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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) was created by a Canadian Parliamentary Act in 1970 and is monitored by an International Board of Governors. The Centre is a development assistance organization which funds scientific research in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, Latin America, the Middle East and Canada, to help developing world countries find solutions to social, economic and environmental problems. More than three years ago the Centre went through a transition process consisting of an 18% reduction in staff as well as a major change in the organization's vision and strategic direction.

The process was essentially launched with the approval of Strategy '91 and the Framework for Transition, by the Board of Governors on October 18, 1991. By April 1, 1993 the Centre's new organizational structure was very much in place and the transition was completed. During the intervening 18 months, the layers of management were reduced from 5 to 3, the organizational structured was revamped so that there were only 5 Program Divisions (from 7), projects were wound down, all internal administrative services were consolidated into a single division, and the total staff complement was reduced from 592 (1991) to 486 (1992).

An eight-member Transition Team including staff from all levels within the organization and a representative of the Staff Association (IDRC equivalent of a union) was established at the outset of the process. The team was mandated to advise senior management, to ensure fairness and equity throughout the process as decisions were being made, and to serve as a buffer or sounding board between management and staff.

The following report chronicles the Transition at IDRC from the genesis and motivation for change and the objectives, through a chronology of events and decisions made. The findings of the report indicate that the key objectives of the transition process were met, though, of course, certain issues were better handled or managed than others. Communication and information flow to staff members throughout the process was timely and effective. In contrast, the new roles/authorities of Regional Directors and Program Division Directors were less clearly defined and decisions were being made even as the study on the role of Regional Offices was ongoing.

The report also provides some analysis of the process and how it was managed and suggests some actions for implementing similar reorganizations.
REPORT ON THE TRANSITION AT IDRC

I. INTRODUCTION

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) is a public corporation created in 1970 by the Canadian Parliament and governed by an international Board of Governors. Through funding of scientific research in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, Latin America, the Middle East and Canada, IDRC helps communities in the developing world find solutions to social, economic and environmental problems. Over 3 years ago IDRC underwent a transition process involving a significant shift in the Centre’s vision and direction as well as a major reduction in staff (Centre staff reduced from 592 in 1991 to 486 in 1992; approx. 18%). From beginning to end the entire process spanned roughly 18 months. This report outlines the motivation behind the transition, its key objectives, a chronology of events in addition to an analysis of how the process was handled and its effectiveness in meeting the original objectives.

II. BACKGROUND

In late 1989 Centre management began serious consideration of strategic directions and the need to ensure that IDRC be well positioned for the future, adapting to the changing development assistance environment, and the new reality of government financial restraint. It was recognized that the Centre needed to both adapt to, and anticipate major changes in the external environment in order to continue to make a valuable contribution to development. The world was changing rapidly so now more than ever a clear sense of future possibilities and directions was needed. There have been 5 major groups of changes in the development assistance environment over the last 20 years. They are:

- Rapidly shifting political environment - end of post-WWII East-West Balance of power and the advent of transnational entities (e.g. NAFTA, EC).
- Explosive growth in social demands in LDCs, due to population growth & rapid urbanization.
- Economic interdependence, growth & globalization of financial markets with the North Pacific replacing the North Atlantic as the world’s largest trading area.
- Decreasing international will, investment resources.
- Technological advances e.g. biotechnology, micro-electronics making the risk of marginalization severe for LDCs².

---

1 October 15, 1992 memo to Board of Governors from President, Keith Bezanson RE: Transition Update.

2 IDRC Strategy '91; pages 2,3
In addition, cultural changes such as the growing importance of religious and ethnic allegiances, the increasing destruction of the global ecosystem and the need for environmental sustainability in development were having a growing impact on development assistance. All of these factors were expected to have an even greater significance in the future.

At that point in time, however, the Centre's Board of Governors felt that dramatic change would be inappropriate since the Centre was on the verge of getting a new President. Instead, it was decided that a body of knowledge on changing needs and potential responses be amassed to assist the new President in making and implementing suitable decisions.

In exploring new strategic directions for the Centre it was decided to use a technique known as search conferencing as a means of getting staff views. IDRC staff world-wide were given the opportunity to voice their visions, on where IDRC should be going in the future, what its priorities should be and what it should be doing, in a series of ten 2-day conferences in Ottawa and the regional offices. A range of topics were covered in each session with the main focus being staff's imagining what IDRC would be like in 5 to 10 years -- what their desired future for IDRC would be. Responses were displayed, sorted, discussed, grouped in categories and then ranked in order of priority. A vote was taken on the issues within the 8 highest priority categories using Vision software. President, Ivan Head then established a staff Steering Committee to analyze the ideas generated. Ideas were only classified after the fact as staff were asked to generate ideas in an open ended manner. In the 10 conferences a total of 256 staff, 43% of the approximately 600 IDRC staff members at the time, took part. Results indicated a broad consensus on a number of key issues. Some of these were as follows:

- that the Centre should emphasize its support of research not as charity but as a means for people to take control of their lives;
- that fewer activities should be supported to increase the likelihood of an integrated approach ranging from problem identification to results utilization;
- that staff should work in inter-sectoral/multidisciplinary teams and increase effectiveness by supporting networks of researchers as opposed to many isolated research efforts;
- that staff should work much more closely with potential project beneficiaries;
- that a flatter, less bureaucratic Centre in which there was a greater degree of program and administrative autonomy in regions should be established;
- that alternative sources of program funding should be considered by the Centre.

Preliminary investigation into how some of the suggested changes might be brought about was also done. Reform of the then sector/discipline-focused divisions was identified as necessary to work on a limited set of themes, in multidisciplinary teams and to work more closely with beneficiaries. Staff suggested that other models to allow greater decentralization (regional empowerment & autonomy) be considered. It was also suggested that achieving a flatter management structure could be assisted by adopting simpler, Centre-wide standards.
and procedures and by making greater use of advances in information and communications technology.3

Later, in October 1990, three working groups were established by then President, Ivan Head. Each of the working groups produced a report on various aspects of Centre operations and activities. Working Group 1 studied IDRC program structure, planning and implementation; Working Group 2 studied options for the delivery of IDRC programs in the field (based on the structural options proposed by WG1) while Working Group 3 looked at various aspects of the Centre's program support and service functions (including the Offices of the Treasurer, for Human Resources and of the Secretary General Counsel).

The new President, Keith Bezanson took office in May 1991, by which time results of the Search Conferences, the working group reports and other documents regarding the need for change and future strategies were awaiting him. These documents included "Towards a New Strategic Framework" (August 1990), "Report on Staff Search Conferences" (September 1990) and "Towards 2000: A Strategic Framework for IDRC" (October 1990)4. Though the issues and ideas put forth in these documents were not new, they indicated an emerging consensus regarding potential areas for change.

At its June 1991 meeting, the Executive Committee requested that the new President develop an action plan for the fall Board of Governors Meeting. In response to this request and moulding the accumulated body of knowledge, President Bezanson assumed the challenge of translating the accumulated information into an action and implementation plan delineating the activities and the means required to move from discussion to action. The Strategy '91 document setting out the strategic direction and vision for the future of IDRC was crafted and then approved by the Board of Governors on October 18, 1991, essentially launching the transition process.

III. TRANSITION EXERCISE OBJECTIVES

Though cost reduction was an important factor in the restructuring process it was not the sole or even the key motivation. In fact there were five major objectives for the process which were to:

• shift organizational focus to better meet the needs of a changing development assistance environment, moving towards larger projects and fund appropriations as well as a decreasing range of fields of operation to emphasize key areas instead;

3October 9, 1990 memo from President Ivan L. Head to IDRC Board of Governors RE: Report on the Staff Search Conferences.

4 Echogramme, Thursday, November 1st, 1990; vol. 4, no. 95
create a less hierarchical, more simplified and streamlined organizational structure by reducing management levels and empowering Centre staff with greater authority and decision-making capabilities;

- increase efficiency and reduce the administrative component of total expenditures - e.g. move to 70:30 ratio of program to administrative expenditures;

- a 20% reduction in staff across all levels and all regions;

- to achieve the above objectives in an open environment in which staff were informed about all the changes being undertaken and free to make their comments, concerns, complaints and grievances heard.

IV. IDRC PRE-TRANSITION STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION

Prior to the transition and restructuring, the International Development Research Centre was headed by a President, supported by two Vice Presidents (VPs); the VP Resources and the VP Programs. Seven program divisions (Agriculture, Food & Nutrition Sciences; Social Sciences; Earth & Engineering Sciences; Information Sciences; Communications; Health Sciences; and Fellowship & Awards), each headed by a Director, reported to the VP, Programs. A unit entitled the Office for Planning and Evaluation (OPE) reported directly to the President. The following five groups: Office of the Treasurer, the Office for Human Resources; Administration; EDP Services & the Internal Audit Department all fell under the jurisdiction of the VP, Resources. At that time the Centre also had 6 Regional Offices world-wide: the Asia Regional Office (ASRO), the Eastern Africa Regional Office (EARO), the Latin America & Caribbean Regional Office (LARO), the Middle East Regional Office (MERO), the South Asia Regional Office (SARO) and the West African Regional Office (WARO). Through its seven program divisions and six regional offices, the Centre was involved in greater than 22 different fields of development research, encompassing 50 sub-fields, in greater than 118 countries around the globe [See Organizational Chart; Appendix IV].

Each of the 7 Program Divisions was headed by a Program Director who was responsible for the management and operation of the Division. The Program Director was assisted by a Deputy Director (DD) in the management and direction of the division, and replaced by the DD in his/her absence. The Associate Director (AD) was mandated to select, train, and guide division POs and other program group staff. Both DDs and ADs

5Proposed Transition Budget 1992-93; IDRC March 1992
reported to the Program Director. Program Division Program Officers reported to ADs and undertook the execution and monitoring of division projects.

Project proposals were submitted to IDRC from various research organizations in the developing world. Projects and research proposals were also designed and initiated by Program Officers within the 7 Program Divisions. Proposed projects were fed into divisional "pipelines" to be reviewed, modified if necessary, and approved by Divisional Directors provided that they were valued at $250,000 or less. Projects valued at greater than $250,000 (and particularly innovative projects) were reviewed by the Project Review Committee, then sent to the Centre Board of Governors for approval. The implementation and delivery of these projects in the developing world was effected through regional offices. Regional Office professional staff consisted of Program Officers (POs) from the various program divisions stationed in the regional office. With the exception of MERO and EARO, the regional offices boasted a full complement of one or two POs from each program division. These regional POs were actually the staff of the Headquarters program divisions who reported to the Program Division Directors in Ottawa. For instance, a PO working out of EARO in Eastern Africa on Health Science activities would actually be part of the Health Sciences division at headquarters. In this context, regional offices (ROs) tended to serve more as administrative entities for Headquarters divisional programming than mechanisms to design, plan and propose research activities within their region. Projects were implemented, monitored and later evaluated under the supervision and authority of Program division staff.

The Centre is unique among Crown Corporations, that group of quasi-government, quasi-private sector institutions, in that it has a fairly arm's length relationship with government and is monitored by a Board of Governors. In fact, in the IDRC Act the Centre is described as consisting of a Board of Governors, meaning that the Board is the essence of the Centre. The Board is made up of up to 21 governors, 10 of which are non-Canadian, by law. A Chairperson, who must be a Canadian citizen, is appointed by the Governor-in-Council. The IDRC Board met bi-annually to make policy decisions as well as all funding decisions with respect to projects valued at greater than $250,000. The IDRC Board carried out its operations through three Board Committees: the Executive Committee, the Program and Policy Committee and finally the Finance and Audit Committee.

---

6 In the new structure division directors (e.g. Program Division Directors) became known as Directors General, the Deputy Director level was eliminated and Associate Directors became known as Directors. These changes took effect in January, 1992. See Section V.x, pg.26

7 International Development Research Centre Act, assented to 13 May 1970, Chapter 21, Section 3.
A system of committees established within the IDRC corporate structure itself was a key component of internal decision-making as well. At the time of the transition 8 internal committees were in existence. Their membership and roles are indicated below:

A. **President's Committee** - was responsible for strategic planning and resource allocation. Members included the President, the 2 Vice Presidents, 2 Program Directors (of the 7) on a rotational basis, the Director, Office for Planning and Evaluation, and the Director, Human Resources. All official documents to be considered by the Board were channelled through this Committee.

B. **Management Group** - consisted of the Officers appointed by the Board of Governors including the Divisional Directors (or in their absence, their deputies). The group was chaired by the President and met to exchange information and review the status of current issues. Twice annually, Regional Directors joined this group for overall policy review discussions and to address regional issues.

C. **Personnel & Administration Policy Committee (PAPC)** developed and approved policies on Human Resources, finance, general administration and project administration. It served as a resource to the Board of Governors Finance and Audit Committee and updated IDRC's Management Policy Manuals, when required. Membership included the VP Resources (Chair), the Director, Human Resources, the Treasurer, the Secretary & General Counsel & liaison with regional offices (ex-officio). Additional members (cross-section of staff including 2 representatives of Staff Association) were appointed by the President.

D. **Program Committee** brought coherence to Centre program activities by reviewing projects being submitted to the Board and responding to Board of Governor's Program & Policy Committee. This body also acted as a forum for the development of Centre-wide policies and practices on program issues. Committee membership included the Vice President, Programs (Chair), Program Directors and the Director, Office of Planning & Evaluation.

E. **Electronic Data Processing Committee (EDP)** was an advisory body providing advice to the Vice-President, Resources on the electronic data processing (edp) function and office automation within the Centre. Specifically, reviewing and advising on long-term electronic data processing policies and strategic plans, annual budgetary requests for edp equipment, and effective interaction and cooperation of those responsible for this area throughout the Centre. Committee membership consisted of the Vice-

---

President, Resources (Chair), the Director, Information Sciences Division, the Associate Director, EDP Services, and 5 representatives of the user community.

F. **Ethics Review Committee (ERC)** consisted of the Secretary and General Counsel, and a minimum of four other IDRC employees appointed by the Management Group. As much as possible, the ERC comprised individuals of differing cultural backgrounds and academic disciplines. The Committee established Centre ethical standards and methods for compliance with these, and arranged for external review of ethical aspects of projects when necessary.

G. **Health and Safety Committee** united representatives of Centre employees and management to discuss health and safety problems and propose solutions. The committee dealt with employee complaints on this subject, consulted with experts in the field and implemented programs to protect staff health and safety.

H. **Records Management Committee** was comprised of the Manager, Office Services (Chair), the Chief, Records Operations (Secretary) and representatives nominated from each Division, Regional Office and services units. The Committee's purpose was to liaise with Centre divisions and regional offices to identify issues in the management of IDRC's records. The RMC made recommendations to Centre management through PAPC to solve common records management concerns.

V. **MAJOR MILESTONES OF THE TRANSITION PROCESS:**

i. **Determination of skeleton of new structure - Minto Place, October 10-11, 1991**

As discussed in the background section, leading up to the transition there was a lot of thought about IDRC's future strategic directions, staff perspectives were solicited and working groups were established which reported back to the President's Committee. Issues considered included:

- organization of basic program structure by discipline, then subject area or a combination;
- model for future of regional offices - same in each region or adapted to each region;
- examination of required administrative support for divisions and roles of the Office of the Treasurer, for Human Resources, of the Secretary General Counsel and divisions.

Once these issues, and the various options and solutions were examined it was time to draft the new Centre organizational chart. The President did this after exploring the
alternatives. During a two day meeting on October 10 and 11, 1991 the proposed new structure for the Centre was unveiled by the President to W.D. Daniels (then Director, Planning & Evaluation), John Hardie (then Deputy Director, Planning & Evaluation) and Raymond J. Audet (then, VP Resources). The proposal included 5 Program Divisions: Environment and Natural Resources, Health Sciences, Social Sciences, Information Sciences and Systems and Corporate Affairs and Initiatives. A sixth division, entitled Finance and Administration would consolidate all Centre administrative activities. The exact program areas to be contained within each of the divisions was not yet clearly laid out. This skeleton structure was outlined in the Framework for Transition document which was approved by the IDRC Board of Governors on October 18, 1991.

At this same meeting preliminary criteria for reducing total numbers of Centre positions were derived. These criteria were as follows:

- Senior Management - position specific;
- A maximum of 4 Program Directors per division (maybe more in CAID)*;
- Number of POs derived from PO disbursement standards: ($1M (1992-93), $1.25M (93-94) & $1.5M (94-95));
- 2 Research Officers per Program division;
- 1 Secretary per Director, 1 per Program Director and 1 for every 2 POs;
- Administrative Support - Regional Office & Headquarters Administrative Support staff be totalled and the 20% reduction target used across the board.

*subsequently revised to 3

Essentially, the President used this meeting to help decide the exact level of reductions that would be required, how resources would be allocated to the different parts of the new skeleton structure and to begin defining which program areas would be assigned to each division. Derivations of the criteria and the numbers of program staff, program support staff and secretaries were clearly itemized.

ii Approval of Strategy '91 & Framework for Transition Papers - October 18, 1991 BOG Meeting

At the October 18, 1991 Board of Governors meeting the Strategy '91 and Transition Plan documents were approved. This was the culmination of the visioning, strategizing, and

---

9 September 24, 1990 memo from Raymond Audet to IDRC Management Group RE: Strategic Framework -- Centre Strategic Framework- Phase II; pgs.1 -3.

10 Memorandum RE: The Transition Process to the Board of Governors from President Bezanson, dated January 14, 1992, pg. 1.
Search Conferencing that had taken place over the previous year to 18 months, including the period just after President Bezanson took office.

The objectives of Strategy ’91 were to translate the Centre mission into a clear framework guiding program and research choices and maximizing the impact of available resources by creating:

- greater efficiency in program execution;
- sharper program focus (limiting range of Centre activities);
- flexibility and agility to adjust according to experience & conditions; and
- perseverance in Centre efforts.

The Strategy’s approval effectively launched the IDRC transition process and moved the Centre from the analysis and preparation mode into one of action.

iii Establishment and Announcement of Transition Team - October 22, 1991

Throughout the transition process IDRC staff were kept informed of decisions made, timely issues and what was taking place overall via all staff memos, among other mechanisms. The very first of these memos was circulated to Centre staff directly following the October 18 Board of Governors meeting (October 21st) indicating that the Strategy ’91 document had been approved and the transition was officially underway. A second memo circulated to all staff on Tuesday, October 22, 1991 from President Bezanson announced the creation and composition of the Transition team (previously alluded to in the October 21st memo). Also outlined in this memo were the mandate, roles and responsibilities of the Transition Team. The roles and involvement of the Transition Team were further explained and discussed at the October 23, 1991 all staff meeting.

The initial membership of the Transition team, and their positions at the time, was as follows:

Raymond J. Audet - (Chair), VP Resources
David Balson - Senior Program Officer, Information Sciences
Irene Bilinski - Staff Association; Administrative Secretary to Deputy Secretary & General Counsel
Doug Daniels - Director, Planning & Evaluation, OPE
David Nostbakken - Director, Communications Division
Pauline Robert-Bradley - Assistant Secretary, OSGC
Daryl Sanford* - Head of Compensation, Office for Human Resources, and
Michèle Wilson - President, Staff Association, Translation

*later replaced by Allan Rix December 13, 1991, then Director, Office for Human Resources
Nancy Hutchison (Secretariat Officer, OSGC) and Carl Chambers provided secretarial support to the Transition Team. They joined the team in January of 1992.
Nancy Hutchison (Secretariat Officer, OSGC) and Carl Chambers provided secretarial support to the Transition Team. They joined the team in January of 1992.

While management was responsible for making decisions associated with the proposed program and staff changes, the Transition Team was to generally oversee the transition from a corporate perspective, reviewing changes to ensure fair and consistent implementation of approved policies.

Specifically, the Transition Team was mandated to:

- be the focal point for the change process at IDRC,
- brief President Bezanson regularly,
- ensure that staff changes were handled fairly and humanely,
- review exceptions and/or problems and channel emergency or unplanned issues that arose,
- clearly identify the responsible person(s) for progress reporting on each of the changes,
- ensure that communication channels were working well,
- review proposed staff changes to ensure consistency with new strategic directions, structure and policy,
- design mechanisms to ensure that the transition addressed changes impacting on existing programs and projects,
- design additional studies that may have been needed and arrange financial assistance for these,
- identify and establish additional transition structures needed, and
- finally sign-off on transition when the process was completed.

The Transition Team was unique in that it is the only committee/task force within a government or government affiliated organization carrying out "downsizing" to include official employee representatives (the IDRC equivalent of Union officials) as full time members of the team. Further, the Transition Team boasted membership from a cross-section of occupational levels within the Centre. In fact, a selection of Centre staff were approached to sit on the Transition Team to ensure a team composition representative of the range of occupational levels, both official language groups, both genders, headquarters and regional office experience, as well as program and administrative perspectives.

Decisions Made and Actions Taken by the Transition Team

Establishment of Communications Links:

11 All Staff Memo from President Bezanson, RE:The Transition, dated October 22, 1991.

12 Memorandum to IDRC Board of Governors from President Bezanson, dated January 14, 1992, pg. 2.
The creation of the Transition Team and its membership and mandate were announced to Centre staff by the President in a memorandum on October 22, 1991. A memo sent out to all staff three days later indicated that mechanisms to facilitate communication between Centre staff and the team were being investigated. A mailbox (TRANSITION@EO BD) was set up so that all e-mail messages could be forwarded in confidence to Transition team members. Other means of effective communications links with staff in Ottawa and in the regional offices were also considered by the team. Beyond responding to questions and concerns forwarded to them, the team also responded to the most frequently posed questions publicly in the staff newsletter Echogramme. Updates on the Transition process and on the specific activities of the Transition Team were also presented in this same publication.

Later when it became apparent that responding to questions and concerns was growing increasingly time consuming, the team took steps to maximize efficiency and effectiveness. First, they increased staff support to the team. At this point, Nancy Hutchison (Secretariat, OSGC) along with Carl Chambers joined the team. Also, the approach to responding to questions was revamped and a request was made to have a "hot line" up and running by early January 1992.

Preparation, Review and Distribution of the Transition Schedule:

A schedule of activities or plan for the Transition process was originally drafted by the Transition Team Chairperson. This was then reviewed and modified by the entire team. In the spirit of openness and cooperation, comments and input were sought from Regional Directors and Program Directors. The schedule listed all activities to be accomplished during the course of the transition, the responsible person or group and the timeframe in which the activity was to be completed.

Commissioning & Review of Human Resource Related Documents:

Following the announcement of the establishment of the Transition Team, the Office of Human Resources came forward with their own team of professionals to provide information and service to the Transition Team. This group, composed of then Director of Human Resources, Allan Rix, Pierre Lacroix, Daryl Sanford and Arlene Lafoley, prepared papers outlining procedures, practices and policies governing staff adjustment. The Human Resources team provided Transition Papers, in order of priority, on: Staffing processes, position profiles, salary protection, termination processes and guidelines and grievance procedures. Papers entitled "Strategy for the Realignment of Staff", "Salary Protection Policy" and "Termination of Employment for Redundancy" were then reviewed by the Transition Team and forwarded to Senior Management for approval and implementation.

Establishment of Divisional/RO Plan Review Criteria & Review of Submitted Plans:
By January 27, 1992 the Transition Team had finalized a 7 question criteria system for divisional organizational plans. Basically, the questions were used to assess whether the plans submitted were consistent with the Strategy '91 document, targets established by the President (levels of management, number of staff, balance of support staff to management), and a fair and open staff selection process.

By December 11, 1991, only 7 weeks after its establishment, the Transition Team was already reviewing the staffing plans for the newly created Finance and Administration division as well as WARO and SARO. Review of the plans of the remaining four Regional Offices was underway as of January 14, 1992. By February 11, 1992 the plans of all six regional offices as well as those of the Finance and Administration, Health Sciences, Information Sciences and Systems, Environment and Natural Resources, and Social Sciences divisions had all been received and examined by the Transition Team. At that point no documentation had been forwarded from the Corporate Affairs and Initiatives Division (CAID) but this was expected soon after. The new head of CAID did not arrive until January of 1992 and this resulted in some delay. Though material had been received (and reviewed) from the Office of the Secretary General and Counsel documentation covering the overall strategy and organizational structure of the Office of the President was still to come.

Regional Office and Division heads were originally notified in the Transition Schedule that their plans re: staffing and programs were due to be submitted to the Transition Team during November of 1991. In a memo of December 30, 1991 the Transition Team Chairperson further informed Regional Managers that they were to provide additional information no later than January 15, 1992. The following information covering both local and Ottawa-hired staff was requested:

- listing of current Regional Office positions and incumbents;
- listing of positions which will remain largely unchanged and in which the incumbent is recommended;
- listing of positions which will remain largely unchanged and more than 1 candidate is qualified and/or interested, your preference and the rationale for it;
- listing of new positions and/or those that are greatly changed.

---

13 Progress Report Memorandum to the President from Transition Team, dated December 11, 1991, pg.2.

14 Memorandum to IDRC Board of Governors from President Bezanson, dated January 14, 1992, pg. 3.

15 Memorandum entitled, "Transition Team Report on Regional and Divisional Strategies and Staffing" to President Bezanson from, R. Audet, Transition Team Chairperson, dated February 11, 1992, pg.1
Regional Office plans were diligently reviewed, questions and comments were itemized and communicated to Regional Office heads for response and clarification by February 7, 1992.

Review of Job Profiles:

The Transition Team reviewed job profiles to ensure consistency, fairness and appropriateness (e.g. concerning level of position, qualifications required and the duties and responsibilities). Profiles were submitted by all Centre divisions and regional offices. In their Progress Report memo of December 11, 1991 Team members notified the IDRC President that skills profiles and job requirements of regional Program Officers had been reviewed.

General Support and Crisis Management:

Although difficult to quantify and assess clear results, this was one of the most critical roles of the Transition Team. In this capacity the Team and its members served as a sounding board for the complaints, concerns and frustrations of Centre staff. Issues were filtered through the Transition Team to be raised with management. Problems were flagged and the appropriate person(s) notified to address them. In crisis moments and tense situations the Transition Team was the focal point of attention. Following the February meeting at the Albert at Bay Hotel, team members worked late into the night reviewing staffing selections to facilitate the rapid announcement of decisions made during the all day meeting.

Progress Reporting:

In addition to all of the activities above, the Transition Team was mandated to keep the President informed of their endeavours as well as the general progress of the transition process. This was done via periodic progress reports. The first Progress Report to the President, issued December 11, 1991, 7 weeks after the creation of the team, outlined actions taken and identified issues and concerns that needed to be addressed. These included:

- clarification of role and authority of Transition Team to eliminate confusion among Centre staff and management;
- division of authority between "old" and "new" management teams to expedite decisions necessary for the transition to progress;
- re-confirmation needed with respect to regional strategies and staff profiles given tentative approval October 31, 199116.

16 Progress Report Memorandum to President Bezanson from the Transition Team, dated December 11, 1991, pgs.3,4.
A similar report of February 11, 1992 indicates which RO and Divisional strategies and staffing proposals had been reviewed and outlines observations on the following topics regarding proposed staffing statistics:

- voluntary termination
- total staff reductions, management positions & reduction of management levels
- program staffing levels
- proposed levels of support staffing, regional vs. head offices secretarial support
- Divisional/RO collaborations & overlap of activities
- Needs based planning
- Contracting outside services
- Documentation RE: staffing decisions, Development of Job Descriptions & posting regional PO positions
- Administrative streamlining/support staff levels & merging Administrative/Financial functions
- Planning and Evaluation\(^1\).

Though only the two reports mentioned above were forwarded from the Transition Team to President Bezanson, the team continued to supply information for the preparation of updates to the Board of Governors and the Board Executive Committee through the remainder of the Transition process.

\[iv\] October 23rd All Staff Meeting with President & Chairperson of BOG

The Chairperson of the Centre Board of Governors, Janet Wardlaw and President Bezanson met with all headquarters staff to outline the Strategy '91 document, explain the proposed changes to IDRC's structure and operations and to respond to any questions. At this meeting, the President announced new management team members selected to date. These were Raymond J. Audet, Karl Smith (Acting), Martha Stone and Anne Whyte as indicated in section i.

\[v\] Restructuring and Empowerment of Regional Offices

One of the original objectives of the transition/restructuring process was to modify the existing IDRC structure to facilitate greater integration of Regional Offices in the decision-making and operations of IDRC. Prior to the transition, Regional offices functioned largely in an administrative role. Program Officers in regions reported to program division directors, in Ottawa. While this arrangement ensured that regional POs had a macro

\(^1\) February 11, 1992 Memorandum to President Bezanson from the Transition Team Chairperson, Raymond Audet entitled "Transition Team Report on Regional and Divisional Strategies and Staffing".
perspective rather than one focused solely on "their region" it did not tend to promote interdivisional or interdisciplinary collaboration on development problems within a given region. This also meant that Regional Directors had limited influence over program/project priorities and directions within their region. In short, it was the headquarters Program Divisions that drove the agenda regarding the development research undertaken in a region.

In January of 1992, two consultants, Graeme Kirby and Claudio Herzka were retained to conduct an indepth study and make recommendations to the President on what the roles, composition and authorities of the Regional Offices (ROs) should be. Emphasis was placed on identifying and defining the role that ROs should play in developing research priorities and initiatives, and in disseminating the resulting research findings within the region.

In total, the Herzka/Kirby report outlined over seventy recommendations subdivided into 5 categories addressing regional strategy formulation, programming, project preparation and implementation and regional office management. With regards to strategy formulation Herzka and Kirby recommended that:

- ROs be mandated to develop regional strategies, increasingly focusing on a more interdisciplinary approach to projects, and subject to the same approval process as the strategies of Program Divisions; and

- ROs should be involved in, and support the strategy formulation of Program Divisions by giving input and commenting on the appropriateness of various concepts to their region.

In the section on Regional Programming the two consultants advocated that these should be developed, monitored and evaluated by ROs. Comparison of experiences, information and idea sharing between ROs was also strongly recommended. As well, they encouraged Centre management to establish Centre-wide information systems to facilitate interactive programming and project preparation between ROs and Program Divisions. In addition, Program Performance Contracts (PPCs) between ROs and management with clearly defined target indicators were advised. They further indicated that ROs should play an integral part in pipeline building by being provided with a means of initiating and promoting project proposals. Internal procedures to deal with and classify proposals received should also be set up by ROs.

Finally, concerning regional office management the consultants felt that IDRC should work towards having as many Regional Directors (RDs) as possible have Program Director experience and vice versa. Also, training in project management, project proposal development, report generation, team coordination and institutional assessment/capacity building was recommended for RO staff. The Herzka/Kirby report strongly favoured greater representation of the views of Regional Directors (RDs) at SMC18 meetings, particularly

18 The Senior Management Committee (SMC) replaced the Management Group and the President's Committee post-Transition.
during discussion of regional issues, and integration of ROs in Centre program delivery. To ensure this, it was suggested that ROs needed a minimum of 4 Program Officers (POs) on staff from the different research fields.

Following receipt of the consultants’ report SMC created three working groups to review the report and identify issues requiring SMC’s attention and follow-up. One Working Group was tasked with identifying key administrative issues related to the management of the regional offices. Another was asked to identify program-related issues concerning strategy formulation, regional programming and project implementation. The third was asked to identify information and systems support issues. Where possible, the working groups were asked to make suggestions about how SMC might address the various issues that were identified.

Claudio Herzka and Graeme Kirby submitted their final study report in June of 1992. By this time, the new Centre structure had already taken effect on April 1, 1992 including new Regional Offices with budgets, in which all regional staff reported to the Regional Director. All this before the Herzka/Kirby report was final. When the report was originally commissioned the restructuring was moving ahead at full tilt. As a result, many changes and decisions were being made simultaneously, even as the study was ongoing. Yet the exercise was not in vain since the study served as an important catalyst, triggering the needed changes.

On September 19, 1992, the Chairpersons of the three Regional Office working groups presented their recommendations to the new Senior Management Group (SMC) for discussion. On February 11, 1993, SMC had the opportunity to review the recommendations of the working groups19. SMC responded to the consultants report and those of the three working groups by listing recommendations that had already been implemented, and those that were being acted upon at the time, and actions that they anticipated taking in the future.

Recommendations already implemented:

- Regional offices should be provided with the means to promote the development of proposals to facilitate pipeline building.

- Each regional office should establish an internal procedure to deal with the funding requests it receives.

- Regional offices should ensure that the utilization of project results is adequately covered in the project proposal. Specific guidelines should be adopted on a Centre-wide basis.

---

19 All Staff Memo from President Bezanson, dated March 4, 1993 RE: SMC's Response to the Recommendations of the "A New Departure" Regional Office Study.
• The LAN system should be expanded immediately to cover all regional offices and all staff should be trained to use it.

• New job descriptions should be crafted for Regional Directors, reflecting increased responsibility and authority. At that time, SMC had just a new job description for the position of RD which reflected the requirements of this position within the context of the new structure and accountability framework of the Centre.

Recommendations being acted upon, at that time:

• The Centre should work gradually towards a situation where as many of the RDs as possible have experience as program directors, and vice versa.

• ROs with strategy and programming responsibilities have at least four POs from different scientific fields on their staff.

• Teleconferencing should be used to enhance communication between ROs and Headquarters. SMC felt that additional information on the associated costs and benefits of this proposal would be required before they could proceed, however, they agreed to pursue a pilot project in this regard.

• That adjustment to the composition of the current regions be viewed within the context of the program directions that are evolving. Accordingly, SMC planned to revisit this issue in 1994-95 when it would also address issues related to regional, country and institutional concentration²⁰.

The general direction of the Herzka/Kirby report was a clear departure from the previous primarily administrative role of the ROs. This shift was very much in line with the vision of the Strategy '91 Document proposing increased empowerment, distribution of authority and reduction of hierarchy within IDRC. In order to truly have ROs play a more active part in Centre operations, decision-making and program delivery it was decided to allocate budgets to ROs just as was done with Program Divisions. This decision took effect as of April 1st, 1992 when the Centre's new organizational structure became operational. The establishment of a more proactive role for ROs in regional project design, development and implementation was made complete with the decision to have all regional Program Officers (POs) report to Regional Directors rather than to Program Division heads. This seemingly simple change constituted a major adjustment in the Centre reporting structure, operations and communication/information flow.

²⁰ All Staff Memo from President Bezanson dated March 4, 1993 RE: SMC's Response to the "A New Departure" Report on the Regional Offices.
vi Submission of Draft Plans by Division and Regional Office Heads

The proposed skeletal structure of the "new" IDRC was presented at the October 10, 11 meeting and later approved by the Board of Governors (with Strategy '91) on October 18, 1991. However, the structure at this point merely outlined the broad framework of the various divisions. Divisional and Regional Office heads were to develop a more refined program strategy detailing the vision and focus, and the program areas to be included within their divisions. These plans were to be submitted to the Transition Team for review by November of 1991.

Divisional and Regional Office heads were provided with instructions and guidelines to assist them in the preparation of their plans. The actual development of plans was a prolonged process of drafting and re-drafting. Involved were the definition of divisional structure and operations, job descriptions, staffing plans, and the entire process of course had major staffing implications.

vii Meeting at the Albert at Bay Hotel, February 16-18, 1992

All Centre Directors and Regional Directors were assembled at Albert and Bay, February 16-18, 1992 to review all plans and proposed structures. In attendance were:

President Keith Bezanson -
Directors General:
Raymond J. Audet, Pierre Beemans, Karl Smith (Acting), Martha Stone and Anne Whyte -
Regional Directors:
Adzei Bekoe (EARO), Fernando Chapparo (LARO), Jingjai Hanchanlash (ASRO), Fawzy Kishk (MERO), Vijay Pande (SARO) and Pierre Sané (WARO) -

Regional Office Study Consultants: Claudio Herzka & Graeme Kirby.

Critical decisions about which staff members would be staying and which would be leaving were made. The Centre was examined division by division and regional office by regional office. How the Centre would be organized and what human resources would be required to carry out IDRC's operations was discussed and determined. The extensive background materials for meeting participants were coordinated and assembled by the Transition Team. Directly following the final day of this meeting the Transition Team was convened to review decisions made, and identify any inconsistencies as major announcements were to be made to IDRC staff the following day.

vii Development & Approval of the Centre's Transition Budget (1992-93)

Following the January Meeting of the Executive Committee the decision to go ahead with a Transition Budget for 1992-93 instead of the Two Year Operational Plan (TYROP) was made. This decision was made with the understanding that during 1992-93 the Centre
would see continual refinement/consolidation of its structure and program-directions, and that the sheer magnitude of the changes made doing a TYROP impractical. In short, this budget had to be prepared without the benefit of the information normally available to management. At the time when the budget was being compiled in January, 1992 all of the restructuring decisions were not fully known. The Transition Budget was essentially designed to allocate resources according to the decisions which had already been made without compromising ongoing decision-making. Monies were set aside to allow flexibility for structures that had not yet been put in place\textsuperscript{21}.

Later as a result of changing parameters the Transition Budget was revised. This revised budget was presented to the IDRC Board Executive Committee in June, 1992, and then to the entire Board in October of that year\textsuperscript{22}.

Development of Sunrise/Sunset Procedures for Projects in Progress and for Pipeline Activities

The restructuring of IDRC resulted in reordering the priority fields of research. Essentially, this meant that in a number of instances previously key fields of research were either eliminated from the Centre syllabus of activities outright, or minimized, while new fields were added. An organization mandated to conduct research throughout the world, IDRC had hundreds of projects at a variety of stages of completion at the moment when the list of areas of continuing Centre involvement was unveiled. Projects were at the conceptual or early development and planning stage, the final reporting and results dissemination stage, or anywhere in between. Clearly, a mechanism to address and deal with this "unfinished business" was needed.

The Transition Team was designated to address overall management of the restructuring, ensuring fairness and timeliness, so this issue did not fall within its jurisdiction. Instead, POs and Program Directors considered all proposals in the pipeline at the time as well as all on-going projects, assessing their fit with the new strategic directions and development research priorities. On this basis projects and proposals were grouped into three categories: those that were completely out of sync with the new directions and themes outlined in the Corporate Program Framework, those that fit somewhat and those that were in-line with the new research priorities. Once this was done, decisions had to be made about how and when to "sunset" projects and proposals and how to communicate these decisions to project collaborators and recipients. In addition, a number of projects in progress were "orphaned" (left without a PO responsible for them) as a result of the reorganization and the termination of some POs.


\textsuperscript{22} Memorandum from President Bezanson to the IDRC Board of Governors Executive Committee, dated June 12, 1992 (EC 99/10), pg.4.
Sunsetting of projects in progress was wrapped up as quickly as possible. Every effort was made to carry such projects through to completion if at all feasible. Afterwards, research in those areas would no longer be pursued. Sometimes it was necessary to reject the 2nd or 3rd phase of projects already underway. Letters were sent out to notify project recipients. Later in May of 1992 during a two-day meeting, Regional Directors and Directors General reviewed the "sunset" and "sunrise" projects. Additional ideas regarding ways to successfully wind-down the "sunset" projects were put forth and discussed, including closing inactive projects early and lightening the administrative workload\(^{23}\). The entire process was handled quickly and efficiently.

ix Development of Job Profiles

Once the new strategic directions and organizational structures for each of the divisions and regional offices within IDRC were decided upon Division and Regional Office heads could derive profiles for each of the positions in their respective sections. These profiles were to be concise identifying key areas of work/responsibility, knowledge, skills and related experience and essential professional/academic qualifications. Emphasis was to be placed on streamlining procedures and processes. In his memo to the Transition Team, dated October 25, 1991, David Nostbakken states that based on meetings in the preceding day and a half between IDRC Management and Regional Directors, Division and Regional Office heads should begin with the principle that all jobs in the program sector will be changing. Determination of Regional POs job descriptions was to involve negotiations between Program Division Directors and Regional Directors. Divisional Directors were also to determine amongst themselves the extent of collaborative efforts in the future, to decide on the need to collaborate on the development of job profiles. Further, the Transition Schedule circulated to all staff in mid-October indicated that job profiles were to be submitted by Regional Offices and Divisions by November of 1991. Due to the amount of work involved submissions were delayed in virtually all cases.

During the IDRC Management Meeting of June 1-5, 1992 (2 months after the new structure took effect) clarifications were reached concerning generic job descriptions for Program Officers and Regional Program Officers. The focus was not limited to the roles but included the relationships between people in these positions. It was decided to take this a step further and develop generic descriptions for \(^{24}\)Directors General, Regional Directors and Program Directors. Three working groups were struck (one for each position), each consisting of a Director General, a Regional Director and a Program Director. Draft job descriptions for these positions were then submitted at the July 13-16, 1992 Management Group Retreat\(^{25}\).

\(^{23}\) Memo to the Executive Committee members from President Bezanson RE: The Transition, dated June 12, 1992.

\(^{24}\) See Section V.x, pg. 26 RE: Change in Position Titles

\(^{25}\) Management Meeting, June 1-5, 1992, Notes of Discussion, pg.2
Staff Adjustment

In a truly unique move, interested Centre staff were given the option of voluntarily being declared surplus with no negative impact on their rights and privileges. The concept of volunteers was initiated by the President and first outlined in the "Realignment of Staff" document. This option had far reaching effects in the management of the transition in that it greatly reduced the tension for those employees wishing to stay and meant that only a limited number of employees were forcibly put out of work in spite of a nearly 20% reduction in total staff. In short, "volunteers" were to receive the same special severance package as if they hadn't volunteered and were later declared surplus. The initial deadline for voluntarily departing was December 31, 1991. This was subsequently extended to February 28, 1992. To prevent coerced "volunteering" Division and Regional Office heads were required to submit a list of all who were voluntarily declared surplus, for double checking. Those volunteering received responses from the Office of Human Resources and their Divisional Directors by mid-January. Acceptance or rejection of volunteer offers was to be based solely on what was determined to be in the best interest of IDRC. By December 31, 1991 16 employees had volunteered. An additional 19 volunteered following the deadline extension, resulting in a total of 35 volunteers. A memo from Allan Rix to Raymond J. Audet dated March 2, 1992 lists the 35 volunteers.

Several options were available to staff either voluntarily or involuntarily declared surplus. Each IDRC employee had been provided with a copy of a document prepared by the expert Human Resources team entitled, "Realignment of Staff" outlining the available choices. All Board Appointed Officers (e.g. Division Directors), full-time staff and term staff within a minimum of 3 years consecutive service with the Centre, declared surplus were eligible to receive the special severance package. This package consisted of the following:

- Notice - **period of time** allocated to staff upon termination calculated by giving 1 month of notice per year of service. For Board Appointed Officers - minimum 9 months; maximum 18 months and for staff minimum 4 months; maximum 18 months. During the notice period, surplus staff had the choice of continuing to receive their salary or accepting a lump payment equivalent to their salary plus benefits for that period. Surplus staff on notice were also given priority for any positions, for which they were qualified that became available.

- Severance Payments - cash payment made to employees at the end of the notice period. Calculated as described below:

  - Board Appointed Officers - 2 weeks/year of service
  - Staff - 1 week salary/year of service

---

26 Echogramme, January 31st, 1992
- Pension Enhancements - request made to Treasury Board for "waiver of pension reduction" for redundant staff age 55 or more so individual would receive pension benefit without the normal early retirement reduction. (NB: was at discretion of Treasury Board).

- Outplacement/Job Search Assistance - independent experts assisted surplus staff in securing alternative employment. Included C.V. preparation, interview techniques, job search/marketing counselling and career and skills assessment.

- Personal Financial/Retirement/Legal Counsel - external advice on options regarding short term personal financial planning, tax issues related to severance payments, retirement income arrangements for Canada Pension Plan, Unemployment Insurance and the Public Service Pension Plan. Surplus employees were also allocated $400 for legal advice.

NB: IDRC's overseas staff had all their expatriate benefits (housing, education, salary support, home leave) continued.

The Transition Severance package was widely considered by employees to be quite generous. On closer examination, it is clear that this perception is accurate in some cases and not so accurate in others depending on the individual's years of service. In comparison to those offered by the National Research Council (NRC) and the Public Service (PS), at the time, the above severance package was less generous for new employees, those with 6 or less years of service. In contrast, the IDRC package clearly outstripped the NRC and PS packages for employees with greater than 7 years service, particularly for those in the 15 to 20 year range.

More than 35 staff members made use of the outplacement services while 63 attended the seminars on financial planning. Employees could undertake temporary assignments, choose alternative work arrangements such as job sharing and part-time employment, apply for modified or new positions becoming open (especially the positions being created in the new Program Service Units (PSUs - See Section V.xii) within the Centre. They could have opted to join the "Skills Bank" a pool of administrative and secretarial staff set up in the interim prior to the implementation of the PSUs. Finally, employees could take leaves of absence of a maximum duration of 2 years. While on leave they were still IDRC employees and as such were eligible in the event that any positions became available.

Once the job profiles were developed as described in the previous section, Directors General and Regional Directors were required to match staff with available positions in their areas. The Realignment of Staff document outlined "If...Then" rules for confirming employees to positions. For positions that were virtually or totally unchanged, if they had the qualifications incumbents were to be confirmed in the positions. Significantly changed positions where the incumbent did not meet the modified qualifications were to be posted and filled via the normal staffing procedures. Similarly, completely new positions were to be posted and filled using the normal staffing procedures (this included the option of promotion...
of someone from within). Every effort was to be made to select suitable candidates from within Centre staff. A priority list of redundant Centre employees seeking another position within the Centre, was compiled. Only if no incumbent or any other candidate could be found in the Centre, who was qualified or could become so with a reasonable amount of training (and time), were outside applicants to be sought. All Directors General were required to provide adequate documentation in support of their staffing selections to ensure fairness.

In a December 30, 1991 memo from the Transition Team Chair, Regional Directors were requested to provide the following, no later than January 15, 1992:

- a list of current RO positions and incumbents; a list of positions basically unchanged where they recommend incumbent be kept;
- a list of positions basically unchanged where more than 1 eligible candidate (with preference & rationale for it); and
- a list of new positions and/or those positions which are significantly altered (and should be open to competition according to IDRC policies).

In selecting employees to fill the positions in the new organizational structure section heads were instructed to explore innovative and creative options as much as possible in order to minimize the termination of employees. Options for and interest in job-sharing and part-time employment were to be fully investigated and applied whenever possible. The only limitation was that all modified work schedules and flexible work arrangements were to be tested out before being formalized. In addition, President Bezanson indicated that all Regional Office staffing was to take a corporate perspective, considering IDRC staff in other regions and at headquarters for any vacant positions.

During the transition, training was also available to redundant employees. This included:
- training of a limited nature, not exceeding 3 months, such as upgrading of computer skills (either in-house or at a local educational institution); and
- training for professional upgrading not exceeding a 12 month period, for example to provide an individual with the professional status needed to undertake an available new or modified position.

The bulk of the reductions occurred in the 1991-92 fiscal year; from a total of 592 to 486 (18% reduction). In all, 199 positions were declared redundant - some eliminated, many others modified or merged. Meanwhile, 110 new positions were created. The fact that more than 1/3 of the Centre's existing positions were markedly altered illustrates the sheer magnitude of the restructuring process. As mentioned, there was an intense commitment to

---

27 Memorandum from J. Allan Rix, Director OHR to R. Audet, Chair, Transition Team RE: Reasonable Training, dated February 4, 1992.
minimizing the impact on staff. In fact, of the 199 redundant positions:
10 were vacant,
20 employees were placed elsewhere,
39 employees volunteered to leave,
27 were term or contract employees whose terms/contracts were renewed
and 32 positions were created in the PSUs which some of the redundant staff were recruited to fill.

Formal letters of notification of termination were delivered to involuntarily surplus staff by divisional Directors General and Regional Directors during February and early March of 1992. By June, 1992, of the staff identified as surplus, 54 individuals had departed IDRC.

One key objective of the restructuring was to have a reduction to only 3 management levels, including the President. The total reduction in management positions amounted to 30%. The desired decrease in the number of management levels was achieved by eliminating the Vice President and Deputy Director categories. Also worth noting is the change that was made in titles; from "Director" to "Director General" and from "Associate Director" to "Director" while the "Deputy Director" position was eliminated entirely. These changes stemmed from a change in nomenclature rather than any upward shift or promotion.

---

28 Memorandum to the Board of Governors from President Bezanson RE: The Transition Process, dated March 17, 1992.

29 Transition Team Report on Regional and Divisional Strategies and Staffing, February 11, 1992; pg.4

30 Minutes from Meeting of IDRC Board of Governors Executive Committee, June 18,19, 1992, pg. 4 EC (88) 06/92.
For Regional professional personnel, April 1, 1992 marked the official severance of past reporting relationships with Headquarters divisions and the beginning of an arrangement were they answered to the Regional Director.

Office space no longer required by the Centre both at Headquarters and overseas was identified in early March of 1992. Efforts were made to renegotiate leases and/or identify sub-tenants.

xii PSU concept, Establishment of PSU Task Force and PSU Implementation

The IDRC Strategy 1991 document stated that all administrative positions of the Centre program and service divisions would be consolidated; hence the formation of the Finance and Administration Division. The Strategy document also strongly emphasized the need to reduce bureaucratic control and increase flexibility in service delivery. Another key objective was to reduce overall administration expenditures in order to increase the total proportion of IDRC funding flowing out to grant recipients. The proposed approach for achieving these goals was to create Program Service Units (PSUs). PSUs would provide administrative and some basic financial services efficiently, effectively and economically in a decentralized mode from within the program divisions themselves. To further study and analyze this concept, the DG Finance and Administration, established a Task Force to assist with the definition of PSUs and to provide recommendations to IDRC Management for their implementation.

The report produced by the PSU Task Force identified the following six key services as being necessary in a generic PSU:

- Program Service Coordination and Management (PSU Manager)
- Financial Services- complete range for program/projects
- Administration - Program Related
- Information Systems
- Administration - General
- Records Management

The Task Force further recommended that the actual number of positions within a given PSU vary depending on the needs of the Program Division in question. Some of the criteria that would be used would be the number of program officers, purchasing requests, the number of projects and the type of project activities. Sizes would range from 5 to 9 employees per PSU with the exact figure being decided by the DG Finance and Administration. PSUs would handle all program and project related administration and

31 Memorandum to Board of Governors from President Bezanson RE: The Transition Process, dated March 17, 1992, pg. 5.

32 March 17, 1992 memo to Board of Governors from President, Keith Bezanson RE: the Transition Process.
financial services for the Program division including preparation of all project-related documents, drafting and administering contracts, liaising with legal counsel, budget preparation/verification and approval, financial analysis, processing payment release and financial reporting. The coordination of all services and the management of all PSU staff would be the responsibility of the PSU Manager. PSUs or more specifically, PSU Managers reported to the DG Finance and Administration but were located in the Program Divisions. Later, once the PSUs were up and running smoothly there was a shift to a dual reporting system with day to day issues being dealt with by Program Division Directors General.

Upon presentation to the IDRC Board of Governors, the final report of the PSU Task Force was approved in February of 1992. Having received the "green light" from the Board of Governors, implementation of the PSUs could begin. Implementation essentially occurred in two phases. From January to March 1992, the following actions were taken:

- review by Senior Management Committee (SMC - see Section VI Post-Transition Committees) of the recommended policy and procedural changes required to make set up of PSUs feasible;
- classification of all PSU positions (levels);
- posting, interviewing for and staffing PSU Manager positions;
- communication to staff of selected PSU Managers;
- posting, interviewing and selection of PSU staff by PSU Managers, in cooperation with Program Directors General and the Director General, Finance and Administration.

The second phase involved the actual set up and initiation of operations of the units. Though the original plan was to get one PSU up and running, as a pilot project of sorts before implementing the others, as the process unfolded all PSUs were established roughly simultaneously. Rather than a first unit being monitored and evaluated to allow "fine tuning" a complete study of PSUs, the concept, their implementation and efficiency vis à vis the previous system was undertaken during May and June of 1994 by Jean and Keith C. Ogilvie of the Internet Consulting Group. This review drew on documentary background information and on interviews of greater than 100 Centre staff members. The final report was submitted by Ogilvie and Ogilvie to the DG, Finance and Administration on August 8, 1994. The numerous parallel initiatives underway at IDRC while PSUs were being designed and set up, and the tremendous transformation taking place made it virtually impossible to isolate the impacts of PSUs on the Centre. In spite of this, the report findings indicated that PSUs substantially realized the objectives originally set for them, and made a significant contribution to Centre functions. The stabilizing of working relationships and processes did however, take somewhat longer than initially anticipated33.

VI. POST-TRANSITION STRUCTURE/ORGANIZATION OF IDRC

The transition and restructuring at IDRC resulted in a flatter, more streamlined organizational structure for the Centre. As mentioned earlier, this new organizational structure came into effect on April 1, 1992. In the restructuring, both Vice-President positions were eliminated so that under the President there were now 6 Directors General (equivalent of the former Directors). As well, instead of 7 there were only 5 Program Divisions. Certainly, on the Program side those heading up the Program Divisions are only 1 level beneath the President as compared to 2 in the previous structure.

Four previously existing divisions were eliminated. They were: Agriculture, Food & Nutrition Sciences (AFNS), Communications, Fellowship & Awards (FAD) and the Earth and Engineering Sciences (EES) divisions. The new Corporate Affairs and Initiatives Division (CAID) was created by bringing several pre-existing functions together; from the former FAD, Communications, the Evaluation Unit, Public Affairs and the Centre library. The Environment and Natural Resources division resulted from the merging of 9 former programs, specifically Crop Production Systems, Animal Production Systems, Fisheries, Forestry, and Post-Production Systems (from AFNS), Technology for Local Enterprises and Earth Sciences (from EES), Environment Program (from Social Sciences). In contrast, the Health Sciences Division remained virtually unchanged with the exception of the incorporation of nutrition (formerly spread throughout IDRC) and the Global Micronutrient Initiative. The Information Sciences and Systems Division retained a title very similar to that of the old division but boasted a new emphasis on improving access to information in the developing world. The new division comprised the Information, Communication Systems and Networks, the Information and Communication Technologies, and the Software Development and Applications programs. Finally, the Social Sciences Division which was formerly made up of 4 programs and a unit was reduced to 2 programs. As mentioned, the Environment program was moved to the Environment and Natural Resources Division, while the Gender Development Unit was transferred to CAID. The remaining 3 Social Sciences programs (Population, Education & Society, Economic Policy and Urban Development) were consolidated into 2 (Economic & Technology Policy and Social Policy). Centre-wide finance and administrative services were consolidated in the new Finance and Administration division. Included in the new divisions were finance, human resources, administrative services and management information systems. [See Organizational Chart, Appendix VII].

Regional Office (RO) personnel complements were re-organized so that each of the 5 ROs now had a Regional Director, and a minimum of 4 Program Officers (POs) in addition to support staff. The ROs for Southeast and East Asia (ASRO), Latin America and the Caribbean (LARO), Western Africa (WARO) and Eastern Africa (EARO) were each allotted 7 POs. Support staff were allocated in a ratio of roughly 3 support staff per PO so that ASRO had 22, and EARO, LARO, and WARO had 24 each. Each of these 4 ROs additionally had a Regional Controller, responsible for overseeing the office’s financial...
matters. The ROs for the Middle East (MERO) and for South Asia (SARO) each had a Regional Director, 4 Program Officers and 14 support staff.

In the new organizational structure ROs were designated as responsibility centres, allocated staff (outlined in previous paragraph) and financial resources to fund regional research activities. Further, the Centre reporting structure was altered so that all POs stationed in the regions began reporting to Regional Directors rather than Headquarters Program Division heads. Regional Directors were tasked with designing and developing regional programs and priorities. Regions themselves were to play a far greater role in the initiation and development of regional program priorities, projects and the dissemination of research results.

Project Approval signing authority levels were also amended. An October 1993 decision by the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors set the limit above which projects needed to be signed off by the Board at $500,000. Regional Directors were to have signing authority for projects valued at up to $150,000 while Program Division heads could sign for those up to $250,000. Regional projects between $150,000 & $250,000 were to be reviewed and signed by an advocate Director General\textsuperscript{35}. Projects valued at between $250,000 and $500,000 required approval by the Senior Management Committee.

Further, simultaneously with the Centre transition, Joan Foley (Deputy Chairperson), assisted by two other Board members, conducted a review of Board of Governors operations and how they could be improved. Among the changes resulting from the Foley report were the elimination of the Program and Policy Committee and the addition of the Human Resources Committee. The Finance and Audit Committee of the Board remained unchanged.

Within the new structure a need was still felt for forums seeking Centre employee input (from a broad range of occupational levels) on issues such as automation, personnel/human resources and project management. As such there was a good deal of support for maintaining the IDRC Internal Committees. In the end, the Committee structure was preserved largely intact. The system consists of 7 internal committees whose roles and mandates are described below\textsuperscript{36}:

A. **Senior Management Committee (SMC)** - made up of the President and the 6 Directors General. This committee is a decision-making body supervising and directing Centre operations, as well as formulating the main corporate objectives, policies and programs, the annual Program of Work and Budget and the evaluation system. SMC also reviews projects submitted to the Board, and supervises regional directors.

\textsuperscript{35} Memo to Executive Committee Members RE: The Transition, from President Bezanson, dated June 12, 1992, pg. 4.

\textsuperscript{36} Management Policy Manual, 1994 version, Section 1.3 - 1.9
B. **Management Group** - meets at the request of the President. The Management Group comprises the President, Directors General, Regional Directors and Directors.

C. **Personnel and Administrative Policy Committee (PAPC)** - develops and approves human resources, finance, general administration, and project administration policies. PAPC consists of the Director General, Finance and Administration (chairperson), the Director, Human Resources, a program division director, the President of the Staff Association, and up to 3 additional employees nominated by the Staff Association and appointed by the President.

D. **Advisory Committee on Information Management (ACIM)** advises Senior Management Committee on issues related to the strategic use and application of information and related information technologies as corporate resources for the development and delivery of the Centre's programs and administrative services. The Director General, Finance and Administration, the Director, Information and Communication Technologies, the Director, Centre Library, the Director, Management Information Systems, a program division director general (appointed to a 2-year term by SMC) and an IDRC user community representative (appointed to a 2-year term by ACIM) make up the committee.

E. **Ethics Review Committee (ERC)** - identifies projects where questions of medical or social ethics arise, arranges for external review of ethical aspects of projects as needed, and establishes ethical standards and methods for ensuring compliance with these. ERC consists of the Secretary and General Counsel, in addition to a minimum of 4 other IDRC employees (from a range of cultural backgrounds and academic disciplines) selected by the Management Group.

F. **Management Evaluation and Audit Committee (MEAC)** the Committee consists of the President, the Director, Internal Audit and no less than 2 members of SMC appointed on a rotational basis. MEAC assists the President and the Finance and Audit Committee of the Board of Governors to plan, control, and coordinate Centre actions resulting from evaluation and audit activities for effective implementation and use of Centre resources.

G. **Records Management Committee (RMC)** is comprised of the Manager, Office Services (Chairperson), the Records Systems Development Officer (Secretary) and representatives nominated from each Division, Regional Office and Program Service Units (PSUs). The Committee liaises with Centre divisions and regional offices to identify issues in the management of IDRC's records. The RMC makes recommendations to Centre management through PAPC to solve common records management concerns.
During the transition, the Management Group, PAPC and ERC were maintained virtually unchanged, though PAPC was briefly dissolved and then reactivated. In general, the committee system and structure was largely preserved, yet, there have been a number of significant modifications. For example, committees such as SMC and ACIM are new versions of previously existing committees. SMC replaces the former President’s Committee while ACIM is the updated version of the EDP Committee. ACIM has a more macro or corporate focus, and deals with strategic information and communications management for IDRC while the old EDP committee tended to focus on isolated technology issues. The Records Management Committee stopped activity for about 2 years following the transition since Centre records systems needed to be redesigned to conform to the new structure. Meetings of the RMC just resumed in December of 1994. Also, during the transition, the number of these bodies was reduced from the original 8 to 7. The Program Committee disappeared both within the Centre and at the Board of Governors level. Instead projects are now reviewed by the SMC. SMC is the equivalent or the regeneration of the former President’s Committee but with higher level membership (re: status in hierarchy of members) than the President’s Committee. Further, SMC does resource allocation - e.g. approval of all Centre projects valued at up to $500,000. The old President’s Committee was not mandated to address resource issues. Only a small sub-group of this committee, limited to the President and the 2 Vice-Presidents had the authority to consider resource issues. IDRC operations have been streamlined with the restructuring and consolidation of the committee system. The Centre Board meets quarterly and in the past projects had to await the 4 times per year opportunity to be presented to the Board of Governors for approval. The current SMC approval system is more efficient since SMC meets monthly or bi-monthly, hence significantly decreasing the waiting period.

VIII. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF THE TRANSITION PROCESS

During the IDRC transition process, divisions were eliminated or created, programs merged, projects discontinued, staff relocated and laid off, and all within a few short months. In "The Strategy Process", Mintzberg describes managing transition as an extremely difficult process necessitating moving from a familiar domain into a less defined future where many of the organization’s old rules, concepts and practices no longer work. Managers and staff must abandon past roots of their success and develop new skills and attitudes and this can be a frightening, threatening process. Minztberg’s description is clearly consistent with the IDRC experience. In such a situation, management is literally in crisis mode, often making decisions in an environment of uncertainty and confusion.

In this section, key events and issues from the transition are discussed and assessed to determine how effectively and efficiently the transition process was conducted. The strengths and weaknesses of the management of the process, the actions taken or not taken, is examined.
A. Communication/Information flow with IDRC staff, Division Directors & Regional Managers

The coordination of information flow and communication with IDRC staff, from what I have read and seen, was handled very well. Within 2 working days of the Strategy '91 document being approved all Centre staff were briefed and provided their own copies. All staff memos informed staff of the launching of the restructuring, the establishment of the Transition Team as well as its role/mandate and membership. Staff were also kept abreast of Transition events and progress through the IDRC internal newsletter, Echogramme. Generally, the Echogramme outlined the Transition Team's accomplishments to date, listing documents already distributed to staff and itemizing the Team's planned activities for the coming weeks. All staff members received personal copies of the Strategy '91 document, procedures and policies regarding staff realignment, the components of the severance package and eligibility. Also, the questions most frequently posed to the team were answered in print in the newsletter. In addition, an E-mail address and a phone hot-line were set up so that staff could air all concerns and questions to the Transition Team. Further, earlier talk of structural change and the opportunity to participate in the Search Conferencing exercise meant that Centre staff were aware that the restructuring was "coming".

Regional Office and Division heads were advised of their responsibility for drafting strategies for their divisions outlining plans, the program areas within their sections, and their staffing requirements. All of this was to be completed and submitted to the Transition Team during November of 1991, according to the Transition Schedule. However, exact details of the responsibilities of then Divisional Directors and Regional Directors with respect to the content, format required in preparing their plans were not outlined as clearly as they could have been. As a result, plans submitted by the various ROs and divisions varied widely in content and structure. This was overly time consuming both for the Directors preparing, then later modifying the plans and for the Transition Team and Senior Managers reviewing the plans. Additionally, preliminary information regarding the role of Regional Directors in staff selection, notification of local and Ottawa-hired staff, seemed to lack clarity since there was some confusion on these issues. In a December 4, 1991 memo to the Transition Team Chairperson, Adzei Bekoe, Regional Director for EARO, at the time, indicates that he was unclear as to whether drafting "the concise job profile for each position" at EARO is indeed his responsibility, particularly concerning Ottawa-hired staff stationed at EARO.

The concerns and questions raised by the EARO Regional Director were responded to by memo (dated December 16) from the Transition Team chairperson. Though providing clarification is fairly simple to do, it seems that time could have
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been saved and some memo-ing back and forth avoided with greater precision in the initial instructions and information sent out.

As mentioned, within two days of the Board approval of Strategy'91 all staff were provided copies of the strategy and informed about the establishment, mandate and membership of the Transition Team. The All-Staff memo dated October 22, 1991 clearly outlined the role and mandate of the Transition Team, which was never intended to be a decision-making body. Yet in doing file reviews and interviews I repeatedly encountered accounts of confusion and frustration concerning the anticipated role of the Transition Team versus its actual activities and powers. In re-reading the Transition Team Terms of Reference I really think that it does not overstate the role of the Team. In my opinion, the confusion stemmed more from the communication/marketing of the Transition Team. Creation of the Team was mentioned in the first communication which announced Board approval of the Strategy, giving the Team a very high profile. Then the second communication dealt solely with the Team, focusing all attention on the Team. In short, the "marketing" of the Transition Team greatly contributed to the high, and perhaps unrealistic, expectations of the Team's role in the process.

**Progress Reporting**

Progress reports were sent periodically from the Transition Team to the President and also from the President to the Board of Governors as an effective means of keeping them informed and up to date. Progress reports to President Bezanson from the Transition Team served to update him on their activities as well as to identify issues requiring clarification, his input or decision. Specifically, I noted memos dated December 11, 1991 and February 11, 1992 briefing President Bezanson. Beyond this point, there were no additional reports from the team to President Bezanson. However, as noted earlier, the Transition Team continued to supply information and updates for the preparation of progress reports to the Centre Board of Governors throughout the transition process.

The first Progress Report to the Board of Governors was dated January 14, 1992 approximately 2 1/2 months after the transition got underway. It was followed by a report from the President to the Board of Governors on March 17, 1992, a memo to the Board Executive Committee, dated June 12, 1992 and a Transition Update memo from the President to the Board of Governors on October 15, 1992. As with the progress reports to the President these memos informed the Board of Governors of recent activities and progress of the transition.

**B. Responsiveness to & Management of Staff Concerns**

One of the key roles of the Transition Team was to ensure that decisions made during the transition, particularly those impacting on Centre employees, were
conducted fairly and humanely. My file review and interviews have indicated that the Centre was very responsive to staff concerns. Questions and concerns brought to the attention of the Transition Team were duly investigated and responded to in a timely fashion. Two members of the Transition Team were delegated to acknowledge any communication received and then to respond to questions. By December 11, 1991 30 enquiries had been received. Later, steps were taken to increase the Team's efficiency in responding to staff.

A clear example of quick response to staff concerns was when questions regarding the consistency of the transition process between Regional Offices and Headquarters were raised by Ottawa-hired program staff stationed at Regional Offices. In response to these concerns a memo was sent out to all Regional Directors from President Bezanson encouraging them to dispel the rumours by clarifying the fact that staff in RO positions being modified may be considered for other positions (in ROs or at Headquarters) and that discussion with Regional Managers about change in positions was NOT equivalent to receiving notice.

A quick response such as this helps to limit the effects of the rumour mill and reassures staff, which is particularly important, during this type of upheaval.

C. Management of Project/Proposals Phase-out

The Phase-out of projects in progress or proposals in the pipeline was a parallel activity necessitated as a result of the restructuring. Essentially, Program Directors and POs decided which fields/program areas the Centre would maintain as part of its operations or business based on their "fit" with the Strategy '91 document and the future directions for the Centre. Fields of research that didn't qualify and all projects in those areas were earmarked to be phased out. The process of categorizing and grouping all Centre projects, determining which were to be kept and which were to be phased-out, and informing project collaborators and recipients was handled quickly and efficiently. However, this process, coupled with the simultaneous reduction in staff resulted in an incredible overload on those remaining IDRC staff responsible for monitoring these projects as they were being wound down. Some Centre staff on the Program side feel that this situation directly resulted in diminished returns on IDRC investments in that useful information stemming from Centre research investments was lost due to slippage in project monitoring. This was certainly true in the case of the so-called "orphaned" projects -- those projects which no longer had a Program Officer responsible for them. Further, the numerous letters that were sent out to potential recipients advising them that their proposals did not "fit" with the new Strategy created some confusion concerning where the Centre was now going.

---
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For example, in his memorandum of February 21, 1992 to Transition Team Chair, Raymond J. Audet, C. Devendra reiterates concern over the Centre's phase out of ongoing projects and others committed to but not yet launched in the Animal Production Systems field. Devendra's concerns focused on the need for smooth and timely exits and maintenance of IDRC's good name and reputation with other donors and with project recipients.39

Clearly, when a decision or choice is made to pursue certain areas of research and abandon others there is an opportunity cost incurred. It will never really be known what would have been had an alternate course been pursued. Yet, in winding down, it is important to ensure that whatever useful information is available is amassed and put to good use, to maximize the investment to date in that activity.

D. Restructuring of & Increased Authority for Regional Offices

My perception was that the issue of empowering the ROs provides a classic example of the centralization vs. decentralization question (one faced by every organization once they expand beyond a certain size). In IDRC's case this eternal tug-of-war is further complicated by the fact that the Centre is a global organization, but a relatively small one. Additionally, during my investigation it became apparent that there was considerable resistance and opposition to the concept of empowerment and increased authority for ROs. Confusion ensued concerning the roles and responsibilities of RO Directors and Headquarters Program Directors in terms of the identification of regional research priorities and the development of plans. In many cases the decisions to provide ROs with budgets and have POs in the regions report to regional directors was viewed as a loss of power for Program Divisions and this was resented. I feel that greater clarification of how joint responsibility, project design, implementation and delivery between ROs and Program Divisions was to be established and managed was needed. However, I do realize that given that the decisions made constituted radical change, and were therefore somewhat unpopular in several instances, clearer directives may have only served to galvanize resistance rather than alleviate or minimize confusion.

Allocating resources to 12 different responsibility centres struck me as being somewhat impractical (a sort of diplomatic "keep all sides happy" solution) particularly since there was no built in mechanism to ensure collaboration in strategizing and project planning. To a certain extent, providing ROs and Program Divisions with their own budgets virtually allowed them not to work together -- afterall, they weren't forced to.

A third issue regarding the empowerment of the ROs was the Kirby/Herzka study and report on RO structure and operations. Specifically, the fact that the study was commissioned and changes to Centre structure relating to RO empowerment were implemented in advance of the report's finalization. This situation could perhaps have been alleviated had the concept of conducting a study of the ROs been a part of the pre-transition planning. I also wonder whether the consultants report sought to "legitimize" the idea of empowering the ROs so that an unpopular plan could be seen to be advocated by "outside experts"?

E. Bridging of Decision-Making between "Old" and "New" Management

As mentioned, organizational change and restructuring of this magnitude is a difficult, often chaotic and painful exercise. Clearly, the "old" management is committed to a particular "tried and true" style of doing business and managing operations. Differences in perception of how best to do things and what is in the best interest of the organization make bridging and shared responsibility during the transition easier said than done. Despite the obvious obstacles, from my review it appears to me that some attempt at bridging between the two groups of decision-makers was definitely needed. Pre-transition planning may have been more effective had it accounted for some form or system of interim decision-making or division of responsibility between the "old" and the "new" management teams. Of course, as they say, hindsight is always 20:20 and having had a plan for bridging decision-making would not have guaranteed success. Nonetheless, I can't help but think that it would have been worth a try.

F. Pace of Implementation of Changes

Accepted management theory advocates quick execution of major structural or organizational change. It is a fact of human behaviour that change, or movement towards the unknown is often frightening, threatening and hence distasteful. However, change is very necessary and at some point in time virtually all organizations need to reassess and revamp their strategic directions, style of doing business etc. Carrying out the change process rapidly alleviates prolonging the suffering of those whose careers and lives are being negatively impacted by change, minimizes the duration of the uncertainty and resultant anxiety for all staff and prevents (by not providing sufficient time) entrenchment of resistance and opposition within the organization. The post-transition organizational structure took effect, April 1, 1992 a little less than 7 months after the announcement that the Transition was underway. Though the major changes were effected quickly, the process was not completed until a year later (April 1, 1993), making the entire duration 18 months. I felt that it took too long for the additional adjustments to be made. In the Centre's defense, it must be noted that in some cases staff was retained to deal with the orphaned projects. As a result, the change phase was allowed to drag on, delaying the return to "normalcy" for the organization and its staff. Further, the Transition Team was originally mandated to sign off on the transition when the process was
completed. Yet there was no clearly articulated or defined "closure" to the Transition which in a way leaves staff hanging and also impedes the return to "normalcy".

IX. CONCLUSIONS

Section III, in the early part of this report, outlined five key objectives of the Transition process at IDRC. In conclusion, consideration of these objectives clearly indicates that they were all largely achieved.

- the restructuring condensed the existing 7 Program Divisions into 5; focusing on specific fields of research and phasing out programs and projects that did not fit within this framework. As well, efforts were focused on fewer individual projects of greater monetary values. Clearly these changes fulfilled the first goal of focusing research effort and increasing project sizes. It is also important to note that this process was actually the prelude to the Corporate Framework (CPF) under which the Centre now operates.

- the Centre did indeed assume a more simplified and streamlined organizational structure with the number of management levels reduced to 3.

- Post Transition, IDRC was back on track with a ratio of 71:29\(^{40}\) program to administrative expenditures. Further the evaluation of the PSUs by the Internet Consulting Group found them to be more efficient and effective than the previous system of delivery of administrative services to Program divisions.

- Centre staff was reduced by 18\%, a little less than the original goal of 20\%. Further, as planned, reductions involved staff at all levels and regions within the organization.

- staff were kept informed about all of the changes being undertaken throughout via all staff memos, meetings, the internal newsletter, and President Bezanson's divisional visits. Staff were able to voice all comments, concerns, complaints and grievances, using the Transition Team E-mail and telephone "hotline".

However, the second objective went beyond a more simplified structure indicating a goal of increased empowerment and decision-making capabilities for centre staff. Whether or not this is seen to have been realized depends on one's perspective. Undoubtedly, this was the case for regional offices which were more autonomous and more integrated in the decision-making and operations of the Centre, post-transition. Yet the opposite is perceived to be the case for headquarters program staff. Discussions with them repeatedly indicated that increased signing levels had resulted in shorter waiting periods for project approval rather than greater empowerment as these increases coincided with changes making the
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number of stakeholders with whom they were required to consult to arrive at a decision significantly increased.

In spite of this particular issue, the fact that all key objectives were essentially satisfied is in itself a testament to the success of the Transition process. These objectives were met all while minimizing the number of employees losing their jobs. The success of the process in achieving these conflicting goals is further underscored by the fact that even though a grievance process was in effect, not a single grievance complaint was received.

X. RECOMMENDED FUTURE ACTIONS AND STRATEGIES

In today's world where resource constraints, funding cutbacks, and the battle against the ever mounting deficit are the norm, and at the forefront of Canadians' minds; the only certainty is that the future is uncertain. IDRC must be poised to adapt to the rapidly changing tides in its environment; both in the world development assistance community and in the realm of Canadian government spending and resource allocation. To this end, in many ways the transition may serve as a template of sorts regarding how to conduct and manage major change within the organization. For instance, the recent budget announced a decrease in IDRC's parliamentary grant (expected to be a continuing trend), Dr. Bezanson indicated a need for the Centre to reduce administrative costs (to maintain 70:30 ratio), and there is a growing push toward revenue generation and cost recovery for the Centre -- all factors which may necessitate a shift in vision and ideology concerning how the Centre does business in the future.

Key learnings from the transition process and recommended future actions are outlined below:

• More extensive planning phase before launching organizational restructuring process

Though the Strategy '91 and the Framework for Transition documents outlined the major thrusts and directions for the restructuring, planning on a more detailed level is an area that could have been improved upon. A memo from then Director of Human Resources indicated that the division proposed its assistance in the preparation of documentation on termination, severance packages etc. The issues of severance and termination of staff are very important in a reorganization process in which downsizing is involved and should have been considered in advance. As mentioned previously, some sort of provision for "bridging" between the "old" and "new" management teams would likely have been helpful. A mechanism to facilitate the development of regional strategies and program plans in a coordinated shared manner between ROs and Program Divisions would also have been helpful.
• Alternate marketing/presentation of any Transition Team type vehicle

Any task force, committee etc. and its role could be presented in a more low keyed manner making it less likely to be viewed as the focal point and making staff expectations more realistic.

Establishing a TT representing a cross-section of occupational, geographical levels and experience within the Centre was certainly very commendable. My file reviews and discussions with some staff members concerning the IDRC transition, indicated that there was some frustration on the part of many staff members (& some transition team members) regarding the perceived versus the actual power and authority of the Transition Team.

Rather than the original mandate of the Transition Team having been deceptive or misleading in any way, it is my impression that the confusion stemmed from the way in which the team was "marketed", as mentioned earlier. All attention was focused on the team and perhaps this led to misconceptions regarding the role and authority of the Transition Team.

• Standard reporting format for all Divisions, Regional Offices submitting plans

This would of course facilitate comparisons between plans and save time for those preparing and for those reviewing any plans generated.

• Greater clarity regarding roles and responsibilities of outgoing and incoming management teams, divisions and regional offices

This again relates to attempting to minimize confusion by having a defined plan regarding roles and responsibilities for specific activities and actions. Although the Transition Schedule did indicate major activities and responsibility areas, on a more detailed level this could have been improved. Prior to the restructuring, Regional Offices had little responsibility for professional staff beyond administrative issues and were not significantly involved in the development of regional program plans. The restructuring changed this dramatically yet pre-planning did not clearly define how such a major change in ROs roles and responsibilities would be effected. It was stated repeatedly that regional plans were to be developed jointly by Program Divisions and Regional Offices yet I noted no guidelines for how this joint effort would be facilitated or occur.
Greater clarity on centralization versus decentralization (Re: roles/authorities of ROs with respect to Program Divisions).

In the Development Assistance business the ultimate goal for an organization should be to put itself out of business. After all, such an organization is really in the business of encouraging the development of local (developing country) capability. For this reason, the move made to alter the operations and increase the authority of ROs was to my mind both relevant and very timely. IDRC needs ROs and these must spearhead regional strategies and programs (particularly in today’s world where there is a great deal of criticism of development work done in the 1950s-1970s; a period during which enormous amounts of money were spent with limited results; characterized by propagation of the "we know what is best for you" mentality). However, in order to maintain a strong unified organization a global/corporate perspective and vision is absolutely necessary, particularly for an organization which is global yet quite small. Therefore, the Centre must have effective mechanisms of communication, shared planning and decision-making RE: Regional priorities, strategies, programs and projects. The organization is too small to be efficient and effective in a scenario in which each unit operates independently. I understand that since the transition the Centre Corporate Framework was developed and implemented to bring greater cooperative strategizing, planning and program delivery into effect. The Regional Strategies (e.g. the Asia Strategy) now being developed aim to move the Centre further towards the headquarters/regional offices collaboration envisioned but not fully realized at the time of the transition.

Clearly defined closure for the restructuring process

The importance of and the need for closure to mark a return to "normalcy" was highlighted in the analysis section of this report. As mentioned, though the Transition Team was initially mandated to sign off on the process this never occurred. Instead, the issue of IDRC being converted to a departmental corporation arrived on the scene as the transition was winding down, then Agenda 21 (& the role bestowed on the Centre by then Prime Minister Mulroney) arrived close on the heels of that. In the event of future restructuring exercises clear and definite closure is recommended.
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1. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

It is time for decision. The Centre has been engaged for over a year in a process of reflection and debate on what strategy it should pursue to make the most effective contribution to development in the coming decade. The experience of thinking in depth about the Centre's role and potential has been a most productive one; it has brought into perspective the Centre's accomplishments and strengths and it has also underscored some relative weaknesses and the need for change in response to shifting circumstances. More specifically, earlier contributions from Centre staff, especially through a series of search conferences in 1990, elicited a number of broad strategic themes, many of which are part of the strategy proposed here. The process of reflecting on ourselves, however, must now be brought to an end in order that the Centre may begin to position itself to meet new challenges, while consolidating the most valuable elements of past experience.

The Centre has been and must remain a "niche" organization, occupying areas where it can exert influence and provide leadership. The mission of IDRC and the resources available require that the "niche" which derives from a strategic planning process be under regular review and re-evaluation.

Following an initial discussion of the strategic issues that need to be addressed, the Executive Committee at its June 1991 meeting requested the President to develop an action plan for the fall Board meeting. This paper responds to that request. It includes an assessment of the emerging context for development, the advantage which the Centre brings to that context, some principles and practices that will guide our
actions and choices over the next several years, and some proposals for organizational and administrative reforms. The document, therefore, is not a definitive strategic plan for the Centre, although it contains elements of such a plan. Companion documents on some tactical aspects of implementing the strategy are available and additional documents will be forthcoming over the next several months. Additional proposals dealing with program objectives and content will be formulated and brought forward over the next several months.

1.1 A New Context for Development Efforts

Over its 20 year history, IDRC has made significant contributions to the work of international development. To maintain the Centre's relevance and effectiveness it is necessary to adjust to and, more importantly, anticipate major transformations in the external environment. The global order in 1991 is markedly different from that prevailing at the Centre's foundation in 1970. The political, economic, social, cultural, environmental, scientific and technological changes of the last two decades have created an entirely new context for developing countries and for IDRC.

There are several major groups of changes that characterize our times, each of which forces us to rethink our ideas and concepts. We should change the way we visualize the process of development, particularly the role that research and knowledge can play.

The first group of changes concerns the rapidly shifting political environment. The predominant feature of the post-war period -- the East-West balance of power -- has been radically transformed. The world is still coming to terms
with the new international order, one in which East-West political differences are a much less powerful influence. Even as this paper is being written, events in the USSR are evolving in a dramatic and rapid way that may leave us breathless but no longer amazed.

The role of the nation state has also been transformed. Our political systems and our thinking about the management of economic, environmental and social forces are based on the concept of the nation state. However, supra- and transnational entities have eroded the ability of these political units to control such phenomena. Also, totalitarianism is in retreat in many parts of the world as democratic movements and political pluralism spread and take hold. Repressive regimes meet with increasingly vocal protest and often international sanctions.

The second group of changes concerns the explosive growth in social demands in developing regions, largely triggered by population increases during the last thirty years. These are extensively catalogued in the World Bank's 1990 "World Development Report" that focuses on poverty, and in the 1991 "Human Development Report" of the UNDP. Coupled with a significant slowdown in population growth in the industrialized nations, this has led to a highly skewed worldwide distribution of needs and of the capabilities to satisfy them. Food and nutrition demands have multiplied many times over, particularly in the poorest countries, and even though aggregate world food production would be more than enough to provide adequate nourishment for all, existing political, social and institutional arrangements -- both at the national and international levels -- have proven incapable of doing so. Similar remarks apply to basic health care and
elementary education.

Rapid urbanization, a phenomenon closely related to population growth and migration, has also created huge demands for housing, sanitation, transportation and energy supply. This adds unmet urban needs and widespread urban poverty to the deprivation that characterizes rural populations throughout the developing world. In addition, unemployment and underemployment have emerged as two of the most troublesome and dangerous phenomena in developing countries.

The major transformations taking place in the patterns of world economic interdependence represent the third group of changes. The rapid growth and globalization of financial markets began in the mid-1970's. Financial markets now form a complicated set of all kinds of transactions which have become increasingly independent of the production and distribution of goods and services. Although these changes may conceivably present new opportunities to developing countries, they also pose new obstacles, the removal of which requires major policy adjustments, highly trained professionals and agile managers.

The content and direction of international trade have also altered significantly. The North Pacific has taken the lead over the North Atlantic as the world's largest trading area. The content of international trade has changed away from commodities (exported primarily by developing countries) towards high technology services and manufactured products (typically the exports of industrialized nations). In addition, powerful new regional trading blocs (e.g. Europe after 1992; Canada-USA-Mexico) are fast emerging and will have major economic effects on much of the world, both
developing and industrial. And continuing uncertainty surrounds the outcome of the currently stalled GATT negotiations, a bleak prospect given the cost of protectionism to the developing economies (calculated by the World Bank to exceed $50 billion annually).

The context for development efforts is increasingly affected by a fourth group of factors concerning the international will and resources for investments in international development. Here we confront the combined impact of "aid fatigue," a global shortage of capital, and the growing trend towards financial transfers from developing countries to their creditors in the North, including negative net flows from multilateral financial institutions. Moreover, all indicators suggest that the world capital shortage which we are currently witnessing will continue for the remainder of this decade and that the prospects for direct private investment in developing countries will, with few notable exceptions, remain limited. The combined effect of these factors indicates clearly that, compared to the levels of the last three decades, resources available for investments in developing countries over the remainder of this decade — whether via concessional or non-concessional channels — will diminish considerably in real terms and even in nominal per capita terms.

A fifth cluster of changes concerns a plethora of technological advances which will continue to open up new opportunities for some countries, but which are likely to create deeper and more intractable problems for others. As part of a more general explosion of knowledge, in a brief span of two decades, and at an ever accelerating pace, we
have witnessed the emergence of entirely new technologies and technological systems relating, for example, to biotechnology, micro-electronics and new materials. Many of these new technologies are highly flexible and mobile, allowing for rapid and continuous modifications and improvements. As such, they are fast changing the way in which the international marketplace has functioned since 1945. Individuals, groups and nations actively participating in the generation and exchange of these new technologies will prosper in the emerging new order; those left behind will become increasingly marginalized. The risk of marginalization is particularly severe for the least developed countries.

In addition, there are cultural and environmental changes which must inform and influence our thinking about development. Of the many cultural transformations under way at present, one of the most pervasive is the growing importance of religious values, ethnic allegiances, and the rise of fundamentalism. In several parts of the world, these phenomena constitute the predominant influence on the lives of people and communities. They are often complicated when the wish to preserve cultural identity comes into conflict with the tendency of the mass media to promote a "foreign" culture.

Social demands and poverty have spread in proportion to population growth, and with them, the realization that the global ecosystem will not be able to withstand the various pressures of its human population. Thus environmental sustainability has become the most stark aspect of planetary interdependence, applying with equal force to all countries, irrespective of wealth, geographical position or political
system. Life-styles, resource use and production systems will have to change in all countries if the challenges of sustainable development are to be met.

Finally, and with specific reference to research for development, we now confront a situation which is sharply different from that of 1970. Donor funding of research has increased very significantly over the past two decades, as has the number of agencies involved in such funding. While detailed information on these increases is not available, the total amount of external support for research in developing countries has grown many times over, and has now reached an estimated level of some $2 billion dollars.

On the recipient side, many more international, regional and national research centres exist today than was the case only a few years ago. The number of international and regional centres in the South increased from 140 in 1970, to more than 200 by 1990. There has also been a notable increase in the capacity to undertake research at the national level in developing countries. The number of agricultural researchers in the Third World has increased fourfold in the 20-year period during 1965-1985, to 45,000 scientists. In all probability, the most significant gains have been made in the field of agriculture and most impressively in the area of plant breeding and production.

The nature of research and how it is conducted have been significantly altered, partly by the products of research itself. New technologies, particularly in the communications and informatics fields, now offer tremendous potential for increasing the speed and efficiency of scientific enquiry. However, perceptions and beliefs about
how research should be carried out to be more effective have probably changed more than actual practice. There is still much work to be done, including research on that very question.

1.2 Implications of The New Context

What then, are the implications of this radically different context for the process of development? What do the dramatic changes which have occurred over the past twenty years, and which continue to accelerate, imply for developing countries and for agencies of development like IDRC?

The first implication is the need to think again what we mean by development. The vocabulary that has been used over time has reflected attitudes and ideas which are often irrelevant by the time the jargon is in common use. "Progressive and backward", "undeveloped and developed", "developing and industrialized", even "rich and poor" are increasingly inaccurate and inappropriate over simplifications. The underlying notion that development is a linear process is no longer valid. More and more, the term empowerment captures the essence of what "development" should be. Given that it cannot and should not be imposed upon a society from outside, development should mean above all that people have the power, in terms of adequate knowledge and capacity, to decide what is best for them and to act accordingly in fulfilling their own destinies.

The second implication follows, and is one of great importance for IDRC - namely that the generation, dissemination and utilization of knowledge will become even
more important in the development process. Perhaps the most vital difference between developed and developing, rich and poor - is the capacity to generate, acquire, disseminate and use scientific and technological knowledge, whether it be modern or traditional. The extent of this capacity will make the difference between those parts of the world where people are able to decide and act independently and those where they cannot.

A third implication is the need for fresh thinking about social, economic and political institutions. Practical and effective intervention through the application of knowledge requires analysis of greater subtlety than that which is based on simple distinctions between "market" and "planned" economies, or "private" versus "public" spheres of economic activity. The theory and ideology that have supported these concepts have outlived their usefulness. For example, the production of goods and the provision of services are carried out through mixed-economy systems in countries that are labelled both "market" and "planned". Interactions that are unencumbered by such distinctions will be needed with a wider variety of entities - trade unions, professional associations, community organizations - that represent civil society and that are in the business of producing and using knowledge.

Fourth, we will need to look differently upon the international system, particularly the multilateral and bilateral development assistance agencies. The system was established to fit the conventional wisdom of "undeveloped vs. developed", "market vs. planned". Even in 1969, before IDRC was created, the Pearson Commission pointed to:
"...considerable uncertainty about the roles of individual international organizations ... (there is) not yet an adequate framework for an expanded and intensified effort to put international development on a firm basis, render it more efficient and make it a cohesive force for international community." (pp. 208 & 227).

As a small but key player, born out of that realization, IDRC must play its part in working out how development agencies can coordinate their efforts better.

Finally, there is the need for all members of the international development community to marshall all conceptual, methodological and technological developments in the theory and practice of social, economic and political change, putting them at the service of development efforts. New concepts of strategy formulation and implementation (e.g. multi-disciplinary, multi-sectoral approaches, interactive planning, strategic issue management) can contribute to a better understanding and management of the problems of the 1990's. Progress in telecommunications, microcomputers and modelling tools make it easier to acquire and exchange information, to experiment with the impact of alternative policies and decisions, and to disseminate ideas and communicate with the public at large. All of this is considerably helped by the growing consciousness about inter-dependencies, and therefore the emergence of global agendas; and by widespread social mobilization -- often supported by mass media -- around issues such as the environment, hunger, the arms race, governance, terrorism, education, drugs and AIDS.
1.3 Comparative Advantage of IDRC

In this new context for development efforts, the Centre faces a range of strategic choices. IDRC's resources are finite; indeed they are minuscule in relation to demand and even in relation to the resources at the disposal of other agencies. We must ask ourselves, therefore, what comparative advantage the Centre brings to bear on the challenges of development in the 1990's.

IDRC has a number of structural and policy-derived characteristics, as well as features it has acquired over two decades of existence, that confer certain advantages in its relations with the entities it supports and other development assistance agencies.

Structural and Policy-Derived Characteristics:

- IDRC is the first of the development assistance institutions that focused exclusively on research support and on the development of science and technology capabilities in developing countries. As such, it has a long and rich experience in this specialized field.

- IDRC has an International Board of Governors that confers broad legitimacy to its activities, differentiating it from purely bilateral agencies. At the same time, the fact that resources from IDRC come primarily from a single source has simplified budgetary negotiations and administrative requirements.
IDRC is based on the explicit philosophy of a full intellectual partnership with its recipients in developing countries; plans and priorities are defined jointly, with the conduct of most research carried out exclusively by recipients. As such, the Centre has avoided the pitfalls of traditional technical assistance agencies, has pioneered an approach that encourages the exercise of judgement and authority, and is prepared to accept mistakes and occasional failures as part of the learning process that leads to capacity building.

IDRC has developed a global perspective on mobilizing science and technology for development objectives, building bridges across continents and putting developing country researchers and policy makers in contact with each other. At the same time, it has given a regional flavour to much of its activity, responding to specific concerns and priorities. A main strength, however (considering IDRC's limited funding capacity), lies in identifying commonalities in development problems and solutions, fostering comparative research across regions, countries and cultures, thereby allowing widely different developing countries to learn from each other.

IDRC is a flexible, agile, mid-size organization that has enough financial
resources to make a difference in research and S & T support. The Centre's resources can be quickly redeployed, given the independence of its Board of Governors and freedom from many administrative and political constraints that affect other development agencies. It has combined support for policy research and for devising specific technical solutions to development problems, showing how knowledge and its proper utilization can make a difference in development.

Acquired Characteristics:

- IDRC has acquired a **favourable reputation and considerable prestige** in most parts of the developing world. This constitutes a capital asset on which the Centre can build. To do so, however, will require innovation; the preservation of goodwill and a favourable image will require adjustments in the Centre in order to deal adequately with the new international context.

- IDRC has developed a broad **network of institutional and individual contacts** throughout the world. Thus, it may be uniquely placed to undertake new initiatives that can make a difference, by mobilizing a large number of organizations and people across continents and regions.
IDRC has developed considerable convening power, based on the confidence it has built over several years of operation according to the principles, features and characteristics described above. Once again, however, it needs to renew continuously this resource by demonstrating that it can continue to be innovative and exercise leadership.

These structural, policy-derived and acquired characteristics are the starting points to guide strategic thinking in IDRC in the coming years.

1.4 Resource Availability

Financial resources available to IDRC have declined in real terms over the past three years, and all indications are that the parliamentary grant to the Centre may continue to decline in real terms over the next few years. Figure 1 outlines the changes in the grant projections provided to the Centre, starting in 1987/88, with projections to 1994/95. The accumulated effect of these changes now requires a fresh look at program planning.

Juxtaposed against our financial (revenue) prospects are the fixed cost factors of Centre operations. Assuming no shift in the nature and general content of our operations, these costs are likely to rise at rates considerably above the increases forecast for the Parliamentary Grant.
IDRC's GRANT: Actual & Projected Levels
(in 1987-88 dollars)

$ Millions

PROJECTED
- ★ March/89
- ★★ May/90
- ◊ April/91 (Est.)
- ♦ June/91 (Est.)

ACTUAL
- ○ 1987/88 TO 1991/92
IDRC programming must take careful account of these changes in revenue prospects. Indeed, it would be unrealistic and unwise to assume any improvement in these prospects over the near term. It is, however, equally true that we must not passively accept a continued decline in our financial situation. Thus, while we must adjust to our short term financial realities, we must do so in such a way as to attract additional, new and more diversified sources of financing as soon as possible. The best way to do this is by maintaining and enhancing our effectiveness.

1.5 The Imperative of Change

Thus a number of factors - the new context for development, the need to define a special role in order to remain effective, the pressures of budgetary limitations on efficiency criteria - combine to make change in IDRC an imperative. Any analysis of the external environment shows that change is the only certainty. On all fronts, from the geo-political to the world of science, the pace of change is quickening. In the face of these factors, the role for IDRC must necessarily involve a careful selection of program areas, a concentration of our energies and resources and a perseverance in our chosen areas of work. As a counterbalance to the need to concentrate and to persevere, we will need to leave some margin for manoeuvre to react to changing circumstances, certainly within our chosen areas of focus. We must, at the same time, increase and improve our communication within Canada in order that the role, accomplishments and potential of IDRC are better understood.

As changes are made, some rapidly, some phased in more
gradually, great care will be taken to keep our sights fixed on basic criteria and practices that will improve the Centre's effectiveness. Some of these fundamentals for change have served us well in the past; others are necessary adjustments to the way in which we will pursue our mission.
2. MISSION AND VISION

The Act of Parliament creating IDRC assigns the Centre a unique role among Canadian institutions and a distinctive place among international development agencies as a knowledge through research organization. The IDRC mission may be stated succinctly as follows:

empowerment through knowledge

It is predicated on the explicit relationship between knowledge and development and in the conviction that development of nations, peoples, communities and individuals, however it is to be defined, requires their empowerment through knowledge. Research provides the means for the production of appropriate knowledge and thence for development. The capacity to conduct research, therefore, is a necessary condition for empowerment. IDRC will continue to dedicate itself to creating, maintaining and enhancing indigenous research capacity, responding to indigenously determined needs, focusing efforts and addressing the barriers to action from research in the interest of equity and social justice.

The task before us is to translate the Centre's mission into a clear program framework which will guide and inform the detailed choices to be made in consultation with our research partners and which will permit an assessment of our progress. To do so requires:

- a new perspective on development and IDRC's place in it;
- adjusted programming instruments in order to maximize the impact of available resources;
- greater efficiency in program execution;
- a sharper program focus (i.e. some limiting of the range of our activities);
- flexibility and agility to adjust as conditions and experience dictate; and
- perseverance in our efforts.

In the coming decade, IDRC will strive to consolidate and reinforce a vision of itself as a results-oriented "research for development" organization. This implies developing and sharing with others a conception of an IDRC that: emphasizes the potential benefits arising from the research that it supports; that links developing countries with global research agendas and potential beneficiaries with local problem-solving efforts; and that is capable of influencing others as a result of the quality and innovative character of its work.
3. FUNDAMENTAL PREMISES AND GUIDELINES FOR CHANGE

3.1 Perspectives on IDRC

What is IDRC's view of what it should be, of the characteristics by which we wish to define ourselves and by which we wish to be seen and judged?

The structural, organizational and cultural characteristics of IDRC have evolved considerably. Our research and development mandate requires that we constantly build and rebuild an organization that provides the necessary structural room for recipients and staff at all levels to take responsibility, to innovate, experiment and learn, thereby tapping and developing a far greater range of their capacities. At the same time, the high degree of scientific specialization engendered by the knowledge explosion means that the Centre must develop mechanisms for drawing the appropriate specialist expertise into its endeavours.

The culture of IDRC must continue to be asserted as that of an organization for learning. This requires that we reaffirm and extend the entrepreneurial nature of our organization and its staff, that we seek ways to reinforce and reward experimentation and risk-taking in the context of a shared culture.

To consolidate and advance these characteristics of organizational culture, our basic operating style must be built on the principles of delegating to staff and recipients at all levels as much authority as possible within a context of agreed objectives; of minimizing the
degree to which the initiatives of staff and recipients require prior approval by other levels; of accountability; and of evaluation of lessons learned in order to inform future decision-making. This calls for devolution of decision-making processes and learning. The intent must clearly be to develop the capacities of people, give them greater opportunities to contribute, and integrate their contributions with a learning process which is cumulative and whose results are greater than the sum of its parts.

It is important, therefore, that we devolve to our research partners greater responsibility and authority in defining, planning, executing and controlling the research agenda. This will entail the acceptance of higher risk: but it is also imperative to the evolution of responsible partnerships and genuine empowerment.

A related requirement is a willingness to embrace error and an understanding that mistakes are an inevitable part of any learning process --- all the more so in the domain of research and in a discontinuous environment. If we do not consciously take risks and embrace the learning value of mistakes that necessarily occur, our ability to innovate and be at the leading edge of research for development will be compromised.

Where should IDRC situate itself in order to profit to the fullest extent from our strengths and to maximize our contribution to international development?

Clearly our relevance and impact are enhanced in direct proportion to the extent to which we make full use of our comparative advantage.
Strategic initiatives will be needed that combine specific program choices with innovations in the way we conduct both our internal business and our relations with our research partners. Such initiatives will typically involve:

- selectively strengthening national research capability in order to create core centres of excellence which can be linked to programs in other countries as well as in the home country;

- international initiatives, such as creating international research or information centres to support disparate national efforts and including the possible involvement of other actors like industrial countries or the private sector, and;

- alliances with other funding and development agencies to create multilateral financial and policy frameworks.

One example of previous Centre experience with this kind of initiative was the creation of a program to explore the potential development benefits of agro-forestry. The potential of combining agricultural and forestry practices for the creation of sustainable agricultural production systems was not unknown, but until the IDRC initiative there was only limited research in a few small programs. It was surprising that there was no recognition then of the need for research on small scale farming systems as they actually function, with an integration of woody perennials, animals and crops. Conventional research was almost invariably directed to the maximization of individual components, rather than the optimization of land use
systems. On the basis of a review of agro-forestry commissioned by IDRC in 1975, it was decided to create the International Council for Research on Agro-Forestry (ICRAF). IDRC sponsored a number of meetings of potential donors before enough support was generated to establish ICRAF as executing agency. ICRAF has now been accepted into the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), which assures financial stability and improves its ability to respond to the growing concern for environmental sustainability.

Similar initiatives have been taken such as: the MINISIS1* program; the macro economics network in Africa; the International Commission on Health Research for Development; and an Economic Mission to South Africa, at the request of the Canadian government. The activities differ widely but all are based on identifying a major niche where the Centre could make a significant contribution and on pursuing a strategy involving other actors over a considerable period of time. These examples serve to illustrate the range of strategic initiatives of which the Centre is capable. They have made a difference by exploiting our comparative advantage.

3.2 Directions For Our Work

Given the need to develop strategic niches and to become a more "results oriented" institution, the following general directions will guide our program choices:

* A software for the management of textual databases.
i) Increasing opportunities: working on global and "common" problems;

ii) Using research capacity more effectively;

iii) Working with others; and

iv) Acting as a knowledge broker.

IDRC's contribution in the past has focused more on the local or micro level. Clearly there are many issues that profoundly affect the quality of life and which are regional or local in character -- and we will continue to support them. However, with increased national capacity to address more sector and location specific research questions and with other donors providing more resources, we feel that the pay-off to IDRC investments can be increased by devoting relatively more resources to a few, carefully selected global and "common" (i.e. inter-regional) problems. Such problems will require that inter-disciplinary approaches be afforded greater emphasis. While issues such as changing trade patterns, financial markets and environmental conditions determine the development prospects of individual countries, research to understand their effects and identify different options is often inadequate. Lack of knowledge about options, opportunities and threats is one of the main reasons why developing countries have only limited influence on the global agenda. This applies in
particular to advances in science and technology where the pace of change is accelerating. The Centre proposes to direct more support to those broad areas where opportunities can be identified to effect change and to increase participation of the developing world.

ii) Using Research Capacity More Effectively

There has been a significant increase in developing country research capacity over the last 20 years. While available resources are still grossly inadequate, the prospects for increasing research output by providing more inputs are limited over the medium term. (This is not to suggest that the creation of new capacity and raising the level of existing capacity do not continue to be legitimate and important components of Centre work). However, given the size of existing research systems in the South, as measured by the total annual expenditure on research and development of all types, estimated to be about $20 billion, there could be significant gains from an increase in productivity in the short term.

The problem for development research then is not just to attract more funds (though this is important), but to ensure that existing capacity is used effectively.

IDRC will contribute to the effective use of research capacity in two ways: greater commitment to utilization, and better understanding of "what works" in development research.
• **IDRC and utilization:** IDRC will make greater efforts and commit more resources to ensure that the products from the activities which it supports are utilized - through better specification of the expected outcomes and clearer identification of potential users, uses, benefits and costs. Intended beneficiaries will be empowered through their participation in determining what research is required and, if appropriate, in the research process itself. IDRC will be more active in funding or seeking resources for follow-up (dissemination, pilot plants and testing).

Efforts to involve the private sector where appropriate will also be made. This is a relatively new area for IDRC and one which will doubtless pose new questions and new difficulties, but one that must be tackled. To take research and knowledge to the stages of application and utilization may require joint actions and partnership with private enterprise. This concern will cut across all Centre programs.

• **Research on effective research systems:** The Centre will continue and intensify its efforts to assess "what works" in development research. Little information exists on how research for development is best organized or how to ensure that the products of useful research can be more speedily and widely applied. A new program will be developed to support research on such topics and to draw closely on the Centre's evaluation research of its own experience. Included here will be
attention to the important question of how to improve policy research -- the formulation, packaging and application of knowledge for policy making.

iii) Working With Others

The Centre will work more closely with others to enhance both the financial resources for necessary research and its overall influence on development issues. To be more effective and relevant, it is necessary for IDRC to be engaged actively with a larger number of actors - including the Canadian universities and scientific community, the multilateral institutions, other donors and, above all, our developing country partners.

While IDRC will be more active in identifying issues to be addressed, the principle of mutual respect will continue to guide the choices that are made. Advisory groups and other consultative mechanisms will allow the Centre to work even more closely with developing country researchers and policy makers. New ways to inform this partnership will be sought, including devolution to appropriate institutions and researchers in the South.

Support for South/South collaboration will continue to be a key feature of Centre operations. IDRC will test new communication techniques to increase knowledge sharing between countries and will explore ways to improve existing networks.
Enhanced partnerships with Canadian organizations and institutions will also be developed. The Centre's involvement with Canadian organizations has been relatively limited, with the notable exception of the Cooperative Program initiated in 1980. The Canadian development community, always small, is in decline and opportunities are decreasing for Canadians to participate directly in development work. In this regard, the complementary natures of IDRC and CIDA suggest a continuation of recent efforts to exploit a special partnership. Involvement with other Canadian institutions should look beyond the traditional concept of North/South technical assistance and asymmetry, and should focus on the mutual interests of Canada and developing countries.

The Centre already has close links with the small groups of agencies and foundations that devote most of their resources to supporting development research. We intend to reinforce and expand linkages to these and other development financing organizations. The larger donor agencies, for whom research is only a small part of their lending programs, contribute most of the funds that are labelled "development research". They are potentially key actors in implementing research results. IDRC will explore a broader relationship with these larger agencies, such as the World Bank, the regional development banks and the UNDP.

iv) Acting as a Knowledge Broker

IDRC plays a role as a knowledge broker, over and
above providing funds to research. Its widespread access to a broad network of Canadian and developing country researchers, and to information on development and on science and technology, mean that it has a responsibility to inform and influence others, both in developing countries and in other development organizations. At the micro or project level, the Centre can provide information to researchers, and put them in contact with the scientific community at large.

The information generated from work on global development and technological changes and on increasing the effectiveness of research systems will provide a more systematic assessment of what works in development and research. This will permit the Centre to build on its existing capability as a learning organization. The knowledge gained from evaluation of project and program results will be used to inform and influence other actors. IDRC will improve its scanning of the research environment and its ability to pick out important but neglected areas.

3.3 Some Guiding Principles

(i) **An Efficient IDRC**: The Centre must become more efficient in the use of resources in the pursuit of its mission. In becoming more efficient, we must retain our effectiveness by reinforcing and advancing the importance of full intellectual partnership in the support and conduct of research. The Centre will continue to provide non-administrative support and certain services in addition to money. Therefore, we
will continue to appear "labour intensive", relative to some other agencies.

The Board, (Executive, June 1991) has clearly indicated that first priority should be given to increasing the "... proportion of the Centre's funds flowing in direct support of research in developing countries." The proportion of total funds that flows out to grant recipients is one indicator of efficiency which has declined in recent years, a trend which now must be reversed. The intention is to increase this percentage steadily over the next several years to a level of approximately 70%.

Program funds appropriated per Program Officer (P.O.) per annum have also declined significantly. The Centre will aim to achieve, as a Centre-wide average, annual appropriations per Program Officer of $1.0 million in 1992/93, and to take further measures to increase that level in subsequent years.

Administrative procedures are to be streamlined and simplified in order to achieve greater efficiency and to permit a reallocation of financial resources from administrative to program matters. This must, however, be effected with great care in order to ensure that the highest standards of administrative service are maintained, and that the fiduciary responsibilities of the Centre are not compromised. The primary consideration is that we must control what is important and only what is important. This will involve a shift to more selective control, with a greater reliance on risk analysis.
Sharpening The Centre's Focus: A critical mass of resources is required for any given program to have a significant impact. Recognizing the need for an integrated and coherent set of research activities, the Centre will concentrate its resources in fewer programs. IDRC will continue to promote and experiment with more integrated approaches that cut across disciplines. The smaller number of program areas and increased attention to "global" and "common" development issues will ensure that the disciplinary and interdisciplinary aspects of problem-solving are addressed in context and not in isolation.

With the new strategy, the average size of IDRC grants is expected to rise. The Centre will focus on a smaller number of institutions, but its support will be more complete - covering research-complementing needs (e.g. library, administration, training) as well as research per se. This is an area in which the Centre has considerable experience, particularly through its experiments with integrated support for research institutions (ISRI). The Centre will select the most appropriate institutions to work with and, where possible, ensure necessary linkages through networking and spillover to other countries ready to engage in similar research activities. Concentration on a smaller number of institutions is likely to lead to the Centre working in fewer countries, but this will be a consequence of selecting a smaller number of institutions to support.

Continuity and Perseverance: Building strong research institutions and strengthening the capacity to conduct
research and utilize its results is a time-consuming process which requires persistence. Future IDRC support will be sustained for longer periods. Short term project support in isolation from the broader institutional development context has proven to be relatively ineffective, particularly when dealing with the weaker research institutions.

(iv) Assessing the Centre's Performance: Like other research support agencies and organizations, IDRC has developed methods for measuring research inputs. By contrast, the measurement of outputs is a much more complex and difficult business. Research, by its very nature, entails a high level of risk and results may be apparent only over the very long term. IDRC must, therefore, reinforce its own knowledge of the assessment activities and results of other organizations. In addition, Centre programs and activities must become more precise in stating objectives in terms that are conducive to assessing and measuring output. It will often be difficult to be absolutely clear about the causal links between Centre activities and development results. This should not prevent us from encouraging the measurement of development effects whenever possible, while making a clear distinction between inputs and outputs, and between intermediate results and ultimate impact. Emphasis on assessing what we do and what we achieve will help the Centre increase the efficiency and effectiveness of its operations, demonstrate quality and willingness to improve performance, and allow it to exert a positive influence on partners and recipients.
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Note: At this stage, the program areas shown under each division are illustrative only. The final number and content of programs will be established by the new management team during the transition.
function of program changes, devolution and greater focusing. Not all such positions have been identified as yet and precise numbers are not available. This illustrates the first feature of the transition: it will be phased over a period of 18 to 24 months. There are several reasons for this. The Centre has a very large "investment portfolio" of active research projects. In moving to a new structure and greater program concentration, decisions about which projects to maintain and which to close should not be taken hastily. The latter will require technical and financial monitoring until our commitments have been met. This work is best done by those familiar with the institutions and procedures, both in Ottawa and the Regional Offices.

Furthermore, the Centre wishes to effect the changes and the transition with sensitivity and full attention to the human dimension. Over the transition period and assuming no significant shift in revenues, the aggregate reduction in positions is expected to be in the order of 20 percent. The reductions will occur in senior management, program and support staff, and will be shared between headquarters and the regions. The process will be managed with extreme care and as equitably as possible.

4.3 Articulating a "Division of Labour" and Partnerships

IDRC must seek out new partnerships in development including Canadian organizations, such as CIDA, and non-Canadian donors. This will include co-financing large-scale projects and programs, exploiting the complementarities of other possible sources of finance. Exploring these options requires the prior identification
of areas of special emphasis and concern to other financial agents of research for development, be these multilateral, public or private. While doing so, the Centre will be mindful of the need for a balance between partnerships and specialization, on the one hand, and the incentives created by healthy competition, on the other.

4.4 Diversifying IDRC Funding

The Centre will attempt to identify new resources for research both from Canadian ODA and external sources. There may be opportunities to use funds from other research funding agencies and to generate revenue from publications, patents, and by contracting Centre services. The Centre already has some experience in this area: approximately 42 million dollars have been managed outside the parliamentary grant. This covers funds from external ODA agencies for specific projects, and modest revenues derived from the sale of Centre patents and publications. However, the Centre has not as yet actively encouraged or searched for alternative sources of funding given the record of growth in its parliamentary grant.

We intend to contract out services or facilities wherever this can be accommodated within Centre objectives, and to test more innovative approaches in promoting the utilization of research. There may be opportunities for private sector funding of pilot development phases arising out of successful research work. These initiatives may best be handled separately from the grant disbursing function and structure of the Centre. IDRC, therefore, will study the feasibility of establishing an appropriate mechanism, (e.g. some form of private sector entity, such
as a wholly owned foundation), which would be able to operate on commercial principles to increase revenue for IDRC.

4.5 Defining the Centre's Regional Presence

IDRC has established a network of regional offices, predicated on the view that a regional presence is important in responding to the variety of needs and characteristics of different developing regions. The definition of roles and responsibilities between headquarters and regional offices does not, however, provide the clarity required for efficient and effective resource allocation. Additionally, the Centre is simply not in the position to build the full range of programs in each regional office. Moreover, as the Centre moves increasingly over the next few years to work on global and "common" problems, we must determine the extent to which the regional offices are the most appropriate vehicles.

In order to resolve these issues and starting in 1992, IDRC regional offices will be designated as responsibility centres for region-specific programs, including planning, execution and evaluation. The first step will be the preparation of regional strategic proposals which will be drawn up under the authority of the head of each regional office. The analysis will include a framework of regional development concerns, the research environment, including the activities of other donors, and proposals involving research priorities and institutions of concentration.

Also, starting early in 1992, the organization and structure of each regional office will be the subject of an
independent examination which will facilitate adjustments and "fine-tuning" to this approach.
5. EMPOWERMENT THROUGH KNOWLEDGE

We are living in an era of change, more powerful and rapid than at any time in recent history. If the very survival of the human species is not threatened, as claimed by many, the shape of our global order is certainly changing in a dramatic and irreversible manner. Those who regard the situation with optimism point to the enormous potential of planetary resources - physical, human, technological - for bringing about increased well-being and they interpret recent events on the geopolitical front as evidence of the human will to remove totalitarianism and permit the emergence of participatory and pluralistic systems within which human creativity can flourish. Other analysts view the current situation with alarm. There is broad agreement, however, on the urgency of directing global resources towards realizing the potential for human benefit that unquestionably exists. The point of balance is fine and the risks from a misdirection of those resources great; thus is it imperative that all conceptual and methodological capabilities be marshalled in the interest of development.

In order to intervene effectively, IDRC will be guided by the focus of our mission: empowerment through knowledge. Resources alone are not sufficient. Our role must be to help provide that other necessary ingredient - knowledge: but in such a way that people are empowered by knowledge to determine and meet their own needs without damaging their neighbours' or their childrens' prospects of doing the same.
All the elements of our strategy - the choice of program areas; the devolution of research responsibilities to partner institutions; the participation of beneficiaries in the research process; the integration of scientific disciplines to exploit opportunities; the tailoring of programs to fit specific regional characteristics - will be directed towards empowering researchers, leaders and citizens with relevant knowledge.

The very act of beginning to implement this strategy will generate new ideas and encounter shifting ground. Certain fixed points and sustained effort will be needed. At the same time, IDRC and its research partners will need to remain conscious of the room to manoeuvre provided by the strategy, of the obligation to exploit it to the fullest, and of the imperative that the Centre's characteristics of risk-taking and perseverance be further developed and reinforced. Preserving the ability to see the horizon as well as the immediate foreground, distinguishing the optimum from the expedient, and pursuing the difficult at the expense of the orthodox: these are the foundations of this Strategic Plan and will be the hallmarks of a Centre of excellence.
The Board of Governors,

Recognizing the need for a comprehensive review of Centre policies and strategic directions,

Having instructed the President in June 1991 to propose an appropriate strategy for its consideration,

Having devoted many sessions over the last year to the discussion and review of proposals in this regard,

Having carefully studied the document, IDRC Strategy 1991 (BG 47/16), presented by the President,

Having taken into account the explanations furnished by the President,

Endorses the strategy set out in the document and agrees that the Centre’s activities and mode of operation be based on the following:

1. The mission of the Centre is:

   **Empowerment through knowledge**

   This re-states the idea, explicit in the Act of Parliament which founded the Centre in 1970, and which recognizes the comparative advantage of IDRC as a development agent.

2. The Centre should strive to consolidate and reinforce a vision of itself as:

   a results-oriented "research for development" organization

3. The Centre’s basic operating style will encompass the following principles:

   - Delegating as much authority as possible to staff,
   - Devolving increasing responsibilities to the Centre’s recipients,
• Encouraging initiative and the testing of new ideas,
• Accounting for actions taken pursuant to authority delegated
• Evaluating lessons learned in order to inform decision-making and guide future action.

4. The Centre will develop strategic niches, and its programme choices will be guided by:

Devoting proportionally more resources to a few carefully selected problems and issues, including those having a global dimension,

Using research capacity more effectively by making a greater commitment to the utilization of research results and by intensifying efforts to assess "what works" in development research,

Working more closely with others in order to link the results of research to development,

Employing IDRC's comparative advantage in order to fulfil its role as a knowledge broker.

Approved by the Board of Governors
October 18, 1991
The Board of Governors,

Having adopted a strategy for the Centre,

Having examined the proposals for a Framework for Transition, as outlined in the document IDRC Strategy 1991,

Taking into consideration further information provided by the President,

1. Resolves that a transition process be put in place, to last up to 24 months, in order to facilitate the introduction of the measures required for the most efficient implementation of the Strategy.

2. Requests the President, during the transition period, to:
   - give effect to proposals for programme choices and for a simplified and streamlined structure for the Centre;
   - take the decisions required in order to reduce at all levels, both at headquarters and in the regional offices, the number of positions in total by approximately twenty percent (20%); and
   - report to Governors on a regular basis on the implementation of the above.

3. Invites the President to explore the possibility of identifying new sources of funding for the Centre.

4. Encourages the President to pursue his efforts in defining the number, roles and responsibilities of the Centre’s representations (offices) in the developing regions.

Approved by the Board of Governors
October 18, 1991
APPENDIX II
- Transition Schedule (November 1991)
8 November 1991

All Staff

Keith A. Bezanson

TRANSITION SCHEDULE

I have now completed my visits to the individual Centre divisions and departments. I enjoyed meeting with you and hope these meetings were as useful to you as they were to me. I will soon begin visiting the regions.

During these meetings, the most often asked questions related to when certain events would take place or about their sequence. I am happy to attach a copy of a Transition Schedule which has now been reviewed both by Management and the Transition Team. It should go a long way in answering many of your questions.

Should you have any detailed questions regarding the schedule of events, please do not hesitate to contact the Transition Team.

More information on policies which will guide us during this transition period will be issued during the next few days.

I count on your continued support.

Attach.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of IDRC Strategy 1991, new organizational structure, appointments of new Directors and special severance package</td>
<td>Oct. 91</td>
<td>BOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement of New Strategy to Staff + External Parties</td>
<td>Oct. 91</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement of Transition Team (TT)</td>
<td>Oct. 91</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin recruitment of new Board-appointed officers</td>
<td>Oct. 91</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement of Transition Schedule</td>
<td>Nov. 91</td>
<td>TT/President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors + Regional Managers (RMs) submit regional staffing requirements</td>
<td>Nov. 91</td>
<td>Dir/RMs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Managers submit organizational structure, regional program staff proposals and preliminary outline of positions</td>
<td>Nov. 91</td>
<td>RMs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II (cont'd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors submit proposals for new organizational structure/programs</td>
<td>Nov. 91</td>
<td>Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and preliminary outline of positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines issued on budget process for FY 92/93</td>
<td>Nov. 91</td>
<td>DAF(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval and dissemination of papers &amp; guidelines on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) strategy for the realignment of staff;</td>
<td>Nov. 91</td>
<td>TT/Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) salary protection termination processes;</td>
<td>Nov. 91</td>
<td>TT/Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) development of position profiles;</td>
<td>Nov. 91</td>
<td>TT/Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) grievance procedure.</td>
<td>Nov. 91</td>
<td>TT/Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHR Briefing sessions in HO and Reg. Offices</td>
<td>Nov. 91</td>
<td>OHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Management Team takes responsibilities</td>
<td>Dec. 91</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of PSU task force report</td>
<td>Dec. 91</td>
<td>DAF/Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of approved PSU function &amp; implementation plan</td>
<td>Dec. 91</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions are made on structures/programs</td>
<td>Dec. 91-June 92</td>
<td>TT/Dir/President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Director of Administration and Finance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Directors and Regional Managers submit budget</td>
<td>Dec. 91-</td>
<td>Dir/DAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition Team reviews divisional + regional implementation plans</td>
<td>Dec. 91-</td>
<td>Transition Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decisions regarding staff selection are made</td>
<td>Dec. 91-</td>
<td>TT/Dir/President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announcement of surplus positions</td>
<td>Jan. 92-</td>
<td>OHR/Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of reduced or terminated program activities</td>
<td>Jan. 92-</td>
<td>Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial structural changes completed</td>
<td>Jan. 92</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress report on implementation (including program definition and initial resource allocation) to Executive Committee</td>
<td>Jan. 92</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Study initiated on role and functions of regional offices</td>
<td>Jan. 92</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress report on implementation to Board, presentation of transition budget for FY 92/93</td>
<td>March 92</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase III</strong> (cont'd)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report on implementation to Executive Committee</td>
<td>June 92</td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent changes implemented</td>
<td>FY 92/93</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to office space requirements completed</td>
<td>Sept. 92</td>
<td>DAF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress report on implementation to Board</td>
<td>Oct. 92</td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation complete + new structure in place</td>
<td>April 93</td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report on transition process</td>
<td>May 93</td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition structures + transition team disbanded</td>
<td>May 93</td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor new organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III
- Transition Team Terms of Reference
TRANSITION TEAM

TERMS OF REFERENCE

✓ provide a focal point for the change process and regular briefings to the President;

✓ clearly identify who is responsible for reporting on the progress associated with each of the changes;

✓ ensure that communication channels are working well;

✓ ensure staff changes are handled as equitably and sympathetically as possible, including the addressing of training and retraining needs;

✓ review any exceptions and problems;

✓ channel any emergency or unplanned issues related to the transition to the appropriate source for resolution;

✓ review the staff changes that are being proposed to ensure they are consistent with the new strategic program directions, the new structure and Centre policies;

✓ help to design, as appropriate, mechanisms in consultation with program divisions, to ensure the transition carefully addresses any changes associated with existing programs and projects;

✓ help to design any additional studies that might need to be done and arrange for financial assistance to do them, if necessary;

✓ help to identify and establish any additional transition structures that need to be put in place; and

✓ sign-off the transition when it is completed.
TRANSITION CHECKLIST BY RESPONSIBILITY

***

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

- approve strategy;
- appoint senior management team;
- approve compensation package;
- define the Board's role in the transition process and in the new Centre (ie. project approval activities, public affairs, committee structures such as P&PC);
- approve transition budget;
- approve new budget process.

PRESIDENT

- announce Board decision regarding strategic plan;
- articulate new vision for Centre to staff and external parties on an ongoing basis;
- announce establishment of Transition Team and its plans;
- clearly establish responsibilities and working relationship with Transition Team;
- make decisions on structures, programs and staff changes;
- report to Board, Executive Committee and staff on transition issues and progress;
- decide on regional office programming responsibilities;
- decide Committee structure;
- address transition issues brought forward by Transition Team;
- monitor the transition process;
- sign-off the transition process and disband the Transition Team.

TRANSITION TEAM

- provide a focal point for the change process and regular briefing to the President;
- ensure staff changes are handled as equitably and humanely as possible including training and retraining needs are fully addressed;
- review any exceptions and problems;
- channel any emergency or unplanned issues related to the transition to the appropriate source for resolution;
ensure communication channels are working well;
identify, with the divisions and regional offices, the new structures, procedures and policies that need to be put in place and map them onto a corporate plan;
identify the financial impacts associated with any proposed changes;
map out a timetable for implementing the different changes;
review the program cuts that are being proposed and ensure the implications are viewed from both a divisional and Centre-wide perspective;
clearly identify who is responsible for reporting on the progress associated with each of the changes;
help design any additional studies that might need to be done and arrange for financial assistance to do them, if necessary;
help identify and establish any transition structures that need to be put in place;
request sign-off of the transition process from the President when the new structure is in place.

DIRECTORS

- develop communications strategy (Corporate Affairs);
- define structures, programs and staffing plans;
- submit transition budget;
- develop implementation plan for making changes;
- review, with RMs, regional office programming responsibilities;
- review Committee structures;
- articulate new vision of Centre to staff and outside interests;
- build staff morale;
- address accommodation and office management logistics (Administration);
- evaluate transition process (Planning and Evaluation);
- monitor new organization.

(Many of these issues will require discussion and review by Management Group).

HUMAN RESOURCES

- develop severance packages;
- develop staffing policies (procedures for staffing new positions, job-sharing guidelines, part-time guidelines, skills bank, etc.);
- assist with recruitment of staff;
- assist with training and retraining.
APPENDIX IV
- IDRC Pre-Transition Organization Chart
ORGANIZATION CHART

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF VICE-PRESIDENT

Program

OFFICE OF VICE-PRESIDENT

Resources

OFFICE OF SECRETARY AND GENERAL COUNSEL

AGRICULTURE, FOOD & NUTRITION SCIENCES DIVISION

HEALTH SCIENCES DIVISION

FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS DIVISION

COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

OFFICE FOR HUMAN RESOURCES

ADMINISTRATION DEPT'T

REGIONAL OFFICES

Nairobi, Kenya
Cairo, Egypt
Dakar, Senegal
Montevideo, Uruguay
Singapore, Singapore
New Delhi, India

IDRC Briefing Manual
1.1.7 INTERNAL AUDIT UNIT

ORGANIZATION CHART

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, AUDIT
(level 15)

AUDIT SUPPORT TECHNICIAN
(level 5)

AUDIT MANAGER
(level 13)

SENIOR OPERATIONAL AUDITOR
(level 11)

OPERATIONAL AUDITOR
(level 10)
ORIENTATION CHART OF THE COMPTROLLERSHIP FUNCTION

Office of the Treasurer

Treasurer

Comptrollership Unit

Deputy Treasurer and Comptroller

Systems Interface

Programmer

General Assistance

Secretary and Receptionist/Secretary

General Accounting

Senior Accountant

4 staff

Regional Office Accounting

Assistant-Comptroller

3 staff

Project Accounting

Assistant-Comptroller

13 staff
APPENDIX V
- IDRC Transition Chronology
Chronology of the IDRC Transition  
October 1991 - April 1993

Establishment of Communication Links

Friday, October 18 (following the BOG meeting) LAN message to all IDRC staff containing exact wording of the resolution by Board of Governors, approving the Strategy '91 document.

Monday, October 21, 1991 All Staff Memo RE: approval of Strategy'91 document by the Board of Governors.

Tuesday, October 22, 1991 All Staff Memo from President Bezanson RE: the Establishment and Composition of the Transition Team its mandate, roles and responsibilities.

All Staff Meeting with President Bezanson and Dr. Janet Wardlaw (then, Chairperson of the IDRC Board) Wednesday, October 23rd from 9 until 11 a.m. RE: The Strategy and its Implications.

Memo to all staff, October 25, Ray Audet, Chair of Transition Team, informed staff of the newly set up E-mail address, TRANSITION @ EO BD for the Transition Team.

Division/department (at Headquarters) visits conducted by President Bezanson between end of October and November 8, 1991.

First transition Echogramme, December 2, 1991. In this internal newsletter mechanisms for contacting the Transition Team were listed and three commonly asked questions were answered.

Echogramme, December 16, 1991 (transition 2). In this bulletin, four more frequently asked questions were answered and issues surrounding voluntary departure were clarified.

Transition Team Progress Report to President Bezanson, December 11, 1991. Actions of the team up to that point in time, as well as issues and concerns requiring discussion and decision, were listed.

January 9, 1992 memo from Transition Team Chair advised Regional and Division Managers of the President’s request that they forgo all travel until the end of February so process/decision-making not impeded by their absences.

January 14th memo from the President to the Board of Governors indicated that each RO was visited by someone from OHR to explain the severance package & answer questions.

Third Transition Bulletin, Echogramme January 31, 1992. The extension of the volunteer redundancy deadline was announced and progress on the review of Divisional and regional office plans was outlined.
Organizational Design and Planning

- October 10-11 - Skeleton of new Structure decided - Meeting at Minto Place -- outlined 5 new program divisions and draft list of the program areas each would include.

- October 23 All Staff Meeting with President & Chair of BOG - new heads of Divisions announced (except Pierre Beemans - CAID announced in November).

- Transition workplan prepared & circulated to Centre staff - early Nov. & at this point former Program Directors & Regional Directors asked to develop strategies Re: reorganizing their areas; staffing plans in keeping with the directions, vision & philosophy of Strategy '91 document.

- CAID - to be composed of 4 program areas - Research Systems Development, Research Information Centre, Policy and Planning, and Canadian Initiatives. Doug Daniels was charged with fleshing out the Research Systems Development Program.

- In a 2 day meeting at Headquarters between Regional Directors and the President (October 30, 31, 1991) rough figures setting out allowable numbers of Ottawa-hired and locally-hired staff for each of the 6 Regional Offices were tentatively agreed to.

- Division Directors and Regional Directors were to submit staffing requirements by Nov. '91.

- Division Directors and Regional Managers were to submit organizational struct. program staff proposals and preliminary position outlines also in Nov. of 1991.

- draft plan for staff reductions in new Finance and Administration division forwarded to President from Ray Audet, Nov. 8, 1991.

- all staff memo containing a brief report on the Management Group Meeting of November 22, 1991 the President announced the appointment of Pierre Beemans as the new Director General of the newly formed Corporate Affairs and Initiatives Division (CAID).

- memo RE: restructuring of WARO received from Pierre Sané Nov. 22, 1991 (had org. chart showing 34 staff while final # was 24).

- plan from SARO received December 2, 1991.

- review of plans from Finance and Administration division, WARO & SARO by the Transition Team underway, December 11, 1991.

- Herzka/Kirby Study on role and operations of Regional Offices was commissioned in January, 1992.
- in a memo of December 30, 1991 the Transition Team Chairperson further informed Regional Directors that they were to provide the following additional information no later than January 15, 1992:
  ○ listing of current Regional Office positions and incumbents.
  ○ listing of positions which will remain largely unchanged and in which the incumbent is recommended.
  ○ listing of positions which will remain largely unchanged and more than 1 candidate is qualified and/or interested, your preference and the rationale for it.
  ○ listing of new positions and/or those that are greatly changed (to be open for competition for Centre staff world-wide).


- Memo from J. Allan Rix, former Director OHR to R. Audet re: Proposed positions in OHR post- April 1, 1992. Indicates that 4 positions - Organizational Development Service, Staff Relations Officer, Staffing Officer, and Full-time Language Officer - will be dropped, while remaining positions will remain virtually unchanged.


- the final report of the PSU Task Force was approved in February of 1992 by the IDRC Board of Governors.

- PSU Managers were selected first week of March, 1992.

- Fifth Transition Echogramme, Friday, April 3, 1992 outlines IDRC's new management team - President, Directors General and all Directors.

- 3 working groups were set up with staff from Ottawa & regional offices to identify key recommendations from Herzka/Kirby RO Report needing further discussion by SMC (Sr. Mgmt Committee). Working gps. presented their findings to Mgmt. Gp, Sept. 29, 1992.

**Staff Selection, Redundancy, Options and Compensation**


- Fourth Echogramme, dated Thursday March 19, 1992 listed all (over 90) vacant positions open for competition. Candidacy of redundant staff was to be given first consideration, ahead of other internal and external applicants. Position descriptions and requirements were available through the LAN on the W:\ drive.
Implementation of Changes

- April 1, 1992 new organizational structure takes effect.
- ROs were allocated their own budgets and Regional Program Officers reporting system altered so that they now reported to Regional Office Directors.

- May 1992 PSUs up and running in the Program Divisions.
APPENDIX VI
- Realignment of Staff Document
"EMPOWERMENT THROUGH KNOWLEDGE"

"S'AFFRANCHIR PAR LE SAVOIR"

STRATEGY

FOR

THE REALIGNMENT OF STAFF

IDRC / CRDI
NOVEMBER 1991
STRATEGY FOR THE REALIGNMENT OF STAFF

Having completed its strategic review, the Centre is now in a position to realign its organizational structure to reflect the changes in direction and priorities.

The following strategy is part of a multilevel, multi-purpose effort undertaken by the Centre in order to both improve its operating efficiency and become more cost effective. The Staff Realignment Strategy is not to be seen as a simple exercise in cutting positions, but as an integral part and essential component of the overall effort to position the Centre within the context of its overall strategic plan.

The various processes presented below have been designed to ensure that staffing decisions are made according to two basic criteria: **consistency** and **fairness**.

**Notes:**

1) It is assumed that as a result of the Strategic Reorientation of the Centre, there will be a reduction of approximately 20% of positions (not necessarily people), starting November 1991.

2) The plans outlining the reduction of positions that each division and each regional office will prepare, will be submitted to the **Transition Team** for review and comments.

3) The Centre will make every attempt possible to minimize the number of employees released.

4) In this proposal, the term "employee" will include all staff that have the "indeterminate" status, all Board-appointed officers, as well as employees who have been on a "fixed term contract" and whose employment has been continuous for three years or more.

5) The policies of the Management Policy Manual will apply in administering this strategy.
Step One: Organizational Design/Planning

(Starting October 1991)

The Director/Manager of each division/regional office clarifies the change(s) in mandate, objectives and priorities that have to be made in the context of the strategic reorientation. Within the limits of the person-years available, the Director/Manager finalizes the new organization structure of the division/regional office. From this, the Director/Regional Manager presents the organization chart and preliminary descriptions of work and position requirements to the President, Management Group and Transition Team. The plan will also indicate any new positions being created.

At this stage of the organizational review, the focus will be kept on streamlining procedures and processes and eliminating work, rather than on choosing who should leave.
Step Two: Development of Job Profiles

The second part of the review will determine the kind of expertise, knowledge, skills and experience that will be necessary to accomplish the work of each division/regional office. A second level analysis will lead to the development of a concise job profile (the job requirements) for each position. The job profile will contain the key areas of work/responsibility for the position, the knowledge and skills required, the necessary related experience and the essential professional and/or academic qualifications. If a position has not been significantly changed by the restructuring, the existing job description may be sufficient.
Step Three: Staff Selection Process

In the third part, the Director/Manager of each division/regional office refers to the job profiles mentioned above, and reviews all existing staff in relation to the revised organizational mandate and structure. This process of matching employees and positions is done to ensure that positions are filled with the most suitable employees. Selection of staff will be based on the job profile with reference to:

- knowledge and skills
- relevant experience and expertise
- past work performance
IF ... THEN rules:

When making decisions on the staffing of positions, the Director/Manager will use the following rules:

**If** the position has not changed significantly, and the incumbent meets the requirements of the position, **then** the incumbent is confirmed in the position.

**If** the position has changed significantly and the incumbent does not meet the requirements, **then** the Director/Manager will post the position internally and follow the normal staffing procedures.

**If** a new position is created, **then** the Director/Manager follows the normal staffing procedures, including the right of a Director to staff a new position by promotion from within.

**If** either the incumbent or any other candidate found through the posting process does not quite match the requirements of the position, and **if** it is believed that with a reasonable amount of training, either one of them could perform the job sufficiently well, **then** either one of them will be confirmed in the position.
If at this point no suitable candidate has been found inside, then the Director/Manager will look outside of the Centre.

If an employee "voluntarily" comes forward and asks to be released, then the Director will balance the needs of the organization and the individual’s request. The employee will indicate in writing to OHR that they wish to be considered for voluntary redundancy.

**NOTE:** Directors/Managers will be required to provide adequate documentation to support their staffing decisions.

**Alternate work arrangements:**

In view of the Centre’s intention to minimize as much as possible the dismissal of employees, Directors/Managers will consult with their employees in order to ascertain the level of interest amongst their staff for job-sharing and regular part-time employment opportunities. These options are available to both managers and employees affected by the changes and if well used can on the one hand minimize the impact on the organization while on the other provide willing employees with some interesting work arrangements.
For example, where the need for two similar positions is reduced to one, due to a reduction of work volume, the two incumbents could share the remaining position and the extra staff year could be cancelled.

This would be an alternative to keeping one employee and releasing another. This option has to be acceptable to both employees affected, as well as to management. If an agreement cannot be reached, then the manager will have to choose the employee to be released by using the criteria presented above.

There are some compensation issues related to part-time work arrangements that will require adjustment in order that this type of employment can be made more attractive to staff. The proposals for changes to the compensation program are presented in Appendix A of this document.
Step Four: Identification of Surplus Staff

As soon as the staffing plan is completed and surplus employees have been identified, the division/regional office forwards its plan to the Management Group for final approval. The surplus employees names are sent to OHR for determination of the severance package or for discussion regarding alternate arrangements, as outlined below. In order to mitigate against the possibility of coerced or unfair "volunteering", the plan will include a list of the employees who volunteered. The list will be filed with the OHR.

Additional options:

Three additional mechanisms will be put in place to minimize further the dismissal of employees by the Centre.

1) Temporary assignments:

Divisions/regional offices will communicate to OHR their need for "special purpose" temporary help. Whenever an employee is declared surplus, OHR will try to match the skills of employees with the requests for temporary assignments filed by the divisions. Employees can choose to go on such assignments or take the special termination package.

In any case, if at the end of an assignment the employee cannot be assigned to a new one, he or she will then be eligible for the termination package.

During the assignment, employees will be encouraged to apply for regular positions becoming open in the Centre.
2) The "Secretarial Skills Bank."

The Centre's ongoing requirement for temporary secretarial help will likely continue. With this in mind, a "Skills Bank" will be created within the new Administration division and managed by OHR, to provide backup secretarial support services to Centre divisions on an as-required basis. The unit will have a finite size, likely in the area of 5 to 10 positions. Employees who are declared surplus can choose to join the "Skills Bank" for a period of up to three months. During that period, employees can apply for regular positions that have become available in the Centre. If at the end of the period, the employee has not found a position, he or she will then be served notice. There should not be more than 10 employees at one time in the Skills Bank.

Note: It is acknowledged that the Centre's requirement for this type of backup will likely extend beyond the transition period. In the long term the creation of a formal Support Unit to fulfill this need is envisioned.

3) Leave without pay:

Extended leaves without pay for professional purposes can be granted. In these cases, the returning employees are not guaranteed a position on return to work but would have their names placed on a priority list. The Centre will offer to cover the full costs of benefits for the period of the leave, to a maximum of two years. Upon return, if no suitable position can be found within a two-month period, employment with the Centre will be terminated. The termination package will be reduced by the Centre's share of the costs of the benefits.

Friday, November 8, 1991
Compensation profiles for Part-time Employment

Compensation arrangements are governed by current eligibility regulations under the various programs. Most programs that the Centre sponsors are with the Treasury Board and therefore not within IDRC's power to affect changes. It should be understood that the Centre should either provide similar programming for this type of employment status or at least make an additional payment in lieu of the restricted access to programs.

The following categories of employment contract conditions currently govern access to pension and group insurance programs.

(1) Indeterminate Contracts

i) Less than 30 hours of work per week; all insurance programs are in effect. Participation in the Public Service Superannuation Act and the Supplementary Retirement Benefit Act is currently unavailable.

ii) More than 30 hours per week; full participation in all programs.

(2) Fixed Term Contracts

i) Less than six months; No access to programs - 4% vacation pay is paid at the end of the term assignment.

ii) More than six months and less than 30 hours per week; all insurance programs are in effect. Participation in the Public Service Superannuation Act and the Supplementary Retirement Benefit Act is currently unavailable.

iii) More than six months and more than 30 hours per week; full participation in all programs.
Modification

Direct Compensation

Compensation for all staff in this category should be similar in terms of access to Centre programs. The ideal situation would be to provide access to full programs for staff who would be employed in any capacity with the Centre. Given the Centre's current lack of control in effecting changes to current eligibility requirements in order to reflect this desired objective, the Centre should:

- modify those program where it has control to include participation for those staff who cannot have access. Specifically, staff in Categories 1 (i), 2 (i) and 2 (ii).
- Develop flexible benefits programs to include all staff employed by the Centre over the next 2 to 3 years, thereby eliminating the need to manage multiple compensation programs based on employment type.
- As an interim measure, the Centre should provide a 15% "top-up" on basic salary for those staff who do not qualify for participation in all programs. When the flex-benefit program is introduced, these staff should then be given the opportunity to "trade" all or part of the 15% for pension and insurance protection.

Overtime

The normal provisions for overtime should apply for all hours worked in excess of 75 hours in a two week period or in excess of 8 hours per day.

Annual and Sick Leave

Annual and sick leave provisions should apply for all staff based on the number of hours of work using the same formulae that currently exist.

Other Leaves

These provisions should apply to all staff regardless of number of hours of work.

Salary Payments

Normally, most staff in this category receive their payments in arrears. This practice should be modified to ensure that this practice be eliminated.
Current Centre Practice
based on employment Type

Description of Benefits

Mandatory Programs

PSSA/SRBA
Public Service Pension scheme = 2% x Avg salary x service

SDB
Supplementary Death Benefit - life insurance = 1 x salary

LTD
Long Term Disability protection = 70% of pre-disability income

Optional Programs

GSMIP
Major medical, vision, hospital room, ambulance and out-of-country medical

DENTAL
Dental expenses for preventative, minor and major restorative, orthodontics for dependant children and prosthodontics

PSMIP
Personal and dependant's lives, Accidental Death/dismemberment

BLUE CROSS
Semi-private hospital room charges

Leave

A/L
Annual Leave based on Centre MPM

S/L
Sick Leave based on MPM

O/L
Other paid leave based on MPM

VACP
4% of earnings in lieu of annual leave

Payroll Facilities

CSB
Canada Savings Bonds deductions

PERSINS
Personal house and car insurance

COMPUTER
Centre Computer Purchase plan

STAFF
Staff Association fees
PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAMS BY EMPLOYMENT TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>IND1</th>
<th>IND2</th>
<th>FT1</th>
<th>FT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSSA/SRBA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTD</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSMIP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSMIP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTAL</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUE CROSS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/L</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSINS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of Employment

IND1: Indeterminate full time - more than 30 hrs/week
IND2: Indeterminate part time - less than 30 hrs/week
FT1: Fixed Term full time - term > 6 mos. and 30 hrs/week or more
FT2: Fixed Term part time - less than 6 mos. and less than 30 hrs/week
SPECIAL SEVERANCE PROGRAM

Draft Resolution

Having considered the proposals put forth by the President in his memorandum to the Board of Governors (BG 47/30) regarding a special severance program,

Having taken note of the further explanations provided by the President,

The Board of Governors

Agreed that, subject only to the availability of funds, an amount of approximately $6,500,000 may be applied over fiscal years 1991/92 - 1992/93 to provide staff members whose employment with the Centre is terminated as a result of restructuring and downsizing with the benefits specified in the above-noted memorandum.
"EMPOWERMENT THROUGH KNOWLEDGE"
"S'AFFRANCHIR PAR LE SAVOIR"

IDRC / CRDI

PROGRAMME DE RÉMUNÉRATION SPÉCIAL

SPECIAL COMPENSATION PROGRAM

1991
IDRC
Special Severance Program

This special severance program has been developed to provide an equitable and fair settlement to staff members whose employment will end as a result of redundancy during the transition period. Although the Centre will make reasonable efforts to minimize staff terminations, this program has been developed because re-employment outside the Centre is the most sensible and realistic manner to assist affected staff.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE?

This program applies only to Ottawa-hired staff, including:

- Board Appointed Officers,
- Staff of indeterminate employment status,
- Term appointment staff who have more than 3 years of continuous employment.

The components of the package are:

1) NOTICE
2) SEVERANCE PAYMENT
3) PENSION ENHANCEMENTS
4) OUTPLACEMENT/JOB SEARCH ASSISTANCE
5) PERSONAL FINANCIAL/RETIREMENT/LEGAL COUNSELLING
In the context of redundancy, notice can be characterized as a period of time allocated to staff upon termination of employment. Notice indicates to the employee that the position is surplus to staffing requirements that are in the interests of the Centre, and that the employee must consider alternative employment. For example, an employee who receives notice will be given a period of time, expressed in months, during which they will seek other employment. Two options present themselves to the employee; the employee can either apply this period of time to:

i) Salary continuation,  
or
ii) Lump sum payment

**Salary Continuation vs Lump Sum**

When an employee is given notice, the employee is not required to report to work after the date of notice. The employee choosing salary continuation will stay on the payroll and continue to benefit from the group pension and insurance plans available from the Centre for the entire period of the notice. Alternatively, if the employee chooses to receive a lump sum payment for the notice period, they will no longer be on the payroll and all participation in the group pension and insurance programs will cease.

If, during the notice period, a staff member wishes to accept a lump sum payment in lieu of salary continuation, the staff member may request the payment of the balance.

**Calculation of Notice Period**

The Centre will calculate the notice period as follows:

- 1 month of notice for each year of service -
Board Appointed Officers  - Minimum 9 months*  
                       - Maximum 18 months  
For Staff              - Minimum 4 months  
                       - Maximum 18 months  

2) SEVERANCE PAYMENT

In addition to notice, a separate cash payment will be made to the affected employee at the end of the notice period. This will be calculated as shown below:

Board Appointed Officers - 2 weeks for each year of service*

For Staff - 1 week for each year of service.

3) PENSION ENHANCEMENT

Where applicable, the Centre will request from the Treasury Board of Canada a "waiver of pension reduction" for those staff who are age 55 and over, and who have at least 10 years of service in the Public Service pension plan. This special opportunity will have the effect of protecting a staff member's monthly pension benefit according to the normal pension formula, without applying the normal early retirement reduction. It is important to note that this enhancement is solely at the discretion of the Treasury Board and therefore cannot be guaranteed by the Centre.

* The contracts of Board Appointed Officers are negotiated each year and reviewed annually. Opportunities for re-employment at equivalent levels are more scarce, and this is therefore reflected in the increased minimum notice and severance payment.
4) OUTPLACEMENT/JOB SEARCH ASSISTANCE

The outplacement services will be provided by independent external specialists to assist staff in securing alternative employment outside the Centre rather than relying on placement within the Centre. These programs contain such components as preparation of c.v.'s, assistance with interview techniques, counsel with job search and marketing methods, as well as career and skill assessment.

5) PERSONAL FINANCIAL/RETIREMENT/LEGAL COUNSELLING

The objective of this element of the package is to provide affected staff with independent external counselling on the options available with respect to short term personal financial planning, tax issues related to severance payments, retirement income arrangements for Canada Pension Plan (CPP), Unemployment Insurance and the Public Service Pension plan (PSSA), as well as issues related to continuation of benefit coverage past the notice period.

Advice and consultation on such issues as tax planning and minimum tax regulations related to severance payments and retirement income, RRSP's and RRIF's, short term individual personal financial planning guides, and analysis of pension options, will also be made available. This information will be delivered through both group and individual counselling sessions, and via information booklets and workbooks.
The Centre will provide reimbursement for up to 350.00 CAD per employee who may wish to secure an initial independent legal consultation concerning the severance arrangements. The objective of this element of the program is to allow staff who do not feel that they have received adequate compensation, to have their case evaluated objectively by outside counsel.

**Process**

When a staff member’s employment has been terminated, the individual will receive an official letter of termination which will include the notice date, the period of notice stated in months, the duration of the salary continuance, the amount of the severance payment, and the last date required to report to work. Information on access to the outplacement and other counselling services available under this program will also be described in the letter.

The program will be in effect from 21 October 1991 until further notice. This severance package will be offered to surplus staff upon termination of employment rather than following the policies regarding redundancy found in sections 4.30 and 4.32 of the Management Policy Manual (MPM). Therefore, the application of the elements of this program will not be combined with the current elements of the MPM provisions for layoff. However, should a staff member prefer to be treated according to the relevant provisions of the MPM, he or she is entirely free to do so.

The other services outlined in this program are available to affected staff, but cannot be negotiated for a cash value.

**Examples**

The following summary and examples provide an illustration of how various levels of staff would be compensated in different scenarios. The data used is based on average salary, age or service for specific grade levels.
TWO KEY POINTS TO REMEMBER

1. THE MANAGEMENT POLICY MANUAL

   THE PROGRAM REPLACES
   SECTION 4.30 AND 4.32

2. ELIGIBILITY

   - ALL STAFF OF INDETERMINATE EMPLOYMENT STATUS
   - ALL STAFF OF TERM STATUS WHO HAVE 3 YEARS OF CONTINUOUS EMPLOYMENT
   - ALL BOARD APPOINTED OFFICERS
# Summary of IDRC Program

## For Board Appointed Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notice</th>
<th>1 month per year of service. Minimum of 9 months. Maximum of 18 months.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Termination Payment</td>
<td>2 weeks for each year of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outplacement</td>
<td>Full service outplacement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial, Retirement, and Legal Counselling</td>
<td>Group information sessions with individual counselling sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Enhancements</td>
<td>If officer is over 55 and has 10 years of PSSA service, Centre applies for waiver of pension penalty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUMMARY OF IDRC PROGRAM

### FOR ALL EMPLOYEES

| NOTICE                  | 1 MONTH PER YEAR OF SERVICE  
|                        | MINIMUM OF 4 MONTHS  
|                        | MAXIMUM OF 18 MONTHS  
| TERMINATION PAYMENT    | 1 WEEK PER YEAR OF SERVICE  
| OUTPLACEMENT           | GENERAL INFORMATION SESSIONS ON JOB SEARCH TECHNIQUES AND C.V. PREPARATION FOLLOWED BY INDIVIDUALIZED COUNSELLING  
| FINANCIAL, RETIREMENT, AND LEGAL COUNSELLING | GROUP INFORMATION SESSIONS ON OPTIONS FOR PENSION PLAN, TAX PLANNING AND SHORT TERM PERSONAL FINANCIAL PLANNING  
| PENSION ENHANCEMENTS   | IF STAFF ARE OVER 55 AND HAVE 10 YEARS OF PSSA SERVICE, CENTRE APPLIES FOR WAIVER OF PENSION PENALTY  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Annual Salary</td>
<td>$27,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice Given On</td>
<td>21 January 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service</td>
<td>8.5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Notice</td>
<td>8.5 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent In Salary</td>
<td>$19,507.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance Payment</td>
<td>$4,501.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sum</td>
<td>$24,009.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option: Lump Sum Payment In Lieu Of Salary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>$18,727.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance Payment</td>
<td>$4,501.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Payment</td>
<td>$23,228.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY:</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEARS OF SERVICE:</td>
<td>5 YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTICE GIVEN ON:</td>
<td>21 JANUARY 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENGTH OF NOTICE:</td>
<td>5 MONTHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIVALENT IN SALARY:</td>
<td>$14,583.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVERANCE PAYMENT:</td>
<td>$3,365.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SUM:</td>
<td>$17,948.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPTION:** LUMP SUM PAYMENT IN LIEU OF SALARY CONTINUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUMP SUM:</td>
<td>$14,281.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVERANCE PAYMENT:</td>
<td>$3,365.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PAYMENT:</td>
<td>$17,584.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GRADE 10 POSITION**

**CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY:** $41,650.00  
**YEARS OF SERVICE:** 9 YEARS  
**NOTICE GIVEN ON:** 21 JANUARY 1992  
**LENGTH OF NOTICE:** 9 MONTHS  
**EQUIVALENT IN SALARY:** $31,237.50  
**SEVERANCE PAYMENT:** $7,208.65  

**TOTAL SUM:** $38,446.15

**OPTION:** LUMP SUM PAYMENT IN LIEU OF SALARY CONTINUATION

**LUMP SUM:** $29,988.00  
**SEVERANCE PAYMENT:** $7,208.65  

**TOTAL PAYMENT:** $37,196.65
| **CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY:** | $56,035.00 |
| **YEARS OF SERVICE:** | 7.5 YEARS |
| **NOTICE GIVEN ON:** | 21 JANUARY 1992 |
| **LENGTH OF NOTICE:** | 7.5 MONTHS |
| **EQUIVALENT IN SALARY:** | $35,021.88 |
| **SEVERANCE PAYMENT:** | $8,081.97 |
| **TOTAL SUM:** | $43,103.85 |

**OPTION:** LUMP SUM PAYMENT IN LIEU OF SALARY CONTINUATION

<p>| <strong>LUMP SUM:</strong> | $33,621.01 |
| <strong>SEVERANCE PAYMENT:</strong> | $8,081.97 |
| <strong>TOTAL PAYMENT:</strong> | $41,702.98 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY:</strong></th>
<th>$70,385.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEARS OF SERVICE:</strong></td>
<td>9.5 YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTICE GIVEN ON:</strong></td>
<td>21 JANUARY 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LENGTH OF NOTICE:</strong></td>
<td>9.5 MONTHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUIVALENT IN SALARY:</strong></td>
<td>$55,721.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEVERANCE PAYMENT:</strong></td>
<td>$12,858.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SUM:</strong></td>
<td>$68,580.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPTION:** LUMP SUM PAYMENT IN LIEU OF SALARY CONTINUATION

| **LUMP SUM:**               | $52,935.39 |
| **SEVERANCE PAYMENT:**      | $12858.80  |
| **TOTAL PAYMENT:**          | $65,794.19 |
APPENDIX VII
- IDRC Post-Transition Organization Chart
APPENDIX VIII
- List of IDRC Staff Interviewed and Consulted
## STAFF INTERVIEWED AND CONSULTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ID Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Audet</td>
<td>2594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Auger</td>
<td>2591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Balson</td>
<td>2436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Robert-Bradley</td>
<td>2589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Des Rosiers</td>
<td>2067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Dunlop</td>
<td>2510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilles Forget (HSD)</td>
<td>2545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micheline Guitor</td>
<td>2442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Morales Gomez (SS)</td>
<td>2308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hardie</td>
<td>2592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine Hawara</td>
<td>2531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul McConnell (ISSD)</td>
<td>2583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Murray</td>
<td>2530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Allan Rix</td>
<td>2410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Smart (CAID)</td>
<td>2323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Soutar</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Thurston</td>
<td>2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michèle Wilson</td>
<td>2082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Zaya (ENR)</td>
<td>2538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raffaella Zumpano</td>
<td>2123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IX
- Summary of IDRC Positions Pre and Post-Transition
## SUMMARY OF IDRC POSITIONS

**Pre-Transition**  
1991-1992

**PROGRAM DIVISIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND NUTRITION SCIENCES</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project related staff</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARTH AND ENGINEERING SCIENCES</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH SCIENCES</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION SCIENCES</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project related staff</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL MANAGEMENT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE OFFICE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND GENERAL COUNSEL</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE OF THE TREASURER</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE FOR HUMAN RESOURCES</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL AUDIT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP SERVICES</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration Provision</th>
<th>Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDMENTS/SABBATICAL/STUDY LEAVE PROVISION</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL - HEAD OFFICE HIRED STAFF</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL - REGIONAL OFFICE HIRED STAFF</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Centre Total                                   | 592       |
### SUMMARY OF IDRC POSITIONS
**Post-Transition**
**1992-1993**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Divisions</th>
<th>Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND INITIATIVES</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project-related staff</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH SCIENCES</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION SCIENCES AND SYSTEMS</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project-related staff</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT'S OFFICE</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL OFFICES*</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL OFFICE LOCALLY HIRED STAFF</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRE TOTAL</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Regional Directors and Controllers, and the Program Officers but not Admin./Support staff.