

# Evaluation of the Australian National Council on Drugs

Report to the Department of Health

November 2013



•SIGGINS MILLER

**Pages ii-ix redacted as per Section  
47C Deliberative processes**

## Acronyms and abbreviations

<b>ADCA</b>	Alcohol and other Drug Council of Australia
<b>ANCD</b>	Australian National Council on Drugs
<b>APDDIC</b>	Asia Pacific Drug and Development Issues Committee
<b>CCDU</b>	Compulsory Centre for Drug Users
<b>DFAT</b>	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
<b>DSS</b>	Department of Social Services
<b>ERG</b>	Editorial Reference Group
<b>Health</b>	Australian Department of Health
<b>IFNGO</b>	International Federation of non- government organisations
<b>IGCD</b>	Intergovernmental Committee on Drugs
<b>KPI</b>	Key performance indicator
<b>MCDS</b>	Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy
<b>NIDAC</b>	National Indigenous Drug and Alcohol Committee
<b>NDS</b>	National Drug Strategy 2010-2015
<b>NGO</b>	Non-government organisation
<b>NPS</b>	New psycho-active substances
<b>PDARN</b>	Pacific Drug and Alcohol Regional Network
<b>PMC</b>	Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet
<b>TOR</b>	Terms of Reference

## Acknowledgement

Siggins Miller acknowledges the support of Departmental officers and the Chief Executive Officer and Secretariat staff of the ANCD who were responsive and extremely helpful in allowing access to records and information relevant to our Terms of Reference. Similarly, we greatly appreciate the willingness of the ANCD members and other stakeholders to make time for interviews in their busy schedules.

**Page 1 redacted as per Section  
47C Deliberative processes**

## 1.1 Terms of reference of the evaluation

### **Goal**

The goal of the evaluation is to provide an independent assessment and make recommendations about the effectiveness of the ANCD's role as a key advisory body to government and the Australian community about the harms of drug and alcohol in the community, and about the effectiveness and efficiency of the ANCD in meeting its broad objectives.

### **Objective**

The objective of the evaluation is to examine the appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency of the ANCD in terms of:

#### *ANCD's Terms of Reference*

- The relevance and efficacy of the ANCD Terms of Reference to the priorities of Government, specifically the *National Drug Strategy 2010-2015*.
- Alignment of the ANCD's work plan with their Terms of Reference.
- Alignment of the scope of the ANCD's performed activities with its agreed Terms of Reference.

#### *Its membership and governance*

- The ANCD's membership, including its size, expertise, balance (e.g. health/law enforcement, and whether it provides a whole of society perspective), executive membership, and term of appointment.
- The clarity and effectiveness of current ANCD governance and reporting arrangements, including whether they support an appropriate level of independence and accountability.
- The roles and outcomes of ANCD sub-groups.
- The role and effectiveness of the Secretariat in supporting the activities of the ANCD.

#### *Financial accountability*

- ANCD procedures concerning its activities and financial accountability.
- Budget allocation, proportionality of funded activities, and funding sources of the ANCD.
- The transparency of ANCD funding.
- Value for money of the ANCD, including possible alternative models for the Government's obtaining policy advice on drugs and alcohol, and comparing the ANCD with any similar bodies.

#### *Specific activities*

- The effectiveness of the ANCD in achieving each of its goals through its work plan.
- Whether the ANCD has provided appropriate advice for Government (including the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, the Department of Health and other agencies) to develop policy on emerging drug and alcohol issues in the interest of protecting public health and safety.
- How advice provided to Government has helped to shape policy and programs.
- Support provided by the ANCD to Government committees, including but not limited to the Inter-governmental Committee on Drugs.
- Whether there is any duplication or overlap between the work of the ANCD and any other body.

#### *Sector views*

- Perceptions of the ANCD, including whether the ANCD effectively communicates and appropriately engages with stakeholders.
- How effectively the ANCD communicates the views of stakeholders to Government.

#### *Other*

- Strategies for improving the ANCD's role in contributing to the Government priorities under the *National Drug Strategy 2010-2015*.



## **1.2 Structure and content of this report**

The structure of this report is:

- Section 1 Introduction and background
- Section 2 Evaluation questions and method
- Section 3 Results of the data and document review and consultations
- Section 4 Provides a conclusion and recommendations

Appendices are provided as a separate volume to this report.

## 2. Evaluation questions and method

As a first step in meeting the Terms of Reference of the evaluation, we used the evaluation questions provided by Health to guide development of the evaluation method and identification of appropriate data sources and data collection tools. They are listed below.

### 2.1 Evaluation questions

- 1a. Are the ANCD Terms of Reference relevant to the priorities of Government, specifically the *National Drug Strategy*?
- 1b. Do the ANCD's Terms of Reference contribute to the efficacy of the implementation of the priorities of Government, specifically the *National Drug Strategy*?
- 2a. Is the ANCD's work plan aligned with its Terms of Reference?
- 2b. Does the ANCD achieve its goals through its work plan
3. Does the scope of the ANCD's performed activities align with its Terms of Reference?
- 4a. Does the membership of the ANCD include the expertise and balance across health/law enforcement, research etc to provide a whole of society perspective?
- 4b. Does the size of the committee allow for efficient and cost effective operations?
- 4c. Is the term of membership appropriate to the Terms of Reference?
- 4d. Is the membership of the executive functional in relation to the role and delegations given to it?
- 5a. Are the ANCD and governance reporting arrangements clear and effective?
- 5b. Do the governance and reporting arrangements support a level of independence?
- 5c. Do the governance and reporting arrangements support an appropriate level of accountability?
- 6a. Do the sub-groups of the ANCD (the Asia-Pacific Drugs and Development Issues Committee (APDDIC), the National Indigenous Drug and Alcohol Drug Committee (NIDAC) and *Of Substance* – National Alcohol, Tobacco & Other Drug Magazine) perform their delegated roles as defined in their Terms of Reference?
- 6b. Have the ANCD sub-groups achieved the outcomes delegated to them by Government?
7. Has the Secretariat been effective in supporting the activities of the ANCD?
8. Are the procedures of the ANCD in relation to activities and financial accountability open, transparent and effective?
9. Has the allocation of the budget by the ANCD been proportionate to its whole of society responsibilities and the three pillars of the *National Drug Strategy*?
- 10a. What are the funding sources of the ANCD other than its core grant?
- 10b. Are the ANCD funding mechanisms transparent?
- 11a. Have the operations and activities of the ANCD provided value for money?
- 11b. Are there alternative models for government obtaining policy advice for drugs and alcohol?
- 11c. How does the ANCD and its operations compare to other similar bodies providing high level advice to Government?
- 12a. Has the ANCD provided relevant advice for Government?
- 12b. How has advice provided to Government helped to shape policy and programs?
13. What support has been provided by the ANCD to government committees, in particular, but not only, the Inter-governmental Committee on Drugs (IGCD)?
14. Is there any duplication or overlap between the work of ANCD and any other bodies?
- 15a. What are stakeholders' perceptions of the ANCD?



- 15b. Does the ANCD effectively communicate and appropriately engage with stakeholders?
- 15c. Does the ANCD communicate the views of stakeholders to government effectively?
16. What are the strategies for improving the ANCD's role in contributing to the Government priorities under the *National Drug Strategy*?

Table 1 below sets out in detail the research questions, data sources and methods used for gathering the data.

## 2.2 Method

These questions were the basis for developing the evaluation methodology and its supporting data strategy, and for developing consultation protocols. Table 1 maps evaluation questions to methods and data sources, as agreed with Health during the planning stage.

**Table 1. Data methods and sources**

Evaluation Question		Methodology agreed at inception meeting	Data sources
1	<p>a) Are the ANCD Terms of Reference (TOR) relevant to the priorities of government, specifically the <i>National Drug Strategy</i> (NDS)?</p> <p>b) Do the ANCD TOR contribute to the efficacy of the implementation of the priorities of government, specifically the NDS?</p>	<p>Key informant interviews</p> <p>Mapping and analysis of TORs against the key elements of the NDS</p> <p>Development of a logic model and contribution analysis and testing it with ANCD members and other key stakeholders</p>	<p>Key documents</p> <p>Interview protocols</p> <p>TORs</p> <p>Logic model</p> <p>Annual reports</p> <p>Reports against work plan</p> <p>NDS</p>
2	<p>a) Is the ANCD's work plan aligned with its TOR?</p> <p>b) Does the ANCD achieve its goals through its work plan?</p>	<p>Mapping the work plan against TORs and activities</p> <p>Key informant interviews</p> <p>Interviews with ANCD members to ascertain the criteria and processes used to develop the work plan and their understanding of the relationship between activities and TORs</p>	<p>Interview protocols</p> <p>TORs</p> <p>Work plan</p>
3	<p>Does the scope of the ANCD's performed activities align with its TOR?</p>	<p>Mapping the performed activities against the work plan and against TORs</p> <p>Analysis of activity reports</p> <p>Analysis of commissioned reports</p> <p>Key informant interviews</p> <p>Interviews with ANCD members to ascertain the criteria and processes used to develop the work plan and their understanding of the relationship between activities and TORs</p>	<p>Interview protocols</p> <p>TORs</p> <p>Work plan</p> <p>Activity reports</p> <p>Commissioned reports</p>



Evaluation Question	Methodology agreed at inception meeting	Data sources
<p>4</p> <p>a) Does the membership of the ANCD include the expertise and balance across health/law enforcement, research etc to provide a whole of society perspective?</p> <p>b) Does the size of the committee allow for efficient and cost effective operations?</p> <p>c) Is the term of membership appropriate to the TOR?</p> <p>d) Is the membership of the executive functional in relation to the role and delegations given to it?</p>	<p>Interviews with ANCD members</p> <p>Key informant interviews</p>	<p>ANCD documents</p> <p>Interview protocols</p> <p>Information about ANCD membership</p> <p>Information about ANCD size</p>
<p>5</p> <p>a) Are the ANCD and governance reporting arrangements clear and effective?</p> <p>b) Do the governance and reporting arrangements support a level of independence?</p> <p>c) Do the governance and reporting arrangements support an appropriate level of accountability?</p>	<p>Analysis of ANCD governance related documents for clarity and elements of good governance</p> <p>Interviews with ANCD members</p> <p>Key informant interviews</p>	<p>ANCD governance related documents</p> <p>Interview protocols</p>
<p>6</p> <p>a) Do the sub-groups of the ANCD (APDDIC, NIDAC and <i>Of Substance</i> – National Alcohol, Tobacco &amp; Other Drug Magazine) perform their delegated roles as defined in their TOR?</p> <p>b) Have the ANCD sub-groups achieved the outcomes delegated to them by government?</p>	<p>Analysis of sub-groups' activities against the ANCD work plan and their TOR</p> <p>Interviews with sub-group members</p> <p>Key informant interviews</p> <p>Interviews with ANCD members and staff</p> <p>Analysis of activity reports from sub-groups</p> <p>Analysis of products/outputs produced by sub groups</p>	<p>Committee work plans</p> <p>Committee TORs</p> <p>Interview protocols</p> <p>Activity reports</p> <p>Outputs e.g. commissioned reports</p>
<p>7</p> <p>Has the Secretariat been effective in supporting the activities of the ANCD?</p>	<p>Development of a set of KPIs for Secretariat effectiveness and application of those KPIs to Secretariat performance</p> <p>Interviews with ANCD Secretariat staff</p> <p>Interviews with ANCD members</p> <p>Key informant interviews</p>	<p>KPIs for Secretariat</p> <p>Interview protocols</p>
<p>8</p> <p>Are the procedures of the ANCD in relation to activities and financial accountability open, transparent and effective?</p>	<p>Analysis of procurement, accounting and reporting policies and practices against required government standards</p> <p>Analysis of annual reports in relation to coverage against standards for annual reports</p> <p>Key informant interviews</p>	<p>Government and annual report standards</p> <p>Key ANCD policy and process documents</p> <p>Annual reports</p> <p>Interview protocols</p>

	<b>Evaluation Question</b>	<b>Methodology agreed at inception meeting</b>	<b>Data sources</b>
9	Has the allocation of the budget by the ANCD been proportionate to its whole of society responsibilities and the three pillars of the NDS?	Analysis of investment against the pillars of the NDS Key informant interviews ANCD member and staff interviews	Financial records NDS Interview protocols
10	a) What are the funding sources of the ANCD other than its core grant? b) Are ANCD funding mechanisms transparent?	Interviews with ANCD secretariat staff and members Analysis of ANCD records, annual reports	Interview protocols ANCD records Annual reports
11	a) Have the operations and activities of the ANCD provided value for money? b) Are there alternative models for government obtaining policy advice for drugs and alcohol? c) How does the ANCD and its operations compare to other similar bodies providing high level advice to government?	Identification and analysis of TOR and operations of similar bodies for lessons learned Key informant interviews with Chairs of any benchmarking bodies identified Key stakeholder interviews regarding value for money from their perspective Analysis of international models for the provision of policy advice on drugs and alcohol	Interview protocols Literature and document review
12	a) Has the ANCD provided relevant advice for government? b) How has advice provided to government helped to shape policy and programs?	Key informant interviews ANCD member interviews Citation search in key government documents of ANCD products and publications	Interview protocols Prospective searches using SCOPUS and Web of Science to identify documents that have cited ANCD products and publications Records of meeting outcomes
13	What support has been provided by the ANCD to government committees? In particular, but not only, the IGCD?	Interviews with IGCD members Interviews with ANCD members and staff	Interview protocols
14	Is there any duplication or overlap between the work of ANCD and any other bodies?	Key informant interviews Identification and mapping of bodies in the human services, law enforcement and justice and corrections areas against the TORs of the ANCD	Interview protocols ANCD TORs
15	a) What are stakeholder perceptions of the ANCD? b) Does the ANCD effectively communicate and appropriately engage with stakeholders? c) Does the ANCD communicate the views of stakeholders to government effectively?	Stakeholder interviews with peak bodies in the areas of drugs and alcohol and mental health Analysis of ANCD communication and consultation strategies and outputs	Interview protocols Peak bodies in drugs and alcohol and mental health Key ANCD communication and consultation strategy and other documents

	Evaluation Question	Methodology agreed at inception meeting	Data sources
16	What are the strategies for improving the ANCD's role in contributing to the government priorities under the NDS?	Interviews with ANCD members and staff Key informant interviews	Interview protocols

The final approved evaluation methodology included a literature and document analysis and review; face to face and telephone interviews with key informants; and the integration of data from all sources against the agreed evaluation questions. These methods are described in more detail below.

#### *Document analysis and review*

A review of documents was undertaken to determine what the activities of the ANCD were; the level and appropriateness of advice given, to whom and for what purpose; the level of interaction of the ANCD with various Government departments and the drug and alcohol sector; and how the ANCD contributed to policy and program decisions.

This comprehensive review and analysis of available documentation used a number of different methods, including:

- a) Analysis of ANCD products, work plans and activity reports
- b) Analysis of ANCD products against the NDS pillars
- c) Mapping performed activities against the TORs and work plan
- d) A citation search to identify where and how often the ANCD commissioned research papers and position papers appear as references in other work and in policy documents.
- e) Development of key performance indicators for the secretariat
- f) Analysis of advisory body models
- g) ANCD annual reports mapped to standard components of annual reports

The results of these methods may be found in the Appendices. Documents and publications reviewed and analysed included:

- Australian Department of Health files
- ANCD annual reports
- ANCD and Executive meeting papers and minutes
- Secretariat steering committee minutes
- APDDIC and NIDAC committee papers and minutes
- ANCD correspondence
- Work plans and TORs (2007-2010 and 2011-2014)
- ANCD media releases, briefs, communiqués, position papers, research papers and other publications.

#### *Analysis of ANCD products, work plans and activity reports*

This analysis helps answer a number of the evaluation questions (1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12 and 15).

The analysis was based on a sample of files made available from Health and the ANCD Secretariat, and publicly available publications. Given the extent of the documentation of the ANCD since its establishment in 1998, this analysis was limited to the past five years (or to the two most recent work plan periods 2007-2010 and 2011-2014). There were 289 departmental files related to the ANCD, and we therefore requested to view only the most recent files from 2007, and those specifically related to the establishment of the ANCD. Classified files were not available for analysis.

Most relevant files related to full ANCD meetings; executive and secretariat steering committee meetings; and various correspondences between the ANCD and the Prime Minister, other federal Ministers and Government departments.

Limitations of these data sources restricted the extent to which the data could contribute to answering evaluation questions. In particular, owing to filing processes, it was most often not possible to follow a complete trail of advice given by the ANCD. For example, some correspondence appeared to be in response to meetings or verbal communication, but often it was not possible to track forward to the result of the communication, or whether the advice was seen as useful or timely.

#### *Analysis of ANCD products against NDS pillars*

This method contributes to answering evaluation question 9.

We analysed the content of the ANCD output and products, which included annual reports, brief reports, communiqués, literature reviews, *Of Substance* magazine, media releases, memoranda, newspaper columns, public addresses or speeches, policy documents, position papers and research papers. These were analysed by the NDS Pillars of harm reduction, demand reduction and supply reduction. Some outputs were categorised as being a combination of the pillars, as they included elements relevant to all parts of the NDS. Outputs not relevant to the NDS Pillars were excluded from the thematic analysis.

#### *Mapping performed activities against TORs and work plan*

As part of answering evaluation questions 1, 2 and 3, we mapped ANCD activities against its TORs for the 2007-2010 and 2011-2014 periods, and ANCD activities against the work plan for 2011-2014. In the absence of a list of activities in the ANCD's work plan, data on outputs (including research and position papers, correspondence, briefings, and meeting minutes) were used, and these activities were mapped to relevant work plans and TORs.

#### *Citation review: links to policy and programs*

This contributes to answering evaluation question 12. The purpose of the citation review was to identify where and how often ANCD commissioned research papers and position papers appeared as references in other work and in policy documents. Research commissioned and published by the ANCD was evaluated to determine its influence on government policy, legislation and initiatives. All research and position papers published between 2006 and 2012 were analysed. A total of 17 papers were identified for inclusion in the sample.

ANCD research and position papers were summarised with a focus on identifying the main points, key findings and recommendations. Key search terms were identified from the summaries and grouped by government department theme. Google citation counts were recorded for each of the papers, and the type of the document citing the research was recorded (e.g. peer reviewed journal article, book etc).

Online search engines were then further examined to determine the extent to which the ANCD material had influenced federal government policy, legislation or initiatives. Websites used included the Parliament of Australia Hansard<sup>1</sup> and Open Australia<sup>2</sup>. 'Australian National Council on Drugs' and 'ANCD' were used systematically as search terms to identify policy and legislation discussions or debates relating to the topics, findings and recommendations of the ANCD research.

The following criteria were used to justify inclusion or exclusion of information:

- The policy, legislation or initiative was published or implemented after the corresponding ANCD research or position paper

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary\\_Business/Hansard](http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Hansard)

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.openaustralia.org/>



- The ANCD is cited (and/or)
- The policy, legislation or initiative addressed key recommendations made in the ANCD research or position paper (and/or)
- Reasonable links can be made between the ANCD research or position paper and the policy, legislation or initiative.

Although every effort was made to conduct the research in a systematic and thorough manner, there were limitations. First, these findings were based solely on the ANCD research and position papers from 2006-2012. Secondly, the study was limited by having access only to publicly available information. Finally, while every effort was made to ensure that policies, legislation and initiatives were identified and included only if a clear and reasonable link could be made between them and the relevant research, in the absence of a direct reference to the ANCD it is difficult to be certain about the ANCD's level of contribution.

#### *Development of key performance indicators*

Key performance indicators (KPIs) for the ANCD Secretariat were developed to contribute to evaluation question 7. A Google search produced common KPIs suggested for small business operations, and they were then adapted for the ANCD secretariat. The KPIs were used as part of the interview protocols. They included:

- Timeliness of distribution of agenda papers, minutes and reports etc
- Accuracy of record keeping (minutes, register of actions etc)
- Quality of position papers, communiqués, briefings etc
- Accuracy and compliance with regard to financial and procurement requirements
- Level of efficiency in organising meetings, forums, roundtables etc
- Level of professionalism in representing ANCD
- Relationships between the Chair of the ANCD, committee chairs and key stakeholders.

#### *Analysis of advisory body models*

This contributes to evaluation question 11. An advisory body audit was conducted to compare and contrast the role of the ANCD with other similar bodies both nationally and internationally. We examined the advisory bodies listed on the AusGovBoards website<sup>3</sup> by filtering by the term 'advisory body', which produced a list of 284 relevant listings. Using a systematic sampling technique<sup>4</sup> a total of 33 advisory bodies were audited based on the following criteria:

- Name of advisory body
- Role of the body
- Budget
- Members and staffing structure
- Who they report to
- What is the governance structure like
- What are their TOR/priority areas
- What is their level of independence and where the Secretariat sits
- How members are appointed
- Who are the stakeholders involved in the committee (if any)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.ausgovboards.gov.au/>

<sup>4</sup> Systematic sampling technique was applied to obtain a representative sample of advisory bodies generated from the AusGovBoards website. This process involved taking every 10th advisory body from the list and if the 10th listing was not relevant/comparable to ANCD, taking the next relevant one below.

For the international bodies we undertook a search of advisory bodies related to drugs and alcohol at an international level, looking specifically at the United Kingdom, Canada and USA. The same audit criteria were used.

#### *ANCD annual reports mapped to standard components of annual reports*

A brief document search of publicly available guidelines was conducted to define standard components of annual reports. This search revealed three state and federal guidelines outlining requirements for annual reports: the Australian Government Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet Requirements for Annual Reports<sup>5</sup>, the annual report requirements for Queensland Government agencies<sup>6</sup>, and the Government of Western Australia Public Sector Commission Annual reporting framework.<sup>7</sup> The following components represent the sections common to these guidelines:

- Overview of agency role and function
- Key membership
- Governance arrangements
- Performance review
- Financial performance including copy of audited financial statements

Most annual reports include a section on organisational structure, but given the nature of a Council such as the ANCD, this component was adapted to cover the key membership.

These standard components were used as criteria against which each ANCD annual report from the financial years 2007/2008 through to 2011/2012 were assessed.

#### *Stakeholder consultations*

In consultation with Health, Siggins Miller developed a set of interview protocols (Appendices A-K) and a letter to announce the evaluation to stakeholders (Appendix L). The interview protocols were based on the evaluation questions and were tailored to different stakeholder groups.

The list of stakeholders, approved by Health, included members of the ANCD (including the Executive and committees); ANCD Secretariat staff; relevant Australian Government departments; members of the IGCD; representatives from the drug and alcohol sector; and the Salvation Army. A list of the stakeholders consulted is in Appendix M.

A total of 56 interviews took place, involving 68 respondents. Fourteen people were interviewed in face to face interviews, but most interviews were individual telephone discussions. An explanatory letter and the approved protocols were sent out at least a week before the scheduled interview. Interviews were semi-structured in nature, and interview protocols were used to guide and prompt discussion. Interviews were audio recorded with the respondent's consent. Data was then entered into an Excel spreadsheet for thematic analysis.

From the initial stakeholder list, 15 were either not available, unable to be contacted, or did not feel they could comment. In each case where the person could not be contacted, three attempts were made. Three IGCD members were either no longer working in that position, or felt they were not in a position to comment about the ANCD. In the case of AusAID, the nominated contact person also felt

---

<sup>5</sup> Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (2013). *Requirements for annual reports for departments, executive agencies and FMA ACT bodies*. Australian Government, Canberra.

<sup>6</sup> The State of Queensland Department of the Premier and Cabinet (2013). *Annual report requirements for Queensland Government agencies: Requirements for the 2012-2013 reporting period*. Department of the Premier and Cabinet Performance Unit, Brisbane.

<sup>7</sup> State of Western Australia Public Sector Commission (2012). *Annual reporting framework for the 2012/13 reporting year*. Western Australian Public Sector Commission, West Perth.

unable to comment owing to limited knowledge of the ANCD and its operations. When we were in doubt whether we should seek alternates for nominated contacts, we sought the advice of Health.

While 68 people were interviewed, not all of them answered all of the questions, and this is noted in the results section below. In addition, some people said their answers were based on the advice of others rather than firsthand experience with the ANCD. These indirect, hearsay observations were not included in the analysis.

The views of respondents have been grouped as follows: ANCD personnel (seven secretariat staff, 15 members and 18 committee members); the drug and alcohol sector, officers of Australian Government Departments; officers of State and Territory governments; and the Salvation Army.

### ***Program logic***

In order to confirm our own understanding of the roles of the ANCD, their activities and outputs we developed two program logics: a higher level logic to describe the theoretical links between the ANCD's TORs and work plans; and a detailed logic that summarised inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes of the ANCD in more detail.

These logic models were discussed with Health early in the evaluation process.

**Pages 13-67 redacted as per Section  
47C Deliberative processes**