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1. Introduction

Sport in today’s era has become so complex and more commercial, operating in an increasingly professional environment. “Sport is playing an increasingly important role in a world of changing economic, political, cultural and social systems” (Chappelet & Bayle, 2005, p.v).

In Papua New Guinea, sport is evolving and in most recent times has seen the emergence of highly competitive athletes competing at the highest level. The emergence of elite athletes requires more investment for performance to be competitive at the international level.

With this come the challenges and demands on sports administrators to manage their sports efficiently and effectively through a process of modernization. What is more challenging for sport organisations in developing countries is the availability of limited resources to run and develop their sport from the grassroots to elite level.

This creates a dilemma for National Federations to prioritize either elite development for a minority, or development at the grassroots level for the majority. The experience in Papua New Guinea shows that most National Federations focus much of their efforts and resources on national or elite teams. However, only a very few sports enjoy success in competitions at the international level.

It is now widely accepted that sustained competitive excellence requires a strong sporting infrastructure. Many countries around the world have realized the importance and need to develop sport structures and resources for sustainable success at the world class level.

In most developing countries there is very little investment made by Governments in sport and with limited resources National Federations must critically assess their needs and priorities.

To ensure that these resources are appropriately targeted necessitates the need for National Federations to plan effectively and strategically for the development and growth of their sport.

Not only should National Federations plan to develop, but they should also have in place systems and procedures to monitor and evaluate their performance to measure their success. Unless they know their capacity levels they cannot plan effectively for the next stage.

Monitoring and evaluation of organizational performance have been neglected by most sport organizations in PNG. All too often much focus is on administration, planning and raising the necessary funds for preparation and participation of teams in competitions and very little evaluation or none at all on organizational performance and competition results.

If sport in Papua New Guinea is to progress and keep up with the rest of the world on the international arena, it must take stock of its infrastructure and programs and see how best to improve for better results and success.
Olympic Sport Organisations are embarking on a period of strategic and performance management (Chappelet & Bayle, 2005, p.114). Today, sport organizations need to develop a range of performance measures to monitor progress towards achieving goals.

This study sets out to develop a self-assessment tool that provides National Federations to determine, by self-assessment, their relative stage of development, and thereby help them to identify the real priority actions to take their organization to the next level of development.

1.1 Background on Papua New Guinea

Lying just south of the equator, 160km north of Australia, Papua New Guinea is the largest Pacific Island nation with a total area of 462,840 square kilometers made up of some 600 offshore islands and a mountainous mainland being the eastern half of the New Guinea island, sharing a border with Indonesia. More than 800 distinct indigenous languages are spoken among the population of 6 million.

The geographical diversity of the country makes it difficult and expensive to deliver programs because of its rugged terrain and limited road, electricity, and communications networks. There is no railway system and travel to most parts of the country is by air and very expensive, or by a combination of road and sea. There is no road link between the Northern and Southern halves of the mainland.

1.2 Structure of Sport in Papua New Guinea

There are two peak bodies responsible for sport in Papua New Guinea: the PNG Sports Foundation and the PNG Sports Federation & Olympic Committee.

(i) PNG Sports Foundation (PNGSF)

The PNG Sports Foundation (formerly PNG Sports Commission) was established in 1992 and is the National Government’s agency for sport, constituted as a statutory authority responsible for policy and sport development and reporting directly to the Minister for Community Development.

The National Sports Policy 2004 proposed a new governance structure for sport in PNG, under its vision called “The Way Forward”. In 2006, the National Parliament passed the Papua New Guinea Sports Foundation Act which repealed the former Papua New Guinea Sports Commission Act and dissolved the PNG Sports Commission, and in its place established the new PNGSF.

The PNGSF delivers national programs throughout the 20 provinces including: the Pikinini junior sport program; disability sport program; youth sport leadership programs; women in sport program; Sport for Development programs; and a physical education program through the National Sports Institute.

It is also responsible for managing the two major sporting complexes in Lae and Port Moresby; and every two years it conducts the PNG National Games.
The mission of the PNG Sports Foundation is: “To lead and coordinate the delivery of quality sport and physical activity into the lives of all people in Papua New Guinea and to create opportunities for sporting excellence” (PNG Sports Foundation Strategic Plan 2008-2011, p2).

(ii) PNG Sports Federation & Olympic Committee (PNGSFOC)

The PNG Sports Federation & Olympic Committee was founded in 1961 to enable PNG’s participation in the 1962 British Empire (Commonwealth) Games in Perth, Australia in 1962. It was accorded NOC status in 1974 and competed in the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games.

PNGSFOC has a membership of 36 National Federations (of which 16 are Olympic Sports) and is responsible for preparing teams on a four year cycle of events for the Olympic Games; Commonwealth Games; Pacific Games; and Mini Pacific Games.

Most of its programs and activities are funded by the International Olympic Committee through Olympic Solidarity; by Australian Government funded programs; and through “Operation Gold”, the PNGSFOC’s successful corporate sponsorship program and fundraising activities.

PNGSFOC is responsible for developing elite athletes through scholarships and high performance programs and provides funding to its affiliate National Federations for coaching development, courses in administration and management, and sports science and medicine.

The only assistance PNGSFOC receives from Government is for participation at the respective games through formal application for Government grants. Government funding levels have been extremely variable, providing little certainty for long term planning, although this should improve with the new governance structure as the capacity of PNGSF is developed.

The mission of PNGSFOC is: “To provide the required resources for elite athletes and officials to participate in organized sporting competitions at national and international levels, including South Pacific Games, Commonwealth Games and Olympic Games” (PNGSFOC Strategic Plan 2006 – 2009, p4).

On 28 September 2007, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between PNGSFOC, PNGSF, and National Sports Trust Ltd to clearly define and set out the working relationship, functions, and responsibilities of each organization as follows:

- PNGSF focus on developing sports from grassroots to national level including infrastructure;
- NSTL coordinates all funding in support of the Government’s sport objectives; and
- PNGSFOC coordinates and manages sporting excellence and Team PNG’s participation in major sporting events abroad, working in partnership with PNGSF and NSTL whilst maintaining its own identity and absolute autonomy.
1.3 The Issue

In 1991, the Government of PNG made a significant contribution and commitment to hosting the 1991 South Pacific Games in Port Moresby, with spectacular results for Papua New Guinea. The number of medals (44 Gold; 28 Silver; 27 Bronze) won by PNG’s sportsmen and sportswomen enabled PNG to be ranked first in the overall medal tally, and still remains PNG’s best ever SP Games result.

However, since 1991, Team PNG’s participation at international games has been adversely affected by the lack of funds, the lack of proper training facilities and preparation, and the deterioration of sports infrastructure throughout PNG. As a result, Team PNG’s performance has shown a steady decline since 1991. In 1995 PNG came 4th; and in 1999 came 5th; then in 2003 was ranked 4th; and at the recent South Pacific Games in Samoa, PNG finished 5th behind New Caledonia, Tahiti, Samoa and Fiji.

PNG has the highest population in the South Pacific: in fact it has a higher population than all the other Pacific countries added up. The expectation would therefore be that PNG would dominate in sports events against these other countries. Unfortunately this hasn’t been the case. The explanation may lie more in recognizing the relative Gross Domestic Product per Capita and economic development of PNG compared with the other Pacific countries: in PNG 85% of people still live a rural subsistence way of life.\(^1\)

This goes to show that regardless of the size in population, a strong sports system focused largely on the effective delivery of quality sports services at all levels is essential for success at the international level.

Pressure is placed on most National Olympic Committees and their National Federations to WIN and this is reflected in the over emphasis on medal winning performance at the multi games such as the Olympic; Commonwealth and Pacific Games.

Over the years a considerable amount of funding has been spent on Papua New Guinean teams to participate at international games, with very little to show for it. The number of medals won as compared to amount of funding invested in elite sport, does not justify the excessive amount of funding for a two week event. This poses the question of “are we spending it the right way?”

With the limited funding that National Federations are able to secure, they tend to prioritize international competitions, which benefit only a minority, over and above development programs at the national level. Their focus should be on systematic development of their sport and more emphasis on domestic competition.

In most cases, National Federations rely entirely on funding from PNGSFOC, which is usually prioritized to support national teams to attend lead-up competitions in preparation for respective international games.

---

\(^1\) See Appendix 3 for a comparison of 2007 South Pacific Games medal results
There tends to be a lack of initiative by National Federations to source alternative funding for support from their international federations or through sponsorship to fund other development programs. In addition, National Federations have generally received negligible funding support from the Government through the PNG Sports Foundation.

However the funding of grass-roots sport activities should improve with the commencement this year of the ten year “Sport for Development Initiative” funded by AusAID, and with anticipated funding for sport from the National Gaming Control Board as well as on-going support of the Australian Sport Outreach Program.

In order for our teams to perform at the International level, we need to ask ourselves whether they are the best team selected and whether they are truly prepared to perform at this level. To answer the question, one can only look at the state of development of each sport to determine the capacity of medal performance at the Pacific Games level.

This sets a bench mark or pre-requisite for sports to be competitive at the Oceania continental level, Commonwealth Games, World Championships and Olympic Games.
2. Literature Review

The first part of the review considered current literature on development levels of sport and critical success factors to achieve elite level performance.

The second part of the review looks at the Planned Approach as an important process for a strategic direction to enable and sustain competitive excellence.

Before any planning can take place it is critical that sports ought to know where they are and where they ought to be and therefore the third part of the review looks at three different types of models of capacity analysis to assess development or capacity levels.

In the fourth part of the review, three examples currently used by sporting organizations are presented for an insight into which Key Result Areas (KRAs) or strategic priorities are evaluated to measure performance of these organisations.

Finally, in part five, some conclusions are drawn and a Sports Planning Self-Assessment Tool for PNG National Federations is suggested.

2.1 Success Factors for Competitive Excellence

A Memos research by Robert Gambardella in his project ‘An Analysis of Sport Organizations and the development of World Class Athletes for Sustained Competitive Excellence’ (2004) revealed key Success factors for competitive excellence at the elite level.

Gambardella highlights the responsibility of National Governing Bodies (NGBs) in the development of a system to identify, educate, and train athletes for success at world class competitions.

He describes NGBs as “workhorses of the Olympic Movement whose function is to prepare athletes for world class sport. The NOC must best determine how to support these delivery mechanisms that will eventually translate into success at the world class level” (Gambardella, 2004, p3).

To build a sustainable pathway for world class success, the NOC & NGBs must identify, define and understand the processes which allow for attainment of these goals.

According to Gambardella, the NGBs studied are realizing the need to identify and develop state of the art organizational structures, systems and programs that will create an environment for high performance sport development. They have undergone a paradigm shift from a focus solely on training and competition towards a trend developing a holistic approach.

In 1993, the New Zealand Olympic Committee and Commonwealth Games Association (NZOCGA) set up a Planning Group to design a process which would lead to the identification of ways to improve performance of New Zealand athletes at Olympic and Commonwealth Games.
The objective chosen for the NZOCGA planning process was: ‘The identification of ways of moving National Federations and their athletes towards gold medal success’.

The objective recognized that the 37 National Federations which comprised the NZOCGA were at different stages of development, each with a unique set of circumstances which would need a different period of time to achieve gold medal status. According to the report, history suggests each National Federation is capable of achieving gold medal status if the right mixture of athletic skill, coaching, management, finance and other resources are available.

In their findings the six main areas of need as identified by the National Federations were: Infrastructure (Administration; Facilities and Equipment); Talent Identification; Coaching (coaching of Athletes and Development of Coaches); Sports Science Support; Access to International Competition; and Athlete Incentive. (NZOCGA – Pathway to Gold Report, 1994, p3).

The report (1994, p13) stated that ‘sports with a strong competitive structure at all levels are likely to be internationally successful at the elite level. Strength in domestic structure due to the number and enthusiasm of participants creates athletes who are mature and competition hardened as they move into international competition’.

It would appear that successful performance in Olympic sport is an outcome of a development system. Therefore the challenge for all Olympic sports organizations is to get their infrastructure and systems right to ensure an outcome of successful performance.

This is best summarized in the words of Forbes Carlise, an Australian Swimming Coach: “aim not to create a champion but create a situation in which champions become inevitable” (www.sportni.net).

Examples of successful sport organizations focusing on creating this “situation in which champions become inevitable” include:

- Swimming Australia, which continuously breeds world class swimmers. This reflects its high performance culture attributed to its sustainable structures of development at all levels of the sport.

- Manchester United is one of the most successful sports clubs in the world, which not only supports the development of soccer in Manchester but also has the infrastructural capacity to support charity and other community initiatives. The structure of the Club is so advanced that it is able to support and maintain performance of its team in the European premier league and at the same time support other community initiatives.

- The emergence of Australia as a significant competitor in the World despite having only 20 million people. This is a situation largely attributed to Government support for sports development program commencing at junior modified activities all the way through to elite institutes or finishing schools for top athletes. Australia has also recognized the need to support their athletes in locations where better competition is available and have in recent years established a European Training Centre in Italy after years of basing its athletes at various specialized training centres around the world (www.ausport.gov.au).
New Caledonia, a French Territory in the South Pacific, has topped the medal tally at every South Pacific Games since its inception during 1963, except for 1991 when the Games were held in Papua New Guinea. At the past two South Pacific Games, New Caledonia have won twice as many medals as the next best teams in the Pacific, reflecting the sophistication and development of their domestic sports infrastructure and access to training in France.

In contrast to sport organizations in developed countries, those in third world countries often lack key infrastructure for sports development from the grassroots to elite level. Much can be said about the lack of financial investment in infrastructure by respective governments. In Oceania, particularly in the Pacific region, a majority of sporting organizations (NOCs and NGBs) are faced with this reality.

The report on Pacific Sporting Needs Assessment found that Pacific Island Countries continue to face development problems, many of which are related to capacity constraints (Australian Sports Commission – Pacific Sporting Needs Assessment, 2004).

The report (2004, p4) identified priority areas for development for each country demonstrating a degree of commonality between the countries. The principle sport development deficiencies that emerged from the needs assessment were:

- National Sport Policies
- Sport Education programs, including coach education, sport administration and sport science / sport medicine
- Physical education and school sport programs
- Volunteer recruitment, development and retention
- Women in sport initiatives
- Sport for people with a disability
- Sport facilities

A common feature in most developing countries is that when there are limited resources elite sport is given priority, while other areas of development are set aside.

The pressure to perform usually results in ‘Top Down’ development rather than ‘Bottom Up’ development. This leads to an imbalance for the organization ultimately leading to a drop in stability and efficiency such that in the long term, the original planning goals either fail outright or are achieved once but do not remain sustainable.

A dramatic example of this is boxing in Tonga. At the 1996 Olympic Games, Tonga won a silver medal through its super heavyweight, Paea Wolfgramm. Tonga remains the only country in the Pacific to have achieved an Olympic medal in any sport. Sadly at the recent 2007 South Pacific Games, Tonga had no boxing team present.

When Wolfgramm achieved his success, Tonga had a very active domestic boxing program and consistently sent large teams to South Pacific Games, Oceania Championships and Commonwealth Games. Tonga made up for its lack of elite infrastructure by supporting athletes abroad in countries like New Zealand and in particular the USA. However by 2007 much of this activity had ceased and the Tonga Boxing Association had become virtually inactive.
Sport in Papua New Guinea also faces the issue of a fragile sporting infrastructure and lack of government funding, not only for sport development programs from grassroots to elite level, but also facility development including lack of resources to adequately manage and maintain current facilities.

2.2 The Planned Approach

The second part of this review looks at the importance of planning, what is strategic planning and tools used in planning to analyze and review current situation of sports organizations.

(i) The importance of planning in sport

Today most sports organizations recognize the importance of effective planning processes as a key component of a strong sports system, and we can find a growing body of literature on planning in sport.

With the increasing complexity of the social, legal, economic, political and technological environments within which sports operates, it has been recognized that sport must take a long-term and comprehensively planned approach to its future development.

Mark Peters, Chief Executive Officer of the Australian Sports Commission emphasized the mere fact that “Success in international competition is the result of strategic planning and program delivery by our national sporting organisations” (Ausport, Vol 2, No 3, Feb 2005).


Planning is an integral part of any organization and in sport National Federations must plan to develop; otherwise they will be marginalized and may cease to exist. In particular, lack of forward planning is the downfall of many National Federations resulting in last minute scrambling to find solutions, especially for funding.

(ii) What is Strategic Planning?

Strategic Planning can be defined as “a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization is, what it does and why it does so” Bryson (1988). Kent and Wilkinson (1991) describe it as the process of determining what an organization intends to be in the future (Wittock, Bollaert, De Knop, Laporte, Van Meerbeek, 1996, p93)

It is a process of identifying and building a broad framework and strategies that allow an organization to achieve its mission and objectives.

Generally strategic planning is the process of determining where an organisation wants to be and how it is going to get there through a strategic direction. It is a process that must be designed to fit the unique nature of the organization.
Advantages of Strategic Planning

The advantages of strategic planning are numerous; however the following specific benefits to sport have been identified in the Strategic Planning Guide for Fiji’s National Sports Federations (Boyd, 2005, p5):

- Increase in awareness of your operating environment;
- Cope with change in your environment;
- Set a clear purpose and direction for your NF;
- Exert more control over your NF’s destiny – decide where it wants to be in the future and work out how to get there;
- Become proactive rather than reactive;
- Improve financial performance and use your resources effectively;
- Improve organizational control and coordination of activities;
- Provide a sound platform for decision-making and forming other plans;
- Monitor and evaluate your progress;
- Unify the NF by providing a common view;
- Develop teamwork off the field.

Strategic Planning Process

Strategic planning is a process that is carried out with varying models by different authors. According to Chappelet & Bayle (2005, p7), the number of stages is variable depending on whether or not the models include operational management and performance management within the process.

Boyd (2005, p8) outlines five (5) phases in the Strategic Planning Process:

- Phase 1: The Strategic Platform – Vision; Mission; Values; Stakeholders
- Phase 2: Environmental Analysis – Internal and External; SWOT Analysis
- Phase 3: Outcomes – Strategic Priorities; Objectives; Strategies; KPIs
- Phase 4: Operating Planning – Action Plan, Implementation
- Phase 5: Monitoring & Evaluation – Monitor progress; Review results; Modify Plan

The “Managing Olympic Sport Organisations” (MOSO) Manual (2007, p62) also outlines the process in five simple steps consisting of: Preparation; Diagnosis; Objectives; Planning and Evaluation.
Figure 2.1 shows that planning is a process that should be ongoing and is usually adjusted every four years adapting to changes within the internal and external environment.

![Figure 2.1: Strategic Management cycle](image)

**Source:** Managing Olympic Sport Organisations, 2007

(v) **Tools used in Planning**

Today there is a range of creative tools used to facilitate the planning process. The key tools are the SWOT Analysis, Stakeholder Analysis, and Pathway Analysis:

**SWOT Analysis**

The most common tool used to diagnose the organization environment, is the SWOT matrix (Figure 2.2) which analyzes the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Analysis</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lack of Government support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good Corporate Support</td>
<td>• Lack of self-funding income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financially accountable</td>
<td>• Poor standard of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional/International network</td>
<td>• Inconsistent administration &amp; management at Provincial and club levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guaranteed annual ICC grant</td>
<td>• Lack of proper training equipment &amp; facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competitive international teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Analysis</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Government Bureaucracy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual coaching &amp; umpiring courses by ICC</td>
<td><strong>Bad economic climate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in Corporate support</td>
<td><strong>Undisciplined players &amp; officials</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• World Cup Qualifiers 2009</td>
<td><strong>Competition with other sports for Corporate sponsorship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U/19 World Cup Qualifiers 2010</td>
<td><strong>High expectations and or misconceptions from public on all international performances</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual participation at Australian Country cricket championship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.2: SWOT Analysis of PNG Cricket Board**

*Source: 2006-2010 PNG Cricket Board Strategic Plan*

The SWOT matrix above serves as a framework for capturing ideas whilst they are being debated. The analysis provides an overview of an Olympic Sport Organisation’s position in relation to its internal and external environment.
Chappelet and Bayle (2005, p9) make specific reference to Nutt and Backoff’s definition of “Strategic Management is a movement toward our mission, built upon an understanding of our current situation and an identification of our desired future, which permits us to build on our strengths, overcome our weakness, exploit our opportunities and block or blunt our threats”.

In most literature of strategic planning SWOT is a tool for discussion and brainstorming to identify an organization’s internal strengths and weaknesses and external opportunities and threats.

**Stakeholder Interest – Control Matrix for NF**

To determine Stakeholder Interest and control in the organization, the Stakeholder Interest – Control Matrix categorizes stakeholders into four quadrants according to their interest and control on the strategy.

According to the MOSO Manual (2007, p72) there are four priorities corresponding to the four quadrants of the matrix:

- **Priority 1**: Stakeholders that should always be considered during the development of the strategy. They should be carefully managed and kept informed during the implementation phase.
- **Priority 2**: Stakeholders that should be kept satisfied during the development phase.
- **Priority 3**: Stakeholders that should be kept informed during the development and implementation phase.
- **Priority 4**: Stakeholders that should be kept an eye on from a distance.

Priority 1 is the most crucial of the four as stakeholders have the power to prevent the chosen strategy proceeding if they are not committed to it.

**Pathway Analysis**

Interestingly, the ASC’s ‘Planning in Sport – A Good Practice Guide for Sporting Organizations’, (2004, p10) makes reference to “Pathway analysis” as another tool to help analyze the needs of a sporting organization is to understand the sport’s pathways.

It is used to describe “the logical progression of athletes, coaches, officials or administrators through a development system”. It claims that for a sporting organization to be effective it needs to have a good understanding of its pathways for athletes, coaches, officials, and administrators to ensure it has capacity to deliver the basic elements at all levels of the organization.

The pathways have traditionally being represented diagrammatically as a pyramid (Figure 2.3). The guide states that “a good pathway diagram will provide a clear indication of the stages of development, the people responsible for each stage and the services or support required”.
The idea of the model serves as a graphical representation segmented into different strata, which typically has a large number of participants at the base and as the programs become more formalized and participants become more specialized the number reduces at the peak of the pyramid (Gambardella, 2004, p73).

The trick for a successful sport system therefore is to find efficient ways to connect up the different strata into a comprehensive pathway for athletes as well as for coaches and administrators.

This paper therefore seeks to design a tool that helps National Federations to focus on the success factors for competitive excellence and to take a planned approach. The next section examines possible tools.

2.3 Models of Capacity & Performance Assessment

The third part of the review looks at different models of capacity analysis to help strengthen organizations to achieve their vision and mission. Before any planning can take place, National Federations must firstly determine their current state of development. Today there are a range of models to assess capacity of organizations and for this research reference is made to three models used by Sport Organisations in their planning: The McKinsey Capacity Self-Assessment Tool for Non-Profit Organisations tested in PNG by the PNG Sports Foundation; the Deloitte & Touche Model used by UK Sport; and the Bayle Model used to measure performance of NGBs in France.

(i) McKinsey Capacity Self-Assessment Tool

In partnership with Venture Philanthropy Partners (VPP) and in collaboration with several other philanthropic organizations and sector experts, McKinsey & Company launched a project to strengthen, develop and maintain the structure of non-profit organizations through capacity building (McKinsey & Company, 2001, p13).
They set out to develop a definition of nonprofit organizational ‘capacity’ as well as develop an easy-to-use tool for assessing it.

McKinsey & Company (2001, p33) conducted case studies on 13 nonprofit organizations that engaged in capacity building over a 10 year period. The research led to the creation of the “Capacity Framework” (Figure 2.4) which defines seven essential elements of nonprofit capacity as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspirations:</th>
<th>An organisation’s mission, vision, and overarching goals, which collectively articulate its common sense of purpose and direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy:</td>
<td>The coherent set of actions and programs aimed at fulfilling the organisation’s overarching goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Skills:</td>
<td>The sum of the organisation’s capabilities, including such things (among others) as performance measurement, planning, resource management, and external relationship building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources:</td>
<td>The collective capabilities, experiences, potential and commitment of the organisation’s board, management team, staff, and volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems and Infrastructure:</td>
<td>The organisation’s planning, decision making, knowledge management, and administrative systems, as well as the physical and technological assets that support the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Structure:</td>
<td>The combination of governance, organisational design, inter-functional coordination, and individual job descriptions that shapes the organisation’s legal and management structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture:</td>
<td>The connective tissue that binds together the organisation, including shared values and practices, behaviour norms, and most important, the organisation’s orientation towards performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.4: McKinsey & Company Capacity Framework.  
*Source: McKinsey & Company 2001*

They saw these elements as being related in the following hierarchy:

![Diagram showing the hierarchy of capacity elements](#)

Figure 2.5: Seven key characteristics of capacity  
*Source: McKinsey & Company*
The pyramid emphasizes the importance of examining each element individually and in relation to the other elements, as well as in context of the whole enterprise. The Culture element is described as the ‘connective tissue’ binding together all elements to achieve organizational performance (2001, p34).

All these elements are relevant to KRAs used by sport organizations in their planning. Using the same conceptual framework, Competitions as the core business of sport can be described as the ‘connective tissue’ binding all other KRAs such as Administration, Human Resources (coaches and technical officials); Physical Resources (sports facilities and equipment); and Financial resources (to fund programs and competitions).

Without athletes competing there would be no administrators, officials, facilities and equipment, and no funding required.

The McKinsey research also developed the Capacity Assessment Grid, a diagnostic tool to measure an organisation’s strength along each capacity element in the Capacity Framework. It enables an organization to conduct its own self-assessment to determine where it stands along the continuum of best practices for each element of capacity (2001, p77).

Using this model, a capacity self-assessment exercise was facilitated in the PNG Sports Foundation by the AusAID Sport for Development Advisor, Mark Clark. This exercise proved to be a positive participatory exercise to stimulate discussion about capacity development, and to identify and recognize capacity strengths and weaknesses as the first step towards capacity development to improve each capacity weakness in the new PNG Sports Foundation.

To build upon the finds of the exercise and to address capacity weakness a Capacity Building Action Plan was also drawn up for adoption by the Board and implementation by Management and lead individuals. As a result, Capacity Development was selected as the first of seven Strategic Objectives in the PNGSF Strategic Plan 2008-2011 (Clark, 2007).

Clark also used the same model for the Sport for Development Initiative’s “Strongim Komuniti Klub” (SKK) project, to allow project communities to self-assess capacity levels of their own club and activities.

The framework and capacity assessment grid provides a practical and useful way for organizations to understand and track their own capacity and then develop plans to improve it. The power of the tool is twofold:

- used as a self-assessment tool it allows a participatory approach that stimulates interest in capacity development and generates a critical sense of ownership and responsibility in the results of the assessment. In this sense, the process of using the tool is as important as the relative validity of the resulting scores.

- the descriptions written within the Matrix framework mean that the (self-assessed) scores are tied to a benchmarked standard.
The Sports Planning Self-Assessment proposed in this paper therefore tries to incorporate these two important elements.

(ii) Deloitte de Touche Model – ‘Investing in Change’

The boost in funding from the National Lottery for sports in the UK, at both the elite and grassroots level, saw the establishment of the ‘Modernisation Programme’ in 2001 to help governing bodies to undergo the process of necessary change to ensure systems and structures are in place to make effective and efficient use of the funding.

With support from the Government, UK Sport (in association with the Home Country Sports Councils) developed the ‘Modernisation Programme’ to help sport’s governing bodies respond to change, by finding innovative ways to improve their structures and systems to enable them to increase participation and develop talent (UK Sport Modernisation Programme Report, 2003).

According to the report (2003, p5), the ‘Investing in Change’ project was developed as a specific initiative within the Modernisation programme to:

(i) Produce a practical framework of optimum model governing body structures, together with appropriate tools to help sports identify which models would best suit them and develop plans to incorporating practical steps, to help them along their journey;

(ii) Enable Sports Councils and Government to prioritise funding to support governing bodies with the change management process both now and into the future.

For the purpose of the report, ‘modernisation’ was defined as: “The process of continuing development of a Governing Body towards greater effectiveness, efficiency and independence”. In order to enable the process of modernisation, a Competency Framework Model was developed to assist NGBs to self assess and develop action plans for modernization. The diagram below (Figure 2.6) describes this process.

![Diagram](source: UK Sport Modernisation Programme Report, 2003)
The modernization programme took into consideration different things for different NGBs with the view that NGBs have various levels of development with varied levels of resources. Their objectives and capabilities differ from one another and therefore they were segmented into five categories to ensure appropriate ‘competency frameworks’ were developed.

Several Success Factors were identified which NGBs must focus on to become more effective and efficient. They are the functions in which NGBs must be competent in order to deliver their core purpose and functions; and are the basis of the “Competency Framework for NGBs”:

- Effective Corporate Governance;
- Sport & Business Administration Effectiveness;
- General Financial Performance;
- Coaching Structure for Grass Roots, Developing Talent and Elite Athletes;
- Service to Members;
- Volunteer Management;
- Event Management;
- Partnerships with Local Authorities, Education and Commercial Sector;
- Exploitation of Commercial Opportunities; and
- Performance Management.

The advantage of the framework used for the modernization programme is that it has been designed to cater for NGBs of different sizes and segmented into five groups each with a specific set of success criteria to be measured against, as well as identify a development plan for those areas not achieving the required standards.

The report took into consideration that the Competency Framework, whilst comparatively straightforward, may seem daunting to smaller NGBs and irrelevant to the larger NGBs. The Sports Councils were therefore recommended to organize seminars to sell the concept in order for the NGBs to “buy into” the modernisation program.

This “selling” to generate the crucial “buy-in” from NGBs is an important point to consider when introducing a new concept or program to NGBs, as some may be receptive to change and others may not.

The Sports Planning Self-Assessment tool proposed in this paper therefore seeks to focus on KRAs which cover the same areas as the ‘Competency Framework’ above.

(iii) Bayle Performance Framework

In his doctoral thesis, Emmanuel Bayle carried out case studies on single-sport federations between 1988 and 1998 based on documentary sources; interviews; onsite observations and also adapted an analytical framework from Lawrence and Lorsch (1973) (Chappelet & Bayle 2005).

Bayle identified six dimensions of performance indicators based on expectation of stakeholders: statutory performance (sports); organizational performance; financial performance; promotional performance; international social performance; and societal performance.
By evaluating the performance using the six dimensions made it possible to assess a global measurement of a federation’s performance based on a multidimensional image of the federation as illustrated below in Figure 2.7.

**Figure 2.7: Measuring the Global Performance of National Sport Federations**

Source: Chappelet & Bayle (2005)

The six dimensions identified by Bayle enable an assessment of NGBs on a global perspective: both internally and externally. The societal dimension appears to be the one often overlooked by most sports organizations. Although the contribution to society is inherent in their activities, it is not usually regarded as a core business of sport.

In Papua New Guinea, the new Sport for Development Initiative (SFDI) will support National Federations to exploit opportunities to develop their sport whilst also contributing to societal development challenges. SFDI activities use sport as a tool for development to address social issues: reducing crime; promoting HIV awareness; strengthening communities and governance; promoting education; and promoting Gender Equity.

The Sports Planning Self-Assessment tool proposed in this paper seeks to translate the dimensions into Key Results Areas more easily understood particularly for sports in PNG.

### 2.4 Models used by Sport Organisations
Several sport organizations have developed their own models or framework to evaluate and assess performance and capacity of their member affiliates. Such examples include:

(i) **FIVB Evaluation of National Federations (NFs) By Their Performance Power Expected in 2012**

With a similar layout to the McKinsey Self-Assessment Grid, the FIVB model identifies five categories of performance and seven indicators to measure performance against.

The five categories include:

- Emerging NFs;
- Up-and-Coming NFs;
- Upgrading NFs;
- Competitive NFs; and
- Leading NFs.

Each category describes the evolving process of a National Federation from a very basic level of development to a professional level.

The seven indicators are:

- **National Competitions** – describes the structure and strength of competitions nationally;
- **International Participation** – describes the level of international competitions the NFs participates in;
- **Funding** – describes the financial capacity and management of funds;
- **Development Programs** – describes the level of programs and regularity of programs run by either volunteers or experts;
- **Management** – describes the administrative capacity of the NF using volunteers to full time professional management staff implementing a National Plan;
- **Position** – describes the strength or position of the NF within the National Sports Structures; and
- **Media** – describes the strength of the NFs marketing; PR activities and media relations.

The description for each category thereby sets a benchmark or standard for NFs to attain as they progress from an ‘Emerging NF’ to a ‘Leading NF’.

(ii) **ITF 5 Year Plan for Member Federations**

The International Tennis Federation’s Strategic Plan framework sets out a five (5) year plan from 2007 to 2011 with twelve (12) Key Result Areas including:

- Constitution/Structure;
- Finance/Administration;
- Staffing;
- Tennis Participation;
- Tennis Performance;
- Competition (International and National);
- Ranking (International and national);
- Coaching;
- Officiating;
• Sponsorship/Fundraising;
• Facilities; and
• PR/Communication.

Under each KRA are specific performance indicators for National Federations to achieve within the five year plan. The plan includes a ‘Current Status’ column to check indicators in place and an “On-Going Review/Plan Status” column.

It is a practical and simple tool which sets out the goals of achievement over a five year period against the indicators as a checklist.

(iii) **Olympic Solidarity NOC Evaluation Project – Questionnaire**

The IOC through Olympic Solidarity designed a questionnaire for evaluation of NOCs under five main themes:

• Institutional – covers the foundation of the organisation, the legal framework, statutes and governance of the NOC.

• Management – covers all aspects of the NOC’s internal organisation, from its human resources management to its patrimony.

• Finance - covers the tracking of funds, accounting practices, financial control and approval of accounts.

• Environment - to identify the key people linked to the NOC (its network and the nature of its relations) and their level of involvement in the worlds of sport, politics, and economy.

• Activities - assesses how the NOC manages its activities, the level of investment (human, financial, etc.) devoted to them and how dynamic the organisation is.

The themes cover all aspects of the life of an NOC and areas that Olympic Solidarity wishes to assess.

The questionnaire is completed by the evaluator in the form of a directed interview. The aim of the evaluation is to have a global and transversal view based on common points of all the NOCs assessed.

This tool could usefully be extended to evaluate National Federations, since they are the main beneficiaries of Olympic Solidarity Programmes and NOCs are merely the facilitators of Olympic Solidarity Programmes, and it therefore makes sense that the evaluation of National Federations themselves is crucial to measure the success of the programmes.

All of these examples provide useful suggestions for KRAs to be included in the Sports Planning Self-Assessment tool proposed in this paper.
2.5 A Sports Planning Self-Assessment Tool for PNG National Federations

Based on the literature review, it is evident that strategic planning is essential for organizations to objectively set out to achieve its goals and mission.

The increasing demands and competition for limited resources requires National Federations to be efficient in their planning and the strategic approach has been adopted by most sport organizations in their planning.

However, the level of planning required depends entirely on the level of development the organization has attained. For National Federations to plan effectively they must be able to assess their existing resources and abilities to determine their capacity to venture into other projects or to expand to another level in development.

The models used for capacity and performance assessment clearly identify key areas or success factors for organizations to focus on and perform to become more effective and efficient.

A specific assessment tool would be useful to assist National Federations to identify their current state of development, and to identify their immediate priorities for focusing the allocation of scarce resources. As discussed, such an analytical tool is most effective if it is a simple, practical, self-assessment tool. This study therefore aims to develop a self-assessment tool for National Federations to use in their planning and assess their capacity against KRAs set out in their plans. Importantly, the prize is less to do with the actual measurable scores identified from the self-assessment, and much more to do with the establishment within a National Federation of a process of assessing development and identifying priorities.

In Strategic Plans the Key Result Areas (sometimes referred to as Strategic Priority Areas) are the areas of performance that an organization needs to do well in to achieve its vision. They describe how organizations hope to achieve their long-term objectives and goals. They are areas the organization aims to measure its results and cover a broad scope of categories (ASC Planning in Sport, 2004, p12).

In order for National Federations to succeed in their sport they are required to be multi dimensional in their planning and execution of plans. With this in mind, the “Sports Planning Self-Assessment Tool” is proposed to determine the level of development that National Federations in PNG have attained under each Key Result Area, and to assist them to accurately assess their planning strategies to prioritize and focus their time and human, financial, and physical resources into areas lacking capacity.

By adopting this approach, National Federations should be able to evaluate more holistically in their planning, to ensure that resources available are appropriately targeted, and to set spending priorities to undertake specific projects appropriate for their stage of development.
3. Methodology

The methodology used for this study involved an exploratory research with a combination of qualitative and quantitative data collected from a sample of eight (8) National Federations selected, representing the spectrum of the 36 National Federations affiliated to the Papua New Guinea Sports Federation & Olympic Committee.

3.1 Research Objectives

The main objective of this study is to:

(i) Develop a Sports Planning Self Assessment Tool for National Federations to assess their development and capacity levels to map out priorities as part of their strategic planning;

(ii) Test the tool on sample sports; and

(iii) Obtain feedback from sample sports on usefulness of the tool

3.2 Sample

The selected sample of 8 National Federations is classified into two main groups Individual Sports and Team Sports. These two groups are broken down into sub-groups; ‘Gold Medal Prospect’ and ‘No Prospect of Gold Medal’ based on South Pacific Games Performance.

(I) Individual Sports:

(i) Gold Medal Prospect: Swimming and Weightlifting

(ii) No Prospect of Gold Medal: Judo and Tennis

(II) Team Sports:

(i) Gold Medal Prospect: Cricket & Softball

(ii) No Prospect of Gold Medal: Basketball and Volleyball

3.3 Data Collection

The research methodology for this study included the following broad data collection activities:

3.3.1 Documentary Review of South Pacific (SP) Games Performance of Sample Sports

A review of the performance of sample sports over the last five SP Games was conducted to analyse the trend of performance from 1991 to 2007.

Data was sourced from the Pacific Games Council website and Reports on Official Games Results of respective Games.

It is imperative to analyse the trend in performance as this process will to some extent reveal factors contributing to performance or non-performance of teams and to see a correlation between KRA scores and competition experience.
Figure 3.1 summarizes the medal performance of team sports over the last five SP Games.

**TEAM SPORTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.1**

M - Male
F - Female

Not on program

For the team sports the results of the analysis revealed that:

Basketball has participated in all five SP Games and has only won two medals; a gold in 1991 and bronze in 2007 in the women’s events only;

Cricket has won gold every time it took part in the games; 1991, 2003, and 2007. It was not on the games program in 1995 and 1999.

Softball has also won gold in the men and women’s events for all the games it has taken part in, except for 1995 and 2003 softball was not on the games program. The women’s team did not participate in 1999.

Volleyball has participated in the last five SP Games and only won a bronze in the women’s beach volleyball event in 1999.

The table (Figure 3.2) below summarizes the medal performance of individual sports over the last five SP Games.

**INDIVIDUAL SPORTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weightlifting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.2**

G - Gold
S - Silver
B - Bronze

Not on program
For the individual sports the results of the analysis revealed that:

Judo has only won 1 bronze medal in each of the three SP Games it participated in 1995, 1999, and 2003. It was not on the 1991 program and in 2007 the team was dropped by the Justification Committee (JC) for not meeting administrative requirements as part of the JC criteria.

Swimming and Weightlifting have consistently won gold medals at the five SP Games.

Tennis has participated in all five games and only won silver in 1999 and a silver and bronze in 2007. These medals were for the women’s events only.

3.3.2 Development of Sports Planning Self-Assessment Tool

Based primarily on the McKinsey Self-Assessment model but incorporating elements from the other tools described above, a self-assessment tool was developed with four stages of development (1 to 4) set out horizontally along a continuum from left to right of Basic Level of Development to Professional & Specialized level of Development (see Figure 3.3).

To the left of the grid five Key Result Areas (KRAs) with specific development indicators are listed vertically with a description of each stage along the horizontal axis. The five KRAs used for this project are:

- Administration;
- Financial Resources;
- Training & Competition;
- Physical Resources; and
- Human Resources.

Under each KRA are specific development indicator descriptions in order for sports to assess their level of development.

The aim of this tool is to have National Federations use this as a strategic planning tool to evaluate their performance and assess their capacity levels; and therefore towards the right of the grid, there is a ‘Why?’ column and a ‘What?’ column for NFs to explain why they are at a certain stage of development and what they need to do to get to the next stage or to maintain the stage at a competent level. Below is a simple diagram of the grid axes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KRA 1</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KRA 2</td>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRA 3</td>
<td>Training &amp; Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRA 4</td>
<td>Physical Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRA 5</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.3

The Key Result Areas chosen for this assessment matrix are:

**KRA 1 - Administration** – describes the required competencies for administration and management of National Federations including: Constitution; Elected officials and AGMs; Membership; Affiliation; Communications; Strategic & Development Plan; and Risk Management.

**KRA 2 - Financial Resources** – describes the capacity of income generation from various sources; and financial management, transparency and accountability.

**KRA 3 - Training & Competition** – describes the level of training and competition domestically and internationally; as well as initiating and sustaining junior development and talent ID programs; integration of sport for development programs; and a system of recognition and incentives.

**KRA 4 - Physical Resources** – describes the physical resources that National Federations have to run their sport such as training & competition facilities; office building facility; office equipment & technology; and sports equipment & uniforms.

**KRA 5 - Human Resources** – describes the quantity and experience of people within the National Federation structure such as Athletes/Participants; Board Members; Administrators; Coaches; Technical officials; Sports Experts as well as gender equality.
3.3.3 Focus Group Discussion on Matrix

A three hour meeting with key sports administrators was conducted on 26th April 2008 to go through the draft matrix to comment and finalize the development indicators of each Key Result Area. This group included a range of key sports administrators in PNG and one representative from the Oceania National Olympic Committees (ONOC):

Sir John Dawanincura – Secretary General, PNGSFOC;
Ms Florence Bundu, Female Vice President, PNGSFOC;
Sainimilli Talakota, Oceania Sport Education Program Manager, ONOC;
Mark Clark, AusAID Sport for Development Advisor, PNG Sports Foundation;
Peter Chalapan, Sports Director, PNG Sports Foundation;
Elizabeth Wells, President, PNG Swimming Inc.

The group critically reviewed the development indicators of each KRA and the description of each stage of development for each indicator. The standards that sports are to be measured against are standards the key group felt were relevant and specific to the environment in which sports in Papua New Guinea operate within.

The aim of the tool is not to compare PNG sports development with that of the most developed sports federations around the world, but to create a tool that is of use to PNG sports federations now and over the next five to ten years, as a tool to help them map out their priorities.

If the descriptions were changed to be harsher, perhaps deliberately to compare PNG National Federations with those of the most developed sporting nations in the world, then all sports in PNG would be likely to score relatively low KRA scores, and this would have an adverse effect on morale and therefore on the likelihood of the tool being used. The tool needs to be a balance of presenting some positives and some harsh realities for a National Federation to focus on. The aim is to have a tool that is actually willingly and readily used in practice: the objective is to establish a habitual process of self-assessment and choice of priorities within national federations. That in turn will lead to improved performance.

Based on the feedback of this meeting, adjustments were made to the matrix in preparation for the workshop with the selected sample sports.

3.3.4 Workshop - Facilitate Matrix Self-Assessment with Sample Sports

On 17th May 2008, a three hour workshop was conducted with key executive members and development officers heading and steering the development of the selected sample National Federations. It is believed that this particular target group determines the decisions and planning process of respective sports. The representatives of the eight sports were:

Basketball: Ronnie Mea, Development Officer, PNG Basketball Federation
Cricket: Andrew Knott, General Manager, PNG Cricket Board
                      Lakani Oala, Operations Manager, PNG Cricket Board
Softball: Harry Keket, Secretary, PNG Softball Federation (PNGSF)  
Joe Lumaris, National Coaching Director (PNGSF)

Swimming: Elizabeth Wells, President, PNG Swimming Inc.

Tennis: Troy Stubbings, Treasurer, PNG Tennis Association

Volleyball: Maria Warupi, President, PNG Volleyball Federation (PNGVF)  
Andrew Ikufu, Executive Committee member (PNGVF)

Weightlifting: Douglas Mea, Secretary & National Coach, PNG Weightlifting Federation (PNGWF).  
Frank Robby, Vice President, Oceania Weightlifting Federation & Committee Member, PNGWF

Judo was the only sport that completed the self-assessment via email by the President, Mr John Jambert.

This workshop provided the opportunity to introduce and explain the matrix to the sample sports and to facilitate the self assessment for their respective sports.

The matrix consisting 29 development indicators covered under the range of the five KRAs was presented in full using a PowerPoint projector. Each KRA and the development indicator descriptions were read out and explained and clarified where necessary.

For each of the development indicators, the participants were required to mark the box along a continuum of 1 to 4 that was closest to describing the situation of their sport at that point in time. They were also asked to note down reasons in the “Why” column, to help them analyse their own situation.

3.3.5 Meeting – Results of Self Assessment & Feedback from Sample Sports

A meeting was held with the sample sports on 31st May to provide them with the results of their self-assessment as well as to get their feedback on the experience of using the tool. This feedback was critical to determine the usefulness of the ‘Sports Planning Self-Assessment Tool’ as a tool for planning in PNG’s National Federations.

The average score of each KRA was calculated by adding the scores of each development indicator divided by the number of indicators in that KRA.

The total average score for each sport was also calculated by adding the average scores of each KRA divided by five (number of KRAs).
4. Results

4.1 Results per Sample Sport

BASKETBALL

Basketball’s total average was 1.51 across all five KRAs representing a relatively early stage of development. Its weakest KRA was Financial Resources followed by Physical resources. Administration was the strongest KRA; then followed by Training & Competition; and Human Resources.

With the change in Executives every so often there has been administrative instability without continuity for achievement of long term goals over the last decade. However, with the support recently of the Oceania Basketball Confederation, Basketball in PNG is starting to pick up and make progress with the employment of a fulltime Admin Officer to manage its development program.
Cricket results revealed relatively higher levels of capacity across all KRAs with a total average of 2.46. Its weakest KRA was Human Resources followed by Financial Resources both falling just below the total average mark. Training and Competition was its strongest KRA, followed by Administration and Physical Resources.

Cricket operates from its own office facility within its competition premises with a staff of six. It receives an annual grant, project grants and high performance grants from the International Cricket Board (ICC). It also has seven corporate sponsors supporting its activities.

The national teams (Junior and Senior) regularly attend ICC tournaments regionally and globally, as well as attend Australian High Performance Camps.

Although it does not have a wide participation base, the sport is well supported by ICC as a result of its performance at the international level.
Judo’s total average of 1.84 across all KRAs indicated relatively early stage of development with the weakest capacity scores being for Financial Resources followed by Physical Resources. Human Resources; Training and Competition; and Administration were all rated equally at 2, being slightly above the overall average for the sport.

The sport’s Executive Board has relatively limited capacity, and is administered solely by the President based in a remote part of the country but with some access to communication including the internet and with assistance from the national coach based in the main city, Port Moresby. Since its establishment the sport has not been able to expand its membership base from its two existing clubs. The high cost of freight and duty on judoka mats has made it difficult to bring them into the country and distribute to other parts of the country for further development.

With only two Executive members running the sport voluntarily, the sport could benefit from increased administrative capacity. In the last few years on average only two to three athletes participate annually in one or two international competitions through support of the PNGSFOC and Oceania Judo Federation. Limited financial resources are seen to be constraint but there is an opportunity for the sport to be more active and take more initiative in raising funds through fundraising activities and sponsorship.
Softball’s total average of 2.77 across all KRAs indicated relatively higher capacity, with the strongest KRA being Human Resources, followed by Financial Resources, Administration, Physical Resources, and Training & Competition.

PNG Softball has a strong membership base from 10 to 15 provinces and an active Executive Board guided by its national strategic plan. Although it holds regular national championships and achieves gold medal performance at SP Games, it attends very few international competitions. Funding is usually a problem to send teams overseas, as is the case for most Team sports.

PNG Softballers are naturally talented and with more high level competitions and a strong development program they are seen as having the potential to be competitive at a level higher than the SP Games.
Swimming’s results revealed the sport to be the most advanced out of the eight sample sports with a total average of 3.16 across all KRAs, indicated relatively high capacity. This is a result of its strong effective Board and administrative structure working towards a four year plan. Its strongest KRA was Financial Resources due to its successful sponsorship campaign and effective financial management. This is attributed to the caliber and energy of Executive Members from the corporate sector who are able to network and secure funding from the business community.

Physical Resources was below average due to the limited availability of facilities within the country. In the entire country there are only two public 50m pools and a very few 25m pools owned by schools and hotels. Both 50m pools have been targeted by PNGSF for refurbishment, but the challenge of expanding the sport to other locations will remain.

Swimming also has an excellent Junior Aquatic Excellence Program for the Development squad (Age) and Target Squad (Open) with regular participation in national and international competitions.
Results for Tennis revealed a medium stage of development across all KRAs with a total average of 2.12.

Its strongest KRA is Training & Competition due to the on-going support from the Oceania Tennis Federation for sub-regional competitions and training opportunities at the ITF regional institute in Lautoka, Fiji; and the ANZ Mini Tennis Program.

Physical resources was its second strongest KRA with adequate facilities to cater for its existing membership and sufficient equipment usually donated by ITF and Olympic Solidarity.

Its weakest KRA is Financial Resources; followed by both Administration and Human Resources due to a decline in membership and volunteers in the sport. The sport has experienced lack of commitment by previous Executive Board members leaving only two coaches performing the job of coaching and administration. This is expected to change with the election of new executive members this year who have recently developed a Strategic Plan for the development of the sport in PNG.
Volleyball results revealed a disparity in capacity across all five KRAs. Total average was 2.09 with the strongest KRA being Administration followed by Human Resources above the average level. Despite its perceived strength in administration and the required human resources, it lacks physical and financial resources and its training and competition is also relatively under-developed.

One would expect that with an effective administration, performance in all other areas would be strengthened; however this is not the case with volleyball. The Executive appears to just hold the annual National Championships and select the national team for participation in only the Arafura Games and South Pacific Games. Apart from club competitions and the national championships there are no other competitions nationally. This indicates a need for the Executive to broaden the scope of their attention beyond the elite levels of the sport to development of the grassroots and pathways for players, coaches and administrators.

Although Human Resources is one of its strongest KRAs, there is no continuity in national team programs and no junior development program in place.

Volleyball is a very popular sport in Papua New Guinea with a large participation base played in the rural and urban areas and has so much potential to lure sponsorship to support its activities, however the sport is not marketed well and this potential remains largely untapped.
Weightlifting results indicated a relatively early stage of development with an average KRA score of 1.82. Training & Competition is perceived to be its strongest KRA, although this may be limited in scope to particular individuals participating at the elite level, reflecting the National Federation’s focus of resources on elite performance of a minority and little attention to development more broadly.

Despite its good performances at the international level, the sport has experienced administrative problems over the last decade. The Executive members of the National Federation are also national coaches and technical officials for the sport. They perform highly in the technical area but lack administrative capacity to effectively run the sport.

PNG Weightlifting has had an on-going sponsor from Trukai Industries (Rice Company) since 1994. This sponsorship is administered by the PNGSFOC. The same sponsor is a platinum sponsor of the PNGSFOC and as a result PNGSFOC steps in to provide a lot of administrative support to Weightlifting to ensure good sponsor management and continuity of performance at the international level.

Perhaps with a specific administrator the sport could achieve its real potential and progress to the next stage of development.

Physical Resources provide the weakest KRA score, with the sport having no office set up as well as no training or competition facility of its own. The purchase and import of equipment from overseas is a major problem due to high cost of duty and poor exchange rate of the Kina currency.
4.2 Collated Results and comparisons

4.2.1 All Sports Results

Figure 4.9

Comparing the results of the eight sample sports, Swimming appears to be the sport at the most advanced stage of development, followed by Softball, and Cricket. What these sports have in common is strong administrative capacity with effective Executive Boards working towards a Strategic Plan steering the development of their sport, and relatively good levels of funding.

Tennis and Volleyball are performing at a moderate level of development, with some strong foundation capacity on which to grow and develop.

Capacity levels for Basketball, Judo and Weightlifting are relatively weak. It is assessed that these results reflect the administrative problems of the sports with ineffective Executive Boards. Although Volleyball claims Administration as its strongest area, the results of the other KRAs do not reflect this.
4.2.2 All KRA Results

The results of all Key Result Areas revealed that Physical Resources was the weakest KRA across all sports mainly due to the lack of training and competition facilities and inadequate sports equipment and uniforms. This reflects limited financial resources, but also the enormous challenges of the physical terrain and limited transport and utilities infrastructure in PNG.

Most National Federations do not own their facility as they are either owned by the City Authorities; Provincial Associations; Hotels or Colleges. With the exception of the few facilities owned by Hotels and Colleges, most facilities have not been maintained or developed since the 1991 South Pacific Games. The high cost of importing sports equipments has also been a major problem. The PNGSFOC on many occasions has had to negotiate exemption on duty on behalf of National Federations for equipment donated by their International Federations.

Lack of financial resources is also an issue affecting the capacity of most sports, except that Swimming and Softball appear to be self-sufficient due their sponsorship and fundraising success. Cricket receives adequate support from its International Federation and sponsorship support to sustain its activities.

The National Federations have not enjoyed Government funding assistance and have had to rely entirely on support from PNGSFOC, International Federations (IF), corporate sponsorship and fundraising. Cricket, Swimming and Tennis receive consistent funding...
support from their IFs; whereas Basketball, Softball and Judo receive some funding support; and Volleyball and Weightlifting receive no funding support at all.

With the establishment of the new PNGSF and the National Sports Trust Limited, the funding situation is expected to improve for sports in PNG.

The Key Result Areas of Human Resources and Training and Competition is also dependent on financial resources to conduct and participate in training programs and competitions, but it is clear that many of the sports need to prioritise the development of their Human Resource more highly, for without it no other development, even of financial resources, is likely.

4.3 Data Analysis

The data collated from the research was used to:

(a) To see the correlation between development level (KRAs) of sport and competition experience; and

(b) To obtain feedback from the sample sports to determine the utility of the Sports Planning Self-Assessment Tool.

(a) Correlation between KRAs and performance

It is interesting to note that the three sports Cricket, Softball and Swimming all showing relatively higher levels of development across all KRAs are in fact sports that have won gold medals in every South Pacific Games they have participated in between the five games from 1991 to 2007.

Tennis, at a medium stage of development across all KRAs has only won 3 medals, two silvers and a bronze out of the five SP Games it has participated in, depicting a stagnant performance over the five games.

Volleyball also at a medium stage of development has only won a bronze (women’s beach volleyball event in 1999) out of the five SP Games. It has never won a medal in the indoor competition. This reflects its lack of participation in international competitions as a result of financial constraints and lack of physical resources. It may also indicate that some of the self-assessed scores for Volleyball may have been unjustifiably high (eg for Administration).

Despite winning gold in 1991 in the women’s event, Basketball had dropped in performance having not won a medal for three consecutive games from 1995 to 2003, until 2007 where it picked up a bronze in the women’s event. The gold medal performance in 1991 was a result of the financial support under the ‘Operation Gold’ sponsorship for Team PNG.
Having dropped in overall performance of the sport since 1991, PNG Basketball is now playing “catch up” with the other Pacific Island countries which have significantly improved their standard of Basketball in recent years. The relatively early stage of development indicated by the KRA scores for Basketball provides some understanding of the relatively poor performances since 1991.

Since 1995 Judo has not improved on its 1 bronze medal performance achieving the same result in 1999 and 2003. As a result of failing to meet administrative requirements of the Justification Committee the sport was dropped from the PNG Team to the 2007 South Pacific Games in Samoa. Again, the relatively early stage of development indicated by the KRA scores provides a correlation with the poor performances.

An interesting analysis is the performance of Weightlifting which since 1991 continues to win a significant number of medals despite its administrative incapacity and lack of physical and financial resources. However, there are some other factors at play here. Unlike the Olympic and Commonwealth Games where only one medal is awarded based on total score of Snatch and Clean & Jerk, at the South Pacific Games a lifter can win three medals in the one event for Snatch; Clean & Jerk and Total Score. This has led to a high medal tally for weightlifting.

Given its medal success at the SP Games and other major international events particularly by the women’s team, Weightlifting has been well supported financially through corporate sponsorship and Olympic Solidarity funding to participate at international competitions on a regular basis.

The low KRA scores indicate relatively weak capacity, which means that the relatively narrow focus of the sport on particular individuals presents a real risk for sustainability of performances: unless a constant pipeline of new talent can be identified and developed, performances will drop off.

Overall then, from the analysis of the results of the South Pacific Games and the assessment results of development levels of sample sports, there appears to be a strong correlation between development levels and competition performance as illustrated in the diagram 4.12.

This reaffirms the need to have the required capacities across all KRAs in place to ensure sustained competitive success at the international level.
(b) Feedback on Utility of the Sport Planning Self-Assessment Tool

A simple Evaluation Form on the assessment tool was completed by the sample sports to get their feedback on the usefulness of the tool and determine the relevance of the KRAs and development indicators. The Evaluation Form is shown at Appendix 2.

The feedback discussion workshop with the sample sports provided an opportunity to discuss the feedback and confirm findings.

Overall, all eight sample sports found the self-assessment tool easy to use and very useful to get an overall picture of their capacity and development levels under the five Key Result Areas.

One sport in particular mentioned that they had never done any evaluation or assessment on their sport and that they had found the self-assessment tool very useful for this purpose.

All agreed that the five KRAs were sufficient for the self-assessment. However, there was an interesting feedback from one sport suggesting that each KRA should be weighted according to their value as a necessity for success of the organization. Currently each of the five KRAs are given an equal weighting.

They all agreed that the development indicators were relevant to their sport, except one sport suggested to include “volunteer motivation” under Human Resources.
There were some mixed feedback on the four stages of development which most felt were sufficient, whilst one sport felt there needed to be some refinement and another felt that stage 4 was a bit too high for most sports in PNG. A suggestion was made to consider five stages for the assessment tool.

Some useful recommendations from the sample sports were made for consideration:

(i) Suggested possible adjustments to the tool itself:

• Consider Weighting the KRAs;
• Ensure the KRA’s are aligned with requirements for PNGSFOC constitution;

(ii) Suggested recommendations for applying or using the tool:

• This tool to be used on all sports and have an annual meet to assess progress;
• Make sports report to it to PNGSFOC as part of annual reporting;
• Make reviewing of Strategic Plans compulsory so that it keeps the plans in check and to ensure continuity of plans. This would stop new people taking over NFs from developing their plans on an ‘adhoc basis’;
• Keep the communication open between PNGSFOC and the sport to make sure the sport is proactive and working on development.

The feedback and recommendations from the sample sports clearly confirm a need for an assessment tool to help National Federations evaluate their performance and determine their capacity levels across the key results areas to develop their sport.

Their feedback was most useful for identifying further improvement on the tool and how best PNGSFOC can apply it to all its affiliated National Federations.
5. Conclusion

As we can see from the results of the Self-Assessment, each sport is at different stages of development and those with higher levels of capacity perform more strongly at the South Pacific Games, compared to those with lower levels of capacity.

One cannot ignore the fact that in order to achieve success at the elite level, sports must have the sporting infrastructure in place for development at all levels.

Robert DeCastella former director of the Australian Institute of Sport (AIS) supports this notion as saying “...passion alone is not enough any more. You need to have the infrastructure, the support and the strategic approach at the national level to achieve results” (Gambardella, 2004, p2).

If we look at what is required of a sports organization, the level of planning needed depends entirely on the level of development that the organization has attained.

In order for administrators to determine the planning process for developing high level sports organizations, they must be able to assess their current level of development to set realistic and measurable goals and objectives as part of their development planning.

The PNGSFOC has never done an evaluation of capacity on all its affiliated National Federations. It is intended that with the development of the Sports Planning Self-Assessment Tool, all National Federations will be encouraged and supported to assess their capacity levels and thereby identify their priorities.

It is also intended that the results of the self-assessment on each sport will enable the PNGSFOC and PNGSF strategically to prioritize funding support to each sport to assist develop areas lacking capacity.

If National Federations are expected to perform at the international level, it is only fair that support is given to assist them develop and strengthen areas they are lacking. Results will not be achieved overnight, however the long term benefits will ensure sustained competitive excellence at the international level.

Physical Resources are a major problem area for National Federations as demonstrated in the results of the self-assessment, and some serious consideration should be given by the PNGSF with respective City Authorities for development of existing facilities.

The poor value of the Kina currency has been a major hindrance for import of sports equipment and apparels, which is also compounded by the high cost of customs duty. These issues cannot be addressed by National Federations alone: it requires a consultative approach between the PNGSFOC and PNGSF to lobby Government support.
The other areas of Administration; Financial Resources; Training and Competition; and Human Resources can be dealt with by National Federations through effective planning and implementation. This obviously will require sport administrators who are knowledgeable, accountable, focused and committed in achieving the goals and objectives of their sport.

Unless there are competent administrators with focus and vision leading the sport, we cannot see development and success in all other Key Result Areas. A strong and effective administration is the foundation of a successful sport.

Strategic Planning is a key function of any administration and National Federations must be encouraged to evaluate their activities, functions and capacity; and draw from this assessment to plan effectively as the way forward to enhance their performance.

It is important to remember that the tool is not really about classifying a sports organization into a particular stage of development, although to some extent the PNGSFOC may find it useful to use it like that for certain purposes. Rather, the tool is much more about establishing within each national federation a process of self-evaluation and measurement, to help them to identify real priorities for the allocation of the scarce resources.

Since the scores are self-assessed, they are given by people working in that sport, not by external assessors or, for example, by scorers from a more developed sporting nation. Therefore the scores are made in the context of the scope of knowledge and experience of the person doing the scoring, which may be relatively limited.

Again, the tool is not intended to provide a comparison between PNG National Federations and those of other countries, rather it seeks to establish a process within PNG National Federations of carrying out the assessment and using it to choose priorities for the future allocation of scarce resources.

Ultimately, the tool is only useful if it is in fact used and seen to be useful by the National Federations. The positive feedback from the sample sports is crucial and provides the confirmation required now to expand use of the tool to all National Federations affiliated to PNGSFOC.
6. Recommendations

The aim of this study was to develop the Sports Planning Self-Assessment Tool as a strategic planning tool for National Federations to use in their planning to determine their capacity and development levels. Using the data from the self-assessment, National Federations should be able to identify priorities and to plan strategically to develop their sport.

The feedback from the selected sample sports was very positive emphasizing the need for such a tool to assist them in their planning. The following recommendations are made in order for this tool to be effective:

(i) Consider recommendations from sample sports for adjustments to the tool (weighting KRAs and/or aligning KRA descriptions with PNGSFOC Constitutional requirements of affiliated National Federations);

(ii) Set a process for PNGSFOC to implement the tool with all affiliated National Federations. This may involve conducting a workshop to introduce and facilitate the use of the tool, and using the results as the initial data for evaluation of capacity levels of each sport. The assessment should be done annually to track performance of National Federations.

(iii) Prepare guidelines on the use of the tool for self-assessment. After the initial workshop, National Federations could do their own assessment with all members of their Executive Board for a balanced view. It is critical to emphasize the importance of an honest assessment with the view that the results will not be used against them however to assist them to progress in developing their sport.

(iv) Use results of the tool to determine funding assistance to National Federations for priority areas. These results can be used as the basis for PNGSFOC and PNGSF to develop funding policies and prioritise funding for sports based on a needs analysis for priority areas.

(v) The tool must be reviewed over time to reflect current environment of sports in PNG.
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