



Citizenship and
Immigration Canada

Citoyenneté et
Immigration Canada

Risk-Based Evaluation Plan

2003-04 and 2004-05



Evaluation
CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION CANADA

September 2003

Risk-Based Evaluation Plan

2003-04 and 2004-05

Evaluation

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION CANADA

September 2003

Table of Contents

PREFACE	2
1.0 THE EVALUATION FUNCTION	3
CORE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	3
OVERALL GUIDANCE FOR THE FUNCTION	3
OPERATING PRINCIPLES	4
SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE EVALUATION UNIT	6
2.0 COVERING CIC'S POLICIES, PROGRAMS AND INITIATIVES	7
3.0 GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES	8
4.0 CIC PRIORITIES	9
5.0 RISK ANALYSIS	10
GENERAL ISSUES	10
RISK-BASED PROCESS	11
SPECIFIC RISKS	11
6.0 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	13
APPENDIX A FUNCTION MODEL	14
APPENDIX B EVALUATION PROJECTS 2003–2005	15
APPENDIX C PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT PLAN	16
APPENDIX D RISK ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK AND WORKSHEET	17

Preface

The Risk-Based Evaluation Plan for fiscal years 2003–04 and 2004–05 guides the evaluation function at Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC). As a key policy document, it serves as the underpinning of evaluation activity by providing a framework for understanding the function's expected results and its contribution to the achievement of departmental goals.

The Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) recently approved additional funding for the continuation of the four-year strategy for implementation of the revised Evaluation and Internal Audit policies, introduced in 2001. Thirty million dollars will be allocated over the next two fiscal years to support policy implementation. For evaluation, a total of \$10.1 million is available for direct allocation to departments: \$6.0 million in 2003–04 and \$4.1 million in 2004–05. The Treasury Board Secretariat has informed us that CIC will receive \$134,890 in 2003–04 and \$93,657 in 2004–05 for the implementation of the Evaluation Policy. Allocations are expected this autumn.

One of the requirements of the new TBS Evaluation Policy—in particular for departments seeking part of the additional funding—is the annual submission to Treasury Board of risk-based evaluation plans for each year following the implementation of the policy. In addition, the TBS Evaluation Policy requires departmental heads of evaluation to ensure that a strategically focused evaluation plan is in place that appropriately covers the organization's policies, programs and initiatives and that the plan is founded on an assessment of risks, departmental priorities and the priorities of the government. The evaluation standards of the TBS Evaluation Policy echo this requirement, as does the preface to the policy. This document was prepared to conform to the TBS policy and aims to provide all the information expected in the format recommended by the policy.

SECTION 1.0

The Evaluation Function

Core Roles and Responsibilities

Responsibility for the evaluation function resides with the Strategic Planning Division of the Priorities, Planning and Research (PPR) Branch within the Strategic Directions and Communications Sector. PPR is responsible for the day-to-day operation of this function at CIC. It reports to the Executive Committee, chaired by the Deputy Minister, for final approval of results-based management accountability frameworks (RMAFs) and evaluations.

Overall Guidance for the Function

The TBS Evaluation Policy states that evaluation has two main purposes:

- To help managers design or improve the design of policies, programs and initiatives; and
- To provide, where appropriate, periodic assessments of policy or program effectiveness, of impacts both intended and unintended, and of alternative ways of achieving expected results.

The policy states that evaluation operates in a complex environment that involves partnerships with other federal organizations, other levels of government, the private sector or not-for-profit entities. In addition, as the delivery of programs devolves to other jurisdictions, the evaluation of underlying policies increases in importance. Evaluation should contribute to improvements in policy, as well as program design and delivery. Departments are expected to embed the discipline of evaluation into the management cycle for policies, programs and initiatives to:

- Develop results-based management and accountability frameworks for new or renewed policies, programs and initiatives;
- Establish ongoing performance monitoring and performance measurement practices;
- Evaluate issues related to the early implementation and administration of the policy, program or initiative, including those that are delivered through partnership arrangements (formative or mid-term evaluation); and
- Evaluate issues related to relevance, results and cost effectiveness.

Operating Principles

Our operating principles include:

- Value-added services: We seek senior management support and participation, practice a client service orientation, and facilitate continuous learning about evaluation.
- High quality products and services: Timely, relevant and evidence-based information that supports CIC and government priorities.

Value-Added Services

The Evaluation Unit strives to offer value-added services that contribute to high quality program delivery and that assist in the development of effective ways to measure performance. The unit provides value to CIC management and staff by producing reliable information to help best manage and deliver effective programs, policies and initiatives. Value is realized for the Canadian taxpayer as a result of relevant, efficient, effective, successful and cost-effective operations.

Senior Management Support and Participation

The Evaluation Unit maintains partnerships with senior managers to facilitate the assessment and enhancement of program performance, help identify improvements in service delivery, and identify and promote best practices. In doing so, the unit ensures that the products produced are consistent with CIC and government policies, that they help to enhance the efficient, effective and economical operation of the Department, and that they contribute to the achievement of CIC goals. The Evaluation Unit seeks to:

- Contribute, through evaluation projects and timely advice, to the development of policies, programs and systems;
- Identify program and operational risks;
- Report evaluation findings in a complete and transparent manner; and
- Share good management practices.

Departmental management will be expected to provide a response for evaluations and some special reports. The Evaluation Unit will provide support and advice to the program lead responsible for management responses as needed.

Client Service Orientation

Cultivating and maintaining a strong client service orientation is a key value of the Evaluation Unit at CIC. We strive to provide accessible, responsive and reliable services to our clients and stakeholders, act as a repository of evaluation materials, and provide CIC management and staff with up-to-date and relevant information on the current developments in evaluation at CIC and throughout the Government of Canada.

The Evaluation Unit has adopted a proactive, results-oriented approach, and provides clients and stakeholders with information to continually improve the quality, responsiveness and cost effectiveness of CIC programs. The unit seeks to add value in decision making about programs and recognizes the importance of accountability in day-to-day operations.

Continuous Learning

As part of a continuous learning organization, the Evaluation Unit contributes to maintaining and developing the human resources of CIC in terms of evaluation awareness and skills. In addition, the unit will focus on the function itself to meet new and greater challenges, including making the unit a better and more satisfying place to work.

High Quality Products and Services

The Evaluation Unit will achieve success only by providing value-added services and high quality products to our clients and stakeholders. To do this, the unit must communicate on an ongoing basis with its clients. Specifically, it will consult and cooperate with internal clients to identify areas of high risk and significance so that its examination of these areas will assist in enhancing programs and services.

Timely, Relevant and Evidence-Based Information

The Evaluation Unit produces timely, relevant and evidence-based information on the performance of policies, programs and operations, including the results they achieve. Its reports present significant findings, including causes and effects, and conclusions. Action plans to address the issues are outlined. These are provided in accordance with assigned responsibilities and should be as clear as possible, consistent with the nature of the subject matter.

Support for CIC and Government Priorities

Providing central agencies with confidence in the program and in the administrative performance of the Department is a key goal. The Evaluation Unit contributes to the assessment of compliance with relevant central agency and departmental policies, directives and guidelines, including finance, personnel, administration and official languages as they relate to CIC activities.

Services Provided by the Evaluation Unit

The Evaluation Unit provides an objective review and assessment of the rationale, success and cost effectiveness of CIC programs, policies and initiatives. The unit supports the Deputy Minister and managers in the discharge of their responsibilities by addressing in a comprehensive and objective fashion the effectiveness of CIC programs, policies and initiatives and other issues of interest to management. Special studies, such as policy, regulatory, program and operational reviews, client surveys and others, may be undertaken to provide the Deputy Minister, senior management and staff with a capability to support management decision making.

Consulting services related to evaluation may be provided to CIC managers. Such services could include assisting managers in the development of interim reporting and measurement strategies on outputs and outcomes, indicator development or any other issue related to evaluation. In all instances, the CIC Evaluation Unit provides managers with the highest quality expertise and service to add value to the organization by assisting in the identification of opportunities for improving CIC's performance. The unit actively seeks input, suggestions and requests from CIC managers and staff for the internal consulting services it can provide.

Short-Term Planning

During the period covered by this plan, the Evaluation Unit will undertake a variety of projects in many functional and program areas of CIC. The projects will vary and will consist of evaluations, a number of RMAFs and some special reports. Our 2003–04 Annual Evaluation Plan is included in appendix B and provides a list of projects for the coming two years.

The Evaluation Unit's long-term goals are linked to CIC's annual performance plans and the day-to-day activities of managers and staff. Our performance will be measured in terms of the expected short- and long-term results of our work. To this end, we have developed a set of performance measures and indicators for the products and services we provide to CIC managers and staff (see appendix C). This information will serve as the basis for the development and implementation of an ongoing, periodic internal client satisfaction measurement exercise with CIC managers and staff on their level of satisfaction with the performance of the Evaluation Unit.

SECTION 2.0

Covering CIC's Policies, Programs and Initiatives

An inventory of policies, program and initiatives that could possibly be subject to review by the CIC Evaluation Unit would embrace the full complexity of CIC operations: from admitting immigrants, students, visitors and temporary workers to Canada to protecting refugees at home and abroad, helping newcomers adapt to Canadian society and become Canadian citizens, and managing access to Canada. The Department invests heavily in the resources, tools and technology needed to provide these complex services in an efficient, economical and effective manner. The activities of the Evaluation Unit add value to CIC and those activities.

This plan does not however envisage an exercise in identifying the full universe of policies, program and initiatives that may be amenable to evaluation within CIC. Instead of developing such a list, we have undertaken a risk-based approach (see below) that includes, as a first step, consulting CIC managers and staff to identify the policies, programs and initiatives that may be considered for evaluation based on their sense of immediate need and risk, thus ensuring appropriate coverage. Part of this risk analysis includes responding to the TBS Evaluation Policy requirement to provide RMAFs and evaluations for areas receiving new funding, and for grants and contribution programs prior to the development of new terms of reference. It also involves responsiveness to the observations of the Auditor General with regard to areas of risk in CIC's policies and programs.

SECTION 3.0

Government Priorities

Managing for results is the prime responsibility of Public Service managers. As outlined in the management framework for the federal government, Results for Canadians, Public Service managers are expected to define anticipated results, continually focus attention on the achievement of results, measure performance regularly, and learn and adjust to improve efficiency and effectiveness. Managers must be accountable to higher management, ministers, Parliament and Canadians for their performance. The Evaluation Unit helps managers to operate effectively in this environment. It also supports managers' efforts to track and report on actual performance and to help decision makers assess program or policy results (revised TBS Evaluation Policy, April 1, 2001).

External factors are an important influence on our planning, and recognizing them can be useful for planning and measuring the results of the Evaluation Unit's performance. These factors may be political, economic, administrative, technological or even environmental. Other factors include the emerging demands from central agencies and other government departments and the availability of, and access to, appropriate resources or core competencies to undertake evaluation tasks.

The Treasury Board Secretariat has established clear and powerful policies with regard to the planning, management, organization and control of evaluation branches throughout the government. Implementing these policy requirements and expectations falls to the individual evaluation functions in government, including ours.

Other major influences include a respect for our work and general direction that reflects the management framework for the government of Canada as described in Results for Canadians. Many of the initiatives under modern comptrollership work hand in hand with the results framework and with evaluation in terms of government accountability.

Lastly, we expect that the continuing focus of the Office of the Auditor General on all aspects of accountability will point to the need to have clear mechanisms in place that will demonstrate that programs, policies and initiatives are well managed and cost-effective. Increasingly, this will put pressure on resources in terms of both the volume and the quality of the work expected.



SECTION 4.0

CIC Priorities

The Evaluation Unit at CIC will provide timely and relevant information that will guide decision makers and lead to improved programs, policies and initiatives. Specifically, the unit has undertaken projects during 2003–04 that reflect CIC's priorities for 2003 as defined in November 2002:

- Renewing citizenship and integration;
- Serving Canada's economic needs;
- Building public confidence in the management of access to Canada; and
- Implementing modern management.

Evaluation products and services provide the Deputy Minister, senior management and program staff with high quality, timely and relevant information that will help managers and staff contribute to the achievement of CIC's overall mandate and priorities.

SECTION 5.0

Risk Analysis

General Issues

Risk assessment is a systematic analytical process based on predetermined risk criteria, professional judgment and experience to determine the probability that an adverse condition will occur. The Evaluation Unit will conduct periodic risk assessments against appropriate risk-ranking criteria (see below) with regard to CIC's policies, programs and initiatives with the aim of identifying where CIC faces the highest risk, and which policies, programs and initiatives would be candidates for evaluation. The evaluation plan, together with the products and services generated, represent the first steps in mitigating the risks identified.

The nature and types of services provided by CIC—widely dispersed across Canada and internationally—suggest possible exposure to significant risks. For example, CIC depends on and works in partnership with many intermediaries to obtain information, advice and assurance on the credentials, medical condition and other bona fides of prospective entrants to Canada. Such a chain of accountability is complex and the potential for negative consequences may exist if management or operational controls are incomplete or inadequate.

The current human resources situation in the evaluation field across the Government of Canada also presents some risk. Currently, in the Public Service, there is a high demand for evaluation professionals and a declining number of available qualified individuals. This makes the recruitment and retention of such professionals very challenging.

Resource limitations across CIC make it unlikely that all high-risk projects will be completed within the coming fiscal year, particularly given the need to provide the RMAFs, evaluations and special reports required by the TBS Evaluation Policy. Medium- and low-risk areas will not be considered immediately, but our risk-based plan ensures that our work will focus on areas where the Evaluation Unit will add value to the operations of CIC, and that all high-risk areas will be covered within a three-to-five-year time frame.

Risk-Based Process

1. Management and staff of CIC's Priorities, Planning and Research Branch identified the evaluation work required through departmental memorandums of understanding (MOUs), approved terms and conditions, acts, regulations, relevant policy decisions or approved RMAFs;
2. Discussions regarding potential evaluation projects were held with representatives of a number of key CIC branches;
3. The Evaluation Unit distributed a draft schedule of projects based on this input, for consideration by the appropriate operational managers and staff for their feedback;
4. The resulting Draft Evaluation Plan was distributed to managers and staff, asking for their feedback and inviting the inclusion of further projects.
5. Using this input, the Evaluation Unit undertook an assessment of the specific risks (listed below) for each project and produced a specific ranking (high, medium or low)] for each of them and a summary risk assessment (H-M-L) for each project in terms of evaluation.
6. Finally, the Evaluation Unit assessed and assigned the relative resource requirements (H-M-L) for each project.

Specific Risks

While the TBS Evaluation Policy does not identify the specific risks that should be considered in the development of a risk-based evaluation plan, it does offer a list of conventional issues to be considered in undertaking an evaluation:

- Does the policy, program or initiative continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities and does it realistically address an actual need? (relevance);
- Is the policy, program or initiative effective in meeting its objectives, within budget and without unwanted outcomes? (success); and
- Are the most appropriate and efficient means being used to achieve objectives, in terms of alternative design and delivery approaches? (cost effectiveness).

Restated as risks, these issues would be as follows:

- What is the risk that the policy, program or initiative will not continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities?
- What is the risk that the policy, program or initiative will not realistically address an actual need?
- What is the risk that the policy, program or initiative will not be effective in meeting its objectives, within budget and without unwanted outcomes? and
- What is the risk that the most appropriate and efficient means will not be used to achieve objectives, in terms of alternative design and delivery approaches?

To these general considerations, we have added another:

- What is the risk that the policy, program or initiative will not be evaluated as required by formal agreements such as departmental MOUs, approved terms and conditions, acts, regulations, relevant policy decisions or approved RMAFs?

Moreover, within the context of the TBS Evaluation Policy, we must also consider whether these risks might have an effect on the achievement of departmental or government priorities.

These general notions formed the framework within which we consider a number of more specific risks related to each of the general and cross-cutting issues. The framework (see appendix D) was used to determine which programs, policies and initiatives should be considered for evaluation by CIC.

SECTION 6.0

Performance Indicators

While it is important to recognize accomplishments in terms of operational performance (e.g., developing the infrastructure and ensuring the provision of high-quality services), an effective evaluation function is defined by what happens as a result of our efforts and how clients and stakeholders view and use the work generated by the function:

- Did clients consider the work to be timely and responsive to their needs?
- Did they find the work convincing?
- Were they able to use the work (e.g., implement the recommendations)?
- Do they believe that the recommendations, if followed, will achieve the desired results?

Our goals and objectives are linked to CIC priorities and the expectations of managers and staff. As a result, our performance includes consideration of the short- and long-term impacts of our work as reflected in programs. In appendix C, we show how our performance is related to the products and services we provide and to the expectations of CIC managers and staff. To answer the questions above, we have developed a fair, complete and appropriate set of indicators that will allow for the assessment of our performance. This information will serve as the basis for an ongoing, periodic assessment of client satisfaction with the performance of CIC managers and staff.

Function Model

Vision Statement	To be recognized as a leader in providing useful, timely, relevant and credible information and advice on the performance, relevance, success and cost effectiveness of programs, policies and initiatives.					
Operating Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> § To help design policies, programs and initiatives that clearly define the expected results and that embody sound performance measurement and reporting and accountability provisions at their outset; and § To help assess in a rigorous and objective manner the results of CIC policies, programs and initiatives, including their impacts—both intended and unintended—and alternative ways of achieving the expected results. 					
Strategic Outcome	Relevant, successful and cost-effective CIC programs, policies and initiatives that result from access to useful, timely, relevant and credible information and advice.					
Services	Planning for Evaluation and Performance Measurement	Performance Measurement	Formative Evaluations	Summative Evaluations	Special Studies and Consulting	
Description	Develop results-based management and accountability frameworks for new or renewed policies, programs and initiatives.	Establish ongoing performance monitoring and performance measurement practices.	Evaluate issues related to the early implementation and administration of policies, programs and initiatives.	Evaluate issues related to relevance, results and cost effectiveness.	Provide CIC management and staff with products, information or advice of a strategic nature related to accountability.	
Outputs	Results-based management accountability frameworks.	Study reports and follow-up.	Evaluation reports and follow-up.	Other evaluation products and advice.		
Immediate Outcome	Useful, timely, relevant and credible information and advice on the performance, relevance, success and cost effectiveness of CIC programs, policies and initiatives.					
Intermediate Outcome	Management and staff are better informed about the performance, relevance, success and cost effectiveness of CIC programs, policies and initiatives.					
Final Outcome	Management and staff develop and implement actions to improve the performance, relevance, success and cost effectiveness of CIC programs, policies and initiatives.					
Final Outcome	Better performing and more relevant, successful and cost-effective programs, policies and initiatives that support CIC and government priorities.					

Appendix B

Evaluation Projects 2003–2005

Evaluation Projects 2003–2005 ¹	FY and Quarter								Overall Risk Ranking [H-M-L]	Estimated Level of Resources Required for Evaluation [H-M-L]
	2003–2004				2004–2005					
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4		
Study - Marine Arrivals - Lessons Learned	>	X							Medium	Medium
Study – Supplementary to the ADR Evaluation	>	X							Medium	Low
Evaluation – Canada's Citizenship Week	>	>	X						Low	Low
RMAF ² - Permanent Resident Card	>	>	X						Medium	Low
RMAF - Medical Inadmissibility (Excessive Demand)	>	>	X						Medium	Low
RMAF - Global Case Management System	>	>	X						High	Low
Report - Public Security and Anti-Terrorism	>	X				X			High	Low
Evaluation – Resettlement Assistance Program	>	>	X						Medium	High
RMAF - Pre-Removal Risk Assessment		>	>	>	X				Medium	Low
RMAF - Modern Management		>	>	>	X				Low	Low
RMAF – Resettlement Assistance Program		>	>	>	X				Medium	Low
Evaluation – Program Integrity		>	>	>	X				High	High
RMAF - Public Security and Anti-Terrorism		>	>	X					High	Low
RMAF - Skilled Workers		>	>	X					Medium	Low
RMAF - Private Sponsorships		>	>	>	X				High	Low
Evaluation – Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC)		>	>	>	X				High	High
Evaluation – Canadian Orientation Abroad		>	>	>	X				Low	Medium
Evaluation – Primary Inspection Line/Secondary Examination			>	>	>	>		X	High	High
Evaluation – Immigrant Settlement and Adaptation Program (ISAP)				>	>	>		X	Medium	Medium
Evaluation – HOST Program				>	>	>		X	Medium	Low
Interim Evaluation - Public Security and Anti-Terrorism					>	>		X	High	Medium

¹ > Planning, > Ongoing, X Report

² Results-based management accountability framework

Performance Measurement Plan

Evaluation Services	Measures and Indicators	Data Sources Methodology and	
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and type initiated. Number and type completed. 	Evaluation review of project files - compile	
<p>Output Quality</p> <p>Useful, timely, relevant and credible information and advice on the relevance, success and cost effectiveness of CIC programs, policies and initiatives.</p>	<p>Quality</p> <p><i>Measure and (target)</i></p>	<p>Evaluation Unit conducts periodic opinion surveys regarding completed projects.</p>	
	Useful		% of stakeholders who indicate that the reports were useful (100%).
	Timely		<p>Time from the start of a project to a draft report (6 months).</p> <p>Stated objective time frames for a project (as planned).</p>
	Relevant		<p>% of stakeholders who indicate that the reports will be used when received (100%).</p> <p>% of stakeholders who indicate that the reports were applicable (100%).</p> <p>% of stakeholders who indicate that the issues covered in the reports were significant and important (100%).</p>
	Credible		<p>% of stakeholders who indicate that the reports were based on fact (100%).</p> <p>% of stakeholders who indicate that the methodologies used to produce the report were appropriate (100%).</p> <p>% of stakeholders who indicate that the reports were complete (100%).</p>
			Assessment of issue coverage against TBS expectations (meets TBS policy requirements).
			Assessment of whether conclusions and recommendations were based on findings (100%).

Appendix D

Risk Assessment Framework and Worksheet

Program ³	Risk Exposure			Overall Risk Ranking by Risk Event (H-M-L)
	Likelihood of the Risk Event (H-M-L)	Consequence or Severity of the Risk Event (H-M-L)	Type of Consequence (see notes)	
<p>Risk Event (from an evaluation perspective – see notes on next page)</p> <p>Relevance: Does the policy, program or initiative continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities and does it realistically address an actual need? Controlled risks (see notes).</p> <p>The program does not continue to be consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities.</p> <p>The program does not realistically address an actual need.</p> <p>Success: Is the policy, program or initiative effective in meeting its objectives, within budget and without unwanted outcomes? Risk control varies from controlled to influenced to not controlled.</p> <p>The program is not effective in meeting its objectives, within budget and without unwanted outcomes.</p> <p>Cost effectiveness: Are the most appropriate and efficient means being used to achieve objectives, in terms of alternative design and delivery approaches? Controlled risks.</p> <p>The most appropriate and efficient means are not being used to achieve objectives, in terms of alternative design and delivery</p>				
Other Risk Events				
The program will not be evaluated as required by formal agreements.				
Non-achievement of CIC priorities.				
Non-achievement of government priorities.				

³ In this table, we use the term "program" rather than repeating the understood phrase "program, policy or initiative".

Notes on risk assessment

Relevance: The relevance question asks whether the program is consistent with departmental and government-wide priorities and realistically addresses an actual need. Here, the general issues are:

- Was the program an appropriate response to the needs identified?
- Have the needs originally intended by the program changed?
- If so, how have the needs changed?
- Should the program continue?
- Are the objectives of the program consistent with current government and departmental priorities and objectives?
- Is the program within the department's mandate?

Success: In general, the issues of program success address two questions:

1. First, success must be considered in terms of the program's impacts by asking: What has happened as a result of the program? Thus, evaluation looks at the results attributed to the program, both short- and long-term, regardless of the stated or claimed objectives of the program.
 2. Second, success is assessed in terms of the accomplishment of program objectives: Has the program achieved what was expected? We want to know if the program contributed to the objectives agreed to (for example, with Treasury Board).
- What has been the impact of the program in terms of each specific objective?
 - Has the program had any unexpected impacts (negative or positive)?
 - How successful has the program been in achieving the overall objectives?
 - If applicable, how successful have the individual projects funded by the program been in achieving the stated objectives?

Cost effectiveness: Issues revolve around whether the most appropriate and efficient means are being used to achieve the program's objectives, particularly in terms of alternative design and delivery approaches. This area of investigation also takes into consideration the possibility that the same services might be better provided by another program.

- Given the impact of the program and the cost, was the program good value for money?
- Could the resources have been used in a more effective way?
- Could and should the program have been delivered in a different manner?
- Is the program the most cost-effective way to achieve the stated objectives?
- Were the elements of due diligence applied by the program?
- What can be done to deliver the program in a more cost-effective manner?

- Are there alternatives to the program that can meet the stated objectives?
- Notes on categorizing by degree of control (from an evaluation perspective)

Controlled: These are risks that we would expect to be mitigated by the program. They include the activities of staff intended to contribute to the achievement of the outcomes and the products or services generated by those activities. They also include short-term outcomes that stem from the activities and outputs of the program and can be considered under the “control” of the program.

Influenced: These are risks that we would expect to be mitigated to a greater or lesser degree by the program. They are the next links in the chain of outcomes-perhaps medium-term. These items are in the realm of “influence” in terms of the program effort.

Not Controlled: These are risks that we would not expect the program to be able to influence or control. They include the longer term outcomes that are subject to influences beyond the policy, program or initiative itself, and may be at a more strategic level.

Notes on the types of consequences

These are risks to the achievement of either CIC or government priorities other than the risks identified in the table. They may include, for example, consequences of a political, economic, legislative, regulatory, strategic, technological or financial nature, or consequences in terms of reputation or human resources.