With three decades' experience as a lawyer, leadership adviser, writer and speaker in New Zealand, Australia, Europe, the US and elsewhere, Dr Pol's practical expertise is supported by scientific rigour and outcome-oriented critical thinking.

Experience with leading law firms and in-house roles in four countries include directing major disputes for outcomes and systematically reducing organisational risk. Dr Pol was also appointed to the Law Society's governing Council and led New Zealand's corporate lawyers' association. Public and private sector leadership advisory work and interim general counsel appointments typically focused on meeting key organisational outcomes in complex environments.

Framed in outcomes and policy effectiveness, Dr Pol's PhD thesis filled an evidence gap in an area with 'wicked' problems, seemingly insoluble. Within that framework, the research uniquely identified and assessed the use of professionals to launder illicit funds. Money laundering controls are globally ubiquitous and immensely costly, yet arguably the least effective policy, regulatory and enforcement endeavour, ever, anywhere; a valuable resource for transferrable effectiveness and outcomes insights.

In the money laundering realm, Dr Pol formally assessed the crime-control impact and effect of AML/CFT controls, globally and in selected jurisdictions. He also undertook the first comprehensive independent assessment of the Financial Action Task Force's global 'effectiveness' methodology, which seeks to evaluate for specified outcomes. The uncomfortable conclusion illustrates that the gap between (crime prevention) policy objectives and outcomes achieved is too large for the standard model and its incremental extension of compliance obligations to bridge. A project is underway to develop, test and implement effective solutions.

In other areas of public endeavour, consistent with governments drawing from evidence-informed, outcome-oriented frameworks, Dr Pol's expertise is focused on outcome effectiveness; notably, policy, regulatory, enforcement, and compliance effectiveness. Not just if rules exist, if they meet received standards, or if they are complied with; but whether they work. Do they achieve intended policy objectives? Despite enabling demonstrably better outcomes aligned with policy objectives and organisational strategy, this multi-disciplinary line of enquiry remains surprisingly rare.

A feature of Dr Pol's application of this fundamental issue in public service includes practical, workable distinctions between inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes. Meaningfully distinguishing these concepts is a defining element of post-'new public management' leadership.

For example, more money spent on police or health budgets (inputs) or the number of operations, arrests or criminal forfeitures (outputs) tells us little about meaningful, measurable public health improvements or crime prevention. Likewise, policy debate mired in argument about social housing unit numbers (outputs) tells us little about the health, educational and employment *outcomes* from safe, secure housing intended by policy initiatives. Similarly, in education, welfare, workplace safety, procurement and nearly every facet of central and local government endeavour.

'Outputs' are easy to measure, and often positively influence outcomes, yet policies, compliance obligations, enforcement activity and strategies from the outset focused on ultimate objectives generate a much greater likelihood of success.

Improved public-sector outcomes also forecasts fewer unnecessary compliance tasks, and less cost. Re-calibrating resources towards policy objectives and organisational goals helps realise economic and social benefits, and less compliance with better outcomes enables renewed focus of private sector resources on customers and innovation.