STATEMENT BY THE MANAGEMENT OF THE CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL GOVERNANCE INNOVATION (CIGI) REGARDING THE FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE CENTRE

The Management of CIGI welcomes the formative evaluation report produced by two independent evaluators into its activities. We welcome and appreciate the evaluators’ work and commitment in fulfilling their mandate thoroughly and fairly under tight deadlines.

We also appreciate the dedicated work and advice of members of the evaluation steering committee, composed along with CIGI personnel of two federal government representatives and two independent members who gave invaluable guidance and advice.

The purpose of the evaluation was to fulfill the commitment under Section 9.1 of the March 2003 Funding Agreement between CIGI and the government of Canada to carry out an independent third-party evaluation of its activities. More broadly, however, we view this evaluation as a key milestone in the evolution of CIGI - an initial independent assessment that will serve as an important tool for management going forward.

The terms of reference as approved by the steering committee asked the evaluators to pronounce on the relevance, success and cost-effectiveness of CIGI in achieving results in support of the purposes of its endowment Fund, as described in Article 5.3 of the Funding Agreement. The five areas are: funding research programs, networking, shaping dialogue, building capacity, and proposing solutions to governance problems.

We are very pleased to note the conclusion of the evaluators that CIGI has met the test of relevance, success, and cost effectiveness-in all five areas. Specifically, a rating of high or very high is attached to the relevance and success of our networking activities (supported by IGLOO), to the relevance, success and cost-effectiveness of our capacity-building activities (all rated "very high", emphasizing of course the cultivating of global governance studies, the CIC and the new Balsillie School of International Affairs), and to the relevance, success and cost-effectiveness of the activities that propose solutions to governance problems.

We are also pleased to note the evaluators’ conclusion that CIGI is meeting other obligations under the Funding Agreement, and notably that it has concentrated to a degree on economic and financial questions, as stipulated in that Agreement.

We acknowledge the evaluators’ finding that an actual and perceived lack of focus has existed in our programs. We also accept their related recommendations to consider strategic relevance to the policy community, and to better communicate the results of our work to stakeholders other than the media.
CIGI’s strategic committee had, in fact, addressed the need for more focus at a retreat held in October 2007. In response, new thematic working groups have been introduced this year that will allow more focused work and selection of projects in six distinct areas of international governance. We share the evaluators’ hope and belief that these working groups will enhance research focus. Furthermore, seasoned professionals have begun working with the communications team over the past few months on the central task of better communicating the results of the work program. Along those lines, we will also address the evaluators’ recommendation to engage stakeholders in the development of the research agenda and reach out to them in a targeted way in terms of distribution of publications and participation in CIGI events.

With respect to IGLOO, CIGI envisages the creation of an IGLOO Advisory Board comprised of both technology and content stakeholders, which should go a significant way toward addressing the reports’ recommendation to create an ongoing monitoring and implementation design strategy to address the needs and concerns of IGLOO network users.

We are delighted with the evaluators’ comments about the spirit, atmosphere, morale and enthusiasm that exist at CIGI. However, we also acknowledge and are taking particularly on board the comment that CIGI has grown beyond the centralized administrative structure of its early years. Centralized decision-making has also been linked to a lack of clarity in the process for project selection and funds allocation, and in job descriptions and other obligations not always being clearly defined. The lack of middle management has made delegation difficult, notes the report. We accept these criticisms as well as the evaluators’ comment that these problems often occur in rapidly growing organizations. Yet, as the evaluators note, serious difficulties may develop if there is not a strengthened middle management and a greater decentralization of decision-making.

In recognition of these current and potential difficulties, we have already begun to take remedial action. We are currently hiring a part-time CA to bolster the finance and budget function, and are in the process of adding HR professional. The hiring last year of Dr. Jennifer Jeffs, who has previous experience in managing a think tank and has taken responsibility for the partnership, events and communications activities also constitutes a concrete move toward the decentralization of responsibilities and enhanced professionalism of the organization, consistent with its growth and ambitious objectives. We will also discuss internally and, where appropriate, externally, the report’s recommendation for a results-oriented management, operation and evaluation plan.

In general, the report notes that CIGI’s activities in support of the mandate are commensurate with the resources available to the organization, are conducted in a cost-effective way and are yielding relevant or highly relevant and successful programs and activities. We are therefore pleased with the results and look forward to addressing the important suggestions for improvement in a way that will sustain even greater successes in coming years. The evaluation will be extremely helpful to CIGI in fulfilling its mandate and expectations.
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