

Initial Concepts: Criteria for Evaluating GIT Governance Models (DRAFT March 2007)¹

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Legitimacy and Voice | Participation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad and balanced representation (diversity of stakeholders, diversity of expertise) with all members able to contribute to decision-making in a substantial way • Opens direct lines of communication between Council and diversity of stakeholders • Facilitates face-to-face interaction and relationship building • State agency cooperation and participation – voluntary or mandated? |
| | Consensus Orientation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mediation of differing interests to reach a broad consensus |
| Direction | Strategic Vision | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling mechanism/clear mandate – executive order versus legislation? • Clearly defined roles and responsibilities of Council, Geographic Information Office (GIO), and State Cartographer's Office (SCO) • Joint and clearly articulated vision and mission to which all stakeholders see how they can contribute |
| Performance | Responsiveness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to access expertise and resources from within and outside the Council to address and resolve issues. • Ability to adjust or create committees and working groups • Ability to adjust meeting frequency and location |
| | Political Efficacy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables the geospatial community to articulate a united vision to policy makers • Increases awareness and understanding of geospatial-related issues and activities among policy makers at all levels and with the public • Involves the highest level of policy makers in geospatial decision making • Promotes the incorporation of geospatial-related issues into statewide policy and decision making • Minimizes the impact of change in administration and of political bias |
| | Effectiveness and Efficiency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Readily understandable structure and manageable size • Tangible links and reciprocity between Council, GIO, SCO, and stakeholders • Tangible benefits and deliverables accrued widely and at all levels • Utilizes best practices from the private sector • Capacity building at all levels • Staffing levels specifically focused on coordination and other Council goals • Ability to influence how funds are expended • Ability to provide incentives for participation |
| Accountability | Accountability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly defined reporting requirements of the Council to the GIO, SCO, CIO, Legislature, and Governor |
| | Transparency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides transparent and democratic mechanisms for broad participation in policy development, decision-making and recommendations for funding allocations |
| Fairness | Equity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All stakeholders are encouraged to actively participate in the Council and associated committees • All stakeholders and the public receive sufficient value from the Council |
| | Rule of Procedure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly defined, open and fair operating and voting procedures |
| Sustainability | Sustainability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to persist under change in administration • Ability to persist under budgetary constraints • Sufficient funding, administrative support and technical support |

¹ Adapted from Graham, J. *et al.*, 2005. Principles for Good Governance in the 21st Century (August 2005). Institute on Governance, Canada. IOG Website: <http://www.iog.ca>, accessed December 10, 2007. Prepared by *ad hoc* WIGIC Working Group under FGDC NSDI CAP Grant Agreement Number 06HQAG0109, administered through the WI DOA GIO, in cooperation with WI SCO.