



Briefing December 2007

Building Policy Research Capacity

At a Glance

- ◆ Government policy-makers face an increasingly complex environment, immense time pressures, and public demand for quick fixes to issues that continually shift. Thinking strategically and formulating effective and evidence-based public policy in this environment requires strong strategic policy-making and research capacity.
- ◆ In Canada and around the world, governments have established organizations and teams dedicated to rebuilding and enhancing this capacity.
- ◆ Across the organizations that were reviewed, commonalities in structure, processes, and tools provide interesting lessons for governments and their agencies, in particular the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care as it builds its own policy research capacity.

INTRODUCTION

There has never been a more important or challenging time for governments to have strong policy research capacity. In today's world, policy-makers face an increasingly complex and rapidly changing environment, and a public that demands immediate solutions to the issues of yesterday, today, and tomorrow. To satisfy these demands—and amid such an environment—governments must use high-quality, robust evidence and research to inform their policies and decisions. But for a period of years, Canadian governments cut back on their capacity to engage in analytical policy research and strategic policy-making. And so, there are concerns, nationally and internationally, as to whether our governments have the requisite ability to fill this policy research vacuum.

In light of these challenges, what would be required to enhance governments' policy research capacity? The Health System Planning and Research Branch within the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (MoHLTC) engaged The Conference Board of Canada to explore this important question, a process that occurred in two stages. First, we began with an extensive literature review and consultation with leading national and international policy experts. This led to a greater understanding of better practices and pointed toward a variety of organizations that have focused on building policy research capacity. Second, this scan and the suggestions from policy experts generated a short list of 10 organizations. Based on a variety of factors, including organizational mandate and experience, the MoHLTC, in consultation with the Conference Board, selected four organizations from this list to serve as the focus of a more in-depth case study review: the Policy Research Initiative, in Canada; the Scientific Council for Government Policy, in the Netherlands; the Strategy Unit, in the United Kingdom; and the Strategic Policy and Research Knowledge Branch (SPARK) of the Ministry of Health, in British Columbia.

This briefing presents a synthesis of the findings drawn from a more detailed analysis, which was prepared for the Ministry. To begin the discussion, we provide definitions of the basic terms that helped frame our understanding of the case study examples' work. (See box "Definitions.")

Definitions

Strategy is the overall process of deciding where we want to get to and how we are going to get there.

Strategic direction describes the desired future and sets out what needs to be achieved in order to bring it about.

Policy provides the means of moving in that direction.

Policy design work identifies how to achieve strategic objectives, selects the most suitable policy instruments for doing so, and details how these instruments will work in practice.

Source: The Strategy Unit.

Research and analysis have an overarching influence on each of these areas. In particular, research has a role in the policy-making cycle at multiple points—from environmental scanning, and understanding and framing the issue, to conducting analysis of various types (e.g., evaluative, contextual, organizational, comparative, economic).¹

THE ART AND SCIENCE OF POLICY-MAKING

Researchers are from Mars; policy-makers are from Venus.

—James Tallon, President of the United Hospital Fund of New York

The literature and case examples indicate that policy-making is both an art and a science. Lomas illustrates the relationship between policy and research by dividing the policy-making world into three interrelating domains. He begins in the centre with the institutional structure for decision-making (he uses the metaphor of a "sausage machine") out of which emerge the products: policies.² Feeding into this machine are the outputs from two other domains: values (that influence a decision) and information (the research produced and purveyed to create knowledge).

Most governments would likely argue that their institutional structures allow them to engage in strategic policy-making, and furthermore, that they have necessary information (research) embedded within their day-to-day policy-making process. In reality, however,

1 Susan Goldberg, *You say 'to-may-to(e)' and I say 'to-mah-to(e): Bridging the Communication Gap Between Researchers and Policy-Makers* (Ottawa: The Canadian Institute for Health Information, 2004), p. 11.

2 Jonathan Lomas, "Connecting Research and Policy," *Canadian Journal of Policy Research* (Spring 2000), p. 143.

the worlds of policy-making and research and analysis are not homogeneous; bringing them together under the purview of strategic thinking and planning can be like mixing oil and water.

Bringing the worlds of policy-making and research and analysis together under the purview of strategic thinking and planning can be like mixing oil and water.

Policy-makers face time and political pressures as well as unexpected shifts in priorities. They often have to contend with powerful lobbies and interest groups. Researchers in health care, for example, can spend months, if not years, on a key piece of work only to find that priorities have changed and the fruits of their labour are not what decision makers need to solve the issues of the day.³ As a result, research and evidence do not always find their way into policies and decisions. Better communication between policy-makers and researchers—perhaps sharing interim findings, for example—would no doubt make a difference.

Lomas writes that “better links between research and decision making depend on the two communities finding points of exchange at more than the ‘product’ stages of each of their processes” He concludes that the early and ongoing involvement of relevant decision makers in the conceptualization and conduct of research is the best predictor of the successful utilization of that research in policy development.⁴ Some governments have reconfigured their institutional structures to ensure this happens; in some cases, such as the Strategy Unit, policy and research have merged within an organization.

If these links have been formed and policy research capacity developed, what will effective policy-making look like? The project team for the 1999 U.K. paper

Professional Policy-Making Core Competencies

Forward-looking—takes a long-term view, based on statistical trends and informed predictions, of the likely impact of policy.

Outward-looking—takes account of factors in the national, European, and international situation and communicates policy effectively.

Innovative and creative—questions established ways of dealing with things and encourages new ideas; open to comments and suggestions of others.

Using evidence—uses best evidence available from a wide range of sources and involves key stakeholders at an early stage.

Inclusive—takes account of the impact on the needs of all those directly or indirectly affected by the policy.

Joined-up—looks beyond institutional boundaries to the government’s strategic objectives; establishes the ethical and legal base for policy.

Evaluates—builds systematic evaluation of early outcomes into the policy process.

Reviews—keeps established policy under review to ensure it continues to deal with the problems it was designed to tackle, taking account of associated effects elsewhere.

Learns lessons—learns from experience of what works and what doesn’t.

Source: *Professional Policy Making for the Twenty First Century*, a report by the Strategic Policy Making Team, Cabinet Office, Government of the United Kingdom, September 1999. www.policyhub.gov.uk/docs/profpolicymaking.pdf.

Professional Policy Making for the Twenty First Century set out to explore, “What should modern policy-making look like?” and “What is current good practice?” Based on their research, the team produced a list of professional policy-making core competencies. (See box “Professional Policy-Making Core Competencies.”) In our case study review, many of these competencies—being forward-looking, taking a joined-up approach, and using the best available evidence—turned up repeatedly in practice.

3 Lomas, p. 141.

4 Ibid.

THE CASE STUDY REVIEW

In keeping with MoHLTC interests, the focus of the case study review was on the form and function of the selected organizations. The review entailed an examination of several elements: background, mandate, human resources, functions, reporting structure, work processes, and current work areas. A brief description of the organizations appears below, followed by a summary of the cross-cutting themes and implications for the MoHLTC.

THE POLICY RESEARCH INITIATIVE (CANADA)

www.policyresearch.gc.ca

A 1993 federal government task force report on strengthening the policy capacity of the Canadian federal government identified a lack of capacity to deal with strategic and horizontal issues. The task force argued that the centre of government—the Privy Council Office—should focus on improving the situation. In 1997, the Policy Research Initiative (PRI), a federal initiative, was created to address the dwindling capacity. Its mandate is to conduct research on medium-term horizontal issues (those that cut across government ministries) and ensure the transfer of the resulting knowledge to policy-makers. It also has a mandate to identify data needs and priorities for future policy development.

With a staff of about 30 full-time equivalents, a turnover rate of about 33 per cent annually, and a yearly budget of approximately \$3 million, the PRI aspires to be a thought leader in the area of policy research capacity. Its functions include engaging in forward scanning to identify emerging issues, deepening the research on emerging horizontal issues, developing processes for building policy research capacity among the workforce, and creating the infrastructure to support horizontal policy research collaboration. The PRI endeavours to harness knowledge and expertise from within the federal government, as well as from external stakeholders such as Canadian universities, private sector research institutions, and international organizations. With representation from all federal departments and agencies, the PRI's Policy Research Data Group provides advice to Statistics Canada on the federal government's data needs.

Horizontal by nature, the projects involve various topics, such as Investing in Youth, and Multicultural Canada in the 21st Century: Harnessing Opportunities and Managing Pressures. Project results are shared with the federal policy community through reports, discussion papers, and a periodical, *Horizons*. The PRI is currently working on building its knowledge transfer capabilities.

THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL FOR GOVERNMENT POLICY (NETHERLANDS)

www.wrr.nl

The Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) in the Netherlands has a long history that dates back to 1972. Its mandate is to advise the government about future developments of public interest using a scientific approach. The WRR is characterized by its strong independence and the requirement, stated in an act of Parliament, that government must respond to its recommendations by indicating what it is doing or intends to do with the issue.

The WRR is characterized by its strong independence and the requirement that government must respond to its recommendations.

The Council itself consists of a minimum of five and a maximum of 11 members. Typically, Council members are university professors who are experts within their given field. Overall, the WRR—with a budget of about EUR3 million—comprises a staff of approximately 40 core people with mostly academic and scientific qualifications, working in various roles. As a result, there is a good level of organizational memory but an occasional lack of expertise in some content areas.

The official advisory opinions of the Council are published as reports and provided to Cabinet, where discussion ensues. Shortly thereafter, the reports are made public and posted to the WRR website. The government's opinions on and response to recommendations are often the subject of debate in Parliament as well; in fact, WRR reports typically generate a good deal of media and public attention too. Presentations of ideas and report findings

are made by the WRR in many government departments. Some of the current topics being reviewed include climate change, safety, and the welfare state.

As an organization interested in remaining current, the WRR welcomes the opportunity to work with external sources. For example, at the WRR Lecture, well-known Dutch or international speakers are invited to share their views on current issues from a policy and science perspective. Also, the WRR is working with other arm's-length organizations in Europe to enhance collaboration and synergy. A network of these organizations is being developed, and consideration is being given as to whether and how joint projects could proceed.

THE STRATEGY UNIT (UNITED KINGDOM)

www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy

Units responsible for strategy and policy advice at the centre of U.K. government have existed in different forms, on and off, as far back as the First World War. The Strategy Unit was formed in 2002 through a merging of its precursors, the Performance and Innovation Unit (created in 1998) and the Prime Minister's Forward Strategy Unit (created in 2001). The Strategy Unit's mandate is to address long-term and/or cross-cutting strategic issues and to promote innovation in policy development. Based in the Cabinet Office, it achieves this by carrying out strategy reviews and counselling (in conjunction with departments) the Prime Minister and his advisors on policy matters. It also provides support and collaborates with government departments in building strategic capability.

The Strategy Unit currently employs approximately 45 staff and has a budget for 2007–08 of £3.6 million. Of this, 80–90 per cent is applied directly to core strategy, policy, and analytical activities. Additional staff come by way of loan from departments, at their expense. The Unit has few day-to-day responsibilities and work is organized around clusters of domestic policy such as education and health. Customized teams of two to six people (individuals recruited from inside and outside the Civil Service) are formed to meet the needs of each project and then redeployed to new work upon its completion. Recruitment

focuses on those with outstanding generic analytical skills. In this environment, silos (i.e., analysts and policy advisors working separately) are rare.

Staff training and development on strategy work is emphasized. Courses provided by the Unit include: economics for non-economists, managing strategy projects, top-down thinking (problem solving and writing), communication/presentation skills, pinpoint (a facilitation course), and stakeholder relationship-building and management. The Strategy Survival Guide, developed by the Unit, highlights a range of skills, tools, and approaches that will help to foster strategic thinking across government.⁵

The mandate of SPARK, with a staff of 10 and a \$1.3 million budget, is to advise Ministry decision makers on corporate policy and research issues with long-term implications for the health system.

STRATEGIC POLICY AND RESEARCH KNOWLEDGE BRANCH, MINISTRY OF HEALTH (BRITISH COLUMBIA)

The Strategic Policy and Research Knowledge Branch (SPARK) of the Strategic Programs Division of B.C.'s Ministry of Health has over 12 years of history in developing linkages between researchers and policy-makers and in creating a research/evidence-based culture within the Ministry. The mandate of SPARK, with a staff of 10 and a \$1.3 million budget, is to advise Ministry decision makers on corporate policy and research issues with long-term implications for the health system. Overall, the Branch provides leadership in the development and enhancement of Ministry capacity to access, use, and generate (when necessary) the best research knowledge to inform policy and program development and evaluation. In addition, it supports, monitors, and reports on Ministry-wide research needs, priorities, and investments. As well, it facilitates

5 The guide can be found at www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/downloads/survivalguide/index.htm.

Ministry access to research and emerging research of strategic relevance. SPARK serves as the Ministry's liaison to the Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research (MSFHR). This focus on capacity-building and knowledge translation, as opposed to direct policy research, sets SPARK apart from the other organizations reviewed.

SPARK achieves its mandate through a variety of activities and initiatives. For example, staff participate as members of the Steering Council of the Health Services and Policy Research Support Network. The network was established to support excellent health services and policy research and knowledge translation activities that inform the development, implementation, assessment, and refinement of current and future health redesign and change initiatives. It functions as the formal provincial forum that connects health authorities, the Ministry, health services, and policy researchers. In 2004, the Ministry granted the MSFHR \$16 million to be used for the network's activities.

SPARK also chairs the Research Advisory Committee (RAC), a recently launched (February 2007) committee that serves as the reference and advisory group for the Ministry's strategic research activities. Apart from being knowledgeable in this area, the 15 RAC members have an interest in and passion for research. RAC provides a forum for coordinated exchange of information related to research across the Ministry and moves forward with Ministry-wide initiatives to improve the access to policy-relevant research within and by the Ministry, as well as to facilitate its use and creation.

Another role involves the organization of knowledge-sharing events:

- ◆ Held twice a month or more, the Policy Rounds program—a lecture series—allows staff from all areas of the Ministry to find out more about a broad range of policy research topics. In 2004, SPARK received awards and recognition from the Ministry and from the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation for this highly successful and popular program.
- ◆ In response to Ministry executive team interest in learning more about program area updates, SPARK launched the Strategic Initiatives series in 2006.

This series provides a forum to showcase program area initiatives and their contribution to the Ministry's core objectives and services.

- ◆ SPARK is also involved with an initiative entitled Community of Practice (CoP). Modelled after a similar knowledge-sharing program dating back to 2003, the policy analyst CoP (i.e., the group of policy analysts working within the Strategic Programs Division of the Ministry of Health) meets monthly for networking and to test the potential of this structure as a knowledge-sharing forum.
- ◆ Finally, SPARK sponsors a continuing education series for Ministry staff. The 2007 series, Retool for Research, features topics such as how to read a research article, program evaluation, and effective integration of evidence into health-care decisions.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND LONG-TERM CARE

Each of these organizations has their own distinct approach to servicing the policy needs of their respective governments. Some focus on producing policy research themselves (with varying degrees of independence) while others are centred on knowledge translation and capacity-building. Of particular interest are the commonalities among them—in guiding principles, structure, and practices. We highlight these as areas for the Ministry to explore as it seeks to build its policy research capacity.

THE IMPORTANCE OF EVIDENCE AND ANALYSIS

All of the organizations reviewed believe in the primacy of evidence in policy and strategy development. Their publications typically provide a clear link between evidence and policy.

At times, the organizations outsourced or seconded experts for projects to ensure they had the requisite capacity to bring the best evidence to bear. Several organizations also provided training and/or resources for their staff in seeking and applying the best evidence in policy development.

- ◆ Evidence must be the foundation of strategic policy-making. It is critical that evidence and analysis translate into policy options and decisions.

KNOWLEDGE TRANSLATION THROUGH A VARIETY OF MECHANISMS

Knowledge translation is important to all of the organizations reviewed. Tools—such as regular seminar series and policy rounds at SPARK and the Strategy Unit, and the strategic thinking series at the WRR—were used successfully as part of this effort. Published reports also provided an effective medium for broad knowledge translation. Finally, the WRR is able to successfully leverage media to stimulate debate and public awareness about its reports and recommendations.

- ◆ A carefully planned and executed knowledge translation and communication strategy is vital to the work of a policy research unit. Without it, good policy research can go unnoticed, or worse, unused.

FLEXIBILITY AND OUTSOURCING

In several of the organizations, teams are assembled and disbanded on a project-specific basis. Team members come from a variety of sources, including the organization itself, secondments from other ministries or departments, and externally from academic or private sectors. This style of building teams has benefits and drawbacks. As a benefit, it brings outside expertise, knowledge, and perspectives to the project as well as enhances the capacity of those who work for the unit. The drawback, however, is the continual loss of organizational memory. This is countered at the PRI and Strategy Unit by well-developed information and communication technology systems. The reliance on in-house capacity at the WRR yields strong organizational memory but occasional shortfalls in content expertise. Overall, the organizations seemed to heed the philosophy of Matthew Barber, former lead of the Prime Minister's Delivery Unit in the U.K.: “. . . a small number of excellent people is infinitely better than a large number of ordinary people.”⁶

Among the units that focus on broad cross-cutting government issues, the number of staff ranges between 30 and 40, while the unit in B.C. that focused on health

alone operates with just 10 people. The mix between internal and external staff deserves close consideration; a 50/50 blend has worked for the Strategy Unit. In terms of financial resources, the organizations that we reviewed had a ratio of budget to government expenditures in the 1:50,000 range.

- ◆ The size of a given policy research unit depends on its mandate. Most of the organizations have been kept purposely small, a quality that limits silos and facilitates multidisciplinary work.

CAPACITY-BUILDING TOOLS

The Strategy Unit and SPARK examples highlight specific instances of the use of tools to build strategic capability. The Strategy Unit's training program and Strategy Survival Guide have been developed as tools to enhance capacity both in-house and in other departments and ministries. Similarly, the initiatives instituted by SPARK have proven to be successful and popular not only inside the Ministry but also among key groups, such as regional health authorities.

A variety of tools can provide effective support for internal and external capacity-building.

In some organizations, we observed a high rate of staff turnover and, as mentioned, concerns about loss of organizational memory. However, this type of workforce movement can be viewed as part of an overall (all of government) capacity-building strategy. For example, in the case of the PRI, of the 120 staff that can be identified as having worked there, some 110 remain within the federal government, with significant numbers at the executive level.

- ◆ A variety of tools can provide effective support for internal and external capacity-building. Many fine examples exist in the organizations we reviewed and could be used as exemplars. The concept of building capacity should be viewed as concentric, with two tiers of focus: narrow (for the unit and/or department), and broad (for the whole of Ministry and/or government).

6 Matthew Barber, *Instruction to Deliver* (London, England: Politico's Publishing Ltd., 2007), p. 64.

THEME-BASED ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND DIRECT REPORTING

In most of the case examples, there is little in the way of hierarchy in organizational design. An executive director typically works with project managers, supported by administrative staff. The bulk of the organization is structured around the current key themes and accompanying projects, which change regularly. This framework allows for the flexibility needed to address new and emerging policy issues. In a few instances, organizations report directly to a key decision maker in government; in the case of the Strategy Unit, to the Prime Minister. Straight-line reporting has the benefit of ensuring congruency with government priorities and maintaining a strong focus in the organization's work.

- ◆ Flattened organizational structures support the theme or project-based nature of policy and strategy research. A reporting relationship with a key decision maker helps to ensure alignment with government priorities.

CROSS-DEPARTMENTAL INVOLVEMENT

All of the organizations emphasized the need for cross-departmental work (across departments within ministries), or cross-ministerial, when appropriate. Many of the project themes, due to their horizontal nature, require this approach.

- ◆ Health policy research often demands cross-ministerial collaboration because, as is commonly accepted now, multiple factors contribute to health status. This collaborative approach should be integral to the work of a policy research unit.

CONSENSUAL PRIORITY-SETTING

Most of the case study organizations have protocols for determining which themes, topics, or projects will be pursued. Typically, themes are developed through a consensus-building process and often are influenced by overall government priorities. A few of the organizations, however, value independence from political pressures. Consultation with other departments and ministries is a consistent feature of the priority-setting processes.

- ◆ Strategy and policy research units should have a clear and systematic process for priority-setting of themes and/or projects. Ideally, this process should feature consultation and consensus-building strategies. Early involvement of decision makers in the conceptualization of research projects is paramount.

MEDIUM- TO LONG-TERM OUTLOOK

Most of the case study examples that conduct policy research have a medium- to long-term focus. This allows them to concentrate on their priority areas and to not get pulled into the daily requests and crises that can occur. Sometimes though, despite good intentions, immediate concerns can take hold.

- ◆ Depending on the interests of the MoHLTC team, a medium- to long-term focus (5- to 15-year window) works best for a policy research unit.

Consultation with other departments and ministries is a consistent feature of the priority-setting processes.

CONCLUSION

It is an opportune time in history for governments, and in particular the Health System Planning and Research Branch, to be considering their policy research capacity. Nationally and internationally, there has been a growing movement toward the development of this capacity in government. With the move toward a decentralized system of prioritizing, planning, and funding through the implementation of Local Health Integration Networks (LHINs), and the new focus of the MoHLTC on overall stewardship and planning, we believe the Branch has much to gain from this review of the literature and leading case examples.

STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

We found that some governments have recognized the need to rebuild policy research capacity within the folds of their public service. And not only do practices,

tools, and processes figure prominently in rebuilding this capacity; these governments have come to know that structure (units, branches, networks, and councils) matters too.

Among the four case study organizations that focus on policy research, we have seen innovative structures that combine the benefits of public sector wisdom with outside expertise, which brings in fresh thinking, free from political influence. Regarding knowledge translation, the review has unearthed new ways of reaching out to the public sector community to ensure that research is embedded in policy development.

It is for each of these governments to determine the ultimate effectiveness of their chosen approach. Anecdotally, from all the organizations, we have heard the belief that their efforts have enhanced policy research capacity and strategic thinking.

As the MoHLTC looks toward its future as a leader and as a partner with the LHINs throughout the province, it would do well to explore more deeply whether structures and/or processes similar to those reviewed in this report could generate the capacity required to meet its policy research needs.

In keeping with The Conference Board of Canada's guidelines for financed research, the design and method of research, as well as the content of the report, were determined solely by the Conference Board.

Acknowledgements
 We would like to thank the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care for commissioning this briefing. A special note of thanks goes to Thomas Townsend, Executive Director, Policy Research Initiative; Stephen Aldridge, Director, Strategy Unit; Anton Hemerijck, Secretary of the Netherlands WRR Council and Director of the Office; Victoria Schuckel, Co-Director of Research; and Elizabeth Jonkel, Senior Policy Analyst of the Strategic Policy and Research Knowledge Branch, Ministry of Health, British Columbia for sharing their knowledge and insights with us.

Building Policy Research Capacity
 by *Carole Stonebridge and Glen Roberts*

About The Conference Board of Canada

We are:

- A not-for-profit Canadian organization that takes a business-like approach to its operations.
- Objective and non-partisan. We do not lobby for specific interests.
- Funded exclusively through the fees we charge for services to the private and public sectors.
- Experts in running conferences but also at conducting, publishing and disseminating research, helping people network, developing individual leadership skills, and building organizational capacity.
- Specialists in economic trends, as well as organizational performance and public policy issues.
- Not a government department or agency, although we are often hired to provide services for all levels of government.
- Independent from, but affiliated with, The Conference Board, Inc. of New York, which serves nearly 2,000 companies in 60 nations and has offices in Brussels and Hong Kong.

The Conference Board of Canada
Insights You Can Count On



255 Smyth Road, Ottawa ON K1H 8M7 Canada

Tel. 613-526-3280 • Fax 613-526-4857 • Inquiries 1-866-711-2262

The Conference Board, Inc. 845 Third Avenue, New York NY 10022-6679 USA Tel. 212-759-0900 • Fax 212-980-7014 • www.conference-board.org

The Conference Board Europe Chaussée de La Hulpe 130, Box 11, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium Tel. +32 2 675 54 05 • Fax +32 2 675 03 95

The Conference Board Asia-Pacific 2802 Admiralty Centre, Tower 1, 18 Harcourt Road, Admiralty Hong Kong SAR Tel. +852 2511 1630 • Fax +852 2869 1403

©2007 **The Conference Board of Canada***
 Printed in Canada • All rights reserved
 ISSN 1205-1675 • ISBN 0-88763-807-7
 Agreement No. 40063028
 *Incorporated as AERIC Inc.



For more information, please contact us at the numbers listed above or e-mail contactcboc@conferenceboard.ca.
This publication is available on the Internet at www.e-library.ca.

Forecasts and research often involve numerous assumptions and data sources, and are subject to inherent risks and uncertainties. This information is not intended as specific investment, accounting, legal, or tax advice.