



Environment
Canada

Environnement
Canada



Evaluation of the Community Ecosystem Partnerships Program

Final Report

**Audit and Evaluation Branch
March 2015**

Canada 

Report Clearance Steps

Planning phase completed	October 2013
Report sent for management response	September 2014
Management response received	September 2014
Report completed	September 2014
Report approved by the Deputy Minister	March 2015

Acronyms used in the report

ACAP	Atlantic Coastal Action Program
AEI	Atlantic Ecosystem Initiatives
CEP	Community Ecosystem Partnerships
DFO	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
DPS	Direct Program Spending
EC	Environment Canada
ECO	Ecosystem Coordination Office
FSDS	Federal Sustainable Development Strategy
MOU	Memoranda of Understanding
OBWB	Okanagan Basin Water Board
OCCP	Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Program
PAA	Program Alignment Architecture
PE	Priority Ecosystem
PYR	Pacific and Yukon Region
RDG	Regional Director General
RDGO	Regional Director General's Office
SOSCP	South Okanagan-Similkameen Conservation Program

Acknowledgments

The Evaluation Project Team would like to thank those individuals who contributed to this project, particularly members of the Evaluation Committee and all interviewees who provided insights and comments crucial to this evaluation.

The Evaluation Project Team was led by Robert Tkaczyk, under the direction of the Environment Canada Evaluation Director, William Blois, and included Urszula Adamik and Sarah Flesher.

Prepared by the Evaluation Division, Audit and Evaluation Branch

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Background	1
2.1 Program Profile	1
2.2 Governance and Management	6
2.3 Resource Allocation	7
2.4 Program Logic Model	8
3.0 Evaluation Design	8
3.1 Purpose and Scope	8
3.2 Evaluation Approach and Methodology	8
3.3 Limitations	9
4.0 Findings	10
4.1 Relevance	10
4.2 Performance	14
5.0 Conclusions	25
6.0 Recommendations and Management Response	26
Annex 1 Summary of Findings	30
Annex 2 Program Logic Model	31

Executive Summary

This report presents the results of the Evaluation of the Community Ecosystem Partnerships (CEP) conducted by Environment Canada's (EC) Audit and Evaluation Branch between October 2013 and September 2014.

The purpose of this evaluation was to assess the relevance and performance of the CEP program and it was conducted to fulfill the requirements of the Treasury Board *Policy on Evaluation* and the *Financial Administration Act*. The evaluation covered the five-year period from 2008-2009 to 2012-2013. The methodologies used in this evaluation were a document review, an administrative file review, and key informant interviews.

The objective of the Community Ecosystem Partnerships (sub-sub program 1.3.4.5 in EC's Program Alignment Architecture) is to maintain and restore the beneficial uses and environmental quality of targeted ecosystems of federal interest through coordination of ecosystem initiatives. The program supports local community ecosystem projects by providing funding, strategic partnerships, and research and science support. Activities undertaken to achieve these goals include conservation of land and shorelines, protection of land and water through special designation status, and preservation of habitat.

The CEP program represents 0.29% of the Department's 2013-2014 direct program spending (DPS), including G&Cs.

Findings and Conclusions

Relevance

The CEP program continues to be relevant as there is an ongoing need to address environmental issues, such as water quality and availability, and to collect scientific data and research, using an ecosystem-based approach. The program is aligned with government and departmental priorities related to ecosystem health improvements, and ensuring water quality and availability. The program is also consistent with federal roles and responsibilities related to the *Department of Environment Act* and the *Canada Water Act*.

Achievement of Intended Outcomes

The evaluation concluded that there is opportunity for improvement in the extent to which the CEP program meets its intended outcomes. The program is successful in achieving increased stakeholder capacity and knowledge, but the participation of governments and stakeholders is limited. The closed nature of the funding process in the Atlantic Ecosystem Initiatives (AEI), where only a restricted number of organizations are eligible to apply for funding, limits EC participation with communities. In the Okanagan-Similkameen Priority Ecosystem (PE), the CEP program has been unable to expand community participation beyond a select number of organizations. Insufficient coordination of activities in both ecosystem initiatives within the department hinders the CEP's progress towards coordinated ecosystem-based management. Progress is being made in the AEI with regard to the overarching goal of maintaining and restoring the beneficial uses and environmental quality in the region, but the evaluation was unable to

conclude to what extent this is being achieved in the Okanagan-Similkameen PE. Achievements of some outcomes were hard to assess because of the lack of a performance measurement strategy for the CEP program.

Efficiency and Economy

The evaluation found that, overall, activities and outputs of the CEP program are delivered at a low cost and that the program successfully leverages contributions from other funding sources. However, some opportunities for improvement in efficiency were identified for the Okanagan-Similkameen PE and include a need for better communication of program objectives and priorities and improving collaboration with funding recipients. The CEP program had already introduced significant organizational efficiency improvements in response to Budget 2012 commitments. For AEI, further changes to the program delivery model are being introduced. For the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, no documented evidence was found as to how the reduced resources will impact program activities going forward.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are directed to the RDG, West and North, and the RDG, Atlantic and Quebec, as the senior departmental officials responsible for the management of the CEP program.

Recommendation 1: The RDG, West and North, in consultation with the RDG, Atlantic and Quebec, should consider the development of an overarching strategic plan and associated performance measurement strategy that would allow the program to better communicate its overall objectives and report on its results.

Recommendation 2: The RDG, Atlantic and Quebec, should revisit the current closed contributions funding process in the AEI to determine whether program objectives would be better served by a competitive process that is open to a wider range and number of applicants.

Recommendation 3: The RDG, West and North, should develop and implement an operational plan for the Okanagan-Similkameen PE to better align program objectives, delivery model, expected roles, and available resources within this ecosystem.

Management Response

The responsible Regional Directors General agree with all three recommendations and have developed a management response that appropriately addresses each of the recommendations. The full management response can be found in Section 6 of the report.

1.0 Introduction

This report presents the results of the Evaluation of the Community Ecosystem Partnerships Program (sub-sub program 1.3.4.5 in EC's Program Alignment Architecture) which was conducted in order to meet the coverage requirements of the *Financial Administration Act* (for G&Cs) and the Treasury Board *Policy on Evaluation* (for direct program spending), which together require that an evaluation of all ongoing G&Cs and direct program spending be conducted at least once every five years.

The document is organized as follows: Section 2.0 provides background information on the Community Ecosystem Partnerships program. Section 3.0 presents the evaluation design, including the purpose and scope of the evaluation, as well as the methodological approach and associated challenges. Section 4.0 and 5.0 lay out, respectively, the evaluation's findings and conclusions. The recommendations and management response are presented in Section 6.0.

2.0 Background

2.1 Program Profile

The objective of the Community Ecosystem Partnerships (CEP) program is to maintain and restore the beneficial uses and environmental quality of targeted ecosystems of federal interest, by coordinating and providing oversight of initiatives in these targeted ecosystems. The CEP program uses strategic partnerships, research, science, and funding programs to support community ecosystem-based projects and partnerships and include conservation of land and shorelines, protection of land and water through special designation status, and preservation of habitat. Between 2008-2009 and 2012-2013, activities related to the CEP program were primarily delivered in two EC regions: West and North and Atlantic and Quebec.¹

An ecosystem-based approach to environmental management considers all aspects of an ecosystem – air, water, land, plants, animals, humans and their interactions – when addressing critical environmental issues. This approach also takes into account the social and economic factors relevant to ecosystem health and recovery. The ecosystem approach to delivering programs adopted by CEP program recognizes cost effectiveness, partnership-building, and other advantages of cutting across jurisdictional and program boundaries and focusing on ecosystem or watershed² outcomes. Environment Canada started applying this approach to its programs in 2007.

In 2008-2009, a departmental assessment was undertaken to analyse the status and relative risk to the health of Canadian ecosystems and to review EC's potential role in the most vulnerable areas. The internal analysis identified vulnerable ecosystems and

¹Activities in the Prairie and Northern Region related to the CEP Program, including the Northern Ecosystem Initiative, ceased in 2010-2011. The department continues, however, to undertake activities related to the Lake Winnipeg Ecosystem Initiative (sub-sub program 1.3.4.4 in EC's Program Alignment Architecture).

² Terrestrial ecosystems are frequently defined as a "watershed" or "basin", delineating the area into which waters collect or flow.

hotspots using integrated, place-based information on ecological health (air, water and biodiversity) as well as pressures and threats to create a “snapshot” of Canadian ecosystems. In 2009, the Department’s Executive Management Committee endorsed recommendations in 12 vulnerable ecosystems and hotspots³ for consideration in departmental planning beginning in 2010-2011.

Decisions about the selection of specific departmental intervention activities in targeted “hotspot” ecosystems, however, had yet to be made and it was decided that work would be consolidated under the CEP Program Alignment Architecture (PAA) element as a “transition” program for a few years, after which it was expected to be replaced by individual Ecosystem Initiatives, each with its own box in the EC PAA. Given the scale of funding allocated to the CEP program and the changing priorities related to implementing Budget 2012 commitments, however, this element has been renewed in the PAA since 2011-2012.⁴

Atlantic Ecosystem Initiatives

The Atlantic Ecosystem Initiatives (AEI) program is delivered by EC’s Atlantic and Quebec Regional Director General’s Office (RDGO) and includes a three-pronged approach: internal engagement, external engagement, and a contribution program (these three components of the approach are discussed in detail further below). It focuses on the Atlantic coastal ecozone, which encompasses all land and marine-based ecosystems within the four Atlantic Provinces and includes 40,000 kilometres of coastline, hundreds of watersheds, over 1,000 estuaries and more than 450,000 hectares of salt marshes, estuarine flats, saline ponds, and islands. Projects undertaken under AEI fall under one or more of these key priorities: nearshore water quality; habitat and biodiversity loss; and the impacts of climate change.

Due to the scientific and jurisdictional complexity of the Atlantic coastal ecozone, AEI’s focus is on collaborative partnerships with other levels of government, communities and other stakeholder groups, to leverage investments and more efficiently coordinate actions. A significant challenge in addressing priority environmental issues throughout the Atlantic coastal ecozone is bridging multiple and overlapping jurisdictions in an increasingly active area of development. These challenges are complicated by overlapping mandates of both federal and provincial departments and agencies. EC’s Atlantic and Quebec RDGO developed a strategy to guide the engagement of internal and external staff, management and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of the AEI. In addition to identifying formal mechanisms for engagement and subsequent collaboration, the strategy also highlights the importance of informal opportunities for the development of strong working relationships in support of effective partnerships.

³ These included: Atlantic coastal region; Okanagan/Similkameen region, Headwater Glaciers/Columbia headwaters, Prince Rupert Gateway, Mackenzie Valley and Delta, Beaufort Sea, Prairie/ Mixed Grassland Ecoregion, Hudson Plains Coastal Wetlands, Lake Winnipeg /Lake of the Woods; Georgia Basin, St. Lawrence and Great Lakes.

⁴The evaluation did not investigate the relevance of the 12 hotspots to determine whether these were still appropriate.

Internal Engagement

The AEI aims to build strategic partnerships within the department and to identify and facilitate formal and informal approaches to collaboration and coordination among existing program activities, in order to identify issues/threats, gaps and opportunities for collaborative work in advancing an ecosystem approach. These included the AEI Inter-Branch Team, the Atlantic Environment Canada Council (AECC), and joint management meetings.

External Engagement

The objective of external engagement activities is to identify opportunities and build strategic partnerships in order to integrate the Department's ecosystem-based management initiatives with those of other governing departments and agencies. External engagement attempts to clarify respective mandates, roles, and responsibilities for environmental issues of mutual interest, and identify issues, threats, and gaps in governance in the four priority geographic areas.⁵ These external mechanisms include:

- the Maritimes Regional Committee on Coastal and Ocean Management (RCCOM), a senior executive forum to provide oversight, coordination, and direction to the planning and management processes related to integrated oceans and coastal management in the Maritime provinces;
- the Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment (GOMC), a U.S.-Canadian partnership of government and non-government organizations working to maintain and enhance environmental quality in the Gulf of Maine to allow for sustainable resource use by existing and future generations;
- bi-Lateral meetings with other government departments and agencies; and
- the Atlantic Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on Environmental Cooperation: Water Annex Work Plan (ended in June 2013).

Contribution Program

The AEI provides funding support through a contribution program, formerly known as the Atlantic Coastal Action Program (ACAP). ACAP was a unique community-based program initiated by Environment Canada in 1991 to help Atlantic Canadians restore and sustain local watersheds and adjacent coastal areas. In the mid-2000s, the ACAP evolved from single watersheds to a more ecosystem-based approach, and the name was changed to the Atlantic Ecosystem Initiatives. The contributions component of the AEI currently works with a fixed number of non-government organizations to collect and analyze data to promote integrated planning and decision-making at all levels, and support projects and initiatives that will improve ecosystem health. AEI is not subject to an open competitive process, but focuses on a closed list of eligible organizations. Currently, there are 18 recipients, which include 14 multi-stakeholder community organizations⁶ in the four Atlantic Provinces and four regional coalitions,⁷ whose work

⁵ These are: the Northumberland Strait (between Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia), the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy, the Halifax coastal zone and Labrador.

⁶ These are: ACAP Cape Breton Inc., Bluenose Coastal Action Foundation, Clean Annapolis River Project, ACAP Saint John Inc., Eastern Charlotte Waterways Inc., Miramichi River Environmental Assessment Committee, Société d'aménagement de la rivière Madawaska et du lac Témiscouata, Quoddy Futures

targets larger ecosystems within the Gulf of Maine, the Southern Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy.

Okanagan-Similkameen PE

In the department's West and North, the Ecosystem Coordination Office (ECO) coordinated an ecosystem-based approach in the Okanagan-Similkameen, focusing on key implementation activities and building ecosystem knowledge. The ECO was also involved in implementing key legacy projects in the Georgia Basin, and in supporting national program work plans in the Prince Rupert Gateway, Columbia Glacier Headwaters, and Mountain Pine Beetle area.

In 2012, as a result of organizational efficiency improvements to realize cost-savings in response to Budget 2012 commitments, the ECO was reduced to a single employee and was placed within the Regional Analysis and Relationships unit. In the near term, the ECO analyst is expected to work to establish the internal and external networks (e.g., the Okanagan Basin Water Board [OBWB], the Okanagan Collaborative Conservation Program [OCCP], and the Fraser Basin Council) required to build and assimilate baseline and trend information on the status of the ecosystem in the Okanagan-Similkameen region, and identify short-term solutions within current resources. These networks are also essential to help identify gaps in essential information needed to understand the carrying capacity of the ecosystem, prioritize key projects to improve knowledge (e.g., providing funding to support the development and execution of the Water Supply and Demand Study and collaborating with the OBWB on a lake evaporation study), and lead to multi-stakeholder projects to address ecosystem issues and threats in the longer term. Longer-term objectives include engaging in commitments previously identified through these networks and pursuing new network partners to address emerging issues and priorities.

Some of the key activities undertaken by EC's West and North in support of the Okanagan-Similkameen ecosystem-based initiative include the following.

Supporting Science and Research

In order to improve its understanding of the risks, threats and opportunities to improve ecosystem health in the Okanagan-Similkameen, the ECO analysis strives to collaborate with departmental partners and with other federal, provincial, regional and First Nations partners. Activities includesupporting the completion of a Lake Evaporation Study in the Okanagan Basin to acquire the necessary data to support future water use decisions, working with regional partners to identify opportunities for collaboration on science and research projects, and identifying funding options to support plans.

Developing and Monitoring Ecosystem Status and Trends

In order to effectively intervene in the region, it is necessary to work to establish an agreed-upon set of indicators to monitor ecological health. These indicators need to be

Foundation, Humber Arm Environmental Assoc. Inc., Central Labrador Environmental Action Network, Labrador Southeast Coastal Action Program, Northeast Avalon ACAP, Bedeque Bay Environmental Management Association Inc.; and Southeast Environmental Association.

⁷ These are: Atlantic Coastal Zone Information Steering Committee; Bay of Fundy Ecosystem Partnership; Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment; and Southern Gulf of St. Lawrence Coalition on Sustainability. Pictou Harbour Environmental Protection Project and Sable Island Preservation Trust also received AEI funding, but ceased operation in 2011, and no longer received funding.

aligned with other departmental work on indicators, such as the Canadian Environmental Sustainability Indicators and the Canadian Biodiversity: Ecosystem Status and Trends report. In addition, the ECO analyst works with federal and regional counterparts to ensure that monitoring is consistent with that used for other Priority Ecosystem work. Activities include participating in the national working group to establish a common approach to measuring ecosystem health and reviewing existing data sources and indicator work specific to the Okanagan-Similkameen.

Coordinating and Monitoring EC's Activities in the Okanagan-Similkameen

There is a need to better coordinate EC's internal activities in the Okanagan-Similkameen to ensure that strategic objectives direct activities from individual EC Branches and that the department is realizing efficiencies in its program delivery while providing integrated service to the stakeholders in the region. ECO activities include coordinating internal working groups on the Okanagan-Similkameen to promote linkages and integrate activities where possible, and participating in priority setting and management initiatives that promote increased involvement in the Okanagan-Similkameen.

Establishing, managing and participating in governance mechanisms in the Okanagan-Similkameen

EC has the mandate to lead and participate in integrated governance mechanisms related to environmental research and management. There are a range of other federal departments that EC currently partners with to better understand and manage issues in the regions. These include, but are not limited to, Agriculture and Agri-Foods Canada (AAFC), the Department of National Defence (DND), Transport Canada (TC), the Parks Canada Agency (PCA), and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO).

The Province of British Columbia is a particularly important partner in the region due to its role as the lead for water allocation, water planning tools, and drinking water protection plans. The province was also the lead for the establishment of the 1996 Okanagan Lake Action Plan, a 20 year plan that attempts to address all the physical and biological factors that influence Okanagan Lake and the Kokanee fresh water fish populations that inhabit it. While EC does engage frequently with the province, there is no formal agreement to work together on environmental issues related specifically to the Okanagan-Similkameen.

The Province has also established the Okanagan Water Basin Board (OBWB), a specialized body that governs water management in the Okanagan. The OBWB has the authority to act on water management issues of Basin-wide significance. The Board has representatives from the three districts in the region and First Nations. The OBWB further established the Water Stewardship Council (WSC) to provide independent technical advice and policy recommendations to inform its decision-making. Members of the WSC are from a diverse group of stakeholders, including EC. Participation on the WSC allows EC to reinforce its role as a provider of impartial advice to improve decision-making by local governance authorities.

Activities include establishing a federal working group and work plan for the Okanagan/Similkameen in order to ensure linkages and leverage science and research resources, developing an EC engagement strategy for key stakeholders in the Okanagan-Similkameen in order to better understand ecosystem issues and engage partners in on-going initiatives, and examining options for a federal-provincial working group on issues related to the Okanagan-Similkameen.

Over the longer term, the program intends to establish itself as the EC lead for ecosystem issues and knowledge in the Okanagan-Similkameen. The program aims to advance the departmental profile in the region, and establish the foundation for future strategic investments in order to have a positive impact on the overall environmental health of the ecosystem.

2.2 Governance and Management

The CEP program contributes to the department's strategic outcome: "Canada's natural environment is conserved and restored for present and future generations".

Accountability for the program rests with the RDG, West and North, and RDG, Atlantic and Quebec, with direct oversight of the AEI provided by the Associate RDG, Atlantic and Quebec. Prior to 2012, the Department operated under an organizational structure that included 6 regions (PYR, PNR, Ontario, Quebec, Atlantic and the National Capital Region). Since 2012-2013, the PYR and PNR have been combined into a single West and North, led by the former RDG, PYR (now RDG, West and North), while the Quebec and Atlantic regions have been combined into a single Atlantic and Quebec organization, led by the former RDG, Quebec (now RDG, Atlantic and Quebec).

There are also cross governance mechanisms in place:

- A working group consisting of Directors General from various Environment Canada programs was established to inform DGs of work under 1.3.4, Ecosystem Initiatives, and to coordinate their programs' efforts in support of ecosystem initiatives. The CEP program was tasked with preparing updates on the results of CEP initiatives for this working group. Although this group is still officially in existence, it has not met in over two years, due to changing Branch priorities from implementing Budget 2012 commitments.
- Prior to 2012, regular meetings were held between RDGs and Directors of Strategic Integration.⁸ These were initially set up to review Priority Ecosystems Analysis results, but they had also been used to prepare material for Deputy Minister presentations related to proposed EC interventions under ecosystem initiatives.
- The Atlantic and Quebec RDGO had established an informal Inter-Branch Team, which provided a forum for sharing information about activities taking place in the Atlantic Region, worked collaboratively to support the implementation of an ecosystem-based approach to environmental management in the Region, and identified gaps and opportunities to better coordinate and/or align EC programs, services and interventions addressing the three environmental priorities (i.e., nearshore water quality; habitat and biodiversity loss; and the impacts of climate change). Members included one representative from each of the departmental branches that carried out activities in the Atlantic Region, as well as representatives from headquarters. This group ceased activities in 2012 as part of the organizational efficiency improvements to realize cost-savings in response to Budget 2012 commitments.

⁸ Each of the three regions involved had its own structural arrangement. The Atlantic region's Strategic Integration Directorate, the PYR's Strategic Integration Office, and the PNR's Strategic Integration and Partnerships Unit. These units were responsible for coordinating the activities of their respective ecosystem initiatives.

2.3 Resource Allocation

Table 1 provides a summary of financial information for this PAA element. This information references expenditures for the period from 2008-2009 to 2012-2013. Financial data for both the Okanagan-Similkameen PE and AEI are not clearly differentiated from expenditures stemming from other regional activities (e.g., Coast Salish gatherings, Georgia Basin legacy projects) due to the manner in which expenditures are coded into the departmental financial system. This is especially the case for salary and O&M expenditures. However, the evaluation was able to differentiate contribution expenditures specifically related to the two initiatives examined. Between 2008-2009 and 2012-2013, the AEI provided \$6,670,292 in contribution funding (a total of 101 projects). Between 2009-2010⁹ and 2012-2013, the Okanagan-Similkameen PE provided \$308,959 (a total of 8 projects).

Table 1: Expenditures – CEP program, 2008-2009 to 2012-2013

	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
West and North regional activities related to community ecosystem partnerships						
FTE	4.04	3.58	4.52	3.40	0.90	
Salary	\$295,395	\$236,609	\$363,105	\$275,359	\$142,229	\$1,312,697
O&M	\$175,321	\$107,973	\$140,165	\$115,662	\$166,300	\$705,421
Capital	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Contributions ¹⁰	\$159,500	\$223,000	\$220,000	\$324,959	\$166,859	\$1,094,318
Total	\$630,216	\$567,582	\$723,270	\$715,980	\$475,388	\$3,112,436
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Atlantic regional activities related to community ecosystem partnerships						
FTE	6.24	5.94	6.21	5.30	2.30	
Salary	\$506,862	\$520,155	\$550,960	\$427,416	\$320,681	\$2,326,074
O&M	\$257,044	\$209,273	\$76,838	\$82,196	\$59,609	\$684,960
Capital	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Contributions	\$1,439,441	\$1,395,000	\$1,395,000	\$1,369,400	\$1,513,576	\$7,112,417
Total	\$2,203,347	\$2,124,428	\$2,022,798	\$1,879,012	\$1,893,866	\$10,123,451
Total	\$2,833,563	\$2,692,010	\$2,746,068	\$2,594,992	\$2,369,254	\$13,235,887

Source: Environment Canada's Finance Branch.

⁹Contributions administered under the Okanagan-Similkameen Priority Ecosystem started in 2009-2010.

¹⁰Contributions administered under both the Okanagan-Similkameen Priority Ecosystem and the Atlantic Ecosystem Initiative fall under the umbrella contribution program "Contributions to Support Sustainable Ecosystems."

2.4 Program Logic Model

A program logic model is a representation of the overall activities, outputs and expected outcomes of the CEP program. Prior to the start of this evaluation, no CEP-level program logic model existed, but it was developed by the evaluation team in collaboration with program representatives as part of the evaluation's planning phase. Efforts were made to ensure that the newly developed logic model was an appropriate tool for assessing performance for the CEP program by basing it on existing performance documents and program descriptions (e.g., the departmental performance measurement framework), and developing and validating the logic model in consultation with the Evaluation Committee. The draft evaluation plan, including the logic model, was also shared with senior management in the fall of 2013. The CEP program logic model can be found in Annex 2 of this report.

3.0 Evaluation Design

3.1 Purpose and Scope

The Evaluation of Community Ecosystem Partnerships (sub-sub program 1.3.4.5 in EC's Program Alignment Architecture) was identified in the 2013 Departmental Risk-Based Audit and Evaluation Plan, which was approved by the Deputy Minister in the spring of 2013. The evaluation was conducted between September 2013 and March 2014 in order to meet evaluation coverage requirements of the Financial Administration Act (for G&Cs) and the Treasury Board *Policy on Evaluation* (for direct program spending), which require that an evaluation of all ongoing G&Cs and direct program spending, respectively, be conducted once every five years.

The purpose of this evaluation was to assess the relevance and performance (including effectiveness, efficiency and economy) of the CEP program. The CEP program represents 0.29% of the department's 2013-2014 direct program spending (DPS), including G&Cs. The evaluation covered the five year time frame from 2008-2009 to 2012-2013 and focused on two regional programs within the CEP program: The AEI and the Okanagan-Similkameen PE. It should be noted that the evaluation did not examine all G&Cs in the West and North Region, only those related to the Okanagan-Similkameen PE (approximately 28% of all G&Cs disbursed by the CEP program in the region). Given that ecosystem activities in the Prairie and Northern Region ceased in 2010-2011, these were not examined in this evaluation.

3.2 Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The methodological approach and level of effort for this evaluation were determined using a risk-based approach. The following data collection methodologies were developed to adequately address the evaluation issues and questions. Evidence gathered was then used to develop overall findings and conclusions.¹¹

¹¹Data collection instruments for each methodology are contained in a Data Collection Instruments technical appendix, under separate cover.

Document Review

A document review was conducted as part of the evaluation. Key documents were gathered, listed in an inventory and then each document was assessed in terms of its contribution to each of the evaluation questions and corresponding indicators. Information was captured for analysis using a document review template. Key documents reviewed for the purposes of this evaluation included Government of Canada and Departmental publications (e.g., Speech from the Throne, Departmental Performance Reports), internal CEP documents on program priorities, processes and governance structure, strategic plans for AEI and Okanagan-Similkameen programs, and overviews of individual funded projects.

Administrative File Review

The review of contribution files included such items as contribution agreements, project activity reporting, financial files (e.g., requests for payment, cash flow statements, recipients' accounting of expenditures), as well as progress and final reports. The review of project-level files and data was intended to fill gaps in the program documents, files and data. The file review included a sample of 24 (out of 101) contribution agreements under AEI and 8 (out of 8) under the Okanagan-Similkameen initiative. The review assessed the extent to which projects funded under these CEP initiatives achieved their expected outcomes and whether their activities were undertaken in an efficient and economical manner.

Key Informant Interviews

Key informant interviews were conducted with 33 respondents to gather detailed information related to all evaluation questions and issues. Interviews were conducted by telephone using a semi-structured interview guide tailored to the specific respondent group. The following provides a breakdown of the interviewees: program staff and management (n=13); internal Environment Canada partners (in Atlantic and Quebec and West and North) (n=5); federal partners (n=1); provincial partners (n=4); project funding recipients (e.g., non-governmental organizations) (n=9); and unfunded proponents (n=2).¹²

All relevant stakeholder perspectives were considered. The evaluation methodology provided a balanced blend of views on program performance, as over 60% of interviewees were not directly accountable for the program's delivery and almost 50% were external to the Department.

3.3 Limitations

Challenges experienced during the conduct of the evaluation, the related limitations and strategies used to mitigate their impact are outlined below:

- The Ecosystems Coordination Office (ECO) of the West and North Region has been affected by reductions stemming from Budget 2012, which reduced program staff from between 3.4 and 4.5 FTEs in previous years to 0.9 of an FTE. The AEI program experienced reductions from 6.2 FTEs in 2008-2009 to 2.3 FTEs in 2013-2014. This has limited the number of perspectives about the program from current staff, further complicated by the fact that much of the current responsibility for the program is carried by individuals new to the program, and hence possessing only limited

¹² Both proponents submitted proposals to the Okanagan-Similkameen PE.

corporate memory. This evaluation challenge was mitigated by data collected through the document and file review.

- As previously mentioned in Section 2.3, financial data for both the Okanagan-Similkameen and Atlantic Ecosystem Initiatives are not clearly differentiated from expenditures stemming from other regional activities due to the manner in which expenditures are coded in the departmental financial system. As a result, the evaluation was unable to undertake any financial analysis to assess the administrative efficiency of each initiative. Data collected through the document review and key informant interviews were used to assess the overall efficiency of each initiative.
- The Okanagan-Similkameen PE does not have formal performance mechanisms that can be used to assess the level of achievement of expected outcomes. The evaluation mitigated this limitation to some extent by examining project-level performance data from funded projects, data collected through the document review, and anecdotal evidence provided through key informant interviews.

4.0 Findings

This section presents the findings of this evaluation by evaluation issue (relevance and performance) and by the related evaluation questions. For each evaluation question, a rating is provided based on a judgment of the evaluation findings. The rating statements and their significance are outlined below in Table 2. A summary of ratings for the evaluation issues and questions is presented in Annex 1: Summary of Findings.

Table 2: Definitions of Standard Rating Statements

Statement	Definition
Acceptable	The program has demonstrated that it has met the expectations with respect to the issue area.
Opportunity for Improvement	The program has demonstrated that it has made adequate progress to meet the expectations with respect to the issue area, but continued improvement can still be made.
Attention Required	The program has not demonstrated that it has made adequate progress to meet the expectations with respect to the issue area and attention is needed on a priority basis.
Not applicable	There is no expectation that the program would have addressed the evaluation issue.

4.1 Relevance

Continued Need for Program

Evaluation Issue: Relevance	Rating
1. Is there a continued need for the program?	Acceptable

- i) **In the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, continuing rapid population growth and economic development in the region have led to significant threats to water availability and habitat loss thus demonstrating a need for careful**

management of the ecosystem to avoid further degradation and foster restoration.

- Evidence from the document review demonstrates that the Okanagan-Similkameen is a unique region of Canada, recognized provincially and nationally as a 'biodiversity hotspot' and for the rarity of species (approximately 50 native species are listed as being at risk) and habitat. The mild continental and arid environment of the Okanagan-Similkameen makes it well suited for agriculture (ranching and vineyards) and attractive to developers. This combined interest has resulted in intensive urban and agricultural development, which in turn drives water demand and challenges supply. Development has resulted in significant habitat loss and degradation, with accompanying impacts to species.¹³ These factors suggest that careful management of the ecosystem is needed to avoid further degradation and foster restoration.
- According to the *Canada Water Act* Water Availability Indicators (WAI),¹⁴ the threat to water availability in the Okanagan Valley is rated "medium" (between 20% and 40%) based on the OECD classifications, indicating that poor water availability was a constraint on development, and significant investment was needed to provide adequate water supply to meet demand.
- A 2009 EC study looking at water availability identified the Okanagan Valley as a high threat (meaning that more than 40%¹⁵ of the water in rivers was withdrawn for human use).¹⁶
- A study on the effects of human population growth on the Okanagan River Valley recognized the Basin as one of Canada's three most endangered natural systems due, in large part, to recent urban and agricultural development, dams, diversions and river channelization. The study concludes that the Okanagan has the highest ratio of population to water supply in Canada¹⁷, current water consumption is not sustainable, and water quantities are too low to meet human and ecosystem needs.¹⁸
- Evidence from the document review is corroborated by findings from key informant interviews. Interviewees unanimously stated that there is a continued need for the CEP program in the Okanagan-Similkameen. Among the reasons cited were the pressures in Okanagan-Similkameen stemming from population growth in the region and accompanying increased demand on resources such as water and land (for farming, vineyards, roads), as well as the presence of a significant number of endangered species in the region that need protecting.

ii) In the Atlantic Ecosystem Initiatives, the program needs to collect scientific data and research that focus on the entire Region, as issues related to

¹³2013 Okanagan Basin Water Board Annual Report.

¹⁴ Water availability indicator is derived by calculating the ratio of water demand to water availability at the sub-drainage area scale (representing 164 watersheds across Canada) on an annual basis. The WAI is presented in maps and graphs at a national scale, but is also intended to be regionally relevant. For more information, please see: <https://www.ec.gc.ca/eau-water/default.asp?lang=En&n=2DC058F1-1>.

¹⁵<http://www.ec.gc.ca/indicateurs-indicators/default.asp?lang=en&n=1B1433B4-1>

¹⁶<http://www.ec.gc.ca/indicateurs-indicators/default.asp?lang=en&n=FCFA75B2-1>

¹⁷The region's population is estimated to increase by more than 1.5% per year to reach in excess of 108,000 people by 2013 and 445,600 people by 2035 (Statistics Canada, 2011 Census of Population).

¹⁸ 2013 Okanagan Basin Water Board Annual Report.

water quality, watershed health and climate change which impact coastal areas transcend provincial boundaries.

- In the Atlantic ecozone (encompassing the four Atlantic Provinces) the intrinsic links between the coast, its biodiversity, settlement patterns, human use, and economy have resulted in increased unsustainable pressures (e.g., untreated or partially treated sewage discharge, eutrophication and red tides, increase in invasive species) on the health of the coastal ecosystem.¹⁹ Key impacts on the health of the coast also result from land-based activities which originate up streams and rivers that then drain into the Atlantic Ocean. Finally, the impacts of climate change from rising sea levels, extreme weather and storm surge events are currently being felt and pose significant current and future risks to coastal areas.²⁰
- There was overwhelming support from all interviewees for the continued need of the AEI and its support of science and research.²¹ The main reasons cited for continued need for the program were: a) limited science capacity, baseline information, information sharing and knowledge of all existing data related to the Atlantic ecozone; b) a lack of compatibility of data and protocols; and c) limited long-term data on ecosystem health status and trends in the Region.
- Interviewees noted that in the absence of scientific data and research (related to such issues as water quality and quantity) generate through the AEI program, there would be a paucity of information on which the federal government could base its ecosystem management decisions in the Region, thus increasing the cost and time it takes to complete projects. For example, the AEI indirectly supports the Canadian Shellfish Sanitation Program at the local level through the work undertaken by eligible organizations that measure and monitor water quality. Others felt that there would also be disconnects between regional priorities and how they translate into national policy, as EC would have less information about what is going on in the regions.
- Although various other federal, provincial and private funding programs exist,²² those funding programs have very specific sets of objectives (e.g., provincial funding programs bound by geography; DFO's funding program focuses on recreational fisheries), key informant interviewees suggested that a more holistic ecosystem-based approach is needed to address broader water issues in the Region, such as the restoration, enhancement and improvement of water quality and watersheds, monitoring and measuring water quality across the Region, or long-term planning through the development of comprehensive environmental management plans.

¹⁹ Environment Canada. Atlantic Ecosystem Initiatives Strategic Plan: 2011-2014. March 2012.

²⁰ Environment Canada. Internal document on the Atlantic Ecosystem Initiatives dated January 7th, 2011.

²¹ While there is no obligation on the part of the funded recipient organizations to share data and research generated from funded projects with Environment Canada, in most cases funded recipients provided final project reports summarizing research findings. AEI shared these reports to relevant divisions within the Department (e.g., Science and Technology Branch for water quality projects, Canadian Wildlife Service for climate change projects), but did so on an ad hoc basis, as the dissemination of results was not systematically built into the program. An annual report describing the types of projects funded by the AEI was also produced and distributed in the Department each year until 2009-2010. As of 2010-2011, the annual reports presented information about the overall project results.

²² Examples of other funding programs include the Prince Edward Island Watershed Management Fund, Royal Bank of Canada Bluewater Fund, Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) Recreational Fisheries Partnership Program, Nova Scotia Climate Change fund, and New Brunswick Environmental Trust Fund.

Alignment with Federal Priorities

Evaluation Issue: Relevance	Rating
2. Is the program aligned to federal government priorities?	Acceptable

The activities of the CEP program are consistent with federal and departmental priorities related to ecosystem health improvements and maintaining water quality and availability, and are aligned with Canada's Federal Sustainable Development Strategy (FSDS).

- At the broadest level, activities under the CEP program contribute to “protecting the health and environment of Canadians”, which was identified as a key government priority in the 2011 Budget.
- One of the goals of Canada's Federal Sustainable Development Strategy is maintaining water quality and availability. Specifically, the Government of Canada is committed to ensuring that everyone has access to a reliable and secure supply of clean water, and that water resources are used both economically and ecologically.²³ This includes a focus on cooperating on ecosystem initiatives, such as lake evaporation in the Okanagan ecosystem,²⁴ and investments to improve the understanding of the factors that influence water availability in EC's West and North Region, such as funding to the OBWB for their Water Supply and Demand Study, a multiyear water resource assessment carried out in partnership by the OBWB and the BC Ministry of Environment.
- Using the ecosystem approach, the AEI is also an important mechanism to assist in achieving FSDS national goals and objectives within Atlantic Canada, specifically focusing on maintaining water quality and management in coastal ecosystems and adjacent watersheds.²⁵
- The Government of Canada's Jobs Growth and Long-term Prosperity Economic Action Plan (Budget 2012) further confirms CEP's alignment with federal government priorities. The document states “the Government is working together with partners to protect and restore Canada's water resources for the benefit of all Canadians. Going forward, the Government will continue to pursue water quality and ecosystem health improvements in lakes and other bodies of water”.²⁶

Alignment with Federal Roles and Responsibilities

Evaluation Issue: Relevance	Rating
3. Is the program consistent with federal roles and responsibilities?	Acceptable

²³ For more details, please see: *Planning for a Sustainable Future: a Federal Sustainable Development Strategy for Canada: 2013–2016*.

²⁴ *Ibid.* Pg. 54.

²⁵ *Planning for a Sustainable Future: A Federal Sustainable Development Strategy for Canada* (October, 2010) (<http://www.ec.gc.ca/dd-sd/default.asp?lang=En&n=F93CD795-1>).

²⁶ Government of Canada. Jobs Growth and Long-Term Prosperity. Economic Action Plan 2012 (Budget 2012), March 20, 2012.

The activities of the CEP program are consistent with federal roles and responsibilities, including roles and responsibilities as outlined in the *Department of the Environment Act* and the *Canada Water Act*.

- Environment Canada’s CEP program is consistent with departmental roles and responsibilities as they are described in the *Department of the Environment Act*, which outlines the Department’s responsibility for the “coordination of the policies and programs of the Government of Canada respecting the preservation and enhancement of the quality of the natural environment.”²⁷
- EC is the federal agency responsible for the collection, interpretation and dissemination of standardized water quality data and information in Canada. EC also has a mandate for science and research on water quality issues, particularly as it relates to impacts on groundwater, sustainability, climate change and biodiversity. Both the AEI and Okanagan-Similkameen PE’s activities have focused on water issues, and their results are presented in the *Canada Water Act* annual reports.²⁸
- CEP program activities also focus on addressing water issues that are transboundary (inter-provincial and international) in nature, and there is therefore a need to involve the federal government, which can more effectively address these issues. The AEI encompasses ecosystems located in all four Atlantic Provinces, including the Bay of Fundy/Gulf of Maine (shared with the State of Maine). The Okanagan-Similkameen region is connected to the Columbia River system in Washington State.

4.2 Performance

Achievement of Intended Outcomes

Evaluation Issue: Performance	Rating
4. To what extent have intended outcomes been achieved as a result of the program?	Opportunity for Improvement

- i) **Direct Outcome 1: Opportunity for Improvement**
 Increased participation of governments and stakeholders in activities contributing to the goals and objectives identified in ecosystem-based management plans or to achieve ecosystem objectives

Despite some progress, increased participation of governments and stakeholders continues to be an area needing improvement. In the Atlantic and Quebec Region, the program’s contribution to this outcome is not as strong as in the past, due primarily to the closed funding process, as well as decreasing EC participation with community organizations. In the West and North Region, some progress has also been made to engage external organizations, though interviewees feel that

²⁷ Justice Canada (1985) *Department of the Environment Act*. <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/E-10/FullText.html>.

²⁸Please see for example the *Canada Water Act* Annual Report April 2012-March 2013 available at: <http://www.ec.gc.ca/eau-water/default.asp?lang=En&n=FDB0F45A-1>.

the program has not been able to increase participation beyond a select group of regional organizations.

- In 2012-2013,²⁹ AEI project activities resulted in environmental actions undertaken by 14 community groups and all 4 provinces (as funding contributors). Furthermore, funding led to over 320 workshops, sessions and events, and community volunteers donated some 14,000 hours to the accomplishment of 52 AEI projects. Without the existence of performance targets against which to compare the performance data collected, however, it is difficult to assess the adequacy of this progress.
- One of the biggest impediments to greater participation is felt to be AEI's current approach to funding only a limited number of prescribed organizations. A few interviewees noted that while there are other non-funded groups whose projects would be eligible, EC's consistent funding of the same groups for the past 15 to 20 years has meant the funded groups no longer engage other stakeholders.
- Funding recipients generally feel that it is a difficult process to get project volunteers, especially during an economic downturn. One funded recipient noted that, since the "window"³⁰ has disappeared, EC is not contributing to increasing project participation to the extent it had in the past. In addition, EC has stopped holding annual workshops with funded recipients to increase awareness of regional activities.
- The Okanagan-Similkameen PE has made efforts to increase participation by working with different organizations and groups like the OBWB, the OCCP, and the Fraser Basin Council. Although the ability to increase participation is asked, but not required, of groups that receive funding, a few interviewees indicated that the program has not been able to increase participation beyond a select number of partners.
- A few interviewees feel that, overall, the program needs to be more directly engaged with regional groups undertaking activities aligned with the program's objectives, especially if the program aims to establish itself as the EC lead for ecosystem issues and knowledge in the Okanagan-Similkameen. As a result, these interviewees did not feel that the program contributed to increased participation in activities related to ecosystem health.
- It should be noted, however, that the file review revealed that the Okanagan-Similkameen PE has been linked to a few of these regional groups. For example, CEP funding was provided in 2009-2010 to support the work of the South Okanagan-Similkameen Conservation Program (SOSCP)³¹ and, since 2010-2011, the CEP has provided funding via the Allan Brooks Nature Centre for the activities undertaken by OCCP.³² In addition, the CEP West and North Ecosystem Analyst sits on the Steering Committee for the OCCP, which provides opportunity for further

²⁹Environment Canada. The Atlantic Ecosystem Initiative: 2012-2013 Year in Review.

³⁰A "window" was a departmental representative who participated on the Board of Directors of an AEI community organization as an ex-officio member, working one-on-one with the organization to provide assistance in developing project proposals and plans. The individual was also available to address any questions the organization had throughout the process and served as a conduit for information flow and the pursuit of common priorities.

³¹Per the Contribution Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Regional District Okanagan-Similkameen, effective November 2009.

³²Per the Contribution Agreements between the Government of Canada and the Allan Brooks Nature Centre.

engagement of key stakeholders also on the committee and identification of areas of potential further partnerships.

ii) **Direct Outcome 2: Acceptable**

Increased stakeholder capacity and knowledge

The CEP program is contributing to increased stakeholder capacity and knowledge. In the Atlantic and Quebec Region, project activities have led to the sharing of knowledge and capacity through workshops and other events, as well as the sharing of tools developed through program funding across regional organizations. In the West and North Region, program activities have contributed to a better understanding of water availability issues in the Region through the Okanagan Water Supply and Demand Study and Lake Evaporation Study.

- In 2012-2013, 15,400 AEI information products, such as pamphlets and booklets, were distributed to over 20,000 individuals. Furthermore, 5,600 individuals attended 320 training and information workshops, sessions and events on topics such as the impacts of climate change on coastal communities, environmental indicators, educational activities for students, geographic information management systems, water quality monitoring, updates of funded organizations' strategic management plans, and others. Funding also led to the creation of 74 jobs (including 22 student jobs).
- AEI-funded projects also led to the development of knowledge and capacity that have been shared with other groups. For example, Saint Mary's University in Halifax is expanding the ability of community groups to do standardized water quality monitoring by providing a simple water quality monitoring kit that produces immediate results and teaching a standard protocol to ensure that results are accurate and comparable. According to interviewees, by expanding this idea to the four Atlantic Provinces, EC is now able to collect data in a consistent manner across the entire Atlantic Region.
- In the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, interviewees feel that capacity and knowledge have increased to a moderate extent. For example, EC provided funding to support the development and execution of the Water Supply and Demand Study,³³ which aims to determine the inputs and outputs of water in the West and North Region. This study defines the parameters around which decisions could be made in the Okanagan Basin, and has drawn individuals from government, industry, and local community groups.
- The Okanagan-Similkameen PE program is also collaborating with the OBWB on a lake evaporation study, which is presently underway. This had been identified by regional academia and local government partners as a key data gap in the accuracy of water prediction modeling processes.

³³ The Okanagan Water Supply and Demand Project is the most advanced water resource assessment ever conducted in Canada, using the latest models and computer technology to estimate Okanagan water availability, taking into account climate change and population growth. The Project includes studies on groundwater, stream-flows, environmental water needs, and water use – balancing water supplies and water demands through a computer accounting model.

iii) **Intermediate Outcome: Attention Required**
Coordinated ecosystem-based management

Evidence shows that significant improvements are necessary in both regions in order to establish coordinated ecosystem-based management of environmental issues.

- There was little evidence of coordination of activities found taking place within the department related to community ecosystem partnerships in the West and North and Atlantic and Quebec regions. Although a DG working group was established to inform DGs within the department of work taking place under sub-program 1.3.4, Ecosystem Initiatives, it has not met in at least two years due to changing Branch priorities while implementing Budget 2012 commitments. In the Atlantic and Quebec, an Inter-Branch Team was established to work collaboratively and support the implementation of an ecosystem approach in the region by sharing information, identifying gaps and opportunities, and providing guidance. Since the Budget 2012 reductions were implemented, however, the team no longer exists. In the West and North, there was no evidence provided of coordination activities being undertaken. Some interviewees were confused as to what role the program was expected to carry out in terms of coordination among regional partners.
- Funding recipients feel that, prior to 2009-2010, the AEI did a better job of ensuring coordinated ecosystem-based management through strong participation in networking activities, such as bi-annual ACAP member meetings where groups would exchange information on projects. Recipients also have the sense that there was increased coordination across the Region, which allowed for more interactions, collaboration and sharing of experiences between the groups.
- In 2005, EC convinced regional governments to take a more coordinated approach to regional development and to water management. This led to the development of the Okanagan Sustainable Water Strategy in 2008, a comprehensive guide to sustainable water management practices. As previously mentioned, however, the Okanagan-Similkameen PE is presently working with the OBWB, the regional body that governs water management in the Okanagan-Similkameen basin, on the Okanagan Water Supply and Demand Study.

iv) **Final Outcome: Opportunity for Improvement**
Beneficial uses and environmental quality of targeted ecosystems of federal interest are maintained or restored

The evidence points to progress being made in the Atlantic and Quebec Region regarding the maintenance and restoration of beneficial uses and environmental quality, although it is too early to conclude whether this outcome will be achieved in the Okanagan-Similkameen PE.

- According to AEI program staff and management, beneficial uses and environmental quality of targeted ecosystems in the Atlantic and Quebec Region have been maintained or restored to a moderate extent. For instance, the AEI 2012-2013 annual report indicates that 84 hectares of habitat were conserved (land and shoreline), 7,340 hectares were protected through special designation status, 718 landowners and resource users participated in habitat protection, and 70 kilometres of shoreline were preserved or restored (among other environmental results). As mentioned previously, without the existence of performance targets

against which to compare the performance data collected, however, it is difficult to assess the adequacy of these results.

- Staff and management also indicated that the program’s contribution to this outcome could have been greater if more groups were able to apply for funding. In their view, it would be far better to work with the provinces and a larger pool of organizations in order to target other areas dealing with similar environmental issues in the Atlantic and Quebec Region.
- With respect to Okanagan-Similkameen PE, it is too early to determine whether the program is making progress toward the final program outcome, although progress toward the final outcome may be in question given current resource constraints and challenges surrounding the achievement of immediate and intermediate outcomes.

v) External Factors

- The file review of projects funded by both the AEI and Okanagan-Similkameen PE revealed that the most frequently noted external factors influencing the achievement of program outcomes were the following: insufficient project funding or funding that was expected from other project partners and that was not received (a factor in 10 projects), severe weather and natural landscape challenges (9 projects), project partners’ capacity and competing priorities (7 projects), recipients’ internal staff changes and departures (6 projects), and problems in soliciting community stakeholder and local volunteer participation (3 projects).
- Additionally, the Okanagan-Similkameen PE has been able to build on existing governance structures (such as the Okanagan Basin Water Board, which was created by the three regional districts). Due to the Budget 2012 reductions, however, there was a period of six months where no one was working on program activities because of the focus on re-alignment.

Evaluation Issue: Performance	Rating
5. Have there been any unintended (positive or negative) outcomes?	Not applicable

While no unintended outcomes were reported for Okanagan-Similkameen PE, three such outcomes were identified for the AEI, including capacity building for young professionals, a sense of entitlement for the short list of approved funding recipients, and one Atlantic province decision not to fund organizations that already receive AEI funding.

- A few interviewees noted that one of the positive outcomes of the AEI is that it has drawn students and young people to local communities because there are opportunities for jobs. AEI funded groups have also become a good training ground for future young professionals, allowing them to learn and develop their skills and then take on management positions primarily within the public sector (either at the federal or provincial level).
- Interviewees also discussed a sense of entitlement on the part of some groups that make up the “ACAP Family,” whereby a select number of organizations that have received AEI funding continually over the years now feel that they are more entitled to funding than other groups and that they should be involved in how the program makes decisions. This is something that was facilitated by the design of the funding program.

- Furthermore, given that the program provides funding to a select number of community organizations, the province of PEI has decided not to fund the same groups who receive AEI funding, as they feel that there are other watershed areas that have similar environmental issues, and should therefore be able to access AEI funding. Interviewees noted that the province felt that this was unfair to other provincial community organizations and that these should also be eligible for AEI funding.

Evaluation Issue: Performance	Rating
6. Are appropriate performance data being collected, captured, and safeguarded? If so, is this information being used to inform senior management/decision-makers?	Attention Required

Although performance data is being collected and reported for the AEI, several weaknesses were noted, including a lack of performance targets, as well as indicators and activities not being clearly aligned with expected outcomes. In the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, no formal mechanisms for performance data collection and reporting exist presently, though there is a plan to develop a formal performance measurement strategy in the future.

- Although a CEP PAA-level program logic model has yet to be developed, the AEI has created an extensive list of indicators aligned to departmental sub-sub-programs in order to connect funded projects to the work being done in other areas of the department. Project proponents are required to choose a relevant set of indicators from this list to measure progress toward proposed activities, outputs and outcomes. This data is then compiled by the program and rolled up into an annual report, which also includes information on the number of projects, funding provided, and resources leveraged (in-kind and cash contributions from all sources).
- The document review and some key informant interviewees suggested a number of improvements to the program’s performance measurement, including: better alignment of the three categories of project indicators presented in the AEI annual reports (biodiversity and habitat; water quality; and sustainable ecosystems) with the three priority issues for AEI (biodiversity and habitat; water quality; and impacts of climate change); indicators that are more relevant to the activities that community groups undertake; improved clarity in terms of performance reporting expectations; and greater consistency in the manner different groups measure data in order to better support data aggregation across projects.
- The file review revealed that a vast majority of project proposals (20 out of 24, or approximately 83%) submitted by the organizations clearly outlined the expected outcomes of the projects, although it also showed that project reporting is done largely against activities and outputs rather than outcomes.
- Furthermore, not all AEI projects demonstrated good links between their planned activities, outputs and expected outcomes. In about half of the cases sampled, some of the outputs did not link plausibly to activities listed (e.g., outputs for some projects mention the number of restored habitats or kilometres of shoreline cleaned by volunteers even though project activities for these projects focused only on providing public awareness to the local population). As well, a few of the sampled projects have as many as a few dozen or more outputs, thus making it hard to link them plausibly to a much lower number of activities and outcomes. For other projects, outputs were not identified at all.

- In addition, the level of performance data collected and reported through these projects varies greatly, with about 15% of projects having none or only 1 or 2 performance indicators and approximately 38% of projects listing 30 or more indicators each. In several cases, as many as 70 and 80 indicators per project were established. Approximately 28% of sampled projects did not report on the established performance targets or the reported performance data fell significantly short of the established performance targets.
- Although a logic model for the Okanagan-Similkameen PE exists, there is no evidence that it is actively being used to collect performance data, as no formal performance measurement mechanisms are in place. Program staff noted that they are planning to work on a performance measurement strategy to better track the impact of program activities and inform decisions on where and how to invest program resources.
- The file review revealed that a strong plausible link between activities and outcomes was found in half of the 8 project files reviewed. In the other half, no project-specific intended outcomes were outlined, but the activities were still aligned to one or more of the expected outcomes of the contribution program “Contributions to Support Sustainable Ecosystems” under which the contributions are administered. Outcomes were not reported on and, unlike the AEI project proposals, they were also not clearly outlined in project proposals. Of the 8 projects, only one mentioned intended outcomes, while the other 7 only indicated activities and outputs.

Extent to which Performance Data Informs EC’s Decision-Making Processes

- With respect to the AEI, performance information is being made available to inform decision-making. Generally, the information received from individual funding recipients is compiled and presented in an annual report, which is then shared with senior management. The annual report presents some of the key program results and accomplishments, providing senior management with information on the extent to which the program is achieving its overall objectives.
- For the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, no established data collection and reporting structure presently exists. Senior management indicated that the program does not have the capacity to capture a wide range of performance data on the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, although there is a plan to develop a formal performance measurement strategy. Presently, performance data is collected at the project-level from funding recipients and used to inform decisions regarding resource allocations for the following year.

Demonstration of Efficiency and Economy

Evaluation Issue: Performance	Rating
<p>7. Is the program undertaking activities and delivering products in the most efficient manner?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could the efficiency of the program’s activities be improved? • Are there alternative, more efficient ways of delivering the program? 	<p>Opportunity for Improvement</p>

The evaluation determined that, in general, the CEP program was delivering activities and outputs at a low cost. Evidence does point to some potential

improvements related to such areas as better communications of program objectives and priorities, and improving collaboration with funded recipients. Funded recipients in both regions have generally been successful at leveraging contributions from other sources, especially for the AEI.

- A common indicator to assess the operational efficiency of contribution programs is the administrative ratio, which compares operational costs (salaries and O&M) to G&C funding disbursed. The administrative ratios for CEP Atlantic and Quebec and West and North are 0.078 and 0.062, respectively. These ratios are much lower than other EC G&C programs, such as the Lake Winnipeg Basin Stewardship Fund, which has a ratio of 0.22, and the Lake Simcoe Clean-up Fund, which had a ratio of 0.15 as of 2011-2012. These latter G&C programs, however, have an open competitive process to disburse G&C funding, and so would be expected to have a higher administrative ratio.
- With respect to AEI, interviewees offered a number of reasons why they generally feel that the program is being delivered efficiently, including:
 - the co-location of EcoAction, EDF and AEI staff, which facilitates communication between funding programs and improves delivery of all three (e.g., reducing duplication through sharing or referring funding proposals among programs);
 - combining offices in the Atlantic and Quebec regions, which has resulted in experienced staff in an established ecosystem-based program (St. Lawrence Action Plan) sharing their experiences and lessons learned with AEI staff;
 - funding the same groups each year through a closed funding process,³⁴ thus ensuring processes are streamlined and funding recipients are very familiar with overall program objectives, priorities and processes; and
 - various other operational characteristics, such as the phased approach to proposal submissions to the Minister's Office, an increased use of online applications, good relationship between EC program managers and traditionally funded groups, and partnerships with universities, which help to keep costs low (e.g., use of labs, field sampling equipment).
- Despite efficiencies from co-location, senior management indicated that operational expenditures were still too high in comparison to other programs and so the total number of FTEs to deliver the contribution program was reduced from 2.3 to 1.3 in late 2013.
- To improve the AEI's efficiency, funding recipients also identified a need to better communicate program changes and priorities (e.g., the move from ACAP to AEI was not felt to have been adequately communicated to partners and eligible organizations) and to better collaborate with funded groups through in-person interaction and annual workshops in order to share experiences and lessons learned.
- In the Okanagan, one of the key program efficiencies identified by interviewees concerned partnerships with local governments and regional organizations, such as the OBWB, to participate in discussions and collaborate on projects to address environmental issues in the Region through established governance structures. For example, as part of the Lake Evaporation Study led by the OBWB, the Okanagan-Similkameen PE provided funding for equipment (large yellow buoys and two land-based stations), thus overcoming a significant hurdle for that particular project.

³⁴ A discussion of negative issues related to the closed funding process is presented in question 9 below.

- Interviewees also indicated a few possible improvements to program efficiency, including:
 - modifying the proposal solicitation structure for the contribution program to expand eligibility, increase communication and collaboration between program staff and funded groups, and reduce proposal approval times; and
 - establishing clear performance measurement requirements in order for funding recipients to collect relevant performance data to demonstrate project results.

Leveraging

- Evidence from the administrative file review suggests funding recipients have achieved considerable success in leveraging cash and in-kind contributions from multiple sources, averaging 9 contributors per funding agreement. In both regions, funding partners most often include municipal and provincial governments, non-governmental organizations, other federal government departments, industry and private businesses, academia, and, in AEI programs, local volunteers and youth. For most funded recipients, leveraging most often involves in-kind contributions because recipients depend on the knowledge, equipment and volunteers in the community.
- Since 2008-2009, EC has provided approximately \$6.67 million to 287 projects in the Atlantic Provinces and leveraged an overall value of \$20.81 million (cash and in-kind). Thus, funded recipients leverage an average of more than \$3 (\$3.12) for every dollar of EC funding, for a ratio of 3:1. The largest non-federal partners are provincial governments (average of 16% of total project value annually) and non-governmental organizations (14%).
- As mentioned previously, however, in the view of a few interviewees, the closed approach to funding has meant less engagement of other stakeholders and a resulting decrease in the amount of funding coming from these other sources.
- In the Okanagan-Similkameen, for every dollar of EC funding, the program leveraged an average of just under \$2 (\$1.86), for a ratio of approximately 2:1. There were a few instances, however, where EC was the sole funding source.

Evaluation Issue: Performance	Rating
8. Is the program design appropriate for achieving expected program results?	Attention Required

The evaluation found that overall governance mechanisms were clear and effective. With respect to AEI, roles and responsibilities were generally clear and commonly understood. In the case of the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, program objectives and the roles and responsibilities of the program were not clearly communicated and commonly understood. Furthermore, the perception is that the program has not adequately engaged other directorates to ensure that a coordinated departmental ecosystem-based approach is implemented in the region.

- Overall, most interviewees reported that governance mechanisms in both regions are clear and effective, with a clear and commonly understood reporting structure. In the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, an EC-specific governance structure was never created, as the program relies instead on existing local bodies (such as the OBWB) and local community groups to coordinate activities with partners and stakeholders.

- Under the current structure or organization of activities in the region, no evidence was found of any mechanism to coordinate multiple departmental activities occurring in the same priority ecosystem. If those areas happen to be a priority ecosystem, one senior manager suggested that there needed to be some way to tie what EC is doing in terms of science, regulatory measures, monitoring, etc. to what local and regional jurisdictions are doing. Key informants feel that the Okanagan-Similkameen PE in particular could be doing a better job at engaging other directorates across EC and ensuring that departmental activities are carried out in a more cohesive manner. It is worth noting that the RDG W&N outlined plans and initial steps to establish a governance structure to coordinate EC intervention actions in the Okanagan. A business plan was developed for the Okanagan-Similkameen PE and initial meetings of an internal coordination group were held. However, the business plan and associated resources were never formally approved, as Budget 2012 implementation took priority over approving new initiatives seeking additional resources.
- One senior manager noted that, when priority ecosystems are designated, two governance structure considerations should be addressed. First, when previously individual program lines are brought together under one priority ecosystem, a coordinated approach needs to be established so that the ecosystem works as a cohesive whole. Second, EC activities in areas such as science, regulatory measures and monitoring in the ecosystem should be tied to provincial and local governments' activities in that ecosystem, since decisions that affect the environment are increasingly being made by those levels of government.
- Interviewees generally feel that the management of day-to-day operations is clear and commonly understood. Despite some confusion among program staff in terms of senior management approval processes following changes to the departmental governance structure in 2012, these issues have since been resolved.
- **Clarity of Roles/Responsibilities:**
Most program staff and external stakeholders interviewed saw their roles as clearly defined and understood. With respect to the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, internal interviewees, however, feel they do not have a clear understanding of the program objectives and the role of the program in the region. Program representatives noted that discussions are underway to clarify the roles and responsibilities of departmental groups involved, particularly in the areas of program policy and priority-setting, outreach and solicitation of proposals, proposal assessment and notification of decisions, and ongoing management of awarded contribution agreements.
- **Clarity of Priorities:**
Most AEI interviewees said that priorities are well communicated and understood and funding recipients noted that the application process clearly communicates program objectives and priorities. In the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, however, interviewees were of the opinion that, while priorities are generally understood by program personnel, other stakeholders (including funding recipients and partners within the department) tend to be confused about the program's overall objectives and role in the region, including a lack of standard application materials.
- **Approval Processes:**
A majority of interviewees indicated that the approval processes are clear and effective. There are a significant number of interviewees who feel that the approval

process has improved over the last few years. There was also evidence that showed that the new phased in (batch process) in the AEI has increased efficiency. Although a few funding recipients mentioned that the timelines for submission and approval are too late in the season, most feel that they are receiving their funding at a more appropriate time in the year than was previously the case. In the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, a few interviewees feel the approval processes are effective but not always clear. Interviewees indicated that this was a bi-product of the program’s greater focus on partnership building and stakeholder coordination than on funding activities.

Evaluation Issue: Performance	Rating
9. Is the program achieving its intended outcomes in the most economical manner?	Attention Required

Under the AEI, the closed nature of the funding process is seen as a major impediment to the achievement of program objectives. The program, however, is in the process of transforming its program delivery model to include open funding.

- Presently, to receive AEI funding, a recipient must be one of a limited list of eligible organizations. Many interviewees noted that an open process, accepting applications from all organizations that may apply, would allow the AEI program to more effectively achieve its intended outcomes and overall objectives through better proposals and improved partnerships and knowledge sharing. An example of such a competitive application process is the EcoAction program. As one interviewee noted, “competition drives innovation, which drives good development, new ideas and ways of doing things.”
- Key informants report that the program is currently considering changing existing delivery processes, which could include moving from a closed to competitive funding process starting in 2015-2016. Although the federal-provincial MOU with the Atlantic Provinces on Environmental Cooperation, which ended in June 2013, is not expected to be renewed, AEI is expected to collaborate with the provinces to gain their support and ensure the provinces are involved in any future AEI approach. This approach would be expected to better align AEI objectives with government-wide priorities, while strengthening federal-provincial relations.

In the West and North Region, despite resource reductions, program objectives and activities have remained the same.

- Since the Budget 2012 reductions were introduced, the number of FTEs carrying out activities related to community ecosystem partnerships in the Region³⁵ decreased from 3.4 FTEs in 2011-2012 to 0.9 FTEs in 2012-2013 and the total budget was reduced from \$715,980 to \$475,388 in the same years. The evaluation, however, found no evidence of corresponding changes to program objectives or program activities following the significant reduction in resources. Senior management

³⁵Including activities related to the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, Coast Salish gatherings, and Georgia Basin legacy projects, among others.

reported that the overall objectives of the Okanagan-Similkameen PE have not changed even though the program continues to play an appropriate role and maintains a liaison with local bodies like the OBWB (including the Okanagan Water Stewardship Council).

5.0 Conclusions

This section presents the overall conclusions of the evaluation.

Relevance

Overall, the activities undertaken as part of the CEP program continue to be relevant, as there is an ongoing need to address environmental issues, such as water quality and availability, and to collect scientific data and research, using an ecosystem-based approach. The CE program is clearly aligned with government and departmental priorities related to ecosystem health improvements and ensuring water quality and availability. The CEP program is also consistent with federal roles and responsibilities related to the *Department of Environment Act* and *Canada Water Act*.

Effectiveness

Although evidence shows that expected outcomes are being achieved to some extent in the West and North and Atlantic and Quebec regions, several issues remain. Although evidence points to increased stakeholder capacity and knowledge, issues remain related to increasing the participation of governments and stakeholders, due mainly to the closed nature of the funding process and decreasing EC participation with community organizations in the Atlantic and Quebec Region, while in the West and North Region, the program has had difficulty expanding participation beyond a select number of regional organizations. Furthermore, little evidence was found of the coordination of activities taking place within the department related to community ecosystem partnerships in the West and North and Atlantic and Quebec regions. The evaluation also found that no formal performance measurement strategy presently exists for the CEP program, and noted some significant weaknesses related to performance measurement, including a lack of performance targets and issues related to alignment of indicators with expected outcomes in the case of AEI, as well as a lack of formal mechanisms for performance data collection and reporting for the Okanagan-Similkameen PE.

Efficiency and Economy

Overall, the evaluation found that the CEP program was delivering activities and outputs at a low cost. The evaluation found that, although overall governance mechanisms were clear and effective, especially in the case of AEI, significant issues were identified for the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, related to clear and common understanding of program objectives and the role of the program in addressing environmental issues in the region. The CEP program has introduced significant organizational efficiency improvements to realize cost-savings in response to Budget 2012 commitments and, in the case of AEI, further changes are being made to the program delivery model, such as opening up the funding process to other organizations. With respect to the Okanagan-Similkameen PE, no documented evidence was found as to how these changes will impact program activities going forward.

6.0 Recommendations and Management Response

The following recommendations are directed to the RDG, West and North, and the RDG, Atlantic and Quebec, as the senior departmental officials responsible for the management of the CEP program.

Recommendation 1: The RDG, West and North, in consultation with the RDG, Atlantic and Quebec, should consider the development of an overarching strategic plan and associated performance measurement strategy that would allow the program to better communicate its overall objectives and report on its results.

The evaluation found that performance information is being collected by the AEI and to some extent by the Okanagan-Similkameen PE. No formal performance measurement strategy, however, exists for the CEP program, nor was there evidence of a clearly defined strategic direction for the program overall. The absence of well-defined strategic objectives and an associated performance measurement strategy thus impedes the program’s ability to communicate its intended objectives, and to measure and report on its performance. An overarching strategic plan should consider clearly articulating the program’s national delivery, oversight and objectives, while an associated performance measurement strategy should consider the development of a program-wide logic model, a standard set of performance indicators and targets against which to compare observed progress, a reporting strategy, and an approach to tracking CEP-specific expenditures separately from other regional activities in departmental systems.

Management Response to Recommendation 1:

Statement of Agreement/Disagreement with the Recommendation
The Regional Director General – West and North, on behalf of Environment Canada’s Community Ecosystem Partnerships Program, agrees with this recommendation.
Management Action
<p>CEP program management will develop an overarching strategic plan for the CEP Program to clearly define program objectives and the overall approach to achieving these objectives.</p> <p>CEP program management will work with departmental planners, performance measurement experts, and financial management advisors to ensure that a comprehensive performance measurement strategy is developed and implemented for the CEP program in the post-Budget 2012 implementation context. This will help to ensure that the program can better demonstrate its results.</p> <p>This work will build upon and be aligned with other performance measurement work that is already underway, as the West and North and Quebec and Atlantic regions have been collaborating on input to departmental planning processes for 2015-2016, including the Program Alignment Architecture, Program Descriptions, and Performance Measurement Framework, and implementation strategies under the Federal Sustainable Development Strategy (FSDS).</p> <p>As a result of recent changes to the AEI program, the Atlantic and Quebec Region</p>

completed the development of a logic model and performance management strategy in September 2014. The activities, outputs, outcomes and indicators identified through that process will support the development of a CEP Program Performance Measurement Strategy.		
Timeline	Deliverable(s)	Responsible Party
December 2015	CEP Program Overarching Strategic Plan and Performance Measurement Strategy	RDG, West and North and RDG, Atlantic and Quebec

Recommendation 2: The RDG, Atlantic and Quebec, should revisit the current closed contributions funding process in the AEI to determine whether program objectives would be better served by a competitive process that is open to a wider range and number of applicants.

In its current form, CEP funding in the Atlantic and Quebec Region is only available to a closed roster of 18 organizations. Although the current closed funding structure yields certain benefits in terms of increased efficiency of delivery (the organizations in the roster are well informed of the requirements and process for funding applications), this approach is seen by many interviewees as an impediment to building partnerships and engaging new funding partners, leveraging resources, promoting quality proposals, and encouraging innovation. Since the currently funded organizations tend to work in the same geographic locations, the present approach also limits the program’s ability to address changing priorities outside of those areas. An open request for proposals process in AEI would contribute to greater transparency of funding and better align the CEP program with other Government of Canada G&C initiatives.

Management Response to Recommendation 2

Statement of Agreement/Disagreement with the Recommendation
The Regional Director General, Atlantic and Quebec, agrees with this recommendation.
Management Action
<p>Changes to the AEI G&C program have been implemented for the 2015-2016 funding year and are expected to address this recommendation. The changes are designed to more strategically use the AEI to better address Environment Canada priorities and to achieve greater environmental results for the Atlantic Ecosystem. The objectives of the changes to the AEI program are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhance internal coordination to better address Environment Canada priorities, • strengthen external partnerships including engaging other governments in identifying priorities for investment, and • enhance competition and transparency by broadening eligibility to more organizations. <p>With a Call for Proposals issued on September 18th, eligibility was expanded through an open and competitive process. Eligible recipients now include all Atlantic Canadian non-government organizations, coalitions and networks of organizations, research and academic Institutions, and Aboriginal governments and organizations.</p> <p>Under a competitive process, funding will be provided for the strongest projects that</p>

address program criteria, including the requirement that they: achieve or lead to measurable environmental results, improve the capacity for a comprehensive ecosystem-based approach, build partnerships through collaboration with other organizations, leverage funding from other sources, and/or disseminate knowledge and results.

Going forward, prior to an annual call for proposals, Environment Canada will engage internal stakeholders and external stakeholders in a collaborative process to determine key priority areas for investment. That process is aimed at achieving greater results by focusing investments in areas that advance EC priorities and are aligned with provincial government priorities in Atlantic Canada.

Timeline	Deliverable(s)	Responsible Party
September 2014	Modified Call for Proposals issued	RDG, Atlantic and Quebec
November 2014	Deadline for organizations to submit project proposals.	RDG, Atlantic and Quebec
February 2015	Recommendations for project approvals submitted to the Minister.	RDG, Atlantic and Quebec
May 2015	Annual priority setting exercise.	RDG, Atlantic and Quebec

Recommendation 3: The RDG, West and North, should develop and implement an operational plan for the Okanagan-Similkameen PE to better align program objectives, delivery model, expected roles, and available resources within this ecosystem.

Following the cost-savings initiatives stemming from Budget 2012, the Okanagan-Similkameen PE resources have been reduced without a corresponding change to regional program activities or objectives, thus creating a lack of alignment between inputs and objectives. The evaluation further found a lack of engagement with departmental partners to clearly communicate the program’s role in the region and ensure that a coordinated departmental ecosystem-based approach is implemented. Developing and implementing an operational plan that clearly outlines a revised program delivery model in the Okanagan-Similkameen would serve to provide a realistic planning tool that better aligns program objectives, activities, resources, and roles and responsibilities, and clearly communicates the program’s key priorities, objectives and expected role in the Region to departmental partners and external stakeholders. This in turn would be expected to encourage projects that are more directly linked to CEP program objectives, and improve coordination of CEP and other stakeholder activities.

Management Response to Recommendation 3

Statement of Agreement/Disagreement with the Recommendation
The Regional Director General – West and North, on behalf of Environment Canada’s Community Ecosystem Partnerships Program, agrees with this recommendation.
Management Action
CEP program management in the West and North will develop an operational plan for the program in the Okanagan, in consideration of available resources, the overarching

strategic plan of the CEP, and other relevant departmental programs.

The operational plan will demonstrate clear linkages to the overall CEP program performance measurement strategy, help to focus program activities in the Okanagan, and will be used to help ensure that both internal and external partners share an understanding of the program's objectives, priorities, and role in the ecosystem.

Timeline	Deliverable(s)	Responsible Party
March 2016	Operational Plan for the Okanagan-Similkameen under the CEP Program	Director, Strategic Relations, West and North

Annex 1 Summary of Findings³⁶

Evaluation Question	Acceptable	Opportunity for Improvement	Attention Required	Not Applicable
Relevance:				
1. Continued need for the program	●			
2. Aligned to federal government priorities	●			
3. Program consistent with federal roles and responsibilities	●			
Performance:				
4. Achievement of intended outcomes		●		
5. Unintended outcomes				●
6. Appropriate performance data is being collected, captured, safeguarded, and used to inform senior management/decision-makers			●	
7. Program undertaking activities and delivering products in the most efficient manner		●		
8. Program design appropriate for achieving expected program results			●	
9. Program achieving its intended outcomes in the most economical manner			●	

³⁶The rating symbols and their significance are outlined in Table 2 on Page 10.

Annex 2 Program Logic Model

