

**THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STATEMENT OF
GOVERNMENT INTENT: THE LITERATURE REVIEW**

Prepared as part of the review of the statement of government intent

ANGOA by Dr. Chris Holland

JULY/ AUGUST 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Aim of the literature review	4
Methodology	5
Concepts	5
Section One: Issues that created the need for action	7
1.1 The Shrinking of the Welfare State	7
1.2 The Contract culture	8
1.3 Consultation	10
1.4 Summary	10
SectionTwo: How the Statement of Government Intent became the solution	10
2.1 Social Movements	11
2.2 UK Compact and partnership	12
2.3 Potential for Partnership	14
2.4 Summary	15
Section Three: The original goals and expectations of the SOGI for Government and the sector	18
3.1 Vision	18
3.2 Principles	19
3.3 The Six Commitments	19
3.4 Change in government culture	19
3.5 Whole of government approach	20
3.6 Treaty of Waitangi	20
3.7 Participation in decision-making	20
3.8 Government funding to community organisations	22
3.9 Strengthening the community sector	23
3.10 Implementation	23
3.11 Summary	20
Section Four: Government and community support actions and monitoring	22
4.1 He Waka Kotuia	27
4.2 The Government Policy on Volunteering	30
4.3 The Local Government Act (2002)	30
4.4 The Office of the Community and Voluntary Sector	32
4.5 Participation by Internet	33
4.6 Government community engagement: key learning and emerging principles	34
4.7 The Review of the Centre	34
4.8 The Treasury Guidelines	36

4.9	The Charities Act	38
4.10	A New Way of Working for the Tangata Whenua, Community and Voluntary Sector in Aotearoa / New Zealand.	38
4.11	Mahi Aroha	39
4.12	Statistics New Zealand's Non-Profit Institutions Satellite Account	39
4.13	Ministry of Social Development's Involvement in the Community Outcomes Process	40
4.14	Government Support for Volunteering 2002 – 2008	40
4.15	Other Recent developments and documents	41
4.16	Summary and conclusion	43
	Some Key Community and Voluntary Sector organisations	49
	References	52

Introduction

In December 2001, the government produced a *Statement of Government Intent* (SOGI) for an improved community – government relationship. The statement makes six commitments to: a changed culture of government, a “whole of government” approach, the Treaty of Waitangi, participation (by the community and voluntary sector) in decision making, government funding to community organisations, and strengthening the ‘third’ sector.

In April 2008, Ruth Dyson, Minister for Social Development and Employment, Minister for Senior Citizens, Minister for the Community and Voluntary Sector and Minister for Disability Issues, committed to a robust review of the intentions of the document, its implementation, effectiveness, and its delivery.

This literature review will examine how well the SOGI has, according to the literature, achieved its goals in terms of its own measures and the measures of the community and voluntary sector. It is part of a larger qualitative research project which aims to determine, from the perspective of the tangata whenua, community and voluntary sector:

- the extent to which public service staff demonstrate “a good understanding of the values, governance arrangements and working realities” of the sector
- the extent to which public service staff have implemented the six “government commitments”
- the next steps in achieving “an improved community- government relationship”

Aim of the literature review

The aim of the review is to synthesise New Zealand and international literature which identifies and explores the issues that:

- created the need for action
- led to the Statement of Government Intent being seen as the solution
- formed the goals and expectations of the Statement of Government Intent for Government and the sector and
- were supported and monitored by Government and the community and voluntary sector

Methodology

The literature was sourced from:

- a search of the internet
- material held by the author
- a search of public and university library catalogues
- material supplied by the Office for the Community and Voluntary Sector
- Material supplied by ANGOA

Search terms included accountability, advocacy, collaboration, compact, community sector, consultation, contracts, networks, participation, partnership, sector relationships, statement of intent, Treaty of Waitangi, trust, voluntary sector. Most of the literature comes from New Zealand and the UK, with smaller amounts from Australia and Canada. The literature included government policy, reports, legislation and guidelines, academic and community comment, information from websites and case studies.

Concepts

The Statement of Government Intent aims to improve the community – government relationship. The following is an explanation of some related concepts that have multiple interpretations in the literature. The interpretations given here are those mostly widely used – varying interpretations will be discussed in the review.

Co-ordination

Co-ordination is when two or more elements of a complex activity or organisation are brought together into a harmonious or efficient relationship (Concise Oxford Dictionary, 1999)

Collaboration

Collaboration is when two or more persons work jointly on an activity or project. There is an acknowledgement of shared visions and outcomes and more relational and negotiated ways of working.

Networks

These are often informal arrangements, where government, community groups, voluntary groups (or a mix of these) come together as equals for their shared benefit. Their structure is loose, they have little authority, and the main resource required is time. There are low levels of risk and accountability (Gray, 2002).

Partnership

Partnerships are usually formal arrangements between two or more parties that may or may not include a legal contract. Erhardt (2000) cited in Gray (2002), adds that it involves a shared commitment to achieving agreed objectives, focused effort towards those objectives, and a shared responsibility and active participation by partners.

Participation

From a government perspective, providing opportunities for participation means setting up websites with a space for citizens to review plans and offer their opinions, make a submission, or comment on 'green paper' documents produced for consultation. The way in which these form of participation are taken into account is unclear.

Section One: Issues that created the need for action

This chapter describes local and global economic, and social changes that impacted on the relationship between government and voluntary and community services up until the late twentieth century.

1.1 The Shrinking of the Welfare State

Community and voluntary efforts to support others in need, advocate around issues, improve the environment and create community recreational opportunities have always existed in New Zealand. Indeed, for Maori, giving time to community and voluntary work has been an expectation, a responsibility of members of the community, rather than a choice to be taken or added on to other work (OCVS, 2007). Voluntary organisations developed with colonisation and have depended on government funding since the earliest parliaments (Cribb, 2006). In 1885 voluntary welfare received statutory recognition through the 1885 Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act. State involvement in welfare became more pervasive during and after the first and second world wars in developed countries. In New Zealand, the expansion of the welfare state under the 1935 labour government remained stable until the 1960s reflecting a period of high employment and affluence. The state took responsibility for welfare from cradle to grave and provided state funded and regulated services. Funding for community and voluntary services was allocated according to the strength of ministerial relationships with favoured organisations (Tennant et al 2006). In a background paper prepared for the New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services, Garth Nowland-Foreman (1995) notes that in these times the emphasis was on whether or not the organisation was “worthy”.

By the 1970s, the New Zealand economy was facing instability. Britain was entering the European Community and the oil crises of the 1970s and 1980s precipitated rising unemployment. In the United States and the UK, liberalisation of the economy and the reduction of welfare spending had been underway since the early 1980s (Cheyne et al., 1997). The New Zealand government responded, as had these countries, with funding cuts and greater privatisation of services. At the same time, globalisation caused the erosion of national economic boundaries and the role of government (in which the state was actively engaged in providing services and maintaining order) shifted to a role of governance (in which services and the maintenance of order were left to the marketplace and voluntary sector with government oversight). This rolling back of the welfare state was adopted by centre left governments throughout the developed world. Fractures in the welfare state

placed pressure on community and voluntary organisations (Tennant, 2006) as they were increasingly required to assume responsibility for activities that were previously the domain of government.

1.2 *The contract culture*

It is argued that the systematic neo-liberal reconstruction of the state that took shape in New Zealand in the 1980s and 1990s, recommodified welfare and widened inequalities (Cheyne et al.). Government purchase of services was introduced (many had previously been provided by government), involving government determined contracts with service providers in the community. Monitoring was undertaken according to rigid specifications and measurable outputs. These practices continued into the twenty-first century, drawing on corporate agency theory, described by Jo Cribb (2006) quoting Eisenhardt:

The focus of the theory is the contract governing the relationship between principal and agent and determining how the contract can be made as efficient as possible (Eisenhardt, 1989, in Cribb, 2006).

As an efficiency measure, Cribb argues that this theory is inappropriate to the public sector/community sector context, because it assumes "...one agent, one principal, conflicting goals, and easily specified and measured outcomes." The realities for the community and voluntary sector are that there are several 'agents' across the sector and within organisations who seek government funding, goals for the sector are usually in line with government stated goals, and outcomes are not so easily specified and measured.

Agency theory attempts to address the problem of goal conflict between agents and principals, and information asymmetry, where the principal assumes the agent has information about the task and that agents delivering services on contract will work to further their own interests. Narrow specification and monitoring is seen as a means of principals controlling agents (Cribb 2006). It uses terms like *moral hazard* and *adverse selection* to describe the potential of agents to shirk and claim expertise and capacity they do not have. Thus the theory on which the government contracts with community and voluntary organisations are based, provides a poor trust relationship with 'agents' who are in this case, the community and voluntary sector. Throughout the 1990s:

The use of contracts increased enormously the power of government to determine what voluntary agencies did, resulting in a sense of resentment and lack of trust (Dalley & Tennant, 2004: XX)

The delivery of services under existing contractual arrangements is described by Pat Hanley (2006) as a “dogmatic prescriptive system” and suggests that this reflects a basic mistrust by government and an erosion of public confidence in the voluntary sector:

These issues are not simply about funding relationships but rather are an expression of a perceived, long term threat to the ability of organisations within the sector to serve our communities and to remain viable as no-for-profit, non-governmental, community based and values led organisations (Hanley, 2006:3)

Jo Cribb describes this contractual system as a ‘hard accountability’ system, elements of which include hierarchical control, exacting performance management, tightly defined outputs regular reporting and rigorous external monitoring. She comments:

The problem does not lie in the use of contracts but rather in the relationships and practices used to generate them and monitor the performance of the contracted organisation. (Cribb, 2006:P. xiv)

Nowland-Foreman, writing in 1995, asserted that contracting was commonly used as a way of exerting government control over voluntary organisations. This practice continued into the twenty first century. Considine (2002) observes that the legal obligation to respect the legitimate interests of others affected by decisions, programs, and interventions is often contradicted by the demands of contracting-out and output-based performance. He describes the current contract system as “Taylorist” and encouraging micromanagement. Contracts are tightly determined by government officials, resulting for the community and voluntary sector in losses in autonomy and security of funding and an increase in compliance costs. Hanley claims that, under this system, the principal and the agent both have a vested interest in overstating the successes and under reporting the problems raised by service users and their families. Further, because the people who *use* the services are not party to the contract they have no voice. Thus, contracts arise from government mistrust, and breed mistrust between service providers (who have to focus on winning contracts for their survival), their volunteers and their clients. He comments:

At least part of the strategy to address the concerns relating to the quality and care of services provision....requires adopting a range of funding strategies. These should be capable of being genuinely negotiated, particularly as appropriate in local settings, and not dictated nationally (Hanley, 2006:4)

Overall, the issues with the contract system included (and still include) insecurity of funding, a burden of compliance costs, the danger that larger organisations would continue to dominate the contracting process, and disempowerment. Tennant et al observe that:

Contracts pushed organisations into the delivery of services and activities identified by the state, instead of determining their own priorities. (2006:14)

1.3 *Consultation*

The need to consult with tangata whenua and the community and voluntary sector on strategic policy or policy implementation matters, had not been well appreciated by the New Zealand Government prior to the 1970s. But with the rise of social movements demanding a say, the government began to engage in consultative practices in terms of public policy. However, this consultation was limited to the release of policy papers for comment prior to ratification, was limited to a market framework, and was mono-cultural. Maori philosophical cornerstones of collective consciousness, collective wellbeing and collective responsibility, espoused through Aroha kit e takata a rohe (love and goodwill towards all people) were not considered by government at the time (Peet & Peet, 2002).

1.4 *Summary*

Up until the 1980s, voluntary and community based services existed for those who fell outside of the social welfare net, or who were culturally or geographically remote from 'the centre' of government policy development and implementation. During the cuts to the welfare state in the 1980s and 1990s, community and voluntary support became increasingly necessary, both for New Zealand citizens and immigrants. Services previously provided by government agencies were now purchased by them as a means of cutting costs. "Communities" were growing and re-shaping – calling for more respectful treatment, including adequate funding for support services, and greater consultation. Despite these calls, rigidly specified and monitored contracts for services, indicating a lack of trust in the sector were introduced, resulting in a loss of autonomy for the sector, a loss of trust in government, and a loss of quality service due to the need to meet contractual demands. After Labour's 1980s 'economic experiment', National's 1990s tightening of welfare spending, and being increased contractual compliance, the community and voluntary sector were struggling to remain viable. Relationships with government were poor.

Section Two: How the SOGI became the solution

While the fourth labour government was intent on seeing through its economic experiment, it also needed the continuing support of its traditional membership. The Royal Commission on Social Policy was established in 1986. The commission's remit was to inquire into and report on the extent to which New Zealand was developing as a just and fair society. It released its report in 1988, but was criticised by key business people with acknowledged neo-liberal views. The report was also strongly resisted by Treasury, who saw economic policy as the most critical in promoting well-being. Labour's social policies had become increasingly compatible with economic reforms (Cheyne, 1997). When National came to power in 1990, it attacked welfare spending and delivery, mainly through drastically cutting benefits. The public sector was restructured, reflecting managerialist practices. This was most evident in the health sector, where funding and provision were separated to contain expenditure, with a much reduced role for the state in the direct provision of services and a focus on specified and measurable outputs (Cheyne 1997).

The effect of these policies was tempered by three factors which led to the development of the SOGI. The first was that social movements in New Zealand were growing in strength, independence and voice. The second was the example of the UK Compact, which focused on real partnership, and which influenced the incoming Labour government of 1999 to set up a working party to explore the potential for partnership between communities and government in New Zealand. The third factor was the report produced by the Community and Voluntary Sector Working Party in May 2001, which showed that there was an urgent need to repair the relationship between the government and the community and voluntary sector.

2.1 Social movements

Since the 1960s and 1970s, there had been a growth in social movements (Maori, women's, environmental, gay and civil rights). In the 1980s and 1990s these movements were demanding government accountability and user involvement in the design of social services. This resulted initially in an individual consumerist, complaints-based form of participation in public services e.g. the Code of Rights for Consumers of Health and Disability Services (Cheyne, 1997). But these movements were beginning to argue that they had the expertise to develop and provide effective services for their membership. Many self-help alternatives sprang up, including women's refuges, women's health groups, lobby groups for the elderly and self-help groups for those with disabilities. Fiona Williams calls these examples of a 'user movement' (Williams 1993 in Cheyne, 1997).

The claims of Maori were a particularly significant component of these challenges to state responsibility. One of the main shifts in social service delivery has been the transfer of the state's responsibility for Maori well-being from the Department of Maori Affairs to mainstream government departments and to iwi (Kelsey 1993 in Cheyne et al. 1997).

2.2 *UK Compact and partnership*

The same sorts of changes to the sector were taking place, more or less, in other developed countries. The increasing inability of the community and voluntary sector to provide sufficient quality services under the new contract funding regimes was bound to reach a crisis point and finally gained the attention of governments. The UK began to examine its voluntary–statutory relationship in 1990, 1993 and 1996. The reviews explored state charity law, the relationship between voluntary organisations and the market, and the role of intermediary organisations such as the National Council for Voluntary Organisations (NCVO). Jane Lewis asserts that the voluntary sector had always sought a “partnership” with the state, but that by the late 20th century, the government held the lead in establishing the nature of that partnership (Lewis, 1999), partly as a factor of the neo-liberal shifts described above, where “Central government set the fiscal conditions that limited the room for manoeuvre on the part of voluntary organisations” thereby undermining their independence (ibid:261). Contracting and greater formalisation had implications, Lewis noted, for governance and volunteering, actually contributing to a decline in volunteering in the 1990s (Davis Smith 1997, in Lewis 1999). The Deakin Commission of 1996 called for a “concordat” between the state and voluntary organisations, arguing strongly against the instrumentalist approach taken by the state, harking back to an earlier discourse around citizenship. The Compact on Relations between Government and the Voluntary and Community Sector in England was published in 1998. “Drawn up in partnership”, it was not legally binding, but rather a general framework to enhance the relationship between Government and the sector (Lewis, 1999).

Despite the lack of legislative support, being drawn up in partnership meant that both government and voluntary sector made ‘undertakings’ to each other. Principles, linked to a democratic society, integrity and openness, and recognition of independence of the sector, were agreed between both parties to the compact. The government undertook to promote the compact across the sector, to respect independence, and to consult early, recognising project costs. The voluntary sector undertook to promote the compact across the sector, be open and accountable, involve stakeholders and embrace diversity, and contribute constructively to public policy.

“Partnership” was being used freely in UK public services at the time, as was “collaboration”. While partnerships can be formed between two partners with unequal power, the term tends to evoke for most at least, a shared commitment and responsibility and active participation by partners (Erhardt, 2000). In the UK there was a link in the inclusion of communities, Lewis asserts, to Blair’s communitarian philosophy and a connection to active citizenship promoted by the earlier conservative government. The National Council of Voluntary Organisations, which had been in existence in some form since 1919, was in a strong position to speak for the sector, so the government had a single entity with which to work in partnership and collaborate. However, Stuart Etherington, writing in the forward of the UK NCVO report *Standing apart, working together* (Blackmore, 2004) cautions the sector about pitfalls of partnership, for instance that although “funders, including parts of government, are important partners in our work...[they] do not and should not drive our agenda.”(2004:3). Ann Blackmore, the author of the report, comments that partnership may be felt by some organisations to compromise independence.

In New Zealand at around the same time, a working party was asked by the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) to develop a website that would support community governance. The working party comprised representatives from the CAB, the National Collective of Independent Women's Refuges, YWCA, the National Kohanga Reo Trust, the Maori Women's Welfare League, NZCOSS, the Disabled Persons' Assembly, Kupenga Maori, the 20/20 Trust, the Funding Information Service and the DIA. The website, CommunityNet <http://www.community.net.nz/> was launched in November 1998, and shortly after it was agreed that the DIA should provide ongoing maintenance of the website. However, after an initially high visitor rate, the level of community input dropped. The issues seemed to be around effective participation (DIA website).

In 1999, the incoming Labour government in New Zealand was aware of the UK compact. The Hon. Steve Maharey was appointed to a newly created position of minister responsible for the Community and Voluntary Sector. Hanley reports that in 2000, Maharey stated publicly that the government was “keen to move away from the contracting model to the partnership model” and that “[the government] also realise that the contract model that National pursued hurt the community and voluntary sector” (Hanley, 2006:3).

Given the community’s lack of faith in the process, Maharey wanted a way to demonstrate Labour’s commitment to the sector. He set up the Community and Voluntary Sector Working Party to provide recommendations for how the government / voluntary sector relationship could be improved (Cribb, 2006:9). This working party, comprising mostly members from a

range of local community / voluntary organisations and chaired by ex-Waitakere City Council deputy mayor Dorothy Wilson, produced a report in May 2001 entitled *Communities and Government – Potential for Partnership Wakatapu Wakaaro*.

So partnership between government and communities was seen by this Labour government at the outset of their first term in office, to be an important ingredient of improved relationships.

2.3 *Potential for Partnership Wakatapu Wakaaro.*

The *Potential for Partnership* report indicated that a UK type Compact, where there were two parties (the government and the voluntary and community sector) who could give specific undertakings towards improving relationships, was not feasible in New Zealand, as there was no single body in the community sector that could sign such a partnership agreement, and because the basis for partnership between iwi and the crown established by the Treaty of Waitangi would need to be reflected in any New Zealand voluntary sector agreement (Wilson et al, 2001). The report recommended that the government should review crown/iwi relations (as required by the Treaty of Waitangi).

It was also recognised that there needed to be more sharing of information between government and the sector, and between sector organisations. Instead of the stronger UK partnership model of government/community and voluntary sector *collaboration*, it proposed a more participatory style of government through shared information, public reports, and training programmes for public servants. For instance, under “Developing a participatory style of government” it recommended the funding of a community based organisation to maintain a database of people able to undertake policy and research work.

Recognising the relationship and operational difficulties brought by contracting, the working party further proposed a change in funding from contracts to grants where funding commitments were less than 30,000, and a longer period of funding (three to five years), and an immediate increased allocation of funding to the Community Organisation Grants scheme (COGS).

The report found that confidence and trust of the community and voluntary workers had been eroded through lack of state recognition and respect for the sector, and called for mutual respect and trust, which, it claimed could be achieved through shared experience.

Twyford (2006) asserts that umbrella groups “have been seeking in good faith to clarify their respective niches in the sector.”. However, she comments

...an increasing emphasis on their contractual roles as service providers, combined with a continued dependence on government funding, has squeezed their ability either to effectively represent their members or to lead the national discourse on social policy (2008:6)

Since a lack of state recognition of the sector might be partly be addressed by funding the development of an umbrella organisation owned independently by the community and voluntary sector with which the government could negotiate, a strong recommendation to this effect could reasonably be expected to have been prioritised in the report. Instead, under “Strengthening the community sector”, a comparatively weak recommendation is offered that the government should:

Develop a strategy for investing in the community sector, including specific commitment to resourcing umbrella, national and strategic groups as appropriate across the sector. (Wilson et al., 2001:24)

The main recommendation of the working party was that the government should commit to rebuilding a “positive working relationship with community and voluntary organisations” [through a] formal *statement of intent*”. (Wilson et al, 2001:13). In this report, the statement of intent was only expected to outline principles, and to be a first step. To progress this work, the working party proposed a ‘phase two’, where a steering group, comprising a chair, three expert members and one member leading a Maori defined approach, should be established to oversee three separate streams of development and three working groups: a *participatory* style of government, resourcing and accountability, and strengthening the community sector (2001:15).

2.4 Summary

In the lead up to the SOGI the community and voluntary sector and a range of social movements that linked with or formed a part of the sector, were demanding government accountability and user involvement in the design of social services. Of particular significance was the growing strength and assertiveness of Maori groups, which resulted in a government wide acceptance of responsibility for Maori well-being.

The UK government was providing a very good model of collaborative partnership with the community and voluntary sector, and this was partly due to the ability of the government to deal with a single entity representing the community and voluntary sector.

In New Zealand government, the situation was less clear cut, and this seemed to contribute to a certain lack direction both in government and in the sector. According to government statements at the time, partnership was important, but the detail of how a contract culture and hard accountability measures could be shifted to accommodate partnership arrangements were not yet clear.

Reference to partnership appears to be no more than rhetoric. The recommendations of the commissioned *Potential for Partnership* focused on wide *participation* rather than on partnership. This may be because appropriate sector-wide representation in an umbrella body that could act as a partner to government, was perceived by the working party to be difficult. The report recognised that short term contracts are a problem, and proposed a shift from a contracting system to a grants system, with funding covering longer periods. The mistrust the sector felt for the government received more attention in the report than the culture of mistrust within government which caused officials to opt for risk averse funding, contracting, and monitoring procedures. The most disappointing outcome of the commissioned work, though, was that it suggested that the intent should focus on principles only (leaving the definition and oversight of implementation to a later phase, another steering group and a further report) and suggested only three workstreams to work towards: participation (not partnership); improved resourcing and accountability, and strengthening the community sector.

Thus, despite Maharey's eagerness to have *partnership* options explored, the voluntary and community sector engagement with state policy would remain at the level of participation: major organisations within the sector would be consulted (notified) about government strategic plans and invited to respond – rather than to contribute actively as partners from the outset. The expectations of the community and voluntary sector, however, had been raised by government statements and the title of the report, and their own dissatisfaction with the current government – community sector relationship. They expected more than participation and talked about collaboration and partnership. Indeed, without partnership or at least collaborative engagement, the sectors' issues with contracting and accountability were likely to be overlooked.

In terms of strengthening the sector, the most urgent task would seem to be the development of an umbrella organisation generally representing sector-wide interests, yet

allowing for any sub-group within the sector to stand apart and represent their specific interests where necessary. The Statement of Government Intentions that was recommended and developed, was doomed to be flawed by its failure to urge government support for the development of such a body.

Section Three: The original goals and expectations of the SOGI for Government and the sector

The *Statement of Government Intentions* (SOGI) for an improved community – government relationship was produced in the International Year of Volunteers, 2001. The document was developed in the shadow of the UK Compact (1998) and the after first draft of the UK Funding and Procurement Code of Practice (2000). However, following the recommendations of its commissioned *Communities and Government – Potential for Partnership Wakatapu Wakaaro* report, it took a different approach to that taken in the UK.

The key difference is that the New Zealand document is unilateral – there are no community and voluntary sector partners to the document. There are other subtle differences in the use of language, possibly due to the different kinds documents that the UK and NZ documents are – one is an agreement between two partner entities, the other a declaration on the part of the more powerful entity, the government. In the UK Compact, ‘undertakings’ (guarantees, or pledges) are agreed. These undertakings are often specific. The Compact was followed by a Funding and Procurement: Compact code of practice which detailed quite specifically how the state and the voluntary sector should work with each other and what they could expect from each other.

In the New Zealand statement, even under the ‘commitments’ section, there are few actions stated. These are not specific. Overall, the government ‘expects’ (hopes/anticipates) that certain changes will take place within the public sector. While the New Zealand statement uses verbs showing attitude such as ‘recognises’, ‘values’ and ‘acknowledges’, the UK document uses verbs showing action (‘promotes’ and ‘consults’). While there are some instances where “will” is used in the New Zealand statement, signifying a promise, what is promised is imprecise. Thus the New Zealand document generally has a weaker tone.

3.1 Vision

The SOGI vision is outlined below.

The statement’s vision commits the Government to strong and respectful relationships between government and community, voluntary and iwi / Māori organisations, as part of building “...a healthy civil society”. It is important to note here that it does not mention equal relationships. The document talks about

Government / sector interdependence in order to "...achieve shared goals of social participation, social equity and strengthened communities". It promises that:

The Government states that it will be an active partner in building a relationship based on honesty, trust and integrity / tika and pono; compassion and caring / aroha and manaakitanga; and recognition of diversity" (SOGI, 2001)

3.2 *Principles*

Principles are rules governing behaviour, underpinned by a belief system. The UK Compact, for instance states that "A healthy voluntary and community sector is part of a democratic society" and that "The independence of the voluntary and community sector should be respected". The SOGI lists similar principles. It identifies co-operation as a principle, while at the same time acknowledging the independence of community, voluntary and iwi/Māori organisations and the Treaty of Waitangi. The tension between co-operation, partnership and independence may in fact be quite pronounced in some organisations, especially those where advocacy is their main function. Dr. Don Matheson (2005) asserts that is important to protect both the independence and the voice (advocacy role) of the NGO sector. The SOGI also supports two-way communication, leadership within the community sector and from government ministers, innovation and creativity, cultural diversity, public accountability and flexible good practice.

3.3 *The Six Commitments*

The statement then lists and describes six 'commitments'. The statement commits itself to a changed culture of government which expects "public servants to treat all New Zealanders with dignity and respect" (SOGI 2001); it commits to fostering partnership in decision making; it reaffirms its commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi; it makes some reference to addressing concerns about funding arrangements; it refers to an intention to strengthen the sector. These are discussed below.

3.4 *Change in Government culture*

First, Government recognises that there will need to be a change in the culture of Government organisations. Its commitments acknowledge that the Government has not always treated people with dignity and respect. The first commitment is that the government *expects* that

...public service chief executives and senior managers [will] ensure that all staff have a good understanding of the values, governance arrangements and working realities of the community, voluntary and iwi/Māori organisations with whom they interact.

The commitment seems well-meaning, but is vague and would be improved by specific actions that can be measured. The understandings do not preclude disrespectful, mistrustful and micromanaging attitudes and practices, it is not clear how they could effect a culture change. Moreover, expectations do not have the strength of *requirements* - there seem to be no consequences for public servants failing to meet them.

3.5 *Whole of Government Approach*

Secondly, and like its UK counterpart, the statement commits to a "whole of government" approach, and "will give priority to breaking down 'silos' and establishing co-ordinated, inter-sectoral policies and programmes". This new departure from existing practice can be expected to improve efficiencies in government. In addition, since community, iwi and Maori providers often deliver integrated services under contract to several government agencies, a whole of government approach is likely to reduce reporting requirements and duplication.

3.6 *The Treaty of Waitangi*

Thirdly, the statement commits to departments and ministries recognising and applying the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. To this end, it promises:

...government agencies will continue to develop and improve public servants' understanding of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, its relevance to the agency in which they work and its application to their own roles.

Again, there is no indication that this is not simply a commitment to business as usual. As for the commitment to a change in culture, this commitment is also vague and lacks any specific, measurable action.

3.7 *Participation in decision-making*

The commitment asserts that the government values the contribution of community, voluntary and iwi/Māori organisations to good policy making and delivery of effective services. It promises to work with the community sector to develop and improve consultation processes through sharing good practice, guidelines, workshops and training.

Participation in decision making can have a weak or a strong form of contribution. The weak form is where participants are consulted about plans and invited to offer opinions, make submissions and register objections, without any guarantee that these will effect decision making. The strong form is where participants have “a shared commitment and responsibility” (Erkhardt, 2000), an active voice in the actual decision making process through membership in decision making bodies, and a collaborative partnership in the implementation of initiatives. Megan Courtney, partnering advisor for the Waitakere City Council, presents a continuum from co-existence through to networking, co-operation, collaboration, and finally, partnership (Courtney, 2006). How far the government values the contribution of community, voluntary and iwi/Maori organisations may be measured on such continuums. The ‘participation in decision making’ commitment talks about working together with the sector and sharing good practice etc. and this indicates a strong, collaborative partnership. The extent to which this sharing is two-way may provide a measure of its real strength.

3.8 *Government funding to community organisations*

The statement acknowledges the “valuable contribution” made by community, voluntary and iwi/Māori organisations to the achievement of shared social, cultural, environmental and economic goals. It states

Government agencies will, together with the community sector, undertake a programme of work to address concerns about funding arrangements, effectiveness, compliance costs and related matters.

Although the non-profit sector drew increasingly on government funding up until 2002, since 2002 non-government sources of funding, such as community and philanthropic trusts, personal donations, and payments and fees for service, have increased significantly (Robinson and Hanley, 2002 in Tennant et al., 2006). This underlines that the contracting model of funding is a key issue for the community and voluntary sector. This commitment only makes peripheral mention of the issues. It is vague, promising only to “undertake a programme of work to address *concerns*”. In contrast, the UK Compact undertakes specifically to “Recognise the cost of doing business when funding public service delivery” (UK Compact 1998).

Jo Cribb’s (2006) discussion of hard and soft accountability might be useful as a yardstick for the impact that this commitment might have. Hard accountability, according to Cribb, reflects a state concern that voluntary organisations are less accountable than public servants, and

that quality (which is difficult to specify) can therefore be jeopardised. She discusses hard accountability from the point of view of the community and voluntary sector, noting that it results in a loss of (community and voluntary) organisational autonomy, an inequitable distribution of resources, high overhead compliance costs, and a reduced ability to provide quality services. She states that soft accountability "...is an exercise in limiting discretion and wielding power" where sector organisations have the freedom to self-regulate, and where performance measures are not always financial. She states that for this kind of accountability, government officials need to have a deeper knowledge of sector organisations. Further, problems with funding and 'related matters' arise from government mistrust of the sector, and create sector mistrust in the government. Cumming and Stace (2006) discuss how contestable funding is now compulsory, following a 2005 complaint from an opposition MP (and therefore sits more comfortably with agency theory). They note that the concept of Good Faith (written into employment legislation since 2000), which recognises that people can exercise common sense and agree on what needs to be achieved, is "obliterated by the assumption underpinning agency theory" (2006:16). They observe:

...more emphasis needs to be put on basic human skills such as relationship development, common sense and trust, which have been overlooked in the enthusiasm for audit and compliance (2006:15).

3.9 *Strengthening the community sector*

The commitment states that "Government will work alongside community, voluntary and iwi/Māori organisations to support and strengthen the community sector". Again, although, vague, this is a promise which can be called upon if the sector continues to be a subsidiary in government –led initiatives.

3.10 *Implementation*

In this section, a statement about *how* these commitments are to be met, could be expected. Instead, the government seems eager to convince the community and voluntary sector of the strength of its commitment. It discusses a "...genuine partnership with community, voluntary and iwi/Māori organisations" It acknowledges this will take "hard work, reflection and active engagement". It sees Government, at some point, as a facilitator of a strong civil society.

The SOGI has been distributed widely to all government agencies and to community, voluntary and iwi organisations, where it has been received positively. The statement did not

contain an implementation plan. Instead, as will be seen, the government was to take the advice of the *Communities and Government – Potential for Partnership Wakatapu Wakaaro*. report and sets up a steering group to recommend and oversee an implementation process.

3.11 Summary

In this chapter, the SOGI has been compared to the UK Compact. A brief linguistic analysis of the document had been undertaken, and strengths and weaknesses signalled. Overall the document seems to be strong on the language of social inclusion (particularly in its vision and principles). It is a document that highlights recognition, valuing and acknowledgement of the community and voluntary sector.

It commits to ensuring better public service understandings about the sector, gives priority to working together towards a whole of government approach, and states that it will continue with existing policies to promote understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi and its implications. All these are weak on specific undertakings. It further commits to working together to improve consultation process, undertaking a programme of work to address concerns, and working alongside the community and voluntary sector to support and strengthen it. Again, few specific promises that can be monitored.

The literature suggests that there may be a central issue of lack of government trust in the sector. This will be tracked through government reports and initiatives.

The following section will explore the extent to which the government's intentions have been supported and realised by the government and the community and voluntary sector, and how reports, policies, legislation, websites and initiatives have effected more harmonious government – community and voluntary sector relationships.

Section Four: Government support actions and monitoring

This section explores government reports, initiatives and other responses (such as legislation, guidelines, training and changes in procedures) and the extent to which they give “teeth” to the Government’s intention to improve relationships between its public servants and the community and voluntary sector, in the sense that they bring about real change. This review is particularly interested in initiatives which meet the intentions of the Statement, by focusing on:

- changing the culture of the public service
- developing a whole of government approach
- developing public servants’ understanding of the relevance and application of the Treaty of Waitangi to their work
- increasing opportunities for community participation in decision making
- improving government funding to community organisations
- strengthening the community sector

Reports and other initiatives are presented chronologically. The ways in which they address (or fail to address) any of these commitments is noted during the discussion of the document / initiative.

To get a sense of how effective follow-up initiatives in New Zealand have been, it is useful to take another look at how the UK followed up on its Compact. Once it was developed and launched in 1998, it was followed by a raft of codes of practice. The UK codes were the Funding and Procurement Code (2000), the Consultation and Policy appraisal code (2000), the Local Compact Implementation Workbook (2000-2006), the Black and Minority Ethnic Groups Code (2001) the Volunteering Code and the Community Groups Code (2003). While codes of practice do not carry the same force as legislation, they nevertheless *specify how people should behave*. Actual practice can be measured against these codes. For instance, in the Funding and Procurement Code, the voluntary sector undertook to have clear lines of accountability, especially with joint bids, to have good systems in place to manage finances and other funded projects, and to account for them. Examples of UK government undertakings are that they would discuss risks up-front and let community or voluntary organisations manage them, make payments in advance of expenditure where appropriate, and to be proportionate in monitoring requirements, focusing on outcomes (www.thecompact.org.uk/information).

In New Zealand, the government was not able to deal directly with an umbrella organisation representing the community and voluntary sector. This meant that the Government (to some extent by default) held a considerable amount of power in determining how improvement in the relationship between the community and voluntary sector and the government should be defined and actioned. Thus it could seek reports, but there was no leverage from the community and voluntary sector, and the government was under no obligation to adopt any recommendations, particularly those that gave the community and voluntary sector more power than the government felt was necessary. Although members of the sector were consulted and recommendations were sought, the lack of a single representative body for the sector further served to weaken its influence with government.

As mentioned earlier, the government funded a range of initiatives in response to the SOGI, such as the commissioning of reports, the development of new policies, the establishment of a dedicated Community and Voluntary Sector office and staff, participative websites, a task force and forums, legislation, guidelines and tools and training workshops. Of the six commitments, these initiatives tended to emphasise most *changing the culture of the public service* and increasing opportunities for community *participation in decision making*.

Stephen Cayley, in his *Literature review on capacity building for the voluntary and community sector* (2006) suggests that problems identified before SOGI and created mainly by inadequate funding and heavy compliance, continue to exist today. Cayley observes that organisations within the community and voluntary sector often work with people closest to the margins of society and at greatest risk of social exclusion. Many of these organisations, he reports, are small and have limited resources, yet spend a considerable amount of time pursuing short term grants to tackle problems that take years to address. This time away from community and voluntary work weakens the sector. There is less time to respond to changing legislative and social requirements and policy, development, evaluation and planning suffer. He observes that “Effective and deliberate attempts (by Government) to assess and respond to the operational needs of the sector have...been largely non-existent.” (2006:4)

These issues are not confined to New Zealand. Internationally, funding for the non-profit sector has reduced, while the number of voluntary and community sector organisations has increased dramatically (ibid:6) The most effective form of capacity building is through face to face support with real people [and yet] face to face support structures are diminishing (Family and Community Services 2005 in Cayley, 2006:8).

One of the government's first initiatives following the SOGI, was to establish a steering group in 2002, comprising people linked to or representing key community and voluntary organisations and government agencies. The group was asked to present a further report to the Ministry of Social Development the following year, on how the SOGI could be implemented. They produced *He Waka Kotuia*.

4.1 *He Waka Kotuia*

The steering group's implementation report, *He Waka Kotuia: joining together on a shared journey*, was published in July 2002. Focused mainly on the community sector (in which voluntary and iwi/Maori organisations are included) the report discusses actions already taken toward building a positive relationship between government and the community sector since the group's establishment, and actions that have yet to be taken.

It reports positive changes within the Department of Child, Youth and Family (CYF), the Ministry of health, Housing NZ, and the Ministry of Youth affairs, a review of the Local Government Act, and the Review of the Centre (public management system). Some of these changes will be explored later in the review.

The report suggests a shift from a time consuming and compliance focused contracting model of resourcing community organisations, which, it claims, detracts from the key purpose of service delivery. While the report does not raise how a contract culture perpetuates mistrust on all sides, it does comment on the paradox of seeking to develop community participation in a non-participatory public service environment:

At the national and umbrella level there has been no real improvement in resourcing to develop a strategic view of the broader issues facing the community sector, to share information, or to undertake research in which to develop robust evidence-based policy advice. It is therefore difficult for community agencies to respond to the renewed interests by government in seeking community participation in policy development and service planning. (Wilson, et al., 2002:13)

Wilson et al identify that "Community, voluntary, iwi and Maori organisations are increasingly seeking collaboration with government rather than a subsidiary role" (2002:48). They identify collaborative processes and / or projects and community driven decision making as strong forms of participation and partnership, and consultation as a weak form, noting that the word 'consultation' is used in the SOGI. Debiprosad Majumdar in his (no date) literature review, states that "Collaboration is about structuring an arrangement for the joint provision of

outputs and outcomes, and has substantial policy implications". The steering group discusses how this stronger form of participation can be achieved.

Recommendations are made towards building positive government / community sector relationships, strengthening the community sector, building participatory processes and improving resources and accountability. The report raises that the issues of sector strength, participation, resourcing and accountability arise from the central problem of unequal power relationships between government and community sector.

There is a fundamental imbalance of power and resources between government and community organisations. A healthy relationship recognises this imbalance and seeks opportunities to mitigate its effects. (Wilson et al., 2002:61).

This issue had been raised seven years earlier by Nowland-Foreman (1995), who comments that "the power relationship between government and voluntary organisations is not and cannot be equal". Indeed, this under-developed relationship remains of primary importance to Maori. Recommendations are as follows:

1. That an Action Group (Maori) be set up.

This would provide advice to government and work with Te Puni Kokiri in order to develop state sector and community sector capability. It would also set up and report to a Strategic Directions forum / hui in 2003

2. That the sector is strengthened through the development of a Community Forum Taskforce that should "lead and implement a series of projects" (2002:8). This group would also be responsible for planning and convening the forum.

3. That participatory processes are improved by (1) the establishment of annual agency reporting of progress in managing relationships with community / voluntary sector / iwi. (2) the establishment of an MSD website called 'participate'.

4. That resourcing and accountability processes are improved by (1) the establishment of annual agency reporting of progress in managing relationships with community / voluntary sector / iwi.(2) the establishment by MSD of a 'good funding' website.

5. That reviewing and monitoring processes be addressed through (1) two standards panels to monitor proposed website resources (2) Introducing 'relationship plans' and steps in government SOIs and chief executive (CE) performance agreements (3) Establish a lead

agency for this work.(4) Establishing a high level group (CEs and community sector people) to meet six-monthly to review progress and report to the Minister responsible for the Community and voluntary sector and the 2003 Strategic Directions Forum.

Recommendations made in this report can be linked to four of the six SOGI commitments. They included the forefronting of Maori issues through a Maori Action group, strengthening the sector through a lead task force, building participatory processes through websites, improving understanding of funding and accountability through websites and annual monitoring process, and changing the culture through introducing relationship plans linked CE performance agreements.

As a result of the report's recommendations, a Maori Action group (known as Te Whero) and a Community Sector Taskforce were established. The Task Force developed a framework for how to work with Maori values alongside those of non-Maori. The framework puts unequal power relations centre stage, by proposing a "relationships" approach to accountability. It states that the key relationships to be managed are power relationships (power to protect, define and decide in ways that are consistent with the worldviews that underpin the values of each group).

New websites were launched, and annual statements of intentions (SOIs) were implemented within government departments and agencies. For instance, in 2002 the Ministry of Health published the Framework for Relations between the Ministry of Health and Health/Disability Non-Government Organisations. In the same year Shand and Loomis identify the Department of Internal Affairs' key learnings: that government needs to better develop its understanding and trust of communities if it wishes to collaborate effectively; being community driven means working to a different time frame; government is learning to operate in a hands-off (high trust, low intervention) as well as hands-on way.

Despite government initiatives and learnings, there are no consequences for the state's failure to engage appropriately with the community and voluntary sector, and no legislative reinforcement. While there are also no stated consequences for failure on the part of the community and voluntary sector, compliance is ensured by the threat of funding withdrawals. Initiatives introduced as a result of the report have the power only to *encourage* (rather than require) a change in the government culture. Perhaps the strongest recommendation in terms of giving teeth to relationship improvement, is that relationship plans and steps are included in performance agreements of CEs. However, this recommendation doesn't include

that these measures should extend to other key and influential public sector staff, for instance, those responsible for administering funds.

Boosting public servants' engagement in volunteering seems to have been regarded as an important way in to a change in public service culture. Possibly as a consequence of the International Year of Volunteering (2001) cabinet papers produced in that year and in 2002 emphasise recognition and valuing of volunteers by government; and supporting and enabling volunteering within the public service sector. The Government Policy on Volunteering was released in December 2002

4.2 *The Government Policy on Volunteering*

This policy recognises the value of volunteering and commits to a range of steps, some of which might strengthen the sector by providing appropriate protection under the law; and reducing barriers in legislation, policy and practice.

Curiously, in the policy document the concept of individual volunteers is given priority over that of organisations. For instance, it aims to (1) take into account the needs of volunteers and their organisations, and the costs associated with volunteering, when developing policies and delivering services (2) consult volunteers and their organisations on policy and operational changes that impact on volunteering. An individualistic approach seems able to do little to strengthen sector organisations or the sector as a whole. In addition, the expectation that government agencies have policies in place that support individual staff to engage in private volunteering activities, seems an unusual strategy toward improving government - voluntary sector relationships. The inference from this policy statement is that public servants will somehow develop more empathy with 'volunteers and their organisations' through their own engagement in voluntary activities. While public sector staff engagement with voluntary work is commendable, it can do little to shift an entrenched public sector culture that is built on a primarily economic approach to working with the 'third' sector. Change does seem to have been achieved where legislation has been enacted.

4.3 *The Local Government Act (2002)*

While policies and reports set out a desired change in culture within central government, there is a lack of legislative force to ensure departmental and staff compliance. It is recognised in government and in the community and voluntary sector that voluntary and community activity happens locally more often than nationally. Shand and Loomis (2002)

observe that the government needs to better develop its capacity to operate in a response, collaborative manner at regional and local level.

The legal requirement that Local Government engages with the community seems to have been an effective measure in improving relationships between government and community / voluntary sector / iwi. Courtney (2006) sees this legislation as a catalyst for “joined up” thinking between local and central government, and communities. The Act sets out not only clear principles, but detailed practices aimed at improving community participation in decision making. For instance, the Act states, Local Government must

...conduct business in an open and transparent manner; making itself aware of community views; providing opportunities for Māori to participate in decision-making processes

These principles are intended to ensure transparency and accountability in decision making. Moreover, they revisit the concept of stewardship. Stewardship theory assumes that the goals of government and non-government organisations such as voluntary agencies are aligned. The theory argues that trust should be the basis on which government manages relationships with service providers, and encourages self-regulation and non-financial performance measures in the community and voluntary sector. The concept of stewardship is evident in the following passages of the Act, which require that the Local Authority facilitates and supports, community processes and outcomes:

...collaborating and cooperating with other local authorities as appropriate; ensuring prudent stewardship of resources; and taking a sustainable development approach... The role of the local authority is to facilitate the process, with the community having ownership of the identified outcomes...Local authorities can decide what processes to use to identify and prioritise community outcomes but they must ensure that the processes encourage the community to contribute.

The Act requires that local authorities identify all reasonably practicable options and assess those options in terms of the present and future well-being of the community, and the extent to which community outcomes would be promoted. Consultation processes must include easy-to-understand summaries of proposals and plans. They must identify who will be affected by decisions and encourage them to make their views known to the council.

Authorities must ensure that they have processes in place for consulting with Māori, and that they establish and maintain opportunities for Māori to contribute to decision-making

processes. They must foster the development of Māori capacity to contribute to decision-making processes, and provide relevant information to Māori, taking into account culture and traditions.

Finally, local authorities must manage their financial matters in ways that promote the interests of the community and consult with their communities about funding and financial policies.

A government review of plans produced by local authorities in 2003/04 and 2004/05 shows that in the following two years, local authorities had followed the full community outcomes processes to varying degrees. In 2006, Courtney wrote:

Processes to identify Community Outcomes have now taken place in varying forms across the country. In some areas, participation by central government agencies has been strong, with some local and central agencies co-funding community engagement and planning processes (2006:3)

Following *He Waka Kotuia*, the *Government Policy on Volunteering* and the Local Government Act, the government undertook several initiatives which aimed to progress the six commitments. The first was the establishment of the Office of the Community and Voluntary Sector in 2003.

4.4 *The Office of the Community and Voluntary Sector*

The Office of the Community and Voluntary Sector (OCVS) was situated within the MSD. Although its mission is to work across government to create “strong and respectful relationships between government and the community and voluntary sector” (OCVS 2005:45), it is interesting to note that the OCVS was not advocated for by the sector. Cribb observes “With a small staff and a wide brief, the office has been set a challenging role.”

The office lists several joint projects, as examples of collaborative processes and partnerships. These include the KOHA-PICD programme (NZAID and NGOs), the Study of the non-profit sector (OCVS, government agencies, universities and community and voluntary sector representatives), Keeping it Legal (OCVS and NZFVWO), Putting Pen to Paper PROFILES – 11 case studies of partnering agreements and how these were reached (DIA), Regional Funders’ Forums (OCVS, DIA, Philanthropy NZ), Funding for Outcomes (MSD), Ministry of Health NGO Working Group (MOH).

Matheson et al (2005) exploring the development of partnership, believes that although there is at best a rhetoric of partnership, it has ushered in accepted values of trust and respect. He cautions about the threat to independence arising from government perceptions of partnership, using as an example a 2003 draft statement that was prepared on MOH contracts with NGOs, and circulated for consultation. One part of the statement read “The Ministry does not fund lobbying activity and such activity will not be included in any contracts”. Dr. Don Matheson, speaking at the 2005 Health and Disability Sector NGO/Ministry of Health Forum, reported that in the near unanimous opposition to the draft statement, NGOs “...reacted strongly to the perceived restriction on their freedom to lobby and / or advocate” (2005:1) Matheson adds:

A common concern was that the statement’s effects would have been to make NGOs de facto public servants of the Ministry, part of the ‘machinery of the state’ or ‘quasi government’ organisations! Activities prevented by the Statement would have gone beyond lobbying and impinge significantly on the essential advocacy work of NGOs (2005:1)

Twyford, writing about the history of The New Zealand Council of Social Services (NZCOSS), supports these contentions when she notes that some national organisations have struggled to maintain advocacy roles and policy influence (Twyford, 2008).

4.5 *Participation by Internet*

One way seen by government to increase community participation in governance, was to establish websites. The first community website was **CommunityNet**, was actually established in 1998, prior to the SOGI. The website was reviewed, restructured and re-launched in November 2002 with increased information, how-to guides and newsletters and, according to a DIA survey in that year, high levels of reader satisfaction. Other resources (including *Managing Well*, a resource catalogue) were added, and visits rose to 20,000 a month.

Following the *He Waka Kotuia* report, The Good Practice Participate website <http://www.goodpracticeparticipate.govt.nz/> and the Good Practice Funding <http://www.goodpracticefunding.govt.nz/> websites were launched to provide information about participation, funding and simplified documentation and processes. The OCVS has located several other websites where citizens can ‘participate’ in terms of commenting on consultation documents, making submissions, requesting information. These include

www.newzealand.govt.nz; www.explore.parliament.nz; and www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/HvYrSay/

During 2003, the government turned its attention developing a whole of government approach. This was an internal efficiency initiative and therefore was less likely to impact on relationships with the community and voluntary sector. However, the work did contain an element of culture change. The work began with a review of central government service delivery.

4.6 *Government community engagement: key learning and emerging principles (2003)*

This document outlines the development of government requirements, and lists the range of initiatives undertaken within government departments, including staff development, guidelines and toolkits, improving planning and accountability, developing and research, and engaging in collaborative partnerships. It notes that there are no legislative requirements of public service staff to consult with community and voluntary organisations, except by local government (Local Government Act 2002) the Environmental Court and the DHB (Public Health and Disability Act, 2000). However, all government agencies are required to prepare a statement of intent and annual report. The NZAID SOI specifically refers to the SOGI and prioritises collaboration with the wider NZ development community.

4.7 *The Review of the Centre*

The Ministerial Advisory Group was established to address concerns over the state sector's performance. The group noted three main areas for attention: achieving a better integrated service delivery; addressing fragmentation and improving alignment; enhancing the people and culture of the state sector [CAB Min (1) 39/14]. One of its streams of work, the Regional Co-ordination workstream, aimed to enhance and build on co-ordination and collaboration models between central and local government, and community agencies and Maori. The State Services Commission's report on this work was the *Review of the Centre – Integrated Service Delivery: Regional Co-ordination* in 2003.

The *Review of the Centre* report claims to address co-ordination and integrated service delivery between government departments, and states that it complements *Mosaics: Wakaahua Papariki: key Findings and Good Practice Guide for Regional Co-ordination and Integrated Service Delivery*. 'Mosaics' describes levels of collaboration and includes examples of collaboration in action. It discusses what it calls 'key levers' for collaboration,

which are: the obligation of government departments to focus on managing for outcomes; the need for government departments to interact in order to support sustainable development; the commitments of the SOGI and recommendations of He Waka Kotuia; the examples of the Treaty of Waitangi as a basis for partnership; the Local Government Act requiring councils to develop community plans in consultation with the community;

The *Review of the Centre* also precedes a review entitled *Factors for Successful Coordination - A Framework to Help State Agencies Coordinate Effectively (2008)*. Both reports acknowledge that they use the terms collaboration and co-ordination interchangeably despite understood differences in meaning.

The report identifies barriers to co-ordination of state services as centralisation and a risk averse public service culture. The first report notes that there is a need for government agencies to recognise diverse Maori realities, and asserts that government needs to increase commitment and consistency in relation to Maori issues. For example, the report states, it should seek and provide more information in terms of Maori outcomes of co-ordination and integration. The Whanau Development Project final evaluation report, commissioned by the MSD and prepared by PHP consulting Ltd., claims the project is an example of the recognition of Maori realities. It describes the project as a pilot in devolved funding and Ministry support for "...whanau, hapu, iwi and Maori communities to assess their own needs and develop and deliver local initiatives to meet those needs." (MSD, 2004:i). It maintains that initiatives resulting from the project helped to strengthen the relationship between most communities involved and the Ministry.

The Review of the Centre recognises the importance of trust to good relationships with stakeholders, and, more importantly, that it takes trustworthy behaviour, not wishful thinking, to engender others' trust:

...fostering good relationships requires developing trust between partners through sharing information openly and honestly in a safe environment (2003:58)

The second report, *Factors for Successful Coordination - A Framework to Help State Agencies Coordinate Effectively (2008)*, suggests that the principles to be applied to building a whole of government approach between government agencies can also be applied to building relationships between government and non-government initiatives.

Earlier in this literature review, a continuum from weak to strong forms of participation was discussed. *Factors for Successful Coordination*, suggests that joined-up government agency

activity can be situated on a continuum from *communication to collaboration*, depending on expected outcomes, shared information and accountability, risk and resource implications. Co-ordination, here, involves shared information, knowledge and expertise. Collaboration involves joint decision-making and responsibility (www.ssc.govt.nz/state-services-coordination). The following report is notable for its shift in tone and specificity of considerations regarding contracting conduct. This may be due to close attention on the part of Treasury to issues raised by the community and voluntary sector. i.e. the use of a more consultative approach.

4.8 *The Treasury Guidelines*

In 2001, the treasury had produced *Guidelines for Contracting with Non-Government Organisations for Services Sought by the Crown*. In 2003, following consultation with NGOs and government agencies, the guidelines were reviewed. The Treasury expects that further refinement may occur as a result of ongoing consultation with NGOs. This process seems to be a good example of collaborative partnership in practice. However, Hanley (2007) notes that because the Treasury guidelines make no distinction between for-profit and not-for-profit organisations this responsibility of sector organisations is undermined.

The new Guidelines (2003) developed primarily for use by government agencies, were important because they addressed a central issue: they intended to encourage better contracting practices as a way of improving relationships between the Community and Voluntary sector and the government. They promote relationships that go beyond the period of a contract, and state that “Contract management needs to be thought about as an aspect of relationship management (and vice versa)” (2003:28). They observe that NGOs have objectives outside of government interests and that “...these objectives need to be well understood lest they undermine the relationship between the Government agency and the NGO” (ibid). They stipulate that “...government agencies should not try to use the contractual relationship to prevent the NGO commenting on public policy matters” (ibid:8) while ensuring “...that contracts do not breach public service standards of political neutrality”(ibid) They warn that government agencies must “...avoid trying to control an NGO’s activities, outside of the contractual rights and obligations” (ibid).

The guidelines include a number of stipulations for how contracts are designed. They should: contribute to the achievement of Government outcomes and objectives; reflect the needs of ultimate users/recipients; provide appropriate accountability for public money; ensure quality; show good faith; demonstrate an understanding of contracting organisations;

be consistent with the relationship Government seeks with the sector. Cumming and Stace comment:

...it is apparent from media reports and anecdotally from NGOs, that many government contract managers and providers are not following Treasury's guidelines (2006:16)

The guidelines discuss the importance of agencies linking with each other, in order to minimise compliance costs and doubling up of contracted services, and suggest integrated contracts(2006:24) Integrated Contracts (known also as Funding for Outcomes) shift the focus of contracting from outputs to results. This process has elements of soft accountability as described by Cribb (2006). The Guideline's suggestions seem to have been taken up by the MSD. Anne Pomeroy, the manager of Funding for Outcomes at the Ministry of Social Development, in a service promotion update, April 2007, explains that the MSD facilitates a process where providers and funders jointly identify results they want, develop a contract that matches service delivered and results sought, and develop a mentoring process. As the Family and Community Services page of the Ministry of Social Development website explains, 'integrated contracts' allow providers to

...report to government agencies on their complete service delivery, not just the part paid for by each funder. This means that the provider doesn't have to negotiate numerous contracts, write as many reports and provide information for multiple audits. (www.familyservices.govt.nz/our-work/community-development/funding-for-outcomes)

Pomeroy claims that as of April 2007, forty nine providers were delivering or negotiating the delivery of integrated contracts. The Guidelines present further examples of soft accountability, in their discussion of non-contractual relationships with Maori organisations (2003:19). Cayley (2006) discusses how Maori and Pacific Island organisations are structured around a whanau based system, with a radically different focus and mode of operations, and unique capacity building needs. Thus he might be expected to applaud the MSD's response to the Guidelines. However, he disagrees with Pomeroy that funders are working alongside providers to make the process more manageable for them. He claims that funding bodies "have begun to demand more rigorous monitoring processes, more definable outcomes and have introduced increasing levels of compliance (Sector Policy Development Team, 2004 in Cayley 2006:4).

Anecdotal reports during the compilation of this literature review suggest that several contract managers are unaware of the existence of the Guidelines.

Shortly after the Guidelines were being prepared and published, a new law was being put in place had the potential to undo advances made. The law addressed none of the six SOGI commitments, and many in the sector saw it as draconian, or at least disturbing.

4.9 The Charities Act

The Charities Act (2005) requires that governing bodies of community and voluntary sector organisations ensure that they act in a manner consistent with the advancement of the public good. The Act established the Charities Commission as an independent agency, or Autonomous Crown Entity (ACE). The Commission's main functions include the registration and monitoring of charitable organisations. While registration is not technically compulsory, the failure to do so means that an organisation's income will not be exempt from tax (but will not necessarily result in a loss of donee status). Registered charities will be subject to ongoing monitoring by the Charities Commission. For charities, confirming their tax exempt status may increase their administrative burdens. New Charities will be required to register as a qualifying charitable entity with the Charities Commission and seek confirmation of tax exempt status from the Commissioner of the Inland Revenue.

www.chapmantripp.co.nz/resource_library/published_Article

At the ANGOA Community and Voluntary Sector Roundtable, Ruth Dyson, Minister for Social Development and Employment, Minister for Senior Citizens, Minister for the Community and Voluntary Sector and Minister for Disability Issues, acknowledged that there is a policy tension between charitable purposes, as defined, and the advocacy role. She stated that she supported ANGOA's proposal to allow organisations who have submitted their application for registration to be given interim tax status until the application is processed. The Minister is supporting the Commission to move to a more efficient and practical process for considering applications, that will not involve so much legal review of every application in fine detail. (ANGOA minutes, 2.4. 2008)

4.10 A New Way of Working for the Tangata Whenua, Community and Voluntary Sector in Aotearoa / New Zealand. (2006)

The Community Sector Taskforce states on its website that it is an independent Treaty-based body of ten community representatives, established in 2003, and mandated to continue the work developed by the joint community sector and government working parties

(2000 - 2002) to develop the relationship between government and the sector. This 2006 report outlines how accountability is at present Crown dictated from Crown worldview, and proposes a two-world view (or a “two-house” model), with the ability of Tangata whenua to act independently on particular issues (tino rangitiratanga). The Task Force is interested in providing a culturally appropriate and safe way of working for community and voluntary organisations. It sees healthy relationships as being tied to respect. “The practice of respect, if standard practice, has the potential to bind people to each other.” (2006:16). The key functions of the Task Force’s work are capacity building, networking and communication, advocacy and advice on policy issues and support for sector service delivery. The Task Force report noted that the government was still overly concerned with accountability, which created barriers for the building of trustful relationships between parties.

4.11 *Mahi Aroha*

Commissioned by the OCVS, Pam Oliver and Associates were asked to explore a Maori perspective on cultural obligations and volunteering. It found that Mahi Aroha – work conducted out of love, sympathy and caring for the community, is connected to a sense of duty and doing the right thing, which contributes to the ‘volunteer’s’ sense of self worth and is an important aspect of cultural identity and survival. The report observes that the sense of responsibility to do unpaid work for the community is found in Western and Asian cultures also – a key difference is that Mahi Aroha is critical to the regeneration of Maori culture, particularly in urban areas, and does not necessarily occur within voluntary agencies (formal volunteering). For instance, it reveals that in 2001 almost twice as many Maori participated in voluntary activities compared to non-Maori (21.2% Maori, compared with 12.68 non-Maori).

A lack of understanding of the difference between Maori and non-Maori volunteering can have implications for funding agencies, where the tendency is towards a one-size-fits-all approach, and for the strength of relationship between the government and Maori volunteers. Oliver et al comment:

This report highlights the risk in government officials expecting Maori and Non-Maori voluntary action to be perceived in and occur in the same way. What is common to one group may seem strange, counter intuitive or simply wrong to another. It is through talking and listening that we can gain a better understanding of other perspectives. (2007: 39).

4.12 *Statistics New Zealand's Non-Profit Institutions Satellite Account*

Released in August 2007, the report provided information on non-profit institutions (NPIs), and their contribution to the wider NZ economy. Since NPIs typically depended on volunteers, the report explored the numbers of volunteers, volunteer demographics, hours worked, their economic value, and the types of organisations they worked in.

4.13 *Ministry of Social Development's Involvement in the Community Outcomes Process*

This MSD report was released in August 2007. It discusses the local government Community Outcomes Process as required by the Local Government Act 2002, and how it has taken a lead role, working collaboratively with councils on outcomes focused projects (listed as urban development, natural environment, economy, community, arts, culture, recreation, Maori) in regions around the country. It provides examples of projects in each region

4.14 *Government Support for Volunteering 2002 – 2008*

This report was a stock take of government agency activity produced by the OCVS in response to the *Government Policy on Volunteering* (2002). Agencies reviewed include the SSC, DOL, DIA, MSD, MYD, SNZ, IRD, ACC and Land Transport NZ. The report lists a number of achievements including: the Statistics New Zealand Satellite account for non-profit organisations, showing the amount non-profit organisations contribute to the gross domestic product; the Mahi Aroha report on Maori perspectives on volunteering and cultural obligations; the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs research into perspectives and cultural obligations to be published in 2008; the ACC report (2007) into cover for volunteers in NZ and overseas; the extension of the H&S Act to cover volunteers; the OCVS *Keeping it Legal* (2004) resource for voluntary organisations; tax exemptions for voluntary work.

In terms of building capacity in the voluntary sector, the report states that work has included: the DIA Support for Volunteering Fund to volunteer centres, tangata whenua, Pacific peoples and ethnic communities; the OCVS publication *Managing Well* for volunteer managers; volunteer training initiatives; good practice resources for voluntary organisations

Finally, the report lists initiatives that have been taken to improve government practice. However, most of this work is focused on supporting volunteers within government and related public sector organisations, rather than independent voluntary and community organisations.

Other Recent developments and documents

In 2006 a *Charter of Community Engagement* was produced by the Families Commission, which aims to open up genuine dialogue with groups and individuals with 'knowledge and expertise that can enhance the Commission's work. Several government agencies have developed memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) with national umbrella organisations, iwi and national service providers.

Examples of resources and guidelines include the *Community participation toolkit: a resource for PHO* – Pat Neuwait (2007), *Engaging with communities over outcomes: a review of innovative approaches to meeting the LGA 2002 challenge of identifying community outcomes (2004)* and *A guide to building relationships for effective engagement with Maori (draft)* aimed at local and central government staff.

Guidelines have been developed for local authority engagement with Maori development (*Council- Maori engagement – co-management case studies, Local Authority and Maori*) and refugee communities (*Standards for engagement – guidelines for central and local govt and NGOs working with refugee background communities- 2008*). As well as these documents, staff can access *various* guides on community engagement produced by the Office for Citizens and Civics, and Australian and Scottish guides on engaging effectively with communities.

There are a number of resources available for staff development, including the public service code of conduct *Standards of Integrity and Conduct*. Courses focus on fairness, respect, responsiveness, accessibility and collaboration. Provision options include in-house training, tertiary institutions and private training. Some programmes are offered on-line, some are face to face. It is not clear if any of these are mandatory for staff in some or all departments.

In June 2007 a Community – Government forum was run by the OCVS, the DIA and a steering group of community and voluntary sector leaders. Described by the OCVS as the first whole of government, whole of sector approach towards the vision articulated in the SOGI, the forum aimed to enable the sector to discuss ways to address issues such as funding mechanisms and participation in government policy processes, and to establish 'an enduring' process for improving relationships.

Twyford notes "Although the language of partnership is fraught with pitfalls, spaces for genuinely collaborative initiatives do exist." (2008:1). In 2008 the DIA offered a workshop that aimed to inform and motivate people into working together for community outcomes.

The workshop was entitled *It takes two to tango: aligning central and local government strategies around community outcomes*. In his power point presentation for this workshop, Geoff Mavromatis of the AgriBusiness Group says his investigations revealed that some relationships and community outcomes are working very well from a government perspective, but that this is not supported by community views. He found that the further the agency was from the community, the weaker the relationship. He asks “Why aren’t relationships well developed when everyone says they are so important?” and suggests “Is it because it’s actually not that important when compared to other responsibilities, tasks etc?” He discusses the importance of relationships for mutual benefits and good outcomes, and explores ‘performance’ from both sides of the relationship, and asserts: “At the very least, the quality of relationships with all relevant stakeholders should be a subject for performance reviews.” But he also underlines the importance of public servants understanding the sector and its desired outcomes so that good performance comes to matter.

An issue that hasn’t received attention in government publications or initiatives is the issue of a peak body to represent the community and voluntary sector. As discussed earlier, this would be a major step in strengthening the sector. There are at least five national organisations representing the sector at present: the Association of Non-Governmental Organisations of Aotearoa (ANGOA); the New Zealand Council of Social Services (NZCOSS); the New Zealand Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations (NZFVWO); the New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services (NZCCSS).

All umbrella agencies struggle to maintain advocacy and / or policy influence. This causes strained relationships at times and confusion over roles and identities. There is some pressure to merge to improve government/sector relations and policy development, but the sector is cautious. As far back as 1991, Margy-Jean Malcolm maintained that whatever co-ordination of national umbrella groups took shape, “...their strength must be in the diversity of their membership and the unity of their message. (Malcolm, in Twyford, 2008:9). Pat Hanley asserts “They will need...to ensure that they have a clear mandate for action and clear agreement on processes and goals.”(Hanley, in Twyford, 2008:9).

4.16 Summary and conclusion

During the cuts to the welfare state that occurred in the 1980s and 1990s, community and voluntary support became increasingly necessary. These “communities” were growing and re-shaping – calling for more respectful treatment, including adequate funding for support services and greater consultation. Of particular significance was the growing strength and

assertiveness of Maori groups, which resulted in a government wide acceptance of responsibility for Maori well-being. Despite their calls, rigidly specified and monitored contracts for services, indicating a lack of trust in the sector were introduced, resulting in a loss of autonomy for the sector, a loss of trust in government, and a loss of quality service due to the need to meet contractual demands. The community and voluntary sector was struggling to remain viable, and the relationship between the government and the sector was extremely poor. The sector was demanding government accountability and user involvement in the design of social services.

According to government statements at the time, partnership was important, yet the recommendations of the commissioned *Potential for Partnership* focused on wide *participation* rather than on partnership. The report recognised that short term contracts are a problem, and focused on the mistrust the sector felt for the government as a result. It suggested that the intent should focus on principles only and suggested only three workstreams to work towards: participation; improved resourcing and accountability, and strengthening the community sector.

The expectations of the community and voluntary sector, however, had been raised by government statements and their own dissatisfaction with the current government – community sector relationship. They expected collaboration and partnership, without which the sectors' issues with contracting and accountability were likely to be overlooked.

The SOGI makes six commitments – to an improved culture of government, to developing a whole-of government approach, to observation of the Treaty of Waitangi, to improve participation in decision making, to explore the issues with government funding to community organisations, and to strengthening the community sector. There are two main issues with the document. The first is that few specific promises in the statement are concrete enough to be monitored. The second is that what the commitments do not meet the expectations of the sector – this means that the sector may see deficits in government practice as failures to meet the SOGI, when in fact the SOGI does not require some of what the sector needs. Below the extent to which each commitment has been addressed in the literature, or seems to be met in initiatives, is discussed.

Culture of Government

He Waka Kotuia recommended changing the culture of government through the introduction of relationship plans and performance agreements for state sector chief executives. The Government Policy on Volunteering recommended boosting public servants' individual

engagement as volunteers. It examined central government service delivery, increased staff development, provided guidelines and tools to staff and engaged in what it called collaborative partnerships with local government and the community. Further, government required that all government agencies prepare a statement of intent and annual report. The NZAID SOI specifically refers to the SOGI and prioritises collaboration with the wider NZ development community. A review of central government was undertaken, which identified a 'risk averse public service culture'. The Treasury published guidelines which observed that NGOs' objectives need to be well understood lest they undermine the relationship between the Government agency and the NGO. Several government agencies have developed memorandums of Understanding with national umbrella organisations, iwi and national service providers. Despite these reports, recommendations and initiatives, in 2008 it has been identified that some relationships and community outcomes are working very well from a government perspective, but that this is not supported by community views. Questions have been asked about why relationships are regarded as important but are still not well developed, and conclusions reached that perhaps, within government, relationships with the sector are not as important as proclaimed. In order to address this situation, it has been recommended that the quality of relationships with all relevant stakeholders should be a subject for performance reviews – a recommendation made by He Waka Kotuia in 2002.

Whole of government approach

This commitment was one which was seen to address compliance issues in the community and voluntary sector, but it also served to increase the efficiency of government (avoiding the doubling up of funding). In fact, most work undertaken in this area did not directly improve services to the community and voluntary sector, but did improve cross-government operations, including operations between central and local government. There was also an intended and actual flow on effect for some community and voluntary organisations and their end users. The Community Outcomes process required by the Local Government Act supported this work.

Treaty of Waitangi

He Waka Kotuia recommended that a Maori action group should be set up, which would provide advice to government and work with Te Puni Kokiri in order to develop state sector and community sector capability. It would also set up and report to a Strategic Directions forum / hui in 2003. The Local Government Act specifically states that local authorities should ensure that they have processes in place for consulting with Māori, and that they should provide opportunities for Māori to participate in decision-making processes.

The Review of the Centre notes that government needs to recognise diverse Maori realities and increase commitment and consistency in relation to Maori issues. The Whanau Development Project produced by a government department, claims the project provides devolved funding and Ministry support for Maori communities to assess their own needs and develop and deliver local initiatives. The Community Sector Taskforce, established in 2003, proposes a “two-house” model), with the ability of Tangata whenua to act independently on particular issues (tino rangitiratanga). *Mahi Aroha*, commissioned in 2007, found that for Maori, volunteering work is conducted out of love, sympathy and caring for the community, is connected to a sense of duty and doing the right thing, does not necessarily occur within recognised voluntary organisations, and is critical to the regeneration of Maori culture. IT recommends that a better understanding of these perspectives can be gained through talking and listening.

Participation in decision making

The SOGI seems to be strong on the language of social inclusion yet weak on specific undertakings. Only ‘participation’ is used – the words collaboration or partnership do not appear in the document. This is not surprising, since the Potential for Partnership report only recommended participation. However, the community and voluntary sector continued to expect more than promised by the SOGI – it wanted strong collaboration, if not partnership.

Although a number of government commissioned reports have been produced, and internal guidelines and toolkits detail public sector obligations to consult, there appears to be little in the way of *statutory* requirements for consultation with community groups. Instead, government reports and initiatives straddle a continuum from a weak to strong form of participation, the strongest being collaboration, sometimes called partnership.

He Waka Kotu pointed up the lack of sharing of information and the paradox of seeking to develop community participation in a non-participatory public service environment. The report recommended that a more participatory process might result from an annual reporting of progress by each agency, and the establishment of a participatory website. Both of these recommendations were acted upon. However, it has also been stated that effective collaboration involved working to different time frames with government operating in a hands-off way. Only the Local Government Act was able to issue an imperative that local government must conduct business in an open and transparent manner; making itself aware of community views. The imperative to be participative required that the process was to be collaborative and facilitative, thus enabling communities to have ownership of outcomes. Local authorities, under the act must identify who will be affected by decisions and

encourage them to make their views known to the council. Collaborative successes are being identified at a local government level (e.g. *Mosaics*), and also at central government level. In 2007, the MSD released a report showing a number of successful working relationships throughout the country. While *The Review of the Centre and Factors for Successful Co-ordination* tend to use terms associated with collaboration interchangeably, the discussion has at least moved from participation to (a limited view of) collaboration.

A positive outcome of these collaborations is that values of mutual trust and respect are consolidated. A possible negative outcome is that the independence of community and voluntary sector organisations is threatened, especially those where advocacy is their main function. For example, a 2003 the Ministry of Health statement that it would not fund or contract lobbying activity resulted in an outcry from NGOs, who struggle to maintain their advocacy roles and policy influence.

The Treasury demonstrates strong consultation with the community and voluntary sector in the development of its 2003 Guidelines, and as a result the Guidelines are a useful document for building the relationship between government and the sector.

However, by 2007, high level consultation and collaboration was still not the norm, and the OCVS, the DIA and community and voluntary sector leaders sought to find ways to progress this commitment. Some of the answer seems to lie in addressing the commitment to an improved government culture.

Government funding to community organisations

The literature reveals that funding and related problems identified before the SOGI continue to exist today, and that there have been few effective and deliberate attempts (by Government) to assess and respond to the operational needs of the sector. He Waka Kotuia recommends improving understanding of funding and accountability through websites and annual monitoring process. The Local Government Act is more forceful, requiring that local authorities manage their financial matters in ways that promote the interests of the community and consult with their communities about funding and financial policies. OCVS established a 'Good Funding' website. The Treasury Guidelines encourage better contracting practices that improve relationships beyond the period of the contract. They stipulate that contracts should contribute to the achievement of Government outcomes and objectives but reflect the needs of ultimate users/recipients and show good faith; demonstrate an understanding of contracting organisations; be consistent with the relationship Government seeks with the sector.

The Guidelines suggest integrated contracts which allow providers to report on their complete service delivery. However, critics note that many government contract managers and providers are not following Treasury's guidelines. One critic claims that funders are not working alongside providers to make the process more manageable for them, but have begun to demand more rigorous monitoring processes, more definable outcomes and have introduced increasing levels of compliance. The compliance burden has also been exacerbated by the requirements of the Charities Act. The 2007 Community-Government forum sought to find ways to address funding mechanisms.

Strengthening the community sector

In New Zealand, the government was not able to deal directly with an umbrella organisation representing the community and voluntary sector. In terms of strengthening the sector, the most urgent task would seem to be the development of an umbrella organisation generally representing sector-wide interests, yet allowing for any sub-group within the sector to stand apart and represent their specific interests where necessary. *Potential for Partnership* and the later *Statement of Government Intentions* were doomed to be flawed by their failure to support the development of such a body.

At some point the discussion shifts from strengthening the sector to 'capacity building' of the sector. This goal has a weaker connotation, focusing mainly on government agency resource development for the sector, networking and communitation. A number of lesser measures are recommended and developed. For example a Community Forum Taskforce is recommended to "lead and implement a series of projects"; and the Government Policy on Volunteering commits to protections under the law and reducing barriers to volunteering in legislation, policy and practice.

A final note on Trust

The literature suggests that there may be a central issue of lack of government trust in the sector. While the issue of trust is raised in many government documents, the links between action and trust are not strongly made. For example, critics of the contracting model argue that the model creates mistrust on both sides.

Stewardship theory argues that trust should be the basis on which government manages relationships with service providers. The Department of Internal Affairs identifies a need

within its organisation to develop its understanding and trust (including a hand-off approach to projects) of communities.

Although many of the commitments have not yet been met, in terms of building a relationship between the government and community and voluntary sector, trust and respect appear to have become accepted values within government agency circles. However, Trust must be earned. When government agencies and their public servants fail to prioritise the development of lasting relationships, and to demonstrate their commitment in action, it is difficult to believe that these really are accepted values.

Some key community and voluntary sector organisations

Although there are references in many government reports to consultation with the community and voluntary sector, there is little discussion in those reports of who the national community and voluntary organisations are that bring together voices from the sector. These organisations are important in that they are concerned to influence policy and, where necessary, and advocate on behalf of the sector. Below is a discussion from a voluntary sector perspective, of the six commitments and surrounding issues. On the following pages, national organisations are listed alphabetically and described.

1.1 ANGOA

ANGOA is a network of organisations from across the range of NGO's in Aotearoa New Zealand including national, regional and local groups. Its member organisations are active in the areas of health, education, international development, human rights, the environment, youth, women and ethnicity. ANGOA facilitates NGO networking around issues of common concern with a particular emphasis on strengthening relationships across the sector and between the sector and government. ANGOA disseminates information as part of its effort to strengthen the Community and Voluntary Sector in Aotearoa New Zealand. ANGOA provides an independent vehicle for interaction, cooperation, and mutual support and exchange amongst NGOs within Aotearoa New Zealand and work in partnership with appropriate tangata whenua organisations and networks. It facilitates the Community Sector [Roundtable](#) which is a monthly forum for the exchange of issues and concerns within the sector. With the Office of the Community and Voluntary Sector we host the Community Sector [Research Forum](#) which brings together researchers from universities, the community sector and government who are engaged in research related activities relevant to the community sector.

1.2 ComVoices

ComVoices is an independent coalition of Tangata Whenua and leading community and voluntary organisations set up in July 2005 to promote and make visible the enormous contribution of the whole voluntary sector to our society. ComVoices is made up of the following national organisations: Angoa; Philanthropy NZ; Funding Information Service; Cancer Society; Healthcare Aotearoa; Presbyterian Support; CCS; IHC; Prison Fellowship; Community Housing; The NZ Federation of Ethnic Councils; RMS Refugee Resettlement;

Council for International Development; NZ Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations; Volunteering NZ; Disabled Person's Assembly; NZCOSS; YMCA; ESOL Home Tutors
NZCOSS

NZCOSS is a national umbrella organisation for local Councils of Social Services and other social service networks throughout Aotearoa New Zealand. It uses its collective voice to influence decision-makers in a way that leads to policy action, social change and community empowerment. It recognises that by working together, it can more effectively support local communities and member organisations to achieve social well-being. The membership of local COSS includes people in local government and people working locally for central government agencies, as well as people working for not-for-profit and voluntary social service organisations. The organisation places high value on Maori and Pakeha working together in partnership based on the Treaty of Waitangi, along with full engagement in our multi-ethnic and multicultural society.

The NZ Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations

The NZ Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations is an active network of social service organisations. It has been active over four decades and has a membership base of more than 130 organisations. The Federation's mission is to inform, inspire and advocate for a thriving voluntary welfare sector in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The Community Sector Task Force

The culture of the current regime...is significantly informed by values that relate to risk management and financial accountability...community groups 'play the game', then work in 'community' ways. (P. 14)

It suggested that a more appropriate funding and contracting regime would express collaborative relationships based on diverse community needs. Accountability would include community benefit, and performance dimensions that would relate to two house values. There would be mutual accountability and commitment.

The New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services

The New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services (NZCCSS) represents six denomination based networks: the Anglican Care Network, the Baptist, Catholic, and Presbyterian social services agencies, as well as the Methodist and the Salvation Army churches. Collectively, these six members are responsible for around 500 social service delivery sites in their networks throughout New Zealand. Its members deliver a wide range of services that cover such areas as child and family services, services for older people, foodbank and emergency services, housing, budgeting, disability, addictions, community development and employment services.

References

ANGOA (2001) Aotearoa / NZ Civil Society...a framework for govt CS dialogue ANGOA & SCPI: WGTN

ANGOA minutes, 2.4. 2008

Baxter, K (2003) Community Govt. Relationships...Local Partnerships and Governance Research Group: Auckland

Belgrave, M (2004) Needs and the State. Evolving Social Policy in NZ Otago University Press: DN

Blackmore, A (2004) Standing apart, working together [A study of the myths and realities of voluntary and community sector independence](#) NCVO London

Cabinet paper Min (1) 39/14

Carter, C (2004) Central Govt. engagement in community outcomes and processes Cabinet paper

Cayley, S (2006) Literature review on capacity building for the voluntary and community sector The Bishop's Action Foundation: UK

Chapman Tripp The Charities Commission - not a one-stop shop (www.chapmantripp.co.nz/resource_library/published_Article). July 2005.

Cheyne, C., O'Brien, M & Belgrave M (2000? 2005?) Social policy in Aotearoa NZ- a critical introduction Oxford University Press: Auckland

Coggan, C & Gibbs, L (no date) Safety and Local Government - Partnerships and Collaboration: How to Find all those Intersections and Actually Do Something about It SCF

Community and voluntary sector research centre Code of Practice October 2007.

Community Sector Taskforce (2006) A new way of working for the tangata whenua, community and voluntary sector in Aotearoa/NZ CSTF: WGTN

ComVoices press release: Government support of giving will strengthen local communities

Considine, M (2002) *The End of the Line? Accountable Governance in the Age of Networks, Partnerships, and Joined-Up Services*

Courtney (2006) *Putting Pen to Paper: Creating partnerships that work*. WCC: Waitakere Auckland.

Crack, S. Turner, S & Heenan (2005) *The Changing Face of Voluntary Welfare Provision in NZ*. McGill: CA

Cribb, J (2006) *being Accountable: voluntary organisations, government agencies and contracted social services in New Zealand* Institute of Policy Studies

Cullen, M. et al (2001) *Tax and Charities....Policy advice*, IRD: WGTN

Cumming, J and Stace, H. *Contracting between Government and the Voluntary Sector : where to from here?* Policy quarterly, volume 2 number 4 2006.

Dalley, B and Tennant, M, Eds, (2004) *Past Judgement: Social Policy in NZ History*. University of Otago Press: Dunedin

Dekker P & Halman. L (2003) *The Values of Volunteering* NY: Plenum

DOL (2002-2003) *Government – community engagement: key learning and emerging principles* CEDAR project DOL: WGTN

Dovey (2003) *Achieving better social outcomes...through collaboration* SSC: WGTN

Dyce, T (2007) *Stories of Development...NZCOSS conference 2007*

Erhardt, P (2000) *Models of Community- Government Partnerships and their Effectiveness in Achieving Welfare Goals: A review of the literature* Ministry of Social Policy: Wellington

Etherington *Standing apart, working together: A study of the myths and realities of voluntary and community sector independence*

The Families Commission (2006) *A Charter of Community Engagement* The Families Commission, Govt: Wellington

Gray, M M (2002) *A Kaupapa Maori framework for volunteering in Proceeding of Volunteering NZ conference* WGTN: DIA

- Hanley, P (2006) *Damaged Goods: the case of Focus 2000 and the failure of contracting*
- Hanley, P (2007) "To whom are National Associations Accountable in Coalition Building and Public Campaigning?" CIVICUS World Assembly, Glasgow 2007
- Hill, R (2004) *State Authority, Indigenous Autonomy...* Vic Uni Press: WGTN
- Johnston, K, et al. (2006) *Promoting Community Wellbeing...* NZCOSS: WGTN
- Karger, H et al (2007) *The challenge of community work in a global economy* SS & SW June 2007 35 (2) 69-85
- Larner, W & Craig D (2002) *After neoliberalism?: Local partnerships and social governance in NZ...* LPGR: Auckland
- Law Commission (2006) *Waka Umanga...* NZLC report: NZ
- Lawrence, H & Suggate, D (2005) *Community-Government Relationship project - some e-products – P.pnt presentation Briefing for the Incoming Minister MSD: Wgtn*
- Lewis, J (1999). *Reviewing the Relationship Between the Voluntary Sector and the State in Britain in the 1990s. Voluntas, 10(3), 255-270.* Retrieved July 3, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database. (Document ID: 927201231).
- Majumdar, D (no date) *Collaboration among government agencies with special reference to NZ: a literature review* Victoria University: WGTN
- Matheson, A, Howden-Chapman, P Dew, K *Engaging communities to reduce health inequalities: why partnership? Social Policy Journal Issue 26 November 2005*
- Matheson, D. *Health and Disability Sector NGO – MOH forum speech notes 7 April 2005*
- Maynard, K & Wood, B (2002) *Tatou, Tatou – working together a model for government / non-government collaboration* SPJ 18 (June 2002)
- MOH (2002) *Framework for relations between the MOH and H/Disability NGOs*
- MSD (2003) *Mosaics Whakaahua Papariki: key Findings and Good Practice Guide for Regional Co-ordination and Integrated Service delivery.* MDS: Wellington
- MSD (2004a) *Briefing paper evaluation Plan* MSD: WGTN

MSD (2004b) Evaluation Plan for FfO (Integrated contracts) MSD: WGTN

MSD (2005) Good practice guide for working with local govt. MSD: WGTN

MSD (2005) Managing well: resources for community and voluntary organisations

MSD (2006) The Social Report MSD: WGTN

MSD (2001) Report of the Advisory group on the Review of the Centre

Ministry of Women's Affairs (2005) Statement of Intent (MWA: WGTN

Ministry of Social Development's Involvement in the Community Outcomes Process. August 2007

MSD (2007) Social Inclusion and Participation: A Guide for Policy and Planning

NCVO UK Compact

Newland-Foreman, G (1995) neither mendicants nor deal makers; contracting, government funding and voluntary organisations NCCSS: CHCH

Neuwait, P (2007) *Community participation toolkit: a resource for primary Health Organisations* MOH, Govt: Wellington

NZAID (2003 Strategic Policy Framework for relations between NZAID and NZ NGOs)

NZ Fed. Of Voluntary Welfare Orgs and OCVS (no date) Counting for more: a report of the value added by voluntary agencies (VAVA) project report summary

NZ Fed. Of Voluntary Welfare Orgs and OCVS (2006) Keeping it Legal...Fact Sheet

NZ Govt. Cabinet manual 2008.

OCVS (2005) Briefing to the Incoming Minister Supporting the Community and Voluntary Sector for the Wellbeing of all New Zealanders Govt: Wellington

OCVS (2007) Mahi Aroha – Maori perspectives on volunteering and cultural obligations OCVS, MSD: WGTN

OCVS (2008) Government support for volunteering 2002 – 2008. OCVS, MSD: Wellington

OCVS A Community- Government relationship: the road to a cross sectoral forum (2007)

OCVS (XXXX) Managing Well

Peet, K and Peet, J (2002) Stolen from Future Generations? The need to move to a political economy of generosity. ANZTSR conference paper, UNITIC, 27-29 November 2002

PHP Consulting Ltd (2004) *The Whanau Development Project final evaluation report*, MSD, Govt: Wellington

Pomeroy, A (no date) Being Accountable: Voluntary Organisations, Government Agencies and Contracted Social Services in New Zealand

Pomeroy, A. Changing the Culture of Contracting: Funding for Outcomes Social Policy Journal of New Zealand - Issue 31 July 2007

Robinson, D & Hanley, P (2002) Finding NZ 2002...Philanthropy NZ: WGTN

Robinson, D & Williams, T (2001) Social Capital and Voluntary activity...SPJ: NZ

Rose, E., et al (2005) Social Values: a report from the NZ Values study SHORE: Auckland

State Services Commission (2003) *Review of the Centre – Integrated Service Delivery: Regional Co-ordination*, SSC, Govt: Wellington

State Services Commission (2008) *Factors for Successful Coordination - A Framework to Help State Agencies Coordinate Effectively* SSC, Govt: Wellington

Shand, D & Loomis, T (2002) Strengthening Communities: Recent Government Initiatives Symposium, AU. DIA: WGTN

Statistics New Zealand (2007) *Non-Profit Institutions Satellite Account* SNZ, Govt: Wellington

SSC & MSD (2003) Progress report on integrated Service Delivery programme SSC & MSD: WGTN

SSC & MSD (2003) Review of the Centre; Integrated Service Delivery. Final work stream report

SSC (2008) *Factors for Successful Coordination - A Framework to Help State Agencies Coordinate Effectively* SCC, Govt: Wellington

Statement of Government (2001) Intentions for an improved community – government relationship NZ Government.

Sullivan, H & Skelcher (2002) *Working across Boundaries: Collaboration in Public Services* Palgrave MacMillan; NY

Taylor, M (2006) "Community Empowerment" Sociology Association of NZ newsletter. The Treasury (2003) *Guidelines for contracting with non-government organisations for services sought by the crown* Treasury: WGTN

Taylor, J & Burt, E *Managing trust, generating risk: Incorporating the voluntary sector in UK eGovernment Information Polity* Volume 10, Number 1-2/2005

Tennant, M (2004) *Mixed economy or moving frontier?* Otago Uni Press: DN

Tennant, M (2006) *Defining the non-profit sector: New Zealand Working Paper No. 45* Johns Hopkins

Tennant (2007) *The Fabric of Welfare...* Bridget Williams Books: WGTN

The Funding and Procurement Code of Practice (2000) UK

The local government Act (2002) Government Wellington

Treasury Department (2001/2003) *Guidelines for Contracting with Non-Government Organisations for Services sought by the Crown* Treasury Department, Govt: Wellington

Twyford, C (2008) *NZCOSS: The story of a National Social Service Umbrella Organisation* Unpublished.

Walker, A . *Understanding Social Capital Within Community / Government Policy Networks*

SPJ NZ Issue 22 July 2004 SOG, Vic Uni: WGTN

Walker (2004) *Overcoming the Neoliberal Legacy...Trust...* SOG, Vic Uni: WGTN

Wilkes and Shirley (1992) Williams, T & Robinson D (2002) Giving by Choice and Sharing through duty

Wilson, D et al (2001) Communities and Government – Potential for Partnership Wakatapu Wakaaro MSP: WGTN

Wilson, D (2002) He Waka Kotuia: joining together on a shared journey MSD: WGTN