

## **Part III : Summary Report**

**APEC Workshop on  
Government Performance and Results Management  
26-28 March 2008  
Chinese Taipei**

**SUMMARY REPORT**

Chinese Taipei, in conjunction with its co-sponsor New Zealand, held a workshop on Government Performance and Results Management on 27-28 March 2008 in Taipei. The meeting was attended by Australia; Canada; Hong Kong, China; Indonesia; Japan; the Republic of Korea; Malaysia; New Zealand; Peru; Singapore; Chinese Taipei; Thailand; the United States of America; and Viet Nam.

**I. Opening Remarks**

**Dr. Jay N. Shih**, Minister of the Research, Development and Evaluation Commission under the Cabinet, Chinese Taipei, warmly welcomed all representatives, speakers and moderators from member economies to this workshop.

**Prof. Bob Buckle**, Chair of the Economic Committee, hoped that the workshop would contribute to a culture of “producing concrete results with public money,” that would benefit all APEC stakeholders, from business to civil society and the ordinary citizen in the APEC region. He also stated three objectives of this workshop: understanding good practice in planning and setting objectives for government agencies in the public sectors, exchanging ideas on monitoring and measuring agency progress, and evaluating performance in order to promote better public sector governance. Prof. Buckle suggested this workshop might help promote the benefits of structural reform in the various APEC economies, as well as raise awareness and stimulate new ideas through the exchange of experiences about managing the overall performance of public agencies and individual project results of government agencies.

**Dr. Brain McCulloch**, Coordinator of the Friends of the Chair Group on Public Sector Governance, Economic Committee, expressed his appreciation to all parties involved in organizing this workshop and shared some recent achievements in the public sector governance theme of the Economic Committee’s work program in pursuit of the APEC Leaders’ Agenda to Implement Structural Reform (LAISR).

**II. Keynote Address:  
Performance Management: It’s the Results that Count**

**The Honourable Jocelyne Bourgon**, President Emeritus of the Canada School of Public Service and Distinguished Fellow, Centre for International Governance Innovation, delivered the keynote address summarized as follows:

- Future trends in public administration involve moving from an intellectual framework of multiple separations (policy/operations, market/democracy, politics/administration, etc.) to one of multiple democratic interactions, with reliance on coordination between agencies, intermediate outcomes, intangible results, indirect tools, and citizen engagement, to meet the imperatives of serving in the 21st Century.
- Separated from the political process, public debate and management decision-making, performance measurement and management is simply an instrument of control and an expensive one at that. Performance management in government needs to be repositioned to improve its performance. The ultimate worth of the system is the use made of it by managers, by elected officials and ultimately by citizens.
- Repositioning performance management must start with clarity of purpose: The goal of performance management should be to improve decision-making in government at all levels in order to achieve better public results and enhance the net public value of those results.
- The test of good performance management is to: 1) contribute to better decisions by managers, 2) contribute to better public policy decisions by elected officials and improve understanding of public policy choices open to citizens, 3) help identify and remove the obstacles to better results, and 4) shed light on the reasons for failures and the need for adjustments.
- A public sector performance management system should be designed as one integrated but differentiated system responding to different needs and purposes: 1) the agency – keeping in mind the particular needs of managers and the users of the services, 2) system-wide – keeping in mind the particular needs of ministers, elected officials and the legislature; and 3) societal – keeping in mind the need for accountability to the general public for good government and good governance. The focus of performance management in government should be about improved decision-making to achieve results – because it is the results that count.
- Performance management should support better decisions by managers, better public policy decisions by elected officials and a better understanding of public policy choices by citizens. On all these counts, performance management is under-performing and is at risk. Performance management needs to be re-positioned. More measures and more indicators will not guarantee better results and are, therefore, not the answer.
- At the agency level, performance management needs to become an instrument of innovation and performance improvement, not an instrument of control and compliance. It should help to free the agency of unnecessary and costly controls in order to speed up the process of innovation.
- As government programs were born out of a political process, the focus of performance management needs to shift to system-wide results and reintegrate elected officials and citizens. This is where the greatest benefits could be achieved.
- System-wide and societal results, political decision-making and citizen engagement

are mutually reinforcing. When effective integration is achieved, the capacity of the country to provide good government and good governance is enhanced. Public trust is the ultimate measure of good government and good governance. This is the result that counts the most.

### Discussion

- **Mr. Rudolph Lohmeyer** from the United States questioned what capacities government must have to deal with the challenges of public policies in the future. The Honourable Jocelyne Bourgon responded that building capacities and using existing capacities are both important for results.
- **Dr. Yu-Hsieh Sung** from Chinese Taipei questioned how to balance administration and politics. The Honourable Jocelyne Bourgon responded that building capacities and using existing capacities are both important for results. Administration and politics should be viewed as one system and should take each other into account.
- **Dr. Hanh Tran Thi** from Viet Nam asked how performance management might be applied in her country. The Honourable Jocelyne Bourgon noted that performance management in government should improve decision-making to achieve results. This is the result that counts the most.

## **III. Session 1: Whole-of-Government Strategic Planning**

### Speech

**Mr. Jón R. Blöndal**, Deputy Head of Budgeting and Public Expenditures Division, Public Government Directorate, OECD, delivered a speech summarized as follows:

- There are two major areas of action in the OECD. One is the Forum of Officials, in which officials from member countries discuss various issues. Another is policy research, which conducts policy evaluation on member countries in some fields such as economics, etc.
- The description of government performance and management: The most important question for dealing with a budget is: what can I achieve with the money I have? Each country has its own way of budgeting, so there is no standard solution to the challenges of performance and management. The goals include improving decision-making, paying more attention to performance and management, providing more information for priorities, enhancing planning and transparency, and improving management. However, few countries have successfully integrated performance and results into their budget processes. It is not a magic bullet, and perceptions and definitions vary; however, it is a long-term process. It is better for the budget to be allocated in different fields, but this might ignore some other considerations, such as political commitments. Successful performance and results management is the key aspect of public policy management reform, which should replace traditional input

control. The roles of agencies are also crucial. Budget management agencies should be given a cabinet-level post, such as under the supervision of the President/Prime Minister's office or the Ministry of Finance. It involves leadership, strategic planning, investment in human resources and coordination among agencies.

- Outcome and production are equally important. It is easier to measure results in some fields. It is not appropriate to set goals for everything; credibility and reliability are also important. There are other methods of evaluation, such as peer review. Information overload should be avoided, with only the amount required by users to be provided. The biggest challenge comes from politicians, since they often pay attention exclusively to budgeting and ignore the subsequent process. Strong leadership is required to reverse this phenomenon, and they must also face lobbying from interest groups.
- Planning is also important. Consistency and long-term processes should be considered while budgeting. Unrealistic projections often appear in the budgeting of countries, which means planning and budgeting can be difficult to integrate.
- In conclusion, similar reforms have been undertaken, or are under way, across OECD countries but from different starting points and with different speeds and different emphasis.

#### Economy Experience Sharing 1 – Chinese Taipei

**Dr. Yu-Hsieh Sung**, Chief Secretary of the Research, Development and Evaluation Commission, Chinese Taipei, shared the experience of Chinese Taipei as follows:

- Chinese Taipei has established a two-level Government Plan/Program Management Scheme for good governance of ministerial strategic plans and individual programs. Chinese Taipei has also built an ICT-based plan/program performance management system, which has proved to be effective.
- Review and evaluation of the 4-year overall ministerial strategic plan review and evaluation is to measure the overall performance of each ministry by applying strategic management and outcome-oriented methods. Individual medium- and long-term program review and evaluations focus on performance management and evaluation of significant programs implemented by government agencies.
- The RDEC has built the “Web-Based Government Plan/Program Performance Management” (GPMnet) to enhance the performance of agencies in plan/program management. This system is also integrated with the plan/program knowledge management operations to provide support and reference for policy-making efforts of the various government agencies and achieve the goal of online management of all government plan/programs.
- Chinese Taipei's experience provides some suggestions: 1) develop online auditing mechanisms to improve ministry internal control, 2) integrate other administrative management information systems (such as budget) to support top-level decision-making, 3) introduce the GPMnet to local governments to promote nationwide performance management, and 4) exchange ideas on good governance

among the international community.

- Objectives for government plan/program performance management:
  - Accountability: Everybody knows which ministry accounts for what kind of plan/program implemented in a specific time and place;
  - Transparency: Everybody can get performance evaluation information about ministry plans and programs online;
  - Participation: Everybody may participate during the review and evaluation process of ministry plans and programs.

### Economy Experience Sharing 2 – U. S. A

**Mr. Daren Wong**, Program Examiner of Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, U. S. A., shared the experience of the United States as follows:

- The United States Government has a series of laws and regulations concerning budget performance and management. These have been gradually established since the 1960s, and some successes have been seen. The Office of Management and Budget, under the supervision of the President, provides advice and recommendation regarding budgeting.
- The Government Performance Results Act of 1993 lays out a series of requirements for agencies on such topics as strategic planning, and annual performance planning and reporting. The Program Assessment Rating Tool evaluates performance and management from four dimensions. The Performance Improvement Initiative requires regular meetings of budgeting officials from different agencies for communication and coordination in order to improve performance results. Most agencies have improved.
- The President signed Executive Order 13450 in November 2007, which sets some directives for improving government performance and management. The order states that government must use the taxpayers' money in an efficient way. Specific goals and plans must be provided by heads of agencies. The position of Performance Improvement Officer is established to supervise performance results and provide advice to the heads of each agency. Performance Improvement Officers (PIOs) from each agency form the Performance Improvement Council, which discusses the performance results, exchanges information, coordinates the continuous process of government performance evaluation, and keeps the public informed.
- Congress amended the law in 2003 to link the salary of the head and officials of each agency with the performance results. Assessment processes must be conducted in each agency in order to launch the government's improvement plan on performance and management.

#### **IV. Session 2: Good Practice in Planning and Objective Setting of Government Agencies**

##### Speech

**Prof. John Halligan**, Research Professor of Government and Public Administration, School of Business and Government, University of Canberra, Australia, delivered the following speech:

- This speech has two topics: 1) good practice in planning and objective setting of government agencies, and 2) understanding management for performance through a comparison of official models and practice.
- Firstly, an integrated planning and management for performance framework was presented. Government engages not only in results-oriented strategic planning based on stakeholder input and previous performance, but also in valid and accurate performance measurement that reflects progress towards goals with a clear and well communicated purpose. As for the management for performance framework, government, legislative and regulatory roles are on the top in Australia. The next, in the framework, are the outcomes and outputs structure, business planning and budget cycle links, which are also connected to corporate planning and governance. The bottom of the framework includes organizational, individual and team performance reviews and feedback.
- Professor Halligan noted that the focus is on the specific results of outcomes. Planned outcomes are the results, or community and environmental effects and impacts, intended by government. Four functions of outcomes are mentioned: to define expected impacts from agency activity, to delineate parameters for agency outputs, to specify the purpose of budget appropriations, and to provide the legislature and other external stakeholders with a statement of goals. Secondly, Professor Halligan compared official models and practice by analyzing the ideal type, country model and degree of implementation. Generally speaking, performance management is the most appropriate model because of its hierarchical performance measurement systems, systemically internal integration, and its coherence, consistency and comprehensive coverage. The performance management model applies in Australia, UK, Canada, USA and New Zealand.

##### Economy Experience Sharing 3 - Canada

**Dr. Ivan Blake**, Executive Director of Management Accountability, Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, shared experiences in Canada as follows:

- The Canadian experience is characterized by a focus on accountability and results within a coherent and integrated framework of management expectations. Dr. Blake emphasized two initiatives to strengthen planning and objective setting and the efficient and effective delivery of results: the renewal of the Expenditure Management System (EMS) and the Management Accountability Framework

(MAF).

- The EMS is the joint responsibility of Finance, the Privy Council Office and the Treasury Board Secretariat. As a result of the EMS, massive spending reductions in the mid-90s have yielded a decade of surpluses. To ensure government programs generate better results and greater value for money, the Government of Canada announced the renewal of the Expenditure Management System in 2006. The renewed EMS has the following key features: 1) the Cabinet examines all new spending proposals taking into account the funding and performance of existing programs, 2) departments are expected to manage programs against planned results and formally evaluate programs, 3) the Treasury Board leads a review of departments' program spending over a four-year cycle to assess whether they are achieving the intended results, are managed efficiently and are aligned with the government's priorities, 4) reviews are to identify 5% of spending that can be freed for reallocation to higher priorities either internally or across the Public Service.
- The Federal Accountability Act was passed in December 2006 to set out clear management expectations for senior executives and to assess capacity and management performance government-wide. The Act put even greater emphasis on accountability and transparency in government operations. In its management office role, the Treasury Board Secretariat is promoting management excellence in several ways, such as streamlining its policies and clarifying their consequences, and looking for ways to reduce the reporting burden it imposes and to risk-manage its transactions with departments. To clarify its expectations and summarize the conditions required for management excellence, the Treasury Board Secretariat developed the Management Accountability Framework (MAF). Using the MAF, the Treasury Board Secretariat assesses 21 areas of management in all departments by rating them as 'strong', 'acceptable', 'opportunity for improvement' or 'attention required'. MAF assessments are now an established part of the annual departmental and government-wide planning and accountability cycle. Assessments represent the Treasury Board Secretariat's "opinion," and findings are made public along with departmental responses. Moreover, assessments are being used as input in resource allocation decisions and to risk-manage departmental business with the Treasury Board. The MAF is also becoming the template for deputy minister appearances before parliamentary committees.

### Discussion

- **Mr. Yap** from Singapore raised questions about how different public sectors have done in capturing specific outcomes among several agencies, and how to make outcomes more measurable. Dr. Halligan replied that a framework can help operate outcome measurement, and the shared outcome may focus on the inter-government agenda and the context. Dr. Blake responded it is important for horizontal management to frame the work and build an information system, and the MAF can help to examine the capacity of departments and to monitor policy compliance.



## V. Session 3: Monitoring and Measuring Agency Progress, and Evaluating Performance/Reporting

### Economy Experience Sharing 4 - Australia

**Dr. Michael Kirby**, First Assistant Commissioner of the Productivity Commission, Australia, shared experiences in Australia as follows:

- Australia's GDP per capita was ranked fourth in the world shortly after the end of World War II. But in the following decades the Australian community experienced a long-term decline in its relative economic performance. Basically, the economy lacked flexibility and had high cost and inefficient manufacturing and government services, so there was scope for widespread reform including trade liberalization, macroeconomic policy, taxation, capital markets, infrastructure, government services, national competition policy and labor markets. In recent decades, Australia has experienced substantial structural reform and the economy has been substantially transformed. The economy is becoming more open. In late 1980s, the decline in Australia's economic ranking spectacularly turned around.
- Such improvements did not come effortlessly. There are substantial and systemic obstacles to reform: costs are concentrated, benefits widely spread, potential winners are poorly informed, costs of reform are immediate and benefits take time, and bureaucratic structures are often aligned with sectional interests. In the case of Australia, it has also been observed that multiple jurisdictions can be a complicating factor. The Australian Federation, has central and state governments, and the constitutional allocation of different responsibilities complicates the reform process.
- As for the reform, building community-wide support has been an important factor. This is an important area where the Productivity Commission fits in. The Productivity Commission is the Australian Government's principal advisory body on microeconomic policy and regulation. It is located within the Treasury's portfolio. The Productivity Commission's role is to inform policy debate and provide a basis for better policy decisions to improve the economy.
- Three key design features of the Productivity Commission have contributed to its success in the Australian context. First of all, it is an independent body. It has its own legislation. Commissioners are statutory appointees, and it works at an arm's length from government. Secondly, its processes are transparent and involve extensive public input into its analysis. All its work is published, and its advice exposed to public scrutiny. This transparency is an important quality control mechanism on its work and analysis. Finally, it takes a very broad view, examining the impact of issues on the entire community, not just on a particular group. It is intended to achieve higher living standards for the community as a whole.
- Why do we want to monitor the performance of government services provision? Many services lack well developed markets, so measuring performance can help drive improvement. Government services are also vital to community wellbeing, particularly for special needs group. For what can we use performance measurement

information? This information can clarify service objectives and government responsibilities, provide indicators of performance over time and across services and jurisdictions, make performance more transparent, inform service users and the community, and encourage ongoing performance improvement.

- The implementation structure of this system of performance monitoring is very important. It is a genuine whole-of-government process. The heads of the national and state governments have all agreed to do this. The exercise is run by a steering committee that was composed of senior officials from central agencies. Below the steering committee, there are working groups that are composed of line agencies and other specialists. The Productivity Commission acts as a secretariat for the steering committee and the working groups. As such, is it able to apply its three key design features of independence, transparency and community-wide perspective to the task. This is obviously a quite cleverly designed institutional structure.
- The Productivity Commission uses equity, effectiveness and efficiency as general performance indicators and further develops indicators into an outputs and outcomes framework. There are some guiding principles which underpin the indicators: a focus on outcomes; a sense of comprehensiveness; comparability across jurisdictions and over time; progressive data availability; timeliness; and iterative improvement.
- Originally the Report on Financial Performance of Government Trading Enterprises (GTE) was very similar to the Report on Government Services. It had a similar structure and objectives. It originally arose from concerns with the slow rate of government business reform. The subsequent reforms included commercialization, and privatization, full cost recovery and other capital market disciplines, competitive neutrality and exposure to competition where possible. As a consequence of these reforms, the GTEs monitoring report is now undertaken solely by the Productivity Commission (without the multi-jurisdictional committee oversight that it originally had), and is focused on financial performance only.

#### Economy Experience Sharing 5 - Singapore

**Mr. William Yap**, Director of Performance and Organization, Ministry of Finance, Singapore, shared experiences in Singapore as follows:

- In the mid 1990s, the Singapore Public Service implemented Public Service for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (PS21) to encourage public officers to become more creative in performing their work. This was important in enabling the decentralization of personnel and financial authority to ministries. The need to focus on performance management also became clearer during this period.
- With greater flexibility introduced through block budgeting, it was evident that performance management would be important in allowing ministries to undertake self-evaluation on how effectively they were using their financial resources. Ministries would set targets and measure their achievement of them which would be submitted to the Ministry of Finance.
- Performance management tools should, however, be seen as a spectrum starting from

individual performance appraisal, which would focus on corporate and human resource (HR) issues, in contrast to performance management at the organization level and performance management at the public service level. The challenge at the higher level would be to ensure that outcomes at the organization level would not lead to suboptimization at the public service level.

- Key performance indicators (KPI) in ministry's performance management would entail quantitative and qualitative indicators. The Ministry of Finance has begun to work with other ministries to systematically analyze the trends of KPIs. It was generally felt that the trends of KPIs were at least as important as the KPIs themselves in enabling agencies to understand reasons for under- or over-performance.
- In the course of studying performance management, Singapore came across some challenges in applying it in the public sector context, such as the inherent difficulty in designing KPIs accurately, and that it was not always optimal to tie budgeting to performance indicators due to the nature of public services.
- There is some scope for improvement in performance management. For example, deeper engagement with ministries on performance issues, wider exposure of senior public officers to government-wide perspectives and simpler reports to make them more user-friendly.

### Discussion

- **Dr Halligan** from Australia asked for more details on the ministries' performance management and if the performance management reporting was submitted only to the Ministry of Finance. Mr. Yap responded that ministries would indicate their strategic outcomes and KPIs, and how they performed relative to the targets set. The current positioning of performance management was aimed at providing ministries with a useful self-evaluation tool and reports were currently consolidated and reported within the government. The Ministry of Finance oversees and analyzes not only individual ministries' performances, but also the trends and issues of concern that may be pertinent across agencies. The Ministry of Finance also engages the ministries to consider follow-up measures to address any areas of concern. Most of the ministries' key performance indicators are currently available to the public through the annual budget estimates.
- **Dr Halligan** further asked if there were other mechanisms to ensure accountability in spending and reporting. Mr. Yap replied that there were several mechanisms. Parliamentary committees are appointed for different areas of public sector work and they are in a position to query ministries on their budgeting and spending. The Auditor-General's Office also audits various agencies and reports to Parliament on its findings. Singapore has also instituted some value-for-money reviews internally to regularly review the program spending of ministries, identify areas for improvement which would be conveyed to agencies, and recommend how agencies could enhance the value of money in their programs.

## VI. Session 4: Demonstration on the Use of ICT in Public Sector Governance (Chinese Taipei GPMnet Report)

**Mr. Chung-Ing Shih**, Director of the Department of Supervision and Evaluation, Research, Development and Evaluation Commission, Chinese Taipei, shared experiences in Chinese Taipei as follows:

- There were several problems relevant to performance management before 2005, for instance, many cabinet oversight organizations, scattered information, highly time-consuming processes, limited involvement of organization leaders, and little performance information disclosure.
- The government of Chinese Taipei has used ICT to build up a single portal for government plan/program management network (“GPMnet”). GPMnet has integrated scattered information systems into a new knowledge management system for decision-making and plan/program monitoring. All overseeing organizations and ministries use the same network and share information online.
- At the organizational level, GPMnet provides several functions, e.g. setting/reviewing strategic plans, allocating the total budget required, and conducting preliminary and final evaluations.
- At the program level, GPMnet also provides several functions, e.g. submitting all programs by the ministry, monitoring implementation progress, directing on-site inspection and follow-up, conducting preliminary or final performance evaluation, and publishing annual reports.
- GPMnet reflects good public governance by establishing platforms for comprehensive management of government programs, program knowledge management, program progress trend monitoring, citizen participation mechanisms and program lifecycles.
- GPMnet provides services to 37 Ministries, 4,000 subordinate agencies and 70,000 users for about 2,000 plans/programs a year, and saves NT\$370 million in system development fees and NT\$ 32 million in maintenance manpower fees per year.
- By harnessing ICT, Chinese Taipei will continue to integrate other information systems into the GPMnet, such as knowledge discovery systems for planning, review, and decision making. With the advent of the Web 2.0 era, Chinese Taipei will introduce GIS, and video and audio clip technology into GPMnet for instant, active, and full-dimensional management of government plans and programs.

### Discussion

- **The Honorable Jocelyne Bourgon** from Canada asked about the role of the Cabinet during the process. Dr. Jay N. Shih replied that the Prime Minister of Chinese Taipei is very busy and must delegate to overseeing agencies the monitoring of government performance. The RDEC is the vital overseeing agency and has the responsibility to

publicize the final report. By harnessing GPMnet, the RDEC can allow ministries pay more attention to performance management.

- **Dr. Blake** from Canada asked how to connect with finance management system. Dr. Yu-Hsieh Sung replied that the Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics (DGBAS) has its own system. A solution must therefore be found to efficiently connect with the finance management system, which is the way forward for future improvement.
- **Dr. Halligan** from Australia asked how useful targets for the National Palace Museum are established. Dr. Yu-Hsieh Sung replied that following normal socioeconomic trends, a 10% higher volume of visitors to the National Palace Museum is predicted. This is a negotiation process and meetings have been arranged to solve the disputes of target setting.
- **Mr. Rudolph Lohmeyer** from the U.S.A asked about how to meet the users' requirements and make the system more attractive. Dr. Yu-Hsieh Sung replied that this was the most important issue to be resolved. The views of all those involved in the process are considered and GPMnet has subsequently been revised twice to meet the users' requirements. Video and audio clip technology will be introduced to GPMnet for active management.
- **Miss Mao** from Hong Kong, China, asked how to balance a diversity of stakeholders' interest during citizen participation. Dr. Yu-Hsieh Sung replied that the National Policy Think Tank Online was launched years ago, through which the public may address comments to the government. Citizens are encouraged with rewards to express their opinions. Output from the National Policy Think Tank Online sends feedback to the GPMnet system. This is just the beginning and there is still a lot of room ahead for us to improve.

## VII. Session 5: Group Discussion

### Outcomes of Group Discussion 1: Whole-of-government Strategic Planning

- The strategic target setting on government performance that relates to the consideration of multiple objectives on policy, society, economy and environmental protection, as well as the requests from multi-interest group, may lead to conflicts on target setting. How does administrative agency make a balance between those different needs and conflicts? Is there any principle or priority?
  - Reduce the gap in access to information and initiate dialogue between the government and the private sectors.
  - Use opinion polls on certain issues and international indicators as a reference for assessment.
  - An institutional framework must exist for conducting government performance, with someone coordinating this task.
  - The idea of "twinning" is needed.
  - Develop guidelines and principles for governance, including agenda items for senior officials meetings, and ensure greater access to electronic resources for participating economies.

- How does government set appropriate whole-of-government strategic targets on performance? Top-down or Bottom-up? What are necessary conditions or considerable factors?
  - Narrow down the differences within the communities and build understanding. Government can get feedback from communities through opinion polls after launching certain policies.
  - Member economies could provide technological assistance and support to each other, such as transfer and education.
- How does APEC or individual economy take a further step to practice what we learn about government performance management from this workshop?
  - Twinning is a new idea in APEC. Economies with a similar scope and concept could be provided with technological assistance and expertise from other experienced economies.

#### Outcomes of Group Discussion 2: Good Practice in Planning and Objective Setting of Government Agencies

- To comply with core values, it always leads to target simplification during the process of governmental objective setting. What factors should be considered to make targets fully reflect to agencies' strategies?
  - Four factors should be considered to make targets fully reflective of agencies' strategies: 1) balance the top-down and bottom-up approach (Dr. Halligan), 2) set out targets based on agenda setting, 3) balance the concerns of central government and line agencies, and 4) balance agencies' targets and societal outputs.
- There is always a gap between government performance and the public satisfaction. How to make a measurement that meets public expectation and government policy?
  - Two viewpoints may eliminate or reduce the gaps between government performance and the public satisfaction: 1) government should make information available to the public (Dr. Halligan) and 2) public servants have a responsibility to tell the President or the Prime Minister information about the future of nation (Dr. Blake).
- How does APEC or individual economy take a further step to practice what we learn about government performance management from this workshop?
  - APEC or individual economics may take steps to: 1) make documentation of whole process of performance management and accumulate into knowledge management (Dr. Halligan), and 2) collect citizens' input during initial stage of performance management, rather than during terminal stages, to incorporate public feedback.

#### Outcomes of Group Discussion 3: Monitoring and Measuring Agency Progress, and Evaluating Performance/Reporting

- The implementation of some programs needs cooperation among more than one government agency. How to clarify accountabilities of different implementing agencies?
  - Cooperation among government agencies is very important.
  - It is difficult in practice for agencies to break out of their silos to undertake shared responsibility for outcomes. Horizontal platforms are required for Ministries to clarify their shared responsibilities and apportion financial expenditures.
  - It is useful to establish lead agencies for inter-agency programs which develop the strategies to deal with problems. However, the challenge is to get the secondary or partner agencies to come to agreement on those strategies proposed by the lead agencies.
  
- There is always a gap between government performance and the public satisfaction. Is it proper to introduce non-government institutes to make evaluation on government's performance? How to introduce?
  - Introducing non-governmental bodies to evaluate the government's performance is feasible. However, it must be noted that internal efforts by governments, e.g. performance evaluation by central agencies over line agencies, have the advantage of access to information and administrative influence that NGOs would not quite have.
  - Chinese Taipei pointed out that a necessary condition was greater citizen awareness. It likes to hear criticisms and to convert these into constructive action.
  - Singapore felt that the objectives of third-party performance evaluation by NGOs had to be made clear and transparent. An informative and fact-based approach should be used.
  
- How to bring the evaluation into full play on government performance management?
  - Chinese Taipei added that it was important to link performance to civil service reward or punishment scheme, and to link performance to budgeting. Peru agreed that budgeting should be performance-informed, but not necessary performance-based, as it was sometimes not clear whether poor performance should be addressed with more or less budget.
  
- How does APEC or individual economies take a further step to practice what we learn about government performance management from this workshop?
  - Indonesia (Mr. Sudrajat) mentioned that we need to establish a platform for officials to pursue and share their initiatives in terms of performance management. We should feel free to call upon any other economy that participated in this workshop to share further experiences with similar initiatives.
  - Chinese Taipei also suggested that APEC institute an e-learning program to facilitate this sharing.

