



PACIFIC JUDICIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Internal Mid-Term Review

June 2011

PJDP is implemented by the *Federal Court of Australia* with funding support from the *New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade*



Contents

1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Parameters.....	3
3.0	Summary.....	3
4.0	Comments.....	4
4.1	Participation	4
4.2	Engagement.....	5
4.3	Relevance	6
4.4	Information & Communication	7
4.5	Organisation and Support	8
4.6	Expectations.....	9
4.7	Management	10
5.0	Response to Comments.....	11
6.0	Conclusion	13
Annex A	Respondents	14
Annex B	Questions.....	16

1.0 INTRODUCTION

As part of the Federal Court's internal quality assurance, monitoring and evaluation processes, this report provides a summary of feedback received from key stakeholders involved in the Pacific Judicial Development Programme (PJDP), and the actions to be taken to address this feedback. The review was conducted between 30 May and 10 June and involved 29 respondents.

The aim of the review was to elicit comments to assess levels of satisfaction with the PJDP within several thematic areas to guide changes and improvements the PJDP Team can make to its approach.

2.0 PARAMETERS

The review is distinct from the other layers of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) undertaken by the Monitoring and Technical Adviser and the capacity building focus of the M&E being undertaken through the Judicial M&E Project integral to the 18-month Implementation Plan. As such, the review focuses primarily on the approach and quality of the Federal Court's management of the PJDP and not the quality of the technical assistance or judicial/court functions.

The reviewer spoke with; four Pacific members of the PEC, nine Chief Justices, fourteen National Coordinators, sixteen attendees at and/or hosts of PJDP activities and three members of the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) Programme Team. The respondents who participated in the review are listed in Annex A.

Respondents were asked a series of questions within several thematic areas namely; participation, engagement, relevance, information and communication, organisation and support, expectations and management. The questions are provided in Annex B. Discussions were not however limited to the questions; instead, respondents were encouraged to share their views without constraint with the proviso that their views would be documented anonymously.

3.0 SUMMARY

Overall, respondents reported that they are satisfied with the progress made to date and that the PJDP is being managed efficiently, effectively and appropriately.

In relation to the thematic areas interrogated, respondents noted that the needs assessment process was appropriate and sufficient to foster participation and that stakeholders are satisfied to date with their participation in bilateral activities. In relation engagement; it is clear that links between peers within the region are equally, if not more important than links with the PJDP Team. Sub-regional and regional activities will be important to supporting these linkages.

In terms of PJDP's relevance, respondents consider that local needs are being responded to adequately within its regional framework and that the Responsive Fund will be a useful means to address national needs not otherwise met. It is generally acknowledged that the needs presented by the region will take longer than the life of PJDP to address and therefore, **an appropriate foundation to address ongoing judicial development needs after PJDP is critical.**

While respondents reported mixed views about the sufficiency, regularity and appropriateness of communication and information, it is clear that **more frequent, informal and informative communication is required in plain English.**

Having surveyed a number of people who have participated or been involved in the PJDP's activities to date, the general view is that activities have been well organised and supported by the PJDP Team. However, **more advance notice of activities and logistical arrangements is required.**

Finally, but no less important is the broad range of expectations about what PJDP will deliver over the coming year. These expectations need to be acknowledged and carefully managed by the PJDP Team to ensure stakeholders accurately understand what the PJDP can provide.

4.0 COMMENTS

The comments received during the review have been summarised and divided into seven thematic areas, namely: participation, engagement, relevance, information and communication, organisation and support, expectations and management. At the beginning of each section, recurring theme from respondents' feedback has been highlighted with other salient points being marked in bold.

4.1 PARTICIPATION

*The needs assessment process was appropriate and sufficiently participatory.
Stakeholders are satisfied to date with their participation in bilateral activities.*

All respondents who participated in the development needs assessment process¹ consider they were afforded sufficient opportunity to provide their views about national judicial development need and priorities.

The respondents from Nauru noted that it was not possible for them to participate in the process as they were not aware of the priority needs at the time it was being conducted. Both respondents look forward to being able to discuss Nauru's needs with the PJDP Team who have made provision to respond to Nauru's priority needs.

Three respondents² noted that time constraints resulted in input into the Development Needs Assessment Survey being limited to senior judges in the capital. This resulted in the reputedly greater and more diverse needs of judicial and court officers elsewhere not being communicated. One respondent noted that it would have been helpful to visit each Pacific Island Country (PIC) to conduct in-depth analysis of needs. It was however acknowledged by all these respondents that within the time and resource constraints, the PJDP Team as much as could be reasonably expected.

Two respondents noted that the Sub-Regional Consultations Workshops were an effective means through which to elicit PIC priority needs as the groups were sufficiently diverse to include a range of views but small enough to ensure all participants had sufficient opportunity to proffer their views. One respondent however, noted the importance of ensuring the views of all levels of the judiciary were heard as different countries use position titles differently to describe various functions. The respondent was concerned to ensure that these differences

¹ Sub-regional Consultation Workshops and the Development Needs Assessment Survey

² Chief Justice Injia and Deputy Chief Magistrate Geita, Papua New Guinea and Ms Tangi Taoro, Cook Islands

were acknowledged in the needs assessment process. The reviewer acknowledged that they were.

One respondent noted that the Survey was a useful process not only in identifying what PJDP can do to assist PIC, but have also provided an additional benefit in that the results are being used to structure other programmes for judicial and court officers.

Respondents from all PIC where bilateral activities have commenced noted they are satisfied with the extent to which the advisers have afforded local participation. All respondents noted that the relevant adviser has been inclusive in his/her approach, providing adequate opportunities for local stakeholders to provide their views and participate in the activity. As a result, the Code of Judicial Conduct developed with counterparts in Niue was reportedly excellent, and importantly, owned locally which was a key factor in its quick finalisation and approval³. The PJDP Team will continue to monitor the delivery of other activities to ensure the levels of participation are replicated elsewhere.

4.2 ENGAGEMENT

Links between peers are equally important as links with the PJDP Team.

Sub-regional and regional activities will increase experiential learning among peers.

Two respondents noted the difficulties of re-engaging with stakeholders given the protracted gaps in the provision of services by PJDP. Many stakeholders consulted by one respondent are reluctant to again trust the PJDP as they have been disappointed and frustrated by the hiatus. PJDP will, according to these respondents need to 'prove itself'. Three respondents were however of the view that the Sub-regional Consultation Workshops went a long way towards re-connecting stakeholders with each other and the PJDP. One respondent noted that given the importance of National Coordinators to the development process and PJDP, it would be more useful if they could meet more often.

One respondent noted that the Sub-regional Consultation Workshops also promoted understanding about different situations and needs in other PIC which previously, were thought to be more uniform. This understanding, it is considered, enables PIC to cooperate and collaborate where they see links within and across development needs. Another respondent noted that to continue to deepen and broaden comparisons between challenges and experiences within PIC, sub-regional and regional activities will be critical. This was confirmed by four other respondents who noted the unique ability of PJDP to provide opportunities for engagement with peers beyond that available from the bilateral projects operating in their countries. The regional activities in their view provide extremely useful opportunities to interact with, share experiences and learn from their peers.

One respondent noted a lack of ownership of activities by each PIC. This could, in the respondent's view, be remedied by better and more frequent communication by the PJDP Team and/or increased participation in the PJDP by regional experts.

Three respondents noted their appreciation that former judge Enoka Puni is again involved in the PJDP given the significant knowledge and value they consider Mr Puni brings to the region.

³ As reported by Chief Justice Savage

4.3 RELEVANCE

Local needs are being responded to adequately within the PJDP's regional framework.

The Responsive Fund will be a useful means to address national needs not otherwise met.

A foundation to address ongoing judicial development needs after PJDP is critical.

80% of respondents⁴ were of the view, that on its face, the 18-month Implementation Plan offers an appropriate solution to addressing regional needs while remaining relevant and responsive to local challenges. One respondent in particular noted that with the limited resources available to the PJDP, the prioritisation process undertaken by the PJDP Team was critical to ensuring an equitable distribution of benefit to all PIC.

Four respondents however prefer to reflect on the effectiveness of the split at the end of the PJDP, while another respondent urged the PJDP to be flexible to enable it to respond to progressive and evolving needs. One respondent, a member of the PEC, considered he has insufficient information about the Plan to make a decision about the appropriateness of the split.

Although most respondents noted the different needs and status quo prevailing in each PIC, one respondent raised a **concern about the feasibility and benefit of assimilating the results of bilateral activities within other PIC across the region**. While the respondent is aware that the PJDP Team is alive to this challenge, the respondent acknowledged that it is a significant problem with no easy answer. The respondent is also concerned that a result of synthesising solutions for regional adaptation might be that smaller countries do not derive the same benefit as larger PIC.

Ten National Coordinators noted the utility of the Responsive Fund in addressing local priorities not otherwise addressed by PJDP. Two National Coordinators noted however that the **Fund's guidelines are restrictive and the application process is rigid and complex**. Both respondents were looking forward to the session about the Fund at the National Coordinators' Leadership Workshop to clarify the criteria and assist them to easily undertake the application process.

Five respondents are of the view that **18-month implementation period is insufficient given the number of activities included in the 18-month Implementation Plan or the volume of needs prevailing in each PIC**. The respondents suggest it would be beneficial if the **PJDP were extended**. This, they noted would also have the benefit of allowing sufficient time to balance other, non-PJDP activities the courts are undertaking. The respondents also noted the need to support judicial development beyond the PJDP. One respondent noted this process should include provision for PIC to be allocated funds to implement their own activities, rather than receiving activities designed for it. This, in the respondent's view will increase ownership over the design, delivery, outcomes and impact of each activity.

⁴ 21 of 26 asked

4.4 INFORMATION & COMMUNICATION

More frequent, informal and informative communication is required in plain English.

4.4.1 Sufficiency

38% of respondents consider they have sufficient information about PJDP projects and activities which involve them, their colleagues and PIC. Interestingly, **the same percentage of respondents consider they have insufficient information about PJDP.**

15% of the respondents asked consider they have more than enough information. These respondents were exclusively chief justices and represent 50% of chief justices surveyed.

Seven respondents noted that it would be useful to receive more information about activities taking place in other PIC. While these activities will not be delivered locally by PJDP, the respondents noted that they can opt to use their Responsive Fund allocation, seek funds elsewhere or at least use any materials developed by these activities to make progress themselves.

One National Coordinator where bilateral activities have recently commenced noted that it would have been helpful to have received more information about the activity to take place. In particular, it was noted that additional information about the scope and objectives of the activity would have been beneficial. One National Coordinator suggested it would have been useful for the adviser to have received preparatory reading about the issues relevant to the assignment before the in-country visit. This, in the National Coordinator's view, would have saved considerable time which could have been used for further consultations with local stakeholders.

The National Coordinator for the Cook Islands confirmed that there continued to be sufficient information, cooperation and support from the PJDP Team in organising the National Coordinators Leadership Workshop and Programme Executive Committee meeting being held in Rarotonga.

4.4.2 Regularity

Fourteen respondents requested informal and more regular briefs about the PJDPs progress. The respondents suggested a monthly email to all National Coordinators (and others who expressed an interest in receiving it) to outline the activities undertaken and progress made in the last month along with information about what is scheduled to take place during the coming month. The respondents noted that this informal communication can be responded to by individuals who wish to:

- know more about activities;
- share their views about activities delivered locally; or
- share information about non-PJDP activities which are scheduled or taking place in their country.

It was mentioned by several of the fourteen respondents, that it would be useful for the initial brief to include a tentative schedule for all PJDP activities to enhance coordination and discussion about the their timing.

4.4.3 Appropriateness

Three respondents noted the need to remove development terminology from communication and provide **explanations in plain English** to ensure that it can be readily understood by all readers.

Two other respondents, both members of the PEC, noted the **need to reduce the length of documents, or otherwise, in addition, provide a brief summary of the document's salient points**. The respondents noted that alongside their other commitments, they do not have time to comprehensively read and digest voluminous documents. It was also noted by these respondents that brief reports can be used to keep other stakeholders within their constituencies informed without the need to spend time summarising lengthy documents.

4.5 ORGANISATION AND SUPPORT

Activities have to date, been well organised and supported by the PJDP Team.

More advance notice of activities and logistical arrangements is required.

All sixteen respondents who attended and/or have been involved in activities to date considered the activities were well organised and well supported by the PJDP Team. Six respondents noted however, that **sufficient advance notice of activities** taking place in and/or with representatives from their PIC is critical to effective and comfortable planning and organisation and to ensure that the most appropriate people are available to participate and/or matters listed for court can be rescheduled.

The respondents from the Federated States of Micronesia noted that due to a late change in the location of the May/June Train-the-Trainer workshop from New Zealand to Kosrae State (in the Federated States of Micronesia), it was more difficult to organise the workshop than would have been the case had more notice been provided. Notwithstanding the difficulties posed by a late change in location, the respondents noted the excellent support provided by the PJDP Team in ensuring the workshop was organised in time.

Three of twelve respondents who have to date travelled to other PIC to participate in activities, noted that travel arrangements were not confirmed or communicated sufficiently in advance. Of these respondents one requested the PJDP Team in future provide, where possible, adequate breaks between flights across the region to ensure that participants are not overly exhausted by their journeys. Another respondent noted that delegates from her PIC arrived too early for the activity which was an unnecessary drain on PJDP funds and their time, particularly as flights were available enabling them to arrive much closer to the start of the activity. Two respondents aired concern to ensure that travel allowances are available by the time participants arrive in-country for an activity so they do not have to rely on their own funds.

4.6 EXPECTATIONS

The range of expectations must be acknowledged and carefully managed by the PJDP Team.

Respondents from the Federated States of Micronesia, Solomon Islands⁵, Vanuatu and Kiribati **all expressed the need to train more trainers** to ensure there is a sufficient local pool available to respond to ongoing and emerging needs.

Respondents from the Solomon Islands⁶, Papua New Guinea⁷ and Niue⁸ also noted the need to ensure that the training offered by PJDP is sustainable in that; local stakeholders must be sufficiently involved in the design and development of training programmes so they consider they own it. The respondents considered that this will encourage **Regional Training Team (RTT) members to deliver training again locally**. The utility of RTT members having more opportunities to deliver training in other PIC will, in the respondents' view, allow RTT members to build their training skills and to share experiences with their colleagues in the region.

Respondents from the Federated States of Micronesia also expect the PJDP to continue to assist courts in Kosrae to establish a system of alternative dispute resolution and start the process in other states.

A respondent from the Cook Islands⁹ hopes that collegiality between National Coordinators will be re-instated to the level achieved during the first phase of the PJDP.

A respondent from Nauru¹⁰ noted that the quality of those engaged to design and deliver activities will be critical to ensuring the value of the PJDP. It is therefore important for PIC to be advised of the background and credentials of PJDP advisers and experts.

The respondent from the Marshall Islands noted that Phase 1 of PJDP was very valuable, and expects to receive a similar level of support throughout Phase 2.

Respondents from Palau, Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea¹¹ expect this phase of the PJDP to assist each judiciary to implement its strategic plan and in doing so; enhance the ability of its judicial and court officers to perform their core functions and duties competently and efficiently.

The respondents from Samoa and Tokelau expect PJDP to deliver benefits at the local level, responding in a timely manner with relevant and appropriate activities to priorities articulated by each PIC.

⁵ In Solomon Islands, of the three people accredited to provide training, only Chief Magistrate Maina remains. His other commitments make it difficult to perform this role to the extent it is required both locally and in other PIC.

⁶ Chief Magistrate Maina

⁷ Chief Justice Injia

⁸ Mr Tohovaka

⁹ Ms Taoro

¹⁰ Chief Justice Eames

¹¹ Chief Justice Ngiraklson, Palau, Chief Justice Lunabek, Vanuatu and Deputy Chief Justice Gibbs Salika, Papua New Guinea

4.7 MANAGEMENT

PJDP is being managed efficiently, effectively and appropriately.

4.7.1 Programme

The respondent considers there to have been sufficient and cooperative communication and engagement with appropriate members of the MFAT Programme Team. The respondent commented that notwithstanding PJDP being a regional programme and its management team is widely dispersed geographically, there has been good communication and flexible interaction between MFAT at all levels and the PJDP Team. The respondent noted the appropriate manner and engagement style adopted by the PJDP Team which is important to MFAT which stem from the inception meetings conducted in Wellington in July 2010.

The respondent noted that to date, reporting has been good, with useful information provided succinctly which has enabled management decisions to be made easily. As the PJDP progresses, MFAT would like the PJDP to focus as far as possible on documenting the short, medium and long term results and achievements and continue to assess and manage risks as the PJDP Team has been doing.

The respondent noted the dramatic improvement in engagement with the New Zealand judiciary since the first phase of the PJDP. MFAT looks forward to learning more about the concrete opportunities for members of its local judiciary to participate in the PJDP.

4.7.2 Contract

The respondent noted that since the awkwardness and difficulties experienced during the first phase of the PJDP, the contractual relations and issues are working much better; and more so since the latest contract variation was signed at the beginning of the year. The respondent noted that correspondence and changes related to the contract are coherent, well-justified, and easy to make decisions about and respond to with no recommendations for improvements being made.

4.7.3 Financial

The respondent noted that following discussions between MFAT and the Federal Court following receipt of the initial invoices in 2010, the standard of invoicing has improved. While minor changes and improvements continue to be made to better streamline the process, the respondent noted no outstanding difficulties or problems related to invoicing.

5.0 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

While acknowledging the generally positive feedback received, there are a number of lessons to be drawn from the review. These lessons can, and will, be responded to by the PJDP Team as follows:

Comment	Response
The 18-month implementation period is insufficient and should be extended	During the NC Leadership Workshop, a unanimous recommendation was made that the PJDP be extended for a further term of three years. This recommendation will be presented to the PEC.
Given the importance of National Coordinators to the development process and PJDP, more regular meetings would be useful	An additional NC workshop has been tentatively scheduled for October, subject to PEC approval and budgetary considerations.
Regional activities are important opportunities to foster collegiality between peers	The PJDP Team including its advisers will ensure adequate opportunity for sharing of knowledge and experience between peers during such activities.
It might not be feasibility or beneficial to assimilate the results of bilateral activities within other PIC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed discussions at regional workshops will be undertaken to promote regional outcomes. • The JM&E Project will now collect baseline data from all 14 PIC to allow more valuable regional outcomes to be achieved. • Technical advisers will be briefed to ensure that the regional outcomes of individual bilateral activities are captured.
Expectations about what PJDP should deliver during this phase are broad and varied	The PJDP Team will continue to acknowledge stakeholders' expectations and clarify the extent to which they can be met within the current parameters of the PJDP.
More information is required to assist PIC prepare to participate in activities	Advisers will send briefing notes to activity participants at least two weeks prior to activities.
The Responsive Fund's guidelines are restrictive and the application process is rigid and complex	Explanatory comments have been added to the application form and were discussed in detail with NCs at the NC Leadership Workshop.
Travel allowances should be available in-country when activity participants arrive	The PJDP Team will continue to seek opportunities to transfer funds required for activities into a court bank account within the host PIC (as occurred for the NC Leadership Workshop and PEC meeting).

More trainers need to be trained	As part of the NC Leadership Workshop, NCs decided that: <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. One more Level 3 ToT should be held to maximise the number of participants becoming certified trainers.b. Future ToT training should target each PIC's needs as well as facilitating more trainers to be trained.
Confidence and capacity within the Regional Training Team needs to be fostered	The PJDP Team will work closely with members of the RTT to develop and deliver the four orientation and decision-making training workshops.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The review process has been extremely useful in assisting the Federal Court to identify areas where it is performing well so it can continue to do so, and to identify areas where changes can be instituted to further improve its management of the PJDP.

The reviewer and other members of the PJDP Team are indebted to all those who generously gave of their time to provide their views and we look forward to working with all the Programme's stakeholders to continually foster the quality of how we manage the PJDP for its beneficiaries.

ANNEX A RESPONDENTS

Programme Executive Committee

1. Chief Justice Lunabek, Vanuatu
2. Chief Justice Ngiraklsong, Palau
3. John Kenning, Cook Islands
4. Manakovi Pahulu, Tonga

Chief Justices

1. Chief Justice Palmer, Solomon Islands
2. Chief Justice Injia, Papua New Guinea
3. Chief Justice Savage, Niue
4. Chief Justice Dishington-Scott, Tonga
5. Chief Justice Yinug, Federated States of Micronesia
6. Chief Justice Eames, Nauru
7. Chief Justice Aliksa, Kosrae State, Federated States of Micronesia

National Coordinators

1. Deputy Chief Justice Gibbs Salika, Papua New Guinea
2. Judge Clarence Nelson, Samoa
3. Chief Magistrates Leonard Maina, Solomon Islands
4. Deputy Chief Magistrate Iova Geita, Papua New Guinea
5. Edwin Ambuse Macreveth, Vanuatu
6. Tangi Taoro, Cook Islands
7. Peter Law, Nauru
8. Kapilly Capelle, Federated States of Micronesia
9. Darren Tohovaka, Niue
10. Lise Suveinakama, Tokelau
11. Tetiro Semilota, Kiribati
12. Sister Bernadette Eberi, Kiribati
13. Ingrid Kabua, Marshall Islands
14. Afele Kitiona, Tuvalu
15. Rita Naviti, Vanuatu

Client

1. Ranmali Fernando, Programme Manager
2. Emma Aitken, Solicitor
3. Kathy Patchett, Contract Payments Officer

Respondents Unavailable to Participate

1. Chair of the Programme Executive Committee, Chief Justice Sapolu, Samoa
2. Chief Justice Ingram, Marshall Islands
3. Chief Justice Baptist Maura, Kiribati
4. Chief Justice Weston, Cook Islands
5. Chief Justice Ward, Tuvalu
6. Chief Justice Elias, Tokelau
7. Judge Peter Boshier, representing the New Zealand judiciary
8. Francis Llecholch, National Coordinator, Palau
9. Matt Dalzell, MFAT

ANNEX B QUESTIONS

Chief Justices

- 1 As you know, we held sub-regional workshops and requested the completion of surveys to find out what your local judicial development priorities are? Through this process, do you think you were given sufficient opportunity to provide your views?
- 2 As you know, PJDP is a regional programme so we need to respond to the collective needs of the region. We recognise however that as those needs exist at the local level, there is a need to ensure that PJDP enables PIC to use regional activities to address local challenges. We have tried to allow for this in the 18 Month Implementation Plan (eg regional leadership workshops and piloting projects in several PIC to draw conclusions relevant to the region). Do you think the way we have done this strikes an appropriate balance between responding to regional needs while making the PJDP relevant to you at the local level?
- 3 Are you satisfied with the frequency, level and type of information you have about the PJDP and the projects/activities which will be implemented in your country/court or involving representatives from your country/court?
- 4 What are your expectations of the PJDP?
- 5 Are there any other comments you would like to make?

National Coordinators

- 1 (For those who attended an Inception Phase activity) Do you think the Inception Phase activities were well organised?
- 2 (For those who hosted an Inception Phase activity) When planning and making the arrangements for the activity, did you get from the PJDP Team all the information and help you needed?
- 3 As you know, we held sub-regional workshops and requested the completion of surveys to find out what your local judicial development priorities are? Through this process, do you think you were given sufficient opportunity to provide your views?
- 4 As you know, PJDP is a regional programme so we need to respond to the collective needs of the region. We recognise however that as those needs exist at the local level, there is a need to ensure that PJDP enables PICs to use regional activities to address local challenges. We have tried to allow for this in the 18 Month Implementation Plan (eg regional leadership workshops and piloting projects in several PICs to draw conclusions relevant to the region). Do you think the way we have done this strikes an appropriate balance between responding to regional needs while making the PJDP relevant to you at the local level?
- 5 (For Niue, Samoa, Vanuatu and Tuvalu) Do you think the in-country visits were well organised?
- 6 (For Niue, Samoa, Vanuatu and Tuvalu) Do you think that the PJDP Team provided sufficient information about the adviser, the activity and its objectives before the adviser's visit?
- 7 (For Niue, Samoa, Vanuatu and Tuvalu) Do you think the adviser who visited your country provided sufficient opportunities for you and your colleagues to provide your views and otherwise be involved in the activity?
- 8 (For ToT attendees) Do you think the activity was well organised?
- 9 (For ToT attendees) Were you given sufficient information about the activity and what you were expected to do (both in terms of travel/logistics arrangements) and to prepare for the training?
- 10 Are there any improvements we can make to:
 - planning and organisation of activities?
 - working with you to organise and host activities?

- how we communicate with you and how often we communicate with you?
- 11 What are your expectations of the PJDP?
 - 12 Are there any other comments you would like to make?

MFAT- Programme Management

- 1 Do you consider there to be sufficient communication with appropriate members of the Programme team to instil confidence that the Programme is going well?
- 2 Are there any improvements you would like the Team to make to either its reports or more generally, its interaction with you and your team members?
- 3 From your knowledge of the interaction between the PJDP Team and the New Zealand judiciary, do you consider there to have been improvements in engagement and the consequent satisfaction of the New Zealand judiciary since PJDP Phase 1?
- 4 From your knowledge of the interaction between the PJDP Team and key constituents in the region (ie Chief Justice and National Coordinators) do you consider the communication to be sufficient (in terms of frequency and content)?
- 5 Do you consider the reports submitted to date contain all the information and analysis you require and are of an appropriate length?
- 6 Are there any other comments you wish to make?

MFAT- Contract Management

- 1 Do you consider that questions, issues about and variations to the head contract have been dealt with by the PJDP Team expediently and appropriately?
- 2 Are there any improvements we might make?
- 3 Are there any other comments you wish to make?

MFAT- Financial Management

- 1 Has invoicing improved since the beginning of the implementation phase?
- 2 Are there any outstanding difficulties, problems or inefficiencies we might attend to?
- 3 Are there any other comments you wish to make?