



 PACIFIC CENTRE FOR PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY

PROJECT REPORT

JUNE 2006



CATHY PELLY
MAUNGARONGO
TRUST



WORLD BANK

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	3
1. Introduction	5
1.1 Background	5
1.2 Study Session Goals	5
1.3 Outcomes & Benefits	5
1.4 Selection Process	6
1.5 Participant Profiles	7
2. Study Session Content	8
2.1 Study Session Format	8
2.2 Programme Content	8
2.3 Presenters & Facilitators	9
2.4 Programme & Event Coordination	9
3. Evaluation Methodology	10
3.1 Background	10
3.2 Purpose	10
3.3 Aims	10
3.4 Outcome Evaluation	10
3.5 Development of Research Tools	11
3.6 Final Sample (Tools A&B)	12
3.7 Current Sample (Tools C, E & F)	12
4. Key Findings	13
4.1 Pre-Event Evaluation Form	13
4.2 Post-Event Evaluation Form	15
4.3 Online Survey	17
4.4 Planning Tool	19
4.5 Other Verbal & Written Feedback	20
4.6 Contextual Comparisons	21
5. Conclusions & Recommendations	26
5.1 Evaluation Summary	26
5.2 Strategies for Ongoing Connection & Support	26
5.3 Recommendations	27
APPENDICES:	
A. Photographs	28
B. Presenter Profiles	30
C. Pacific Centre for Participatory Democracy: Future Plans	33
D. Media Reports	34
E. Evaluation Form: Pre-Event Survey	36
F. Evaluation Form: Post-Event Survey	37
G. Planning Tool Templates	38

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Much thanks and gratitude is due to many people and organisations who all helped make the Study Session such a success:

To the whanau of both marae who provided outstanding hospitality and grace to the manuhiri, the event would not have achieved any where near the outcomes it did without your manaaki, awahi and tautoko – he mihinunui ki a koutou katoa.

To the outstanding organising committee of volunteers who gave up many lunch hours, a few days work and maybe a few nights sleep. Thank you for sharing the vision and commitment to making a very ambitious dream a wonderful reality.

To the generous hosts in Gisborne (and their even more generous whanau) who provided accommodation, meals and transport for billets at very short notice – you are all awesome people who deserve a few nights at the Portside for your willingness to open your homes, hearts and wallets to our guests!

Department of Internal Affairs

The original project proposal was incorporated as an outcome of the fourth year of the Community Development Scheme project contracted to Te Ora Hou Te Tairawhiti Inc. and subsequently transferred to Te Aka Ora Charitable Trust. This project included the establishment of the Pacific Centre for Participatory Democracy as the logical development from three years previous involvement in community development work in the Kaiti community along with Gisborne regional initiatives, national networks and international development projects.

NZAID

Te Ora Hou Aotearoa made a successful application to the NZAID Pacific Island Communities Pacific Participation Fund to cover the costs of participants from eligible Pacific countries. This funding made the original vision a reality as it enabled the invaluable participation of young people from diverse backgrounds from around the South Pacific region.

Grants and contracts related to the Study Session were also provided by:

- The World Bank (Environmental & Socially Sustainable Development Division, Washington DC)
- Cathy Pelly Maungarongo Trust (Wanganui, NZ)
- Ministry of Youth Development (Wellington, NZ)
- Te Puni Kokiri - Ministry of Maori Development (Wellington, NZ).

Substantial in-kind contributions were made by:

- He Taonga mo Nga Uri Tukuoho Charitable Trust (Ruatorea, NZ)
- Te Heopera Marae (Ruatorea, NZ)
- Kariaka Marae (Ruatorea, NZ)
- Tairawhiti Polytechnic (Gisborne, NZ)
- Aotearoa Indigenous Rights Trust (Wellington, NZ)
- Global Education Centre (Wellington, NZ)
- Youth for a Sustainable Future – Pasifika (Sydney, Australia)

- Te Wananga o Raukawa (Otaki, NZ)
- Centre for European Studies, University of Canterbury (Christchurch, NZ)
- Ngata Memorial Area School (Ruatoria, NZ)
- Kotare Trust (Warkworth, NZ).

The outstanding presenters must be acknowledged for the time, thought and experience they contributed:

- Mr David Gray
- Mr Marcus Akuhata-Brown
- Ms Glenis Phillip-Barbara
- Judge Caren Fox
- Mrs Tracey Whare
- Dr Malakai Kolomatangi
- Mr Shasheen Jayaweera
- Ms Atareta Poananga
- Ms Catherine Delahunty
- Ms Kay Robin
- Mr Hugh Lynn
- Mr Michael Ross
- Papa Anaru Kupenga
- Mr Omar Hamed
- Mr Justin Duckworth.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The 'Democracy in the Pacific: Regional Study Session 2006' was held over a five-day period from April 24-28, 2006. Participants from several Pacific countries and two European countries travelled to Ruatoria, near Gisborne.

The Study Session was a chance for a group of people to come together for a short time (five days) and take look at some issues together with the help of provocative 'experts' in the respective themes of the event. The time together was to be about learning from each other - sharing stories and thinking about ways to apply the learning in the places people came from.

Diversity was important, the event had no party political, religious bias or other sectarian agenda. It was designed to be a time of informal sharing and learning from each other and invited 'experts' who have some experience in areas of interest connected to the themes of the Study Session.

1.2 Study Session Goals

Organisers aimed to bridge theory and practice, action and reflection by providing a platform for the considered exchange of opinions, inter-cultural and inter-generational dialogue while enhancing youth leadership, local activities and regional networking.

The two primary goals of the Study session were:

1. To identify the relationships between the principles and practices of democracy and notions of identity, nationhood and culture;
2. To plan and implement initiatives that will address these issues through constructive, sustainable and innovative strategies at local, national and/or regional levels.

The Study Session targeted participants from communities and organisations that would benefit significantly as a result of the participant's involvement in the Study Session. Subsequently, it was expected that participants would:

- add value to the activities of their local community, organisation and networks by making an increased contribution to their organisation and/or community as a result of participation; and
- identify opportunities for multiplying the learning and benefits they experience as participants in the Study Session for citizens in their home country.

The project was designed to provide selected young leaders, their organisations and projects with training and support in developing their activities and capabilities. As such this activity does not only involve the participants but has a multiplying effect for other members of the participating communities, organisations and networks.

1.3 Outcomes & Benefits

The Study Session content, format and follow-up activities were designed to build the capabilities of participants and subsequently the capacities of their communities, organisations and networks.

Participants were expected to have increased their::

1. knowledge and understanding of the relationships between the principles and practices of democracy and notions of identity, nationhood and culture;
2. skills to plan and implement initiatives that will address these issues through constructive, sustainable and innovative strategies at local, national and/or regional levels.

Follow-up activities from the Study Session will include:

- initiatives and projects planned by participants as part of the Study Session;
- an internet-based forum and online community;
- based on the evaluation and outcomes, the possibility of similar events within the target region;
- a reference document of resources, papers and reports from the Study Session participants and facilitators/presenters.

The capability and capacity building benefits from the project were expected to be three-fold:

1. The immediate impact on the participants understanding of the issues and skills to undertake constructive work and ongoing discussion related to the themes;
2. The medium term impact on the communities, organisations and networks that participants are connected to through increased knowledge and activity related to the themes;
3. The general medium to long term benefits to democratic governance and participation in the target countries through an increase in active citizenship as result of benefit multiplication from participants to their communities.

Participants were selected partly on their ability to transfer and multiply learnings and on a demonstrated commitment to the issues addressed by the Study Session. Organisers were pleased that every participant was able to identify new learnings from participating in the Study Session and made plans for implementing these on their return to their home communities.

1.4 Selection Process

Selection was through an open invitation to young people from around Aotearoa and the South Pacific. An Application Form including event details, goals, expected outcomes, organisation information and other relevant information was distributed widely through mailing lists, national and international networks, websites, newsletters and newspaper articles. Feedback from participants and distributors indicated that the information was widely distributed across the South Pacific, around Aotearoa and was received by applicants from places as diverse as Eastern Europe, India and Alaska.

The project was targeted primarily at young people aged 17-30 years and actively involved in NGOs, youth organisations, grass-root initiatives and community organising.

Participants were required to be:

- supported by an organisation, faculty, church, student body, local authority or network;
- able to communicate and work in English; and
- aged between 17 and 30 years old;
- available and able to participate in the full residential programme and follow-up activities.

Participants were selected by a three member panel on the basis of the quality of their application and on the basis of the following criteria:

1. Personal motivations for participation;
2. Potential to act as multipliers of the study session activities and outcomes;
3. Gender and age balances;
4. Geographical spread;
5. Diversity of academic, professional and organisational backgrounds.

Applications from young people who had attended similar international events and programmes were welcomed but had a lower priority as the organisers were keen to provide new experiences for participants who had not had similar opportunities before now.

1.5 Participant Profiles

Participants selected included young people from:

Aotearoa New Zealand	9
Australia	1
Cook Islands	1
Fiji	1
Indonesia	1
Tonga	2
Tokelau	1
Papua New Guinea	6
Republic of Palau	1
Romania/Roma	1
Slovakia/Roma	1
Vanuatu	3

In addition to the participants formally selected a significant number of people who helped organise and host the Study Session also participated in the workshops, formal presentations and informal discussions during the event:

Eight individuals who formed the organising committee participated as well as five pakeke (elders) and four rangatahi (youth) from the host marae bringing the total number of participants from Aotearoa to 26 and the total number participating for the duration of the event to 45 people.

In addition to the core group who stayed for the duration of the event, six presenters participated for between half a day and three days each plus a number of local residents from Ruatoria and Gisborne including those providing catering, administrative support and tikanga experts joined in during public lectures and presentations bringing the total number of people participating in the six day event to well over 70 individuals.

The majority of formally selected participants were given financial assistance to attend the Study Session. Those funding agencies included organisations within the home countries of participants, the World Bank, NZAID, the NZ Department of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Youth Development, as well as the families and home communities of the participants and the participants themselves.

2. STUDY SESSION CONTENT

2.1 Study Session Format

The Study Session included a range of training modalities and development opportunities both formal presentations and informal discussions.

Social events were organised in Gisborne for participants arriving early and an official welcome by the Mayor of Gisborne and event organisers on the Sunday night before the event provided participants with an opportunity to learn about the region, meet fellow participants and have any outstanding questions about the upcoming week answered.

Participants travelled from Gisborne on Monday morning two hours north to Te Heapara Marae, 5km west of Ruatoria. A powhiri (traditional welcome) was the first experience participants had of life on the marae.

The Study Session was based at the marae for meals and accommodation as well as evening sessions. Other sessions were held at Kariaka Marae and Ngata Memorial Area School, both a short drive from Te Heapara.

2.2 Programme Content

DAY	SESSION THEME	PRESENTER/FACILITATOR
1	The Waitangi Tribunal and the Independence of the Judiciary in Modern Democracies	Judge Caren Fox
1	Thinking Globally, Acting Locally, Responding Personally – Stories from an East Coast Maori Boy	Mr Marcus Akuhata-Brown
1	The Politics of Self-Determination at the Personal Level – Tino Rangatiranga a Whanau	Ms Glenis Phillip-Barbara
2	Nation Building and the New Zealand Experience	Mr David Gray
2	How the news media in the Pacific can and does influence democratisation in both individual countries/cultures and in the region as a whole.	Dr Malakai Kolomatangi
2	Participatory Structural Analysis for Community Development – mapping issues and building a common vision	Ms Catherine Delahunty & Ms Kay Robin
3	The new 'good governance' agenda and the changing 'logic of development' which requires aid recipients to conform to accepted standards of public sector reform and guiding principles developed in metropolitan centres.	Dr Malakai Kolomatangi
3	Strategies to Manage the Impact of Global Media on Communities, Families and Young People	Mr Justin Duckworth
3	The United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples – Implications for Indigenous Minorities & Problems of Participation for Pacific Peoples	Ms Tracey Whare
3	Indigenous Models of Governance – A Hapu Development Perspective	Mr Michael Ross
3	Tribal Governance, Local Government	Ms Atareta Poananga
4	Nga Uri a Maui: Tribal Governance & Hapu Leadership	Papa Anaru Kupenga
4	Growing Effective Pacific Youth Networks & Participation in Decision-Making	Mr Shasheen Jayaweera
4	Effective Planning & Implementation for Community Development Projects	Ms Deanna Harrison
4	Effective Planning & Implementation for National Development Projects	Mr Shasheen Jayaweera
4	Evaluating Community Development Outcomes Using Participatory Processes	Ms Danica Waiti
4	Effective Youth Leadership in Community Decision-Making	Mr Omar Hamed
5	Waiapu Research Project Summary	Ms Tui Warmenhoven
5	Plenary Session: Sustaining Positive Change in Our Home Communities	Mr Manu Caddie

2.3 Presenters & Facilitators

The Study Session was fortunate in attracting a range of experts to present papers, facilitate sessions and lead discussions on a wide range of topics related to the core themes of the Study Session. Many of these individuals have a background in academic and community education, activism and community organising, international diplomacy and law making, tribal development, national and local government politics.

Very positive feedback was received on the quality of the presenters and facilitators and many engaged actively in other parts of the Study Session beyond their own sessions, making valuable contributions without dominating the discussions and marginalising participants. Most of the presenters and facilitators donated their time and some were able to include it as part of their regular employment.

A full list of profiles is included in the Appendices section of this report.

2.4 Programme & Event Coordination

A group of eight people were primarily responsible for supervising the event – half of them live in and around Ruatoria while the other half came from Gisborne to support the event for the week. Six of the eight had been involved in the pre-event planning process involving monthly then weekly meetings with another four people based in Gisborne who were unable to attend the Study Session due to existing work and family commitments.

In addition to the eight support workers, two other important groups were present for the duration of the event:

- a team of five people were responsible for preparing the meals and ensuring all catering and related needs were met;
- another group of people from the marae ensured that appropriate tikanga (customs and correct ways of doing things) was adhered to including looking after the needs of individual participants and the group in terms of a proper welcome and farewell, presentations on the history of the area, entertainment in the evenings and explaining the way things work on that marae.

All of these responsibilities were related to the official programme and ensured participants experience was much more than the learning just from the formal sessions, and that an appreciation of tikanga and local history was also something they took home with them.

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 Background

In order to measure the success of the Study Session in meeting its goals, it was decided that an evaluation was needed. This would not only assist the organisers in determining the success of the event, but would also provide evidence of the benefits of the event for the participants concerned and their respective home communities. This information could be useful to external parties also. Amorangi Ki Mua Ltd a small indigenous research consultancy was contracted to undertake the evaluation and Ms Danica Waiti was the Lead Evaluator.

This report includes findings from the initial analysis conducted by Amorangi Ki Mua Ltd. of the Study Session using the data received to date. Further evaluative activities are planned in the near future and a final report will document those outcomes by April 2007.

3.2 Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to provide evidence of the benefits for participants of the Study Session and their home communities.

3.3 Aims

To achieve this objective, an Outcomes Evaluation was designed to measure:

1. pre-event relevant knowledge, experience and assumptions of participants;
2. post-event relevant knowledge and application of new knowledge and resources by participants; and
3. the benefits to home communities that can be attributed to the application of the new knowledge and resources by participants.

3.4 Outcome Evaluation

The following table outlines the objectives, methodology and timeframes of the Outcome Evaluation.

Objective	Methodology	Timeframe
1. To determine the pre-event relevant knowledge, experience and assumptions of participants.	A pre-event survey completed by participants prior to commencement of the event. N= 24 Research Tool = A	Undertaken on Sunday 23 April.
2. To determine the post-event relevant knowledge and application of new knowledge and resources by participants.	A post-event survey completed by participants following the close of the event. N= 23 Research Tool = B	Undertaken on Thursday 27 April.
	A post-event online survey to be completed by participants and members of their home communities and sending organisations following the close of the event. Research Tool = C	To be undertaken by 31 October.
	An online message board for participants to record any	Available from 31 October until 30 April

	<p>activity after 31 October until 30 April 07.</p> <p>Research Tool = D</p> <p>A session during the Study Session that asked each participant to identify key learnings from the event for themselves and how these could be applied on their return home.</p> <p>Research Tool = E</p> <p>Verbal feedback received from participants during Study Session, particularly debriefing sessions, discussions and the <i>poroporoaki</i> (farewell ceremony).</p> <p>Written feedback received via email, reports and letters from participants, presenters and members of the home communities and organisations sending participants.</p> <p>Research Tool = F</p>	<p>07.</p> <p>Undertaken on Thursday 27 April.</p> <p>Used during the Study Session and subsequent to it.</p>
<p>3. To determine the benefits to home communities that can be attributed to the application of the new knowledge and resources by participants.</p>	<p>A post-event online survey to be completed by participants following the close of the event.</p> <p>Research Tool = C</p> <p>An online message board for participants to record any activity after 31 October until 30 April 07.</p> <p>Research Tool = D</p> <p>A session during the Study Session that asked each participant to identify key learnings from the event for themselves and how these could be applied on their return home.</p> <p>Research Tool = E</p> <p>Verbal feedback received from participants during Study Session, particularly debriefing sessions, discussions and the <i>poroporoaki</i>. Written feedback received via email, reports and letters from participants, presenters and members of the home communities and organisations sending participants.</p> <p>Research Tool = F</p>	<p>To be undertaken by 31 October.</p> <p>Available from 31 October until 30 April 07.</p> <p>Undertaken on Thursday 27 April.</p> <p>Used during the Study Session and subsequent to it.</p>

3.5 Development of Research Tools

Based on the methods suggested in the table above, four tools for gathering data are necessary:

- A. Pre-event evaluation form for participants – knowledge, experience and assumptions.
- B. Post-exchange evaluation form for participants – knowledge and perceived short/long term use
- C. Post-event online survey for participants of the Study Session
- D. Online message board for participants of the Study Session
- E. Planning Tool for participants to key learnings and make plans for activities on their return home.
- F. Verbal and written feedback from participants, presenters and members of participants home communities and sending organisations (including participants written reports and newspaper reports).

At the time of writing this report, tools A, B, C, E and F have been developed and tool D will be developed and implemented by 31 July 2006.

3.6 Final Sample (Tools A & B)

The final sample for the early evaluation stage was reasonably representative of the total number of participants. The pre-event evaluation form was distributed to participants at the first briefing prior to the beginning of the Study Session on Sunday 23 April. Twenty one evaluation forms were returned to the evaluator. Of these, 20 were filled in by participants and one was filled out by someone involved in presenting as part of the Study Session.

Twenty-four post-event evaluation forms were filled in on Thursday 27 April as part of the Study Session program. Of these forms, 23 belonged to participants of the Study Session and the remaining form belonged to a member of the Organising Committee.

Twenty participants filled in both sets of evaluation forms. These can be analysed according to their expectations of the Study Session and their perceptions of the Study Session after the event.

3.7 Current Sample (Tools C, E & F)

Six responses from members of participants home communities and sending organisations had been received from the online survey (C) by 5 June, one week after it was sent out. One participant from PNG requested a survey as an attachment to an email as internet access was unreliable at the best of times.

Twenty-four participants completed the Planning Tool (E) on Thursday 27 April, eighteen were provided to the organisers to copy for evaluation purposes and to send to participants by September to remind them of the key learnings identified and action plans made at the Study Session.

Verbal feedback from all participants was received during the event, particularly at the poroporoaki and written feedback has been received from a wide range of stakeholders since the event via email including one formal report and a number of general comments contained in email messages.

4. KEY FINDINGS

4.1 Pre-event evaluation form

Question 1

The idea of the pre-event evaluation form was to find out what participants hoped to learn as part of the Study Session, what they were looking forward to and if they thought participation would be worthwhile to their personal growth.

Participants were asked to explain why they chose to take part in the Study Session. Many of the responses could be grouped into common themes. For most participants, the opportunity to share with and learn from peoples of different backgrounds and countries was seen as valuable. They identified the value in gaining insight from other countries as to how they operate politically and their experiences (in terms of democracy as well as other issues). Recognition was given to the diversity of participants and this was seen as valuable. Participants felt that through the sharing of ideas, their own knowledge would be enhanced.

The chance for networking was another theme. Participants felt that the Study Session would provide the opportunity to connect with other people in similar situations or with similar interests and ideas.

“Because the knowledge that I will learn from the Study Session will hopefully help the youth of my community and area, as they say, knowledge is power” (NZ participant).

“This is an opportunity to share with other participants from all around the globe on issues of interest. The bottom line is to learn from each other and also open up a new horizon on what we can do as a group or individuals in our own regions” (Participant from PNG).

Question 2.

This question asked participants to identify if they had received financial assistance from an organisation to cover some or all of their costs to attend the Study Session. All but two participants who completed this evaluation form indicated that they had received assistance from an organisation. These organisations included:

- The World Bank
- NZAID
- Pacific Centre for Participatory Democracy / Te Aka Ora Charitable Trust
- Te Ora Hou Aotearoa
- Ministry of Youth Development (NZ)
- Office of Environmental Resource and Development, Palau
- Pacific Democratic Centre, Papua New Guinea
- CDI Foundation Trust, Papua New Guinea
- Boys and Girls Institute, Wellington

Question 3

This follow-on question asked participants to identify if they had received financial assistance from their home community to cover some or all of their costs to attend the Study Session. Six participants who completed this evaluation form indicated that they had received assistance from their home communities, either from their own family, the youth in their community, a private company, politicians or their employer.

Question 4.

This question solicited data about how much each participant already knew about the Study Session program and details. Participants were asked to indicate the level of their knowledge on a scale from ‘not very much’ through to ‘some’ through to ‘a lot’. The majority of participants indicated that they knew little about the Study Session. These results are not conclusive however due to the fact that this question was not followed up later in the evaluation and that those levels of knowledge are not very specific.

Question 5.

Participants were asked to identify if they had specific questions or issues that they wanted to investigate during the Study Session. Half of the participants that completed the first evaluation form said they did have specific questions or issues. These specific questions/issues were:

- true practice of democracy.
- strategies and tactics to encourage participation in democratic processes.
- democracy in relation to NGO's.
- how democracy works in other countries.
- how to promote community needs at a government level.
- how to involve youth in effective governance.
- limits and alternatives to democracy.
- youth identity.
- ideas for new projects.

Question 6.

Participants were asked to identify what they were hoping to learn as part of the Study Session. Many of the answers given here were similar to those given in response to the first question about choosing to participate in terms of the ability to share with and learn from the experiences of other countries and cultures. Participants were interested to know what political systems are in place in other countries, how democracy is practiced and what the notion of democracy means for different countries.

Furthermore, participants were interested to learn about community projects that others are involved with and how ideas can be applied in their respective countries or communities. One participant was particularly interested in learning more about non-government organizations in other countries. Many participants were interested in learning more about Maori and Pacific issues.

Question 7.

The purpose of question 7 was to identify how participants are involved in their home communities. Through these responses it is evident that the participants come from varied backgrounds and are involved in their home communities in many different ways. This involvement includes youth initiatives, activism, political parties, peer education, academic studies, volunteer work, church initiatives, human rights, political awareness, participatory evaluation, fundraising and acting as trustees.

Question 8.

When asked if they thought what they would learn at the Study Session would be beneficial to their home communities, 100% of participants said it would be.

“This is the first step in a journey that I hope will lead to me being more active in my community” (NZ participant).

“In regards to the fact that I will take experiences home with me to use in my study and my life. In regards to future employment as well I think it will be helpful” (NZ participant).

“When I go back home I will have a meeting with the politicians and explain what went on here and hopefully will influence their decisions politically” (Participant from Palau).

“By sharing, learning and involving in the workshops through stories, experiences and new skills and ways of doing things differently. It would really help to better understand democracy from each and everyone's perspective and will plan to take ideas and information into action” (Participant from Vanuatu).

Question 9.

Participants were asked to identify what part of the Study session program they were most excited about. The results of this question are as follows with the most popular being the chance to learn from each other. This result is consistent with responses given in question one.

0	Being in another country	0	The keynote speakers
3	Meeting people from different countries and cultures	7	Learning from everyone around me
0	Staying on a marae	1	Progressing my community projects
5	Learning about the culture and political systems of other people groups and countries.	5	Having discussions about democracy, identity and other themes of the Study Session
0	The food	0	Not excited about any of it

4.2 Post-event evaluation form

Question 1.

Participants were asked to identify if the Study Session had been a positive experience for them. 100% of participants indicated it was a positive experience, as illustrated through selected quotes below:

“To be amongst a group of young enthusiasts who are working towards a common goal – ‘to make a change’” (member of the organising committee).

“I think the Study Session as helped me to better understand democracy through different stories, experiences and histories from different people from different cultures, societies and even customs and traditional ways of bringing democracy into societies/communities” (Participant from Vanuatu).

“I had an incredible learning time and now feel inspired to go back and get back into youth work. Also had heaps of fun” (NZ participant).

“I’ve made so many new friends and being able to share my own knowledge with them has been a life changing experience for me. The knowledge that I did learn will not only empower myself but will empower many of the people back in my home community, especially the youth” (NZ participant).

“The greatest thing I learnt personally is respecting cultures and being able to converse freely as if we all came from a single culture. Secondly, the Study Session has opened up avenues for information sharing in the future through different youth networks” (Participant from PNG).

Question 2.

The second question asked participants to identify what they learnt from the Study Session. The following table shows the options participants had to choose from, with the option to add others. As the results show, each participant’s knowledge was enhanced in at least 3 areas.

18	My knowledge about democracy has increased	9	I have received guidance for a project I am currently working on
10	My knowledge about models of democracy has increased	20	I am more motivated to initiate projects in my community
18	My understanding of the principles and practices of democracy has increased	18	I have more tools to help me and my organization/community

20	My understanding of identity, nationhood and culture has increased.	18	I have made new networks
4	Other: my knowledge of other cultures has increased		

Question 3.

Participants were asked to identify how they thought they would use the things they learnt from the Study Session. The results in the table below show that learning's will be used in a variety of ways.

19	For myself personally	18	In current projects involving my home community
24	With my home community	22	In future projects involving my home community
15	With my own family	0	I won't use anything I have learnt

Question 4.

From the responses to this question it is evident that participants will be able to use what they have learnt in the Study Session in a number of specific ways including:

- In designing or participating in evaluation activity
- In managing or undertaking current and future projects
- In educating home communities
- In undertaking research
- In securing funding
- In conceptualizing new projects
- In setting up new community organizations/initiatives

Question 5.

Participants were asked to identify their favourite part of the Study Session. The responses to this question were varied but could be grouped according to the following themes:

- Learning
- Networking and new friends
- Keynote speakers (particularly from Marcus Akuhata Brown and Dr Malakai Koloamatangi)
- Maori cultural component of the Study Session
- The workshops (particularly from Kay and Catherine)

Question 6.

This question asked participants to indicate whether they thought their participation in the Study Session was worthwhile. 100% of participants said it was worthwhile. The following quotes capture some of their thoughts:

“It has been a great time of learning and friendship. It has given me ideas and a lot of food for thought” (NZ participant).

“Provided an avenue for youth to integrate and share with each other” (Participant from Vanuatu).

“Complimented some of the work which we do with our own community. Study Session gave me the opportunity to look at things from a number of perspectives” (Fijian participant).

“Because now I have the tools to help with my projects, networks of support and inspiration from the knowledge that you are just a part of one big group trying to make a difference” (NZ participant).

Question 7.

The idea of question seven was for participants to indicate their level of satisfaction of the Study Session. The results of this question, as shown in table below, suggest that participants were indeed satisfied with the Study Session and organizers can be satisfied that the Study Session was successful.

14	The Study Session exceeded my expectations
10	The Study Session met my expectations
0	The Study Session did not meet my expectations

4.3 Online Survey

Six responses from members of participants home communities and sending organisations had been received from the online survey (C) by 5 June, one week after it was sent out. One participant from PNG requested a survey as an attachment to an email as internet access was unreliable at the best of times.

Some comments include:

[The participant has] an increased awareness and appreciation of political influences on decisions... and how they play out in everyday.

[She has] an enhanced sense of personal responsibility and contribution to her work and her direction in life.

[She has] an increase in desire to experience more of the activities and exposure to ideas such as those presented at the Study Session.

[The participant] is putting more energy and focus into a youth network project that she has been working on. She has made an appointment to meet with a community development advisor to discuss possible synergies with a local authority.

[The participant] is also considering her long-term career options and direction in further self-development.

[The participant] has a broader world view and insights about youth within and outside of Aotearoa.

[The participant's] career aspirations are broadened and based more on interest and capability rather than notions of grandeur.

[The participant has increased] maturity, political awareness, sense of responsibility.

[The participant was] very enthusiastic about what was covered in workshop and is becoming more proactive around issues discussed. 'bigger world view'

[The participant] has a higher sense of motivation to recreate her community. She has shown more interest in politics on a local, national and cultural level.

[The participant] returned from this conference eager to implement the new skills and knowledge she gained from the conference into her current and future work.

[The participant] has also taken steps to initiate local projects involving the council and youth since returning. One initiative she has taken from the programme directly.

Other feedback by survey respondents (members of participant's home community and/or organisation)

Considering the investment made in supporting the participant to attend the Study Session, how confident are you that it was a worthwhile investment?

Extremely: 66% / Confident: 33% / Not Sure: 0% / Unconfident: 0% / Extremely Unconfident: 0%

How confident are you that the benefits of the participant attending the Study Session will flow on to the communities they live and work in?

Extremely: 66% / Confident: 33% / Not Sure: 0% / Unconfident: 0% / Extremely Unconfident: 0%

The following comment summarises much of the feedback received to date:

"I am [the participant's] employer. I am really pleased that she: 1) took the initiative to apply for the programme; 2) once selected fully participated and seized the opportunity; 3) has expanded her thinking and network of like-minded and inspiring people.

Was the investment worthwhile and will there be benefit to her community? [Her] community is the world and I am confident this programme has helped empowered her to see the contribution she is making/will make."

4.4 Planning Tool

Twenty-four participants completed the Planning Tool (E) on Thursday 27 April, eighteen were provided to the organisers to copy for evaluation purposes and to send to participants by September to remind them of the key learnings identified and action plans made at the Study Session.

This process demonstrated that every participant was able to identify specific learnings from the event and how they would be able to implement the new knowledge and networks to benefit their home communities and countries. Many participants work in the area of community development, anti-corruption and improving participation in decision-making. New skills and understanding of the value that simple but robust evaluation and monitoring can add to improved outcomes from projects and programmes was a feature of a number of project plans. Others included initiatives like hosting similar events on the themes of democracy, identity and participatory decision-making in their home countries and communities. A number of plans included projects designed to increase opportunities for young people to negotiate and reflect on issues of identity, history and whakapapa (genealogy) as well as the importance of reconnecting with 'home' for those who had either grown up away from traditional home communities or had subsequently moved away to a larger city or another country.

Some examples of participants feedback during planning session:

- increased appreciation of the frustrations of power imbalances and increased understanding of the desperation of some victims of injustices (NZ)
- recognised the importance of decision-makers hearing the voice of young people and indigenous peoples before, during and after the decision-making process (NZ)
- new commitment to reconnecting with own family and home community (Romania/NZ/PNG)
- increased awareness of the impact of global forces (positive and negative) on cultures, communities, families and individuals (NZ)
- new appreciation of the need to ensure the participation of communities in decision-making (NZ)
- a changed view of democracy – more awareness of its short-comings in terms of minority populations (NZ)
- increased appreciation of the value of effective evaluation and monitoring for projects with clear and measurable indicators of success (Vanuatu)
- new awareness of the right young people and communities have to talk to the Mining Companies (PNG)

- new comparisons between Roma and Maori in terms of identity with indigeniety vs. ethnicity; similarities in terms of lifestyles/thinking/abuse; differences in terms of status of language and access to parliamentary processes – it is greater for Maori than Roma (Slovakia)
- going home to Mobilise community (Romania)
- increased appreciation of the value of language and culture – these are what we use to make sense of the world and give life meaning (NZ)
- new awareness of elements in a project cycle – planning, implementation, evaluation, etc. (PNG)
- new commitment to working toward self-governance for our people (Palau)

For the organisers this planning process was the best evidence that participants had all found value in the Study Session experience and were able to translate that into tangible, practical actions that would see the value increased as many more people from each community were given the opportunity to engage in the processes and projects established and/or developed as a result of the Study Session.

4.5 Other Verbal and Written Feedback

Verbal feedback from all participants was received during the event, particularly at the poroporoaki and written feedback has been received from a wide range of stakeholders since the event via email.

“Best youth development/empowerment workshop I have experienced to date.”

“What a fantastic group of young people, so inspiring.”

“I had always thought the Pacific nations were relatively poorly off compared to Maori but had not previously realised that the Pacific nations had been colonised and had gained their independence – it was surprising to see Maori say ‘yeah we were colonised too - but we have never gained our independence’. Also amazing to me was to hear the Fijian Indian person their express that she now could see things more from their indigenous peoples point of view from hearing the Maori story in Aotearoa.”

“Thank you for giving me the opportunity to participate in your event. As you know I have worked in a number of international youth conferences run by international bodies with many more resources than you had at your finger tips. And you pulled it off very well. Congratulations to you and to all the people that helped you.”

“Heaps more I am thinking of doing.”

“Thank you for what you have done for us. I have learnt a lot and will be using this knowledge and skills back in my community, my organisation and even my nation to help young people with issues facing our world.”

“I found it very Pacific, inspiring, humbling, admirable, grass roots, diverse and very indigenous. As a Pakeha I felt like a fish out of water but as a person I felt totally comfortable and accepted – and yet challenged.”

“I learned a lot about making participation in democracy fair and equal for everyone, I also made a great network of friends from across the Pacific and around the world.”

*“He has developed an action plan for how he is going to use what he learned at the conference to help people in Vanuatu.”
(newspaper report)*

“Being in the marae I finally understood why workshops, conferences and study sessions organised for Roma activists did not achieve satisfactory impact and effect. Organising such events in several-stars hotel is comfortable and pleasurable, but to stay in direct interaction with Roma community and culture motivates and helps the participants to better understand the way of living, thinking and cultural values of Roma. In Slovakia as well as in other European countries where Roma live, there are cultural and community Roma centres which would welcome an idea of organizing and financing similar activities in community centres.”

"The week-long stay at the foot of Hikurangi Maunga was an overwhelming, empowering and uplifting experience." (delegate from Palau)

"It is definitely a stepping stone for us all here. We have learnt many things about ourselves and about each other. It has certainly inspired us to become even more active in areas which need improvement in our own countries." (delegate from Palau)

"I look forward to hearing about the supportive relationships which have been established between individuals, organisations, communities and networks over the next few years as a result of initial contact being made during our time together here." (organiser from Aotearoa/NZ)

"Marae life was a new experience for all international delegates. Communal sleeping arrangements and housekeeping chores like washing dishes were easily accepted by the group members." (newspaper report)

"I have never before experienced the Ngati Porou/East Coast homelands. It is a unique world and I feel very privileged to have spent time here." (delegate from Aotearoa/NZ)

"My greatest interest was to get acquainted with new solutions or approaches, to get to know the policy and activities of an other minority and to bring home something which would be useful, applicable and valuable for the development and inclusion of the Roma living in European countries." (Roma delegate)

4.6 Contextual Comparisons

Māori, Pacific and Roma Participants benefited from exposure to the experiences of young people from political, cultural and economic contexts entirely different to their own. The structured reflection and comparisons built into the programme ensured opportunities for making comparisons were explored in some depth even in the short time available.

Written reports and anecdotal feedback from a number of participants suggest that most found much value in the interaction between Maori, Pasifika and Roma young people. One Indian Fijian participant had a new appreciation for the perspectives of indigenous Fijians based on understanding Maori perspectives on colonisation and being an ethnic minority in their own country.

Roma participants commented on the ways in which Māori have succeeded in becoming integral to political, economic and social institutions in New Zealand, while maintaining strong ties with culture and community. Learning about policy innovations such as te reo education and Māori health providers was of direct relevance for Roma in Europe.

The following are observations and comments made by a Roma participant comparing and contrasting their situation with that of Maori during their time in New Zealand for the Study Session and looking at Maori development in the wider society during the days prior to and after the main event:

General Comments

The experience and my own activities connected with the work in Roma communities motivated me to concentrate mainly on getting to know the cultural specifics of those people, as well as their way of their living and important historical aspects of this minority. I think that the problems which the minorities in each country have to face are often connected with culturally specific issues and knowing these specifics may be helpful and effective in addressing these problems. Very interesting was the information about the relationships and coexistence of Maori with the European settlers called Pakeha. My greatest interest was to get acquainted with new solutions or approaches, to get to know the policy and activities of another minority and to bring home something which would be useful, applicable and valuable for the development and inclusion of the Roma living in European countries.

Marae is the meeting point of Maori tribal life. A rural or urban marae consists of courtyard, meeting house, associated buildings and land. The meeting house is named after and represents the body of an important ancestor. The carvings and kowhaiwhai (patterns) tell important stories to the tribe. It is a special place for gathering together in times of celebrations and of sorrow (such as funerals) and to share information, debate and enjoy being themselves as tangata whenua (people of the land).

Hospitality is important to Maori and marae are designed to ensure that visitors are well looked after. The Ngati Porou tribe has many marae. I think that Roma activities of a similar type (workshops, study sessions, meetings of youth, meetings of Roma activists etc.) should take place in a similar way (near to Roma communities).

Being on the marae I finally understood why workshops, conferences and study sessions organised for Roma activists do not achieve satisfactory impact and effect. Organising such events in four-stars hotel is comfortable and pleasurable, but to stay in direct interaction with Roma community and culture motivates and helps the participants to better understand the way of living, thinking and cultural values of Roma. In Slovakia as well as in other European countries where Roma live, there are cultural and community Roma centres which would welcome an idea of organizing and financing similar activities in community centres.

Language and Cultural Development

The whole Study Session was held in the spirit of Maori culture, traditions and the workshops were enriched with Maori language. I admire the way Maori have been fighting to preserve their identity. The presentations of Maori speakers were bilingual – Maori and English – even those speakers whose first language is English and their have only been learning Maori, made presentations in bilingual form. I think it is admirable to see the attitude of Maori leaders towards their own language. That is something that we Roma miss.

Despite the progress which we have reached in Roma language (e.g. the existence of the schools where Roma language has been taught and a lot of publications in Roma language), we are still behind in conversation in our mother tongue at official forums and events. It is necessary that Roma language should be heard more in public. Roma language is still at the rear, the majority of Roma and non-Roma consider Roma language still as a hidden language or dialect which is used only in Roma houses.

In the historical background of both, Maori and Roma mother tongue use, there are lot of similarities. Both languages were officially forbidden in the past and Roma like Maori could not develop their culture and society in their mother tongue. In term of primary and secondary schooling conducted almost all classes were taught entirely in language of the majority culture. That is the reason why a great amount of Maori and Roma lost their mother tongue and today they are receiving the information in foreign, that is, borrowed, languages.

As far as morphological development of the language is concerned, the development of new terminology (technology and other sciences) – the same as the long-standing focus on raising standards of language use – is needed and missing for Roma language. Also missing is the inclusion of Roma language into the training and educational processes of the state schooling system and lower stress put on conversational language. Up to the present day both minorities lack satisfactory experience to confidently present their opinion and ideas in their mother tongue to officials and decision-makers.

However Maori have been putting a lot of resources and energy into learning their language, and it seems they are succeeding in pushing through the right to develop their own mother tongue and to speak it in public. During my visit of Te Puni Kokiri, the Ministry for Maori Development, in Gisborne and also by talking with Mrs. Georgina Boyd- Kerekere, Section Head of Maori Languages Programmes, Tairāwhiti Polytechnic, I obtained information that New Zealand works on the implementation of Maori language into the teaching process in the state-funded school system.

There has been a national Maori Language Strategy prepared and implemented. Several government agencies have been involved in the development of the Maori Language Strategy and have responsibility for the delivery of specific functions to support the Maori language. The Strategy supports Maori language education in the early childhood sector, primary and secondary schools, and the tertiary sector. Focusing on increasing Maori language use and the value accorded to the Maori language by all New Zealanders, a national Maori Television Service has recently been established.

The responsibility for Maori language broadcasting policy and planning was allocated to Te Puni Kokiri and the implementation of this work was allocated to Te Mangai Paho, a state funding agency for Maori programmes and the Maori Television Service through various policies and legislation. The Government has also supported the growth of the Maori language via performing arts including speech competitions and new writing in Maori. The implementation of the Strategy was allocated to

the Ministry of Education, which cooperates with other departments, education providers and Maori organisations.

A visit to Waikirikiri School, a bilingual school in Gisborne, demonstrated that New Zealand is far more developed in terms of preserving the Maori language compared with how European countries deal with the Roma language. We were sharing strategies on the retention of the native language and it seems that Maori people have a lot of focus on retaining and teaching their language in practice, whereas we Roma are just beginning to design language strategies in a few European countries.

Maori are acknowledged as an important minority in New Zealand education, but this recognition is still missing for Roma. The Minority Act exists in the legislative framework of some European countries, which gives the right to minorities (also to Roma) to establish and maintain minority schools and other educational institutions, there is also written in the Constitution of the Slovak Republic that all recognised ethnic minorities have the right to receive education in their mother tongue and actively use their language. Still the reality and the practice in the field is different and Roma do not yet benefit from any official policies relating to these Acts. The current situation in Slovakia, but also in other countries of Central and Southeast Europe is that governments tend to ignore the need of developing and retaining the Roma language.

I think we should change our approach to our mother tongue and take examples from the Maori context. In my experience, not just educational institutions but also many Roma activists, do not believe in Roma minority education. This is because they see it as segregated education, where children only obtain low quality knowledge through substandard learning. I would like to highlight that through the Roma language we can be recognised as a minority in education and the best approach on the development of our language is to implement the Roma language in the official educational system. While there are a lot of urgent issues that should be addressed in Roma communities, we should not forget that the language is one of the most significant indicators in terms of Roma identity and Roma development.

Other Educational Issues

Maori also face low levels of educational achievement compared to the majority society similar to Roma in Europe. Segregation is one of the main reasons that Roma cannot get equal access to quality education. Discrimination can also be recognised as a form of segregated schooling. In Central Europe, many Roma children are channelled into schools for the mentally disabled, which provides inferior quality education. Through discussions with Maori teachers from elementary schools I recognised that New Zealand adopted a policy on eliminating special schools and have a specific policy to mainstream all education. In the past Maori children were targeted in different ways in schools compared to majority children, but today have the access to improved quality educational support systems. From my point of view the elimination of special schools and integration of children into mainstream schools in Central and Southeast Europe should be a priority which will have a beneficial effect on providing equal access to educational support for Roma children. Some European countries have tried to solve the issue of inequality of access to education through policies of eliminating special schools, but there are still many countries which did not recognise this approach as one of the most effective ways to address this serious problem for Roma education.

Gender & Ethnicity

Roma women in Europe as well as Maori women in New Zealand face special problems not only because of gender, but also because of the dominant culture's attitude toward Roma in Europe and Maori in New Zealand. Talking to Maori women I had the impression that the privilege of men over women is not a significant part of Maori culture. I think this is a significant difference between Maori and Roma culture with respect to gender.

Roma's culturally specific understanding of the role and status of women push Roma women into fulfilling the role of housewives and mothers within the context of the nuclear family model, which makes them focus on the domestic sphere. The privileging of men over women is considered part of Roma tradition. Nowadays, Roma accept strong patriarchal values that have no place in a healthy environment for a minority group and should be rejected by the community. From my point of view segregation and isolation of Roma women as well as segregation and isolation of Roma communities generally is one explanation contributing to the practice of patriarchal values.

My suggestion would be to support Roma women (and men) in getting a broader understanding and analysis of our society. I think it can empower their self-confidence and reduce mistrust in the own abilities and lead to an apathetic satisfaction with the perceived destiny. From my experiences low self-confidence, mistrust in the own abilities and an apathetic attitude toward their destiny, are the biggest problems of Roma women in Roma communities.

In terms of gender roles many Maori women, like Roma women, are left to raise children and they have to devote more time to housework compared to men. Maori girls, like Roma girls, face the same problems with early childhood maternity. While Roma face this problem mostly because of poor living standards, Maori girls face this problem often because of alcohol abuse or drug addiction.

My suggestion would be to prepare a strategy targeting the specific needs of Roma women which would culminate in an analysis of disparities between Roma women and men. Te Whare Whai Hua, an Early Childhood Centre in Gisborne provides a good example how Maori are trying to solve the problem of low educational achievement by young mothers. I think we should follow this model developed by and for Maori. A more effective approach to reduce low education of teenage mothers among Roma would be to implement policies and initiatives which will encourage young Roma mothers to stay in school. I would like to outline the fact that it is always necessary to discuss the Roma women situation in general terms or comparing the situation of Roma women with women from the majority society.

Other similarities and differences between Maori and Roma in terms of majority-minority relations and attitudes, housing and identification.

Analyzing the situation of Roma, the complicated relations between majority- minorities has been and still is a potential source of conflict, national tensions and mistrust among Roma and Non-Roma. From my perspective, the European and New Zealand societies face many similarities in their relations between minority and majority (Maori and Pakeha). From my experiences usually this is a consequence of forced policies on Roma (Maori) without really accepting and respecting their cultural specifics and particular needs and priorities.

Sharing my experiences and information about the housing situation of Roma with Maori, taught me that Maori also face differences in the state of their housing compared to the rest of New Zealand society. In spite of those differences in the housing status of the both communities (Pakeha and Maori), I did not observe as much vulnerability among Maori minority as that faced by Roma in Europe. During my short visit to both urban and rural New Zealand I did not find households without access to secure housing, clean water sources or adequate sanitation. These are all common issues for households in Roma communities.

The biggest difference among Maori and Roma I see in their identification. The primary identity of most Maori is that of being an indigenous people, whereas Roma identify themselves mainly in terms of their ethnicity. While Roma face displacement, Maori appear to enjoy a special position as indigenous people in New Zealand and it provides them with certain status and privileges in their country. I saw this as the main indicator of different thinking of both communities.

A nice sentence I heard from them was: "The land does not belong to us, we belong to the land". While Maori have strong feeling for the land and a lot of jobs are linked to agriculture, most Roma miss such a feeling to the land and their thinking in this case is closer to displaced people.

Conclusion

In spite of the fact there is no common genetic, cultural and historical background between Maori and Roma, similarities between these two 'minority populations can be clearly recognised. Cultural and ethnic differences of both communities compared with the majority reflect non-acceptance and lack of respect to their cultural aspects and specifics as well as ethnic tensions, intolerance, apathy and aversion. The consequences of this situation are low educational achievement levels, high rates of poverty and unemployment, significant prejudices and discriminatory stereotypes as well as general marginalisation and a lack of strong leadership in both communities.

The experience from New Zealand suggests that certain principles, approaches, projects and strategies implemented for Maori development could also be applicable and implemented in European countries

for Roma. Those principles, approaches, projects and strategies can be successful only with a reflection of the specific needs and cultural aspects of Roma.

Linking the above and other participants comments to something like a Maori Potentials Framework, outcomes could include the following achievements from the Study Session:

Area	Outcomes
Te Ira Tangata	<p>Rangatahi involved in the event have an increased awareness and appreciation of international conventions and systems and how other minority groups utilise mechanisms to enhance their meaningful participation in democratic processes.</p> <p>The whānau and communities hosting participants have had their ideas about and understanding of the world broadened by the korero and experience both historic and contemporary of the European and Pacific participants.</p> <p>Participants articulated through the evaluation and future planning processes a conception of themselves as global citizens with a social and cultural conscience who can and are taking up leadership roles and positive, pro-active decision-making for and with their whānau, tribes and communities.</p>
Mātauranga	<p>Inter-cultural and inter-country transmission of knowledge was promoted throughout the event and the relationships and networks that have evolved out of the Study Session will create new opportunities for these participants, their peers and future generations. The new learning has assisted whānau with representatives who contributed in some way to the event to realise the great advances Māori have made toward realising their potential and the value that their experience has for other indigenous and ethnic minority people groups around the world.</p>
Whakamana	<p>The Study Session provided an excellent, perhaps unique, opportunity to build the esteem of potential leadership from amongst rangatahi with the guidance and knowledge of their Pacific, Pakeha and European peers. The opportunity for rangatahi to share their views, hopes and vision for Aotearoa with young people from around the Pacific region and around the world acknowledged that Māori are experts and world leaders in many areas of culturally-validating social, economic and political development. For rangatahi connected to the iwi and hapu of Te Tairāwhiti it reinforced the mana whenua status they have inherited and provided an opportunity to showcase the rich cultural, environmental and economic innovations of their tipuna and contemporaries.</p>
Rawa	<p>By utilising local sites, events and stories of significance as opportunities for reflecting on the themes of the event, rangatahi were able to compare and contrast their relationship to land, the Crown and experiences of dispossession and transience with that of Roma and other Pacific peoples who often do not have one state or one country but many to negotiate with, or as indigenous peoples they are a majority in their country with different but related issues in terms of democratic processes, identity and development.</p>

5. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Evaluation Summary

The following statement is taken from the report prepared by Amorangi Ki Mua Ltd. based on analysis of the Pre and Post-Event Surveys:

The results of this initial data suggest that all participants have benefited greatly from taking part in the 2006 Study Session. The provision of an avenue for discussion and the combination of diverse backgrounds and experiences has culminated in new friends, networks and personal motivation. Although the statistical data provides one level of evidence in terms of what participants learnt, it is perhaps the participants' own quotes which truly communicate those benefits.

Analysis of the pre-event and post-event surveys indicates that all of the participants experienced a degree of personal growth over the period of the Study Session. This growth, however varied for each participant, was characterised by an increase in learning of a political, spiritual, social and/or cultural nature.

From the results, it is anticipated that these learnings will be used in some way that benefits the home communities of participants. The extent of this is not known yet, however the intentions, as communicated by the participants, are positive. Each participant is at a different point on a continuum of involvement with community/regional/national development activities. The ways in which they apply what they have learnt at the Study Session will be different, but equally as valid.

Further evidence will be made available as the evaluation moves into its second phase. With the online survey in October and the availability of the online message board between October and April 2007, the longer-term benefits for the participants will be revealed. Furthermore, connections to benefits of the home communities may also be revealed at that later stage.

For now however, the organisers of the Study Session can be assured of a job well done. The evaluator acknowledges that participants have communicated their satisfaction with the Study Session in ways other than the tools designed for this evaluation. Quick analysis of the evaluation forms distributed by the organizers confirms that participants were satisfied with the Study Session, in line with the findings of this evaluation.

5.2 Strategies for Ongoing Connection and Support

On the final morning of the Study Session participants and organisers agreed on the following initiatives to maintain contact and build on the learning and development opportunities as a group.

1. An Auckland-based participant agreed to help set up and disseminate email list for participants, presenters and organisers to maintain contact and share experiences.
2. It was agreed the following information would be posted on the PCPD website:
 - I. Keynote Speakers address
 - II. Papa Anaru's korero
 - III. Photos of Study Session
 - IV. Survey template to indicate progress in three months time.
 - V. Other relevant information that is sent for general distribution.
3. Project plans prepared by participants would be sent to them by organisers in six months time.

4. A group from New Zealand agreed to create a journal containing:
 - a. Profiles on participants and their projects
 - b. Poetry, stories, artwork and photographs from participants home communities
 - c. Articles or publications developed as a result of Study Session
5. Expressions of interest to host next Study Session were made by participants from:
 - I. Papua New Guinea
 - II. Palau
 - III. Auckland, NZ
6. It was suggested that interested participants be appointed to the International Advisory Board for the Pacific Centre for Participatory Democracy.

All of the suggestions above are in the process of being implemented by participants and organisers. Decisions on the location of another Study Session will largely be dependent on securing support from the same or new funders, and Papua New Guinea in mid-2007 is the most likely venue at this stage.

5.3 Recommendations

Recommendation	Basis	Target Stakeholders
1. Similar events should be supported by organisations and governments in the South Pacific.	<p>There are already many benefits accrued from the investments made by funders in this event.</p> <p>The outcomes already demonstrate value for money in terms of the impact the event has had on communities around the region and these benefits are only going to increase and multiply as participants apply the new knowledge, implement plans and develop relationships they have established. Other young people in the region should have access to similar events on an ongoing basis to broaden regional cooperation amongst current and future community and national leaders in the region.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pacific Island State governments - New Zealand government agencies (NZAID, Ministry of Youth Development, Ministry of Maori Development, Department of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Education) - Multilateral Institutions in the region (Pacific Island Forum, Commonwealth Youth Programme, European Union, World Bank, UNDP, etc.) - Private & Public Philanthropic Organisations (Trusts, Estates, Foundations, Lottery Grants, etc.)
2. Further research should be undertaken within 12 months to monitor impact of the event on participants home communities.	<p>Ongoing evaluation has been planned but will require participants to complete surveys and participate in online discussions but some have limited and infrequent internet access. Monitoring visits by a contracted evaluator to a proportion of the participants projects to review progress, conduct interviews and compare impacts could be another option.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NZAID, MYD, TPK, World Bank - Participants
3. Participants should work hard to build on the learning and networks they have acquired for the benefit of their home communities.	<p>Participants have had the privilege of sharing a week with some extraordinary young people doing exciting and innovative work around the Pacific (and Europe). They have had the opportunity to meet people from very different contexts and learn from them and should pass on anything of value to their home communities and consider organising similar events in their area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participants

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A:
Event Photographs





APPENDIX B:

Presenter Profiles

	<p>Judge Caren Fox, <i>Maori Land Court</i></p>	<p>Judge Caren Fox (formerly Wickliffe) is the kaiwhakawā of the Tai Rawhiti Māori Land Court based at Gisborne. She has been a law lecturer at the University of Waikato and at Victoria University of Wellington. A specialist in international human rights, Judge Fox was a Harkness Fellow to the USA in from 1991 to 1992.</p> <p>Before being appointed to the bench, Fox also acted as legal counsel for Treaty claimants.</p> <p>Judge Fox was appointed to the Waitangi Tribunal in 2000. She is currently the presiding officer for the Rotorua, Taupo and Kaingaroa inquiries which cover the central North Island.</p>
	<p>Marcus Akuhata-Brown, <i>Tukaha Global Consultants</i></p>	<p>Marcus grew up on the East Coast, his father is Ngati Porou (Tuwhakairiora) from Te Araroa on the East Cape and his mother has English and Welsh ancestry. A qualified teacher and gifted communicator, Marcus has led a number of innovative alternative education programmes addressing the learning needs of youth at risk and young offenders.</p> <p>Since 1996 Marcus has travelled all over the world as both a national and international representative and delegate. Marcus was a Director on the international board of CIVICUS as well as being an ex-officio member of the Commonwealth Youth Caucus.</p> <p>Marcus founded Tukaha Global Consultancy in 2000 and currently divides his time between speaking and consultancy work, whanau development in Te Araroa and personal studies through Te Wananga o Raukawa.</p>
	<p>Glenis Phillip-Barbara, <i>Tairawhiti Polytechnic</i></p>	<p>From Reporua and Ngati Rangī, Glenis has a background in whanau, hapu and community development work, research and academic studies, political organising and advocacy. Glenis is currently head of Maori Studies at Tairawhiti Polytechnic, a Trustee of Te Aka Ora Charitable Trust and an active member of the Maori Party Turanga Branch and contributes to the development of policy for the Maori Party.</p>
	<p>David Gray, <i>Governance Coach</i></p>	<p>David is a first-generation Kiwi born to Scottish immigrant parents. He and his wife Dianne have three children and live in Pukekohe.</p> <p>David Gray works as a consultant in Māori development. Over the past several years, he has consulted to a number of tribal organisations on matters to do with strengthening governance practice. Recently, he was retained by the New Zealand Law Commission to advise on the creation of a new form of Māori entity. David is the former chief executive of an iwi authority (Waikato/Tainui). He has held general management positions in both the private and local government sectors, and is the former head of corporate banking for a major New Zealand bank. He has also had extensive governance experience in the not-for-profit sector.</p> <p>In his spare time, David has developed a workshop about the Treaty of Waitangi, which he delivers to community groups and as a training programme for businesses. David has qualifications in general management, Māori studies, human resources management and Māori development from the University of Waikato and the University of Auckland.</p>
	<p>Tracey Whare, <i>Aotearoa Indigenous Rights Trust</i></p>	<p>Tracey Whare (Ngati Raukawa and Te Whanau a Apanui) currently practises law in Lower Hutt. A graduate of Victoria University, Tracey has practised in a number of areas including Maori land, resource management, litigation and more recently property.</p> <p>In 1998 Tracey was awarded an indigenous fellowship at the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights based in Geneva, Switzerland. She has continued to be involved in indigenous peoples human rights participating in a number of international meetings including the United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and as an Advisor for the International Indian Treaty Council.</p> <p>Tracey is also a trustee of the Aotearoa Indigenous Rights Trust, a charitable trust she helped establish to disseminate information and create awareness amongst Maori concerning indigenous peoples human rights.</p>

	<p>Dr Malakai Koloamatangi, <i>University of Canterbury</i></p>	<p>Dr Koloamatangi joined the National Centre for Research on Europe at the University of Canterbury in 2003 as a Post-Doctoral Fellow. He has taught at the University of Auckland, and worked for the New Zealand Parliamentary Services. He has also worked as a consultant and commentator on various issues in Pacific Island media in New Zealand and the Pacific.</p> <p>Dr Koloamatangi will be working with the Centre's Director, Professor Martin Holland, to evaluate the political aspects of the European Union's Economic Partnership Agreements with the Pacific Islands.</p> <p>As well as his extensive research interests, Dr Koloamatangi regularly contributes media commentary in both Australia and New Zealand on Pacific Island, particularly Tongan, issues.</p>
	<p>Manu Caddie, <i>Pacific Centre for Participatory Democracy</i></p>	<p>Manu started his professional career as a political activist in the early 90s. As the Kaihautu (Manager) of Te Ora Hou from 2000-2005, Manu helped grow the organisation from one voluntary youth project to over a dozen youth and community development projects with a staff of 26 professional youth workers, educators and support staff. Over the past year Manu has been involved in the establishment of the Pacific Centre for Participatory Democracy based in Gisborne. He has recently taken up a new role managing the relationships between the Department of Child, Youth & Family Services and Non-Governmental Organisations.</p> <p>Manu is involved with a range of community development initiatives in Gisborne and provides project support to organisations in Nepal, Ethiopia and a new youth work training programme in the South Pacific.</p>
	<p>Shasheen Jayaweera, <i>Youth for a Sustainable Future</i></p>	<p>Shasheen is a co-founder of Youth for a Sustainable Future Pacifika, the largest Pacific Youth Organisation working on the UN Millennium Goals with 170 members. YSFP initiated the first Pacific Youth MDG Summit last year in Samoa.</p> <p>Shasheen is also on the International Youth Parliament and is currently studying commerce in Sydney.</p> <p>His interests range from business, sustainability, helping youth and music. Contact: shishj85@hotmail.com</p>
	<p>Atareta Poananga, <i>Gisborne District Councillor, TRONP Trustee</i></p>	<p>Atareta Poananga, Gisborne District Councillor, Elected District Health Board member.</p> <p>Ngati Porou, Te Whanau-A-Apanui, Ngati Kahungunu, Rangitane and Ngati Kauwhata.</p> <p>Atareta grew up in the Middle East and Malaya, she has a strong community background and an interest & involvement in Maori political development. Her passion is constitutional change from a Te Tiriti o Waitangi perspective. Her legal background focuses a legislative change. She is involved in local government as a Councillor for a rural ward for three terms on Gisborne District Council, and as an elected Tairawhiti Health Board member and a member of the Community Sector Taskforce. Atareta stood as a Maori Party candidate for Ikaroa-Rawhiti in the 2005 and only narrowly lost the general election and has been a member of the Ethics Committee for the Health Research Council and a diplomat. Atareta has an MA in Political Studies.</p>
	<p>Rev Brent Swann, <i>Te Hui Amorangi ki Tairawhiti</i></p>	<p>Brent has connections to Tairawhiti iwi and hapu. He has served on a large number of national and international committees for the Anglican church and is the new Minita a Rohe for Turanga.</p>
	<p>Justin Duckworth, <i>Global Education Centre</i></p>	<p>Justin has been working in grass roots youth and community work for the last 15 years. He has pioneered and developed different projects over this time. A driving passion running through all these projects has been a desire to see young people equipped and encouraged to work together for a better world. Justin during this time has also dabbled in teaching, street performing, marathon running and community theatre.</p>

	<p>Kay Robin & Catherine Delahunty, Kotare Trust.</p>	<p>Kotare is a Charitable Trust established in 1996 by a wide range of people involved in community, church, youth, union, local economic development and adult education. This group has since broadened to include people from Te Tiriti and environmental activism backgrounds. Kotare was founded in the belief that people from all sectors need to be inspired and supported to develop and sustain their organisations working for justice and positive social change. We saw a need for the potential of flaxroots/grassroots people and communities to be fostered, supported, sharpened and realised. Our initial years of experience has taught us that this potential needs to be realised and encouraged outside of conventional institutions within an independent and creative environment.</p> <p>The Kotare Trust believes that for real change to be effective, solutions to poverty, inequity and injustice must come from the people who are most directly affected. Our educators have learned that respecting culture and developing analysis, organising and leadership skills are fundamental requirements for successful community development in all its forms.</p>
	<p>Hugh Lynn</p>	<p>Hugh Lynn has been involved in the entertainment industry since age three. He has won numerous awards for his contributions to the industry in New Zealand and has promoted the largest concerts held in this country including 1983's David Bowie concert at Western Springs Stadium attracting a crowd of 83,000 still the largest paying crowd ever seen in New Zealand. In all, Hugh Lynn has promoted over one hundred international acts, including Bowie, Elvis Costello, Fleetwood Mac, Bob Dylan & Tom Petty, Mick Jagger, Guns & Roses, Pink Floyd, the Police, R.E.M., Rod Stewart, Tina Turner, UB40, Stevie Wonder and Neil Young.</p> <p>Between 1983 and 1991 Hugh Lynn managed the group Herbs, who became one of New Zealand's top bands travelling throughout the Pacific including: Australia, Fiji, Japan, New Caledonia, New Guinea, Tahiti and Tonga.</p> <p>He is currently an adviser in his iwi negotiations for their settlement under the Treaty of Waitangi.</p>
<p>Michael Ross, <i>Te Wananga o Raukawa</i></p>	<p>Michael is head of the School of Management Studies at Te Wananga o Raukawa and specialises in research on hapu/iwi governance and Kaupapa Maori models of management. Michael is also Chairperson of Te Ora Hou Aotearoa, a national Maori youth and community development organisation.</p>	

APPENDIX C:

Pacific Centre for Participatory Democracy: Future Plans

The primary purpose of the Pacific Centre for Participatory Democracy (PCPD) is to facilitate learning and raise public issues related to participation in and access to democratic systems, particularly for young people and minority groups – and to make evidence-based information and resources on these issues available to interested stakeholders.

The Centre aims to facilitate and coordinate events and learning opportunities that creatively explore ways that organisations, structures and systems can improve participation by the public and the integration in decision-making of interests from minority groups.

Established in 2005 and currently based in Gisborne, New Zealand, the Centre plans to grow slowly and over time increase the scope of activities. The two major initiatives of the 2005-2006 year have included:

- co-hosting a lecture series entitled ‘Myths of Democracy’ which involved three guest lecturers presenting papers on Democracy & State Secrecy; Democracy & Terrorism; and Democracy & The Media;
- hosting the Regional Study Session 2006 ‘Democracy in the Pacific: Young People Negotiating Citizenship, Identity and Globalisation.’

Upon a request from the PCPD Director, participants at the Study Session expressed an interest in forming an International Board for the PCPD.

At present an Advisory Group of individuals with specific expertise from around the world contribute programme development advice to the Centre. It is suggested that an International Board would formalise some of the structure and decision-making processes for the PCPD and help set future directions and possibly new locations for PCPD offices. No other organisation in the Pacific region has the same purpose and aims as the PCPD and the need for increased debate and research on democracy in the Pacific has never been greater.

Expressions of interest have been received to expand PCPD activities and offices into other Pacific Island countries and these opportunities will be explored in more depth during the second half of 2006 with the assistance of interested parties and potential funding partners.

For more information contact:

Mr Manu Caddie
Director
Pacific Centre for Participatory Democracy
PO Box 3072
Gisborne
NEW ZEALAND

Email: manu@pcpd.org.nz
Tel: ++64 +6 8687730

APPENDIX D:
Media Reports

GISBORNE HERALD April 29 2006:

The Gisborne Herald • Saturday, April 29, 2006

NEWS 3

International youth leaders 'certainly inspired' by forum held at Ruatoria

by Alice Te Pahi

FUTURE international leaders newly armed with knowledge gained from a youth conference at Ruatoria are determined to make a difference to the running of their respective countries when they return home today.

Delegate Sabina Ulahi Sullivan of Palau said her week-long stay at the foot of Hikurangi Mountain was an eye-opening, empowering and uplifting experience.

"It is definitely a stepping stone for us all here. We have learnt many things about ourselves and about each other. It has certainly inspired us to become even more active in areas which need improvement in our own countries."

Conference organiser Maura Caddie said the delegates were "the future" and he expected great things from them as future leaders of their nations.

"As most of you will go on to be leaders in a wide range of contexts, you will need to lean on the wisdom and experience of your peers in other parts of the world."

"I look forward to hearing about the supportive relationships which have been established between individuals, organisations, communities and networks over the next few years as a result of initial contact being made during your time together here."

Marae life was a new experience for all international delegates. Communal sleeping arrangements and housekeeping chores like washing dishes were easily

accepted by the group members.

"Some thought they would be staying in four-star hotels but soon welcomed the unique marae experience," said Mr Caddie.

The forum concentrated on promoting and encouraging better education, the advancement and well-being of youth and future generations, and the preservation and restoration of the natural environment.

There was a range of local and national guest speakers, including International Youth Parliament member Shaheen Jaisawara, Justin Duckworth, a grassroots youth and community worker for the past 15 years, Pacific Islands political expert Dr Malakai Kelomotengi and Taranaki Māori Land Court Judge Corey Fox. More than 30 international delegates from Romania, Papua New Guinea, Japan, Palau, Turkey, Slovakia, Fiji, Tonga, the Cook Island and New Zealand delegates from throughout the country attended the conference.

Delegate Mera Pikai from Christchurch said communication between elders and youth was not as strong as it should be.

She said this was a global issue which needed immediate addressing. Changes had to be made in the home by the whānau.

"We need to keep our dreams alive and have a strong foundation with our whānau and kaitiaki. We don't need to wait for handouts."

"I have never before experienced the Ngāi Tahu East Coast hāwehanga. It is a unique world and I feel very privileged to have spent time here," she said.



"We are very blessed to have the world come to Ruatoria," said host organiser Te Whaitohurangi from Ruatoria, pictured third from left with Democracy in the Pacific – Youth Conference delegates Joel Albert from Vanuatu, Mera Pikai from Christchurch and Titus Kuman from Papua New Guinea. More than 30 delegates from throughout the world and New Zealand attended the week-long forum, which ended yesterday.

Picture by Alice Te Pahi

Palau 'being swamped by American culture'

by James Ihaka

A VISITING Palauan student says her country is in danger of being swamped by an all-consuming American culture.

Sabina Sullivan, who lives in the Palauan capital of Koror, said since her country gained its independence in 1996 from the United States her people had become "lazy and had not challenged the government".

Despite the country being totally owned and run by the indigenous population, the 20-year-old said there had also been a gradual erosion of traditional knowledge and customs by a dominant American culture.

"These days it seems a lot of people would prefer to speak English rather than Palauan," she said.

Miss Sullivan, who was at Te Heapea Marae near Ruatoria at the Pacific Centre for Participatory Democracy conference, said the meeting had expanded her networks and had given her ideas to take home.

"With the help of those people we will be able to change the government so we won't be

totally consumed by Western cultural ideals," she said.

"For us it's about holding onto our cultural identity while promoting democracy with the help of other delegates."

She said there were discrepancies in the Palau health system, where immigrants were taking advantage of pre-natal care meant only for the indigenous people. There had also been an influx of foreign workers into Palau from countries such as the Philippines, China and Bangladesh, many of whom were now undermining the Palauan workforce illegally.

Ms Sullivan said there were corruption allegations against the Palauan government in certain sectors and she would be encouraging her people to follow the investigations through.

The small group of islands, about 1000 kilometres north of Papua New Guinea and with a population of about 18,500 people, was colonised by Germany and then by the Japanese. Under the tutelage of the United Nations, the islands were then administered by the United States following World War 2.



Sabina Sullivan who was at the Pacific Centre for Participatory democracy conference in Ruatoria this week. Miss Sullivan said her country's culture and traditions were gradually being consumed by Americanism.

'Roma people marginalised regarding education'

by James Ihaka

IT'S quite a way from Bucharest to Ruatoria but that is no problem for Florin Nasture, who comes from a long line of travellers.

Mr Nasture, 31, was at the Pacific Centre for Participatory Democracy conference held near Ruatoria this week.

Working as a country facilitator out of Budapest (Hungary), Mr Nasture is actually from Recharasi in Romania.

He is of the Roma people, who are often mistakenly referred to and perceived as gypsies.

Mr Nasture said his ancestors left their homes north of India more than 1000 years ago and headed towards Europe in what he called "three waves of migration".

He said the view that his people still travelled around in caravans playing word games with fortune tellers was a common misconception.

Under Romania's former communist regime the Roma people were almost totally assimilated into society, with 95 percent now living in the community.

The Roma officially number about 200,000 but Mr Nasture said that figure was more likely to be about 2,000,000 as

many have either forgotten who they are or no longer identify as Roma.

Mr Nasture said because his people were not indigenous to Romania, particularly in areas of housing,

he said his people sought equal opportunities in Romania, particularly in areas of housing.

"There is a huge gap between the Roma people and Romanians in regards to education."

"I have seen here that Maori have a parallel education system which is separate from the mainstream. What we actually

want is to be included more in education."

Mr Nasture hoped to implement cultural projects upon his return to his country.

He also wanted to include his people more in his country's decision-making processes.

"It's important to stay connected with your communities and know what their needs are."

"It is also important to involve your communities in decision-making processes and any solution to problems should come from the people, not from someone who sits in an office removed from the people," he said.

VANUATU DAILY POST:

Youth attends NZ meeting on community development (Issue 1731)

Joel Albert from Youth Challenge International Vanuatu recently participated in a Regional Study Session hosted by the Pacific Centre for Participatory Democracy. The international event was held over 6 days in Gisborne, New Zealand. Mr Albert's participation in the conference was supported by NZAID. The goals of the study session were to identify the relationships between democracy and notions of identity, nationhood and culture; and to plan and implement initiatives that will address these issues at local, national and/or regional levels. The session targeted individuals and organizations they believed would most benefit from participation and who would share their new knowledge and experience with others in their home country. Topics that were addressed as part of the session included: indigenous models of governance, effective pacific youth networks and participation in decision-making, planning and implementation for community development projects, and many others. The participants were also exposed to aspects of Maori culture and the impact of colonization in New Zealand. Mr Albert said he enjoyed the conference immensely and that it had been a valuable learning experience. "I learned a lot about making participation in democracy fair and equal for everyone," stated Mr Albert. "I also made a great network of friends from across the Pacific and around the world." He has developed an action plan for how he is going to use what he learned at the conference to help people in Vanuatu. "My major goal is to establish a youth space in my home community," he said.

Posted on 21 May 2006

http://vanuatudaily.com/news/currentweek.php?misc=search&subaction=showfull&id=1148198455&archive=&cnshow=news&ucat=1&start_from=&do=archives

APPENDIX G: EVALUATION FORM – POST-EVENT SURVEY

Name: _____
 Country: _____

The aim of this survey is to find out what you think *after* participating in the Study Session. Please be honest with your answers and try to answer every question.

1. Was the Study Session a positive experience for you?
 Yes No

Please explain your answer:

2. What have you learnt from the Study Session? Please tick the boxes you agree with. You can also write in your own answers.

<input type="checkbox"/>	My knowledge about democracy has increased	<input type="checkbox"/>	I have received guidance for a project I am currently working on
<input type="checkbox"/>	My knowledge about models of democracy has increased	<input type="checkbox"/>	I am more motivated to initiate projects in my community
<input type="checkbox"/>	My understanding of the principles and practices of democracy has increased	<input type="checkbox"/>	I have more tools to help me and my organization/community
<input type="checkbox"/>	My understanding of identity, nationhood and culture has increased.	<input type="checkbox"/>	I have made new networks
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:

3. How will you use the things you learnt from the Study Session? Tick as many boxes as needed.

<input type="checkbox"/>	For myself personally	<input type="checkbox"/>	In current projects involving my home community
<input type="checkbox"/>	With my home community	<input type="checkbox"/>	In future projects involving my home community
<input type="checkbox"/>	With my own family	<input type="checkbox"/>	I won't use anything I have learnt

4. Please list one specific way you will use what you have learnt from the Study Session with your home community.

5. What was your favourite part of the Study Session experience to date?

6. Do you think that participating in the Study Session was worthwhile?
 Yes No

Please explain your answer:

7. Tick the box next to the statement you agree with most.

<input type="checkbox"/>	The Study Session exceeded my expectations
<input type="checkbox"/>	The Study Session met my expectations
<input type="checkbox"/>	The Study Session did not meet my expectations

Thanks, that is the end of the survey. Have a safe trip home!

APPENDIX H:
Planning Tool Templates
He Mahi Hou – A New Project

1. What do you want to do? (in one or two sentences)

2. Why do you want to do it? (in one or two sentences)

3. Where do you want to do it?

4. Who else would/could need to be involved?

5. How will you know it has been successful?

6. How will you be able to measure the success?

7. What steps will you need to take to make it happen?

TASK	BY WHO	BY WHEN

8. What are the risks/threats to the project happening and/or being successful?

RISK/THREAT	STRATEGY TO MITIGATE THE RISK/THREAT

Mahi Tonu – Developing an Existing Project

1. What is the project/work you are currently involved with?

2. How long have you been involved with the work?

3. What is your role?

4. Thinking about the Study Session so far, what new ideas/information have you been able to connect between your work/community/project?

5. What are three things you can take away from the Study Session to improve/development the work you do?

a)

b)

c)

7. What steps will you need to take to apply those new learnings and when will you do it by?

TASK	BY WHEN

8. What are the risks/threats to implementing the new learning you have?

RISK/THREAT	STRATEGY TO MITIGATE THE RISK/THREAT

