



P 02 6154 9800
PO Box 4349 Kingston ACT 2604
info@act.ipaa.org.au
www.act.ipaa.org.au

ABN 24 656 727 375

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS IPAA ACT 2018 CONFERENCE SESSION D: WHAT'S NEXT?

**HOTEL REALM
BARTON, CANBERRA
WEDNESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2018**

Nina Terrey: Okay, thank you. Welcome back. So, we still have your full attention. We're going into our fourth session, and this is all about where to next. We started the day with a quick poll, and we're actually going to move into this session with a quick poll, so do get your devices ready so that you can respond to a couple of questions. The pretty cool thing though is that these questions haven't just been answered or will be answered by you, we actually have also sent these two questions out to the IPAA Future Leaders Group, so they are aspiring, imaginative, creative. What are they, problem what?

Audience: Finders.

Nina Terrey: Finders, exactly, likely problem finders that we need for the future along with yourselves, so we're actually going to compare and contrast their responses to yours. It's really fun to play into this, so we're first going to see your responses and then we're going to see their responses.

The first question that you're going to answer, if everyone's ready to go, it's actually about given everything that you've heard, what do you think is the biggest challenge the public sector is facing in being fit for purpose? There are five options. Clearly the front runner, cultures and structures that resist change is a front runner. You can't quite work out between understanding and meeting the aspiration of the citizens or keeping up with technology and digital advances. Those are battling it out. Oh, the other two are battling it out now. Okay, so there's a bit of a spread there that's moving, but consistently the cultures and structures resisting change.

That said, what do you think the young leaders are saying? Is it the same or different? So your front runners are culture and limited financial resources. Do you reckon it's the same or different? Put your hand up if you reckon that it's the same as you. Okay. Who thinks it's going be different? Who didn't put their hand up at all? Yes, exactly. That's what actually happened.

Alright, let's have a look at the Future Leaders. So who said it was different? Oh, you were right. Good on you sticking your hand up. So that's interesting, right? They've called out limited financial resources slightly higher, that was your number two. Cultures and structures, so there's some synergy there, so they're also identifying that, but interestingly that understanding the citizens is quite high and also inability to attract and retain talent. So you know, there's some similarities and differences there.

Great. All right, question number two. Well, it's kind of interesting, right? There's a bit of an equal split there between the chance to redesign how it you engage with citizens to build trust and opportunity to increase collaboration within the public sector and other sectors, and harnessing the potential of data and digital advances. What do you think? Same for those

young leaders? Now you're thinking, nah, it's going to be different. Different? And again, no hands up, right. Okay.

So we'll go to the young leaders' results. They still didn't think it was exciting or new careers opportunities. So, look, there's some synergies there as well, right, but the idea is that clearly all those aspects for the challenges and opportunities, we all need to address those, and on that note, I'm not going to say any more about these results. I'm actually now going to be moving into the last panel of discussion. I'm actually going to introduce each of our esteemed panellists, and they're later going to give us an opportunity to kick off a conversation around what's next, what can we take away from today, what can we now do in advance of the APS review conclusions, and how do we build on reforms already taking place? What are the priorities for federal and state governments, and what needs to happen next? And, there will be an opportunity to take questions from the floor as well. Our four panellists are, and by the way I've got long bios and they just came to scrap them so they clearly are very modest. You just get one sentence about each of them.

We have Dr. Steven Kennedy PSM, is a Secretary of the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development and Cities. A position he has held since September 2017.

We have Kathy Leigh who is the Head of Service for the ACT Government and Director General of the Chief Minister Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

We have Dr. Gordon de Brouwer PSM. Was a secretary of Department of Environment and Energy from 2013-2017 and he's of course a panel member of the independent review of the APS.

And we also have Carmel back on stage, IPAA's ACT Deputy President and Conference Chair and former Deputy Secretary Defence Immigration Citizenship and former Deputy Australian Public Service Commissioner.

On that note, I'm actually going to hand over to the panel and I'm going to ask yourself Carmel to kick us off.

Carmel McGregor: Alright, thanks Nina and I guess I was wanting to reflect from an IPAA perspective as to the journey we've been on and having these conversations and how it culminates today. And, I guess I sort of mentioned this morning over the four years the various topics that we've discussed and in 2015 it was all about making the public service great, interesting times, and I went through the findings from last night and really what was resonating with people then was how do we do these big reforms, how do we nail them, how do we actually get the outcomes expected? And then, collaboration was a very big theme in that conversation was well. And again, capability and capacity.

So those were the 2015, we go to 2016 we talked about thinking big and our byline at the time was has there ever been a more exciting time to be a public servant? And, everyone thought it was pretty exciting but they talked about risk, innovation, capability again, culture and leadership were the very significant conversations. But also, I do recall Katherine Livingston imploring us about risk and saying you just live with it, you manage it, you manage the hazards and deal with those ethical dilemmas.

2017, and this was really the year where everyone was talking about building trust. And we talked about the death of deference, the death of or the concern about experts versus non-experts and very much what does the APS need to do or what is the role of public servant.

And then, as we got into the planning of 2018 [inaudible] what do we do with all of that? Comes along the APS review and for me, what's happened even today in conversations with the programme, you can see a resonance of the things I've already mentioned: collaboration, capacity, capability, leadership, culture, risk, all the rest of it. And so, we're sort of really nailing something here and I think all of us really are very heartened by David's presentation and the five things and I might be in your court David as opposed to yours Andrew, with I think really nailing some things around that will be quite critical and I was quite taken by Fook Seng telling us about thinking big, starting small and acting fast. I think that's really wise council for how you do actually not lose pace with an APS review, which can be so big and so unwieldy, but I think that's good council.

Looking back then on this morning, and really I think it's been a terrific day and we really very much appreciated the international dimension to really stretch us as to what's going on around the world. And, of course, so many similar challenges. And, I don't want us to rehash the whole day but there's just a few things that lept out for me because I think they really resonate with what was being said in the APS review.

I loved Chris Seed's spirit of service and that really appealed to me as a former public servant because I know that people join the public service because of commitment and sense of purpose. And they their craft and profession, acknowledged and regarded well. And so, I think we've lost something in the Australian debate and all the rest that we can argue about all the reasons for that. But, if we were to get behind that vision, as you described David, then it does give us that sense of everyone working towards a similar purpose. Having it recognised and regarded, we don't all need medals for it, but it's also that what we're doing is something terribly important and there's a real pride in being a public servant and I think that really will appeal to people as the review beds down some of these recommendations. I get there's a real energy and I really applaud the review for how you've gone about engaging with people and even today as you've responded to questions, I get the impression there's chance still for everyone

who wants to have a say, have a say and I think that really will be quite critical.

Another thing again, and it was Fook Seng and others who said about the life-long learning. And really going to that issue of capability and the conversations I've been having through the day with people, people really want to know about this \$500 and how it works. Well, here you go, I know something about this. Most of the people who get the \$500, [inaudible], guess what they spend it on? Korean, learning Korean. And that is, and I've fact-checked this with Fook Seng because the Singaporeans love K-Pop and, as I understand now, adult drama. And so, they want to understand, apparently the Koreans are doing this pretty well. And so, that's what they are doing but I think the most important thing about that is, and I do sort of think if Australia went down this sort of path, let's not put the rules around it. The whole thing about life long learning is curiosity. It's what else can you learn and understand. How can you bring a different perspective and if conquering another language isn't part of that, I think, good on you for just doing it and doing it without the rules that absolutely restrict and stymied sort of innovational [inaudible].

I thought that was great. That lifelong learning came up again in the second session. And again, we love the sort concepts of "problem finders" or the "way finders" as Elanor said. But, the two other messages, and that session actually went in a different direction toward what I thought it would, but I really did love the sentiment that it was about people understanding what it was to be in one and other's shoes. And, that was a future perspective. It is absolutely grounding in what public servants need to do and maybe we've lost a bit about that but we have to get back into one and other's shoes to understand their problems. And, the sorts of issues that Dion and Hannah raised about not leaving anyone behind. Make sure that we're pitching to all segments and they really sort of implored us to recognise that the public service is Australia wide, it's not just Canberra based. And, I guess going back to capability, and this will be my last point. Having spent time in the commission, I, we do need to do something about the capability and capacity of the public service but we sort of shouldn't just start at the top, where we tend to and sort of try and remediate all those leaders we probably shouldn't have put there in the first place. And then, start at the graduate level. There is a bunch, and we sort of have lost the way of career pathways and how you actually can find, or have the in time skills on that journey to prepare you. And I have loved all the things about the permeability and the porous nature, which we've always been talking about but, I think the fact that review is really talking about how it strongly does give it the impetus that we couple probably crack that one this time. So, I've probably taken too much time so I'll stop there.

Nina Terrey:

Don't apologise. That's great. Thanks Carmel. Steven, your thoughts?

Steven Kennedy:

Okay. I just saw the last session so I didn't get to see early in the day but just thought I'd make a couple of remarks on some of the things I saw coming out, and some things actually we were discussing at secretaries board this morning. And, that is, when you're thinking about the public service in the review, I actually do tend to think about it in two parts. I tend to think about the public service as an institution or its role as an institution among other institutions in our democratic framework and as an organisation. And so, a lot of the conversation today, and a couple of things I want to talk about in a moment, are really about how it functions well as an organisational. Rob Heferen was talking about that, you know, how does an organisation improve the way it operates and how do you call these things out. You can see these two differences in the survey, in the APS survey, in my department in the APS survey, I get very high scores on peoples, how proud they are to be in the role or to be a public servant. But, this is no reflection on me, of course, I just got there, but less proud about being in the department. They're telling you something about how the organisation runs. They're telling you about how you behave and how you do your things. So, it's quite an important thing.

I think the great selling point of the public service is the role, which is enduring and will change a little but it doesn't change much. It's a huge selling feature. The organisation is a supplementary thing. Often if you come in and try and think about this as if we were like another large conglomerate you would tend to focus just on the organisation, but we have a unique selling feature in the public service which is the role and our role as an institution. So, I thought I'd just make a couple of remarks on the, perhaps the approach to organisation. And, the first piece I would say on that is you really don't need to wait for David's review to make many of the changes to make your organisations healthier and more productive places to work. In fact, I wouldn't be waiting for David's review if I was you. There are a bunch of things you could do immediately, and we could get a little bit caught up in saying, "Well, you know this great piece of wisdom is going to be handed down upon high, many people will have thought it through and then we'll just act" and that's just not sensible. We can really get on with it today.

So, I thought I'd reveal to you my secret list of things that I ask myself when a group of public servants come in to brief me on an issue often when an issue is breaking hard. You need to keep this secret, you can't tell anybody in the Department of Infrastructure Redevelopment and Cities about this list. But these are, and honestly, these are the things I'm thinking about when people are coming in to have a chat and most of these things I learned on the hill when I worked as an advisor rather than a public service. One of the first things I'm thinking about is, how far behind are we on the issue because we are often slow to appreciate the change or the thing that's coming down the track.

The second thing I'm wondering is have they got any context in which the change is happening and I'm trying to test that. I'm pretty certain that all of

this is being done in a way that's quite aloof from society and the broader community. So, I'm thinking, this isn't a criticism of us, these are just the things I'm thinking about because of the way things will roll. I'm tending to think this solution is probably going to be rules driven, and I have to make sure I take us back to outcomes. We're probably going to be a little bit arrogant about our assessment of the issue at hand. We probably haven't asked anybody else for review, in particular people outside the public service, as we roll through that answer. I'm going to check the level of expertise that the people are briefing me on and sometimes it's not there. We're going to be a little bit dismissive of the concerns of others and the change that's about to be made. We may well be pursuing our own agenda. We're probably not very well connected to the rest of the public service and I may well have to ask the person to go and ring a few people in other departments just to check that they've sort of connected it up. And lastly, the solution is probably one that's on the risk adverse end.

So, just keep that to yourself. Don't tell anybody else about that. But, they are the things that I'm running through my head to be really honest, when people come through and begin to give me advice about how we're going to and so there in a sense I've revealed to you some of them are prejudices but some of them are behaviours that we've tended to implement. They're about organisation, they're not about institution, they're just about how we behave.

Nina Terrey: Great. Thank you very much Steven. I've written all of those down, I'm ready to go. Kathy.

Kathy Leigh: Thank you. First of all, I'd like to acknowledge the Ngunnawal people and, being head of the ACT public service I always like to start by acknowledging the contribution that all of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander members of our service make to the quality of that service. I'd also like to start by saying how proud I am to be a public servant and how particularly proud I am of our ACT public service. You know we're a small we're young, we give advice to ministers on an incredibly broad range of areas and provide an incredibly broad range of services. I'm really proud of what we achieve. I think it's particularly important to mention that here because I agree with the comments that this is about how we go on and keep building on our strengths and any healthy organisation keeps looking at how we can build on our strengths. It's not that there's something broken that we need to go around castigating ourselves about, so just some opening context.

One thing that David talked about was a public service being united in a common endeavour. I think that really resonates and in the ACT Public Service, we have been focused for the last few years on behaving as one service. We're small, so to be fair, if we can't do it, no one can, but I'm really proud of how far we have come on that. We are providing far more coherent advice to our ministers and coherent services to our community, including

regulatory services that are far better organised around the individuals and organisations being regulated.

I think we've come a long way on that, but it's still my number one priority. We need to keep focused on that and it's probably the single biggest thing that can make a real difference in how we perform as public service. One of the reasons why I think we've done so well on that has been mobility. We've been really strong at mobility at our Director General and Deputy Director General level. Almost everyone has been in at least one other directorate in a senior role.

It's a challenge at other levels in the service and so, that's another priority for me. Reflecting on that, one, I want to make clear that I'm not on about arbitrary mobility and mobility for its sake. It has to be mobility that builds on the expertise and skills of the public servants. One area where we have been successful down through the layers is where we tend to have networks that cross across the public service. For example, a human resources network, we have quite good mobility amongst our human resources experts.

When we were talking to our Singapore colleagues a little while ago, it was a similar challenge that they were facing. They talked about this as one way of improving mobility, having these professional networks. That's something that I think is worth pursuing, is a very specific thing that we could be getting on with. It helps build up knowledge across the service amongst like professionals. It means that we are talking about mobility that isn't just arbitrary. It deals, to be quite honest, with that fear people have that they might be passed a lemon. If they're actually working with people in a network, then they're able to exercise some judgement themselves.

Another thing on mobility is mobility outside of the public service. And again, in the ACT, we've had some small forays into exchanges into the private sector, into the community sector, and with other public services. I think we could benefit from doing a lot more of that. I'm, particularly like to mention today, between public services and I'm pleased that Peter Woolcott is really positive about this as an opportunity. I think it's an opportunity to build our skills as public servants. It's also an opportunity to enhance the performance of our Federation because we all know that the divides between Commonwealth and State responsibilities are not necessarily the most efficient divides. The more people can work on both sides and have an understanding of the whole picture, I think, the better chance we have of mitigating those issues.

There are a few things that I'd like to make immediate priorities. I just mentioned also, trust was raised. And I've talked before at IPAA forums about engagement with our community, so I won't talk about that at length. I'll just say that if we're going to get trust, that engagement needs to start right at the beginning and by at the beginning, I mean before we actually

think we really know what the problem is. It needs to go right on to the end where we go back and tell people what we actually did with their import, so that they will actually believe that we genuinely wanted to receive it. We don't have to agree with it, but we tell them what we did with it. If we operate like that, I think that's a good starting point to start to build that trust in the community.

I'd also like to mention data. It's huge, we all know that that's a huge priority. It's a huge priority for the ACT. We're just getting started, but it's clearly one of the great opportunities for the public service to strengthen the evidence base of our policy, the effectiveness of our services, and the effectiveness of our engagement. But, again if we're gonna have the trust of the community in relation to our use of data, we've got to be able to win that trust by demonstrating that people's privacy will be protected. We could just lose all the opportunities if we can't provide that assurance to our community. So, there are a few things that are the top list for my agenda.

Nina Terrey: Great. Thank you, Kathy Gordon.

Gordon de Brouwer: Thanks very much. Like Kathy, I'd like to acknowledge the traditional owners and also what wonderful discussion points that you've all rose. I thought I'd talk about working on the panel. I'm a rather slow learner of three things that I've learned on the panel. Or maybe even where I've changed my mind. So, maybe start with one of the things I've learned, is just how important frameworks and incentives are.

In some of our discussions and David mentioned this, I love working with David, by the way, is that we've had quite a few reviews in the past and recommendations and some of them just passed by. Often, they're actually very beautiful statements, they're very beautiful things, but they're not embedded. They don't get embedded. I think, really, on reflection they don't either fit the framework of the way things work or they're not compatible with some people's incentives.

If you really want to drive some of the change, the transformational change, you've got to think about other frameworks, right? And really, are you getting at the heart of those incentives? People talk about siloed cultures, that we don't bring different talents together or skills together. If that problem is due to mobility, we just haven't grappled with mobility, actually, the impediment's to mobility for a long time. It be terms and conditions or internal recruitment and other constraints.

Going to Rob's point, Rob Heferen raised, for senior leaders or for senior officers, frankly, for all public servants. If you've got behaviours that, frankly, are counterproductive to collaboration or a culture of openness or debate or having ideas around, well, how do you deal with that? You can't just say, pretend that it doesn't happen. You've got to go back to, how do you change that sort of behaviour? Well, you have performance, you have capability

assessments. You make it transparent, you're open about it. That's the key driver of changing people's behaviour.

Myself, I think that the first bit that I've learned is what's so important is getting those frameworks and incentives right to enduring real change. The second is, we're all products of our own backgrounds and I'm trained as an Economist. I loved abstract thought, I worked in Treasury in the Reserve Bank for a long time, so very beautiful, rarefied elegant environments. PM&C, environment, but what the review has really shown to me is just how broad the public service is. It's not just policy and regulation, the bulk of it is actually service delivery. Two-thirds of it's outside Canberra, so it's been a real one of those eye-openers for me of understanding the broad range of people and activities and talents. It's not a narrow set of skills, it's actually quite broad.

How do you engender that broad range of expertise? And they're all really important. The third would be, in David's talk, he [inaudible], I thought, this has been a recurring element of getting back to focus on people. This whole business is about people's lives, protecting and improving people's lives. It's about outcomes. That's, frankly, I've found, I'm surprised to have deeply aspirational and inspirational I've found that to be. And this is where I'll change my mind on something, on the Federation.

The nature of our relationships really matters across the board on all these different things. With the Federation, we find it can work really well at times, but often it's a slog. I think people have become disillusioned. If you go back to a focus on, frankly, what are all our public services, all our governments about? They're about people. They're about doing something on the ground. That's a wonderfully inspiring way to bring people together and to focus on something where you can get a collective action and not just your own.

To my mind, it can be a game changer in thinking about how do you actually do policy on the ground, deliver services, collect, get the data, and do something that's really gonna make a difference and improve people's lives. And Federation is the mechanism to do that, so use it. Don't whinge about it, use it.

Nina Terrey: That's great. Excellent. Thank you, Gordon. That set up the right tone to open up to the broader group now. I'm really interested in your questions from the floor to really stimulate some further conversations. Make sure your hand, oh, one strong hand is going up there. Fantastic. And anywhere else? There's one hand here. We'll take both of those questions and if there's a third, just so that gives us something to think about in terms of more questions.

Cate: My name's Cate Saunders. I'm from Department of Parliamentary Services. My question is for Gordon. What is the most surprising thing you've learned so far from your involvement in the APS Review?

Nina Terrey: Do you want to answer? Could I get that question and the next one and then you can answer that one and we can build it. This is another question, as well?

Samantha Palmer: Thank you. Samantha Palmer from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. So, we had the culture panel up from EVPoll and each of you have talked a little bit about culture. In the book, "Immunity to Change," Kegan and Lahey show how our individual beliefs combined powerfully with the collective mindsets in organisations create a natural and really strong immunity to change.

My question to each of the panel members are, what is the one individual belief or organisational mindset that you think we should start challenging very strongly in order to bring about this vision for the future?

Nina Terrey: Great, thank you very much, Sam. We can take both questions, but Gordon, the one that was firstly directed to yourself and then we can [inaudible] the others.

Gordon de Brouwer: Can I come back to the [inaudible]. The biggest mindset change, frankly, be a responsible adult. It's your life, you're in control, do it. Don't wait to be told or asked. Just get on and do it. I've got to say, one thing I saw, I was doing something around Defence and Industry in the Woomera prohibited area, mid-level defence officer, couple of officers have changed the whole dynamic of the relationship between Defence and the five original nations in the WPA. Didn't come from someone up in Canberra or someone, they just did a very practical on the ground, I'm gonna do this, and they went off and did it.

It's made a huge amount of difference to the way that area works. Be responsible for your life and just take charge. The Review isn't someone else's, it's your Review, so do it.

Now, on what I've learned. I quite enjoy speaking my mind. I would go back to the things around Federation and just how important that sort of relationship is. We don't individually have the wisdom, frankly, you get it from talking and listening to people. That Review, lots of submissions, lots and lots, you wouldn't believe how many conversations. But how rich that is, just how rich. You get an awful lot by engaging with other people. That's been a bit humbling for me that I'm not the repository, in fact, I'm the dumping ground. But, the wisdom's out there and that's where you go.

Nina Terrey: Great. Thank you, Gordon. Kathy, your thoughts on the question of mindset?

Kathy Leigh: Yeah, I turn the question around and put in the positive. I think that the thing that all public servants share is an absolute passion for doing something to improve their community. Australia. ACT. And a real belief in the capacity to make a difference. And we all can and I think we should harness that to throw away any excuses people are making or any frustrations people are

feeling because we really can make that difference. That's why we're all here. I remember a former, former PM&C Secretary used to call it psychic salary. It is what's here and it is what motivates us all and it's what we can use to really get that positive movement.

Nina Terrey: Steven.

Steven Kennedy: Mine would probably be a version of Gordon's, but mine would probably be, if you thought the answer was we've already looked at that or we know the answer, then you're probably wrong. My guess, it's a version of that thing I spoke about earlier, I suppose about arrogance and it's in line with Gordon's comments. The harder you look at some of these issues, especially when they turn up again, and if you look at them with a little bit of humility, you will find you may well have been wrong or the answer has changed. The biggest thing I find, that I'm really big on having deep expertise, but deep expertise is not about finding a position and never changing or never reconsidering or not being curious about what it might be. I'm extremely sceptical when someone comes in and says, "we had a look at that and this is what the answer is."

Nina Terrey: Thank you. Carmel.

Carmel McGregor: I guess the thing that leapt out for me a question is be mindful of the impact. I think when cultures deteriorate, it's because people don't understand one another's behaviour or what the intent was. For me, it's thinking about your actions and the impact. That would be what I'd say.

Nina Terrey: Thank you. Couple more questions from the floor.

Meredith: Hi, it's Meredith Edwards from the Institute for Governance at the University of Canberra. I was reading The Mandarin today, of course not during sessions, and it says "Despair for its future disquiet over the retreat of liberal democratic traditions now plague more than two-thirds of the public sector's most self-motivated employees." That comes from Peter Shergold's trip around the country. So, that's concerning and it's not what we have been hearing today. If it's true, it doesn't fit with the answers to the first survey question this morning, which where I think the majority or the biggest response was the people were feeling fairly confident about the future, so can the panel explain the difference?

Nina Terrey: Thank you for that question.

Carmel McGregor: Much better audience, that's what I say. I think that did stand out and I've sort of wondered whether even the conversation here can inform, being part of it and feeling like you can actually contribute can give one a sense of confidence. As I recall, Peter was doing that as part of his roadshow and maybe people didn't feel warmed up or included, they were just being asked an abstract view. It is a bit of a dilemma, I think this probably might be a

slightly different audience, as well, just in terms of demographics. I'm not quite sure, but it was quite a stark difference, Meredith. I think this is helping with that confidence, that would be my take on it.

Steven Kennedy: We had Peter to give a seminar at the department last week. He talked a little bit about the survey results. I'm not sure about the makeup of this audience, but he, a lot of people who might be picking up frankly, are service delivery people in the states. And I think this is important because I think to be a slightly more in the gloomy side, this could be a pretty self-selected, in control, ambitious, on the road type of group who feel pretty good about this because they also feel pretty good about the control over their own careers and where things are going. Then there's, in those state public services, they have over 400,000 people I think in each in Victoria and New South Wales.

So we're talking about big public services out here and we're all staring at the sort of federal level, not the whole of the country. So I think this Peter has got something. One of the remarks he made to us, which goes exactly to the issue that Kathy raised was the failure to connect at that sort of at the grassroots or at the very beginning of a policy process and you said it very well connect all the way through and then go back again. He, to channel him for a moment, he thinks that's fundamentally breaking down at the moment and that we go away in a room and develop policy and then go out and tell everybody about it and call it consultation. He thinks that's a really big deal. Part of what he might be picking up with some of those public servants, is that sort of dissatisfaction separation from a group like this, which you might call a leadership group.

Nina Terrey: Thank you. Kathy do you have some thoughts?

Kathy Leigh: Look, I don't know the answer. I do think that we need to be constantly communicating with all members of all of our public services so that they don't feel, that disjoint that leads to that sort of negative feeling. I do think we could do a lot more of that connection between federal and state public services and it's, it's quite disparate really in my experience between different subject areas as to how the connections work. So I think it's something that we could work on in order to make sure that everybody is part of that united common endeavour and if there is such an issue, I think that would be a great way to take it forward.

Gordon de Brouwer: I can't remember the exact question from that was shown here. My sense was that again, it's people have a sense of what the issues are and they can see solutions and that, but that's a positive thing and that's motivational. I thought with Peter Shergold, the thing that struck me when he talked about that people don't feel validated or appreciated. I wasn't sure what, where that, where that happened, whether it was actually from the ministers or from public. Because sometimes relationships with ministers are not easy or frankly from the people that they work with, especially their bosses, that

people feel disempowered. They're not given responsibility to do their job and that's a source of frustration or it's a sense of just not achieving in general. So to my mind, they kind of, it's worth pursuing what was driving. Peter said, people don't feel validated or loved what was actually driving that and what was it?

Nina Terrey: Okay. I have a question to ask, but I want to. It's not my conference. It's yours. Are there some other questions on the floor that we'd like to throw to the panel? Oh, great. Thank you.

Audience: Bronwen Overton-Clark. Gordon, you talked about frameworks and that was one of the things that you've really taken out of being on the panel and you've got to get the frameworks right. I get the bit about incentives. Do you want to just expand a little bit on the frameworks part?

Gordon de Brouwer: Okay. Just in terms of, maybe the range of what the policy responsibilities, regulatory or service delivery for part of the framework. An example of a framework would be, do you have a sense of what's the community of practice? What's good practice or what do you do? What's involved in that? How do you go about? What's good policy? How do you bring in a range of disciplines or insights? How do you do the genuine engagement with people where it's co design? Those sorts of things. Do you have a professional development program that supports that? Do you have recruitment policies that actually support that? So one of the things people have talked to us is, you need to have recruitment at various stages across the service of various stages of seniority. You need to really develop people and grow them and give them opportunities to be generalists or specialists, that's what I meant by framework. So it's, you can say you do something but it doesn't. It just doesn't fit with the way the system works.

Carmel McGregor: Can I ask where you see that sitting, like in terms of, we've all talked about the, the very diverse nature of the public service and that there will be regulatory agencies, there will be central agencies, and yet there's a hell of a lot of waste that goes on where every department has to feel. Feels like they developed their own so and at sometimes that's entirely appropriate and other times it just looks to me as ego and waste. So where do you see, is there a right answer to that one I suppose?

Gordon de Brouwer: But maybe over time Carmel, kind of, these things evolve anyway, so you get a bit of centralization, decentralisation. But, it might be just actually sharing expertise, having people move back and forth from different areas. As you can think of digital as well, how do you approach that, those problems. That's the kind of frameworks around that and, and the balance of what's coherent across the system, but also it's got to be delivered and implemented in a department or agency.

Nina Terrey: So I'm going to ask the questions. I'm burning to ask it, so I'm going to throw it out there for all of you. We've heard themes around, both from the Review

and other speakers around driving collaboration and being connected and then we want to change. So then whose responsibility is it to change?

Carmel McGregor: It's every grown up.

Nina Terrey: Yes that's right. But it's intention, right? Because, if you're connected in the system, you know talk about accountability. But what does that mean when you're in something that's more complex where people were like ecosystems and acting. So, so just what are your thoughts on it?

Carmel McGregor: So, I want to say just one thing just about the incentives. So it's the incentives and disincentives have got to be in balance as to, to drive collaboration because it is the framework. So, there's the architecture of the system that doesn't reward that behaviour currently, so that sort of fundamental change to the sort of basic architecture to drive the collaboration. That's not answering the second part. But, I'll hand over to the others.

Steven Kennedy: Look, I'm not so sure that there's that many blockers there to be quite honest. I'm feeling like I'm being a bit gloomy about the public service, but I think there's actually ample opportunity to collaborate and solve problems in those worlds, in our world. And as Gordon said, it's just a matter of taking responsibility and going forward and in doing it. There's no doubt there's some people who are resisting and the system is going to push back. I'm not trying to diminish that at all, but the opportunity does present itself. And when I was reading my little list out before, there's lots of people that do all those things when they come through, but that's just a way of working and a way of a way of thinking carefully and thoughtfully about your whole exercise and not being formulaic in the manner in which you approach issues. So I, lots of disciplines like economics, are ways of thinking. So it's, yeah, I think that's where I am.

Kathy Leigh: I've got two answers to that. One is we should all be grown up. And the other one is actually, I believe people are fundamentally rational and there are conflicts in some of the legal structures that we have set up so that people are accountable to what's fundamentally a silo quite often and they would. But, then they're told they should collaborate and so everybody should play nicely, but fundamentally this is the accountability. A few things that I'm looking at, the ACT where I think has helped us with that. We've done for some time now what the Commonwealth has just done in its latest mog, where we have mogged ministers as much as the public service. And so when all of your Ministers are cross accountable and all of your Directors General are cross accountable, it instantly creates a self-interest in collaboration. When we legislated and changed our Public Sector Management Act to actually say that there was an obligation on collaboration. It's all, it's in all those things you would expect like performance agreements, etc. It's in our Public Service Values. But, I think more than anything, we're actually starting to lock it into the system. So

there's not this difference between what you're actually accountable for from what everyone sort of says should be how we play, right?

Nina Terrey: Great. Thank you.

Gordon de Brouwer: I just what do I add? Just, everyone's responsible in a way, and you do need those decisions to be made about organisations or frameworks or changing incentives. That's generally done at the top so that, that's got to be done. But, frankly you can do an awful lot yourself in your job and how you behave. And that's usually frankly, I think the great indicator of someone that you want to promote is someone who's got that get up and go around that. But also around communication. You really can't listen enough and kind of engage with people enough and being open about what your intentions are, what you're doing, also really important. So there's no hidden games.

Nina Terrey: Thank you. Now we have a final comment from each of you to wrap up this session. This session is all about next steps. So I'd just like to give each of you an opportunity just to leave the audience with one closing remark each. We'll start with Gordon.

Gordon de Brouwer: I felt like I've talked too much.

Nina Terrey: No, no. You have to. That's my demand. Want to come back to you Gordon? You said you'd like to contribute and think, and talk.

Gordon de Brouwer: But, I'm thought out now. I feel like I have nothing to say. I think, frankly there's still an opportunity to be engaged and involved in this. The listing process isn't over. They'll be engagement on the materials that comes out, please, please engage with it. I'm repeating what David said please engage with them as you see it flowing through.

Nina Terrey: Great. Thank you.

Kathy Leigh: I'd say, as I started, public services, just the most fantastic role you can possibly have. There's no other job where you can have all of the really interesting challenges that we all face and know that by definition you're acting in the best interest of your community. Because, you are actually serving the elected government of the day that's elected by the whole community. So, I just think we're really lucky to have the roles that we have and we should grab hold of that and, and make the most of it that we can.

Nina Terrey: Great. Thank you Kathy. Steven.

Steven Kennedy: I guess my final comment is don't wait for the review. Off you go and make changes and get on it, because you all have that capability to do that. I totally agree with Kathy, just the fabulous opportunity we get to make and the institutions that we serve. I mean that opportunity is present immediately but engage with the review. It's a fantastic opportunity to set a platform and

to provide a story for all of us to repeat and help for new public servants to adopt. But, don't wait for it.

Nina Terrey: Thank you.

Carmel McGregor: Now all of that and I guess going back to something Rob Heferen asked about. How do you know where the glitter is? Then leveraging from what the other panellists have said, go and do it, share that, where that glitter is, as we, we don't sort of really empower or let people loose on that one. And I guess what panellists are saying is, go forth and no, don't wait to be asked. But, I think it is. I thought David, your presentation today, I've really felt very uplifted by it and I thought, when we've heard about reviews before, you sort of groan and think, oh, here we go again. But, I think there really is this very optimistic moment and therefore we should all engage in and grasp and share those ideas about where that glitter is.

Nina Terrey: Fantastic. Thank you. Can we put our hands together for our panel? Well, that concludes our Session D. So we're on our home stretch. Carmel I'm actually going to invite you to the lectern to close our conference.

Carmel McGregor: I don't really have anything further to add. I think it's really just a moment to acknowledge that it's been a terrific day, a wonderful set of conversations and started by Francis setting the scene and then having that international perspective and [inaudible]. Thank you so much for staying the day, its been a real privilege to have you with us. But, these conferences don't just happen overnight and a lot of people really contributed to the preparation of this conference and I did want to acknowledge a number of people. We've had the, there are bunch of merry volunteers. The conference committee, and I just wanted to acknowledge them. We sort of started off almost when you, pencils down at last conference and you say what are we going to do next year?

And so Will Story, Kathy Kostyrko, San Palmer, Alison Larkins, Meredith Witten, and Drew Baker, Sue Reagan and Mariline Zarrouk. Now, part of that team is also the IPA team and we've mentioned Drew and how central he has been to that as has Sue Reagan, our conference director. But I did want to pay particular mention to Mariline Zarrouk. She's standing down the back there. She's very shy and I already embarrassing her. I'm very sorry about that, but it'll be Mariline's last conference with IPAA, which has been fantastic. It's a great shame. But she, Francis Adamson's posted her partner on an overseas post. So that's, you know..., there ya go. But I did want to just acknowledge all of your efforts, Mariline. Can we please join me and thank you.

And also, IPA is very, a great support by our key sponsors and I wanted to acknowledge them. We couldn't do what we do without their support and ongoing commitment, KPMG, Hays, Commonwealth Bank, Telstra, MinterEllison and Microsoft. So thank you again and there're many

representatives of those organisations here today. So thank you for your ongoing support. Thank you. And could I finally thank Nina Terry. So Nina has done a fantastic job today. I think you'll all agree in helping us design some of the interactions, and really keep the whole thing flowing and it's been wonderful to have you as part of it, Nina. And thank you. And if you wouldn't mind coming back up, we just have a little something for you. Alright, so that's it. So keep up with all those great ideas, get engaged in the APS Review and hope to see you here next year. And I can't really predict what sort of momentous global event will be occurring on that day, but you know, rest assured something will. Thank you.