

Part IV : Questionnaire Survey Results

1. Overall Assessment

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree	N/A
I believe this workshop achieved its stated objectives				21% (3)	79% (11)	
The concepts shared are directly relevant to the demands of my economy				21% (3)	79% (11)	
The speakers' presentation methods helped me to understand				50% (7)	50% (7)	
The material enhanced the content of the workshop and met my needs				57% (8)	43% (6)	
The general discussion enhanced my learning				50% (7)	50% (7)	
What I have learned will enhance my job/role performance				57% (8)	43% (6)	
I am motivated to apply these new concepts in my economy				57% (8)	36% (5)	7% (1)
The overall quality of this workshop was excellent				21% (3)	79% (11)	

Keynote Speech: Performance Management: It's the Results that Count	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Completely satisfied	N/A
Session content			7% (1)	29% (4)	64% (9)	
Keynote speaker				29% (4)	71% (10)	
Material logistics				43% (6)	57% (8)	

Session 1: Whole of government strategic planning	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Completely satisfied	N/A
Session content			14% (2)	43% (6)	43% (6)	
Speaker			7% (1)	29% (4)	64% (9)	
Material logistics				57% (8)	43% (6)	

Session 2: Good practice in planning and objective setting of government agencies	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Completely satisfied	N/A
Session content				57% (8)	43% (6)	
Speaker				50% (7)	50% (7)	
Material logistics				71% (10)	29% (4)	

Session 3: Monitoring and measuring agency progress, and evaluating performance /reporting	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Completely satisfied	N/A
Session content			14% (2)	43% (6)	43% (6)	
Speaker			7% (1)	36% (5)	57% (8)	
Material logistics			14% (2)	43% (6)	43% (6)	

Session 4: Demonstration on the use of ICT in public sector governance (Chinese Taipei GPMnet Report)	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Completely satisfied	N/A
Session content			14% (2)	36% (5)	43% (6)	7% (1)
Speaker			29% (4)	29% (4)	36% (5)	7% (1)
Material logistics			21% (3)	29% (4)	43% (6)	7% (1)

Session 5: Group Discussion / Group Report / General Discussion	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Completely satisfied	N/A
Overall						
Session content			9% (1)	27% (3)	64% (7)	
Moderator			9% (1)	18% (2)	73% (8)	
Reporter			9% (1)	18% (2)	73% (8)	
Group 1 (Answer one you joined)						
Session content					100% (2)	

Moderator					100% (2)	
Reporter					100% (2)	
Group 2 (Answer one you joined)						
Session content				100% (1)		
Moderator					100% (1)	
Reporter					100% (1)	
Group 3 (Answer one you joined)						
Session content			14% (1)	29% (2)	57% (4)	
Moderator			14% (1)	43% (3)	43% (3)	
Reporter			14% (1)	43% (3)	43% (3)	

2. Summarize Workshop's Result

(a) What new knowledge or value have you gained from the workshop?

Most participants (APEC, U.S., Singapore, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia) thought what they gained from the workshop are other economies' experiences in performance and results management and the importance of ICT.

Individual opinions:

- Knowledge about how various economies is undertaking performance and results management.
- Challenges in performance and results management.
- The information on ICT, the Australian Productivity Commission and the Canadian MAF was very useful.
- Insight the latest knowledge and methodologies by specialists from dedicated agencies.
- The importance is to manage performance instead of just measure performance.
- An international perspective on the challenges and solutions by other counties in the field of performance and results management.
- Experience of other counties.
- Use of ICT in performance management.
- Shifting the focus of performance management on agency-wide to system-wide or society-wide.
- How to increase the performance or utilization of performance management..
- The Chinese Taipei Performance Management System and techniques, especially the GPMnet.

- More detail information regarding performance management that I get from this workshop.
- The role of ICT in evaluating/publishing the government performance.
- The important of having comprehensive coverage of evaluation.
- ICT is the important / key tool make performance management successful.
- Performance management for results should be kept distinct from central control mechanism.

(b) Do you consider that the outcome of the workshop could/should lead to collective EC actions, or action by individual economies? If so, what?

Some participants (APEC, Chinese Taipei, Indonesia) thought it should lead to collective EC actions and suggest a “twinning” approach for exchanging information; some participants (Singapore, Malaysia) suggested that actions should be taken individually, since individual governments are ultimately responsible to their own political leaders and their citizens.

Individual opinions:

- Both. It struck me that the early developing economics participant that spoke during the general session, Vietnam, expressed a sense of bring at a very early stage of considering performance budgeting management. Probably the lack of active participant by the economies means they are far behind. Suggest a “twinning” approach (through EC), where “strong” PM economies (AU, US, SIN) to pair with a weak/newcomer to PM (Vietnam) for exchanging information and develop a start.
- As individual governments are ultimately responsible to their own political leaders and their citizens, actions would be most successfully undertaken by individual economies.
- Action should be taken individually. The issue is really that there is no clear one way to go about addressing performance management issues. And given this premise, what would be better is for different economies to learn from one another’s experiences and pick and choose what could be applied in their situation and context.
- It should lead to collective EC actions. Sharing experience platform is a good start.
- I can confirm the Thai Public Sector Performance System and applied some ideas to improve my jobs.
- To conduct regular meeting.
- We need the political will to convince ministers to start looking seriously into this issue.
- Some further steps (actions) proposed by the participants seem feasible.

(c) What needs to be done next? How should the workshop be built upon?

Participants (APEC, Peru, Singapore, Thailand, Malaysia) suggested to record and report key insights, build a network for sharing experience to continue dialogue between EC economies, and pool of ICT experts from each country to make best application.

Individual opinions:

- Record and report key insights and learning.
- Followings with initiations focusing on priorities identified from the workshop.
- Build a network for sharing experiences.
- For participant to continue their dialogue and their improvement and success in their field.
- I would like more of the same. I think it could be tailored in the future to group economies in different stages of development (e.g. more advanced performance management implementation?) and tailor the presentations to different groups.
- Conclude the questions and answers, ideas and suggestion to all delegations. The workshop should provide for other countries to provide their experiences.
- More participants to be included are better.
- Include the matter in Finance ministry.
- Develop a common software / ICT infrastructure for individual economy to apply in their countries.
- Pool of ICT experts from each country to make best application.
- Develop a common indicator for government progress.
- Share the development and practices between EC.
-

(d) Please provide any additional comments. How could the workshop be improved?

Generally, participants (APEC, Peru, Singapore, Indonesia) thought that it needs more time for discussion and deep analyzing of experiences.

Individual opinions:

- Allow none time for general discussion after formal presentation.
- The event was extremely well organized and planned!
- I think that the time that we have to learn from experiences was too short. I would like to have more time in deep analysis of the experiences.)
- The workshop logistics were very well handled by RDEC and Chinese Taipei. It would be nice to allow a bit more time for Q&A and for group mingling among the participants.
- Way too little time for final group discussion.
- More time for Q&A
- More sharing from individual economy may be better.

