



CLINTON GLOBAL INITIATIVE
An Initiative of the Clinton Foundation

COMMITMENTS TO ACTION

CLINTON GLOBAL INITIATIVE

ANALYSIS OF UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS

2005 – 2015

A NOTE FROM CGI'S DIRECTOR OF COMMITMENTS

Since 2005, members of the CGI community have made thousands of Commitments to Action that are helping millions of people and addressing major social, environmental, and economic challenges around the world. In the Commitments Department at CGI, we have the privilege to help our members develop commitments, share the lessons they've learned along the way, and highlight the story – whether on our stage, on our blog and social media platforms, or through coverage in the media.

As part of this effort, we regularly review our portfolio of more than 3,400 commitments and strive to make information about our members' work available to the broader CGI and global development communities so that they, too, can benefit from our lessons learned.

In 2014, as CGI conducted its 10th Annual Meeting, we did a comprehensive review of Commitments-to-Action made by the CGI community. The goal of this portfolio review was to examine progress made in order to be more efficient and effective in the years to come.

Building upon our 2014 portfolio analysis, we've realized the great opportunities that come with sharing as much information as possible about our commitment portfolio as a whole. To encourage continuous learning for our members and to strengthen future Commitments to Action made through CGI, we conducted an analysis of those commitments which have been reported to CGI as unfulfilled for reasons ranging from issues with local government regulation to lack of funding to leadership changes within an organization having a negative impact on the success of a project's execution.

We believe that this practice will help to encourage our community to learn and adapt and to reflect on what's worked and what hasn't. This study is meant to examine the key learnings from unfulfilled commitments and draws conclusions for how we at the Clinton Global Initiative approach commitment development.

The CGI community has been able to achieve incredible things through the power of creative collaboration and partnership. We're confident that this report will further strengthen our membership's work and ability to learn from one another, ultimately allowing them to improve even more lives around the world.

Elsa Palanza
Director of Commitments
Clinton Global Initiative

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2014, CGI published a report, [Commitment Portfolio Analysis 2005-2013](#), analyzing commitments made from 2005-2013. This report, the first of its kind, took stock of the more than 2,800 commitments made at that time, and identified common trends to better understand the CGI commitments portfolio in aggregate. This report helped to significantly advance our understanding of what issues are being addressed by commitments in CGI's portfolio and where they are having an impact.

In 2016, the portfolio of CGI Commitments to Action continues to grow and serve as a resource for better understanding broader trends in the development space. Members of the Clinton Global Initiative community have made more than 3,400 Commitments to Action – the vast majority of which have been successful and are ongoing in their efforts to make a positive impact in our communities and around the world.

However, while CGI commitment-makers share a common goal to improve the world around them, the challenges they face in developing and implementing Commitments to Action are as diverse as the issues they address. This report examines the small percentage of commitments that are unfulfilled.

Using information reported to CGI through annual updates on the progress of commitments, CGI has, where possible, tried to identify trends or observations about the 190 unfulfilled commitments, which comprise 6% of the commitments portfolio. The findings in this report serve to illuminate common trends and challenges related to unfulfilled commitments to encourage continuous learning for CGI and its members and strengthen ongoing and future commitments.

Topline findings include:

1. **Of 3,452 commitments made between 2005 and 2015, 190 (6%) have been reported unfulfilled.** In addition, 1,570 (45%) have been completed, 1,257 (36%) are ongoing, and 59 (2%) are stalled. True to the CGI model, commitment-makers are asked to report progress on their work annually. When a commitment has not reported progress in over two years, CGI considers that commitment “unresponsive” and removes related target and impact metrics from its portfolio; 376 (11%) commitments are in this category, but can be re-activated at any time through the submission of a progress report.
2. **Countries with the highest commitment occurrence also had the highest occurrence of unfulfilled commitments.** The United States, India, Kenya, Uganda, and Haiti are the five countries with the highest occurrences of unfulfilled commitments. These countries were identified in the 2014 report, analyzing commitments made from 2005-2013, as having the highest occurrences of commitments, regardless of commitment status.
3. **The most common reason commitments were unfulfilled was due to a lack of funding.** Of the 190 commitments reported unfulfilled, 52 (27%) commitments reported that the primary reason they were unfulfilled was due to a lack of funding. In some circumstances this manifested through a major funding partner pulling out of a project, but in other cases the commitment-makers were simply unable to secure funding needed to successfully implement a commitment. As a result of this finding, commitments are now recommended to have over 50% of the required funding secured and are required to have a minimum of 30% secured prior to making the commitment.

4. **The percentage of unfulfilled commitments with partnerships, in a given year, is generally lower than the percentage of commitments made that year with partnerships.** This trend aligns with CGI's finding in the 2014 report that commitments with partnerships tend to be more successful than commitments implemented by a single organization.
5. **CGI has observed a relative spike in the percentage and number of unfulfilled commitments around the Global Financial Crisis.** The highest percentage and count of reported unfulfilled commitments, year over year, occurred in 2007, 2008, and 2009. Of the commitments made between 2007 and 2009 that have since been reported unfulfilled, 26 cited a lack of funding as the primary reason the commitment was unable to be successfully implemented. Of these 26 commitments, 23% explicitly referenced the Global Financial Crisis's contribution to the commitment-makers inability to secure the necessary capital for implementation.
6. **Information and Communications Technology (I.C.T.) is the most common primary subtopic among unfulfilled commitments.** Members of the CGI community have made I.C.T. commitments in the areas of internet access and adoption, access to computers and mobile phones, radio and television transmission, and data management, among other related topics. A review of these commitments suggests that I.C.T. commitments are not necessarily predisposed to failure and is not linked explicitly to integrating I.C.T. as an approach. However, CGI has observed that due to the high investment of financial and human resources necessary to implement I.C.T. commitments, these commitments tend to be more vulnerable to the same barriers, such as a lack of funding, that lead to failure among unfulfilled commitments generally.

Examining what works – and, with this report, what doesn't – is one more way CGI strives to create a community of continuous learning and maximize our members' impact over the long term. While a certain level of entropy is inherent in commitment implementation, it is incumbent upon CGI to help mitigate this risk. To this end, CGI has made a concerted effort to continue learning from the commitments portfolio and better support commitment development.

COMMITMENT TO ACTION OVERVIEW

CLINTON GLOBAL INITIATIVE

Established in 2005 by President Bill Clinton, the Clinton Global Initiative (CGI), an initiative of the Clinton Foundation, convenes global leaders to create and implement innovative solutions to domestic and global challenges. CGI Annual Meetings have brought together 190 sitting and former heads of state, more than 20 Nobel Prize laureates, and hundreds of leading CEOs, heads of foundations and NGOs, major philanthropists, and members of the media. To date, members of the CGI community have made more than 3,400 commitments which have improved the lives of over 430 million people in more than 180 countries.

CGI also convenes CGI America, a meeting focused on collaborative solutions to economic recovery in the United States, and CGI University (CGI U), which brings together undergraduate and graduate students to address pressing challenges in their community or around the world.

WHAT IS A COMMITMENT TO ACTION?

CGI convenes leaders to drive action through its unique model. CGI does not fund or implement commitment projects, but instead facilitates action by helping members connect, collaborate, and make effective and measurable Commitments to Action. CGI staff support the development of commitments by facilitating dialogue, providing opportunities to identify partners, showcasing the actions taken by commitment-makers, and communicating results.

A Commitment to Action—the defining feature of CGI—is a plan for addressing a significant global challenge. Participants must make a Commitment to Action to be a part of CGI. Commitments can be small or large and financial or nonmonetary in nature. Many commitments are the result of cross-sector partnerships, with members of the CGI community combining efforts to expand their impact. Every CGI commitment must meet three basic criteria:

- **NEW:** A CGI commitment must present a new idea or approach to a major challenge. While ongoing work is not eligible, an expansion of a successful program does qualify as a valid Commitment to Action. Additionally, participants can become partners on other CGI commitments by, for example, providing in-kind support or technical expertise.
- **SPECIFIC:** A CGI commitment must outline a specific approach to a problem, have clear and feasible objectives to be accomplished within a defined period of time, and articulate the desired outcome of the effort.
- **MEASURABLE:** A CGI commitment must have specific quantitative or qualitative goals that can be monitored by the commitment-maker to evaluate progress over time. As each commitment is implemented, annual progress is reported to CGI to show the extent of its impact.

HOW DOES CGI COLLECT DATA FROM ITS MEMBERS?

As each commitment is implemented, CGI asks its commitment-makers to provide a progress update every year on their commitment. Commitment-makers report cumulative impact on the specific target metrics set when the commitment was developed, in addition to providing a variety of other qualitative data related to the

commitment (summary of progress, lessons learned, best practices, etc.). The CGI Commitments staff review progress reports, make that progress publicly available on the CGI website, relay this collected information in year-round meetings in order to create a shared learning community, and help other members explore what works and what does not in addressing global challenges.

HOW DOES CGI DEAL WITH COMMITMENTS THAT DO NOT REPORT PROGRESS?

With a portfolio more than 3,400 commitments and a decade of participants, CGI attempts to contact past commitment-makers regarding the status of commitments, particularly those who have not reported progress in more than two years. Any commitment that has not reported its status to CGI in two years is classified as “unresponsive.” While those commitments can be reactivated at any time through the submission of a progress report, all unresponsive commitments are excluded from commitments analyses because the commitment-maker has not confirmed the continued accuracy of their reported data. While it is possible that unresponsive commitments may be either on-going or unfulfilled, all data related to those commitments, including impact metrics, value, geographic scope, keywords, etc., are excluded from CGI commitment analyses in an effort to be clear about where members have and continue to implement work.

HOW DOES CGI AGGREGATE METRICS ACROSS COMMITMENTS? HOW DOES CGI ACCURATELY CALCULATE INDIVIDUAL LIVES AFFECTED AND ACCOUNT FOR COMMITMENTS OPERATING IN MULTIPLE COUNTRIES?

CGI is cautious when aggregating metrics associated with commitments, both target and impact, to reduce the possibility of double counting individuals who may be reached by multiple commitments. To summarize the process, for each metric CGI counts the largest number, with attention to the specific countries included in the geographic scope of that commitment (e.g. India, Mexico, and China). Because CGI is unable to disaggregate reported values among countries on a multi-country commitment, if any of these countries also appear in the geographic scope of a second commitment, those values from the second commitment are discounted, regardless of whether new countries are also present. Therefore, the only values that are counted, in addition to the largest value, are those reported by commitments that are operating in unique countries not represented by any of the larger previously counted values. Finally, once the appropriate values have been identified, those values are summed. This process is repeated for each individual metric. Because the value is by nature an estimate and CGI’s aggregation method is so conservative, the final aggregated values are likely underestimated.

[For example: If Commitment A reaches 100 people in India, China, and Mexico, Commitment B reaches 80 people in China and Mexico, and Commitment C reaches 45 people in South Africa, CGI counts 100 people from Commitment A, discounts the 80 people reached in Commitment B because it is unknown what the degree of overlap is with Commitment A’s impact in China and Mexico, and counts the 45 unique people reached through Commitment C. Therefore, through these commitments, CGI would report that 145 people were reached (rather than 225).]

DOES CGI VERIFY THE DATA RECEIVED FROM COMMITMENT-MAKERS?

All data is self-reported by CGI commitment-makers. CGI serves as a platform for companies, individuals, governments, and nonprofits to learn from one another’s efforts, in an effort to maximize the success of CGI

members — not as a watchdog organization to evaluate the effectiveness of a specific organization’s work on global challenges. During the commitment development process, CGI staff work with each commitment-maker to establish target metrics that are realistic and maintain the same approach CGI takes in the reporting progress. Additionally, CGI works with the organization to ensure it has the capacity to accurately measure, evaluate, and report on their impact. The commitment-maker is ultimately responsible for identifying the metrics it wishes to use to measure their commitments’ impact.

DO IMPACT NUMBERS INCLUDE FORWARD-LOOKING COMMITMENTS AND THE PROJECTED IMPACT OF COMMITMENTS STILL IN PROGRESS?

No. CGI calculates impact as reported by commitment-makers through annual progress updates, regardless of status (ongoing, completed, stalled, etc.), and representative of the actual work accomplished by commitments to date. The initial target metrics, established by commitment-makers at the outset of their commitment, are always kept separate from the impact metrics.

ARE UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS INCLUDED IN AGGREGATED IMPACT NUMBERS?

Yes, but only what was reported accomplished, not the full value of the commitment’s initial target goals. While unfulfilled commitments were unable to meet their stated objectives and target metrics, in some cases these commitments still had a positive impact on a given community before winding down their operations. Furthermore, at the time when a commitment is reported as being unfulfilled to CGI, the commitment-makers report final impact numbers and confirm the continued accuracy of their reported data.

WHAT IS MEANT BY A LIFE BEING "IMPROVED"?

CGI commitments each employ different approaches and strategies, address different challenges, and work in different geographies. Due to the broad spectrum of work being done, the way in which each commitment-maker measures impact is specific to that commitment. In evaluating whether a life has been “improved,” CGI relies on commitment-makers to report when a person’s life has been positively affected socially, economically, and/or environmentally as a result of that commitment CGI asks commitment-makers to be practical when establishing initial goals, accounting for the organizations’ ability to accurately measure and report impact.

WHAT METHODOLOGY DID CGI USE IN REVIEWING ITS PORTFOLIO OF COMMITMENTS FOR THIS REPORT?

CGI’s analysis includes all commitments made for the CGI America, CGI International, and CGI Annual Meetings from 2005 through 2015 that have since been reported as unfulfilled. In that time, members of the CGI community made a total of 3,452 commitments. The final data set used for this analysis includes progress updates received through December 31, 2015. It is important to note that this information is gathered from data that has been self-reported by CGI commitment-makers.

CGI offers a number of metrics for members to measure commitment progress. CGI members are asked to set targets and report annual updates on their commitments’ cumulative impact. The most cross-cutting of these metrics is the ‘Number of Lives Affected,’ a measure of the total number of individuals directly benefitting from a commitment.

HOW DOES CGI DESCRIBE AND TRACK THE COMMITMENT THROUGH DATA?

CGI uses keywords to more accurately aggregate commitments based on their specific area of focus (e.g. Climate Change, Girls/Women, or Small/Medium Sized Enterprises). Each commitment is tagged by CGI with no more than 10 keywords, chosen from a master list of 143 keywords, which provide context on the main issue being addressed, specific populations that will be targeted or engaged, and unique approaches the commitment-makers may be utilizing in the commitment's implementation. Of these 10 keywords, the one that most aligns with the crux of the commitment is selected as the primary subtopic.

2005 - 2015

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of unfulfilled commitments. Using information reported to CGI through annual updates on the progress and current status (ongoing, completed, stalled, unfulfilled, or unresponsive) of commitments, CGI has, where possible, noted facts about the unfulfilled commitments.

From 2005 to 2015, members of the community have made 3,452 commitments. Of those, 1,570 (45%) have been completed, 1,257 (36%) are ongoing, 59 (2%) are stalled, and 190 (6%) have been reported unfulfilled. When a commitment has not reported progress in over two years, CGI considers that commitment “unresponsive” and removes related target and impact metrics from its portfolio; 376 (11%) commitments are in this category.

NUMBER OF UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS

As of December 31, 2015, 190 commitments, 6% of the 2005-2015 CGI commitments portfolio (3,452 commitments), have been reported unfulfilled. Commitments may become unfulfilled for a variety of reasons, due to commitment-makers being unable to start or successfully complete the activities of their commitment during the designated timeframe. In general, the percentage of unfulfilled commitments year over year fluctuates from 5-9%, with the exception of 2013 and 2014, of which 1% and .03% of commitments made in those years have been reported unfulfilled, respectively. The highest count of unfulfilled commitments in a given year is in 2008 with 31 commitments. The highest percentage of unfulfilled commitments in a given year is in 2007 and 2009, with 9% of commitments made in each of these years reported unfulfilled. No 2015 commitments have been reported unfulfilled as of December 31, 2015.

TOTAL NUMBER OF UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS BY YEAR (2005-2015)

Year	Total		Unfulfilled Commitments by Platform		
	Total Commitments	Total Unfulfilled	Annual Meeting	International	America
2005	271	18 (7%)	18	-	-
2006	363	18 (5%)	18	-	-
2007	324	28 (9%)	28	-	-
2008	380	31 (8%)	22	9	-
2009	293	27 (9%)	27	-	-
2010	311	25 (8%)	25	-	-
2011	325	18 (6%)	11	-	7
2012	281	19 (7%)	8	-	11
2013	335	5 (1%)	2	-	3
2014	321	1 (<1%)	-	-	1
2015	248	-	-	-	-
Total	3,452	190 (6%)	159	9	22

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS

As CGI identified in a 2014 report, Commitment Portfolio Analysis 2005-2013, analyzing commitments made from 2005-2013, the United States, India, and Kenya have the highest occurrences of commitments, regardless of commitment status. Uganda and Haiti are also countries where CGI has observed high commitment occurrence across the entire commitments portfolio.

At the outset of the now unfulfilled commitments, commitment-makers anticipated operating in more than 110 countries. In particular, the five countries with the highest occurrences of unfulfilled commitments are the United States (56 commitments), India (30 commitments), Kenya (22 commitments), Uganda (14 commitments), and Haiti (13 commitments). It is important to note that the values for geographic scope are non-exclusive; a single commitment can be represented multiple times across a group of countries.

Observing the year over year geographic distribution of unfulfilled commitments in the five countries with the highest unfulfilled commitment occurrence (United States, India, Kenya, Uganda, and Haiti), the trends are reflective of historical commitment-making patterns, as driven by CGI programming. Spikes in unfulfilled commitments operating in a given country are loosely aligned with CGI events that drove higher rates of commitments addressing specific geographies, such as: 1) Convening the CGI Asia Meeting in 2008; 2) Establishing the Haiti Action Network in 2008; and 3) Convening the annual CGI America Meeting since 2011.

COUNTRY(S) WITH HIGHEST OCCURRENCE OF UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS BY YEAR (2005-2015)

Year	Country	No. of Unfulfilled Commitments
2005	United States	3
	India	3
2006	United States	3
2007	Kenya	4
	Uganda	4
	United States	4
2008	India	11
2009	India	9
2010	United States	9
2011	United States	9
2012	United States	13
2013	United States	3
2014	United States	1
2015	-	-

15 COUNTRIES WITH HIGHEST OCCURRENCE OF UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS

Country	No. of Unfulfilled Commitments	% of Total Commitments in Country
United States	56	5%
India	30	7%
Kenya	22	7%
Uganda	14	6%
Haiti	13	6%
Brazil	10	5%
Tanzania	10	5%
Ethiopia	8	5%
Mexico	8	4%
Bangladesh	7	6%
China	7	4%
Nepal	7	7%
Pakistan	7	6%
Rwanda	7	4%
South Africa	7	4%

5 COUNTRIES WITH HIGHEST OCCURRENCE OF UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS (2005-2015)

Country	No. of Commitments Year over Year										
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
United States	3	3	4	5	6	9	9	13	3	1	-
India	3	1	2	11	9	-	3	1	-	-	-
Kenya	-	2	4	4	4	3	2	3	-	-	-
Uganda	-	1	4	2	2	2	-	2	1	-	-
Haiti	-	-	1	2	2	6	2	-	-	-	-

In addition, the majority of unfulfilled commitments, 104 (55%), were commitments working to address a challenge in a single country. This is reflective of the trend observed across the entire commitments portfolio, with the majority of commitments operating in only one country.

NUMBER OF COUNTRIES TARGETED BY COMMITMENTS

No. of Countries	No. of Unfulfilled Commitments	No. of All Commitments
1	104 (55%)	1,683 (55%)
2-4	32 (17%)	414 (13%)
5-9	16 (8%)	262 (9%)
≥10	11 (6%)	315 (10%)
Undeclared	27 (14%)	402 (13%)

PRIMARY SUBTOPIC & KEYWORDS

CGI uses keywords to more accurately aggregate commitments based on their specific area of focus (e.g. Climate Change, Girls/Women, or Small/Medium Sized Enterprises). Each commitment is tagged by CGI with no more than 10 keywords, chosen from a master list of 143 keywords, which align with the issue being addressed, specific populations that will be targeted or engaged, and unique approaches the commitment-makers may be utilizing in the commitment's implementation. Of these 10 keywords, the one that most aligns with the crux of the commitment is selected as the primary subtopic. Looking at the primary subtopics of the unfulfilled commitments can suggest whether any particular types of commitments are have been more inclined to become unfulfilled.

Information and Communications Technology (I.C.T.) is the most common primary subtopic of the unfulfilled commitments. The World Bank defines Information and Communication Technologies (I.C.T.) as the hardware, software, networks, and media for the collection, storage, processing, transmission, and presentation of information, as well as related services. Members of the CGI community have made I.C.T. commitments in the areas of internet access and adoption, access to computers and mobile phones, radio and television transmission, and data management, among other related topics. Thirteen unfulfilled commitments are categorized with the primary subtopic of I.C.T. Year over year, I.C.T. occurs as one of the most common primary subtopics in 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2010.

In 2011, the year of the first CGI America Meeting, focusing on economic recovery in the United States, Jobs appears as the most common primary subtopic for unfulfilled commitments.

10 PRIMARY SUBTOPICS WITH HIGHEST OCCURRENCE OF UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS

Primary Subtopic	No. of Unfulfilled Commitments	No. of Total Commitments	% of Total Commitments
I.C.T.	13	80	16%
Clean Energy	9	105	9%
Girls/Women	9	154	6%
Agriculture	8	59	14%
Awareness Raising	8	125	6%
Skills Development	8	136	6%
Health Systems	7	85	8%
Entrepreneurship	7	57	12%
Housing	6	42	14%
Water	6	80	8%

MOST COMMON PRIMARY SUBTOPIC(S) OF UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS BY YEAR (2005-2015)

Year	Primary Subtopic	No. of Unfulfilled Commitments
2005	Clean Energy	2
	Community-Based	2
	Entrepreneurship	2
	Peace Building	2
	Skills Development	2
2006	I.C.T.	2
	Policy/Advocacy	2
	Supply Chains	2
2007	Awareness Raising	4
	I.C.T.	4
2008	Capacity Building	2
	Clean Energy	2
	Health Systems	2
	I.C.T.	2
	School Infrastructure	2
	Transportation	2
	Water	2
2009	Agriculture	3
	Girls/Women	3
2010	Agriculture	2
	Awareness Raising	2
	Girls/Women	2
	I.C.T.	2
2011	Jobs	3
2012	Housing	3
2013	Skills Development	2
2014	Early Childhood	1
2015	-	-

PARTNERSHIPS

In order to better understand unfulfilled commitments, CGI examined the role of partnerships and compared the percentage of unfulfilled commitments with partners, year over year, to the percentage of commitments with partners, in a given year. CGI defines a partnership approach as an organization working to implement a commitment in collaboration with at least one other organization. The role of a partner organization in the implementation of a given commitment may vary, from providing financial support to coordinating the actual project implementation for a member commitment. It is important to note that CGI does not serve as a partner on commitments and commitment-partners are not direct partners of CGI as an organization, but instead partners of CGI members in the implementation of their commitment.

Since 2005, the percentage of unfulfilled commitments incorporating a partnership approach has varied. Excluding 2014, in which only one commitment was reported unfulfilled, the highest percentage of unfulfilled commitments incorporating a partnership approach in a given year is in 2010 (84%). In 2013, the lowest percentage of unfulfilled commitments incorporating a partnership approach is (40%). Finally, in eight of the past 11 years (2005-2015) of commitment-making, the percentage of unfulfilled commitments with partnerships, in a given year, is lower than the percentage of commitments made that year with partnerships.

PERCENT OF COMMITMENTS WITH ONE OR MORE PARTNERS (2005-2015)

Year	% of Unfulfilled Commitments	% of All Commitments
2005	61%	62%
2006	72%	61%
2007	52%	70%
2008	77%	81%
2009	70%	85%
2010	84%	83%
2011	78%	84%
2012	74%	85%
2013	40%	90%
2014	100%	86%
2015	-	85%

UNDERSTANDING WHY COMMITMENTS ARE UNFULFILLED

Of the 190 commitments reported unfulfilled, 44 (23%) commitments did not report information on why it was unable to meet its goals. Using qualitative data reported by commitment-makers, CGI categorized the remaining 146 unfulfilled commitments into the following groups, describing the primary factor that contributed to a commitment's inability to meet its goals:

REASON WHY COMMITMENTS ARE UNFULFILLED

Category	No. of Unfulfilled Commitments (% of total)
Lack of Funding	52 (27%)
Shift in Organizational Priorities	28 (15%)
Issues with Project Plan	19 (10%)
Organization No Longer Exists	10 (5%)
Leadership Change within Organization	9 (5%)
Loss of Project Partners	9 (5%)
Challenges Related to Government or Policy	8 (4%)
Lack of Local/Stakeholder Support	8 (4%)
Natural Disaster or Conflict	3 (2%)
Total	146

Of the 190 unfulfilled commitments, 52 (27%) reported a lack of funding as the primary reason for not meeting their goals. In some circumstances this manifested through a major funding partner pulling out of a project, but in other cases the commitment-makers were simply unable to secure funding needed to successfully implement a commitment.

While some factors may have been unexpected and difficult to account for during a commitment's development, other factors do seem somewhat addressable, such as prompting commitment-makers to consider their financing and fundraising strategies. The ideal time to discuss risk in the context of commitment implementation is before commitment-makers begin, using the planning phase to discuss funding and other foreseeable barriers. Historically, making a commitment has been a largely aspirational undertaking; discussing innovative approaches and partnerships, without always considering the practical details necessary to bring a commitment to fruition. The categories listed above, Lack of Funding, Shift in Organizational Priorities, Issues with Project Plan, and Lack of Local/Stakeholder Support, could in part be addressed and mitigated during the commitment development process by raising questions such as "Are you planning on engaging any local partners?" or "What type of organizational support and buy-in exists internally to ensure that this commitment is successful?"

It is important to note that many things occur outside the control of commitment-makers that can threaten a commitment's success regardless of how much time is invested in planning a commitment. Even the most thoughtful and well-structured commitment can become vulnerable when faced with challenging and

unpredictable political, environmental, and economic climates. Therefore, it is important to keep in mind that a certain level of entropy is inherent in commitment implementation.

KEY LEARNINGS

GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS

In 2007, the global economy began to slow significantly, triggering in 2008 one of the worst financial crises in history. Referred to commonly as the Global Financial Crisis, this economic recession negatively impacted many global financial institutions, reducing the amount of capital available for loans and increasing the risk and cost associated with distributing these loans. These market conditions also negatively impacted other institutions, such as small- and medium-sized enterprises.

CGI has observed a relative spike in the percentage and number of unfulfilled commitments around the Global Financial Crisis. As noted previously, the highest percentage and count of reported unfulfilled commitments, year over year, occurred in 2007 (28 unfulfilled commitments; 9%), 2008 (31 unfulfilled commitments; 8%), and 2009 (27 unfulfilled commitments; 9%). Considering the economic conditions in 2008 and the slow recovery following this recession, the higher rates of unfulfilled commitments are not surprising. Commitments made before, during, and shortly after the Global Financial Crisis would have likely been faced with new funding challenges in the vulnerable early stages of implementation. Of the commitments made from 2007 to 2009 that have since been reported unfulfilled, 26 cited a lack of funding as the primary reason the commitment was unable to be successfully implemented. Of these 26 commitments, 23% explicitly referenced the Global Financial Crisis's contribution to the commitment-makers inability to secure the necessary capital for implementation. This conclusion is based on information reported to CGI through annual progress reports from commitment-makers and is therefore likely to be underestimated.

PERCENT OF UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS THAT CITE LACK OF FUNDING (2007-2009)

Year	No. of Commitments with Lack of Funding as Primary Barrier to Success (% of All Unfulfilled Commitments in Given Year)	No. and Percent of Commitments with Lack of Funding that Explicitly Cite Global Financial Crisis
2007	9 (32%)	2 (22%)
2008	13 (42%)	3 (23%)
2009	4 (15%)	1 (25%)
Total	26 (14%)	6 (23%)

INFORMATION COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY

Information Communications Technology (I.C.T.) is the most common primary subtopic among the unfulfilled commitments, occurring as the primary subtopic of 13 unfulfilled commitments. The World Bank defines I.C.T. as the hardware, software, networks, and media for the collection, storage, processing, transmission, and presentation of information, as well as related services. Members of the CGI community have made I.C.T. commitments in the areas of internet access and adoption, access to computers and mobile phones, radio and television transmission, and data management, among other related topics. CGI sought to understand whether focusing on I.C.T. predisposes a commitment to failure. If so, what context, related to the technology space, can inform CGI's understanding of why I.C.T. commitments fail? If not, what lessons can CGI learn from these I.C.T. commitments that may be applicable to unfulfilled commitments?

A review of the reported qualitative data of these 13 commitments suggests that I.C.T. commitments are not necessarily predisposed to failure and is not linked explicitly to integrating I.C.T. as an approach. However, CGI has observed that due to the high investment of financial and human resources necessary to implement I.C.T. commitments, these commitments tend to be more vulnerable to the same barriers, such as a lack of funding, that lead to failure among unfulfilled commitments generally.

In the creation of I.C.T., secured funding is essential. The amount of funding secured should be a significant proportion of the total value of the commitment, so that developers are properly compensated and that necessary supplies and programs can be acquired to implement a commitment. Partnerships also seem to play an important role in driving success among I.C.T. commitments, particularly for these funding purposes. In the absence of established partnerships, several commitments were unfulfilled to even progress beyond the ideation phase into the development and deployment of a given technology.

In the planning and development phase of a commitment, commitment-makers should account for time to conduct rigorous testing prior to the deployment of a technology. This testing phase may expose significant issues which may, in turn, lead to a need for more time or funding than initially projected. Accordingly, commitment-makers may want to budget for additional funding and time. Again, partnerships can play a key role in securing funding, as commitment-makers may have the technological expertise to complete the necessary testing, but not the financial resources.

Lastly, failing to take proper measures in educating beneficiary populations on the technology to be deployed can be a barrier to success. For example, without identifying cultural- and community-specific approaches, educating people on how to use a technology may not be effective. While I.C.T. allows for relatively low-cost interventions for persistent health, economic, education, and environmental issues, it is also important to consider whether there may be other barriers to adopting a given technology and understanding how to account for these in a commitment's design and education strategies. In deploying the technology, success is dependent on relationships, funding, and efficiency.

UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS IN SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHIES

Noting that the United States, India, Haiti, and Brazil are countries with high occurrences of unfulfilled commitments and are also coincidentally geographies which CGI has driven action through various meetings, CGI took a closer look at the breakdown of these commitments year over year.

UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Only 5% of commitments operating in the United States have been reported unfulfilled. The largest number of unfulfilled commitments made in a given year and operating in the United States were made in 2012, with 13 commitments reported unfulfilled. The majority of these commitments were made in conjunction with the 2012 CGI America Meeting. Commitments operating in the United States made in 2010 and 2011 also have a higher occurrence of unfulfilled commitments, with nine commitments per year.

UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS OPERATING IN THE U.S. (2005-2015)

Year	Annual Meeting	CGI America	CGI International	Total
2005	3	-	-	3
2006	3	-	-	3
2007	4	-	-	4
2008	4	-	1	5
2009	6	-	-	6
2010	9	-	-	9
2011	2	7	-	9
2012	2	11	-	13
2013	-	3	-	3
2014	-	1	-	1
2015	-	-	-	-
Total	33	22	1	56

REASON FOR UNFULFILLED U.S. COMMITMENTS

Category	No. of Commitments
Lack of Funding	14
Shift in Organizational Priorities	10
Leadership Change Within Organization	7
Issues with Project Plan	6
Lack of Local/Stakeholder Support	3
Loss of Project Partners	2

Organization No Longer Exists	2
Challenges Related to Government or Policy	1

UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS IN INDIA

Only 7% of commitments operating in India have been reported unfulfilled. The largest number of unfulfilled commitments made in a given year and operating in India were made in 2008, with 11 commitments reported unfulfilled. The majority of these commitments were made in conjunction with the 2008 Annual Meeting.

CGI held the first international meeting in Hong Kong in 2008, centered on driving regionally-focused commitments in Asia. As CGI identified in a 2014 report, Commitment Portfolio Analysis 2005-2013, analyzing commitments made from 2005-2013, 2008 was the only year in which the United States was not the most common country of implementation, having been displaced by India.

While CGI has noted a relatively higher number of commitments operating in India made in 2008, the higher occurrence of unfulfilled Annual Meeting commitments in India, compared to unfulfilled CGI International commitments in India is reflective of the greater volume of commitments made in association with the Annual Meeting (53 commitments, including a focus on India, were made at the 2008 Annual Meeting; 14 commitments, including a focus on India, were made at CGI Asia).

UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS IN INDIA (2005-2015)

Year	Annual Meeting	CGI America	CGI International	Total
2005	3	-	-	3
2006	1	-	-	1
2007	2	-	-	2
2008	7	-	4	11
2009	9	-	-	9
2010	-	-	-	-
2011	2	1	-	3
2012	1	-	-	1
2013	-	-	-	-
2014	-	-	-	-
2015	-	-	-	-
Total	25	1	4	30

REASON FOR UNFULFILLED INDIA COMMITMENTS

Category	No. of Commitments
Lack of Funding	11
Shift in Organizational Priorities	5
Organization No Longer Exists	3
Challenges Related to Government or Policy	2
Loss of Project Partners	2
Lack of Local/Stakeholder Support	1
Leadership Change Within Organization	1
Issues with Project Plan	1

UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS IN HAITI

Only 6% of commitments operating in Haiti have been reported unfulfilled. The largest number of unfulfilled commitments in a given year and operating in Haiti were made in 2010, with six commitments reported unfulfilled. Unfulfilled commitments in Haiti have been made in conjunction with the Annual Meeting.

In 2008, CGI first convened the Haiti Action Network, in response to the destruction caused by multiple hurricanes in Haiti that year. Coincidentally, CGI has noted a higher occurrence of commitments operating in Haiti following the creation of this Action Network in 2008 along with the initial occurrence of unfulfilled commitments in the country.

More about the Haiti Action Network: In 2008, President Bill Clinton issued a call to action to address the pressing challenges Haiti faced in the aftermath of four devastating hurricanes, resulting in the formation of the Haiti Action Network. In response to the January 2010 earthquake, the network intensified their efforts toward long-term development in Haiti by addressing issues such as agriculture, cultural preservation, education, energy, enterprise development, health, and shelter, as well as water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH). Clinton Global Initiative (CGI) members have made more than 100 Commitments to Action focused on Haiti, which will be valued at \$500 million when fully funded and implemented. The Haiti Action Network maintains a significant focus on creating sustainable jobs and encouraging investment in the country.

UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS IN HAITI (2005-2015)

Year	Annual Meeting	CGI America	CGI International	Total
2005	-	-	-	-
2006	-	-	-	-
2007	1	-	-	1
2008	2	-	-	2
2009	2	-	-	2
2010	6	-	-	6

2011	2	-	-	2
2012	-	-	-	-
2013	-	-	-	-
2014	-	-	-	-
2015	-	-	-	-
Total	13	-	-	13

REASON FOR UNFULFILLED HAITI COMMITMENTS

Category	No. of Commitments
Lack of Funding	4
Issues with Project Plan	2
Challenges Related to Government or Policy	1
Lack of Local/Stakeholder Support	1
Natural Disaster or Conflict	1
Organization No Longer Exists	1

UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS IN BRAZIL

Only 5% of commitments operating in Brazil have been reported unfulfilled. The largest number of unfulfilled commitments made in a given year and operating in Brazil were made in 2008, with five commitments reported unfulfilled. Unfulfilled commitments in Brazil have only been made in conjunction with the Annual Meeting.

UNFULFILLED COMMITMENTS IN BRAZIL (2005-2015)

Year	Annual Meeting	CGI America	CGI International	Total
2005	1	-	-	1
2006	-	-	-	-
2007	1	--	-	1
2008	5	-	-	5
2009	2	-	-	2
2010	-	-	-	-
2011	1	-	-	1
2012	-	-	-	-
2013	-	-	-	-
2014	-	-	-	-
2015	-	-	-	-
Total	10	-	-	10

REASON FOR UNFULFILLED BRAZIL COMMITMENTS

Category	No. of Commitments
Lack of Funding	3
Organization No Longer Exists	2
Shift in Organizational Priorities	2
Loss of Project Partners	1
Issues with Project Plan	1

CONCLUSION: OPTIMIZING SUCCESS FOR FUTURE COMMITMENTS

Members of the CGI community have improved lives and made a positive impact worldwide through the power of creative collaboration and partnerships. We believe this report sheds light on challenges faced by commitments and contributes to our growing body of knowledge of what works, what hasn't worked, and will help to encourage CGI and the broader development community to learn and adapt.

Since publishing the 2014 report, Commitment Portfolio Analysis 2005-2013, analyzing commitments made from 2005-2013, CGI has made a concerted effort to continue learning from the commitments portfolio and better support commitment development and implementation.

To this end, CGI staff have begun facilitating more detailed conversations with commitment-makers during the commitment development process to understand a given commitment-maker's funding strategy and contingency plan should the primary funding source fall through. Some additional approaches adopted by CGI staff in recent years to increase the likelihood that commitments are successful:

- 1) The development of a new measurement framework with increased specificity to capture the breadth and depth of commitments and more accurately understand the scope and potential impact of a given commitment;
- 2) The creation of a glossary to define terms referenced in the measurement framework and to ensure increased standardization of CGI metrics measurement and reporting;
- 3) Integrating a conversation on potential risks to new commitments' implementation in preliminary commitment development conversations;
- 4) Providing introductory informational webinars on the commitment development process for commitment-makers; and
- 5) Programming CGI convenings specifically for commitment-makers to share best practices and lessons they have learned through the process of designing and implementing commitments. Through these convenings, CGI strives to advance a community of continuous learning, acknowledging the challenges faced through commitment development and the opportunity to further improve ongoing and future commitments.