

Evaluation of CANADEM

months (April to October of 1997).

The most recent organizational form for CANADEM is that of an independent NGO. CANADEM is currently pursuing incorporation as a NGO. There is some conflict as to the rationale for this move. CANADEM believes it to be required by the funding sponsor, to allow for more direct contractual arrangements (DFAIT to CANADEM). However, the funding sponsor (AGP) is under the impression that this was a move which CANADEM believed to be necessary and initiated.

The decision on what organizational form should be adopted should be based on where the service can be best delivered. Implicit to this issue is whether or not this service needs to be 'outside' government in order to maintain legitimacy, neutrality and efficiency. Opinions on this issue vary greatly.

Interviews done within government, revealed mixed opinion. Some felt there was no compelling reason to have the organization separated from government, particularly noting the sole funding issue. It was also commented that, as an independent NGO, CANADEM may be seen to be receiving preferential funding vis à vis rosters in other NGOs. Others reiterated the original rationale and the role of DFAIT as a policy, not program delivery department.

CANADEM itself believes its success is largely dependant on being, and being perceived as neutral and at arms length from government. It also points to the cost advantages of not being bound to government salary and procedural guidelines. Clients did not specifically differentiate the organizational source as a defining factor. Discussion with representatives from international organizations tended to include reference to rosters as a group, referring collectively to NORDEM, CANADEM and the Danish model, which is within the Foreign Ministry. One CANADEM member, of those surveyed, warned of need to avoid political interference.

If the issue of neutrality is not deemed to be critical and the program could reside within government, there are four potential 'homes' which could be considered - DFAIT, CIDA, RCMP or the PSC. While not exhaustive, some of the pros and cons associated with each of these locations are highlighted below.

The issue of cost efficiency has purposely been omitted. Without directed investigation, this evaluation is unable to conclude that costs will be adversely or positively affected, by virtue of being in or out of the government structure. While some procedural freedoms may exist outside of government, there may be offsetting gains through economies of scale. Costing relevant to each option would have to be undertaken to determine relative cost effectiveness.