

Appendix

As noted above, we tested the Prototype and its components with the public and public servants

- In workshops; and
- On Dialogue – the Department’s online engagement platform (here: <https://engage.industry.gov.au/draft-framework-for-public-participation-in-the-public-services-work>).

Below we have sorted and analysed that feedback on our overall prototyping process + all of the prototype components.

We have sorted and analysed using the following headings:

- Summary text: A summary of the feedback.
- Recommendation: What we will change based on that feedback.
- Raw feedback: Exact quotes/records of the feedback, for transparency.

Overall feedback on the prototyping process

Summary text: We received a range of feedback on our overall process. In particular, we note that people suggested we include all or parts of our work in the 2nd Open Government National Action Plan (in development – see: <https://pmc.gov.au/news-centre/public-data/development-australias-second-open-government-national-action-plan>).

Recommendation: Raise relevant work in context of development of second National Action Plan.

Raw feedback:

- What does the research show is helpful in engaging people? ...
- Is it a case of Industry 'eating its own dogfood' as far as engagement goes?
- Also, thinking about this would be very helpful in thinking about what might be included in both future commitments, and built into the structure of engagement framework to optimise for improved engagement patterns.

Analysis: Ensuring that any engagement processes we recommend might require tailored probity advice – our standard ways of undertaking probity might not be sufficient for more advanced engagements (especially deliberations and collaborations).

- It was ages ago, and it may be too late for this feedback, but at the prototype workshop I undertook to find out how the Department of Social Services’ Try, Test and Learn Fund people had been managing probity through their processes. The reason this is important for the framework is that my colleagues have been actively engaging in quite extensive ‘deliberate’ and ‘collaborate’ engagement processes with service providers who may or may

not then end up with funding as a result of the completion of the engagement process. Hence their focus on probity.

- After discussion with my colleagues, I've come to the conclusion that somewhere (whether it's the framework itself or tools accompanying, etc.) the APS (who the framework is aimed at) should be made aware of the possible probity issues that could be introduced if using a 'deliberate' or 'collaborate' engagement process that engages with organisations that could be eligible for funding through a subsequent competitive funding process. What I learnt from my colleagues is that the probity advice will need to be bespoke; standard probity advice will not cut it for these engagements.

Objective component

Summary text: Feedback focussed on capturing the mutually beneficial aspect of good engagement – it can help both government and civil society. Concerns were raised that it is very public service focussed.

Recommendation: Acknowledge in Objectives that engagement can be mutually beneficial, and the degree of public influence on developing the framework.

Raw feedback: Some feedback focused on how the Objectives do not sufficiently acknowledge that engagement is beneficial for the public, as well as the public service.

- Do we need to acknowledge that engagement is a mutually beneficially thing – noting that the public has a right to be involved in decisions that affect them.
- Very public service focused – are we implying that we will retain decision-making power, should it?
- Important to note degree of public influence on the framework, that it was collaboratively developed
- Do we need to say anything about the Australian community?

There were suggestions to note when and how the public might be included.

- Note about when to include the public – people were keen to be involved in early stages, but leave the end parts to experts – rather than talking to people at the end, when you've already narrowed down to a few options.
- Participation throughout the entire development process can be useful for continuous improvement.

The objective might also be worded more strongly to suggest that engagement must (not just should) change.

- Could it set a stricter expectation/imperative to change practices?

Guiding principles for engagement and participation

Summary text: Specific feedback was received on each of the principles. Most focused on amending the language to add nuance. Others identified risks – related to misuse of the principles, or their lack of use.

Recommendation: Language will be amended to make it more specific, precise and consistent in accordance with feedback. A glossary will also be added, and other guidance on how to apply the principles to address some of the risks.

Analytical text:

Keep terminologies consistent

- Really need to include 'Accessible' in the principles – for people you're engaging with.
- Is there too much text?
- Blue background was hard to read.
- How do we define 'community'? Community may vary depending on where you work in the Commonwealth.
- Is it exclusive in the way it talks about experts? Not everyone may identify as this. Also, can we add some about cultural sensitivities? Might read as only talking to experts.
- Could we add a glossary?

Layout

- Blue background hard to read.
- Is there too much text?

Risks

- Can be gamed.
- Can become tick and flick.
- These principles are important. But actually doing them is even more important. Are the principles an educational tool for the public service (less useful) or will they inform concrete actions which the APS will take in engaging (more useful)?
- Is having an approved set of engagement principles so formulaic as to prescribe how the APS engages with the public? For example, the Murray Darling Basin Plan report was burnt on camera by those the public service had "consulted".
- The application of these principles are context dependent - especially if you are dealing with wicked problems. This might mean throwing away the rule book that so many APS practitioners rely on and building a relationship with someone whose life and work is directly impacted by a government decision.

IAP2

- Don't reinvent the wheel – borrow from other jurisdictions / IAP2.
- Similar to common language.

Specific Language changes and amendments to principles

- Language is very public service centred – can it focus more on what's already out there, and working with that?
- Can we really say we won't waste people's time – maybe more our intention not to waste time – e.g. we have turnover ourselves that slow us down etc – maybe try to make best use of your time- part of the sales job to help people understand that it is genuine.
- When we engage people we will provide feedback that closes the loop. Maybe the same principles could apply internally to the APS? This might require trickling down from the top.

- Be real -- could it be 'be transparent – or maybe some other option? But we've used simple language – could we say 'authentic' 'genuine' – so real maybe not so bad'.
- First point under be real, first point under be open – very similar – could we shorten to 'influence' here?
- Can we add 'roadmap'.
- Can we have an overarching principle about putting the client at the centre of everything we do, something like that? Although, will we really do that?
- Limitations and constraints might be more effective.
- Is there scope to include something about being inclusive? Equal opportunity to engage people from different sectors, statuses in society for eg – maybe in the 'be real' section?
- Can we frame so to the norm, make a bit more about transparency, good engagement by default – unless...
- Listen can we make this a bit stronger? More about taking on board?
- We will try to remember what has gone before and not keep asking the same questions.
- 'Be real': Need to unpack what this means to make it possible.
- Be open: Issue re expectations – if we mandate something too strict is there a risk people will avoid it – level of detail, complexity.
- Be open about the *environment*/context too + need to link with making time principle above, noting the nature of the work can make this difficult, acknowledges the ideal and the reality.

Re this principle: We understand that there is expertise in the community that can help deliver outcomes and we are committed to listening more than telling.

- The community would like (and has a right to) define outcomes too – can we make cleaner?
- Can we be clearer about definition of 'expertise'.
- Could include knowledge, of their experience – can we get a really clear definition up front e.g. experts in their own lives.
- What is the expectation of public servants of obligations to involve citizens in outcomes etc – different motivator to do it.
- Citizens might not see themselves as experts.
- Language suggestion: Design and delivery of outcomes.
- Let's ensure the language is clear, and there isn't unintended barriers to engagement through the language that we use.
- We will engage the right people at the right stage? As early in our processes as we can.
- REAL Suggested change; Genuine? Accessible?
- We will be clear on our objectives and chose ways to engage that match our intent. We won't waste people's time language suggestion – fit for purpose?
- When we engage people we will provide feedback that closes the loop
- Still no mention of it being a right for citizens to be engaged – should this be addressed?
- For be open: Sharing learnings – add this?
- OGP language could fit in here re openness?

Ways of engaging

Summary text: Feedback was received on each of the ways to engage within the report.

Recommendation: Language will be amended to ensure it is consistent, precise and clear. Glossary will also be included to provide clarity. We could integrate IAP2 standards more, or at least acknowledge them and provide more context as to why we are adding to them.

Raw feedback:

A number of participants queried why this component was necessary given that IAP2 standards already exist, and/or how the ways of engaging would be reconciled/coordinated with these.

- Could I use IAP2?
- Not good to have something that is different from what is already industry standard or well-known e.g. IAP2.
- Do the existing ones work?
- IAP2 recognises more complex mechanisms than this.
- If this contradicts or is different to well-known stuff like IAP2 might actually undermine building a common language.
- The APS is full of frameworks already.

Others wondered whether this language would be accepted given that the public service is diverse, and does not have a common language for engagement activities.

- Not clear – in particular, a lot of agencies will have different interpretations of these ways, or different frames.
- Service delivery in particular – people from this background might not understand the ways of engaging – e.g. in Indigenous policy many people would never use submissions for consultation, so it's a bad example for them.
- Keep it in plain English.
- How do we carry the concepts from consultation on policy development, through to ongoing consultations and refinement in service delivery phase?

Indeed, there was a fair bit of confusion about terminology.

- Is this different to the way others use the word deliberate – it has to meet more specific requirements to meet this e.g. picking certain people, given people time, neutral accurate information, and a charge on which to deliberate. Also, is there a bit in between these – like involve in the IAP2 spectrum? Risks creating unrealistic expectations, and 2) limits approaches that might be valid but not as onerous as deliberate and collaborate.
- For share: UK good example of info sharing – UK civil service site has a central whole of government policy page – can subscribe for alerts – possible good example to draw on.
- For deliberate: Is there enough on the end user? is this where co-design fits.

The Citizen Panel

Summary text: Concerns were raised about ensuring the panel is not biased, diverse in capability and background, and representative of the population.

Recommendation: Will need to resolve concerns and operational issues raised when designing the citizen panel. If the final design does not address all of these concerns, ensure we explain why.

Analytical text:

User surveys

- Could we use more user surveys (AusIndustry has done these) to tap into expertise, if this doesn't work?

- Could give a decision more authority if tested with users through the panel, or surveys.
- ABS does a fair bit of user testing – it can get retirees, unemployed people, but stock standard 9-5 professionals – very tricky to get involved – how will you do this?

Recruitment and ethical concerns

- How to make representative? Picking good people important.
- Ethics of the engagement important – DHS already has something like this – privacy and application of technology.
- Multidisciplinary – might need people with capability in public participation.
- How will you get good people?
- Ethical.
- Useful to avoid appearance of bias in policymaking.
- Flawed: might get over engaged by old people who are recreational complainers.
- Won't get a single mum working part time, or a people who left high school in year 10, etc. so won't be representative.
- Anyone who would agree to be part of this wouldn't be representative.
- Majority of people who get involved are for negative reasons.
- Potential for bias at every step here – make sure you control for this.
- Always need different publics for different problems.
- If you're a disinterested observer who you're trying to pub test ideas with, why would they get involved?
- Better to recruit for a particular panel at a particular time.
- How do you get underrepresented groups involved?
- Technology – can it be used to reach people?
- How do you make it accessible?
- Getting rid of its bias is hard to do.

Operational issues

- Needs to work with specific topics if it happens.
- Might be especially useful earlier in the policy process.
- Wouldn't want to rely on the panel alone though.
- Citizen jury example to draw on: Moorebank intermobile company (www.milc.gov.au or mlc.gov.au) – was how might \$1 million be spent on community benefit.
- This isn't a citizen jury – don't hold it out as such.
- Language not consistent – what is the idea here?
- Really need to pay people.
- Level of commitment would be a big deal for most people.
- Digital option: could use the census to ask questions to test things.
- Could there be easier ways to get public input/voice into your work?
- Don't underestimate the time impost and logistics – lots of things to get right.
- Things like this have worked in niche areas and bridging the gap between sectors and different areas of government.
- This part of this proposal concerns me, "Panels would provide no-binding recommendations." The panel would just ask, what's the point?

- The ACT Government recently held a citizens panel on changes to the CTP Insurance. The Jury CHOSE the new scheme. The jury's decision appears to be binding. Why should this good idea be limited by a no-binding recommendation?
- I think there are situations where you wouldn't want it to be binding (boatie mcboatface) but other situations where it should be binding. But in general this sort of consultation is highly valuable because you receive input from the "person on the street". If executive remuneration tribunals and the like had this more representative composition, there would be some much better outcomes in this country.

Engagement reporting and metrics

Summary text: Participants were very supportive in principle, even if they acknowledge metrics are difficult to do in practice. They want this as a way to also measure cultural change. Some examples were discussed on what this could look like.

Recommendation: Ensure any engagement metrics devised ensures transparency, accountability and incentivises engagement.

Analytical text:

What it could look like

- Some kind of measure/transparency/incentivise/accountability to get the cultural change.
- Reporting useful.
- Really hard to get.
- Capability is mixed – need to get ta consistent baseline though – tricky.
- Needs to come from the community as well.
- Needs to include a list of examples where certain methodologies got applied.
- Do this, even though it's hard.
- Go for 1-2 metrics and make transparent from the start.
- Possible metrics “was engagement considered for this process?” “How did it get included?”
- Good idea – what gets measured gets done.
- Start with simple metrics, how many people, how many times did you engage, how did you take it into account etc. Can go bigger as people get better at engagement.
- Challenge: how do you track how feedback was taken into account?

Why you need metrics

- Even if metrics are not very good, increase trust through transparency.
- Even just numbers might help (rather than just qual metrics).

Examples

- APS Census, State of the Service offer places where we could put some metrics.
- Innovation statement – the Innovation snapshot – could go in here.
- The Hub can do this.

General engagement standards

Summary text: Overall participants found this section very useful, but they would like more integration between the standards and principles.

Recommendation: Will integrate the standards with the principles, and decide whether it is a standard, set of behaviours or guidelines.

Analytical text:

Generally speaking, people liked this component.

- The establishment of a standard would set a clear expectation for the APS on what is required to effectively engage the broader community, it would also give community members confidence of what to expect from the APS.

Standard or guidelines?

- A standard should be able to tell you whether you meet them or not – so definitive statements. Given that – are these standards or guidelines?
- Maybe don't call it 'specific standards' but rather 'expected behaviours' or 'guiding behaviours'. Have a look at the 'National Statement of Principle' on child safety as an example.
- Need a threshold test: when is it worth consulting or sharing information.
- Need more connection between principles, standards, and specific standards. Need it all to flow together.
- Principles are aspirations/vision and the standard is the 'how to' guidance. Should be placed together.
- The General Engagement Standards appeared to be more 'Guiding Principles' to me. Having said that, I liked them.
- Standards to me are more something which would support Engagement Reporting and Metrics (or an extension of it). They would be measurable, and set clear 'standards' that need to be met. Examples of what I see standards to be are things such as: Evidence that non-English speaking groups were provided a channel to contribute, Evidence Rural Communities consulted, Evidence non-digital channels available, Evidence community provided with information on budget, political, community, environmental issues related to the policy, evidence community provided with feedback on ideas they put forward.

Accountability

- Need accountability mechanisms if standards are not complied with: random auditing, need to explain why the process was skipped.
- Provide positive incentives e.g., awards, have champions such as PSIN.

Raising awareness and obtaining buy in

- Must have buy in from above e.g., secretaries.
- Could implement and promote through online and face to face training through APSC.

Lessons learnt

- Have a feedback loop – have surveys.
- Maybe should have a standard on 'continuous improvement'
- Really liked the 'promise the public' section.

- I agreed with a comment made on my table that the 'Promise to the Public' is a very powerful concepts and should be given more prominence (perhaps up front?).

Toolkit and methodologies

Summary text: Concerns were raised by participants on who will manage, promote and take responsibility for it. A number of solutions were also discussed under 'design issues'.

Recommendation: Ensure mechanisms are in place to make toolkit accessible, up to date, and promote it widely.

Analytical text:

Raising awareness

- To raise awareness, could have a first team in each department using the toolkit and then to use that as a case study – some early adopter.
- The toolkit could go on iCentral (or a department's intranet).
- Needs to be supported by a Centre of Excellence.
- Needs ongoing promotion to be embedded and really work.
- This is fundamentally change management – so use these techniques.
- I personally feel this should be obvious, but having them there won't hurt.

Design issues

- The quality of this toolkit obviously depends on how good its advice is.
- Needs to be hosted by an individual department – adapted to their communications channels – with context on individual agencies' own sites and maybe then linking to a central place where it is stored (the Hub's website?).
- Staggering implementation a good idea: start with early adopter sections, use it on high impact people, to prove it'll work first. Also those early adopters should be working on something interesting and 'not dry'.
- This needs to be obviously useful for a range of different users – so ensure there is a case study of people using it for each department to prove that.
- I would not want to read the whole thing – how could I easily find the parts relevant to me?
- Who will volunteer their resources/information for the toolkit? Will they want to be case studies? Or can you trust the case studies offered up to be genuinely good examples?
- Keeping current difficult (assuming people adopt it).
- I like the idea of being able to search – not having to go through 300 pages in the toolkit to find something useful.
- Search by function useful – not everything will be useful to everyone, depends on what they're doing.
- Service delivery: Consultation with specific customers and tailoring to this would be useful (e.g. cultural sensitivities) .
- Needs to give people help to do it.
- Make it simple – do you need to engage? When? About what?
- Provide assistance with the different methodologies - a process – good steps on how to actually plan an engagement.

- E.g. what is the purpose, who are stakeholders? How do you read them? What are the key messages about the project?
- Who will maintain it? Promote it? Central authority needed.
- What is included has to be doable for government.
- Needs context on how to use and where to link to other resources, including evidence on how it has worked.
- Accessibility crucial: if you have to search the document and get lots of hits – how do you make it easy to find.
- Fantastic idea to start with – good practice, case studies are a good idea.

Continuous improvement

- How would you get feedback and iterate the toolkit?

Enforcement

- Can this be mandated?
- What authority does it have?
- Assessing people on its use is important – carrots and sticks.
- Not a compliance thing, but could it be? Will it be perceived as such?

Previous Examples

- OBPR best practice regulation guide – how did they do this? And/or are there other models to learn from?
- Rate of adoption will be low – needs to be used/built into existing processes and accepted as part of the job.
- Can help make the argument as to why it should be used.
- Policy lab – “What you can do if you have one day” is a great way to frame the information in the toolkit.
- IAP2 has a tool kit like this – methods and categories.

The Engagement Marketplace

Summary text: The concept and the model was very popular with the workshop participants. Some design suggestions were received which we have agreed to incorporate.

Recommendation: Keep as it is, and provide more details when implementing.

Analytical text:

Establish common language

- Need to ensure that everyone has common understanding of terminologies and clearly articulates what is required from the task.

Ensure consistency

- Risk that the brief describing the task may not be sufficient.
- Need to have set template and practical milestones.

Validation

- Need to be able to do proper referee check-ups. The DTA one apparently didn't have a proper verification process and anyone could be part of the panel.

Raising awareness

- Need to ensure there are enough users – raising awareness and promoting.
- Accessibility – need to ensure people are aware and has the technology and skills to fill out the online form, is aware of the market place.

The Engagement Network

Summary text: People were happy with this component, but note that its success really depends on implementation. We received a few suggestions for implementation.

Recommendation: Add search capability to the network.

Raw feedback:

- Useful network.
- Needs search capability to find other members.
- A good quality search capability – something that works.
- Ideally as simple as a google search to find someone.

Exchange programmes/secondments

Summary text: This component was really well received. There were a few great suggestions on how to make the implementation more feasible.

Recommendation: No changes, just some practical suggestions that will be considered when implementing this component.

Analytical text:

Positive feedback

- Desirability = high.
- Spending time with a provider is a good idea.

Raising awareness and obtaining buy-in

- Could get Secretaries writing to each other, requesting seconders, to implement this one.
- Need buy-in from higher up and plan for sharing information afterwards – should be included in the MoU – think it through before starting.

Implementation Issues

- Need to consider issues such as:
 - Who pays?

- People are protective about their ASL, as well as their best workers.
- Incentives for external stakeholders.
- Security clearance.
- HR functions are already too stretched.
- Might be more feasible with longer term secondments rather than shorter term.
- The right people need to be sent. Can't be someone who has a vested interest. Otherwise they may manipulate outcome or learning.
- Learning could be captured in an objective factual based template, which is standardised for everyone.
- Need to ensure the purpose of the secondment is well articulated and there is a benefit to both parties.
- If it is a mutually beneficial objective then both parties should pay wage 50-50. If it's one sided then only one party should pay.
- Can do this as a trial/pilot basis to smooth out the implementation issues before doing it widely.
- There is a lot of talk about secondments but the bureaucracy is astounding. It is about making it substantially easier for staff to undertake them while knowing they will have a permanent position after secondments are completed.
- Indeed, we have talked a lot about secondments. And there is a general consensus that they are very useful. However, I can't see them happening much at all. Is this too expensive? Impracticable? Is there a way to take this forward?

Previous successful example

- PM&C used to send out their grads to Qantas, Indigenous communities etc. This was about 2 years ago.
- There is already Operation Free Range, but it would be nice to extend the concept to across the APS.

The Engagement Hub

Summary text: Discussion focussed on the hub's role, activities, governance, and accessibility.

Recommendation: Ensure design issues raised are tackled and mechanisms are in place to promote the Hub.

Analytical text:

Raising awareness

- How will you make everyday people aware of this?

Design issues

- It won't solve everything but useful.
- Look closer to home, rather than the hub – that is, will people look for support within their own agency rather than try to contact an 'outside' hub? Will they even be allowed to look outside their agency? Or will they be afraid of relying on a resource outside their agency?

- How does the hub have relevant information? How will users find its information easily? It will have to be a 'digital hub' too.
- Could the hub include government business managers, in order to reach out to agencies? This was done in Indigenous Communities – a go between for Indigenous communities and the Public Service.
- Have a greater emphasis on digital.
- Make it easy to use – plug and play.
- Governance will be a big challenge.
- Needs to be practical – eg if I'm designing a survey, can the Hub make comments on questions like 'do these questions really achieve their purpose?'
- Good idea, people need help with the basics.

Hub activities

- Could have 'citizen engagement officer' equivalents that work with the hub.
- Can I test hub products – will they overlap with what is mandated in my department?
- Can the hub help coordinate APS engagement?
- Could shadow, go through the decision-making process.
- Can provide advice, build engagement consistency in the APS, governance
- Provide advice, consistency (need good governance).
- Build capacity essential.

Has potential to a bridge between Civil Society and the APS

- Could the Hub ask Civil Society to suggest engagement projects it would like, with the Hub scaffolding them?

Examples

- Bizlab a good example of a webpage that the Hub could copy.
- Hub and Spoke Data Integration Framework could be a model to learn from.
- Coordinate the Hub with existing bodies.