



Joint Public Advisory Committee (JPAC)

Comité Consultivo Público Conjunto (CCPC)

Comité consultatif public mixte (CCPM)

18 February 2010

Jim Prentice  
Minister of the Environment, Canada

Lisa P. Jackson  
Administrator, US Environmental Protection Agency

Juan Rafael Elvira Quesada  
Secretary of Environment and Natural Resources, Mexico

Dear Council members:

I am pleased to submit to you the “Joint Public Advisory Committee Effectiveness Review Report” that offers JPAC’s advice on the prospects for enhancing the effectiveness of JPAC and, by association, the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) of which JPAC is one component. The report is the result of a review of JPAC’s working relationship with the Council and the Secretariat, which was conducted with the goal of enhancing interactions within the organization and outcomes for the public. Taking steps to increase the effectiveness of JPAC and the CEC has the potential to produce noteworthy results of both social and political significance.

It is hoped that the advice offered in the report will improve the relevancy of JPAC and the CEC, in keeping with the original intentions of the trilateral Agreement (NAAEC) that created the organization. It is our hope that this report will assist you in guiding the CEC toward more effective and relevant outcomes in support of the Council.

Please accept, Council members, our regards.

Sincerely,

Glen Wright  
JPAC Chair for 2010

c.c.: Alternate representatives  
Evan Lloyd, Acting Executive Director  
GSC representatives  
JPAC members



# **JPAC EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW REPORT**

---

**PREPARED BY ROY K. MOULD, BGEN (RET), BA, MBA, MSM, OMM, CD  
MERIDES BUSINESS SOLUTIONS  
DECEMBER 2009**

---

This document (including attachments) is intended for the sole use of the Joint Public Advisory Committee, the Commission for the Environmental Cooperation of North America and Merides Business Solutions and may contain information that is privileged, proprietary, confidential and exempt from disclosure. Unauthorized dissemination, distribution or copying of this material is strictly prohibited.

# JOINT PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW REPORT

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
PURPOSE.....	3
BACKGROUND .....	3
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS .....	3
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	4
<b>JOINT PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW REPORT .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>REVIEW METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
GOVERNANCE .....	8
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT.....	9
COMMUNICATIONS.....	9
PRIORITIZATION .....	10
ROLE AMBIGUITY.....	10
TRANSACTIONAL ACTIVITY .....	10
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>13</b>

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## JOINT PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW REPORT

---

### PURPOSE

---

This Executive Summary recaps the accompanying “JPAC Effectiveness Review Report” that offers advice to enhance JPAC’s effectiveness. The intention of the review was initially to study ways that JPAC’s outcomes could be more strategically effective. It was soon realized that this depended in large part on the interrelationships and interactions between all of the CEC’s constituents (the CEC Council, the CEC Secretariat and JPAC). This then became an essential focus of the report, which is therefore inclusive of commentary regarding all of the components of the CEC.

---

### BACKGROUND

---

In spite of the continuing uniqueness and utility of the CEC, the organization, including JPAC, finds itself increasingly challenged over its ability to meet the many and varied expectations demanded of it. In anticipation of the arrival of a new executive director and in keeping with its advisory role, JPAC believes that it is appropriate to assess the effectiveness of its ability to contribute to the outcomes intended by the Agreement (NAAEC) that created it. Previous studies that have provided commentary on the CEC and JPAC remain matters of public record and are not intended to form part of this review.

---

### FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

---

While some improvement opportunities were unique and specific to JPAC, others were not and involved the collateral relationships between JPAC, the Council, and the Secretariat. Certainly, issues regarding JPAC’s relevance, its relationship with Council, timeliness of its advice, the allocation of resources and its operational protocols will be addressed by JPAC as a consequence of this report. Other opportunities to enhance effectiveness are more complex, involving partner organizations and therefore cannot be addressed by JPAC alone. Issues surrounding multiple levels of direction, oversight, spans of control and ambiguous accountabilities serve to erode the strategic alignment of JPAC, in particular, and, in our view, of the CEC in general, with Council. The causes of this, we believe, are three-fold:

- The delegation of accountability for governance and oversight from the Council members to the Alternate Representatives and further to the General Standing Committee has added significant levels of procedural activity to the approvals processes.
- The delegation of oversight, which has distanced the CEC Secretariat from its governing Council.
- The necessity of responding to various staff levels of the three Parties for issues that require Council approval.

While it is understood that the very existence of the CEC is a complex arrangement involving three countries, the unfortunate result of these factors is that process requirements have become onerous and unwieldy. Both JPAC and the Secretariat are now burdened with excessive, time-consuming and costly transactional activity. Certainly, multiple layers of repetitive process and numerous pockets of influence complicate communications with senior levels and obscure strategic alignment. The process requirements have also served to erode the authority of the executive director. It is our opinion that the CEC Secretariat would have difficulty finding clarity amid the numerous sets of interpretations that serve to complicate its operational work.

The Effectiveness Review Working Group concludes that the key issue isn't whether or not the CEC's work is professional—it is and impressively so. The issue is more around whether JPAC and the CEC Secretariat are doing the right work—work that is aligned with the strategic intentions of Council. Opportunities do indeed exist to improve JPAC's effectiveness and those opportunities unique to JPAC will be addressed by the Committee as a consequence of this report. It is certain that if the basic direction for a clear strategy is accessible and the opportunities exist to reengineer the governance and oversight relationships, the CEC as a whole will generate more effective and relevant outcomes. With this in mind, the Joint Public Advisory Committee, in keeping with its advisory role, offers the following advice.

---

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

---

In consideration of this analysis of JPAC's effectiveness, the recommendations below consist of those items unique to JPAC as well as items affecting JPAC's effectiveness as a consequence of the relationships and interactions with the Secretariat and Council. It is JPAC's advice that the following recommendations be implemented as early as possible:

1. JPAC needs to establish periodic access to Council so that it can offer relevant advice that meets Council's needs and can receive and react to Council's feedback in a timely fashion. JPAC should establish more effective communications by arranging periodic meetings between individual Council members and/or Alternate Representatives and JPAC member(s) from that country. This would ensure that JPAC's strategic priorities are aligned with Council's priorities.
2. To be strategically aligned, JPAC needs to maintain a formal connection with the Alternate Representatives. It is recommended that the practice of having the JPAC chair participate in Alternate Representative's meetings continue. Additionally, formal contact with the Alternate Representatives is necessary periodically so that JPAC's contribution of relevant advice is received and responded to in a timely manner.
3. Integrate JPAC strategic planning activity with the strategic planning process of the CEC Secretariat. JPAC should take more responsibility for its own agenda by fully participating in the CEC planning and budget process through the establishment of a finance committee to integrate its annual work plan into the CEC budget cycle.
4. Expand public outreach and increase the effectiveness of JPAC's interactions with the public and its stakeholders by continuing to experiment with the webinar concept and by making better use of technology as an instrument for public discussion, consensus building and assessing public opinion.

5. Moderate the workload challenges of the volunteers that make up JPAC's membership through better use of technology for communicating and consensus building, the provision of consulting and report writing assistance and the provision of orientation briefings.

The above recommendations, unique to JPAC, will increase the effectiveness of its outcomes. The recommendations that follow involve collateral organizations and have the potential to increase effectiveness beyond JPAC and in some instances beyond the CEC as well.

6. Establish a more effective governance model for the CEC. In keeping with the spirit of the original Agreement, Council and its Alternate Representatives should act as a Board of Directors dealing with governance, strategic direction, due diligence, oversight and succession issues.
7. While we respect that the GSC was established by Council Resolution to try to deal with issues requiring day-to-day supervision and contact, we recommend that the GSC's role be to assist in the delivery and coordination of program activities exclusive of the administration of the Secretariat. Administration of the Secretariat should be the responsibility of the executive director who in turn should be responsible to Council and the Alternate Representatives acting as a Board of Directors.
8. Clearly establish the authority level of the Secretariat's executive director, who, in exercising the responsibilities of a CEO, should have the latitude to implement operational activity once the budget and operational plans are approved. The executive director should be accountable for running the Secretariat in accordance with the strategic goals and direction of Council and the Alternate Representatives, who should meet at least four times per year acting as a Board of Directors.
9. Clarify and coordinate the roles of the three CEC components and establish guiding principles for communications among them and all partner organizations, with the intention of removing role ambiguity and time-consuming and costly transactional activity (such as yearly resubmissions of multi-year project plans).
10. The material contained in the TRAC (Ten-year Review and Assessment Committee) Report and the JPAC at Ten Report contain useful perspectives and recommendations that continue to be consistent with improving the outcomes of the CEC and JPAC. We believe there would be value in the new executive director reviewing them and proposing changes where it makes sense to do so.

# JOINT PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW REPORT

---

## PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

---

Since its inception, the CEC (with JPAC as a constituent organization) has made significant contributions towards the preservation of the North American environment within the context of the North American Free Trade Agreement. The emergence, over the intervening years, of opportunities to enhance JPAC's effectiveness has given rise to this Effectiveness Review, its conclusions and its recommendations.

The goal of the JPAC Working Group was to explore issues associated with the work of JPAC as a component of the CEC and, in keeping with its advisory role, to provide advice on how to improve effectiveness. The intention of the review was initially to study ways that JPAC's outcomes could be more strategically effective. It was soon realized that this depended in large part on the interrelationships and interactions between all of the CEC's constituents (the Council, the Secretariat and JPAC). This became an essential focus of the report, which is therefore inclusive of commentary regarding all of the components of the CEC. This review does not propose changes to the Agreement (NAAEC), which created JPAC as a constituent within the CEC, nor does it consider that changes need to be contemplated.

---

## BACKGROUND

---

The Joint Public Advisory Committee (JPAC), as one of three bodies comprising the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC), is responsible for the provision of advice to the CEC Council on any issue related to the linkages between North American free trade and the environment. As a nongovernmental group, JPAC is unique in that it also facilitates active public participation to ensure that public concerns are expressed and available to the three governments.

As an overall mission, the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) serves as a venue for advancing the understanding of environmental issues that are associated with North American free trade. It is a vehicle for the three governments to address environmental issues of collective importance. The CEC program is a proven initiative through which the Parties have wide latitude to address almost any environmental issue in North America. Since its inception, it has created extensive linkages between the three countries. Through its work and to its credit, the CEC (comprising JPAC, the Secretariat and Council) has significantly strengthened environmental policies and tightened enforcement issues throughout the North American ecosystem.

In spite of the continuing uniqueness and utility of the CEC, the organization, including JPAC, finds itself increasingly taxed over its ability to meet the varied expectations demanded of it. In anticipation of the arrival of a new executive director, JPAC believes that, in keeping with its advisory role, it is timely to conduct an assessment of JPAC's work with a view towards enhancing its effectiveness as a component of the CEC.

The objective of the review is to improve the effectiveness of JPAC's outcomes from the efforts to link environmental cooperation among the NAFTA Parties with trade relations between the three countries—and to ensure that the North American ecosystem remains in focus at the highest decision-making levels of the three governments. It is within this context that JPAC convened a representative working group from its membership to conduct the effectiveness review and followed it up with deliberations among the JPAC membership.

---

#### REVIEW METHODOLOGY

---

A review working group consisting of the JPAC chair for 2009 plus one JPAC member from each Party—Canada, Mexico and the United States—conducted this effectiveness review. The Working Group members, all well experienced, distinguished professionals, were as follows;

- Glen Wright – Canada (JPAC Effectiveness Review Working Group Chair)
- Adriana Nelly Correa – Mexico (JPAC Chair for 2009)
- Gustavo Alanís – Mexico (JPAC member)
- Rafael Marquez – United States (JPAC member)

The review consisted of interviews with representatives from the CEC Secretariat (including the outgoing executive director and the program directors) and the Joint Public Advisory Committee (including the JPAC chair). Selected support staff from both the Secretariat and JPAC also participated. Their open dialogue concerning the effectiveness of JPAC and the related working processes necessary to generate relevant and effective outcomes shape the conclusions and recommendations of this report.

---

#### FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

---

There is no doubt that the focus on North America as an environmental region and its linkage to free trade between Canada, Mexico and the United States continues to have traction both politically and publicly. Connecting the environmental authorities of the three countries through an environmental commission with a Secretariat and a Joint Public Advisory Committee (JPAC) is an effective vehicle to address the issues relevant to North American free trade-related environmental matters.

JPAC acknowledges the existence of past studies that, among other things, provide commentary on the effectiveness of JPAC's (and the CEC's) work. This review does not intend to draw from the issues tabled in the previous studies but acknowledges that some of the issues are similar. However, the Working Group does conclude that past reports contain well written and appropriate commentary which may warrant periodic review. Notably, the material within the TRAC (Ten-year Review and Assessment Committee) Report and the JPAC at Ten Report contain useful perspectives and recommendations that continue to be consistent with improving the outcomes of the CEC and JPAC. These reports remain matters of public record and can be reviewed at will.

In undertaking this retrospective, what became evident are significant concerns around strategic communications and alignment with Council's priorities. It is not that there are



opposing opinions as to what the work should be but rather a pervasive uncertainty that the work being done is aligned with Council's priorities. The Effectiveness Review Working Group has concluded that the key issue isn't whether or not the CEC's work is professional—it is and impressively so. The issue is more around whether JPAC and the CEC Secretariat are doing work that will result in timely, relevant and effective outcomes.

Certainly, JPAC-specific issues regarding relevance, its relationship with Council, timeliness of advice, its allocation of resources and its operational protocols will be addressed by the JPAC membership as a consequence of this report. Other opportunities to enhance effectiveness are more complex, involving partner organizations and including the collateral relationships between JPAC, the Council, and the Secretariat. Issues surrounding multiple levels of direction, oversight, spans of control and ambiguous accountabilities serve to erode the strategic alignment of JPAC, in particular, and, in our view, the CEC Secretariat, with Council. Issues such as these, therefore, cannot be addressed by JPAC alone.

We believe that the delegation of accountability for governance and oversight from the Council members to the Alternate Representatives and further to the General Standing Committee has added significant levels of procedural activity to the Secretariat's work—collaterally affecting JPAC. The intervening layers between the Secretariat and Council have tended to distance the Secretariat from its governing body and have injected intermediate staff levels from the three Parties, affecting the timely flow of information and approvals.

The very existence of the CEC is a complex arrangement involving three countries and process requirements are onerous and unwieldy. Both JPAC and the Secretariat are burdened with excessive, time-consuming, and costly transactional activity. Certainly, multiple layers of repetitive process complicate communications with senior levels and tend to obscure strategic alignment. Regrettably, the burgeoning process requirements have also served to erode the authority of the executive director, affecting his ability to do his job. It is our opinion that the CEC Secretariat would have difficulty finding clarity amid the numerous sets of interpretations that serve to complicate its operational work.

Strategic alignment, communications and the associated processes that drive JPAC (and the CEC) are therefore an integral focus of this report. While both JPAC and the CEC Secretariat rely on each other for support, both must rely on the Council, the Alternative Representatives and the General Standing Committee (and their associated staffs) for governance, strategic guidance, operational prioritization, approvals and resource allocations. Areas of concern that surfaced as a consequence of this review are as follows.

- **Governance:** JPAC is dependent upon and ably supported by the CEC Secretariat which, in turn, is governed by and directly accountable to the Council. In many respects, this arrangement means that both organizations need to be aligned with Council although to varying degrees and for different reasons. As foreseen by the Agreement, it was determined that in the absence of Council members, Alternate Representatives would have the authority to address the responsibilities of the CEC. Subsequently, by way of Council Resolution, direction and oversight was further delegated to a General Standing Committee (GSC). This has resulted in multiple levels of oversight and a somewhat challenging governance structure affecting both JPAC, which is considered to be independent, and the Secretariat—albeit to differing degrees.

Program and project work involves multiple partners—many from various departments within the three governments. This results in other points of influence

that exist at the working group level, which advise on and, in some instances, actually carry out, trinational programs and projects.

Not only have the above-mentioned multiple levels of influence added considerable process activity to the CEC Secretariat's work, but also the delegation of accountability for governance and oversight has served to distance the CEC Secretariat from the Council members who ultimately govern it. While JPAC is not reliant on Council for governance, its reliance on the CEC Secretariat is significant. Distancing the Secretariat from Council has reduced the Secretariat (and, by association, JPAC) to a significantly lower level of importance than was intended by the Agreement. Also, it has served to erode the authority of the executive director.

- **Strategic Alignment:** Key to maintaining relevancy, JPAC fully recognizes, is the importance of its own strategy being aligned with the strategic priorities of Council. It also considers it vital that Council benefit from JPAC's trinational knowledge when considering what priorities to set.

In spite of the existence of a long-term strategic planning cycle within the CEC, JPAC's inability to incorporate the strategic priorities of the Council members remains of significant concern. Lack of alignment serves to complicate the operational work and confuse the strategic responsiveness of both JPAC and, in our opinion, the CEC. The resultant ambiguity erodes the perception that the JPAC's work is timely, relevant and aligned with its mandate and Council's priorities.

The working group determined that renewing the focus on the overarching strategic principles implicit in JPAC's mandate provide opportunities to increase effectiveness and relevance. The trinational makeup of Council certainly implies that JPAC's resources need to remain focused upon free-trade-related environmental issues impacting North America as an ecosystem while resisting the tendency to narrowly focus on regional and/or non-free-trade-related issues.

The strategic resources at JPAC's disposal are largely determined by its budget and the availability of its volunteer membership. JPAC's budget is, for the most part, allocated as a consequence of the overall CEC budget process with little participation by JPAC. The establishment of a finance committee supplemented by one organizational meeting at the beginning of each year to integrate JPAC's annual work plan with the CEC budget cycle will facilitate JPAC in taking more responsibility for its own agenda.

**Communications:** JPAC's advice to Council, inclusive of feedback resulting from its unique public advisory role, can be very useful in assessing the public consciousness at the highest decision-making levels within the three governments. To this end, opportunities exist for JPAC to increase the effectiveness of its interactions with the public (and stakeholders). Past experiments with web-based technology have provided avenues for building a larger public audience. Use of technology to expand public outreach and to solicit broader public views through web casts, e-mail, chat rooms, etc., can be leveraged to increase the relevancy of advice provided to Council.

As is often the challenge with consensus building, achieving consensus (especially involving complex issues) can be very time consuming and often results in the proffering of overly generalized perspectives. It is fully understood that, in JPAC's advisory role, if the advice provided to Council is to meet Council's needs; it must be

relevant, substantive, timely and meaningful—as must be the reaction to Council's timely responses and feedback. JPAC needs to find methods to achieve consensus in a more timely fashion.

In conducting this review, we determined that sustaining relevance is fundamentally dependent on the effectiveness of the strategic communications with Council and the Alternative Representatives. It is understood that the Council members, being senior political officials, have innumerable priorities—all demanding their time and attention. With the Alternate Representatives similarly challenged, JPAC will need to consider carefully how to seek a stronger dialogue with Council members (both individually and collectively) to clarify where best to add value.

**Prioritization:** JPAC (and in our opinion, the CEC Secretariat) is affected by its inability to obtain the strategic clarity necessary to align its operational work and resolve issues of prioritization. The overabundance of governance levels and the intervening staff levels requiring highly negotiated project parameters result in ambiguous strategic alignment and confusion over prioritization—the right work being done in the right priority. It was our finding that face-to-face meetings that could discuss and resolve such issues are often contemplated but do not occur often enough (two in 2006, one in 2007, and none in either 2008 or 2009). If JPAC's successful future lies with its ability to be both trinationally and nationally relevant, then clear alignment with Council's strategic priorities and unambiguous authority levels will be essential contributors to its effectiveness. The importance of continuing the process of having the JPAC chair attend meetings of the Alternate Representatives should be continued. Additionally, JPAC will need to explore more effective dialogue with both Council and the Alternate Representatives to clarify priorities to the greatest extent possible.

- **Role Ambiguity:** Referencing the outgoing executive director's concerns around inaccessibility and the lack of direct communications with senior levels, it is not surprising that role ambiguity surfaced as an issue. To the extent that the CEC Secretariat becomes distanced from its Council, the executive director and the JPAC chair (including their organizations) become relegated to less influential roles. Given that the three components within the CEC rely on each other for their work, clarifying and coordinating their respective roles and how they interact with Council and partner organizations is important to maximize the effectiveness of their respective outcomes. For the Secretariat's executive director and the JPAC chair to be able to carry out the responsibilities of their positions, access to the leadership and clarity around the roles and authority levels of the organizations, both within and external to the CEC, needs to be established.
- **Transactional Activity:** The abundance of interactions and negotiation activities requiring repetitive processing serve to considerably increase the administrative costs of running the organization. More than 120 ongoing tasks within 18 operational projects are being managed by the CEC—a large workload, most would agree. Within the CEC's fixed budget, many tasks are allocated small budget amounts to keep them active. As a result, a number of project tasks span several years—and all, regardless of size, require the same amount of annual transactional activity as a large project. The high volumes of transactional activity, which include yearly reviews of every project, consume approximately one-third of the year and a significant amount of staff time.

Excess process and onerous transactional activity affect not only the Secretariat but also JPAC, which is heavily reliant upon the Secretariat for support and present some unique challenges for its members. The JPAC membership is made up of distinguished professionals from each country. All are volunteers who are not collocated with each other and who, by their very nature, have busy agendas of their own. Precious little time is available for them to meet the CEC's onerous process requirements.

While every effort should be made to reduce costly excess process and burdensome transactional activity, it is concluded that the effectiveness of JPAC's membership could be enhanced through the provision of selected assistance (such as consulting and report writing expertise) where required. With fifteen non-collocated members, communications requirements quickly become onerous and time consuming. Efforts to streamline communications and prioritize them for easy identification by individual JPAC members so as not to consume valuable time unnecessarily would undoubtedly prove beneficial. In the aftermath of reports and meetings requiring consensus, potential improvements to the website could be developed to facilitate the circulation and use of key documents and consensus building commentary.

Because of the complexities of the CEC's mandate and its associated processes, orientation briefings for new members would help reduce their time challenges. Better use of technology for communicating and consensus building would further lighten the time and workload requirements. Some members who, because of their busy professional obligations, are unable to actively and effectively contribute may welcome the option of having the latitude of discontinuing their participation.

Overall, this JPAC Effectiveness Review concludes that pressing concerns and resultant opportunities for improving JPAC's (and by association, the CEC's) effectiveness do indeed exist—both within the CEC and through the external linkages among the organizations and agencies with which it is aligned and governed.

Evident professionalism and notable dedication are manifest throughout JPAC and the CEC Secretariat. The fully engaged staff has the talent and the passion to do the job and clearly want the best possible outcomes for themselves, their leadership and the North American environment. It is certain that if the opportunities exist to reengineer the governance and oversight relationships and the basic direction for a clear strategy is accessible, JPAC and indeed the entire CEC will generate more effective and relevant outcomes.

The advice that follows offers prospects to enhance the effectiveness of JPAC and the CEC within which it functions.

---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

---

The high-level interest in North American free trade-related environmental issues that was manifest through recent, very positive public statements by the Heads of State of Canada, Mexico and the United States and their respective Council members suggest the pivotal role that JPAC (and the CEC as a whole) will need to play in the way ahead. Taking steps to increase their effectiveness has the potential to produce noteworthy results—not only of social and political significance but in the business sense as well (cost effectiveness).

In consideration of this analysis of JPAC's effectiveness, the recommendations below consist of those items unique to JPAC as well as items affecting JPAC's effectiveness as a result of the relationships and interactions with the Secretariat and Council. It is JPAC's advice that the following recommendations be implemented as early as possible:

1. JPAC needs to establish periodic access to Council so that it can offer relevant advice that meets Council's needs and can receive and react to Council's feedback in a timely fashion. JPAC should establish more effective communications by arranging periodic meetings between individual Council members and/or Alternate Representatives and JPAC member(s) from that country. This would ensure that JPAC's strategic priorities are aligned with Council's priorities.
2. To be strategically aligned, JPAC needs to maintain a formal connection with the Alternate Representatives. It is recommended that the practice of having the JPAC chair participate in Alternate Representative's meetings continue. Additionally, formal contact with the Alternate Representatives is necessary periodically so that JPAC's contribution of relevant advice is received and responded to in a timely manner.
3. Integrate JPAC strategic planning activity with the strategic planning process of the CEC Secretariat. JPAC should take more responsibility for its own agenda by fully participating in the CEC planning and budget process through the establishment of a finance committee to integrate its annual work plan into the CEC budget cycle.
4. Expand public outreach and increase the effectiveness of JPAC's interactions with the public and its stakeholders by continuing to experiment with the webinar concept and by making better use of technology as an instrument for public discussion, consensus building and assessing public opinion.
5. Moderate the workload challenges of the volunteers that make up JPAC's membership through better use of technology for communicating and consensus building, the provision of consulting and report writing assistance, the provision of orientation briefings and by providing for the allowance of replacement members when workloads clearly preclude member's effective participation.

The above recommendations, unique to JPAC, will increase the effectiveness of its outcomes. The recommendations that follow involve collateral organizations and have the potential to increase effectiveness beyond JPAC and in some instances beyond the CEC as well.

6. Establish a more effective governance model for the CEC. In keeping with the spirit of the original Agreement, Council and its Alternate Representatives should act as a Board of Directors dealing with governance, strategic direction, due diligence, oversight and succession issues.
7. While we respect that the GSC was established by Council Resolution to try to deal with issues requiring day-to-day supervision and contact, we recommend that the GSC's role be to assist in the delivery and coordination of program activities exclusive of the administration of the Secretariat. Administration of the Secretariat should be the responsibility of the executive director, who, in turn, should be responsible to Council and the Alternate Representatives acting as a Board of Directors.

8. Clearly establish the authority level of the Secretariat's executive director, who, in exercising the responsibilities of a CEO, should have the latitude to implement operational activity once the budget and operational plans are approved. The executive director should be accountable for running the Secretariat in accordance with the strategic goals and direction of Council and the Alternate Representatives, who should meet at least four times per year acting as a Board of Directors.
9. Clarify and coordinate the roles of the three CEC components and establish guiding principles for communications among them and all partner organizations, with the intention of removing role ambiguity and time-consuming and costly transactional activity (such as yearly resubmissions of multi-year project plans).
10. The material contained in the TRAC (Ten-year Review and Assessment Committee) Report and the JPAC at Ten Report contain useful perspectives and recommendations that continue to be consistent with improving the outcomes of the CEC and JPAC. We believe there would be value in the new executive director reviewing them and proposing changes where it makes sense to do so.

---

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

*The Working Group was ably supported by the JPAC Liaison Officer, Marcela Orozco, and her assistant, Jocelyn Morin, who went beyond the call of duty to ensure that the Working Group members were well looked after: thank you. JPAC sincerely hopes the time and effort spent by the participants of the JPAC Working Group and the entire Committee, all busy professionals, in offering sound advice on behalf of JPAC and the CEC will prove useful in furthering the effectiveness and efficiency of the CEC and its intra-organizational communications.*