
Centre for International
Governance Innovation



Conference Report – Gatineau, Quebec, October 2017

The Global Common Services Forum

Morgan MacInnes

Centre for International
Governance Innovation



Conference Report – Gatineau, Quebec, October 2017

The Global Common Services Forum

Morgan MacInnes

CIGI Masthead

Executive

President **Rohinton P. Medhora**
Deputy Director, International Intellectual Property Law and Innovation **Bassem Awad**
Chief Financial Officer and Director of Operations **Shelley Boettger**
Director of the International Law Research Program **Oonagh Fitzgerald**
Director of the Global Security & Politics Program **Fen Osler Hampson**
Director of Human Resources **Susan Hirst**
Interim Director of the Global Economy Program **Paul Jenkins**
Deputy Director, International Environmental Law **Silvia Maciunas**
Deputy Director, International Economic Law **Hugo Perezcano Diaz**
Director, Evaluation and Partnerships **Erica Shaw**
Managing Director and General Counsel **Aaron Shull**
Director of Communications and Digital Media **Spencer Tripp**

Publications

Publisher **Carol Bonnett**
Senior Publications Editor **Jennifer Goyder**
Publications Editor **Susan Bubak**
Publications Editor **Patricia Holmes**
Publications Editor **Nicole Langlois**
Publications Editor **Lynn Schellenberg**
Graphic Designer **Melodie Wakefield**

For publications enquiries, please contact publications@cigionline.org.

Communications

For media enquiries, please contact communications@cigionline.org.

Copyright © 2018 by the Centre for International Governance Innovation

The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Centre for International Governance Innovation or its Board of Directors.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution – Non-commercial – No Derivatives License. To view this license, visit (www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/). For re-use or distribution, please include this copyright notice.

Centre for International Governance Innovation and CIGI are registered trademarks.

Centre for International Governance Innovation

67 Erb Street West
Waterloo, ON, Canada N2L 6C2
www.cigionline.org

Table of Contents

vi	About the Rapporteur
1	Executive Summary
1	Introduction
1	Post of the Future
2	Co-location and Shared Premises
3	Cost Recovery Methodologies
4	Regionalization and Centralization
5	Cyber Security
5	Measuring Success
6	Topics for Future Consideration
6	Conclusion
7	Agenda
10	About CIGI
10	À propos du CIGI

About the Rapporteur

Morgan MacInnes holds a B.A. (Hons.) with a specialization in economics, political science and philosophy from the University of Western Ontario and an M.A. of global affairs from the Munk School of Global Affairs at the University of Toronto. Having previously served in the political section at the Canadian High Commission to the United Kingdom, he currently works as a research associate at CIGI. Morgan's current research focuses on global populism and the effects of technology on global politics and governance

Executive Summary

Globalization, coupled with the freedom of movement enjoyed by the citizens of most countries, has made it imperative that national governments possess extensive and capable diplomatic networks to deliver services to their citizens and achieve complex foreign policy objectives. Moreover, many ministries of foreign affairs (MFAs) are facing increasing budgetary pressure while the need to deliver on multiple fronts is intensifying. While digital technologies have improved the ability of MFAs to deliver services, they have also increased expectations of innovative delivery of these services. One solution to these dilemmas is multilateral cooperation among the MFAs of different nations.

On October 16-17, 2017, in collaboration with the MFAs of Australia, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, Global Affairs Canada (GAC) organized the Global Common Services Forum (GCSF) to provide a venue for senior officials from select MFAs to share information and discuss common services provision in their respective international networks. Sweden and Estonia also participated while Mexico could not participate because of urgent domestic pressures.

This report summarizes the issues, insights, conclusions and areas of possible cooperation that emerged from the discussions held during the forum. Topics such as co-location/shared premises, regionalization versus centralization of common services delivery, information sharing (such as pay scales for locally engaged staff (LES) in a specific location), joint procurement (such as facilities management or security guard contracts) and performance measurement were all identified to be of particular interest.

Introduction

During the forum, participants shared their experiences and approaches to common services delivery in addition to identifying areas for possible collaboration. Common services, broadly defined as procurement, human resources, information management and information technology (IT),

financial management and property management, are essential components of an international platform. One of the additional objectives of this first forum was to explore interest in holding future discussions, both in person as regular events and through ongoing remote communication, possibly including additional MFAs as suggested by participants. Australia offered to host a second forum in the autumn of 2018, which will include the original participants in addition to Norway, New Zealand and Mexico. Participants agreed to conduct ongoing communication and exchanges on a range of issues, such as opportunities for co-location and digital approaches to managing the network abroad.

The International Platform Branch of GAC thanks the attendees for their enthusiastic participation during the forum. It was truly an exceptional opportunity to learn from the experience and contributions of a dynamic and impressive group of innovative thinkers and practitioners.

Post of the Future

The forum's first presentation sought to address how foreign missions could be restructured to better contend with the tasks asked of them in the twenty-first century. The prevailing template assumes a self-sufficient business unit — an intensive presence requiring relatively high operating costs. Participants shared a common desire to use a more flexible mission structure with a smaller fixed cost and a less substantial physical presence while retaining the ability to adapt to changing priorities. Some participants related a positive experience with single-person missions and a desire to expand the number of such operations. An inherent challenge to this sort of operation is that LES are frequently left in charge of the mission during the absences of the single staff member from the home nation. “Pop-up” and virtual presence posts were also mentioned as possible alternatives to the traditional diplomatic presence. However, it was noted that attempts to achieve more flexible mission structures frequently encounter practical obstacles that were not foreseen in the planning stage, such as security precautions for mobile ambassadors. The consensus among participants was that better metrics were

required for assessing the effectiveness of the more flexible mission structures being considered.

One participant related how their government had achieved substantial savings by making their MFA the sole property provider for activities abroad, taking over properties previously managed by other government departments. This was coupled with a new set of global property guidelines pertaining to the size of accommodations and offices. This initiative involved the implementation of a central data mechanism to keep track of the space rented by each government department and the precise cost. The same participant described the establishment of a global services delivery board, combining all service delivery options into one comprehensive catalogue.

Participants shared approaches for upgrading the skillsets of mission staff. The recruitment process for specialized staff could be altered to target recent graduates with a specific degree of interest. Offering a short co-op placement to current students was offered as another strategy. Upwards mentoring programs to educate senior staff in the intricacies of social media technology were also mentioned. The effect that property guidelines, established with the intention of cutting costs, may have on highly skilled individuals considering a career in the foreign service was identified as a concern. Austere guidelines may end up discouraging individuals from entering a career in which they may be assigned to countries bereft of modern amenities.

The discussion touched on the role of LES in the mission of the future. Relying increasingly on LES for the full suite of activities offered in a mission abroad (political, trade, development and corporate) carries certain advantages, such as reducing the need for staff quarters for Canada-based staff, but bears a possible cost to the national interest. A number of participants brought up the career prospects afforded to LES and questioned whether they could be given the opportunity to take assignment at different posts. The challenge therein would be legal compliance across jurisdictions, for instance, it might not be possible to transfer pension plans for LES between countries. Many participants expressed concern that foreign missions exhibited something of a two-tiered work force, and that harmonizing LES salaries and providing these key colleagues with proper training has been a challenge.

Co-location and Shared Premises

All participants voiced that circumstances had left them encumbered with excess unused space in certain foreign-post locations. Large embassies housed progressively less activity as the importance of relations with the host country declined or efficiencies were introduced. Areas dedicated to immigration services were vacated after those activities moved online or visa requirements changed. The costs of maintaining this space could be recovered by hosting the missions of other MFAs looking to expand their diplomatic network. Participants described how their past experiences with co-locations had yielded notable financial benefits. While participants reported mostly positive experiences with their co-location and shared premise arrangements to date, a common issue was that the time required to put agreements in place (for example, sorting out IT and security details, receiving ministerial approval) had proved frustrating for all involved. In some cases, these delays imposed a reputational risk on the section of the government responsible for negotiating the arrangement. Another source of consternation was the need to clearly delineate at the outset of an arrangement what would, and would not be, provided by the co-location host. In some previous instances, co-location partners had asked for things beyond the scope of the initial memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the host mission acceding to greater responsibilities to foster a better relationship, resulting in a more substantial and complex arrangement than had been initially hoped for. However, a number of participants noted that the difficulties encountered in co-locating with other MFAs were in many instances the same difficulties faced when co-locating with other branches of their home government. Moreover, one participant stated that home capitals have not been as clear as they could be to mission staff as to what to expect from a co-location.

There was a consensus that a good personal relationship between the participating heads of missions (HOMs), and a degree of shared values between the countries in question, is a precondition for viable co-location arrangements. The most important factor is the clarity and transparency of the arrangement. Some participants noted that after an initial co-location arrangement

with another country, the forging of subsequent co-location arrangements with that country became much easier since the initial agreement could be used as a template. A few participants had developed MOUs with other governments outlining terms for co-location arrangements, while others had established special co-location arrangements with other branches of their own government. One participant mentioned a positive experience with short term co-locations involving a single person fulfilling duties while housed in another nation's embassy, who departed once their specified task was completed.

Participants agreed that while co-location was an attractive option for smaller missions, in cases where particular importance was attached to relations with the country in which the mission was located, co-location could compromise visibility and the symbolic value of the embassy. Similarly, in certain locations the reputation of one's potential co-location partner must be taken into account. There are situations in which turbulent relations between a co-location partner and the host country could, by extension, negatively impact one's own relation with the host country.

Participants also identified issues which could occur, such as unequal security requirements, signage and climatic conditions, and put forward possible solutions (for example, agreeing to implement the more stringent of two security protocols in shared premises, as this would satisfy both parties).

Cost Recovery Methodologies

Immediately following the session on co-location, attendees engaged in a discussion about the methodologies for recovering costs for services rendered to external or internal clients hosted at foreign missions. Most participants, although not all, had a mandate to aim for full cost recovery in such arrangements. One participant detailed their government's ongoing effort to overhaul their cost recovery methodology. The model under development is intended to replace the disparate patchwork of costing methods that characterize the current system, which has

been deemed unsatisfactory by both clients and service providers. The new methodology involved the creation of a service catalogue to provide a comprehensive and structured listing of all services available to clients. Six cost models will be developed based on differing types of services, with cost estimating based on historical costs adjusted for expected future changes. The new methodology will allow discounts to be passed on to clients based on funding levels. Rate setting will be conducted at the mission level and evaluated on an annual basis. The hope is to make clients' costs more predictable and more closely tied to the specific services provided to them, as well as reduce the time spent on the manual manipulation of costs by the service provider.

There was some variety in the level of precision on which participants' costing methodologies were based. Some participants preferred to base costing analysis at the mission level as much as possible, to be fairer to clients, whereas others favoured simply using average costs in their analysis to cut down on the administrative burden, which greater specificity required.

A participant whose MFA had recently introduced a costing model for charging between different branches of their own government noted that the ideal model should take account of costs from the taxpayer's perspective. The participant asserted that taxpayers do not care how costs are distributed between various branches of government and are only concerned with total costs. Another branch of government looking to establish an overseas office might find it cheaper to rent a new facility than make use of space in one of the MFA's missions, but from the taxpayers' perspective a new facility would be an unnecessary additional cost. To this end, some of the participating governments have disallowed other branches of government from seeking premises abroad outside of pre-existing embassies.

The discussion touched on some of the practical problems with cost recovery methodologies. In one example, a co-location partner hosted in one of the participant's missions had been taking advantage of the fact that growth charges were not applied to temporary workers by continuously cycling through temporary workers to fulfill their needs in lieu of permanent staff. Another dilemma, which had been encountered by a number of attendees, was how to account for costs incurred as a consequence of a co-location partner withdrawing

or reducing their presence. In one example, a post underwent extensive expansion, only to have an internal client relocate its staff away from the mission shortly thereafter, rendering the expensive renovations redundant. In another, a participating MFA spent substantial time searching for a new location to house its own operations alongside another branch of government. They were informed afterwards that the other government branch did not want to sign a lease for more than three years, which would have eventually burdened the MFA with an unnecessarily large premise.

Regionalization and Centralization

Participants discussed their efforts to transfer back-office functions from missions to either regional service delivery hubs or to centralized service providers based in the home capital. Regionalization and centralization of common service delivery were generally found to yield financial savings, as well as offer some protection from fraud and bolster the professionalization of service delivery. Efficiency gains were reported through the standardization of services at regional and central hubs.

Participants identified a number of factors to be considered in choosing the locations of regional hubs: available space; the local labour market; geographic location in relation to the services offered; the network available; and the willingness of the resident HOM to accept the regional service delivery hub at their post. In some cases, the implicit promise of preferential service support was offered as an inducement for accepting the service hub, although other participants deliberately tried to avoid this. One participant detailed their experience in moving service delivery to regional hubs, stating that while some hubs were situated in pre-existing missions, others were deliberately located in newly procured buildings, as it was felt that establishing a new environment would help mark a break from old inefficient habits.

The concern was raised that service delivery hubs are often relegated to second-class establishments, with a deleterious impact on staff morale. In one participating nation, management of the

regional service delivery hub was made the duty of the hosting HOM, but in practice this was never considered when evaluating their performance. However, skepticism was voiced over whether charging HOMs with managing service delivery hubs was appropriate.

Mollifying the trepidation that many missions felt towards regionalization efforts was identified as a major challenge. The removal of back-office functions from individual missions has been perceived as a loss by some posts that feel that regional support offices do not possess adequate knowledge of particular local conditions. Staff in small missions can feel particularly vulnerable, as the removal of back-office functions reduces them to a small dedicated workforce, resulting in a loss of flexibility. At least one instance was reported of missions trying to continue provision of consular services to citizens after such services were delegated to a regional hub. Reasonable success in allaying these concerns was reported in several ways, including through investing in increased personal contacts between regional hubs and missions; establishing a regional board through which missions could give input to regional offices; conducting customer satisfaction surveys; and creating regional support agreements with all missions. One participant noted that although their ultimate goal was the centralization of common service delivery, they had undertaken the establishment of regional service delivery hubs as an intermediary step in order to ease skeptical missions through the process. Participants who had already undertaken regionalization and centralization initiatives advised those participants still in the planning stages to heed the importance of communication and consultation with the missions throughout the entire project.

Given the importance of mission buy-in to the success of regional service hubs, the rotation of HOMs has proven somewhat problematic. HOM appointments to missions that house regional service hubs are not done on the basis of administrative acumen or interest in the endeavour, suggesting that a change in organizational attitude must still be attained in order to derive the maximum benefits from regionalization efforts.

One participant reported success in the centralization of consular services. Citizens travelling abroad tend to have a limited repertoire of questions that can be addressed through a single worldwide number for consular emergencies,

along with comprehensive web-based provision of citizens' consular needs. This has resulted in a 90 percent reduction in the number of calls received by embassies, allowing for the elimination of the large consular sections present in many missions. Numerous participants remarked that despite efforts to centralize consular services by establishing a comprehensive consular website, some citizens will still call the embassies, often simply requesting to have the information on the website read to them. This suggests there is a desire for human contact among service recipients, which imposes an absolute limit on the degree to which service provision can be centralized and automated.

It was observed that some services have been more amenable to regionalization and centralization than others. Finance and procurement services have made the transition well, while human resources remain a more problematic area; a single hub covering multiple countries with different labour laws is often impractical. Several different countries all collecting the same information on local hiring laws in order to staff their missions seems inefficient, and some manner of a joint approach to address this issue could be of great benefit. The question was raised as to which types of services need to remain in-house and those that can be outsourced. One participant mentioned that service catalogues could be shared to inform other participants of what services others had managed to offer through central and regional delivery mechanisms.

Cyber Security

The reduction of staffing levels in missions abroad has led to an increased reliance on technology to increase productivity of remaining staff. One participant has implemented a digital platform for shared services used by all state institutions to counter staff reductions and consequent reductions in on-the-ground capacity. The aim of the platform is to increase coherence between state institutions and saving costs on personnel. This platform has different functions and has proven useful for coordination between staff, for example with regards to personal data, vacations, business trips, assets, costs reimbursement, trainings and absence management. However, the platform is

only available in the local national language at the present time, presenting some difficulties with LES.

The ubiquity of digital technology inevitably makes foreign missions more vulnerable in the cyber realm. One participant related how in preparation for an ambassadors' conference, almost all of their ambassadors fell for a fake phishing email intended to demonstrate susceptibility to cyber attacks. Another participant noted that cyber security consisted of both a hardware element and a human element, which must be addressed by fostering a culture of awareness towards cyber security. The object of value in need of protection is no longer fragments of information, but volumes of big data.

One participant related how they were abandoning the idea of maintaining their own secure network, moving towards working in the cloud with private companies who could provide for the ministry's needs at reduced cost. MFAs may encounter problems with data residence requirements, impeding the transfer of data across political jurisdictions. A crucial question was in which circumstances is it safe to outsource IT services, for example, making use of external providers for passport services? MFAs must also contend with a younger generation entering the workforce who are accustomed to instantaneous communication through the use of potentially insecure devices such as smartphones and smartwatches. Determining the right balance between ease of operation and security is a difficult issue for MFAs to resolve in general, but a co-location arrangement presents special challenges for partners, who must accommodate each other's needs at every step of the process.

Measuring Success

There was a strong consensus at the forum that better metrics must be developed for measuring the efficacy of diplomatic networks and for determining the success or failure of the many initiatives that MFAs undertake. A common sentiment was that decisions were, to a certain extent, made on an ad hoc basis, and that decision makers do not have access to the right sort of information to make objective assessments, such as whether it would be beneficial to enter into a co-location arrangement in a given location.

The discussion touched on the need for metrics capable of measuring non-financial goals held by MFAs, such as environmental objectives. Specifically, the “greening” of diplomatic networks was considered as an initiative whose success or failure had to be measured in non-monetary terms. One participant voiced that, with regard to these sorts of projects, achievement of substantive goals necessitates an embedded culture where decision makers are intuitively conscious of the non-financial metric that the MFA is attempting to optimize at every stage of planning. This sort of culture is hard to engender through deliberate action and may not take root even after years of pursuing said objective.

Topics for Future Consideration

Participants identified certain topic areas which did not receive extensive focus at the GCSF, but would be valuable to explore more in-depth in subsequent discussions. Many participants were interested in investigating the application of automation technology, big data and artificial intelligence to the functions of diplomatic networks and how this might affect the way embassies should be structured. At least one participant voiced that their automation efforts had been continuously hampered by limited bandwidth and lagging IT systems. Another participant stated that they will investigate the active technology start-up environment in their country to determine if any of the services being developed would be applicable to the activities of diplomatic networks. Those in attendance also indicated a desire to find an appropriate forum for deliberating how environmental sustainability goals could be pursued as part of the operation of foreign missions, a discussion that followed GAC’s presentation of their greening strategy.

Conclusion

Over the course of the GCSF, participants identified substantial areas of overlapping interest. All participants voiced a willingness to consider co-location when establishing a new mission and an enthusiasm for finding partners to fill the excess space found at many of their missions. Performance measurement was a key issue that came up in various contexts. However, beyond the prospect of collaborative initiatives and joint ventures, the GCSF was successful in simply providing a venue for sharing information and best practices. Participating MFAs are at different stages of advancement in the various areas discussed, and they clearly appreciated hearing from the experiences of those further along the process, receiving recommendations and collectively identifying obstacles that they would need to address.

Confronting the common service delivery challenges which MFAs faced with in the twenty-first century will require more efficient use of resources and adaptable strategies. To this end, future iterations of the GCSF will hopefully provide MFAs with the requisite information and opportunities for collaboration needed to build strong and nimble diplomatic networks.

Agenda

October 16-17, 2017

River View Salon, Museum of
History, Gatineau, Quebec

Monday, October 16, 2017 — Session facilitated by Aaron Shull, CIGI

8:00 a.m. **Opening Remarks, Tour de Table, Introduction of Facilitator**
Dan Danagher, Assistant Deputy Minister, International
Platform Branch, Global Affairs Canada

9:00 a.m. **Round Table Discussion: Contemporary Practice and Issues
in International Common Services Delivery**

→ Government agencies are often being asked to do “more” with “less.” At the same time, the operating environment has markedly shifted in the last decade. This session is designed to provide delegates with an opportunity to speak about the challenges that they have been facing in recent years with delivering common services at missions and discuss innovative approaches, share best practices and identify areas for collaborative engagement among participating governments.

All countries: Each country is invited to present for 10 minutes. An exchange of views will follow the presentations.

10:30 a.m. **Health Break**

11:00 a.m. **Mission/Post of the Future**

→ The role played by foreign missions is changing rapidly in the face of technological progress and the shifting international landscape. This discussion considers how foreign ministries can meet the challenges of a changing world by reconsidering the traditional conceptions of a foreign post, the role of embassies, and the skillsets required of an effective diplomatic service.

LEAD: Australia

12:30 p.m. **Lunch hosted by the United Kingdom High Commission in Canada
Keynote: Digital Distruption and the Modern Workplace**

Guest Speaker: Debbie Baxter, Deloitte Real Estate, Vice
President & National Leader, Corporate Real Estate.

2:00 p.m. **Co-locations and Shared Premises**

→ Many of the participant governments have a comparable set of interests and values, which are being pursued and strengthened through the operations of missions abroad. This presents a unique opportunity to combine resources in order to achieve both efficiencies and scale. This session will address the potential benefits and challenges inherent in co-location arrangements. Participants will be invited to speak about their cost recovery arrangements for co-location and shared premise arrangements.

LEAD: Canada: Leslie Scanlon, Director General, Client Relations
and Missions Operations, Global Affairs Canada

3:30 p.m.

Cost Recovery Methodologies

→ Following on the discussion of foreign government co-locations and shared premises, this discussion will focus on how governments cost recovery for services abroad from their internal or external partners, such as foreign governments, investigating innovative costing and reporting requirements. Participants will be invited to speak about how they cost recover in foreign co-location and shared premises situations.

LEAD: Canada: Rita Rudaitis-Renaud, Director, Client Relations Division, Global Affairs Canada

5:00 p.m.

Wrap up for Day 1

6:00 p.m.

Dinner: Hosted by the Dutch Ambassador to Canada, his Excellency Henk van der Zwan.

Tuesday, October 17, 2017 — Session facilitated by Aaron Shull, CIGI

9:00 a.m.

Regionalization vs Centralization

→ Inevitably certain shared services will realize efficiencies through centralized administration — others will not. This discussion will to identify which instances call for greater centralized or regional administration, as well as the potential obstacles that must be considered when consolidating service delivery operations.

LEADS: The Netherlands (Centralization) and the United Kingdom (Regionalization)

10:30 a.m.

Health Break

11:00 a.m.

Cyber Security and Options for Missions Abroad

→ The application of digital technology to diplomatic processes has greatly improved the service provision capabilities of diplomatic posts. However, the deeply embedded nature of technology into the critical functions of missions abroad has simultaneously rendered them more vulnerable to disruption. This session considers strategies for mitigating cyber threats and risks inherent in the use of digital technology.

LEAD: Netherlands, Speakers: Anastasia Semenova and Andrew Schumann, Gowlings Privacy and Data Protection Group with introductory comments by the Netherlands.

9:00 a.m.

Regionalization vs Centralization

→ Inevitably certain shared services will realize efficiencies through centralized administration — others will not. This discussion will seek to identify which instances call for greater centralized or regional administration, as well as the potential obstacles that must be considered when consolidating service delivery operations.

LEADS: The Netherlands (Centralization) and the United Kingdom (Regionalization)

12:30 p.m.

Lunch hosted by the Australian Embassy in Canada

1:30 p.m.

Measuring Success

- While cost efficiency remains an overarching concern for all government activities, looking beyond strictly financial impacts will allow governments to properly account for the value of initiatives that advance various goals, such as environmental goals. Various members of Canada's International Platform Branch will present on initiatives that they have been working on — including greening of the Network and seeking out opportunities to collaborate with others in areas other than co-location.

LEAD: Canada

2:30 p.m.

Opportunities for Future Collaboration and Next Steps

- By comparing the insights and first-hand experiences of different foreign ministries, this discussion aims to foster a greater understanding of the common service innovation landscape, identify challenges and develop mutually beneficial strategies for the provision of services at diplomatic missions.

All countries

4:00 p.m.

Closing Remarks

Dan Danagher, Assistant Deputy Minister, International Platform Branch, Global Affairs Canada

Note: Under the Chatham House Rule, those present, “are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant may be revealed.”

About CIGI

We are the Centre for International Governance Innovation: an independent, non-partisan think tank with an objective and uniquely global perspective. Our research, opinions and public voice make a difference in today's world by bringing clarity and innovative thinking to global policy making. By working across disciplines and in partnership with the best peers and experts, we are the benchmark for influential research and trusted analysis.

Our research programs focus on governance of the global economy, global security and politics, and international law in collaboration with a range of strategic partners and support from the Government of Canada, the Government of Ontario, as well as founder Jim Balsillie.

À propos du CIGI

Au Centre pour l'innovation dans la gouvernance internationale (CIGI), nous formons un groupe de réflexion indépendant et non partisan doté d'un point de vue objectif et unique de portée mondiale. Nos recherches, nos avis et nos interventions publiques ont des effets réels sur le monde d'aujourd'hui car ils apportent de la clarté et une réflexion novatrice pour l'élaboration des politiques à l'échelle internationale. En raison des travaux accomplis en collaboration et en partenariat avec des pairs et des spécialistes interdisciplinaires des plus compétents, nous sommes devenus une référence grâce à l'influence de nos recherches et à la fiabilité de nos analyses.

Nos programmes de recherche ont trait à la gouvernance dans les domaines suivants : l'économie mondiale, la sécurité et les politiques mondiales, et le droit international, et nous les exécutons avec la collaboration de nombreux partenaires stratégiques et le soutien des gouvernements du Canada et de l'Ontario ainsi que du fondateur du CIGI, Jim Balsillie.

**Centre for International
Governance Innovation**

67 Erb Street West
Waterloo, ON, Canada N2L 6C2
www.cigionline.org