INSTITUTE OF
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
AUSTRALIA
ACT

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

ABN 24 656 727 375

TRANSCRIPT OF PODCAST

WORK WITH PURPOSE
EPISODE 31

PROFESSOR MARK EVANS
Director, Democracy 2025
Museum of Australian Democracy

MICHELLE GRATTAN AO
Chief Political Correspondent
The Conversation and Professorial Fellow, University of Canberra

Hosted by DAVID PEMBROKE, Founder and Chief Executive Officer, contentgroup

7 December 2020

Enquiries should be directed to Caroline Walsh on 0413 139 427 or at caroline.walsh@act.ipaa.org.au

Delivered in a partnership between IPAA ACT and contentgroup

contentgroup

DAVID PEMBROKE: Hello ladies and gentlemen and welcome to Work with Purpose, a podcast about the Australian Public Service. My name's David Pembroke. Thanks for joining me. Before we begin today's podcast, I'd like to acknowledge the Ngunnawal people on whose land we broadcast from today, and recognise their elders past, present and emerging, and pay my respects to their contribution to the life of this city and region.

Okay, so today is a Work with Purpose episode with a difference. We are going to be joined by Professor Mark Evans and Michelle Grattan, the famous Australian Federal Parliamentary Press Gallery journalist, and I'll come to their introductions in a moment. But we are programming in response to feedback from the membership that they want to hear different voices and different views.

Now, IPAA is a non-partisan organisation that does provide a platform for discussion and debate about all things public administration. We do hope that this podcast does inspire and provoke some thoughts with you. And certainly IPAA remains committed to promoting excellence in public administration. Along with large departments and agencies, IPAA's members also include people who work outside of the APS who are interested in public administration.

But certainly, this is an episode with a slight difference. It certainly expresses opinions probably a little bit more strongly than we would normally have here on Work with Purpose. But again, that is what the audience is looking for, and that is indeed what we are providing for you today on this particular episode.

Now, Professor Mark Evans is Director of Democracy 2025 and Professor of Governance at the Institute for Governance and Policy Analysis at the University of Canberra. He was formerly Director of the Worldwide University's Public Policy Network, Vice President of the Joint University Council for the Applied Social Sciences, Head of Politics at the University of York in the United Kingdom, and Dean of the Faculty of Business, Government and Law at the University of Canberra.

: Mark has played an international role in supporting governments to change their governance practises and has acted as a senior policy advisor and managed research and evaluation projects in 26 countries, the European Union, the United Nations, and the World Bank. Mark is an IPAA ACT counsellor, and in October 2020 was awarded an IPAA National Fellow for his outstanding contribution to Public Service and to IPAA.

Michelle Grattan AO is one of Australia's most respected political journalists. She has been a member of the Federal Parliamentary Press Gallery for more than 40 years, during which time she has had a front row seat on most of the big stories in Australian politics. She was the former editor of The Canberra Times, was political editor of The Age, and has been also reporting with the Australian Financial Review and The Sydney Morning Herald.

Michelle currently has a dual role with an academic position at the University of Canberra and as Associate Editor of Politics and Chief Political Correspondent at The Conversation. She's also the author and co-author and editor of several books, and she was made an officer of the Order of Australia in 2004, for her long and distinguished service to Australian journalism.

Now, these are two of the finest minds in Australia, and I'm sure you'll enjoy their conversation. Professor Mark Evans in conversation with Michelle Grattan.

MICHELLE GRATTAN: Mark, it's been such an extraordinary year, one that we could have never contemplated, I think. So should we begin with some personal reflections on how the year has struck us?

MARK EVANS: Yes. I think it's been a particularly surreal year for me, largely because my family is based in the United Kingdom. Every night I've been having chats with them, and of course they've been going through a much more serious crisis than we have. My dad lives in Lancashire, in a place called Clitheroe. Within literally a 20-kilometre radius of him, ten and a half thousand people have died during the COVID-19 period.

Obviously, that means that lived experience has a big impact on how you cope and how you respond to COVID-19. I think possibly because of that, I've been a lot more emotional in terms of my response to the crisis than probably a lot of my colleagues and peers. Obviously it's a social science, that's meant that I've had to default to the evidence as much as possible to make sure that I just don't get over emotional about the crisis.

MICHELLE GRATTAN: I suppose my experience has been a bit of a contrast to that because I've been in Canberra all through, and not had any direct personal connections due to COVID or family crises or anything of that sort. You're very aware in Canberra of how lucky we are. Cases were soon eliminated, the restrictions were soon relaxed. But nevertheless, the whole thing was very unreal. There was an air of the anxiety around the place.

I worked all through in Parliament House but Parliament House became a sort of ghost town, people in masks, politicians not here for a very long time. Then when they did return, there were only some of them and really no one wandered around and saw people. Very few people did. It was a such a strange atmosphere, such an uncertain atmosphere, even in parts where things were pretty good comparatively.

It's hard to even imagine what it would have been like for all those months in Victoria. I was dealing with colleagues in Victoria and of course they were scattered to the four winds in their lounge rooms or studies or bedrooms on Zoom calls. The whole thing was extraordinarily difficult for them.

MARK EVANS: I think you said earlier this morning as well, that it's very psychological in terms of its effects. Because in theory, it should be much easier for us to go about doing our business, but it's still very sticky. Doing the work is much stickier than I imagined it would be because of the psychology of COVID-19 and how it impacts on colleagues in very, very different ways.

MICHELLE GRATTAN: And doing things at a distance is easier at one level, but more difficult at another, because it's so abnormal, I guess. It's going out to the University of Canberra campus, for example, during some of this time as we got back to doing face-to-face videos, and seeing hardly any people around and things not open. It all seemed quite weird.

MARK EVANS: Well, you've got that distinction as well, haven't you, between the public and the private realm? In your work, you're more often than not, in the public realm and less in the private realm. But because of COVID-19, we're much more pushed into the private realm. We're at home, we're in our heads much more. For me that brings some real challenges as well in terms of public policy debate.

Because in many ways, we've been leaving it up to the politicians. And in times of crisis, maybe that's okay. Maybe it's okay to leave it up to the politicians. But now that we're looking to recovery, we need to be having a much more forensic debate about the future in the public realm. But I still get the sense that people really aren't focusing on the big issues in the way that they should be.

MICHELLE GRATTAN: Well, I think they've pushed the politicians aside to a certain extent, or at least the political fighting aside, even though in a sense they've become so much more dependent on government. Let's perhaps turn to the question of political trust and how that fits in, because your work in particular has concentrated on that over a number of years now. How do you see the question of political trust and how's it changing in this situation?

MARK EVANS: Our starting point in terms of defining political trust is the seminal definition that's used by Marc Hetherington, the American political scientist. He defines political trust as I quote, "Keeping promises and agreements, and thereby holding positive perceptions about people in government, and their actions." But as you know, we've also been asking this question to Australians all over Australia over the last three years. We've asked them what trust means to them.

They emphasise very similar things. They emphasise the importance of politicians having integrity, being honest, open and transparent. They emphasise the importance of empathy. That politicians should care about the issues that they care about and they should respect their views. They emphasise the importance of delivery. This is the sort of 'not breaking promises' issue, but actually it's a little bit more than that. They expect people to change their minds about issues, because of course in their everyday lives, they change their decisions all the time. But they expect politicians to explain why they've changed their minds.

This is a bit of a change to public opinion. There's an expectation for loyalty from government that politicians should have their back. They should look after Australian citizens. Of course, many of the listeners of this podcast will be aware, that literally since the end of the Howard period, there's been over a decade of decline in public trust. Essentially, we've seen public trust decline from 43% in 2007, to 25% last year. Alongside that, there's been a corresponding decline of trust in political institutions and the media, and in particularly political parties.

But astonishingly, since COVID-19, trust in people in government has literally doubled. It now stands at 54%. Trust in the Australian Public Service has increased from 39% to 54%. In a very, very short period of time, trust particularly in executive government, in Commonwealth government has increased very significantly. This is partly explained by what's called the rally around the flag phenomenon.

In times of crisis, Australians historically tend to be much more patriotic. But also, it's a response to some good early decision-making and effective governance are on the COVID-19 issue as well. It's a combination of rally around the flag and effective governance, and a shift towards more collaborative problem solving. We've done two recent surveys on trust in times of coronavirus, comparing the views of Australian citizens with the views of citizens in the United States, in Italy, in the United Kingdom. What has set Australia apart has been the belief that Australia has engaged in much more of a collaborative approach in terms of problem solving.

MICHELLE GRATTAN: And also the success one would think of the Australian response, because despite the Victorian second wave compared to other countries, and especially now, I think that Australia has been incredibly effective in its policy. Do you also think that people are very pleased to see some diminution of the hyper-partisanship that's been a feature of our politics recently, and that that has increased the trust factor? I wonder also whether as politics returns more to normal, the trust will go down somewhat. What do you think about that?

MARK EVANS: Well certainly, the standouts statistic in the comparative survey that we did was that when you ask citizens in the US, the UK and Italy, their views on the performance of their Prime Minister or President, they tend to go along partisan lines. People who vote for the opposition have a dim view of the performance of the President or Prime Minister.

Not so in Australia. Over 50% of Labor supporters commend the role that Scott Morrison has played in COVID-19. What that suggests is at the moment, at least, Australia is a far less polarised society than particularly the UK and the US, as has obviously been demonstrably demonstrated in the US presidential election. The US is a deeply divided country. So there's a positive take home message from that, and that is that it should be easier in the recovery process where there is a political will, to find common ground here in Australia.

The evidence suggests that those countries that are able to find common ground and build coalition of interest behind an agreed recovery plan will recover far more quickly than societies that are more polarised. That was the big take home message, for example, from the global financial crisis and the recovery from the global financial crisis.

MICHELLE GRATTAN: I think the institution of the National Cabinet, which the Prime Minister put together early in the crisis has been a unifying factor, even though there have been some very sharp divisions, and increasing divisions, of course over the borders, which are now fading out again as the borders are starting to come down.

But it managed the descent and division effectively, was an instrument that pushed for consensus, but accepted that in our federation, when so much of the power rested with the states, that the differences had to be, to some extent, accepted and managed. I think that that was a reinforcing factor on trust.

MARK EVANS: I think you're absolutely right there again. In terms of our survey data, Australians were great champions of the National Cabinet. Again however, we need to see how that develops over time. Because there was also an expectation that it wouldn't just become a hollowed out COAG. That there would be more sharing of power. That for example, there would be a rotation of the chairs of the National Cabinet. That states and territories would have the capacity to make proposals.

In other words, it was envisaged to be much more of an inclusive approach to problem-solving. Now, again it remains to be seen as to whether that will be the case once we get into the recovery process, and there's much greater contestation around resources.

MICHELLE GRATTAN: I think it's a long-term thing, the National Cabinet is likely to be able to be less than was promised, frankly. Because there will inevitably be divisions between federal and state governments over policies and resources, and so on. It may be a bit less bureaucratic than COAG, but you would think that it'll revert to an area where there'll be a lot of contesting of issues, rather than everybody being in the same boat.

But certainly for COAG, it's been a very positive development, and of course, arose out of the fact that Scott Morrison realised that the federal government lacked power over some of these areas, over many of these areas, and he was in a sense, dealing himself into a position where he had maximum clout to handle the crisis. He'd learned about this lack of power very harshly during the bushfires when the power rested mainly with the states.

MARK EVANS: Look, I think that's a really, really important observation. Because the critics would argue that this is a classic divide and conquer approach. And that clearly he learned lessons from the bushfire crisis. Interestingly enough, in terms of the survey data, in general, Australians prefer in terms of crisis management, a more centralised approach. If you look at public attitudes on the performance of different state Premiers and Chief Ministers at the territory government level, in general, their viewed in a very lukewarm way in terms of how they've managed the crisis.

And then Morrison is way ahead, so clearly he's very skilfully used the National Cabinet to build his power base and to promote his role as the key voice in terms of the management of the crisis. He has done that so far, very skilfully. But the big issue is around recovery. Because most economists are now arguing that this is going to be the most profound recession that Australia has experienced since the end of the second World War. When resources are tight, obviously there's going to be a great ideological battle between states, territories and Commonwealth Government for the scarce resources.

MICHELLE GRATTAN: But the recovery sees the main player as the Commonwealth Government, because recovery frankly is all about money, is driven by money and it's where you spend it, how you spend that money. So the central players in that become the Commonwealth Government and its officials and the public service generally. Perhaps we should turn our discussion to the public service and how the crisis has affected the service.

I think that the service, pre-crisis, the Federal Public Service was feeling in a very defensive position, that the Morrison government had made it quite clear that it saw the service as implementing an agenda that was very much politically driven, set by the government, and that it didn't really want the public service to have any independent ideas. It didn't see it as generating policy.

And of course, we'd just seen the Thodey review and the Morrison government had rejected a number of the recommendations of Thodey which would have given, I guess the top of the public service a bit more independence, but the government was having none of that. Yet paradoxically of course, when the crisis hit, we saw in broad terms, the role of experts elevated. And in specific terms, the role of public service advice becoming absolutely crucial to the government. It became incredibly dependent on the readout of Treasury as to where things were likely to go economically and how to respond.

MARK EVANS: Yes, absolutely. It's been an error of once again, of evidence-based policymaking. Experts being taken seriously once again. But look, I'm interested in that claim, that general claim that the independence of the Australian Public Service has decreased in recent times. Obviously you've been commentating on the Westminster model for a long period of time. Do you think that the independence of the Australian Public Service has been undermined?

MICHELLE GRATTAN: Yes, I do. I think the concept of an independent public service is interesting in itself, because of course a public service under our Westminster system is there to serve the government of the day. It's the servant of the people, but also of specifically the government. Independence is always, to some extent, a limited concept.

However, I think that we have seen in the last few decades and probably specifically the last 30 or so years, a progressive decline of the independence, the autonomy of the service. I think there are a number of factors involved here. The introduction of the contract system for the senior level of the service, the secretaries, by the Keating government, I think was a very big marker in terms of this loss of independence or decline of independence. Because it did make people at the top much more vulnerable to government pressure and it meant that public servants who the government felt were out of favour, were really not at all secure.

Now, they never were entirely secure. We always romanticise things a bit in the past, and perhaps you wouldn't want them to be entirely secure. But it became more arbitrary, so of course, we went through that period of John Howard, the day of the long knives, a whole lot of secretaries biting the dust. Recently in Morrison's time, we saw the same sort of thing, that a number of secretaries were removed because the government wanted to shake up the top of the service.

I think the fact that it did reject those 30 recommendations was another sign that it was not going to cede any power to the public service, any more power. Also, I think that the Coalition government has found it politically quite useful to use the public service as a punching bag. It always is inclined to talk about public service fat. The Public Service is a key part of the Canberra bubble, and that goes down quite well as a campaigning tool, so I think that's been another factor.

A further factor has been the increasing power of ministerial advisors over the years. This has perhaps started in the 1970s and has progressively increased. I think the media cycle has meant that ministers want public servants to be more attuned to the politics of things, their politics, the ministers' politics, and of course the notion of the responsiveness of the public service is important here, that that's come to the fore in recent times.

There are really multiple factors. Perhaps also one should throw in the fact that the public servants these days are competing much more in a bigger pond of advice coming to governments, whether-

MARK EVANS: So in combination, this has undermined the cultural authority and the role of the public service?

MICHELLE GRATTAN: It's undermined the importance of the public service to governments, and it has affected the culture in which the public service operates. Public servants, less senior public servants we're talking about here, are less revered, I think, than they would have been in the days of the mandarins of the '50s, '60s.

MARK EVANS: Now, at the same time as we've had this increase in public trust, we've also seen a number of quite significant corruption scandals, and yet this doesn't appear to have undermined trust in government more generally. Or is there a lag going on at the moment? Will that work its way through public opinion over the next few months, do you think?

MICHELLE GRATTAN: I think it depends on how the general story on trust goes. I think it won't be just the next few months but probably the next few years where we will see whether this is just a blip or a longer-term trend in the restoring of trust. But I also think that when people, so many people are preoccupied with their own futures, with their incomes, whether they're retirees suffering loss of income, whether they're workers suffering loss of jobs, whether they're businesspeople finding their businesses are collapsing or on the brink, then they're inclined to push other issues aside. There've got to be pretty big scandals to engage the public who are dealing with fairly desperate situations.

MARK EVANS: Do you think the political class is worried about the trust issue?

MICHELLE GRATTAN: I think that politicians are aware of the problem of lack of trust. But I think that perhaps they feel that it's too generalised to deal with, or perhaps it's just too nonspecific. And therefore, they just live in this world. One of the factors, I think of lack of trust has been the increasingly bad behaviour of politicians, say in parliament. I'm not talking scandals here, but more general abuse and bad conduct. Well, they know people don't like that and yet they don't seem able to reform themselves basically.

MARK EVANS: Again, do you think the three-year electoral cycle plays a role there that opposition parties often think that they just need to be a low target, and then they will get their go again? So they're less on the front foot in terms of criticising the government around the trust issues.

MICHELLE GRATTAN: I think the three-year cycle means that we're always just a little way away from campaign mode. And that dials up the partisanship and that has implications for trust. The whole question of opposition at the moment is I think quite a vexed one in the COVID crisis, because we saw at the beginning, the federal opposition saying, we want to work cooperatively and dialling down partisanship. But now it feels the need to dial it up again.

Yet again, ordinary people, preoccupied with their own personal issues, don't want all this skirmishing, so they don't necessarily attend to the opposition all that much, so there's been a bit of a desperation, I think, about how to deal with its situation among members of the federal opposition, and this has been quite difficult for Anthony Albanese to negotiate.

MARK EVANS: What do you think the APS needs to do to build stronger trust systems, not just with government but with the public more generally?

MICHELLE GRATTAN: Well, obviously it can't necessarily do much about being a punching bag. It's a victim of other players in the system. For itself, I think that it is well-regarded and public trust will be built specifically on performance. You're dealing with several levels here but the interface with ordinary people is in service delivery, and people will trust and respect the service if they have a good experience when they interact with it.

This is as basic as if they go to a centre link and find that they get good response, good service, prompt service, they're helped. Then they'll have a positive view. At a higher level, I think that the service will be judged on the advice that it gives government and how well that advice, or how effective in dealing with the critical policy problems that come up, that advice proves to be. Because we are, or the government is so dependent on the very fine judgments that are now being made week by week, month by month, by the officials in Treasury and other areas of government.

We do hear about that advice eventually, and so if the public service's policy advocacy turns out to be sound and we come out of this economic crisis fairly fast and in a reasonable state and minimise the costs in terms of unemployment and so on, then I think the public service will receive due credit for helping to point to the road ahead.

One question that I think is worth just exploring here is this whole issue of expertise, which we touched on before. Experts came into their own during this crisis and still are very well-regarded. But it was also interesting at a political level, that experts found themselves attacked on some fronts. For example, in all the debate about the Queensland border, critics focused on the Queensland Chief Health Officer, and said she's been politicised. She's just doing what the government's wanting, or she's too conservative, or whatever.

Same has happened in Victoria, where you had this bizarre situation of the Chief Health Officer becoming a Saint to his supporters and a demon to his opponents. There was even merchandise with his face on doonas and coffee cups and so on. Yet his critics were very harsh indeed on him. I think that the journey of experts in this crisis has been fascinating.

MARK EVANS: But evidence is always going to be contested, isn't it, in the same way that the Murray–Darling Basin Plan is probably one of the most contested policy areas that we've seen in recent times. But I guess people would argue that what is important is that we're having the debate, rather than there being a top-down government knows best approach.

Again, if you look at the survey data on trust, and we look at the questions around progress what you see time and time again, is the view by the majority of Australians that we really haven't made much progress on those big public policy issues, really over the last decade. Whether you're talking about climate change or whether you're talking about combating poverty or whether you're talking about big decisions in foreign policy vis-a-vis Australia's relationship with China, or with the United States.

And the view basically that COVID-19 has brought all of those issues into sharp focus. Do you think that there is an opportunity now as a consequence of that kind of quickening of public policy debate, for those big issues to be tackled in a more serious way going forward?

MICHELLE GRATTAN: Look, I think Mark, it's hard to know the answer to that question. There was a lot of talk of course, about how COVID would provide an opportunity for the government to step up on reform. My impression is that this has really not happened or happened to a very limited extent. We'll see soon what the government's proposing on industrial relations, which is often talked about as the big reform area.

But I think that there's a certain reform fatigue. Maybe it was there before, but perhaps people have become even more fatigued during COVID. Those who hoped for say an overhaul of the tax system or some such, are not going to be rewarded, as it were. Because I think the federal government recognises that people are not in a mood for great disruption on the back of COVID.

But on other fronts, if you take the climate front, I don't think that it's COVID that's going to push this forward. But from Australia's point of view, international developments and pressures, change of administration in the United States, and suddenly the atmosphere that Australia faces on that issue starts to look different. I think that there are various drivers here, but it's not that the virus is going to produce a wide transformation-

MARK EVANS: I guess the argument-

MICHELLE GRATTAN: ... of the reform atmosphere.

MARK EVANS: ... is that it's not the virus, it's the economic dislocation that the virus causes. In other words, the economic crisis. We know that historically, the big disruptive events are normally rooted in the changing nature of the economy. It doesn't look as if Australia's relationship with China is going to get any better for some time. It's our largest trading partner. The forecasting is looking pretty dismal.

In stable times, you're able to put off the big decisions. But in times of crisis, you're less able to put off the big decisions. In other words, we've not been through this type of crisis before. Is that going to provide some sort of shock therapy to the system?

MICHELLE GRATTAN: Well, if you take the China relationship, what's driving that is, I think fundamentally what's driving the change has been China becoming tougher and more assertive in recent years as its power is growing a great deal. Australia in the COVID debate pushed back by calling for an inquiry into the origins and handling of the virus, and that soured relations.

But those relations were already pretty sour. An Australian Prime Minister hasn't visited China for ages. Ministers had trouble even before getting their calls returned. They don't seem to have any hope of getting them returned now. You had the Foreign Interference legislation by the Turnbull government, and that was a big marker in the deterioration of the relationship. Actually, the COVID issue has fed into that deterioration but I think it's driven by other more fundamental factors.

MARK EVANS: In a sense, you seem to be suggesting that Australian politics and public policy will be characterised more by incrementalism rather than any radical change over the next period. But what COVID impacts do you think are here to stay in terms of how we do public policy in Australia?

MICHELLE GRATTAN: I think that the use of expertise, the evidence-based policy has been given a boost, and it's not necessarily a transformation, but people have become more aware of the importance of that, and that will be some sort of a legacy. I think that the way we do work and the business operates, there'll be changes there, that things will go back to a different normal. Of people working from home and less travel and that sort of thing will be something that's lasting.

At the level of the structure of government, I think that despite my qualifications about the National Cabinet, that that will have some lasting impact, that new structure. I think that federalism will be viewed differently. Now this is a debate in progress, but the states of course, have been very active, very assertive during this crisis. The relationship between the Commonwealth and the states, I think will be changed by the crisis, but it's not quite clear the shape that change will take so far.

MARK EVANS: We've seen the emergence of a lot of instruments of collaborative governance in response to bushfire recovery, in response to COVID-19 management and recovery. There's clearly a trend towards more collaborative governance and building stronger relationships with states and territories. We're also clearly seeing the way in which data sharing between Commonwealth Government and states and territories has become a Trojan horse into more collaborative problem solving.

There seems to be a recognition now, of the importance of taking what's called a systems approach to public policy, and that it's not good enough to be in control of your own part of the system. You need to have an overarching approach to the system that requires strong working relationships between Commonwealth Government, states and territories.

I suppose the other thing that I would chip in here, and I'm interested in your views on this, is whether COVID-19 now means that we're focusing more on the longer term than we were previously. Because obviously, pandemics can only really be managed through longer term thinking, never mind droughts and the impact of climate. And obviously in a sense, that gives the role of the public service, doesn't it? It gives it back towards that stewardship role, stewardship for the term.

MICHELLE GRATTAN: I think we are likely to focus more on the long-term at a planning level and a bureaucratic level because what's come through is just how things can change for the worst so dramatically. For example, I think we will see more long-term planning in our health system and awareness that we have to keep the health system up to scratch.

I think on the economic side, there will be even though it's not all COVID, the whole issue of the China relationship will mean that there will be more emphasis on trying to be self-sufficient to a greater extent on some key products. Medical products, for example. Now the government does say it won't go into protectionism, but nevertheless, this question of self-sufficiency and diversification of markets, I think will be a big issue.

Maybe just circling back to the reform question, although I would perhaps downplay the extent to which this will drive reform, one area where I think it will, the experience of COVID will drive reform is aged care. There was already a Royal Commission on aged care, but the fact that most of our deaths were in aged care, I think has been really a goad to saying that that system must be fixed up and fundamentally reformed, and that will be a big issue next year.

MARK EVANS: Michelle, thank you, and thank you so much for sharing your time with the Institute of Public Administration Australia this morning. I know you have a very, very busy schedule, so it's been wonderful hearing your thoughts on these fundamental issues in terms of the future of Australian public policy.

MICHELLE GRATTAN: Great to chat, Mark. Thanks a lot.

DAVID PEMBROKE: Well, there you have it, a Work with Purpose episode with a difference, and thank you so much to Professor Mark Evans and Michelle Grattan for sharing their time with us today, and with you the audience. Because again, I know you are looking for that diversity, and at Work with Purpose, we are certainly going to provide that for you.

Thanks again, to the team at IPAA for their ongoing support for Work with Purpose. It's been a fantastic year, a program that has really made a difference, and it would not have happened without the support of the team at IPAA. Nor would it have happened without the support of the Australian Public Service Commission, so a big thanks to them. And also a big thanks to the team back at contentgroup, who are also putting their shoulder to the wheel to bring you the Work with Purpose series, so thank you to everyone back at contentgroup.

Join us in a fortnight's time for another edition of Work with Purpose. But for the moment, it's bye for now.

SPEAKER 4: Work with Purpose is a production of contentgroup in partnership with the Institute of Public Administration Australia, and with the support of the Australian Public Service Commission.