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Multiview: framework or smorgasbord?

evaluating different types of apples...

... with all kinds of oranges
My entry point.... (and biases)

- Evaluation done by public managers themselves
- Evaluation, an element of budgeting processes
- In particular, looking at performance measurement
  - a type of control evaluation - clarity of objectives & (perceived) clarity of cause and effect
- In practice – what public managers are doing in the “real world”
  - wealth of existing practice from which to base research
  - central government
  - evidence from Canada and the US
  - now beginning Netherlands case study
- Ultimately interested in cross-agency coordination
  - looking at budgeting process as a tool for coordination
Performance meas. status quo

- Governments worldwide are making use of geospatial technologies and are in the process of developing and delivering an array of geospatial services.

- Given this ubiquitous investment in geospatial infrastructure, why do so few government ministries or agencies evaluate public effort in this area?
Performance meas. demand

- Thus far, evaluation done (only) if required:
  - A legislative requirement (INSPIRE, implementing rules)
  - A contractual requirement or part of corporation law (AltaLIS, PSMA)
  - A budgetary requirement / program accountability (Geospatial One-Stop, OMB Circular A-11; GeoConnections, RMAF)
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Public sector reform context

- Low level of evaluation of geospatial efforts striking in light of prevalent NPM reforms

- New Public Management (NPM)
  - rationalization of public service delivery
  - increased accountability for the achievement of policy outcomes - ‘managing for results’
  - third-party contracting (and service level agreements)

- “Joined-up government” / “Whole of government”
  - Within government, cross-sector
  - Integrating services inter-jurisdictionally for client-centric delivery
  - Emphasis on policy outcomes
  - Return to the center
Concern 1: evaluation scope

When it comes to evaluation, is SDI initiative ‘just’ the efforts of SDI coordinating body, or is SDI initiative the amalgamation of activities of all contributors?

- e.g., GOS is well-circumscribed e-gov project, covering an aspect of SDI development
- FGDC’s annual report doesn’t cover progress of states; NGPO just USGS (one agency)
- GeoConnections, just one program (much activity ‘beyond’)
Concern 2: vertical nature of eval.
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Utopia: horizontal evaluation

Deliver public service delivery to citizens
Manage natural resources
Strengthen national security
Design and monitor poverty reduction programs

Ministry of Health
Ministry of Education
Ministry of Water
Ministry of Agriculture
Ministry of Transportation

SDI activity
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So... how to get horizontal evaluation?

(in a vertical environment)
US case

- OMB is getting smarter at this…. “like peeling layers off an onion”
  - Circular A-11 annual business case & performance measurement
  - federal enterprise architecture effc
  - Geospatial Line of Business
- Annual report
Canada case

- Federal Geomatics Strategy and Policy Framework
  - TBS and IACG
  - Governance framework – investment mgt – accountabilities
- Value Management Office (VMO)
  - improving accounting to report both vertically and horizontally
- Sunset evaluation of GeoConnections Phase I
- Results-based Management Accountability Framework (RMAF)
- Annual report
Dutch SDI – many parallel initiatives

- Base registries (e-government project, Ministry of Internal Affairs)
- Kadastre (VROM)
- TNO-DINO (ZBO, Ministry of Education), € 15 million
- Geonovum (“private”, VROM), € 700,000
- Space for Geo-Information
- Meteorological Institute (KNMI)
- Council for Geo-information
- etc.
Is current evaluation practice good enough?

- Individual well-performing services
- At end of day, does it matter if there’s no “joined-up” SDI evaluation?

  - if all the Oompaloompas do their jobs and the chocolate factory churns out chocolate...
Or, is a portfolio review needed?

- portfolio review would provide an overall picture of activity
- joint-evaluation of Dutch NSDI
  - relevance and ‘fit’ of geospatial portfolio in relation to overall national and local needs/priorities
  - effectiveness of geospatial portfolio in contributing towards data access, compatibility, and use
  - efficiency and cost-effectiveness of geospatial portfolio
Tools are lacking…
Tools still are lacking…

- vertical nature of existing government accountability tools
- absence of common performance indicators, and the means to report against them
- inability to track funding because of poor interoperability of management information systems across agencies

- But, countries are squarely grappling with dilemma… and learning…
Ultimately…

- Evaluation, an indication of an SDI initiative’s maturity
  - i.e., SDI ‘taken seriously’ when results are expected or when there are potential consequences for weak performance
  - i.e., evaluation, part of legitimacy
Geospatial investment maturity model

Non-compliance
Unreliable (Ad Hoc)
Unpredictable environment; controls not designed or in place

Repeated (Intuitive)
Controls designed and in place, but not adequately enforced

Standardized (Defined)
Controls designed and in place and are adequately enforced

Monitored (Measured)
Standardized controls with periodic testing and management reporting

Value-adding
Optimized
Integrated internal controls with real-time monitoring and continuous improvement

Adapted from PriceWaterhouseCoopers
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