



*Office of the Auditor General / Bureau du vérificateur général*

**FOLLOW-UP TO THE 2005 AUDIT OF THE EMERGENCY  
MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

**2009**

**SUIVI DE LA VÉRIFICATION DU PROGRAMME DE GESTION DES  
SITUATIONS D'URGENCE DE 2005**



---

## Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	i
RÉSUMÉ.....	iii
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
2 KEY FINDINGS OF THE ORIGINAL 2005 AUDIT OF THE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....	1
3 STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF 2005 AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS ...	4
4 SUMMARY OF THE LEVEL OF COMPLETION .....	13
5 CONCLUSION.....	13
6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	14



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### *Introduction*

The Follow-up to the 2005 Audit of the Emergency Management Program was included in the Auditor General's 2009 Audit Plan.

The key findings of the original 2005 audit included:

- An active, multi-departmental emergency management program with strong support from senior management but the program still lacks some important elements, including a municipal evacuation plan.
- The City is compliant with the requirements of the Emergency Management Act and associated regulations. However, the team also identified a number of risks that need to be addressed:
- The current location and design of the Emergency Operations Centre restricts the City's ability to effectively and efficiently manage emergencies;
- Operating funding has not yet been identified to sustain the long-term benefits of capital projects totalling \$7.1 million;
- A formal process is needed to ensure that compliance is regularly monitored and sustained over the long term; and,
- Project teams may not have the necessary resources with the required qualifications to successfully meet project objectives.

### *Summary of the Level of Completion*

The table below outlines our assessment of the level of completion of each recommendation as of Fall 2009.

CATEGORY	% COMPLETE	RECOMMENDATIONS	NUMBER OF RECOMMENDATIONS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
LITTLE OR NO ACTION	0 – 24	-	-	-
ACTION INITIATED	25 – 49	-	-	-
PARTIALLY COMPLETE	50 – 74	-	-	-
SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	75 – 99	6	1	14%
COMPLETE	100	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7	6	86%
TOTAL			7	100%

### *Conclusion*

The risk remaining rests primarily with the present location of the Emergency Operations Centre. Although improvements to its design and functioning were made, its current location at City Hall, Laurier continues not to be optimal or

desirable. We understand from management that preliminary high-level discussions have taken place however, at this time, no concrete decision for a relocation of the centre has transpired.

Additional work is also required in order to consolidate the dispatch centres for all emergency services (i.e., fire, paramedics and police) and by-law services and to establish one coherent, effective and efficient unified dispatch. Management advises that the tabling of a business case for the viability of consolidation is tentatively scheduled for the fall of 2009.

Overall, sound progress has been made towards implementation of the 2005 Audit of Emergency Management Program recommendations. Challenges to full implementation are primarily associated with the various players' involvement with the Emergency Management Program and with efforts and relationships spanning across departments. Although some efforts are still needed, we are satisfied that the advancements made have served to enhance the management and control of the City's Emergency Management Program.

Although solid progress has been made regarding the issues raised in the 2005 audit, the events that occurred in the summer of 2009 related to the Glen Cairn sewage backup have revealed additional concerns with respect to communications and response dispatch. These recent events require further attention from EMP and operations management.

### ***Acknowledgement***

We wish to express our appreciation for the cooperation and assistance afforded the audit team by management.

## RÉSUMÉ

### ***Introduction***

Le Suivi de la vérification des programmes de gestion des situations d'urgence de 2005 était prévu dans le Plan de vérification du Bureau du vérificateur général de 2009.

Les constatations principales de la vérification de 2005 sont les suivantes :

- il existe un programme de gestion des situations d'urgence multiservices bénéficiant de solides appuis auprès de la haute direction, mais il manque toujours des éléments importants à ce programme, notamment un plan municipal d'évacuation;
- la Ville respecte les exigences de la *Loi sur la gestion des situations d'urgence* et des règlements qui y sont associés; toutefois, l'équipe de vérification a également déterminé un certain nombre de risques qui doivent être considérés :
- l'emplacement et la conception actuels du Centre des opérations d'urgence limitent la capacité de la Ville à assurer une gestion efficace et efficiente des situations d'urgence;
- un budget de fonctionnement n'a pas encore été établi pour assurer les avantages à long terme de projets d'immobilisation totalisant 7,1 millions \$;
- un processus officiel doit être mis en place pour faire en sorte que la conformité fasse l'objet de contrôles réguliers et qu'elle soit soutenue à long terme; et,
- les équipes de projets risquent de ne pas disposer des ressources nécessaires, possédant les compétences voulues, pour atteindre les objectifs de ces projets.

### ***Sommaire du degré d'achèvement***

Le tableau ci-dessous présente notre évaluation du degré d'achèvement de chaque recommandation à l'automne 2009 :

CATÉGORIE	POURCENTAGE COMPLÉTÉ	RECOMMANDATIONS	NOMBRE DE RECOMMANDATIONS	POURCENTAGE DU TOTAL DES RECOMMANDATIONS
PEU OU PAS DE MESURES PRISES	0 – 24	-	-	-
ACTION AMORCÉE	25 – 49	-	-	-
COMPLÉTÉE EN PARTIE	50 – 74	-	-	-
PRATIQUEMENT COMPLÉTÉE	75 – 99	6	1	14 %
COMPLÉTÉE	100	1, 2, 3, 4, 5 et 7	6	86 %
TOTAL			7	100 %

## **Conclusion**

Les risques restants ont principalement trait à l'emplacement du Centre des opérations d'urgence. Même si des améliorations à son aménagement et à son fonctionnement ont été apportées, son emplacement actuel, à l'hôtel de ville, avenue Laurier, continue de n'être ni optimal, ni souhaitable. La direction nous a informé que des discussions préliminaires avaient eu lieu au sein de la haute direction, sans toutefois que celles-ci aient débouché à ce jour sur une décision concrète concernant le déménagement du Centre.

Du travail reste encore à faire pour consolider les centres de répartition de tous les services d'urgence (c.-à-d. incendies, paramédics et police) et les Services des règlements municipaux, afin de créer un centre de répartition cohérent, efficace et efficient. La direction nous a informé que le dépôt d'une analyse de rentabilisation faisant le point sur la viabilité d'une telle consolidation soit prévu, provisoirement, pour l'automne 2009.

Dans l'ensemble, de bons progrès ont été accomplis relativement à la mise en œuvre des recommandations de la vérification du Programme de gestion de situations d'urgence de 2005. Les défis posés par une pleine mise en œuvre de ces recommandations se situent surtout du côté de l'engagement des divers intervenants dans le plan de gestion des situations d'urgence, et des efforts ainsi que des relations entre les divers services. Si certains efforts sont encore nécessaires, nous sommes satisfaits de voir que les avancées réalisées ont permis d'améliorer la gestion et le contrôle du Programme de gestion des situations d'urgence de la Ville.

Même si des progrès concrets ont été accomplis dans les questions soulignées lors de la vérification de 2005, les événements survenus à l'été 2009 reliés au refoulement d'égouts de Glen Cairn ont soulevé des questions supplémentaires en matière de communications et d'aiguillage des interventions. Ces événements récents exigent une attention plus soutenue du Programme de gestion des situations d'urgence et de la gestion des opérations.

## **Remerciements**

Nous tenons à remercier la direction pour la coopération et l'assistance accordées à l'équipe de vérification.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The Follow-up to the 2005 Audit of the Emergency Management Program was included in the Auditor General's 2009 Audit Plan.

The key findings of the original 2005 audit included:

- An active, multi-departmental emergency management program with strong support from senior management but the program still lacks some important elements, including a municipal evacuation plan.
- The City is compliant with the requirements of the Emergency Management Act and associated regulations. However, the team also identified a number of risks that need to be addressed:
- The current location and design of the Emergency Operations Centre restricts the City's ability to effectively and efficiently manage emergencies;
- Operating funding has not yet been identified to sustain the long-term benefits of capital projects totalling \$7.1 million;
- A formal process is needed to ensure that compliance is regularly monitored and sustained over the long term; and,
- Project teams may not have the necessary resources with the required qualifications to successfully meet project objectives.

## 2 KEY FINDINGS OF THE ORIGINAL 2005 AUDIT OF THE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

### Compliance

The Audit Team observed that the City is compliant with the requirements of the *Emergency Management Act* and associated regulations. Specifically, at December 31, 2004 the City was compliant with the relevant sections of the *Emergency Management Act* (included in Appendix B) and with the Essential standard of the Community Emergency Management Program Framework.

The Audit Team identified one area for improvement with regard to improving the City's process for ensuring compliance to provincial legislation and regulations.

The City has been recognized by the Province of Ontario as compliant to relevant legislation and regulations; however, a formalized process does not exist to ensure compliance is regularly monitored and consequently sustained over the long term. Additionally, our review of current Program activities indicates that additional processes may be required to be compliant with the Enhanced and Comprehensive standards, as defined by Emergency Management Ontario. There is a risk that by maintaining its current portfolio of Emergency Management Program capital

projects the City will possibly be non-compliant to the Enhanced and Comprehensive standards defined by Emergency Management Ontario.

There is a risk that Council and the Steering Committee will not receive timely compliance information to assist them in their decision-making processes.

## **Management Control Framework**

We observed that the Program has an adequate management control framework. Specifically, formal and informal controls and processes were observed for all of the audit criteria supporting the control areas identified above.

While it was observed that an adequate management control framework exists, three observations were made to reduce the risks facing the Program and to strengthen existing processes. Specifically, the Audit Team identified improvement opportunities in the following areas: governance structure and processes; benefit sustainment; and, the sufficiency of resources assigned to the Program.

## **Governance Structure and Processes**

Community and Protective Services and EMU management has increasingly developed and implemented processes and controls to effectively manage the Program. Nevertheless, three key additional processes and controls are required to mitigate the risks associated with the current Program governance model and consequently enhance the probability that the Program will achieve its long-term goals and objectives.

There is a risk that discrepancies will exist between the Emergency Measures Unit capital project summary reporting and individual capital project status reporting.

There is a risk that project teams may not have the necessary resources with the required qualifications to successfully meet project objectives.

## **Benefit Sustainment**

The City has approved \$7.1 million in Program related capital projects; however, associated operating funding has not yet been identified to sustain the long-term benefits of these projects.

There is a risk that Emergency Management Program capital project 511-19, Municipal Evacuation Plan, will experience further project delays and consequently that the City will continue to be without a comprehensive plan for the effective and orderly evacuation of all or segments of the City.

There is a risk that the Steering Committee will not have a full understanding of the human resources and operating costs associated with the 29 Emergency Management Program capital projects and consequently that the City will not allocate sufficient future years resources to sustain the benefits of these investments over the long term.

## **Sufficient Resources**

Through the establishment of the Emergency Measures Unit, the funding of the Emergency Management Program capital project portfolio and the ongoing operation of the Working Group, the City has dedicated comprehensive multi-year budgetary and human resources for effective emergency management planning. While an extensive array of resources have been dedicated to emergency planning by the City, issues exist regarding the adequacy of resources assigned to the Working Group and the adequacy of the Emergency Operations Centre.

As a multi-departmental program, the Program is reliant upon other departments and branches to provide staff resources to enable it to successfully deliver upon its mandate. The Program is currently at risk of not having sufficient full-time resources to successfully deliver upon the Program goals and objectives as outlined in the Five Year Emergency Response Program Action Plan.

The current location and design of the Emergency Operations Centre adds avoidable constraints and challenges to the City's capability to effectively and efficiently manage emergencies.

## **Projects**

The Audit Team observed that the current Emergency Management Program capital project portfolio of 29 capital projects is aligned to the stated goals and objectives of the Program and that the capital project portfolio contains all the EMP related capital projects currently underway at the City. Additionally, it was observed that monitoring processes exist at the branch and departmental level but not at the Steering Committee level to track capital projects schedules, costs and scope.

The Audit Team identified the following opportunity to strengthen the Program's project management processes and to increase the likelihood that the 29 Emergency Management Program capital projects will be completed prior to the deadline of December 2007.

The Program does not have a formalized process to allow for the regular review and reprioritization of the EMP capital projects portfolio. The City is at risk of not meeting its Emergency Management Program capital projects completion schedule. Without the implementation of additional project monitoring processes at the Steering Committee level, the likelihood of this risk occurring will increase over the next two years as the City approaches the end of its first Five Year Emergency Response Program Action Plan and attempts to gain closure on the remaining Emergency Management Program capital projects.

### **3 STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF 2005 AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **2005 Recommendation 1**

That the management of the EMU develop a mapping of EMP capital projects and Program activities to the standards defined by Emergency Management Ontario and that the subsequent mapping be:

- a) annually reported to Council; and,
- b) updated and reported to the Steering Committee on a twice yearly basis.

#### **2005 Management Response**

Management agrees with these recommendations.

Although the Audit Team determined that “the City is compliant with the requirements of the Emergency Management Act and associated regulations” as reported to Council at its meeting of December 15, 2004, the Audit Team recommended development of a process to map Emergency Management Program (EMP) capital projects and activities to the enhanced (year 2) and comprehensive (year 3) standards.

Because the City’s five (5) year, \$7.1 million EMP actually pre-dates the Emergency Management Act, tracking tailored to its requirements was not built into the original design.

Although the Province does not require it until 2007, the Office of Emergency Management is developing an annual planning cycle process as follows:

- Annual project review including a legislative program mapping process for approval by the Steering Committee;
- Semi-annual reprioritization exercise to ensure legislative compliance will be achieved with an update provided to the Steering Committee for approval; and
- Bi-monthly formal program status updates to the Steering Committee to ensure financial accountability, mitigate risks associated with projects and ensure that information is shared appropriately.

This process will be tabled at the Steering Committee meeting in Q1 2006.

#### **Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 1 at December 31, 2008**

- a) On an annual basis, the Office of Emergency Management conducts a review of its emergency management program and reports to Committee and Council on the status of the emergency management program and its level of compliance with the Provincial legislation.

- b) An annual planning cycle has also been developed that includes a legislative program mapping process for all EMP projects and program activities. The EMP Working Group conducts this review on a semi-annual basis and its outcomes are reported to EMP Steering Committee for review and approval. These outcomes are reported to EMP Steering Committee via a formal written report and/or a program status report that includes a verbal update from the Chair of the EMP Working Group. A formal work plan is also developed on an annual basis. The work plan captures the EMP program-related activities that are required: to meet legislation compliance; to address gaps or identified issues; and, to enhance the Ottawa's emergency management standards.

***Management: % complete***

***100%***

### **OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 1**

We are satisfied that a mapping of EMP capital projects and program activities has been developed. In April 2008, EMP management reported to Council on the status of their work plan as well as on seven projects prioritized to move forward. In addition, as part of the 2008 EMP work plan reported in an internal report to the Emergency Management Program Steering Committee, project prioritization for the 2009 budget exercise was scheduled for May to September. For the 2010 budget exercise, the EMP project prioritization is calendarized from January to mid-September.

***OAG: % complete***

***100%***

### **2005 Recommendation 2**

**It is recommended that the EMU develop the following key controls for approval by the Steering Committee.**

- a) **A detailed Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee including a description of the Steering Committee's program oversight roles and responsibilities and an approvals matrix for the Working Group, Steering Committee, and EMU.**
- b) **A formal program planning framework, including strategic and annual program planning processes for the Program. A performance measurement framework for regular reporting to the Steering Committee and Council including performance measures in the areas of legislative and regulatory compliance and Program goals and objectives.**

### **2005 Management Response**

Management agrees with these recommendations.

"The Audit Team observed that the Program has an adequate management control framework. Specifically, formal and informal controls and processes were observed for all of the audit criteria supporting the control areas identified above. While it

was observed that an adequate management control framework exists, three observations were made to reduce the risks facing the Program and to strengthen existing processes.”

As noted under Recommendation 1, the current Terms of Reference for the Emergency Management Program were developed in 2002, prior to passage of the Emergency Management Act, and focused primarily on the project structure. Now that the City is approaching the end of its first 5-year planning cycle, it is appropriate to review the current Terms of Reference and reorient them to support the ongoing governance structure and processes required to support the ongoing Emergency Management Program.

The updated Terms of Reference will identify roles, responsibilities and approval processes. It will include an annual mapping/planning process and semi-annual self-assessment to ensure legislative compliance. It will outline program objectives and develop performance measures to ensure that the program is meeting those objectives and it will outline a strategic planning cycle for the Emergency Management Program.

A Terms of Reference will be tabled for approval by the Steering Committee in Q1 of 2006.

The existing management control framework is being strengthened departmentally and within the Branch, the reporting areas, nature of the reports and frequency have been documented and will be actively reviewed by individual managers and collectively by the Branch Management Team.

### **Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 2 at December 31, 2008**

- a) A detailed Terms of Reference (ToR) was developed for the EMP which outlines roles, responsibilities and approval processes. The EMP SC reviewed and approved the EMP ToR, Version 1.0 on October 10, 2006. In May 2008, the EMP WG reviewed the ToR and updated it in consideration of enhance project management processes and the changes to the organizational structure. The EMP SC reviewed and approved the revised Version 2.0 on September 9, 2008.
- b) To date, a formal planning framework has been established to ensure that legislative compliance is achieved, and that the City’s ability to prevent, plan, respond and recover from large-scale emergencies is enhanced while ensuring continuation of core services. Included in the formal planning framework is a structured annual review that is conducted with the EMP WG members. The results of this review are reported to EMP SC for approval. Formal work plans are also developed for approval and are used to guide program and project activities annually.

- c) The EMP ToR identifies that the EMP WG is responsible for conducting a formal program review which purpose is to ensure legislative compliance will be achieved for the following year as well as to identify any potential program risks. A formal planning day is scheduled with the EMP for this purpose and the outcomes of this review are reported to the EMP SC. The Chair of the EMP WG also submits formal status reports to the EMP SC membership that documents the progress of the EMP and project activity. On an annual basis the Office of Emergency Management also reports to Committee and Council on the progress and level of compliance with the provincial program.

***Management: % complete*** ***100%***

**OAG’s Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 2**

- a) An Emergency Management Program Terms of Reference was first presented and approved at the Emergency Management Steering Committee on October 10, 2006. It was updated and approved by the Committee September 9, 2008. Management advised us that the Terms of reference will be modified once more.
- b) A formal program planning framework, including strategic and annual program planning processes for the Program has been developed and provided.
- c) Accomplishments are reported annually to Committee and Council through status reports. Although these are not performance measures in the areas of legislative and regulatory compliance and program goals and objectives per se, they do serve to provide relevant information on progress to date against the established workplan.

***OAG: % complete (a)*** ***100%***

***OAG: % complete (b)*** ***100%***

***OAG: % complete (c)*** ***100%***

**2005 Recommendation 3**

**That the Steering Committee place a priority upon the timely completion of capital project 511-19, Municipal Evacuation Plan, and regularly monitor the project’s progress and adequacy of resources assigned to the Project.**

**2005 Management Response**

Management agrees with this recommendation.

Management recognized the Evacuation Plan as a priority and dedicated resources to support this initiative in October 2005. The project focuses on planning all elements of an evacuation, which requires multi-departmental coordination. The first phase was completed in December 2005, and described the coordination mechanisms and major procedures for all plan elements and detailed internal City of Ottawa responsibilities within the plan. The next phase, anticipated to be

complete by June 2006, will address all major job aids, coordination mechanisms and responsibilities involving external partners.

**Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 3 at December 31, 2008**

The Municipal Evaluation Plan, Version 1.0 is completed. The EMP SC approved it on February 13, 2007 and CPS Committee and Council approved it on April 5, 2007. This plan has been approved as an appendix to the City's Emergency Management Plan and it is available to the public.

*Management: % complete* **100%**

---

**OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 3**

We are satisfied with the implementation of this recommendation. Council approved the Municipal Evacuation Plan on April 25, 2007.

*OAG: % complete* **100%**

---

**2005 Recommendation 4**

**That the EMU undertake a process to identify and document the anticipated operating and human resources costs for all EMP capital projects (pending, scoping, active, and completed) and that these costs be discussed and agreed to by the Steering Committee.**

**2005 Management Response**

Management agrees with this recommendation.

In August 2005, a revised project approval process was formally established and approved by the EMP Steering Committee. Included in this process are the identification of human resources and their time allocation, and the potential operational impact of the project. Throughout a project's development, the Steering Committee members will be kept apprised of the project's progress and its integration operationally. Staff recently conducted a historical review of the human resources allocated to the projects as well as projected human resources required to complete the projects in 2006 and 2007. The results of this analysis were used for the annual project review for 2006 and will subsequently be used in 2007.

**Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 4 at December 31, 2008**

Effective November 2007, the EMP WG conducted a complete review of the EMP management processes and redefined the phases of the project life cycle. As a result of this review, project charter templates have been updated to include a section where project managers must identify the human resources required to do the project work. Project managers are also responsible for seeking EMP SC approval before proceeding with the project. SC members' review and approval of

the project charters signifies their respective commitment of the human resources to complete the project charter activities. The revised project management processes and methodology were presented and approved by EMP SC on February 12, 2008.

Also included with the project management lifecycle is an Operational Support and Maintenance Plan that project managers much complete. This plan provides guidance on how the project will be implemented, who will be responsible for its ongoing maintenance as well as the associated human resource costs to transition the project to operations.

Human resources costs are also discussed with EMP SC through the Status Report updates. The revised project management methodology, along with the status reports, provides a means for discussion and approval of human resources costs by the EMP SC.

*Management: % complete* *100%*

---

#### **OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 4**

We are satisfied that a project methodology and charter template was developed in late 2007 early 2008 for new projects. Emergency Management Program project prioritization human resources estimates for 2008 were provided.

*OAG: % complete* *100%*

---

#### **2005 Recommendation 5**

**That the EMU develop and document a process for the selection and approval of new Working Group members and ensure that the process: documents the anticipated workload requirements of Working Group members; clearly outlines roles and responsibilities; and includes formal senior management approval of the department from which the resource belongs.**

#### **2005 Management Response**

Management agrees with the intent of this recommendation.

Further to recommendation 2, the new Terms of Reference will include a process to document requirements of Working Group membership, core competencies and a process for gaining formal approval at the Steering Committee level on Working Group membership. This formal approval will assist in ensuring workload balances are made with respect to Working Group members.

A detailed human resources impact analysis was presented to the Steering Committee November 22, 2005. Subsequent to this, an implementation plan for 2006 & 2007 will be presented to the Steering Committee in Q1 of 2006. The implementation plan will identify the implementation of various projects and the financial and human resources required to successfully complete each project with in the identified timeline. Each future project will also follow the project start-up

process approved by the Steering Committee in August 2005. The 2006 & 2007 implementation plans, the project start-up process and bi-monthly status reporting to the Steering Committee will ensure effective benefit sustainment.

**Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 5 at December 31, 2008**

The EMP Terms of Reference outlines the process for selecting WG members, their roles and responsibilities, and their approval by senior management.

*Management: % complete* **100%**

---

**OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 5**

We are satisfied that the EMP Terms of Reference documents the composition, appointment as well as time commitment of the working group membership.

*OAG: % complete* **100%**

---

**2005 Recommendation 6**

**That the Steering Committee place a priority upon the timely completion of EMP capital project 511-07, Emergency Operations Centre Design.**

**2005 Management Response**

The current location and design of the Emergency Operation Centre (EOC) is problematic. The layout is not appropriate for the number and types of activities required by a single tier municipality of Ottawa's size, is located downtown and therefore at higher risk from a vulnerability perspective, has no permanent audio visual equipment and computer workstations and lacks an effective form of controlled access.

Accordingly, a project has been identified for the design of a new Emergency Operations Centre. A Best Practices Review has been completed and an EOC Design Concept document was developed to aid in decision-making processes and the design phase. To date, the project team has also developed detailed operating procedures for the current EOC, which addresses notification procedures for mobilizing staff and procedural processes for the effective management of the EOC. The City of Ottawa is currently seeking partnership opportunities with the Federal Government - Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada to co-locate Federal and Municipal Emergency Operations Centers. Temporary modifications to the existing EOC are also being evaluated to enhance efficiencies of space and personnel.

**Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 6 at December 31, 2008**

Initially in 2005, it was identified that the current location and design of the City's Emergency Operation Centre (EOC) was not optimal. It was also realized that it

would take a number of years to complete the planning and design work needed to read an ideal end-state solution. Until such time as the new EOC facility is designed and established, modifications and upgrades have been made to the current Emergency Operations Centre (located at City Hall) resulting in enhanced efficiency of space and personnel. These modifications were completed effective May 2007.

As part of 2008 budget deliberations, City Council directed that a SC be established to review the feasibility of consolidating dispatch functions (i.e., Fire, Police, Paramedics, By-law, and EOM). Council has requested that the SC report back on their findings. This SC is currently conducting this review and has proposed that the new Emergency Operations Centre should be considered in the design of the amalgamated dispatch centre.

***Management: % complete*** ***100%***

#### **OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 6**

As part of Council's deliberation of the 2008 draft Operating and Capital Budget Estimates a motion carried to review the feasibility of consolidating the Fire, Police, Paramedics and By-law services dispatch centres; the OEM centre; the traffic control centre through the development of a business case which includes a cost benefit analysis and that the business case be submitted to CPS Committee, the Ottawa Police Services Board and Council.

Management advises that the tabling of the business case is tentatively schedule for the fall of 2009.

Although effective improvements were made to the Emergency Operations Centre, its location at City Hall, Laurier continues not to be optimal or desirable.

***OAG: % complete*** ***75 %***

#### **Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 6 as of Winter 2010**

Management disagrees with the OAG's follow-up audit finding that implementation of this recommendation is only substantially complete.

Recommendation 6 stated that: "the Steering Committee place a priority upon the timely completion of EMP capital project 511-07, Emergency Operations Centre Design".

As indicated in the Management Representation of the Status of Implementation, a series of modifications and upgrades have been made to the current Emergency Operations Centre (located at City Hall) resulting in enhanced efficiency of space and personnel. These modifications were completed effective May 2007. With the completion of these renovations the original recommendation has been met.

Since the report from the Auditor General, Council carried a motion as part of the 2008 budget process which requested a review of the feasibility of consolidating the Fire, Police, Paramedics and By-law services dispatch centres; the OEM centre; and the traffic control centre through the development of a business case which is to include a cost benefit analysis. The business case is to be submitted to CPS Committee, the Ottawa Police Services Board and Council.

In Q3 2009, the newly formed Emergency and Protective Services department received a report from an external consultant outlining the options and associated cost estimates for the construction of a consolidated dispatch. After a review of the report by all emergency services partners and select non-emergency partners, it was determined that there are a series of potential opportunities to enhance interoperability and information sharing beyond just the consolidation of dispatch centres. Meetings between partners have been initiated. Once the partners have identified a series of options to enhance the interoperability and information sharing between services, a report to all impacted governance bodies will be presented.

*Management: % complete*

*100%*

### **2005 Recommendation 7**

**That the management of the EMU document and implement a process to ensure the Steering Committee review and where required reprioritize/re-profile the EMP capital projects portfolio on a twice yearly basis.**

### **2005 Management Response**

Management agrees with this recommendation.

The Audit Team “observed that the current EMP capital projects portfolio of 29 capital projects is aligned to the stated goals and objectives of the Program and ...that monitoring processes exist at the branch and departmental level but not at the Steering Committee level to track capital projects schedule, costs and scope.”

A semi-annual process will ensure that projects are appropriately prioritized on an ongoing basis by the Steering Committee as well as to ensure provincial program compliance.

The Terms of Reference planned for Q1 of 2006 will include this requirement.

### **Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 7 at December 31, 2008**

The OEM has documented and implemented a process for reviewing and prioritizing the EMP capital project portfolio. A structured annual review is conducted with the EMP WG members and results of this review are reported to EMP SC for review and approval. A budget analysis is included with this review and the amount of the capital budget request is determined for the next year.

Formal work plans are also developed and are used to guide program and project activity annually. These work plans, along with an identified spending plan, are presented to EMP SC members on an annual basis for approval.

On a semi-annual basis, via the EMP SC meetings, the Chair of the EMP WG also submits a formal status report to the membership that documents the progress of the EMP projects. During these updates, the EMP SC members have the opportunity to discuss and re-prioritize project activity as necessary and/or provide direction regarding reallocation of the EMP capital budget.

**Management: % complete** **100%**

#### **OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 7**

We are satisfied that a process for reviewing and prioritizing the EMP capital project portfolio has been documented and implemented.

**OAG: % complete** **100 %**

## **4 SUMMARY OF THE LEVEL OF COMPLETION**

The table below outlines our assessment of the level of completion of each recommendation as of Fall 2009.

CATEGORY	% COMPLETE	RECOMMENDATIONS	NUMBER OF RECOMMENDATIONS	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
LITTLE OR NO ACTION	0 – 24	-	-	-
ACTION INITIATED	25 – 49	-	-	-
PARTIALLY COMPLETE	50 – 74	-	-	-
SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	75 – 99	6	1	14%
COMPLETE	100	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7	6	86%
TOTAL			7	100%

## **5 CONCLUSION**

The risk remaining rests primarily with the present location of the Emergency Operations Centre. Although improvements to its design and functioning were made, its current location at City Hall, Laurier continues not to be optimal or desirable. We understand from management that preliminary high-level discussions have taken place however, at this time, no concrete decision for a relocation of the centre has transpired.

Additional work is also required in order to consolidate the dispatch centres for all emergency services (i.e., fire, paramedics and police) and by-law services and to establish one coherent, effective and efficient unified dispatch. Management advises that the tabling of a business case for the viability of consolidation is tentatively scheduled for the fall of 2009.

Overall, sound progress has been made towards implementation of the 2005 Audit of Emergency Management Program recommendations. Challenges to full implementation are primarily associated with the various players' involvement with the Emergency Management Program and with efforts and relationships spanning across departments. Although some efforts are still needed, we are satisfied that the advancements made have served to enhance the management and control of the City's Emergency Management Program.

Although solid progress has been made regarding the issues raised in the 2005 audit, the events that occurred in the summer of 2009 related to the Glen Cairn sewage backup have revealed additional concerns with respect to communications and response dispatch. These recent events require further attention from EMP and operations management.

## **6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

We wish to express appreciation to the staff and management for their cooperation and assistance throughout the audit process.