Institute of Public Administration Australia
ACT Division

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
SECRETARY SERIES
CHRIS MORAITIS PSM

CHRIS MORAITIS PSM

SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY

PARKES, CANBERRA

WEDNESDAY, 21 FEBRUARY 2018

Chris Moraitis: Thank you very much, Frances.

Good morning everybody, it's great to be here. Let me also acknowledge the Ngunnawal people, the traditional custodians of the lands on which we meet, and pay my respects to their elders, past and present. And can I also acknowledge any Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people here this morning.

Many thanks also to IPAA for hosting this session, and to my colleagues who are here. And of course the current IPAA chair Frances, my dear colleague for inviting me to speak as part of this series this year and to kick it off, in fact, with the Secretary Series.

Let me just say IPAA's doing some great work and I missed last night's session but I gather it was a pretty interesting one with the Canadian head of the public service. Really encouraging thinking and promoting a fertile dialogue amongst us all. About how we improve the practise of good public administrations and really the principles underpinning it, that. And so my presentation really is a continuation of what depth of the things we touched on late last year. This, I guess, a modest addition to that discussion, the larger current of discussion about how the public administration should be improved in this country. And IPAA's playing a pivotal role in that space.

And finally, thanks to all of you for being here this morning, to join us for this session.

The title I've given the managing change concept is never getting the challenge of organisational change, but the change imperative. And the reason I picked on that is because it's something that I've been thinking about for quite a few years now, and I'll get to the reasons for that later. But I thought I'd start off with a bit of an anecdote about when you reach a certain age and when you're a Secretary, you sort of look at your youth through the prism of this amazingly beautiful retro view of life.

Anyway, picture this. It's 1977. I'm going to grade school with my friends. I'm in Year 9, after school on Sydney Road. Anyone who's Melbourne? Philip Bell, you're from Melbourne. You know what I'm talking about. We're in a class learning Greek. Greek from our parents forcing us to Greek school. And we had a teacher who was telling us about philosophers and Greek philosophers, and I said to my mate, Peter Andrianakis his name was, "Pete, what's a philosopher and what's philosophy?" He said, "Let's jump on the tram during the break and go down to the Brunswick Library and we'll borrow some books."

So we jumped off the tram at Victoria Street where Franko Cozzo's Furniture was. I don't know if you remember Franko Cozzo. Franko Cozzo's Furniture Store, but we remember the ad. So we went to the Brunswick Library and we borrowed two books. I remember, one was Bertrand Russell's History of Western Philosophy. That one was the pre-Socratic philosophers. I read half of it and I couldn't understand the thing except one thing stuck in my brain, and that was a philosopher called Heraclitus. And he talked about, in Greek they say, "Ta panta rei," which means "everything flows." And this is the guy that had that metaphor of a river you can never get in to the same time twice. And it was about the idea of flux and constant change, and for a 15

year old in that sort of milieu of life. And Brunswick is now part of the quinoa belt not the secow belt, but anyway.

It's a great reminder for me of the fact that I've been thinking about the flux and change and permeability of everything. How it permeates all the time. And so when I'm sitting down and thinking about change in this context, I went back to that recollection of young guy 30 years ago in Melbourne trying to think about what's going on around him.

So the point I'm trying to make is, and starting with Heraclitus of all things, is that we all experience change. All of us. And indeed, our ability to survive as individuals and a species is a cornerstone of that. In fact, it's a key criterion of what it means to be an intelligent species. Intelligence and change go hand in hand and it's been the key to our survival.

So jumping from the philosophical to the existential to the APS. Let's just say, we have an imperative to manage and to effectively manage change. To deal with it in all its manifestations, and it's something I'm sure all of us are grappling with all of the time. So we're no different in this respect from the private sector or any other sectors, if you think about it.

Think about change in the private sector, you're a social media company dealing with ... I deal with Google and Microsoft and Facebook, and we talk about risk and we worry about risk. But the idea of risk is you don't do anything and change just floods you. You're a hotel chain dealing with Airbnb. You're a retail service industry dealing with the digital disruption. You think about that.

So for us, similar imperatives. Not as cutthroat and not based on Q1 and Q2 returns but nevertheless, the trajectory of our lives, it's a key component. And it's compelling and it's pressing. We need to address change on so many levels. On the individual level, as an employee, we have to be critically self-aware enough to grapple with that reality and the contours ever changing of our work life and the policy and service delivery landscape we inhabit at any point in time in our careers.

As managers and as future leaders, we have to spend, I think quite rightly, a significant amount of time thinking about how we prepare our workforce skill for the capabilities and skills they need for the future. Optimising the collective ability to deliver for the government and for the people of Australia, and that's an immense challenge for all of us. It means working to ensure that our people are equipped as best they can be with the skills, the training, and experience they need to have to be able to respond to what will be new challenges. Not the challenges of the 1990s or the 2000s but the 2020s and 2030s.

It means thinking about the future of work and the workforce that we need to put in place right now to align with the challenges the next decade or two. Think about big data, for example, and we are thinking about big data as we all know and its role and its place in our world in the 2020s and 2030s. We need to start thinking very differently right now about what sort of skill set we need in our graduates, in our offices, and the re-skilling and the challenges that it brings about.

The third area I want to focus on, this is the core of the discussion this morning, is about how in public administration we think about organisational change. The change in an entity. And when I talk about the organisation or the entity, it's obviously an abstraction. So what we're really talking about is the leadership, the management, and in fact all the staff of that organisation grappling with both change itself and also the organisation and the entity's own sense of itself as it grapples with change. So there's some various dynamics going on there. And that's the expect I want to focus on this morning, that is, how organisations and entities deal with change and how the permeate and permutate over a period.

So from this perspective, I'm just drawing on my own experiences of organisational change in the APS, and I can say this quite frankly that I'd say the last five or six years I've been dealing with it, I think on an ongoing basis. When I was in DFAT as the COO, the Dep Sec, one of the first challenges I had with Peter Varghese was AusAID returning to the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. And that was a massive undertaking, and it's still, I think, a work in progress because it takes time to make these things happen. I mean, in DFAT I recall people still complaining about how Trade and Foreign Affairs was a big failure. And I'm like, "Well, it sort of reminds me of the fighter in the jungle from the Second World War not giving up on the Empire."

Anyway, that was a massive change element full of many, many people. When I joined AGD as Secretary, one of the first tasks was bringing the Australian Government Solicitor back into the Department as a group within the Department. It had been a government business enterprise for almost 20 years, and so obviously that's a big challenge and you need to grapple with the elements of an enterprise that's earning its own way, paying its own salaries, at the same time bringing it into an APS context. And that creates some really interesting challenges.

And of course, the normal MOG changes that everyone confronts day in and day out. I've had quite a few, we've had the Arts and most recently the Home Affairs portfolio MOG process. So it'd be fair to say that I think a month has not gone by in the last half a decade where I haven't sit down and think about change, people in it, and where we're going. And so I've had to think very carefully about how organisations and their people manage change with this magnitude. And I guess I used the word navigate because it picks up on that idea of fast flowing flux and water and trying to make your way through the various passages. So we use the concept of navigating change, rather than managing.

It means thinking about what organisations and people need and ideally should be doing to transition successfully from where they are to where they should be, and to thrive in the future context. That's the other important element of this process. So in short, all the consequences and the by-products and implications that come with all these processes.

In my view, I've sort of come to the view that there are three interrelated concepts, or streams of approach if you want to use that metaphor again, and they've helped me navigate my way through the challenge of organisational change. I think if you articulate and you apply them consistently, I think in a genuine way I'm hopeful that they also help staff

themselves deal with it through a framework of thinking about the change, both at the individual level but also at the entity level. So they can see, and staff can see and subscribe to the future contours of that entity as it evolves. And at the same time, they see themselves as an integral part and a thriving player in that entity, both as a contributor and as a co-creator.

So what are these concepts that I'm talking about? I'll bring them down now, bear with me, they're pretty broad, but I think they're pretty critical. I think they are mission, people, and culture. And they're sort of very generic terms, we can spend hours and hours talking about the three and have separate sessions about them but I just want to touch on them in this morning session on the basis of organisational change. There's no sequencing of this, there's no priority. One doesn't go ahead of the other. We can't talk about culture without focusing on people and mission can't be achieved without culture.

And in fact, when I was a Commissioner in PNG, interesting environment to work in. People bring their families and children, and you're in an environment that can be quite challenging for a variety of reasons. And in terms of my mission there and my approach, I prioritised what was required. I said to my senior management on the first day, "The first priority's the safety of our people. The second priority's the well-being of our people. The third priority's making sure the priorities one and two are done efficiently and effectively and are seen to be done. And fourthly is our policy mission achieved?" Because my view was in an environment like that, you can't achieve policy priorities without people feeling safe. It's not like you're an unaccompanied officer in Baghdad and you just focus 24/7 on your work. You're there with your family, your children. My view was, the first Secretary isn't going to write that cable about political developments in Port Moresby if they're worried about whether their child is going to be safe coming home from school that day.

So that's the sort of concept of mission culture and thinking about the priorities in that sense. So that's a good example, I think of, about how the three are inter-meshed and equally important. So there's no hierarchy, as I said. We could spend days, as I said, talking about each of them.

In my view, culture is central to any objective you care to think about. Frances alluded to the work in Male Champions of Change in the disability space. In my view, dealing with the culture of an organisation is the necessary condition for success in any aspect of that task. And people management goes to the heart of course, also to what we're all about. So let's just focus very quickly on those three elements and I'd like to share some of my perspectives on those three.

I'll start with people because I think organisational change and the disruption it entails both structurally and from an individual's personal perspective is often an incredibly unsettling experience for many people in that context. Not surprisingly, it challenges in dramatic ways ones professional identity because we all know that much of our sense of self is infused with one's working life persona. So many others, on the other hand, see it as a chance to experience something new and if they're perhaps not relishing the experience, they're certainly up for the challenge, as they say, and the

opportunities that change will bring and that they expect to be thrown at them in those opportunities.

But whatever the responses will be, and there'll be various responses, it's incumbent on all of us to appreciate that organisational change is not an abstraction, a structural realignment, which can be dealt with, as they say, on the papers. For these reasons, it's incumbent on all of us to recognise and put front and centre the real person-centric dimensions of organisational change. It starts with accepting that there will be real and genuine concerns, as well as genuine expectations and aspirations. Either way, there's a human dimension that needs to be looked at head on. And one of the clearest and most effective ways to start the process is to start the discussion. And that requires, I think, a genuine commitment to communication. What's happening, why it's happening, and where we want to end up at the end of the process. Put it very simply, communicate, communicate, communicate. And when you think you've had enough of communicating, you're probably getting to the point where the message is happening and communication is being effective. And you have to do it in real-time. Real-time communication as well.

Communicate as much of the ideas and the knowledge you have about the process, and the objectives around it. If you don't know all the details, be upfront and say so. Point out the lacunae, the gaps, the unknowns. People will know that you don't know and they will be okay, mostly, with that. And actually they'll know one more thing that the bosses actually don't know everything, so that's actually, it's a known unknown and that helps people understand. We've got this much achieved, this is the stuff we're still working on, and it's a dialogue so hopefully it's a positive.

Don't have separate narratives. So you have the official story and what the people in the papers are working on. It's got to be a consistent, true, genuine narrative about what's happening and don't allow any delays and time to develop between formulation of an idea and a narrative and the message and the effects of that. Create, also, channels for two way communication. That means really listening to what people are saying, seeing what can be done about what's being raised, and then communicating back what's proposed to be done as a response to those questions and demands.

It means sharing widely, I think. You know, the 5, 10, 6, 3 organising principles that you start on day one with and say, "These are our strategic principles about how we go forward. We don't know all the answers but these are the 5 or 10 things we're going to be referring to as we go ahead." They guide the current and the future change process for the organisation. They map the general direction, which you're hoping to go. They also become genuine reference points as you go on the journey. So as you arbitrate future decisions and unforeseen issues, you can actually have points of reference you go back to and say, "Well, this is our dilemma. What are our principles? Let's go back to principle four, we said we would do it this way. Well, ergo, how do we decide this?" So you're trying to be as consistent and as strategic as you can based on those transparent, open, and widely communicated principles of organisation.

You keep coming back to these organising principles you set up from day one. And you've got a broad direction but you fine tune as you go along. At the same time, don't let the strategy blind you to the importance of the detail as it affects individuals or specific cohorts. These need to be addressed both, well invariably because these things matter to a sufficient number of people to make it critical to the material overall success of that enterprise. So you think it's one group or individual or cohort but it actually builds up and you have a tipping point where the discussion and the process actually is side tracked and the strategic purpose is mixed. So please focus on those elements in my view.

I keep saying, a centrality of people to the organisational change dialectic goes without saying, and my staff in AGD know this because they've heard me countless times say this. You know the motto of people are our most important asset? Well I keep saying AGD. Well, guess what? People are our only asset, actually. When I think about AGD, what makes the difference is the people, and that's the only asset. The rest of it is [inaudible 00:16:22], in my view.

So, really, you need to be clear about that. It's people who make change a success. It's people who will transition to the new reality and create the new organisation bit by bit by bit in the future. And it'll be your people and our people who really show you and ask what new opportunities are thrown up by this change. Actually, this I think illustrates the people-centric importance of an organisational change.

The second element I alluded to was culture. Now we can spend a lot of time talking about organisational culture and the benefits which accrue when leadership and management invest in building a work culture that leads to an engaged, resilient productive workforce. You've heard that a thousand times because it's true. Suffice to say that I fully endorse this view and its critical path for any successful organisation. I don't want to explain all the elements to organisation culture; it's made up of many components. I'll emphasise and highlight three on this occasion. An inclusive work culture premised on leadership's commitment to fostering a diverse workforce, an inclusive workforce; commitment to collaboration and teamwork; and an environment that fosters trust and respect, incubates a preparedness to be bold and try novel approaches without fear of failure but also with a measured appreciation of risk. I think those three elements sum up very quickly my view, the general ballpark of getting the culture right.

You can't say it's just abstract, it's unverifiable. I actually think you can objectively measure the success of culture. You can see it in measured levels of staff engagement, staff surveys and census, satisfaction rating with the quality of the working environment by staff, the metrics on whether the workforce is proud of its employer and encourages others to join it, and whether you're competing in a competitive workforce for talent and you're getting that talent. And I think that's also measurable. So I don't think the argument that culture can't be measured is sustainable. It is very much measured and as well as knowing it as a leader whether it's ticking or not. Everyone says if you walk into a place, you know it's ticking right or wrong. It doesn't take much, but you can also verify it objectively.

In other words, it's an integral part of the organization's makeup, of its sinews and its energy. It will determine whether the entity thrives, whether it gets by or just muddles through, or actually whether it fails. So it makes a real difference in the organisational change context. Why's that? Think of it as the ballast of an organization's DNA. Ballast and DNA anyway. You know what I'm getting at. It's what allows an organisation and its people to weather the storm, again the navigation metaphor. Because in having fostered engagement and trust, the culture has also engendered resilience and commitment to getting things done with a genuine people-centric dimension at the heart of this process. It means the organisation and its people know instinctively that everyone is working to achieve an outcome that is the right outcome at all levels of the process in organisation.

It's also the disinfectant against cynicism, mistrust, apathy. At the very time when these emotions can be the most toxic in any process. This means that organisational change can be managed strategically with a full understanding of the goals being pursued with a clear commitment from all concerned that the process will play out in a measured genuinely considered way. And a workplace culture which people find enriching and to which they're therefore committed is one the imbues their worldview about the work environment they want to be in in the future. Wherever organisational change leads them, a positive work culture travels with those staff like a virus and infects the host. So I think positive culture can play in many ways.

So in the next phase of organisational development in that cycle syncretic process of forming new entities from disparate components, this culture will play a key role in forging a new entity and hopefully it takes root and it grows in that new entity, in that combined entity, in that existing entity. And finally, in heading forward in a new environment when forging a now yet still not fully delineated direction, a good place to be starting from is from the position of a strong and engaged work culture. Put simply, as I said, it makes all the difference in the process of organisational change.

And I guess it'd be fair to say that you can't have a decision to have a change and then stay working on the culture. It's something you have to have invested quite a bit beforehand. And ideally you have done that and that's a symbol of a good organisation.

Thirdly, mission. And obviously culture and the values which underpin an organisation, an integral part of an organization's mission. But at moments of organisational change, a defining future mission beyond the cultural and values proposition, becomes an additional critical element of that conversation the organisation needs to have with itself. This is because defining the mission goes to the heart of the strategic direction one is embarking upon. You can easily get it in mission statements and statements by administers and the Prime Minister about where you're going to be, and they provide, of course, critical lodestones for helping you find that mission direction. But it's got to be more and it can be more. Ideally, it should go to the heart of the organization's essence and the reason for its existence.

In managing the future for any organisation in times of change requires anticipating the future, but it also means looking back on the journey so far in order to recalibrate and reimagine the future pathway. I reminded my

staff last year at our Christmas address that on the day the Commonwealth of Australia was created and the Federation was completed 117 years ago, the Attorney-General's Department was there, "present at the creation" to use that phrase from another historical context, and it's been at the heart of government ever since. It was one of the first Commonwealth Departments of State and still one of the very few agencies still as a distinct entity with the same name. Since January 1st 1901, Attorney-General has had many permutations and it's had many and very disparate tasks entrusted to it by successive Australian government. By and large, I think the Department has delivered on these undertakings.

We've obviously got a traditional I think overarching, rightly so, role supporting the First Law officer in upholding the rule of law in Australia, but successive Australian governments over this century and a bit entrusted AGs with a dizzying array of matters - territories, arts administration, film classification, countering violent extremism on the internet, natural disaster mitigation, I could go on and on to name a few. So it's really quite a broad spectrum of activity for them to get their head around. And the common thread has been helping Australia and its people grow, thrive, and succeed as a prosperous, secure, and just nation. That's a pretty good mission statement, I think.

By any measure, it's a good track record and a good starting point. A great starting point, I think, for re-imagining the future organisation in its new permutation. In reminding my staff last year of our history, I also reminded them of the real people in that story and in particular the person who IPAA itself celebrates through its annual oration in his honour, Sir Robert Garran. This is the person whose, our building is named after in fact, and where today's staff in AGD come and go every day, continue almost to the section and paragraph, the work that was going on in 1900. I'd love to hear what Robert Garran thought about Section 44 of the Constitution, but anyway.

I won't recount the details. He was the first Commonwealth public servant. The first public servant. He was not only present at the creation, he was actually there before the creation, helped the creation. He was one of first Secretaries of State. He served 11 Attorneys-General, 16 governments as Secretary for 31 years. He was the confidant of governments on legal and Constitutional matters, of course. He was also present at one of the earliest international events where Australia sought to have its say as a nation on matters of international relations and international law, the Versailles Treaty, almost a hundred years ago next year, isn't it? And that's where actually we got New Guinea and all of that, so interesting destinies, but anyway.

The salience of the past is the point in the context of mission and organisational is this, to remind ourselves of an unbroken record of public service and the many organisational permutations which have been required to date to achieve that. Permutations which are all about refining and redefining what serving the public requires today with all the complexities and challenges and priorities that were unheard of in 1901 or even 1951 or 1991 or 2001 or even 2011, to be honest. It's relevant because it's a reminder that, while culture and values should continue to prevail and endure through changes, there will always be an imperative to adapt and

innovate to meet the new realities. And in doing so, we need to remind ourselves of the service ethic to which we are committed. The role we can play in building the next chapter in the story of Australia and its people.

All organisations during time of change therefore need to look carefully at their ongoing mission. Look to its values, its journey to date, and expectations placed upon it by government and by the Australian people. In our case, the staff at Attorney-General's have undertaken an internal discussion to help refine our mission for the future. It's a case where leaders such as me have said, "We wish to listen carefully to the collective experience and wisdom of our own people who make up the organisation and who are given the opportunity to imagine what the contours of that future organisation, their organisation, will look like in the future."

So they're the three elements. People, culture, mission. As I said at the beginning, there's no priority or hierarchy amongst the culture, mission, and people propositions. It'd be fair to say people who make the culture and people who deliver the mission, but culture leads to engagement of staff and makes the mission critical objectives ... You can put the circles around, you can see how they all work together. The mission must be articulated, understood, and embraced. And I'm not suggesting by any way that these elements are some sort of guarantee of success. Far from it. Organisational disruption and change it complex and it's messy, and there are no guarantees. But mission, culture, and people are the necessary conditions for success, in my view, and looking through these three prisms when navigating the currents of change, as I said, can make all the difference. So thank you.

Frances: Well, thanks very much indeed, Chris. I'll thank you more, or properly perhaps, towards the end. But as I was listening to you, we always want these events to be events that sort of stretch our minds a bit and I think you did that right from the outset. I have not heard many IPAA speeches or indeed many speeches in Australia starting with the great philosophers and Heraclitus, but I thought putting us in a two and half thousand year time frame really does put the sorts of challenges that we're facing in perspective. So, flux and change.

The other thing that I'm very keen that these events do is stimulate discussion, stimulate good questions. And I think you have done that extremely well. There are many, many areas that I suspect are ripe for questions. So without further ado, I'm going to hand over for exactly that. We've got just under 15 minutes to be able to do it, so please as you rise to ask a question or signal your intention to, when you actually stand up could you please state your name and where you're from and then it will be over to Chris. Thank you.

Question One: Thanks, Chris. I get the importance of history in navigating change, but one of the things that I think we're struggling with as an APS is understanding how quickly we need to change. We think that it's an incremental thing but it's not. And so that's one of the traps of legacy is not understanding the challenge that's ahead of us. So how do you balance that in crafting a new mission and culture?

Chris Moraitis: That's a really good point and for three years I really haven't alluded much to Robert Garran. In fact, I didn't know much about Robert Garran. I used to see his portrait every morning going into my office and the conference room next door has a Robert, he's a statue in the foyer. I said, "Who's this Robert Garran guy?" I kept reading up on him and Frances illuminated. And I really got into his history, but I haven't focused on the history because for the first three years we've been in AG has just working non-stop on really innovative things. Dealing with social media companies on the internet and terrorism, massively challenging new laws in the national security space, dealing with societal challenges like elder abuse which has always been around I imagine but literally yesterday the Attorney was talking about this in a national conference.

So reforming the system. So it's not as if we're sitting around worrying about the legacy and reading books about Robert Garran. It's actually, at times of change, I think it's just worthwhile, pause for a minute, snapshot. Pause the video but no one knows what I'm talking about. And I just think about, "Okay, there's a moment now we've got to, we're going here, we're going there or we're going there. Let's just remember a bit of who we are and why we're doing this. Either we keep going the way we're going or we just permeate change it a bit and tweak it a bit." And I think understanding the journey to date actually puts it in a bit of a context.

I didn't know that AGD, and I was talking to Iain Anderson, one of my deputies, and he said, oh he was in Cocos Island. I said, "What are you doing there?" He said, "I was overseeing the building of an airstrip." I said, "What are you doing that for?" He said, "Because we still run the territories." And I said, "You're joking?" In a quick turning workforce, people don't remember the history. I'm sure the young officers in APS don't know the stuff that when on from 1901 an onwards. And just once in a while, it's useful to just put a sort of point of reference. It's not about looking back, it's about really just catching your breath and thinking about the way forward.

So I totally agree with you, the pace of change is immense. And alluded to that with the issue for example, data. We're all grappling with this every time we meet, Glenis and others, we talk about this all the time. How are we going to deal with this? I don't know how to deal with data. I need someone who's 20-something who can tell me how to do it. And we've got to be challenged by this. And that's really the imperative.

Question Two: Thank you. Jack Dan from Telstra and from the IPAA Council. I have to ask these questions because you started with philosophy and that's a soft spot of mine. And you talked about Heraclitus and the change of flow or the constant flow, and then you move to existentialism, and then APS, right?

Chris Moraitis: Well I didn't touch on existentialism.

Jack Dan: So I'm going to put you a bit on the spot because that reminds me of Sumpter, right? And the idea of the elected change. And my question, simply, is about the role of friction in change. And the reason it reminds me of Sumpter is because he defined boxing as binary practise of-

Chris Moraitis: Binary practise, here we go.

Jack Dan: Anti-holistic reciprocity, right? So friction as essentially a reciprocity-

Chris Moraitis: We're talking about Dante here.

Jack Dan: As I'm really interested in your comment about the role of friction in change, whether it's positive or not.

Chris Moraitis: Well, let me just say I'm not a Satrean. I'd line up behind Camus, but anyway, that's another story. The other thing is, you're right. You call it the dialectic of friction, I call it syncretism. I use the word syncretic because my idea of this is when you've got cultures, and in the previous life I studied Portuguese and one of them was reading Brazilian literature. It was about the influence of African culture in Brazil and the syncretism of religion, Catholicism and Nigerian worshipping, it's called syncretism. And what happens in organisational change, both organisations affect each other, and as a product it's called syncretism. It's not a friction. It can be a friction and there will be frictions, but how you manage ... There's always going to be friction whether it's dialectic or whether it's syncretic, friction is part of it.

What I was talking about in my speech was about three elements, people, culture, and mission, that help you deal and manage that friction. Because that's what I'm really getting at. The friction of the process can be really detrimental to the mission, it can be detrimental to the people, and the culture can actually lubricate the friction. I can go on ad-libbing like this for as long as you like, but you get the flavour of what I'm trying to get at?

Jack Dan: Yes.

Chris Moraitis: That all those things play a part. That's why I think those three elements actually help you get your head around that dynamic, that dialectic, that binary practise, that boxer, syncretic, whatever you want. That's the process that you've got to deal with. So I'm not far from it, I think the friction is inherent in this process. That's why I'm looking for options to manage it.

Question Three: Hello, Secretary. My name's Suzanne Howarth and I'm from the ACT Law Society. I had the privilege last year of meeting the granddaughter of Sir Robert Garran, and that triggered a question I'd like to ask. Namely, are you able to make any comments on the timing of the review of Commonwealth Legal Services?

Chris Moraitis: Yes, that reviews been with government for a while now, and I'd like to be able to say that its pending. We're working on getting it to government this year, so hopefully it'll be available pretty soon. And I think it's actually, if not available on the website, is it? I'm not sure. But I'll follow up with you separately.

Question Four: Hi, I'm Sally Whyte. I'm from the Canberra Times. You've talked a lot about how to change and all of the elements to do with organisational change and the challenges that you face. And you've talked about technology. What are you thinking that other changes that you're going to be applying your theory to in the next 5 to 10 years?

Chris Moraitis: I don't know. I seriously don't know. I seriously don't know. I mean, the one thing I think one of the big things will be how you structure your organisation

and the workforce that you need. My theory's always been, and I'd say this to staff in AGD, I'm building a department for you to inherit, not for me to be running in 5 or 10 years. So everything I say and do is about the culture that I envision that you'll need for not for 2025, 2035. And so through that prism, you're trying your best to guess what is needed.

What sort of workforce skill do you need? Do you need someone with STEM experience? We're trialling a scientific exchange in the APS. We're actually bringing in a scientist to work in our department for a year to help us with the technology challenges. Is that what we need? Or do we need emotional intelligence, which comes from a generic studying philosophy and the pre-Socratic's or something. I don't know but they're sort of contours. That's what I'm saying, I don't know, but you can make some intelligent guesses and position yourself. If you're not making the right call, you don't make the absolutely wrong call. So you're actually in the fight or you've got a 50-50 chance of getting over the line in the future. That's what I think.

Frances: Thank you very much. I think this has been a fabulous start to the year, actually. There are lots of things that we'll focus on in the course of the year, but I think you've certainly made me think. One of the reasons you've made me think about change is many of perhaps the older public servants in this room, is that the approved term, John, I'm not sure. But we'll recall back to 1996, which was a period of very significant change in the public service following a change of government. And I remember being in DFAT at that time and we dealt with massive change, some of it coming about as a result of very substantial budget cuts but also adjusting to a new government's priorities and helping develop policy to implement those.

And after about 18 months of this, I think there was sort of a collective sigh. There was in my own department that now we had dealt with that and we could go back to the way we were before. And of course, that sounds totally ridiculous now. It was totally ridiculous then. We quickly realised it, but I think since then change has been a constant. And the language that Chris has used about change, navigating change. That verb navigate gives us some sense of it. I mean, there'll be times, if we're going to pick up the sailing methodology, when you've got a fair breeze set behind you and you're able to go exactly where you want to go. There'll be other times where you're hauling in the sheets and at quite an angle and sort of winding your way, well, not winding your way. Hanging on for dear life in a storm. Perhaps that's a more accurate way of doing it. And other times when you're sort of close tacking.

Now as a public service, we need to be able to do all of those things and as IPAA President, I'm very keen that IPAA should have a role in encouraging us to think in this way and to have these conversations. You've very clearly emphasised and re-emphasized in perhaps triangular form, you were looking at it from every possible angle, mission, people, and culture. And I think that's a very useful frame of reference for all of us.

I think what your address also shows is that time for think deep thinking over decades. I think you said 30 years, but surely it must be closer to 40 since you were 15. But anyway, sorry I'll just leave that, right. What I'm talking about really is deep thinking over many years. And not just deep thinking

over many years but taking the time in very busy jobs to think deeply. Time for strategic thinking, time to pause. As Chris said, you pause, you think. But you can't think in moments, and as a service I think yeah, we're often challenged to be able to do that.

Using my prerogative as IPAA Chair and because Chris and I were former colleagues, I also want to take a moment just to encourage you all to read, I don't think I've done it from the podium before, the Foreign Policy White Paper. It's a whole of government effort and enterprise, something of which all departments and agencies can be proud. But what we did was took a year to think deeply about what's happening out there in the world, the uncertainties, the drivers of change, and how we as Australian public servants, how we as government in terms of our policy making and service delivery, should respond to those, should anticipate those, should seize opportunities because there are plenty of opportunities out there but there are also some risks and threats that we need to manage.

So, I'd encourage you to read the whole 122 pages but if you don't have time to do that, just the overview combined with perhaps a rerun on using our digital content of Chris' speech or reading the text will give you, I think, a good frame of reference for thinking not just about 2018 but about the longer term. Perhaps we can't think two and a half thousand years ahead as Chris' sort of brought us to this point today, but certainly over the term of the next couple of governments is a useful frame of reference.

So thank you very much indeed, Chris. And can I thank all of you for attending today. A Secretary Series address is an important event. I'm glad to see that it has your support. It's certainly one where we encourage and I think everyone is certainly willing to step up and take their turn as Secretaries to provide insights and ideas about the public service.