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Foreword

In many ways, not-for-profit organisations play a significant role in the well-being of our State. They serve the needy and disadvantaged, and add immeasurably to the quality of life and social fabric we all take for granted. And they are made up of thousands of selfless individuals whose interests lie in making a difference to those around them.

The benefits that these organisations – and the people who make them up – bring to our community clearly extend beyond mere economic considerations. Their services harness the skills, drive and energy of countless dedicated people. Their work enables Western Australians from all walks of life to contribute to the development of their communities and is more connected with the needs of those they serve.

In achieving this, NFP organisations promote active Western Australian citizenship, help to develop an inclusive sense of community, and engage people in a common cause to make our society better, fairer and stronger.

For these reasons I believe it is important that government funding arrangements recognise the real nature and motivation of the NFP sector, and facilitate and assist, rather than detract from, the good work they do.

Up until recently, Government policy imposed a universal tendering requirement – conceived as a business philosophy – which saw precious organisational resources diverted into, and in many cases wasted on, complex bidding processes, culminating in pseudo “commercial” contracts and accountability across the board. As a consequence, this requirement added to red-tape but detracted from the real aim of NFP organisations – the delivery of services to those who need them.

My Government recognises there is a clear need to distinguish the work of philanthropic bodies from that of other providers so as to ensure resources available for service delivery are not reduced.

This recognition does not lessen the need for good process. However, open and transparent funding arrangements – other than market-based competition – can be appropriate when supporting specific work of NFP organisations, without diminishing value for money or accountability.

This document sets out an approach for working more flexibly and less formally with the NFP sector and in providing funding. I encourage Government agencies and all interested parties to become familiar with, and to take advantage of, the new direction my Government is taking in this important area of service delivery.

DR GEOFF GALLOP MLA
PREMIER

October 2002
Background and Rationale

The Impetus for Change

The impact of the policy of competitive tendering and contracting on arrangements for community-based services delivered by the not-for-profit sector was highlighted in two reports.

The Auditor General’s June 2000 report *A Means to an End: Contracting Not-for-Profit Organisations for the Delivery of Community Services* and the Public Accounts Committee Report *Accountability and Not-for-Profit Organisations* issued in December 2000, highlighted many difficulties that the not-for-profit sector had experienced with the system of competitive tendering and contracts.

Following the change of Government in 2001, a Working Party was formed to facilitate a transition to the new Government’s policy approach and to action the recommendations of the two reports.

In pursuing its terms of reference, the Working Party was guided by a speech by the then Leader of the Opposition, now Premier, to the WACOSS Conference in 2000. The following extracts in particular were understood to be indicative of the Government’s intended approach:

“*We believe that flexibility in funding arrangements, rather than a rigid adherence to competitive tendering, is vital to a successful policy relationship between the Government and non-Government organisations …*"

*Government also has to recognise and give weight to the history of an organisation’s performance and the context in which applications for funding arise. A preferred service provider might be identified using these criteria rather than through open competitive tendering.*

*There will be situations in which a competitive tendering format is judged to be the most appropriate. Where a general initiative or service is capable of being delivered by a multiplicity of organisations then there is room for competitive tendering.*”

On this basis, the Working Party aimed for a system that requires Public Authorities (i.e. government agencies) to adopt more flexibility in funding arrangements and a more inclusive, community-responsive attitude to developing those arrangements.

Furthermore, through better harmonisation across Western Australian Public Authorities of processes, documentation and performance accountability measures, the proposed policy seeks to reduce the time and money that service providers need to put into meeting the requirements of the tender process, so that these resources can be put to service delivery.

Setting a New Direction

The Working Party members were drawn from Public Authorities that fund community-based human services and from peak community and volunteer bodies and significant not-for-profit organisations. (See page 19)
In addition to the new Government’s policy directions, the Working Party’s deliberations were influenced by developments in relationships between governments and the community sector in other jurisdictions in Australia and overseas. Also having significant impact were the WA Council of Social Service document *Healing the Social Divide* issued early in 2001 and the publications and seminars associated with *2001 The International Year of Volunteers*.

Members felt strongly that, at the outset, they should express a vision for the future working relationship between the sectors and advance a set of principles to guide the development of the proposed policy.

Accordingly, the Working Party developed the statements of commitment that appear in the *Policy*, which Public Authorities and providers of community-based services (defined as “Organisations” in the *Policy*) are encouraged to share.
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Vision and Purpose

The aim of this Policy is to achieve a mutually respectful relationship between State government agencies (Public Authorities) and funded service providers from the not-for-profit sector including local government (the Sector), which is committed to:

- contributing to the wellbeing of individuals and the common good of society;
- ensuring high quality, safe and appropriate services for the community;
- enhancing the capacity of the parties to respond effectively to the needs of the community through cooperation and innovation, whilst ensuring efficient and effective allocation of resources;
- building a relationship based on integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness and honesty; and
- maintaining high ethical standards in dealing with each other and serving the community.

The Policy:

- promotes flexibility, innovation and community responsiveness in the funding or purchasing of services by Public Authorities so as to better meet community needs;
- encourages a better, more productive working relationship between Public Authorities and Organisations (the providers of community services);
- clarifies when services are to be put out to open tender to the market and when a more targeted or non-market approach is appropriate; and
- reduces “red tape”, complexities and inconsistencies, and standardises terminology to clarify the dialogue between the parties.

Overview

A flow-chart illustrating the Policy is on page 5. The Policy provides for:

(a) New processes for the provision of grants that maintain transparency and accountability but do not necessarily involve open market tendering.

(b) Service funding and purchasing within a framework that is consistent across participating Public Authorities. The new measures involve:

(i) Greater Sector involvement in planning and evaluation of services.

(ii) Standardised access for new potential providers and the availability of Preferred Provider recognition of existing providers in certain circumstances.

(iii) Common service agreement documentation being used by all participating Public Authorities.

(c) Using the public tender process.
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(see text for explanation)
Definitions

For the purposes of this policy, the following definitions apply:

**Community-based services** mean those services of a nature intended to address physical or social disadvantage and/or that promote the health and wellbeing of individuals and families. Examples of community-based services include:

(a) services which contribute to the building of capacity within the community to respond positively to an identified need;
(b) services required to address disadvantage for which a collaborative approach is required with the community;
(c) services that encourage the involvement of volunteers, increased business or community support or the personal empowerment of recipients of the service; or
(d) services which contribute to the ability of people to live and participate in the community.

**Grant** means a financial assistance arrangement or contribution provided by a Public Authority to an Organisation for a discrete purpose and period.

**Organisation** means an organisation, having corporate status, that provides services funded or purchased by Public Authorities, including, but not limited to, not-for-profit organisations and local government authorities.

**Public Authority** means a department of the Public Service of the State established or deemed to have been established under the *Public Sector Management Act 1994*, or an agency, authority or instrumentality of the Crown in right of the State.

**Service Agreement** means an agreement for the purchase of community services by a Public Authority.

Scope of Application

**Public Authorities to which the Policy Applies**

This *Policy* applies to all Public Authorities that provide funding for, or purchase, community-based services. The *Policy* applies to:

- all such State funded programs; and
- Commonwealth and industry funded programs to the extent that it is not inconsistent with the requirements of that program or program sponsor.

**The Public Interest**

The arrangements for funding and purchasing services established in this *Policy* are designed to be consistent with the Government’s approach to community engagement, and governance of the public sector, and to achieve a level of regulation suited to the particular conditions of this customer group. Competition is set within a framework of public interest in that, whilst there are processes to ensure that potential new providers are sought and that existing services are subject to
market testing, this is done in a manner appropriate to the characteristics of the service providers and clients for those services.

**Relationship to the Commercial For-Profit Sector**

Whilst services of this nature are generally delivered by government and community-based not-for-profit organisations, in appropriate cases, arrangements for such services may be open for bids from the commercial for-profit sector.

**Implementation**

Implementation of this *Policy* is to be phased-in, with new arrangements put in place as existing arrangements expire.

Each Public Authority is to ensure that key indicators are established to measure the effect of the *Policy* over time.

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the State Supply Commission will jointly facilitate ongoing oversight of the implementation of this *Policy* and evaluation of its effectiveness by representatives of Public Authorities and the Sector. Enquiries should be directed to the State Supply Commission in the first instance.
Guiding Principles

The Policy is underpinned by a series of Principles that give effect to the Vision and Purpose by further defining the relationship between the parties. These are:

- An innovative, responsive approach to the needs of individuals, families and communities is paramount and best served by funding agreements which incorporate flexibility.

- The parties recognise the value of sharing knowledge and expertise in planning, developing and evaluating services.

- Public Authorities will work together to achieve a greater consistency of approach and practice.

- While accepting that the parties are accountable to each other and to the stakeholders and consumers they serve, it is important that accountability requirements placed on funded Organisations are relevant, achievable and consistent.

- The parties acknowledge a mutual responsibility to maintain appropriate standards of governance and to manage services and funds in a transparent, effective, efficient and accountable manner.

- There is a mutual commitment to a funding framework that establishes and maintains good practice, imposes acceptable obligations on Organisations and achieves value for money (see note below) in delivering service outcomes.

- The parties will negotiate and work in good faith while recognising and supporting each other’s autonomy and independence.

- The parties recognise the value of investing in building the capacity of the community to respond effectively to community needs, through a variety of approaches, including volunteer effort and other community initiatives.

Where these Principles are cited in the following text, they are italicised for ease of reference.

Note: Value for money is a key policy objective of the State Supply Commission supply policies to ensure that when purchasing goods and services, Public Authorities achieve the best possible outcome for the amount of money spent. The Commission’s Supply Policy Manual notes that this does not necessarily mean selecting the lowest price offered. Further definition of value for money and guidance to Public Authorities is available by reference to the Supply Policy Manual.
Planning and Formation of Agreements

Guidance on procurement planning and formation of agreements is provided for Public Authorities in the State Supply Commission’s *Supply Policies and Guidelines Manual*. In addition, however, Public Authorities must adhere to the following requirements so as to capture community and provider input into client and service needs. Planning should be premised on a recognition of the value of investing in building the capacity of the community to respond effectively to community needs, through a variety of approaches, including volunteer effort and other community initiatives.

Currently policies applicable to grants are formulated by individual Public Authorities, as grants are not subject to the *State Supply Commission Act 1991*. Henceforth, Public Authorities’ policies for grant funding must align with this *Policy*.

Needs Analysis to Contribute to Mutually Respectful Relationship

Public Authorities will adopt transparent and consultative needs analysis processes, consistent with the Guiding Principles. It is especially important that the parties recognise the value of sharing knowledge and expertise in planning, developing and evaluation of services.

Relevant stakeholders, including service providers, will be consulted on needs in the community, and the nature and mix of service responses.

Public Authorities must publish details of all contractual awards for community-based services (excluding grants) at $10,000 and above in the WA Government Contracting Information Bulletin Board.

Procurement Strategy Decision-making

Public Authorities, having established needs and available resources will establish the optimal funding or purchasing arrangement that is best suited to the service and desired relationship with the service provider. In so doing, they will adhere to the principle that an innovative, responsive approach to the needs of individuals, families and communities is paramount and best served by funding agreements which incorporate flexibility. Setting of standards for service delivery, provider governance and accountability also takes place at this stage of procurement planning.

The choice is between grant funding, purchasing via standardised service agreement or competitive tendering and contracting. If the choice involves a change to existing arrangements with a provider, there must be full consultation with and adequate notice to the provider and to the Sector. This can be achieved through supplier information seminars.

An important difference between grants and service agreements is that grants are usually time limited, focusing on supporting the provider to deliver a community service. In contrast, service agreements focus on outputs, requiring service providers (“Organisations”) to produce a specific volume and quality of services. Thus, the Public Authority either “funds” or “purchases” outputs of services from the Organisation.
The Standardised Service Agreement provided for in this Policy is a hybrid between competitive tendered contracts and grants, which is designed to promote the Vision and Principles. It differs from a grant in being specific in the level of outputs to be provided. Its difference to the typical ‘goods and services’ contract lies in the nature of its formation, which is more inclusive of the Sector in the interests of promoting flexibility and responsiveness in addressing community needs. There is, nonetheless, a form of competition involved, albeit limited (a “Restricted Process”) in the interests of client and community outcomes.

The challenge is to choose the optimal funding or purchasing arrangement for the particular service. To meet the Guiding Principles underlying this Policy, grants and the Restricted Process are the preferred mechanisms. Competitive tendering and contracting may be used only in certain circumstances, discussed later.
Grants

Grants are financial assistance arrangements made for specified purposes. They are generally provided to Organisations to help them carry out their established purpose or specific programs, and may contain conditions relating to the Organisation's conduct or activities.

Whether a Public Authority wishes to provide grants to Organisations is a matter to be determined by that Public Authority. However, Public Authorities intending to provide grants to Organisations are required to comply with the terms of this Policy.

Grants are appropriate where:

(a) an Organisation requires one-off subsidies, top-ups, seed funding, or funding for discrete projects, innovative trials, pilot programs or research of a non-commercial nature, and
(b) the grant is for a discrete period, and
(c) the grant amount does not constitute the entire financial base of an Organisation.

Whilst grants are for a discrete purpose and period, the timeframe may extend beyond a fiscal period. In certain circumstances, such as providing support for community capacity building projects, grant support may be provided for a longer period to allow adequate time for project development, implementation and evaluation.

Grants should be provided to Organisations for a single specified purpose, either by instalment or lump sum payment.

Compliance Requirements for Grants

In providing grants Public Authorities must comply with the following requirements:

- There should be a documented application and approval process for each grant.
- Public Authorities should publicly disclose details of all grants, subject to any directives in the Financial Administration and Audit Act and Treasurer’s Instructions.
- Public Authorities should ensure that the Organisation agrees to provide a properly documented acquittal of the grant funds. This may include a formal annual audit of related activities of the Organisation, undertaken in accordance with standards set by the granting Public Authority and consistent with incorporation legislation. Public Authorities should ensure that Organisations are aware that they may be subject to a possible audit by the Office of the Auditor General or their representative, in certain circumstances in accordance with the Financial Administration and Audit Act.
- Public Authorities should ensure that grants are tied to a clearly defined purpose. Organisations should be required to provide certification to Public Authorities that the grant was used for that specified purpose.
Service Procurement - Restricted Process

In general, a Restricted Process applies to an arrangement whereby the Public Authority is purchasing services for its own benefit or is contracting with an Organisation to provide a service to a third party to whom the Public Authority has undertaken to provide a service. In other words, a Restricted Process is a form of contracting for services. The term “Restricted Process” is used to distinguish it from the public tender process.

Whether a Public Authority wishes to purchase services from Organisations is a matter to be determined by that Public Authority. However, Public Authorities intending to purchase community services are required to comply with the terms of this Policy.

Standardised Service Agreements will be introduced for use by Public Authorities. These Agreements and surrounding processes are designed to promote flexibility, innovation and community responsiveness in the funding or purchasing of services by Public Authorities so as to better meet community needs whilst meeting probity and accountability requirements. The process of formation avoids the adversarial approach of competitive tendering and is more inclusive of the not-for-profit Sector. The various approaches leading to formation of an agreement are described in the section titled Procurement Tools.

Compliance Requirements for the Restricted Process

In establishing service agreements Public Authorities must comply with the following requirements:

- The process of Restricted Process planning and formation must conform to this Policy, particularly in relation to the involvement of the not-for-profit sector.
- Open and transparent processes such as Registration of Interest, Expression of Interest or Request for Proposal (described below) or other similar mechanisms will be used to establish Service Agreements for new or replacement services.
- The process for review and renewal of existing Service Agreements must comply with the relevant sections of this Policy.
- Recognising the special circumstances that apply to the delivery of community-based services, Service Agreements should be of sufficient duration so as to encourage continuity and efficiency of service delivery.
- As far as possible, all Public Authorities will use the Standardised Service Agreements to reduce the impost, particularly on the not for profit Sector, of having to meet multiple and inconsistent requirements. The content of the Standardised Service Agreement document will be developed in consultation with the Sector and will specify, inter alia, clear performance measures relating to effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet and State Supply Commission will jointly facilitate the formulation of the Agreements.
- A specification must be issued, a formal offer received and a formal contract document executed. This document may be in the form of an Acceptance Letter.
- Public Authorities should ensure that Organisations are aware that they may be subject to a possible audit by the Office of the Auditor General or their representative, in certain circumstances in accordance with the Financial Administration and Audit Act.
Procurement Tools

A range of mechanisms is available to formally invite interest and offers from potential service providers, and at the same time ensure appropriate probity in the selection process. Processes such as Expression of Interest, Request for Proposal and Direct Negotiation also provide a framework for evaluation of potential providers’ viability and quality of governance.

There will be services where the processes described below are considered, or have proven to be, unsuccessful. For example, in rural or remote communities where there are few if any provider organisations. In these situations, community developmental processes working with interested parties may be required in order to establish new or replacement services.

Registration of Interest
When planning new or reviewing existing services, Public Authorities will publicly invite potential service providers to register interest. Registration of interest will be taken on a standardised registration form to be used by all participating Public Authorities. Information required of respondents and/or selection criteria specific to the service, for which expressions of interest are invited, are to be appended to the standard template.

Expression of Interest
Public authorities may call for an expression of interest for a particular service. An expression of interest can be useful in establishing preliminary interest and can enable transparent selection of parties who will contribute to development of service specifications. The expression of interest can also be used to shortlist and pre-qualify potential service providers for future service negotiations or formation of a panel of pre-qualified providers for a given area of activity. (See below)

Request for Proposal
The request for proposal is used when a range of possible service solutions is invited and there is a service agreement or agreements to be awarded. This potentially allows for creative solutions to community problems as envisaged by the guiding Principles underpinning this Policy.

Public Authorities will use a standard Request for Proposal template to call for submissions (offers) against the stated criteria.

Pre-qualification
A pre-qualification process is a means by which a Public Authority may shortlist potential service provider Organisations on the basis of capacity to provide the required service(s). Assessment of capacity may include factors such as the Organisation’s quality assurance, pricing and management attributes. The resultant shortlist may be used for a restricted process, including direct negotiations or to form a panel from which clients with individual funding can select. Pre-qualification of its own does not ensure funding; it is part of a system of attracting and assessing potential service providers.
Direct Negotiation with Potential Supplier
Direct negotiation involves negotiating with one potential provider only. This would normally occur after a process such as an expression of interest has identified a provider that best meets the selection criteria for the particular service. Moreover, direct negotiation may be considered appropriate where:

(a) no provider exists with the necessary skills and there is a need to develop such; or
(b) only one provider exists with the skills and experience necessary; and
(c) a recent open call for submissions has been conducted and the preferred provider offered best value for money; and
(d) there are strategic considerations, such as viability of other funded services, which make direct negotiation desirable.

Public Authorities must exercise great care before choosing to negotiate with a sole supplier so as not to exclude other Organisations that may be in a position to offer a competitive solution if given the opportunity. Public Authorities will need to be able to demonstrate, if called on by for example, the Auditor General, that the decision to enter into direct negotiations is justifiable, equitable and responsible.
Use of Preferred Service Providers

The Principles include a mutual commitment to a funding framework that establishes and maintains good practice and achieves value for money in delivering service outcomes. This implies a commitment by Public Authorities to working with their providers to achieve best outcomes for clients. Public Authorities also have to recognise and give weight to the history of an organisation’s performance and the context in which funding negotiations arise. A significant aspect of this is the need, in many instances, to ensure service continuity. This may require the setting aside of universal application of “market testing”.

Therefore, Public Authorities may, at their discretion, exercise the option of retaining the existing service provider through a Restricted Process. The existing service provider will then be known as a Preferred Service Provider.

In view of the risk associated with setting aside market testing, all decisions to award Preferred Service Provider status must be approved by the Accountable Officer (chief executive officer) or Accountable Authority of the Public Authority, or delegate, who shall have regard to the Government’s policies in relation to funding and purchasing of services from the not-for-profit sector.

To assess an existing provider’s suitability for Preferred Service Provider status, Public Authorities must determine whether the provider is:

- continuing to meet the identified need,
- meeting the agreed service specifications, contractual requirements, and set standards of delivery and volunteer involvement,
- operating efficiently and effectively, and
- actively engaged in continuously improving services to provide the best possible service for the Public Authority’s clients.

To ensure appropriate probity and accountability for decisions of this nature, Public Authorities must ensure that the review of Preferred Service Providers is transparent and that the service providers are involved. Furthermore, in the interests of ensuring that other potential providers are not inadvertently excluded from consideration, there must be a clear process through which the decision to award Preferred Service Provider status may be challenged by other Organisations. In the first instance, this should provide for an avenue of appeal to an alternative decision-maker within the Public Authority. Further avenues of appeal would consist of external agencies such as the forthcoming State Administrative Tribunal.

If there is to be any change to arrangements, for example from Preferred Service Provider to competitive tendering and contracting, then the Public Authority must ensure that the relevant parties from the Sector are fully consulted and early notice is given of the consideration of possible new arrangements. Once again, these discussions must demonstrate that they are in the best interests of the clients and the community.
Competitive Tendering and Contracting

Public Authorities may purchase services under the normal public tender process. All decisions to purchase via competitive tendering and contracting must be approved by the Accountable Officer (chief executive officer) or Accountable Authority of the Public Authority, or delegate, who shall have regard to the Government’s policies in relation to funding and purchasing of services from the not-for-profit sector.

For instance, competitive tendering may be the appropriate course of action in circumstances such as:

- (a) a general initiative or service is capable of being delivered by a multiplicity of Organisations, or
- (b) service requirements are particularly complex or unique, or
- (c) proposals offered by Organisations through an expression of interest, request for proposal or similar process do not represent value for money, or
- (d) the use of competitive tendering and contracting in a particular instance can potentially demonstrate better outcomes for clients and the community.

Competitive tendering and contracting involves the processes and requirements set out in State Supply Commission policies, and Public Authorities choosing this course of action must conform to those policies in accordance with the State Supply Commission Act 1991.
Management of Grants (Funding Agreements), Service Agreements and Competitive Contracts

Guidance on contract management is provided for Public Authorities in the Supply Policy Manual. In addition, however, Public Authorities must adhere to the following requirements in recognition of the special features of funding and purchasing when applied to the not-for-profit sector.

Accountability and Governance Standards

Public Authorities have a role in developing the capacity of the not-for-profit sector to meet needs in the community. For their part, service providers need to recognise that they have a duty of due diligence in the deployment of public funds. There are two significant elements to this.

Firstly, it involves the recognition that the parties are accountable to each other and to the stakeholders and consumers they serve. Having said that, it is nevertheless important that accountability requirements placed on funded service providers are relevant, achievable and consistent and, to that end, Public Authorities will work together to achieve a greater consistency of approach and practice. Public Authorities are expected to adopt consistent accountability requirements that flow from the standardised Service Agreements and structure the contents so as to meet these aims.

The second aspect, corporate governance, relates to Sector capacity building. It has earlier been stated that the parties acknowledge a mutual responsibility to maintain appropriate standards of governance and to manage services and funds in a transparent, effective, efficient and accountable manner. It is in the interests of Public Authorities, service providers and clients that provider organisations large and small are well managed, deliver effective and efficient services, commit to continuous service improvement and exercise appropriate stewardship of public monies. The Government recognises the unique contribution made to the community by the not-for-profit Sector and the responsibility of both parties to strengthen this relationship.

Accordingly, Public Authorities are to demonstrate a commitment to fostering sound governance among their not-for-profit service providers and to ensuring that quality of governance is included in the evaluation of potential and existing service providers.

Review and Evaluation of Funding or Purchasing Arrangements

Consistent with the State Supply Commission Supply Policy and Guidelines Manual, Public Authorities must have in place a review and evaluation system that will meet accountability requirements, preserve the integrity of the processes, aid in maintaining the Public Authority’s knowledge base and contribute to the identification of areas for improvement. There is a need to review the outcomes of each agreement against the original service objectives. This then feeds into the next round of needs assessment for formation of future agreements.

Public Authorities must ensure that their system for review and evaluation of funding and purchasing arrangements incorporates the principles of Sector involvement. Notably, the principle that the parties recognise the value of sharing knowledge and expertise in planning, developing and evaluating services.
Effective Funding and Purchasing of Community Services

Public Authorities will continue to work in conjunction with the not-for-profit sector to promote and foster best practice service delivery to the citizens of Western Australia.

Public Authorities will comply with any Guidelines related to this Policy that may be issued from time to time by the State Supply Commission.

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the State Supply Commission will jointly facilitate ongoing oversight of the implementation of this Policy and evaluation of its effectiveness by representatives of Public Authorities and the Sector.
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