

Productivity Report Submission. 2 December 2014

CAN STEERING GROUP

36 Aymes Road

Hornby

Christchurch 8042

1. COLLABORATION

Clients want providers and agencies to cooperate and to deliver services seamlessly. However,

many clients are wary of the degree of information-sharing that might better enable such

cooperation. (page 2: Productivity Report)

Our recommendation is to create a mechanism which measures collaborations enacted within agencies both vertically and horizontally. To do this it must be measured and accountable in the funding provisions specified in process and outcomes.

Appropriate skills are required in the sector which must provide formative ratios of trained and professional expertise who adhere to ethical codes of practice. Without this the sector takes further risks which mean too many precautions are taken in order to assess impacts before an action is taken.

Funding – the competitive and limited supply of funding can create Turf-wars, NGOs have been defensive of their position and this becomes a barrier to communication. [vertical and horizontal]

With the changing demographics of NZ society it is imperative that collaborations are encouraged and woven into the systemic processes of funding requirements. While it is anticipated that personalities will either aid or hinder this, we recognise that the funder does have the ability to dictate the culture enabled within sector environments. A good example of this can be enacted by such projects as community capacity building initiatives such as what is occurring in the Canterbury region at present. The next steps will be to look at how to contain the momentum created by this. This is simultaneously an example of putting welfare at the forefront of agency's own agendas.

Working collaboratively - from a social enterprise/socially responsible business perspective

While the discussion document identifies that some private businesses are well suited to some areas of social service delivery and some business make philanthropic contributions to social services, these keep the businesses in relatively isolated positions. The challenge is how to incorporate businesses into collaborative arrangements with other organisations/agencies. Our director for CAN has recently returned from the USA, and saw many of the community collaborations were instigated by the local business sector. This is an important consideration to encourage to meet the needs of local economies.

Many social enterprise/socially responsible businesses generate much of their revenue from their private business however the drivers behind the business are not only profit, many have a strong social responsibility mission. In the past any organisation that made a profit was viewed by many in the NGO and government sector as being 'profit driven' and therefore a less than ideal project partner. Attitudes are changing as many people now understand that all organisations need to be able to operate on a 'not for loss' basis and that achieving positive outcomes should be key drivers. This change in thinking creates a more accepting and understanding environment where collaboration is possible.

Where there are common goals amongst organisations, whatever their funding source, then some synergies can be expected. For example the goal of addressing social isolation and loneliness amongst older people may be common to a number of organisations. Rather than working in isolation, collaboration should be possible. The benefits of including a wide range of organisation types including businesses in such an arrangement include:

- * Different resourcing models can spread the risk and provide stability. A social enterprise/socially responsible business is, for example, less likely to make an application for government social service funding for their wider organisation and if they do it would be more likely to be made to a different funding agency eg for a development grant.
- * Sharing of diverse skills
- * Broader range of skills and perspectives
- * Access to a wider range of networks

Obstacles include:

- *Differences in values and ideology
- * Imperative to promote ones own organisations wider agenda rather than the projects'

Possible solutions:

- * Ensuring the focus is on the clear definition of the goal and expected and agreed outcome
- * Agreement to prioritise the project and common goal (being clear about conflicts of interest)
- * education and transparency of all working in the project about the cost of the project
 - * fostering of programmes such as Canterbury DHBs 'particip8' a programme open to anyone who has a good idea for improving health outcomes. This programme brings together people who share this common goal regardless of their position, agency/ organisation etc and focuses on progressing good ideas.
 - * funding agencies actively searching out good/new ideas particularly around gaps in service provision or where previous activities have not achieved the desired outcomes - e.g engaging 'innovation scouts'

2. ALIGNMENT

Strategic Visions and Intentions

With the changing political and demographic landscape it is imperative that goals are transparent and clear guidelines on the overall aim, both within NZ context, as well as regional and local economies.

It is important for the advent of innovation and exploration that the overall strategic aims for sectors are communicated effectively and transparently with the opportunity to add submissions for policy initiatives which are rewarded adequately when these are able to meet strategic intentions.

This also enables innovative and experimental interventions to be structured and have the capacity to be aligned to meet the aims and goals of overall policy.

This includes:

- Knowledge of overall intentions for the social sector interventions.
- 'Blueprints' are an imperative and unifying means to establish this.
- Knowing what KPI's/outcomes are required in order to secure future funding - operational transparency between government and agencies, which minimises power issues which may be present.
- A database with access for sector agencies on reports.

Ownership/Intellectual Property Rights:

Using the NGO to develop an intervention and then tendering out the opportunity, which often means the intervention and approach are jeopardised. While there is a legitimacy in making the most competitive quote, this is too often a linear equation, and not taking into consideration the multi-tiered aspects of the intervention, which have organically grown in the NGO .

It is therefore necessary to determine the best vehicle for service delivery for the role in a consultative process with the originating designer or leader of the service intervention. This minimises discrimination based on assets in an organisation. (P 29.) or the tangible budget of the organisation. Intellectual and relational capital can be a measured 'good' in specifying the capability of the agency to deliver results, which reiterates the professionalism and positional context of the service provider. In some local areas this will be more important than others.

Ownership of the social sector intervention is community driven. The funding agency is envisaged as a public servant of the needs in the organisation. The needs are assessed by consumer and advocacy which is supported by research and evidence in the specific communities and demographics.

Resourcing – we would suggest making it realistic, which includes administration support and running costs.

In the grass-roots NGO sector, this can be an impediment to launching and running an effective pilot. Costings need to correlate with such queries such as "what is a hospital social worker in a district health board costed at, or what is a WINZ worker costing MSD? When transparency includes the real costs of staff, then the reliance of good will in the NGO sector becomes more salient.

Resourcing can be an impediment to the impact of pilot projects. There need to for further access to support which may include funds based on needs for networking materials to communicate and launch initiative.

Access to multi agency collaborative and creative think tanks may catalyst a solution to limitation of under-resourced NGOs, which includes funding the qualitative research to assess the need for particular interventions. This would construct a deeper basis for why the intervention is worthwhile. Overseas examples include the RSA, or thinktack, the engine room.

Collaboration

The need to collaborate is essential if a holistic and wrap around solution is going to be lead within the social sectors that require a capital investment.

To be holistic there is a need for utilising models which are strengths based and capacity building within target communities. Two examples are the Whanau Ora model, which is much more than a bicultural model, as it can be replicated across sectors because it creates a sustainable and community lead approach. It maximises the strengths and assets available in an individual and community which are accessible, and builds solutions around these. The emphasis is upon the question of: What do you need? The second form of example would be a well-being mode, which can also incorporate a holistic approach, because it facilitates helping individuals and communities achieve a balanced lifestyle. Both of these models can be achieved via an integrated approach, which may incorporate more than one agency and further reinforces the need for effective collaboration.

Collaboration can be further enhanced by research and innovation. Catalyst meetings which concentrate on funded arenas, whereby forums address the specific needs of sectors, which are managed by funders. This also needs to incorporate a number of innovations and ideas, as well as rotating positions in the forums which are accessing community and consumer voices.

Further spotlight upon innovation in the social sector..... New ideas - for emerging markets. CAN[Communitites and Neighbours] is a good example of this. However a lot of its potential is stymied by the difficulties in having constructive collaborations with horizontal organisations in a realistic time frame given the funding timeframe.

We as an organisation would be very happy to meet with the committee at any time.