities of the plan and whatever improvements in the capabilities of the PS's human resources and human resource management practices can be only observed by anecdotal evidence.

4.1.3 Goal 3: Improve Public Administration Integrity and Culture.

The M&E Framework for the plan had 2 performance indicators to track progress in achieving the outcomes of **Goal 3**:

Indicator 1: Score for control of corruption in World Bank governance indicators increases

Indicator 2: Percentage increase in compliance with integrity standards.

Samoa's percentile rank in terms of the World Governance indicators on the control of corruption has continued to improve since 2011. The plan's End of Term and Post Implementation report appears to suggest that Samoa's improving integrity ratings are due, in part, to the activities of the PSC that were not planned under the PASP. Many government activities contribute to Samoa's score control of corruption. It is not possible to establish a link between the activities of the PSC alone and Samoa's improving Anti-Corruption ratings. The plan's indicators were in any event not suitable tools for

measuring integrity levels in the country. Conventional evidence-based corruption measurement and assessment tools include the following (UNDP 2011: p. 21): (a) Surveys of perceptions and attitudes (b) Documentation / compiling experiences of corruption or bribery (c) Public integrity assessments and (d) Assessing systems, institutions and legal frameworks (e) Assessing capacity/performance of anti-corruption agencies.

4.2 Assessment as per SMERF

4.2.1 Relevance.

PASP 2013-2018 was relevant to Samoa's context to the extent that its goals and outcomes were consistent with the policies and priorities of the country, including the priorities set out in the SDS. The Plan identified some real problems (such as unsatisfactory service delivery, human resource skill shortages, weak coordination between sector agencies) and the goals and outcomes to which the plan aspired mirrored the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries, the citizens. However, the PASP also had some critical shortcomings: The plan did not identify the root causes of the problems identified. The strategies and activities / outputs of the plan were not consistent with its overall goals and the attainment of its objectives. The activities and outputs of the plan were also not consistent with the intended outcomes. The methods and approaches proposed by the plan were not relevant to policy context. Awareness of and commitment to the plan in the relevant sector bodies was limited. The plan has not met the needs of the intended target groups. The high-level goals of the plan identified are still relevant.

4.2.2 Efficiency.

Government did not provide a budget to fund the activities of the PASP, beyond salaries and expenses for the operations of the PASPCD. Due to absence of buy-in by sector entities, the plan was only marginally implemented. Only the PSC and MPMC integrated the plan in their own sector plans and corporate plans. The PSC leveraged its internal HR to implement as many of the plan's activities as it could. Progress towards achieving the goals and sector outcomes set out in the PASP (2013-2018) has been limited. The scaled down activities of the plan were executed in a cost-effective manner. The costs for the plan can be justified by its results. Considering the challenges to the implementation of the plan, including financial constraints, the PASP has been efficient.

4.2.3 Effectiveness.

The plan identifies some problems that it intends to address in very general terms. It does not go a step further to explore the nature of the identified problems and their root causes. The PASP's omission to identify the nature of the problems that needed to be addressed resulted in the adoption of general very broad ambiguous strategies. Many of the outputs and activities of the plan were not consistent with intended goals, impacts and effects. The monitoring and evaluation framework of the plan was not a useful tool for measuring progress in achieving the plan's objectives. Most of the performance indicators of the plan do not comply with the SMART principles, in being Specific, Measurable, Affordable, Relevant and Time-bound. The link between some of the indicators and the activities of the plan was tenuous. The relevance of other indicators is open to question. The plan did not address the critical cross-cutting issues of gender equality, disability and climate change and disaster risk management. As a result of absence of buy-in by most of the stakeholders, the implementation of the plan did not follow the stipulated activity planning and reporting. The problems that the PASP's activities and outputs

addressed are still evident in the PS. The plan has not contributed significantly to progress towards achieving the plan's intended outcomes. PASP did not meet the needs of most of the intended target groups. The limitations of the plan in achieving the intended is partly a result of the plan's design and partly a result of the challenges and obstacles discussed in **Section 4** of this report.

4.2.4 Sustainability

The plan had 19 activities. 10 activities of these activities were completed by June 2018. Of the 10 completed activities, the assessment of the evaluation team is that only one activity (**Strategy 6, Activity 3: Executive Development Program for Public Sector** is developed and implemented on annual basis) could conceivably have had an impact on the intended beneficiaries of the plan. This evaluation is not able to identify any changes in individual or institutional practices, norms and attitudes that have taken place as a result of the plan's 18 other activities. The evaluation does not find any evidence of reforms of any kind being integrated into formal public administration institutional norms and procedures as a result of the activities of the plan. The assessment of the evaluation team is that because of the factors discussed above (especially lack of buy-in by sector bodies), the long-term effects of the plan on the strengthening and modernization of the PS in general and improvement of delivery of services to citizens in particular is limited. Progress towards achievement of the PASP outcomes is minimal. This finding does not in any way seek to negate the achievements of other any activities (of which there are many) of the PSC falling outside the ambit of the plan.

4.2.5 Impact.

In view of the finding that the evaluation has not identified any significant changes in individual or institutional practices, norms and attitudes that have taken place as a result of the plan's activities, it follows that the assessment is not able to identify any the benefits or negative consequences of the plan's activities that are likely to continue beyond the plan's lifespan. The results from implementation of the plan have not built or improved upon progress from prior public administration reforms. The most consequential constraint to the success of the plan was absence of buy-in by virtually all sector bodies. As at the time of this evaluation, the majority of sector entities remain uncommitted to a new PSC-led PASP.

4.2.6 Cross-cutting Issues

The plan did not address the critical cross-cutting issues of gender equality, disability and climate and disaster risk management.

5. EMERGING ISSUES.

The evaluation has highlighted the following issues pertaining to the public administration sector:

5.1 Policy framework.

The last major reforms of the PS were introduced between 1999 - 2003. Institutional knowledge about the objectives, substance, progress and impact of the reforms of the 1990s is limited. The SPS is managed in a policy void. A new policy that both builds on the achievements of past reforms and articulates the government's vision of the PS of the future is needed.

5.2 Capacity for policy making.

Capacity for policy making in the public service is highly variable between agencies but generally weak and could be improved.

5.3 Policy coordination.

The PSC is currently responsible for the function of coordination of public administration policy through the PASP. Cabinet decided in 2012 that the function should be transferred to the MPMC. The decision of the Cabinet has not been implemented. Line ministries have not bought into the PASP and have failed to integrate its content into their respective corporate plans. The PSC does not have any viable mechanism to hold sector institutions accountable for their failure to implement the components of the PASP relating to their respective mandates. Reform of an enormous and influential public sector, including the SOEs, can only work if it is driven from the center and not from the periphery of Government. It is necessary to institute a new mechanism that can coordinate public administration policy and public sector reform more effectively.

5.4 Planning approach.

The traditional approach of the PSC – that of using consultants to draft the plan in seclusion after a round of consultations with stakeholders - is not sufficient to give stakeholders a sense of ownership of the PASP. A new, more inclusive and participatory approach must be adopted. The approach must aim to maximize stakeholder participation in the planning process in the sense of broad-based dialogue at every step of the planning process, from the situation analysis that leads to policy choices, all the way to the validation of the policy implementation, and later its evaluation.

5.5 Human resource management.

High-quality human resources are the centrepiece of state capacity. The PASP identified shortage of skills as a major concern in the sector. PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 goals and objectives relating to HRM remain very relevant.

5.6 Service delivery.

The quality of service provided by the state to citizens is the ultimate test of a country's governance. PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 rightly identified unsatisfactory service delivery as another of the key problems that the public administration sector needed to address. PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 goals and objectives relating to improving service remain as relevant as they were 5 years ago.

5.7 Cross-cutting issues.

PASP 2013/2014 – 2017 did not address the cross-cutting issues of gender, disability, anti-corruption and climate change and disaster risk management. These issues should be mainstreamed in policies and plans of sector bodies. Mainstreaming is a strategy to ensure that concerns related to a specific issue or theme are considered within this central decision-making arena.

5.8 Financing for public administration reform

PASP did not receive any funding beyond salaries and benefits of the staff of the PASCD and its operations. Public sector reform aims to enhance the capacity of the state to perform its core functions. It is essential that government commit resources to programs to enhance the capacity of PS entities to fulfil their mandates.

6. REVIEW OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REFORMS INTRODUCED SINCE 1990s.

One of the requirements of the TOR was that the evaluation of the PASP should make an assessment of the reforms of the public sector that Samoa has implemented since the 1990s. The evaluation team was asked to answer the following, among other, questions.

- Which of the major public sector reforms introduced since 1990 have made a significant difference to government performance and service delivery?
- Which of them deserves more attention?
- Which of them can be built on?

Samoa implemented far-reaching reforms of the PS from the 1990s. The impetus for the reforms factors were aimed at poor economic performance, constant financial pressure, inadequate public sector management systems and practices, and certain overseas trends (Amosa 2003: p.91). The reforms were intended to address problems such as the following:

6.1 State-owned enterprises.

Government owned and operated a vast range of loss-making enterprises SOEs. The financial difficulties of the SOEs were attributed to a wide range of factors, including lack of clear commercial objectives to underpin a strict system of accountability; poor commercial practices;⁶ the pursuit of non-commercial activities at the request of the government⁷; weak financial systems; shortage of managerial skills; government controls on prices; problems in ensuring debt repayment; lack of effective oversight; and absence of institutional structures within government for coordinating the overall management and monitoring of SOEs were inadequate and political interference (AIDAB 1994: 43–44; Asian Development BANK 2000: P. 78). Performance of SOEs was also constrained by political interference. Ministers or other senior officials sat on corporate boards, often serving as Chairmen of the boards. ((AIDAB 1994; Asian Development Bank 2000).

6.2 Public Administration

The public administration system was beset by a wide range of problems, including: HR policies and procedures were outdated, inefficient and lacking in transparency, a PFM system that was similarly ineffective and not adequately transparent. bureaucracy was reputed to be rigid and heavily controlled, organisational structures that were overly hierarchical, territorial and unresponsive, duplication and or overlapping of functions, absence of policy discourse and evidence-based policy making, weak capacity for policy development, unsatisfactory coordination of policy, shortages of critical skills,

⁶ By way of illustration, the rural electrification program imposed large losses on the electricity utility.; the low level usage of the airport made it difficult for the Airport Corporation to operate at a profit without imposing very high user charges.

⁷ One SOEs was instructed to develop a 162-a sport and recreational complex that would include the country's 18-hole golf course (Asian Development BANK 2000: P. 78)>

high turnover of staff, decision making processes that time-consuming and lacking in transparency, weak capacity to carry out institutional mandates, low levels of professionalism, weak accountability in the PS. These problems rendered public sector institutions inefficient and ineffective and the quality of their services was unsatisfactory.

Although the reforms were nationally driven, they were heavily influenced by foreign consultants. The reforms that Samoa introduced tried to replicate New Public Management reforms that Australia and New Zealand had implemented. The reforms were of three categories (1) changes in machinery of government (2) Reforms that transferred certain functions of the state to private markets and (3) reforms of public sector management policies, processes and procedures. The reforms have had a positive impact on the PS overall. On the other hand, the reforms have helped the PS to achieve satisfactory levels of efficiency, effectiveness and service delivery. One factor that accounts for the mixed record of the reforms that some introduced from the 1990s is that the reforms did not take adequate account of local context. The evaluation team's comprehensive assessment of the reforms that Samoa has introduced since the 1990s is attached as **Annex 1** to this report.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS.

The evaluation team makes the following recommendations:

7.1 Coordination of public administration policy.

The function of coordination of public administration policy coordination and public sector reform in general should be transferred to a Public Sector Reform Unit (PSRU) to be established in the Office of the Prime Minister.

7.2 Planning approach for next PASP

The preparation of the next sector plan should be aligned with the Sector Planning Manual. Participation in future planning processes should be more inclusive at all stages of the planning process, from design, to implementation to monitoring and evaluation. The goals, strategies and proposals of activities of the next PASP should be developed in partnership with the implementing entities. Planning processes should not shy away from identifying and address real problems.

7.3 Governance arrangements for next PASP.

The Steering Committee should be expanded to include all stakeholder entities that will have responsibility for important components of the next PASP. It is recommended that that MESC, MCIT NUS and the SBS be included in the Steering Committee of the next PASP.

7.4 Priority interventions for next PASP.

The evaluation team recommends that the next PASP should focus on the following priorities of the public administration sector

- (a) Strengthening policy framework for public administration.
- (b) Enhancing capacity of sector entities for policy making.
- (c) Human resource development.
- (d) Strengthening leadership capabilities.
- (e) Improving service delivery
- (f) Accountability strengthening in government.

7.5 Financing arrangements for the PASP.

Government should adopt HRD as a key development priority. Government should commit to providing adequate funding in annual budgets to support HRD. Government should include HRD in budget priorities. Government should consider launching a donor-supported Governance programme to support HRD.

7.6 Strengthening of ownership of the PASP.

The centre of government should hold sector bodies accountable for their responsibility to integrate the PASP's strategies and activities in their respective corporate plans and to monitor and report on the implementation of the strategies and activities in accordance with the plan's M&E framework

8. CONCLUSION.

Samoa introduced far-reaching public sector reforms from the 1990. The reforms of the past have had a positive impact on performance of the PS. However, some aspects of the PS still need strengthening. Future reforms of the PS should prioritize revitalization of the policy framework, improvement of capacity for policy, strengthening policy coordination, investing in development of human resources for the twenty first century economy and further strengthening of accountability in government. Planning for the future of the PS must start with identifying and addressing most pressing and important problems. Strategies for addressing these problems must be grounded in a good understanding of the political economy and country context. Strong, consistent and well-placed political leadership will be essential for revitalizing and driving the reform process.

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SECTOR PLAN

2013/14 – 2017/18

1. INTRODUCTION.

1.1 Public administration reform in Samoa.

In spite of the influential neo-liberal arguments of the 1980s and 1990s which sought to roll back the state, recent surveys find that citizens want state institutions that are democratic, efficient in the use of public resources, effective in delivering public goods, but also strong and capable of standing up to powerful global forces. People want the state and its public administration to act as a social and economic promoter, capable of ensuring equitable distribution of opportunities, sustainable management of resources and equitable access to political, economic, social and cultural opportunities (UNDP 2003: p. 3). An efficient, responsive, transparent and accountable public administration is of paramount importance for the proper functioning of a state. It is also the basic means through which government carries out its development agenda.

Samoa has a history of ambitious and fairly successful public-sector reforms dating back to the 1990s. The country's public administration sector has been at the fore front of these reforms. The public administration sector was the first to develop a sector plan, PASP 2007-2011. PASP 2007 – 2011 was the launchpad of several far-reaching reforms, including reforms of the justice sector and public finance management. PASP 2007-2011 inspired and informed subsequent sector plans of other PS bodies, until the sector wide approach became the norm across government. The reforms that the country has implemented over three years have transformed the public-sector landscape, largely with positive results. Samoa officially graduated to middle income country status in 2014.

There is a pervasive sense, however, among many in the PS and political leadership that the country's trailblazing reforms of the public sector have somewhat slackened or even stalled. The Samoan state plays a very substantial role in the country's economy. The state accounts for over 40% of gross domestic product (GDP), and owns a significant number of state-owned enterprises (SOEs) that account for a substantial proportion of the economy's capital stock ADB (2015). Reform of Samoa's public sector is critical to the vitality of Samoa's economy and the achievement of government's development goals. The large size of the SPS and its significant contribution to Samoa's GDP and the high proportion of the national workforce that it represents mean that returns to Samoan society from productivity and performance improvements in the public sector will be high (Adam Smith International 2018). Addressing critical variables in the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery should be regarded as a central part of the SPS reform agenda.

The PASP is government's principal mechanism for continuing reforms of the PS. The PASP is also the primary policy framework for enhancing the contribution of the public administration sector to national development in line with the Strategy for the Development of Samoa.

1.2 Background to Public Administration Sector Plan 2013/14 – 2017/2018.

The Public Administration Sector Plan 2013/14 - 2017/2018 was preceded by the PASP 2007/08 - 2010/2011. In 2013, the public administration sector commissioned a review of the just completed PASP 2007 - 2011. The review (summarised in the PASP 2013/14 - 2017/18) outlined a number of 'key findings' from its 'stakeholder consultations' and its review of the 2007-2011 plan. The review identifies the following problems or challenges of the public administration sector (Public Service Commission 2013: pp. 1-2; 8-9):

- Very low level of awareness and understanding of the previous PASP among most of the public-administration sector ministries and agencies.
- Ineffective communication and marketing of the PASP to the very agencies whose support was needed to implement the plan.
- Absence of a dedicated capacity within the PSC to coordinate and facilitate the implementation of the plan.
- Absence of link between the PASP and sector plans and corporate plans of PS entities.
- Weak “whole of government approaches’ including the coordination in the public administration sector.
- Need to strengthen “informed based policy and technical advice options (to be) presented to Ministers and Cabinet (meaning the need to strengthen evidence-based policy making).
- Urgent need to develop an effective M & E framework.
- Greater need to develop an “integrated public sector planning and performance management framework that will enable timely and effective reporting especially by the key central agencies of Government, the MPMC, PSC, AGO and MoF to Cabinet to ensure Ministers are kept fully informed of the performance of the entire public sector in the delivery of approved Government programmes, projects and services to the people of Samoa”.
- Poor quality of public service delivery and the unresponsiveness of ‘public servants at the front office level as well as senior management level to criticisms from the general public’
- Acute skills shortages in technical skills required by the public sector to effectively deliver services to the public.
- Need for more “specialised and general leadership training targeting the middle to senior management across the entire public sector” (in other words, need to strengthen management capabilities).
- Importance of gaining public confidence in the integrity and accountability at all levels of the public administration sector and the need to put in place whole of government integrity and anti-corruption mechanisms as part of the sector’s key performance evaluation framework.

1.3 Key features of the Public Administration Sector Plan 2013/14 – 2017/2018

PASP 2013/14 - 2017/2018 was developed to address the challenges of the sector outlined in the previous section. The vision of PASP 2013/14 - 2017/2018 is “a professional and competent Public Administration that provides quality and coordinated service delivery to the people of Samoa in a cost effective, efficient and transparent manner ". The plan identified its three goals as:

Goal 1: Improve the quality of Public Administration Service Delivery.

Goal 2: Improve Human Resources Capabilities.

Goal 3: Improve Public Administration Integrity and Culture.

The goals of the plan were to be delivered through ten (10) strategies including strengthening or improving of the following:

1. Whole of Government coordination.
2. Policy research, development and coordination.
3. Whole of Government performance monitoring systems.
4. Public awareness of government functions and roles.
5. Public service delivery mechanisms.
6. Human Resources Development.
7. Human Resources Management.

8. Consistent public financing of Human Resources Development and Management.
9. Application of consistent and relevant integrity standards across the whole Public Sector, including mainstreaming of gender equity and vulnerable groups issues.
10. Upholding of integrity standards, including mainstreaming of vulnerable groups issues.

The plan originally envisaged a total of 29 activities.

In 2016, the PASP Steering Committee established 3 taskforces to undertake a stocktake of activities of the plan. While the stocktake found that progress in implementing the plan was generally satisfactory, it also found that some of the activities of the plan could be consolidated to ensure the PASP is realistic and achievable given the remaining timeframe. The stocktake also found that some of the activities shared the same intentions and could be combined into one holistic activity, with the details to be specified during the planning phase. In addition, the stocktake found that while some of the activities were still relevant, they had to be “given new direction as a result of Cabinet decisions and changes to Government priorities” (Public Service Commission. (2016 (a):2). In line with the recommendations of the stocktake, the number of activities of the plan were reduced to 19, and the number of strategies was reduced to 8.

A key feature of the 2016 revision of the PASP was the introduction of the One-Public Sector-One Vision for Good Governance-One Policy activity. The activity aimed to “strengthen the Whole of Government approach (WoG) and to address coordination issues within the public sector” (Public Service Commission 2016(c): p. 2). The activity combined 5 activities (a review of public sector governance arrangements; review of the policy development capacity in the public sector; review of the Human Resource Management framework for the public service to be applicable to the whole public sector; review and consolidation of Human Resource Development systems under PSC and the development of a Human Resource Management policy strategy for WoG) that had previously been listed separately in the PASP.

The 8 strategies and 19 activities of the revised sector plan are indicated in the plan’s M&E framework, which is **Annex 2** to this report.

The 5 anticipated outcomes of the plan were:

- Efficient and effective public service delivery;
- Improved client confidence in public service;
- Enhanced human resource capacities;
- Enhanced human resource management practices;
- Ethical and accountable public administration sector.

2. THE EVALUATION

2.1 Purpose and objective of the evaluation

The purpose of an evaluation refers to the rationale for doing the evaluation. An evaluation may be for one or both of two purposes: learning and accountability. The purpose of the current evaluation is primarily about learning. Learning about how an intervention has been implemented and the reasons for its failure or success provides useful information for decision making about priorities, program design and deployment of resources.

The government of Samoa is committed to continuing reforms of the public administration system with a view to enhancing efficiency, effectiveness, innovation and the quality of service delivery in

the public sector (Ministry of Finance 2017; Ministry of Finance 2018). The 5-year lifespan of the Public Administration Sector Plan (PASP) 2013/14 - 2017/18 came to its end in December 2018. The government of Samoa intends to develop a successor plan to continue the process of PS strengthening. The aim of the current assignment, including this evaluation, is to work collaboratively with the PASCD of the PSC to assess the state of the SPS, to review the PASP (2013-2018), and then to develop the PASP (2019-2024).

The objective of the evaluation is to gauge the extent to which the goals and sector outcomes set out in the PASP (2013-2018) have been achieved. With regard to the review of the PASP 2013-2018, the TOR for the assignment required the evaluation team to research a wide range of questions relating to the design and implementation of the plan including the following:

- a) Did the planned inputs and techniques operate as expected?
- b) Efficiency and cost-effectiveness - To what extent were activities and outputs delivered on time and in a cost-effective manner? To what extent did predicted budgets compare with actual expenses? To what extent is the sector managing its resources more efficiently and so delivering a better service across the country? Do the services delivered by government represent value-for-money?
- c) Does the monitoring and evaluation framework act as a useful tool to measure progress?
- d) Is the whole-of-sector approach helping to improve performance? If not, why? If yes, how?
- e) Impact: To what extent, if at all, have the goals and sector outcomes set out in the PASP (2013-2018) have been achieved? Has the achievement of PASP activities and outputs addressed the identified needs? Did the PASP meet the needs of the intended target groups? What changes have occurred, either directly or indirectly as a result of PASP -related activities?
- f) What, if any, unanticipated (adverse) consequences have there been during the implementation of the plan?
- g) Legacy (sustainability): Are the benefits of PASP 2013 – 2018 activity likely to continue beyond the intervention? Will there continue to be positive effects over time and after the PASP term ends?
- h) Looking back, what were the strengths of the plan? What were its weaknesses?
- i) How is the plan viewed within the public sector? How is it viewed among leadership of stakeholder entities? How is it perceived among general staff of such entities? Is the existence of the plan even known across stakeholder entities? What factors account for knowledge or perceptions about the plan?

The intent of the Sector Steering Committee is that the assessment of the state of the public service and the review of the PASP (2013-2018) shall inform the development of a new strategic plan for the public administration sector.

2.2 Scope of the evaluation

As required by the TOR, the evaluation has:

- Assessed the extent to which the goals and sector outcomes set out in the PASP (2013-2018) have been achieved.
- Conducted an assessment of the reforms of the public sector that Samoa has implemented since the 1990s.
- Shared lessons that might be of use for future planning.
- Made recommendations on a planning procedure to produce the next sector plan;

- Proposed governance arrangements (responsibilities and commensurate authority) to oversee its implementation and to provide for accountability.
- Proposed new financing arrangements for the PASP.

2.3 Limitations of the evaluation.

- The time allowed for the assignment did not permit us to investigate as thoroughly as we would have liked issues surrounding some of the outputs. Even so, we believe that the primary and secondary data that we were able to gather were sufficient to support the conclusions that we have drawn and the recommendations that we have made.
- The evaluation team experienced problems in finding historical documents on which prior PS reforms have been based and documents relating to the implementation of the relevant reforms.
- The consultations provided very limited access to PS staff in non-managerial positions.
- Consultations organised by the PSC for the evaluation team did not give adequate attention to seeking the views of service beneficiaries, private citizens, vulnerable groups or citizens living outside the capital.
- The strained state of relations between PSC and sector entities imposed challenges in determining whether or not information received from interviewed sources is objective and offered in good faith.
- There appears to exist in the PS a culture of avoiding facing up to problems for fear of offending stakeholders.

2.4 Evaluation approach and methodology

The evaluation principally relied on primary data. The data were collected through a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. Data were gathered through the use of structured and semi-structured interviews, group or ‘focus’ discussions, public consultations, and observations in the field.

Field work included observations and individual and group interviews with relevant stakeholders, ranging from private citizens, to managers and staff of government agencies, state owned enterprises, and representatives of the private sector, civil society and service beneficiaries. The consultants were privileged to meet several ministers and to hear their views on public service reform. The consultants endeavoured in particular to seek the views of the consumers of government services, that is, ordinary citizens. All individual and group interviews were conducted in accordance with interview protocols tailored to the respective stakeholder groups.

The evaluation team’s inquiry was guided by a list of potential questions set out **Annex 3**. Shorter lists of questions drawn from the three lists of questions formed the basis of focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews that the consultants carried out.

Primary data were complemented by a desk review of a variety of secondary sources, including the Samoa Governance Support Programme documents (including the Compendium of documents); statistical data; central government policy documents and reports (including the Strategy for the Development of Samoa (2016 – 2020), the National Policy for Women, the One Public Sector-One Vision for Good Governance-One Policy paper, the National ICT Policy, and the National Security Policy); sector plans and other policy documents, corporate plans and annual reports of ministries and other bodies covered by this study; legislation governing the various institutions covered in this study and relevant literature.

The evaluation team originally hoped to discuss their preliminary finding with focus groups. Due to time constraints, the focus group discussions were not held. The evaluation team instead presented their preliminary findings to a seminar that the Public Administration Sector Coordination Division (PASCD, PSC) organised. The consultants also sought comments on the draft of the report from a sample of ministers, CEOs and other senior public servants. While the consultants took into account all input from the stakeholders who were consulted, the report evaluation on the state of the public service is based on the evaluators' impartial professional assessment of the relevant evidence that – in their view - is in the best interests of the country.

2.5 Evaluation standards

The evaluation examined the overall quality of implementation by applying the following criteria from the Samoa Monitoring and Evaluation Framework: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, and mainstreaming of gender, disability and, climate change and disaster risk management.

3. FINDINGS.

The evaluation assessed progress on implementation of PASP 2013-2018 as per PASP goals as well as per the Samoa Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (SMERF).

3.1 Progress as per PASP goals,

3.1.1 Core elements of PASP 2013 - 2018

The plan has 3 overarching goals, 8 strategies and 19 activities.

To reiterate, the following were the plan's 3 goals:

Goal 1: Improve the quality of Public Administration Service Delivery

Goal 2: Improve Human Resources Capabilities

Goal 3: Improve Public Administration Integrity and Culture

The outcomes, strategies and activities of the PASP following the 2016 revision are indicated in the revised Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, which is **Annex 2** to this report.

3.1.2 Assessment of the progress of PASP against its goals.

3.1.2.1 Improvement of the quality of public administration service delivery (Goal 1).

There were 5 strategies and 12 activities under Goal 1. Only 5 of the 12 activities were completed. The activities that were completed are (a) review of mechanisms for central agencies coordination to support WoG cohesion completed by 2014 (**Strategy 1**); (b) scoping study for Public Sector Research Institute completed by 2014 (**Strategy 2**); (c) Review of mechanisms for public service information dissemination and feedback undertaken by December 2013 & implemented on annual basis (d) hold Public Service Day annually & Public Service Excellence Awards biennially and (e) conduct survey every 2 years to gauge public feedback on government service delivery (**Strategy 4**).

In addition to the plan's 5 completed activities under **Goal 1**, the plan's End of Term and Post Implementation report provided very detailed information (see Public Service Commission 2018: pp. 11; 18 - 27) on the following other activities (referred to hereafter as the **Additional Activities**) of the

PSC that are said to have made a contribution to progress towards achieving the outcomes associated with **Goal 1**.

Strategy 1: Strengthen Whole of Government (WoG) coordination

1. Review of Central Agencies Committee Terms of Reference.
2. Review of the Human Resource Management Framework.
3. Legislative Review of the Public Service Act 2004.
4. Review of the Public Bodies Act 2001.
5. Review of the Recruitment and Selection process for Contract Employees.
6. Review and amendment of Working Conditions and Entitlements.
7. Review of Recruitment and Selection Manual for general employees.
8. Review of Performance Appraisal System for general employees.
9. Review of Remuneration Frameworks.
10. Review of wage positions & terms and conditions of temporary employees for the Samoa public service.
11. Establishment of the Ministry for Public Enterprises.

Strategy 2: Strengthen policy research, development and coordination

1. Establishment of the National Policy Coordination Committee.
2. Providing training on policy development and analysis and public-sector management for public servants through a partnership with the PSC-Pacific Islands Centre for Public Administration.
3. SBS-UNESCAP Policy-Data integration workshops conducted by the Samoa Bureau of Statistics in collaboration with UNESCAP.

Strategy 3: Strengthen Whole of Government performance monitoring systems

1. HRM Monitoring and Evaluation
2. Changes to the Working Conditions and Entitlements

Strategy 4: Improve public awareness of government functions and roles

1. PASP Parliamentary awareness session
2. Development and implementation of Public Administration Sector Communication Strategy, including publication of 14 editions of a sector newsletter.

Strategy 5: Improve Public Service delivery mechanism

1. Pilot of public sector service delivery project, with the support of Australian Public Service Commission-DFAT
2. Review of PSC Service Charter, with the support of Australian Public Service Commission
3. Providing assistance to ministries in connection with the Functional Review process
4. Producing Service Delivery Comparative Analysis Report, and submitting it to cabinet
5. Establishment of One Stop Shop approach in some ministries
6. Public Private Partnership Program.

The End of Term and Post Implementation Report links the **Additional Activities** listed above to the PASP with a statement to the following effect that:

“while the PASP had been developed with the high-level goals and strategies, the technical details as to how it would be implemented were established along the way. It shows that implementation is very much dependent on circumstances surrounding government operations at the time, and the political environment by which Ministries and agencies would have to perform in” (Public Service Commission 2018: p. 18).

The End of Term and Post-Implementation report includes:

1. Activities that were clearly envisaged in the plan;
2. Activities that were not envisaged in the plan, but can be linked to a particular strategy and goal in the plan;
3. Activities that fall within the routine operations of the PSC, that would have been carried with or without the sector plan (examples: management of scholarships).

The evaluation team decided not to treat the **Additional Activities** as part of the PASP. These activities are not referred as PASP activities in annual reviews of the plan. They were not included in the PASP M&E framework. The Additional Activities were not monitored and reported upon. Most the activities are activities that could or would have been carried out as part of the PSC's mandate, regardless of the PASP. The attempt to link the **Additional Activities** to the PASP appears to be intended to bolster the PASP in the light of the gap left by the failure of most stakeholder entities to participate in the implementation of the plan.

Regardless of whether or not the **Additional Activities** are part of the PASP, there is little evidence to suggest that the outcomes of **Goal 1** were achieved. The M&E Framework for the plan had 2 performance indicators to track progress in achieving the outcomes of Goal 1:

Indicator 1: Score for government effectiveness for Samoa in the World Bank Governance indicators increases.

The PASP 2018 End of Term and Post Implementation report draws attention to the rise in Samoa's percentile ranking on government effectiveness under the World Bank Governance indicators (WGI) from 73 in 2011 to 55th ranking in 2017 as evidence that this indicator was achieved.

The World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) define governance as "the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised. This includes (a) the process by which governments are selected, monitored and replaced; (b) the capacity of the government to effectively formulate and implement sound policies; and (c) the respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them." (Kaufman, D. et al 2010: p. 3). The indicators draw together data on perceptions of governance from a wide variety of sources and organize them into six clusters corresponding to the six broad dimensions of governance: Voice and accountability; political stability and absence of violence / terrorism; government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law and control of corruption. Data for WGI are gathered through surveys and other evaluations conducted in collaboration with more than 30 international organizations, including information from individuals, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), think tanks, aid donors, public officials and corporations doing business in the countries being assessed.

The cluster of Government Effectiveness captures perceptions of the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to such policies.⁸ By its very nature, a measure of over-all government effectiveness reflects the

⁸ The Government Effectiveness indicator measures the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to its stated policies. Countries are evaluated on the following factors: (a) competence of civil service; effective implementation of government decisions; and public service vulnerability to political pressure; (b) ability to manage political alternations without drastic policy changes or interruptions in government services; (c) flexibility,

performance of many institutions, in and outside of the public administration sector. Bearing in mind the fact that most public administration sector entities have not integrated the PASP into their respective corporate plans, it is not possible to establish a link between the PASP's activities and Samoa's improved ratings on government effectiveness.

Indicator 2: Annual increase by 5 % of citizen satisfaction of government service delivery.

This indicator was expected to be tracked through surveys of citizen satisfaction with government service delivery. Well-designed and properly conducted surveys of perceptions and attitudes on government service delivery could have produced evidence on this indicator. However, only one survey was conducted during the life time of the plan. The PSC was not able to secure financial resources to carry out a professionally designed and conducted survey, and it opted for an on-line format designed and implemented by the PASPCD. This survey had limitations. These shortcomings are acknowledged by the report on the survey itself (Public Service Commission. (2017(c): pp. 5 - 6). The Samoa Bureau of Statistics takes the position that the 2016 Government Service Delivery Survey was not a credible, professionally designed and conducted survey. The survey did not attempt to compare its results with the baseline information. The survey did not report an increase in citizen satisfaction with government service delivery. The survey report only concludes that there is "a below average level of customer satisfaction regarding the performance of government employees". (Public Service Commission. (2017(c): p. 22). It may safely be concluded that reporting on the plan did not

learning, and innovation within the political leadership; ability to coordinate conflicting objectives into coherent policies; (d) the efficiency of revenue mobilization and budget management; (e) the quality of transportation infrastructure, telecommunications, electricity supply, public health care provision, and public schools; the availability of online government services; (f) policy consistency; the extent to which government commitments are honoured by new governments; (g) prevalence of red tape; the degree to which bureaucratic delays hinder business activity; (h) existence of a taxpayer service and information program, and an efficient and effective appeals mechanism; (i) the extent to which: effective coordination mechanisms ensure policy consistency across departmental boundaries, and administrative structures are organized along functional lines with little duplication; the business processes of government agencies are regularly reviewed to ensure efficiency of decision making and implementation; political leadership sets and maintains strategic priorities and the government effectively implements reforms; hiring and promotion within the government is based on merit and performance, and ethical standards prevail; the government wage bill is sustainable and does not crowd out spending required for public services; pay and benefit levels do not deter talented people from entering the public sector; flexibility (that is not abused) exists to pay more attractive wages in hard-to-fill positions; government revenues are generated by low-distortion taxes; import tariffs are low and relatively uniform, export rebate or duty drawbacks are functional; the tax base is broad and free of arbitrary exemptions; tax administration is effective and rule-based; and tax administration and compliance costs are low; policies and priorities are linked to the budget; multi-year expenditure projections are integrated into the budget formulation process, and reflect explicit costing of the implications of new policy initiatives; the budget is formulated through systematic consultations with spending ministries and the legislature, adhering to a fixed budget calendar; the budget classification system is comprehensive and consistent with international standards; and off-budget expenditures are kept to a minimum and handled transparently; the budget is implemented as planned, and actual expenditures deviate only slightly from planned levels; budget monitoring occurs throughout the year based on well-functioning management information systems; reconciliation of banking and fiscal records is practiced comprehensively, properly, and in a timely way; and in-year fiscal reports and public accounts are prepared promptly and regularly and provide full and accurate data; the extent to which accounts are audited in a timely, professional and comprehensive manner, and appropriate action is taken on budget reports and audit findings. Millennium Challenge Corporation. Available at:<https://www.mcc.gov/who-we-fund/indicator/government-effectiveness-indicator>. (Accessed on April 8, 2019).

generate any evidence on the basis of which an assessment of improvement in public administration service delivery could be made.

3.1.2.2 Improvement of human resource capabilities (Goal 2).

The M&E Framework for the plan had 3 performance indicators to track progress in achieving the outcomes of **Goal 2**:

Indicator 1: Increase in number of Human Resource Management reports submitted.

Indicator 2: Personnel Cost as % of Current expenditure.

Indicator 3: PASP Annual Sector Review Report.

Goal 2: Improve human resources capacities

Key Outcome 3: Enhanced human resource capacities

Key Outcome 4: Enhanced human resource management practices

Five (5) activities were planned under this goal. **Activity 1** (Workforce plan across whole public sector are completed) was not achieved. The National Human Resource Development Plan (**Activity 2**) was drafted but is yet to be approved by cabinet, let alone be implemented. This activity may in fact have been superseded by another initiative, the Clever Country Policy: Guide Samoa's transition into becoming a Knowledge Based Economy. Yet, even progress towards adoption and implementation of the Clever country Policy is uncertain. **Activity 4** (HR development programmes are established by December 2014 and implemented on an annual basis) was achieved, but its impact in terms of improving the capacity of the country's human resources is open to question, given the absence of funding for staff development in agency budgets.⁹ While hundreds of the staff of the PS have benefitted from various capacity building activities during the life time of this PASP, these capacity building activities were largely carried out under sector plans or corporate plans of other PS entities. **Activity 5** (Review existing policies/systems and processes to ensure consistent funding of HRM &HRD is completed) was not undertaken. The only activity envisaged under the PASP whose completion can conceivably be considered to have made a contribution to the improvement of human resources capacities within the PS is **Activity 3** (Executive Development Program for Public Sector is developed and implemented on annual basis).

The plan's End of Term and Post Implementation report holds up the achievement of the three indicators under this goal (**increase in number** of Human Resource Management reports submitted, personnel costs as % of current expenditure, and **submission** PASP annual sector review reports) as progress towards achievement of the outcomes identified under this goal. It is the opinion of the evaluators that these three indicators were not appropriate tools for measuring progress in improvement of human resources capacities or effectiveness of HRM systems within the PS.

There are several ways of measuring the effectiveness of HRM systems. One approach would be to use Key **Performance Indicators** (KPIs). A KPI is a metric that measures the performance of a particular activity or process. The objective is for this to serve as a reference depending on the process or activity on the basis of the objective you want to achieve. KPIs for effective HRM include: Retention of talent, duration in position, absenteeism, average time for recruitment, education and training, average time to achieve goals, and accidents in the work place. An alternative approach

⁹ See Report on the Assessment of the State of the Samoa of Samoa Public Service, p. 19.

would be to use the World Bank's Actionable Governance Indicators (AGIs). The impact of capacity building in the PS could also be measured by tracking inputs or outputs and in the individual budgets of agencies

In summary, the plan's M&E framework is not a useful tool for measuring improvement in the capacities of the PS's human resources and human resource management practices during the life time of this PASP. Neither is it possible to establish a link between the activities of the plan and whatever improvements in the capabilities of the PS's human resources and human resource management practices can be observed by anecdotal evidence.

3.1.2.3 Improvement of public administration integrity and culture (Goal 3).

The M&E Framework for the plan had 2 performance indicators to track progress in achieving the outcomes of **Goal 3**:

Indicator 1: Score for Control of Corruption in World Bank Governance Indicators increases

Indicator 2: Percentage increase in compliance with Integrity Standards.

Samoa's percentile rank in terms of the World Governance indicators on the control of corruption has continued to improve since 2011. PASP 2013-18 had two activities under this goal. Neither of the two activities under this goal's strategy was completed. On the other hand, the PSC undertook 3 integrity related activities (providing anti-Corruption training to PCS staff, conducting a survey on harassment in the workplace, and organizing and delivering training on the conduct of investigations relating to complaints and grievances brought to the PSC). The plan's End of Term and Post Implementation report appears to suggest that Samoa's improving integrity ratings are due, in part, to the activities under Strategy 8 of the plan. Many government activities contribute to Samoa's score control of corruption. It is not possible, however, to measure the contribution of the above-mentioned 3 integrity related activities to Samoa's rank in World Governance indicators. It is a fair conclusion to say that it is not possible to establish a link between the activities under this strategy and Samoa's improving Anti-Corruption ratings.

The plan's indicators were in any event not suitable tools for measuring integrity levels in the country. Conventional evidence-based corruption measurement and assessment tools include the following (UNDP 2011: p. 21):

- Surveys of perceptions and attitudes: Usually conducted at national level. They are considered effective in raising awareness about extent of corruption. They do not always provide actionable data for policymaking.
- Documentation / compiling experiences of corruption or bribery: This measures direct experiences of citizens. It can be used to measure experiences of local governance and public administration performance.
- Public integrity assessments: These tools "usually aim to assess the institutional framework for promoting integrity and combating corruption across the public sector, and/or to identify corruption or corruption risks within specific government agencies and/or among public officials." (Martini & U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre, 2012).
- Assessing systems, institutions and legal frameworks: Example is the voluntary UNCAC compliance review/gap analysis by a national expert team.
- Assessing capacity/performance of anti-corruption agencies: Looks at (1) Functional or core capacities—capacities necessary for managing ACAs; and, (2) Technical capacities—specific

areas of professional expertise or knowledge linked to specific functions of anti-corruption agencies.

3.2 Findings as per SMERF.

3.2.1 Relevance.

Relevance refers to the extent to which sector plan activities /outputs and intermediate outcomes achieved are suited to the priorities and policies of the target stakeholders.

Assessing the relevance of a policy addresses the extent to which the policy responds to the needs and is also consistent with the priorities, livelihood strategies and the culture of the main stakeholders and beneficiaries. Relevance involves assessing the consistency of the policy with the policies and priorities of the country. This includes looking at whether the overall objectives of the intervention conform to existing policies, whether this policy represents a priority for the country and, for intervention targeted to the administration, the extent to which the design of the intervention and its implementation take into account the actual functioning of the administrative system. Assessing relevance includes looking at the technical adequacy of the intervention, including in relation to the institutional environment. Relevance has to be assessed in relation to the design and the implementation of the policy or plan.

PASP 2013-2018 was relevant to Samoa's context to the extent that its goals and outcomes were consistent with the policies and priorities of the country, including the priorities set out in the Strategy for the Development of Samoa. The plan states that the overarching purpose of the Public Administration Sector Plan 2013/14-2017/18 is to support the SDS vision for "*Improved Quality of Life for All*" and goal of Improved Governance by enhancing the capacities and capabilities of the public administration to provide high quality, timely and effective public service to every person in Samoa. The PLAN identified some real problems (such as unsatisfactory service delivery, human resource skill shortages, weak coordination between sector agencies) and the goals and outcomes to which the plan aspired mirrored the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries, the citizens.

However, the PASP also had some critical shortcomings: The development of the plan could have delved deeper to identify the root causes of the problems that the review of the previous plan had identified. **Some of these problems are outlined in section 1.2 of this report.** The strategies and activities / outputs of the plan were not consistent with its overall goals and the attainment of its objectives. The activities and outputs of the plan were also not consistent with the intended outcomes. The plan did not address the causes of less optimal performance of the public service. The methods and approaches proposed by the plan were not relevant to the policy context.

Managers and staff of the PS entities to which the plan applies concede that their knowledge of the plan has been very limited. The low level of awareness of the plan in the relevant sector institutions is attributed, at least in part, to the absence of a universally accepted policy framework for the public administration system, lack of clarity about roles and responsibilities for management of the public administration reform process, and planning processes that are not adequately participatory, as well as low awareness in sector bodies of the advantages of policy coordination.¹⁰ In addition, sector entities

¹⁰ Ministries may have the essential expertise in to prepare policy proposals for their own domains. However, most policy cuts across the domains of more than one ministry. This is the case with public administration. So, while most policy is developed in ministries, it should be coordinated by the centre in order to ensure that the overall system creates policies

are motivated to devote their attention and resources exclusively to implementing their own sector plans and corporate plans rather than invest in a PASP in which they do not perceive themselves as having ownership. Managers of PS stakeholders were generally of the view that the PASP did not reflect the needs or priorities of their respective institutions. The plan failed to attract ownership from PS stakeholders. The themes of the plan were not integrated into the institutional policies and plans of the agencies of the PS.

The activities and outputs of the PASP have not addressed the problems that it was intended to resolve. The plan has not met the needs of the intended target groups. The high-level goals which the plan identified 5 years ago are still relevant. Changes in strategies to achieve those goals are recommended. A stronger emphasis on HRM should be considered in the process of developing the next sector plan.

3.2.2 Efficiency

Efficiency measures the outputs – qualitative as well as quantitative – in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term which signifies that the sector plan uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results.

Assessing efficiency requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

Government did not provide a budget to fund the activities of the PASP. The only funding that the sector plan received were salaries and operation costs of the PASCD. In the absence of funding and lack of buy-in by sector entities, the plan was only marginally implemented. With the exception of the PSC and the Ministry of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, sector entities did not integrate the plan in their own sector plans and corporate plans. Consequently, sector entities did not monitor and satisfactorily report on progress (inputs, outputs and outcomes) on the plan.

In the absence of funding for the plan (whether from the national budget or development assistance) the PSC leveraged its internal HR to implement as many of the plan's activities as it could. The scaled down activities of the plan were executed in a cost-effective manner. The costs for the plan can be justified by its results.

Communications between sector entities with regard to the plan have not been satisfactory. The PASPCD has performed as well as could have been expected in communicating with stakeholders about the plan and coordinating its implementation, given the lack of interest in the plan in sector institutions. The PASPCD appears to have communicated with sector entities with adequate transparency, clarity and frequency concerning the implementation of the plan. It appears that that communication and coordination concerning the plan has have been adversely affected by the on-going contest of the mandate of the PSC.

The implementation of the PASP was constrained by several factors, which are outlined in **Section 4** of this report. Partly as a result of these constraints and partly as a result of shortcomings in the plan's design, the plan's achievements have been modest, as the end of Term report and Post-Implementation

that are not deficient in law or substance, are consistent with one another, are economically efficient and do not impose unnecessary regulatory burdens; are in line with overall government priorities; are sustainable in budgetary terms; ensures that decisions can be implemented; and support principles of integrity in government through transparency and consultation with the public.

Report and the fore-going assessment of the plan against the plan's goals indicate. Progress towards achieving the goals and sector outcomes set out in the PASP (2013-2018) has been limited. However, considering the the very limited resources that government has made available for implementation of the plan, the challenges that the implementation of the plan has faced and the activities of the plan that have been completed, the PASP has been efficient.

3.2.3 Effectiveness

Effectiveness refers to achievement of Sector Plan activities and outputs planned, using the inputs and techniques planned. Is what we planned working?

Effectiveness measures the extent to which a policy's objectives (the intended results) were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, whether at **output, outcome** or **impact** levels. Evaluating the effectiveness of an intervention involves understanding how the project contributed to these results, whether it was appropriately designed in relation to the expected results, what were the success factors, what was the weight of external factors, and who were the beneficiaries of the intervention. Effectiveness contributes to institutional learning by demonstrating what worked and under which conditions. Due to the difficulty of measuring effectiveness at impact level and depending on the purpose of the evaluation, it may be decided to focus the evaluation on outputs and outcomes only. Assessing the effectiveness of an intervention **at output level** requires to examine the extent to which the project/program activities have taken place and produced the expected outputs. Assessing the effectiveness of the intervention **at outcome and impact levels** requires a two-step approach: (i) measuring the extent to which the objectives have been achieved and (ii) assessing the extent to which the changes can be attributed to the development intervention or to external factors.

The characteristics of a good policy are: The policy is in line with the Government programme and other commitments made by the Government; the policy is actually needed in order to address a real problem; the policy or law actually addresses the identified problem; the policy or law is effective and cost-efficient (compared with alternatives); the policy or law does not create (serious) new problems; the policy or law does not contradict other laws, or create legal and enforcement confusion; the means for implementation of the policy or law are available (money, human resources, organization). In developing a policy, these aspects of policy should be assessed by collecting and analysing the best available information.

The PASP has not been effective:

Problem identification.

The plan identifies some problems that it intends to address in very general terms. It does not go a step further to explore the nature of the identified problems and their root causes. We will discuss a few examples.

- a) Unsatisfactory service delivery.

The plan identifies unsatisfactory service delivery as one of the problems that it aims to address. The plan does not identify exactly in what part of the public sector the problem of unsatisfactory service delivery manifests itself. Is it in ministries or it in SOEs? The plan does not explore the nature of the problem or its root causes. Is the problem poor customer service at front offices? Is it that public service entities do not have service delivery standards? Is the problem that established service delivery standards that are not being met? Is the problem that public service entities are under-funded or under-

staffed? Is the problem caused by lack of appropriate education and training of staff? Is the problem caused by absence supervision and weak management capabilities? Is the problem that access to service is hindered by official user fees or hidden charges such transportation costs? Do the problems of unsatisfactory service delivery affect all social groups equally, or are some groups disproportionately exposed to the problem?

b) Skill shortages.

The plan identifies skills shortages as a problem but does not provide any details about the nature of the problem. Is the problem that public service entities across the board find it difficult to attract and retain all talent? Are skills shortages restricted to certain disciplines? Are skills shortages present at all levels of the public service hierarchy, or are they associated with new entrants into the service? Do all public service bodies face the same skills shortages, or do some have their own peculiar human resources needs?

c) Weak “Whole of Government Approaches”.

The plan identifies weak “Whole of Government Approaches” as a problem deserving of intervention but does not clarify the exact nature of the problem. Is the problem that government does not have a legal or policy framework to facilitate whole of government approaches? Is the application of WoG approaches constrained by cultural barriers to organisational change? Are WoG approaches limited by practical challenges and barriers, such as that these approaches are time consuming; require individual agencies and managers to put aside their own agenda; are difficult to measure in terms of success and may have poorly defined, incompatible goals and frequently competing political and community agenda? Other practical challenges to WoG approaches include lack of incentives to share data; institutional, budgetary and financial ‘walls’ between agencies; lack of time and other scarce resources and departmental cultures (Colgan, A. et al. 2014: pp. 30-32).

Weak “Whole of Government Approaches” may imply many different problems. Those problems cannot be addressed and resolved until they are identified.

Successful policy implementation emerges from a combination of the political (setting an overall vision and strategic objectives) and the technocratic (policy design, evidence and plans). If the problem and necessity is not well understood, the solutions presented will be limiting.¹¹ A plan cannot have effective strategies to address problems that are yet to be identified.

- The original plan’s weakness is that it failed to identify the real problems that needed to be addressed. There is little or no attempt to analyse in detail the causes of the problems identified (which themselves seem unlikely to have covered the full range of likely issues), which could have yielded specific remedial possibilities that were not simply restatements of the problems themselves. (Adam Smith International 2018: para. 28). This omission had implications for the rest of the planning process.
- The PASP’s omission to identify the nature of the problems that needed to be addressed resulted in the adoption of general very broad generic strategies. The goals and ‘strategies’ of the Plan mostly repeat at different levels of generality and in slightly different words the

¹¹ OECD (2015) Strengthening the Role of the Centre of Government in Driving Priority Strategies, OECD Publishing, p. 5

problems to be solved. This is tautological, meaning that the Plan's 'contribution' is simply to say words to the effect that 'we shall fix the problems by fixing the problems and addressing the issues involved'. (Adam Smith International 2018: para. 28)

- The omission to identify real problems at the beginning of the planning process and the plan's reliance on very generic broad strategies meant that the developers of the plan did not have baseline data to ensure that the plan was adequately evidence based; that its implementation could be monitored, and that progress could be measured.
- Consistency of activities and outputs with the intended goals, impacts and effects: Many of the outputs and activities of the plan were not consistent with intended goals, impacts and effects.
- The monitoring and evaluation framework of the plan was not a useful tool for measuring progress in achieving the plan's objectives. The design of the plan was constrained by lack of satisfactory baseline data to begin with. Most of the performance indicators of the plan do not comply with the SMART principles, in being Specific, Measurable, Affordable, Relevant and Time-bound. The link between some of the indicators and the activities of the plan was tenuous. For example, progress in the indicators for goal 1 (Indicator 1: Score for government effectiveness for the World Bank Governance indicators increases; Indicator 2: Annual increase by 5 % of citizen satisfaction of government service delivery) was certainly the collective result of the totality of activities of many other sector plans and corporate plans of various entities of the government of Samoa and not attributed solely to the PASP, if at all. The relevance of other indicators is open to question. It is difficult to conceive how the indicators for goal 2 (Indicator 1: Increase in number of Human Resource Management reports submitted; Indicator 2: Personnel Cost as % of Current expenditure and Indicator 3: PASP Annual Sector Review Report) comprising merely the preparation of reports could by themselves constitute appropriate and satisfactory measurement of progress improvement of human resource capacities of sector. The plan's indicators were not differentiated by gender to make it possible to assess the impact of the plan on both men and women.
- The plan did not address the critical cross-cutting issues of gender equality, disability and climate change and disaster risk management

While the PSC and the Ministry of the Prime Minister and Cabinet implemented activities of the plan, the objectives and planned results were largely not achieved. The majority of the sector stakeholders did not fulfil the roles in the implementation of the plan that was assigned to them. As a result of lack of buy-in by most of the stakeholders, the implementation of the plan did not follow the stipulated activity planning and reporting. The problems that the PASP's activities and outputs addressed (**see section 1.2 of this report**) are still evident in the PS. The plan has not contributed significantly to progress towards achieving the plan's intended outcomes. It can safely be concluded that the PASP did not meet the needs of most of the intended target groups. The limitations of the plan in achieving the intended is partly a result of the plan's design and partly a result of the challenges and obstacles discussed in **Section 4** of this report.

3.2.4 Impact

Impact refers to progress toward Achievement of end of sector plan outcomes planned.

Impact assesses the positive and negative, primary and secondary, short-term or long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Assessing impact is different from measuring effectiveness which focuses on measuring intended (and therefore positive) results. Assessing impact involves measuring the totality of the effects brought by a development intervention. Assessing impact is particularly difficult. Identifying unexpected or

negative effects of an intervention requires some additional research. Baseline data on unexpected or negative effects is usually non-existent and the causality may be even more difficult to establish.

The plan had 19 activities. 10 activities of these activities were completed by June 2018. As of June 2018, major progress had been made towards the completion of the remaining 9 activities. Against this background of apparent progress towards completion of the planned outputs, the assessment team also considered the following other factors:

- (a) Relevance of strategies and activities;
- (b) Ownership of the plan by sector entities;
- (c) Evidence of impact of the plan on institutions and individuals in the PS.

As already indicated in the preceding subsections of the report (sub-section **3.2.1** and sub-section **3.2.3**) the design of the plan did not identify the nature of the sector's problems that needed to be addressed. As a result, the strategies and activities of the plan were largely not relevant. Additionally, the plan has had no buy-in from most of the sector institutions. Only the PSC and the Ministry of the Prime Minister and Cabinet implemented the plan. Lack of buy-in by sector entities is demonstrated by the plan's End of Term and Post Implementation report. The report is essentially a narrative of the activities of the PSC, and only the PSC. The monitoring and evaluation framework of the plan was not a useful tool to measure progress towards achievement of the end of sector plan outcomes. Some of the indicators (specifically the indicators for **Goal 2**) were not relevant. Other indicators (specifically the indicators for **Goal 1**) had no direct link to the activities of the plan.

Of the 19 activities of the plan, only one activity (**Strategy 6, Activity 3: Executive Development Program for Public Sector** is developed and implemented on annual basis) could conceivably have had an impact on the intended beneficiaries of the plan. This evaluation is not able to identify any changes in individual or institutional practices, norms and attitudes that have taken place as a result of the plan's 18 other activities. The evaluation does not find any evidence of reforms of any kind being integrated into formal public administration institutional norms and procedures as a result of the activities of the plan. The assessment of the evaluation team is that because of the factors discussed above (especially lack of buy-in by sector bodies), the long-term effects of the plan on the strengthening and modernization of the PS in general and improvement of delivery of services to citizens in particular is limited. Progress towards achievement of the PASP outcomes is minimal. This finding does not in any way seek to negate the achievements of other any activities (of which there are many) of the PSC falling outside the ambit of the plan.

3.2.5 Sustainability.

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of a sector plan activity are likely to continue. Sector plans need to be socially, environmentally as well as financially sustainable.

In view of the finding that the evaluation has not identified any significant changes in individual or institutional practices, norms and attitudes that have taken place as a result of the plan's activities, it follows that the assessment is not able to identify any of the benefits or negative consequences of the plan's activities that are likely to continue beyond the plan's lifespan. The results from implementation of the plan have not built or improved upon progress from prior public administration reforms. The most consequential constraint to the success of the plan was absence of buy-in by virtually all sector bodies. As at the time of this evaluation, the majority of sector entities remain uncommitted to a new PSC-led PASP.

3.2.6 Crosscutting Issues: Gender, disability, climate change and disaster risk management.

The plan did not address the critical cross-cutting issues of gender equality, disability and climate and disaster risk management. The evaluation team does not discuss the impact of the plan in relation to gender equality and disability. **However, the evaluation team includes in this section sub-section (contributed by consultants of the USAID Climate Ready Project) that discusses the issues of climate change and disaster risk management.**

3.2.6.1 The SDS 2012 – 2016.

The SDS 2012-2016 clearly outlines the importance of CC/DRM in its *Key Outcome 14: Climate and Disaster Resilience* under *Priority Area 4: Environment Sector*. The national strategic document further highlights mainstreaming climate and disaster resilience and responsive planning as a strategic area.

The importance of integrating climate and disaster resilience into core national and sector plans and implementing agencies corporate plans ensures that appropriate resources are provided for their implementation. While the SDS highlights the importance of integrating climate and disaster resilience, the PASP 2013/14-2017/18 does not specifically feature CC/DRM as an emerging nor a cross-cutting issue across its goals, strategies and activities. In the past, mainstreaming of CC/DRM into Government sector plans appears to have focused and concentrated on its main core sectors, such as environment, health, infrastructure, tourism, finance, and agriculture. While the PASP 2013/14-2017/18 was developed with the understanding and guidance of the priority areas and key outcomes of the SDS 2012-16, it has not, to a great extent, taken the negative impacts of climate change and natural disasters into account in its formulation.

3.2.6.2 PASP 2013 – 2018

The PASP 2013/14-2017/18 was developed with the intention of supporting the SDS 2012-2016 vision for *Improved Quality of Life for All* and the goal of *Improved Governance* by enhancing the capabilities and services of the public administration sector in Samoa.

The PASP 2013/14-2017/18 focuses on three core functions: (1) improving the quality of public administration service delivery; (2) improving human resources capabilities; and (3) improving public administration sector integrity and culture. These core functions are governed by the underlying principle of a public administration sector that upholds the values of *honesty, impartiality, service, respect, transparency, accountability, efficiency and effectiveness*. Using these values and principle, the PASP 2013/14-2017/18 identifies ten strategies¹² with specific activities that will contribute to achieving its vision and core functions.

The strategies and activities of the PASP 2013/14-2017/18, however, make very little reference to CC/DRM, except in terms of the need to build the capacity of the public administration sector to improve access to climate finance and to be able to deliver communication protocols on a timely basis during times of natural disasters. It was clear from the consultation process for this review that when the PASP 2013/14-2017/18 was developed, Samoa had not yet specifically considered CC/DRM as a key economic or social threat for the public administration sector.

¹² The ten PASP 2013/14-2017/18 strategies are : (1) Improve/strengthen Whole of Government coordination; (2) Strengthen policy research, development and coordination; (3) Strengthen Whole of Government performance monitoring systems; (4) Improve public awareness of government functions and roles; (5) Improve public service delivery mechanisms; (6) Improve human resource development; (7) Improve human resource management; (8) provide consistent public financing of human resource development and management; (9) Ensure consistent and relevant integrity standards apply across the whole Public Sector; and (10) Ensure integrity standards are upheld.

The PASP review noted that due to the lack of integration of CC/DRM in the PASP 2013/14-2017/18, none of the CC/DRM programs implemented in Samoa over this period can be adequately captured and directly linked to PASP 2013/14-2017/18. Further, during the review process, different views on the PASP 2013/14-2017/18 and CC/DRM were shared by key stakeholders in Government, private sector and non-government organisations. Stakeholders who are directly affected by the impacts of CC/DRM saw the value in integrating CC/DRM in terms of being able to access global climate funds and holistically address CC/DRM issues. Stakeholders who were either indirectly or not obviously affected by the impacts of CC/DRM were unclear as to how integrating CC/DRM would add value to planned activities and, therefore, did not prioritise CC/DRM into sector strategic plans or activities. However, most stakeholders identified the need for guidance on integrating CC/DRM into the design and implementation of their programs and activities. Despite the different views, some specific public administration sector programs reflect activities that can be classified as having mainstreamed CC/DRM. These included capacity building trainings in CC/DRM and public awareness programs for the public service carried out and financed by other sectors. It is encouraging though to note that some sectors do demonstrate an understanding, albeit limited, of CC/DRM and its impact on the country and their responsibility, to some extent, to address these issues. CC/DRM knowledge exists within certain Ministries, but these appear to be limited to those working on on-ground activities or those who have direct working relationships with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment and the Disaster Management Office (DMO).

The National Disaster Management Plan defines the roles and responsibilities for Government agencies and staff in disaster risk preparation and response, although not all of these recommendations are reflected within the PASP 2013/14-2017/18. In addition, the DMO has developed sector-specific guidelines for Samoa's other fourteen sectors, the implementation of which, however, is not clear.

3.2.6.3 Sector Planning

Since the formulation of the PASP 2013/14-2017/18, the SDS 2016/17-2019/20 and subsequent sector plans tend to reflect the increasing importance of mainstreaming CC/DRM as called for in the Ministry of Finance Sector Planning Manual 2015 for Samoa, which highlights that *“Climate change and vulnerable groups, including gender equity, are priority issues for investment by SPs that cut across all sectors and these issues need recognition and incorporation into each SP and program”*. Specifically, the Sector Planning Manual 2015 further notes that *“end of SP outcomes and programs need to be developed in ALL SPs for vulnerable groups, gender equity and climate change”*. Although several public entities have integrated CC/DRM into the delivery of service to the public in terms of public awareness, training and planning, the review noted that not many Government Ministries have integrated and made CC/DRM issues a part of their daily routine. The Public Administration Sector Coordination Unit and the PASP 2019/20-2024/25, therefore, have a crucial role to play in integrating CC/DRM and building resilience across the public administration sector.

3.2.6.4 SDS 2016/17 – 2019/20

The highlighting of climate change and disaster risk management by the Sector Planning Manual 2015 as important cross-cutting issues that *need recognition and incorporation into each sector plan and program* was subsequently reflected in the SDS 2016/17-2019/20 in *Key Outcome 14: Climate and Disaster Resilience and Strategic* and *Outcome 1: Climate and disaster resilience and responsive planning improved*. On the basis of these SDS 2016/17-2019/20 Outcomes, Government entities have now mainstreamed or need to consider mainstreaming CC/DRM into their respective sector plans. These SDS Outcomes should also be the basis for developing the proposed PASP 2019/20-2024/25.

3.3 Governance Arrangements.

3.3.1 Drivers of the sector.

The main drivers for the Sector are the PSC, the Ministry of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (MPMC), the Ministry of Finance (MOF), the Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development (MWCSD), and the Ministry for Public Enterprises (MPE). The CEOs of these entities (and two representatives of civil society and the private sector) together constitute the Public Administration Sector Steering Committee (PASSC). The PASSC is responsible for the development, and oversight of implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the PASP. The PSC is the lead agency for the Sector and host of the Public Administration Sector Coordination Division (PASCD), the Secretariat for coordinating public administration sector plan. PS bodies are responsible for integrating the PASP into their respective corporate plans, and to monitor and report on the implementation PASP-related activities in those corporate plans.

3.3.2 Evaluation of current governance arrangements.

PASP 2014 – 2018 had clear governance arrangements. Apart from the PSC and the Ministry of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, all other entities which had assigned roles in the implementation of the PASP had authorities that were commensurate with their respective responsibilities. The only drawbacks of the plan's governance arrangements were:

- Lines of upward and downward accountability and reporting were not clear.
- The PSC lacked authority to hold public administration bodies accountable for their responsibilities under the PASP.
- The plan's governance arrangements did not take into account the 2012 directive of Cabinet that the function of coordination of public administration sector policy be transferred to the Ministry of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

Managers of sector entities assert that their institutions did not have a role in shaping the plan. Sector bodies have not taken ownership of the plan. Most have failed to integrate the plan in their respective corporate plans. The level of commitment to implementation of the plan among the principal responsible agencies remains weak at best even at the time of writing this assessment. There currently is no mechanism for holding sector bodies which have not integrated PASP activities into their respective corporate plans accountable for failing to carry out their responsibilities under the PASP.

Lack of commitment to implementation of the plan among the sector entities may be due to several factors, including the following:

- Non-participatory planning process: Managers of sector bodies who were interviewed during the consultations insisted that the development of the plan was not adequately participatory and inclusive. The managers indicated that they did not have roles in shaping the plan, including analysis of problems to be addressed and crafting of appropriate strategies and activities. Managers of stakeholder entities still insist that the plan was imposed on them.
- Sector bodies are very focussed on implementing sector plans in their own spheres; and the perceive the PASP as a distraction from their core functions.
- At least a significant number of the managers of sector bodies do not see further reform of the public administration system (beyond limiting the scope of the mandate of the PSC) as a government priority.

- The PSC lacks authority to hold sector bodies accountable for fulfilling their responsibilities for integrating PASP activities in their respective corporate plans and for monitoring and reporting on those activities.
- The uneasy relationship between sector bodies and the PSC constrains possibilities of constructive inter-agency dialogue on public administration reform.
- The ability of the Ministry of the Prime Minister and Cabinet to resolve the dispute over the location of the function of public administration sector policy coordination has been constrained by the fact that the PSC and the Ministry are both laying claim to the right to responsibility for the function.
- Financing: The plan's budget estimate was not a realistic approximation of the funding that could be raised.

4. KEY CHALLENGES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018.

The implementation of PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 was constrained by several factors that were beyond the control of the major implementing agency, the PSC. These challenges included the following

- Skills shortage;
- “Inadequate estimation in terms of the timeframe and resources required for each activity” (in other words, inadequate capacity for policy development and planning);
- Lack of buy-in by most of the other stakeholder entities, leading to failure by the stakeholders to integrate activities under the PASP in their respective agency corporate plans;
- Resources constraints (much more pronounced than under the previous plan);
- Limited communication between the Sector Coordination team and implementing agencies, and limited reporting in terms of implementation progress.
- Gaps in knowledge on sectoral approach, need for implementing agencies to improve their level of awareness and understanding of the intentions of each activity in PASP to ensure the right outcomes are achieved by the completion date
- Difficulties in developing medium term expenditure frameworks (MTEFs)
- “Data collection and availability” (meaning weak and M&E capacity)
- Lack of risk management plans developed prior to implementation to address unexpected challenges or results
- Changes in organizational priorities as a result of a shift in strategic direction either from management level or Cabinet; Administrative and procedural delays.

These challenges are well documented in the annual and End of Term reviews of the plan (Public Service Commission. 2016(a); Public Service Commission. 2016(b) and Public Service Commission 2018: pp. 33 - 34).

5. EMERGING ISSUES.

5.1 The need for a new guiding policy framework for the public administration sector.

The PASP is an attempt to carry on a reform process about which PS entities appear to have limited institutional knowledge. The last major initiatives to reform the Samoan public administration system were introduced between 1999 - 2003. Few in the current PS have any knowledge of the objectives and substance of those reforms beyond the fact that the reforms involved some devolution of HRM functions to line ministries and the re-alignment ministries and departments. Knowledge about the extent to which

the reforms of the 1990s were implemented, the extent to which the reforms that were implemented achieved or did not achieve their goals, the factors that facilitated or constrained the reform process, the aspects of the reforms that can still be built upon even if they have previously failed to achieved the intended objectives, is limited. Historical documents relating to the reforms (policy documents, cabinet papers that outlined those reforms) review reports or are very hard to find. The Samoa PS is managed in a policy void.

Knowledge about the history of the reforms of the public administration system that Samoa introduced in the 1990s is vital to future of the PS. Experience teaches us that public sector reform only works through incremental approaches to reform, building on cumulative success over time and creating pockets of effectiveness in the public sector that can serve as a model for reform. (Robinson, 2007, Roll, 2014). The country needs a new policy that both builds on the achievements of past reforms and articulates the government's vision of the PS of the future, providing broad outlines of strategies to achieve that vision.

5.2 Capacity for policy making.

The PSC is the lead agency for HRM and one of the two key institutions responsible for guiding public sector management reform. The PSC and the membership of the Sector Plan Steering Committee were responsible for the development of PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018. The weaknesses of the plan have been documented in the preceding sections of this report.

The evaluation team had the opportunity to look at the corporate Plan of the PSC (Corporate Plan 2015 - 2019). The PSC's corporate plan is an exact replica of PASP. 2013/2014 - 2017/2018. The concerns relating to the quality of PASP. 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 outlined in the Findings section of this report equally apply to the PSC's Corporate Plan.

The PSC has overall responsibility for HRM policy and oversight. It has primary responsibility for organisation of the PS and human resource development for the sector. The fact that a sector plan and a corporate plan for which the PSC is the lead agency have such glaring weaknesses is probably illustrative of weaknesses in capacity for policy making across government as a whole. Strictly speaking, PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 reflects the weak capacity for policy development and planning at the time the plan was developed. As part of this assignment, the evaluation team has had the opportunity to learn about current capacity for policy making in the PS. The evaluation team's findings suggest capacity for policy making could be improved.¹³

5.3 Policy coordination.

Public administrations have traditionally been organized along vertical functional lines, which allows for division of labor and specialization but poses the challenge of fragmentation and lack of cohesiveness of the government as a whole. The coordination function is the response to these potential problems.

The PSC is currently responsible for the function of coordination of public administration policy, Cabinet decided that in 2012 that the function should be transferred to the Ministry of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. That decision of the Cabinet has not been implemented. Line ministries have not bought into existing public administration policy. Sector bodies have not bought into the PASP and have failed to integrate its content into their respective corporate plans. The PSC does not have

¹³ See Report on the Assessment of the State of the Samoa Public Service (Section 5.1).

any viable mechanism to hold sector institutions accountable for their failure to implement the components of the PASP relating to their respective mandates. It does not have the political or legal authority to drive public sector reform. The disconnect between the responsibilities and authority of the PSC undermines effective implementation of public administration policy (see separate note on ‘centre of government’ agencies).

An effective system of policy coordination is characterised by the following: The Government agenda is planned clearly, ideally for a year but at least for the coming weeks and the coming months; ministries consult each other on draft laws and policy papers, so that they are not conflicting with each other's objectives; the government takes decisions on the basis of adequate information, coherently presented, well-argued and with clear cost estimates; decisions are in line with the money to implement them; individual decisions are related to the Government's stated priorities; there is a process to resolve minor (and even “medium”) disagreements between ministries so that disputes are settled before the Government meets and process is monitored on a regular basis. The effectiveness of policy implementation is linked to the authority of the institution responsible for its design and coordination. The literature suggests that higher levels of coordination are associated with better quality policies (Allesandro, M. et al 2013: p. 18).

The PSC cannot coordinate public administration policy effectively because:

- First, public administration cannot be addressed effectively in isolation from the wider public sector, given the linkages between ministries and SOEs;
- Reform of an enormous and influential public sector, including the SOEs, can only work if it is driven from the most authoritative arm of government.
- Second, line ministries have not bought into existing public administration policy; and
- Third, the public administration sector plan has not been properly funded – in part, perhaps, because past plans have not been seen to be addressing the most pressing and important problems.

It is necessary to locate the function of coordination of public administration policy in a part of government where it can be performed more effectively and with greater authority (see attached note on ‘centre of government’ agencies).

5.4 Planning process.

The PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 was developed before the latest guidelines on sector plans came into force. The developers of the plan consulted stakeholders, as **Annex 2** to the plan clearly indicates. Nevertheless, managers of line ministries insist that their respective had no role in the development of the plan. The strongly divergent views of the PSC and line ministries regarding whether or not the development of PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 was inclusive and adequately participatory demonstrates that a new approach to the preparation of the sector's strategic plan is needed. The traditional approach of the PSC using consultants to draft the plan in seclusion after a round of interviews with stakeholders will likely not be sufficient to give stakeholders a sense of ownership of the plan.

Human resource management.

High-quality human resources are the centrepiece of state capacity. The ways in which the public service (PS) is managed - human resource planning policies, recruitment and selection, professional development, and incentives for professionalization, among other factors—are critical for attracting, retaining, and motivating the right people. Good management of the public service entails having in

place solid workforce planning routines; reliable data on staff and pay; adequate organizational structures with updated and relevant job profiles; a merit-based system for recruitment, selection, and promotion with a reasonable level of flexibility; competitive and fair pay; a solid performance framework; career development opportunities for staff, continuous training that responds to changes in technology and the more complex policy issues, and good relations with staff associations, among others (Lafuente and Molina 2018).

PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 identified “Acute skills shortages in technical skills required by the public sector” as one of the major problems facing the PS. The plan did not, identify the nature of the skills that are in short supply and the appropriate strategies to fill the skills gaps. Virtually all managers of agencies who were interviewed in the course of the assessment of the state of the SPS that was part of this assignment indicated that a significant part of their staff did not have the knowledge and skills to perform their duties effectively. PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 goals and objectives relating to HRM very relevant.

5.5 Service Delivery.

Public services provide the most common interface between people and the state, and their functioning shapes people’s sense of trust in and expectations of government. At a national level, public services underpin human welfare and economic growth.¹⁴ PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 rightly identified unsatisfactory service delivery as another of the key problems that the public administration sector needed to address. Indeed, improving service delivery has been a key element of many if not most of the reforms of the public sector that Samoa has introduced since the 1990s.

Public services need to be delivered with integrity, centred around citizens, and responsive to their needs, particularly the needs of the most vulnerable. Promoting greater transparency and enabling ordinary citizens to assess the quality, adequacy and effectiveness of basic services, to voice their needs and preferences and to become involved in innovation offers an opportunity to enable better use of public funds, and improve service delivery (Ringold et al, 2013). PASP 2013/2014 - 2017/2018 goals and objectives relating to improving service remain as relevant as they were 5 years ago.

5.6 Financing for public administration reform.

PASP did not receive any funding beyond salaries and benefits of the staff of the PASCDC and its operations. Public sector reform aims to enhance the capacity of the state to perform its core functions. It is essential that government commit resources to programs to enhance the capacity of PS entities to fulfil their mandates.

5.7 Cross-cutting issues.

PASP 2013/2014 – 2017 did not address the cross-cutting issues of gender, disability, anti-corruption and climate change and disaster risk management. Ideally, these issues should be mainstreamed in policies and plans of od sector bodies. Mainstreaming is a strategy to ensure that concerns related to a specific issue or theme are considered within this central decision-making arena.

¹⁴ Open Government Partnership. Available at <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/theme/public-service-delivery>. Accessed on April 23, 2019.

6. REVIEW OF PUBLIC SECTOR REFORMS INTRODUCED SINCE THE 1990s.

One of the requirements of the TOR was that the evaluation of the PASP should make an assessment of the reforms of the public sector that Samoa has implemented since the 1990s. The evaluation team was asked to answer the following, among other, questions.

- Which of the major public sector reforms introduced since 1990 have made a significant difference to government performance and service delivery?
- Which of them deserves more attention?
- Which of them can be built on?

At the beginning of the assignment, the principal national counterpart stressed that an assessment of the impact of the major public sector reforms introduced since 1990 was of particular interest to the Chairman of the PSC.

The evaluation team's assessment of the impact of the major public sector reforms introduced since the 1990s is attached as **Annex 1** to this report.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS.

Policy change happens through consultation, persuasion, and alliance formulation over extended time. A SWAP needs to reflect this and respect that it implies not all things can be addressed up front. Donor attempts to lead the policy process with short term TC often fail. To develop dialogue and capacity among partners to address policy issues, there is a need for a permanent analytical capacity to support government, an effective policy process, a focused annual review process with good concentration on the important problems and the immediately feasible solutions, plus a process for how important but not immediately feasible solutions will be addressed in future (Forster, M. et al 2001: p. 46)

With these considerations in mind, the evaluation team makes the following recommendations.

7.1 Policy framework for public administration sector.

The evaluation team recommends the development of a new policy that articulates the government's vision of the PS of the future and provides broad outlines of strategies to achieve that vision, building on progress achieved from the reforms introduced during the 1990 - 2003 period.

7.2 Coordination of public administration policy.

The evaluation team recommends that the function of coordination of public administration policy coordination and public sector reform in general be transferred to a Public Sector Reform Unit (PSRU) to be established in the Office of the Prime Minister. **A recommendation to the same effect was made in 2013 by the End of Program Review of Samoa's Public Sector Improvement Facility (PSIF)** (Shead 2013). **Even more important, the recommendation is in line with a previous directive of Cabinet.** The Cabinet made a decision in November 2012 to the effect that the Secretariat for the Public Sector Administration Plan, and responsibility for leading the implementation of the Plan, move to the Ministry of the Prime Minister and Cabinet within two years.

7.3 Planning approach for the next PASP.

The preparation of the next sector plan should be aligned with the Sector Planning Manual. Participation in future planning processes should be more inclusive at all stages of the planning process, from design, to implementation to monitoring and evaluation. Broad-based participation is important in ensuring that perceptions and views from communities outside the capital are collected and fed in to the national policy debate and the associated monitoring. At a minimum this should

happen through the indirect mechanism of participatory survey work, but preferably also through more direct involvement of community-based organisations in national decision-making; and by ensuring transparent, open debate with diverse participation. **Annex 9** proposes criteria for assessing participation in the SWAP process (Forster, M. et al 2001: p. 36). The goals, strategies and proposals of activities of the next PASP should be developed in partnership with the implementing entities. Planning process should not shy away from identifying and address real problems.

7.4 Governance arrangements for the next sector plan.

The Steering Committee should be expanded to include stakeholder entities which will have responsibility for important components of the next PASP. Based on the results of the consultations that the evaluation team has conducted, the next sector plan is likely to have a strong focus on HRD, use of ICTs for improving access to knowledge, learning and service delivery. It is recommended that that MESCS, MCIT and NUS be included in the Steering Committee of the next PASP. It is also recommended that the Samoa Bureau of Statistics be included in the membership of the PASP steering committee, as is the case with other sector plans, The SBS can assist in providing required data for the sector and it would also make invaluable contribution to also validating the data used in sector planning

7.5 Priority intervention areas of the next PASP.

The evaluation team recommends that the next PASP should focus on the following priorities of the public administration sector:

- (a) Strengthening policy framework for public administration.
- (b) Enhancing capacity of sector entities for policy making.
- (c) Human capital development.
- (d) Strengthening leadership capabilities.
- (e) Improving service delivery.
- (f) Accountability.

Human resource development (seen in a broad and holistic sense is an investment in human capital to meet the organization's strategic agenda) should be the ultimate priority of the PS and government as whole.¹⁵ Government has got to provide a policy framework for HRD. Institutions must develop expertise to manage HRM. HRD must be more effectively planned and managed.

7.6 Financing arrangements for the next PASP.

Sufficient resources will have to be made available to drive the HRD agenda through effective support, properly planned monitoring and evaluation interventions, and the establishment of clear accountability lines and reporting structures. PS bodies have long been left to rely on development partners in terms of identifying resources for staff development. Primary responsibility for investing in HRD lies with the government. Government will have to mobilise domestic resources to support HRD over the long haul. Government should include HRD in budget priorities. Government should consider launching a donor-supported Governance programme to support HRD to complement government's investment in human capital development.

¹⁵ Here, human resource development in the Public Service is defined as those efforts undertaken by organizations to ensure that employees are well prepared to undertake their responsibilities and grow into viable careers, thereby adding value to the productivity and service of their organizations, the motivation and performance of their peers and the attainment of the overall vision of the developmental state. In doing so, organizations seek to ensure that the right people are prepared at the right place, at the right time and for the right positions to which they can readily contribute.

7.7 Strengthening ownership of the next PASP

It is recommended that when the next PASP is adopted by cabinet, each public administration sector entity should affirm its commitment to the PASP's intent and priorities. The centre of government (as defined in the attached note on 'centre of government' agencies) should hold sector bodies accountable for their responsibility to integrate the plan's strategies and activities in their respective corporate plans and to monitor and report on the implementation of the strategies and activities in accordance with the plan's M&E framework

7.8 Cross-cutting issues

The next PASP should address the critical cross-cutting issues of gender equality, disability, anti and climate and disaster risk management.

The cross-cutting issues of gender, disability, anticorruption and climate change and disaster risk management should be mainstreamed in all plans and policies of public administration sector institutions.

A gender perspective in the next PASP is of critical importance. Gender equality is a human right and a pre-requisite for poverty reduction and sustainable development. Gender equality is achieved when women and men, girls and boys, have equal rights, conditions, opportunities and power to shape their own lives and affect society. The PASP's interventions on gender equality could focus on the following aspects of the gender equality agenda.

- Access to services;
- Women's political participation and influence;
- Women's economic empowerment and working conditions;
- Sexual and reproductive rights and health;
- Girls and women's education
- Women's security, including combatting all forms of gender-based violence and human trafficking.

8. CONCLUSION.

The public sector plays a dominant role in Samoa. In the 1990s, Samoa distinguished itself as a leading public policy reformer in the Pacific region. Its policies transformed the economy from incurring high budget deficits and state-dominated import substitution to achieving macroeconomic stability, free trade, and a reduced role for the state. The far-reaching reforms undertaken by the Government of Samoa resulted in the region's highest sustained rate of economic growth in the decade between 1996 and 2006, and a sharp improvement in Samoa's human development indicators 2006 (ADB 2008).

There is a consensus in and outside government that the momentum for public sector reform has slackened or stalled. The last major reform of the public administration (outside of public finance) were introduced almost two decades. Institutional knowledge about the substance of past reforms, their impact and their 'unfinished business' aspect is limited in the PS.

While the reforms of the past have had a positive impact on the PS, there are aspects of the PS that need strengthening. The policy framework for the PS calls for revitalization. Capacity for policy making needs improvement. Policy coordination must be streamlined. Development of human resources to meet the needs of both the public sector and private enterprises must be elevated to a key

priority of the national development agenda, and work to further improve transparency, integrity and accountability in government must continue.

The process of moving the PS to next level must start with identifying and addressing most pressing and important problems (some of which have been identified in this Report). Strategies for addressing these problems must be grounded in a good understanding of the political economy and country context. Strong, consistent and well-placed political leadership will be essential for revitalizing and driving the reform process.



Samoa Governance Support Programme

Tanoa Hotel
Conference Fale
Sogi, Apia, Samoa

Tel: +685 84 222 23