

"Canada's Family Violence Initiative: A Model of Federal Intersectoral Coordination"

ABSTRACT

The presentation will describe the 20-year history of federal government activity on family violence in Canada, from the creation of the original "National Clearinghouse on Family Violence" in 1982, to the launching of a "Child Sexual Abuse Initiative" in 1986 through three successive Family Violence Initiatives that have followed.

Primary focus will be on the evolution of the characteristics of "interdepartmental collaboration" and the relationship among the federal government, other levels of government, and Non-Governmental Organizations. In looking at the early stages of the current Family Violence Initiative, the focus will be on the mechanisms developed to enhance the effectiveness of the coordination efforts of 13 diverse federal departments. This will be followed by a consideration of the obstacles that were encountered by the participating partners, the challenges identified by evaluators, and the lessons learned in the course of preparing a five-year progress report. The presentation will outline the plans that have been formulated with a view to enhancing the extent and quality of horizontal management at the federal level during the next phase of the Family Violence Initiative.

Consideration will also be given to the factors bearing on the relationship between a federal government initiative and a potential "national strategy". The presentation will conclude by identifying key elements of a potential comparative dialogue among countries that have followed analogous processes over recent years, with a view to refining our understanding of what works and what doesn't in the efforts to support intra-governmental coordination.

Introduction

This paper is meant to serve as the formal background for the conference session on this topic. That session will be led by a panel of federal officials who are active in the Family Violence Initiative and who have engaged in a variety of interdepartmental activities. The panel members will add to the content of this paper by reference to their individual experiences and observations about the Initiative. While this paper is meant to provide historical facts and a consideration of the more abstract dimensions of the topic, the conference session will raise more immediate issues and provide opportunity for dialogue between panellists and session participants.

“Intersectoral coordination” is only one phrase that is used to refer to the approach that has become common in government and community agencies over the past two decades. At the community level analogous phrases refer to “a multidisciplinary approach,” “inter-agency consultation” and “intersectoral case management.” In government we have gone from identifying the separate silos of departmental mandates to speaking of “interdepartmental collaboration,” then “multi-departmental coordination,” and most recently “horizontal management.”

The need for interdepartmental cooperation on the issue of family violence has been well appreciated by the Government of Canada for at least the past three decades. Given the multi-faceted nature of the issue, the consequent need for a multidisciplinary perspective, and the fact that various aspects of family violence fall within the mandates of many federal departments, it has long been realized that an interdepartmental approach is warranted. But since the establishment of the very first forms of interdepartmental cooperation on the issue of child abuse in the 1970s, through three successive federal Family Violence Initiatives that followed, there has been a gradual evolution in the ways in which that approach has been manifested. This presentation offers an overview of that evolution, considering the benefits that have been demonstrated, the challenges encountered and the limitations identified.

A brief description of the federal system in Canada may help to situate this analysis within the Canadian context. In Canada’s federal system, the Constitution confers legislative and executive powers on two levels of government, which are each sovereign in their respective spheres. There is a central government for all Canada, and a government for each province and territory. The *Constitution Act* defines the federal and provincial responsibilities. Services and institutions that fall within provincial jurisdiction include health and social services, education, municipal institutions and land development, the administration of justice and the development and organization of provincial courts of both civil and criminal jurisdiction. The territories have legislative, executive and judicial powers that are becoming similar to those exercised by the provinces. Municipal governments are created by the provincial legislatures and have such powers as the legislatures see fit to give them. Most government initiatives that relate to direct delivery of services are under provincial or territorial jurisdiction. Federal initiatives are designed to support provincial/territorial service delivery initiatives while assisting with the development of a national perspective.

The First Family Violence Initiative

With regard to the issue of child abuse, the federal government's attention goes back to at least the early 1970s. As well, the federal government did carry out initiatives to address other aspects of family violence during the early 1980s. The Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC), for example, funded women's shelters through its non-profit housing programs (CMHC providing the capital financing and the provinces providing the operating funding).

From 1985 to 1988, through its Non-Profit Housing Program, CMHC funded 52 shelters with over 650 beds. So there was a well-established precedent for federal action in addressing family violence issues, and these federal supports were operating collaboratively with many provincial and territorial governments and the shelter sector itself prior to the first Family Violence Initiative.

The earliest significant initiative to address the broader issue of family violence in its many forms and to do so on behalf of the federal government as a whole was the government's decision in 1978 recommending the establishment of a clearinghouse on family violence and violence against women. This decision led to the creation of an Interdepartmental Committee on Family Violence and, in 1982, to the establishment of the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence (NCFV).

Four years later, in 1986, the government launched the Child Sexual Abuse Initiative, providing multi-year funding to community groups allocated through three federal departments. Two years later, in 1988, the government launched the first Family Violence Initiative, combining the efforts of seven departments. Within what was then the Department of Health and Welfare Canada, the Family Violence Prevention Division was given responsibility to coordinate the Initiative and manage the Clearinghouse. This was the first occasion on which an identified body was given responsibility specifically for interdepartmental coordination on the issue.

In 1988 the Family Violence Initiative was unique in its scope and ambition – in offering federal leadership to address a serious social issue and in trying to bring together, in a coordinated way, so many federal departments whose activities touched on the issue. Moreover, the federal government was taking this initiative with regard to an issue that had been largely relegated to the domain of social services under the jurisdiction of the provinces and territories.

For the most part, the substantial funding directed to hundreds of community groups in the course of this first Initiative were provided by the member departments individually, reflecting the priorities of their individual mandates. However, even in this first multi-departmental Initiative, there were significant examples of coordinated cost-sharing among members:

- The Department of Health and Welfare partnered with the Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship to co-sponsor a Task Force on Mental Health Issues

Affecting Immigrants and Refugees.

- CMHC undertook a joint evaluation research project with Health and Welfare and developed a longstanding Data Sharing Agreement with the Department of Statistics Canada for information from its Transition Home Survey.
- The Department of Indian and Northern Affairs joined forces with Health and Welfare to jointly fund more than 180 community-based projects addressing the needs of Aboriginal people.
- Health and Welfare also partnered with the Ministry of the Solicitor General to sponsor the first national conference on elder abuse.
- Similarly, three departments cost-shared a series of projects addressing the issue of abuse of persons with disabilities.

While collaboration between departments was not unheard of prior to the first Initiative, most of these collaborations would not likely have happened without the impetus that it provided.

It is also noteworthy that many of the projects funded by member departments emphasized coordinated, multidisciplinary approaches to the prevention and treatment of family violence. This was most dramatically demonstrated by the organizing of the 1989 National Forum on Family Violence, an event that brought together research experts and front-line workers representing an array of disciplines from across the country to share ideas and develop plans for collaborative initiatives.

The principle of intersectoral collaboration was extended to intergovernmental work as well. For example, Health and Welfare collaborated with the provinces and territories to develop the publication, *Guidelines for Establishing Standards on Health Care Related to Abuse, Assault, Neglect and Family Violence*.

All of these factors strengthened the degree to which the member departments of the federal government were able to increasingly speak with one voice in discussions with the provinces and territories regarding family violence issues. This may have helped to mobilize political will that led to the creation of a Declaration on Violence Against Women that was issued in 1990 by the Federal/ Provincial/ Territorial Ministers Responsible for the Status of Women.

The Second Family Violence Initiative

In 1991 the federal government launched the second Family Violence Initiative. This time it involved a partnership that included not only an additional, seventh funded department but also the active membership of several departments that did not receive any portion of the designated funding – including the departments of Finance, Status of Women, Communications, Defence, Employment and Immigration, Agriculture and Veterans Affairs – an element that distinguished it qualitatively from the first Initiative.

Funding for this Initiative included resources that, for the first time, were allocated specifically to the task of coordination. The second Initiative was characterized by an extensive committee structure that ensured a much greater degree of interdepartmental communication and coordination than was the case in the first Initiative. The principal leadership body was a Steering Committee composed of Assistant Deputy Ministers (ADMs) from 15 departments and agencies. Representatives of specific responsibility centres in each of those departments formed the Interdepartmental Working Group (IWG), which reported to that senior Steering Committee.

This IWG was assisted by an array of sub-committees and ad hoc working groups. Those various committees addressed, respectively, the issues of evaluation, research, communications, violence against women, media violence, and elder abuse. Also established was an Advisory Committee for the National Clearinghouse and an interdepartmental “Funding Programs Group” that met regularly to review project proposals, assess outcomes and advise on future activities. As well, several *intradepartmental* committees were established to coordinate activities among separate programs within individual member departments.

In its public document, *Family Violence in Canada: A Call to Action*, issued in 1991 to announce the second Initiative, the government stated its commitment to “work in partnership with provincial, territorial and municipal governments, professional associations and community groups.”¹ An evaluation report on this second Initiative, published in 1994, observed that there was consensus among all respondents that “the federal government was perceived to be the most suitable body to coordinate activities both among provincial governments and between the federal and provincial governments. This coordination was seen to be essential to ensure that governments at different levels are not working at cross purposes.”² The creation of partnerships was reported to be one of the more successful components of the Initiative and a large majority of provincial government representatives who were interviewed felt that the Initiative had encouraged such partnerships.

This evaluation also noted that federal members of the Initiative identified several benefits to what was then referred to as simply “interdepartmental coordination.” They included:

- greater awareness of the activities of other departments, which allowed officials to bring to bear resources in ways that complemented the direction of other departments;
- as a result, an increased impetus to raising awareness on the issue throughout the federal government (not just among members of Initiative committees);
- greater likelihood of partnerships that resulted from the regular information sharing that

¹ Canada. National Clearinghouse on Family Violence, *Family Violence in Canada: A Call to Action* (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1992), p. 4.

² Price Waterhouse Associates, *Evaluation of the Global Issues of the Interdepartmental Family Violence Initiative – Final Report* (Unpublished report prepared for Health Canada, March 7, 1994), page iii.

- characterized the various interdepartmental committees;
- the opportunity to make use of the experiences of and materials produced by other departments;
- avoidance of duplication of effort; and
- a reduction of the isolation that had been felt by officials in individual departments when working on such a large issue with so many different facets, and a resultant increase in the confidence levels of individual officials who came to see themselves as working in concert with others.³

The second Initiative also facilitated collaboration on the development of various policy positions – on issues such as gun control, a sex offender registry and the public consultations on drunkenness as a defence in cases of spousal assault.

The Third Family Violence Initiative

In 1997 the federal government renewed its commitment to reduce family violence in Canada by launching the current Family Violence Initiative. This Initiative marked a new stage in federal efforts, one in which the issue of family violence is integrated into ongoing programming in many government departments. Programming and project expenditures related to family violence are determined by the mandates and priorities of member departments.

As well, unlike its predecessors, the current Initiative has no sunset year specified. That is, previous Initiatives were time-limited at their outset, the funding allocations being specified for a given duration and ending in a predetermined “sunset year.” The absence of any sunset year for the current Initiative reflects the appreciation that family violence is a long-term problem that requires a long-term, ongoing response.

While most community-based funding is provided through regular and ongoing departmental programming, an additional annual allocation of \$7 million is shared among seven member departments to supplement those expenditures and ensure that the Initiative is able to coordinate interdepartmental activity, collect national data, address identified gaps and operate the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence.

In 1998 the first annual report on this second Initiative reported that, “with a few exceptions, all federal activities related to the reduction of family violence — that is, those carried out under departmental mandates as well as any specially-funded activities — will be integrated into a single strategy. This approach is known as *horizontal issue management*. The federal government is using this approach for issues

³ Ibid., p. vi

that cross traditional departmental and sectoral boundaries and involve many players.”⁴ Later formulations elaborated on this concept, noting that the Initiative “is horizontally managed to ensure a shared federal perspective, foster collaboration, create partnerships and provide opportunities for joint action, thereby enhancing the federal capacity to achieve results. Horizontal management is appropriate because family violence issues are multi-dimensional, cut across federal mandates and link to federal-provincial-territorial and First Nations areas of jurisdiction and responsibility.”⁵

In a study done for the Initiative in 2002, Consulting and Audit Canada defined horizontal management as the “process of managing work across organizational boundaries in a coordinated and collaborative manner in order to achieve mutually agreed-upon objectives.”⁶

Interestingly, the 1997/98 report on the current Initiative also observed that it had “streamlined the previous Initiative’s coordinating structure to better manage family violence issues.”⁷ This may have implied that the large number of committees, working groups and ad hoc sub-committees that characterized the previous Initiative had become too unwieldy and/or that the staff complement and person-hours needed to maintain them were not easily sustainable. In spite of this early observation, however, by the second year of the current Initiative interdepartmental coordination was supported by several working groups – including ones on child abuse, family violence research in general and public awareness research in particular, as well as the continuation of an interdepartmental evaluation group and the advisory committee for the Clearinghouse.

The Initiative’s second annual report, submitted in 1999, made the following observations:

“Operationally, horizontal issue management remains the most promising strategy to build a national approach to address family violence issues. However, such an approach requires an ongoing federal investment in consultation and collaboration, and a commitment from all players. Coordination is an opportunity to show leadership and

⁴ Canada. Family Violence Initiative Interdepartmental Working Group. *The Family Violence Initiative Annual Report 1997-98, December 1998* (Ottawa: Health Canada, 1999), p. 5. Available: <http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hppb/familyviolence/pdfs/fvannualreport.pdf>

⁵ Canada. Family Violence Initiative Interdepartmental Working Group. *The Family Violence Initiative Year Five Report, December 2002* (Ottawa: Health Canada, 2002), p. ii. The *Year Five Report* is available on the NCFV website – <http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/nc-cn>.

⁶ Canada. Consulting and Audit Canada, *Horizontal Management Issues Study*. Prepared for the Family Violence Initiative Interdepartmental Working Group, Health Canada (Ottawa: Health Canada, 2002), p. 3.

⁷ *The Family Violence Initiative Annual Report 1997-98*, page 12

influence outcomes. At a very practical level, resource limitations in coordination capacity within the Family Violence Initiative—at both departmental and interdepartmental levels—are becoming increasingly evident. This, in turn, hampers the ability of the Family Violence Initiative as a whole—and member departments—to fully execute a horizontal approach to issue management. Because the scope and reach of the Family Violence Initiative are growing through successful partnership development, the problem of the capacity to coordinate is becoming more acute.”⁸

In 2002 the Initiative published its *Year Five Report*, assessing the progress made to date. The Report offered the following observations about the challenges posed to horizontal management:

“The Office of the Auditor General of Canada has noted that horizontal management processes are based on a set of common objectives, apply results-oriented performance measurement strategies, use information to effectively report on and improve performance, and operate with effective coordination structures.⁹ While the Family Violence Initiative possesses these fundamental elements, like most horizontally managed initiatives it has experienced some implementation challenges. Some of these challenges relate to the substantively *unique* nature of family violence, such as the systemic and multi-faceted nature of the issue and the requirements of a multi-sectoral policy response (including involvement by the health, justice, social services and housing sectors). Others relate to the *policy environment* which encompasses a number of legislative and mandate differences across jurisdictions; intersectoral and cross-jurisdictional challenges — including resource constraints — in partnership development and implementation; diversity within populations at risk; and differences in community awareness of, and capacities to address, family violence issues.

“Other challenges are more *operational* in nature. For example, the current configuration of the Family Violence Initiative includes activities funded wholly through the Family Violence Initiative annual allocation as well as other activities funded wholly or in part through departmental programs. The Initiative involves consultation and coordination across departments and with related initiatives to develop strategies to address the myriad interrelated factors that contribute to family violence. In addition, over the past five years, staff turnover has posed an ongoing challenge. This approach to funding, and the numbers of departments and strategic linkages required, combined with the persistence of vertical lines of authority and accountability, add a layer of complexity

⁸ Canada. Family Violence Initiative Interdepartmental Working Group. *The Family Violence Initiative 1998/99 Annual Report*. Ottawa: Health Canada, page 17

⁹ Canada. Office of the Auditor General of Canada, “Managing Departments for Results and Managing Horizontal Issues for Results,” *Report of the Auditor General of Canada — December 2000*, chapter 20 (Ottawa: Supply and Service Canada; Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 2000). Available: <http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca> This chapter is based on case studies of horizontally managed initiatives, including the Family Violence Initiative.

to strategic planning. It has also tended to blur lines of accountability. Streamlining the strategic planning process, clarifying accountability requirements and simplifying performance reporting are continuing challenges. Finding appropriate mechanisms and tools to effectively coordinate activity within existing resource parameters is also an ongoing challenge.”¹⁰

In spite of these obstacles, the *Year Five Report* concluded that “there have been advancements in the creation of a coordinated and increasingly collaborative approach to family violence.”¹¹ Nonetheless, the Report also pointed to the intention to refine the Initiative’s horizontal management in the next phase. In aid of that goal, it noted that “studies of horizontal management ... suggest that stronger links between the working level and the senior public service level within the federal government would increase the effectiveness of the ... Initiative.”¹² It also observed that “central agency support is vital to refining mechanisms, processes and tools to horizontally manage the Family Violence Initiative.”¹³

The *Year Five Report* affirmed that, during its next phase, the Initiative would be committed to “revitalize its approach to horizontal management, moving beyond information-sharing and networking to a greater emphasis on collective activity to produce resources and results that reflect multi-departmental input and collaboration.”¹⁴ To those ends, the Report indicated the Initiative’s intention to consider the following:

- Mechanisms to enhance interdepartmental coordination of research, evaluation and information-gathering activities
- Information and data base management systems as a foundation for a more sophisticated, ongoing process of information-sharing among FVI members
- Regularization of mechanisms to ensure sharing of information on activities carried out by member departments (e.g., regular and more frequent IWG meetings, regular interdepartmental electronic bulletins, periodic newsletters published by the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence)

¹⁰ *The Family Violence Initiative Year Five Report, December 2002*, pages 16-17

¹¹ *Ibid.*, page iii

¹² *Ibid.*, page viii

¹³ *Ibid.*, page 18. Central agency is the term used to refer to those agencies and departments that are at the centre of the government decision-making process, most notably the Treasury Board Secretariat, the Privy Council Office and the Department of Finance.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, page 49

- Improved interdepartmental activities for the coordination of public information dissemination via conferences and the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence, such as:
 - Implementation of new and systematic mechanisms to obtain interdepartmental guidance of and input to the content of NCFV publications
 - Mechanisms to ensure “one-stop shopping” for Canadian information on family violence
- Development of selected multi-departmental projects
- Development and implementation of more effective federal inter-initiative collaboration (e.g., with the National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention and the National Homelessness Initiative)¹⁵

The report concludes with the observation that “the challenges of horizontally managing an initiative that spans [many] very distinct departments are amplified by the fact that horizontal management still remains largely in its infancy and there are no tested guidebooks to follow.”¹⁶

Challenges and Obstacles – A Summary

Horizontal management must be seen as an approach that can take a variety of forms along a continuum, differentiated according to the breadth and intensity of coordination that is evident. At the least complex end of the continuum is simple information-sharing among departments that are addressing a common issue, albeit from the perspectives of their individual mandates. Moving further along the continuum would see the use of that shared information for the systematically pursued goals of duplication-avoidance and cross-fertilization of knowledge and workplans. Next would be occasional collaborative partnerships – the sort that were created in the course of the first Family Violence Initiative in the late 1980s.

More ambitious forms of horizontal management would entail formal statements about collective goals, together with significant organizational mechanisms for information-sharing and the facilitation of collaborative activity among members, as was the case during the second Initiative. The third Initiative reflects an even more developed form of horizontal management, with its formulation of not only specific objectives but also the tools by which their accomplishment would be measured and reported (though the limitations of this paper have not allowed for the elaboration of those tools here). At the extreme end of the continuum one would find partnerships confirmed through formal agreements regarding common objectives and the

¹⁵ Ibid., pages 49-50

¹⁶ Ibid., page 51

specification of cost-sharing parameters and coordinating procedures.

The history of federal activity regarding family violence in some ways resembles a process of “two steps forward and one step back.” That is, over the course of the past 17 years, on the one hand there have been the following indicators of an enhancement of federal horizontal management around the issue:

- The number of formal partners has expanded within each successive Initiative and continues to expand in the current phase.
- The federal funding devoted to the issue has been mainstreamed to the extent that almost half of the participating departments now take part on the basis of their ongoing “A-base” or regular budgets in the absence of any specially designated funding.
- The need for ongoing interdepartmental activity has been acknowledged by the approval of permanent annual funding without any sunset year.
- The tools to monitor, record and report on member activities – both individual and collective – have become more rationalized and formal, and departments have become consistently involved in contributing to performance measurement progress reports.
- Linkages with other federal initiatives that are relevant to family violence have increased and in some cases been formalized by overlapping memberships.
- Information-sharing, dialogue and collaboration between the federal and provincial/territorial levels have become well-established and helpful to all parties.
- Coordination structures have been “streamlined” over the years, making for a less top-heavy and complex set of committees and working groups.
- The National Clearinghouse on Family Violence has become increasingly reflective of the concerns and programs of many partner departments rather than largely a reflection of the host department that is responsible for its management.
- The production of the major *Year Five Report* allowed for the identification of steps that can be taken to strengthen the horizontal management of the Initiative in the coming years.

On the other hand, this history has exhibited the following continuing and new challenges:

- The absence of community-based project funding (e.g., for multi-year demonstration projects) from most of the member departments’ programming has lessened the perception of the need for interdepartmental mechanisms such as the “Funding Programs

Group” that met regularly during the second Initiative and allowed for very practical cross-fertilization of ideas and collective enrichment of project activity.

- The “streamlining” of coordination structures has been accompanied by periods of dormancy of formerly valuable bodies, such as the Interdepartmental Evaluation Working Group and the Clearinghouse Advisory Committee.
- Progress on the development of a national strategy on family violence has been especially challenging.¹⁷

This history confirms conclusions which have been expressed in a growing number of government policy documents and academic analyses on the issue of horizontal management, including the following:

- Interdepartmental coordination is time-consuming and requires a serious commitment of person/hours from each member department.
- The breadth of this particular issue poses a challenge to effective coordination.¹⁹

This analysis also points to challenges that must be addressed in the current phase of activity. Addressing those challenges will require an appreciation of the following realities:

- The commitment and formal involvement of senior departmental officials is essential to

¹⁷ The *Year Five Report* (page 6) made this observation about a “national approach” to the issue:

“Federal leadership and partnership development — two cornerstones of the Family Violence Initiative — influence and contribute to the creation of an integrated, national approach to family violence issues. Working together with all sectors of Canadian society, the Family Violence Initiative enhances opportunities for joint action and opens the possibilities for change.”

While this may all be true, it is not to say that Canada has yet produced a truly “national” approach or strategy to address family violence. This state of affairs may reflect the lack of sufficient public pressure more than any characteristics of federal interdepartmental coordination.

¹⁹ It is noteworthy that in the course of the 1994 evaluation of the second Initiative, the possibility of expanding the membership was raised. Some interviewees suggesting that other departments and agencies, such as the Human Rights Commission, Revenue Canada and the Official Languages Commission, should also be involved. Others countered that if too many other departments and other forms of violence were included within the ambit of the Initiative, it would lose the focus it then had on violence against women, children and the elderly. This raises the question as to whether the effectiveness of intersectoral coordination may be positively related to the narrowness of the focus of that coordination.

the implementation of collective programs that have fiscal implications at the federal level.

- Departmental auditing processes mitigate against interdepartmental co-managed, cost-shared projects.
- Horizontal management requires a cultural shift within government, including a move away from some of the traditional ways in which departments have done business.
- Although there is a great deal of promotion of the approach, the organizational mechanisms to fully support horizontal management are not yet fully developed.

Conclusion

This 17-year experience of three successive Family Violence Initiatives has identified the following elements as key to the effectiveness of federal horizontal management of this issue:

- The degree of public pressure in support of both intra-governmental coordination and a “national strategy” that would require such coordination
- The clarity, credibility and persuasiveness of the rationale for such a horizontal approach
- The formality and imperativeness of the requirement for such horizontal management as it is expressed by central agencies of the federal government
- The clarity and specificity of the form of horizontal management that is expected (i.e., along the continuum described above)
- The degree to which very pointed directives are given to member departments, specifying their role, responsibilities and expectations vis-a-vis interdepartmental activity – including the funds that they are expected to devote to cost-shared efforts
- The degree to which, within each participating department, human and financial resources are explicitly and unequivocally allocated to Initiative activities and, more specifically, to interdepartmental activities
- The formally expressed support for this policy by the highest levels of the government administration
- The incentives provided to senior officials for their wholehearted support for and personal involvement in horizontal management

- The guidance and support offered by central agencies to those responsible for horizontal management
- The adequacy of mechanisms and authorities provided to those bodies responsible for leading the process, to truly empower them to lead and coordinate
- The effectiveness of policies and practices to minimize staff turn-over and maintain corporate memory within the Initiative
- The explicitness and consistency of guidelines from central agencies as to the parameters of expected performance measurement (e.g., a clear restriction to measurement of performance regarding interdepartmental activity rather than individual department performance)

These are elements that should be used in any comparative dialogue on this issue among countries that are following a similar process. The continuing evolution of Canada's Family Violence Initiative is expected to benefit from enhancements in all of these dimensions of horizontal management.
