



Office of the Auditor General / Bureau du vérificateur général

FOLLOW-UP TO THE 2007 AUDIT OF THE COUNCIL REQUEST

TRACKING PROCESSES

2009

VÉRIFICATION DE SUIVI DU PROCESSUS DE SUIVI

DES DEMANDES DU CONSEIL MUNICIPAL DE 2007

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
RÉSUMÉ.....	v
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 KEY FINDINGS OF THE ORIGINAL 2007 AUDIT OF THE COUNCIL REQUEST TRACKING PROCESS.....	1
3 STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF 2007 AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS ...	3
4 SUMMARY OF THE LEVEL OF COMPLETION	31
5 CONCLUSION.....	31
6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	33
Appendix 1	34
Appendix 2	43
Appendix 3	45

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The Follow-up to the 2007 Audit of the Council Request Tracking Processes was included in the Auditor General's 2009 Audit Plan.

The key findings of the original 2007 audit included:

- City must improve its processes for managing requests from Councillors;
- The audit was undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the City's process for responding to both formal and informal requests from Council;
- The current process does not seem reliable, lacks consistency and requires follow-up on items, particularly informal requests, to obtain a response;
- The audit shows that currently the vast majority of requests from Councillors are informal and are routed directly to staff within departments;
- Timeframes for responding to inquiries should be set and monitored on a consistent basis;
- An interim reply step is needed to confirm timeframes once staff has had an opportunity to consider what will be involved in responding; and,
- An agreed upon corporate set of standards should be developed to provide clarity and direction for staff responding to these requests.

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	1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17	12	70%
ACTION INITIATED	25 – 49	2, 3	2	12%
PARTIALLY COMPLETE	50 – 74	16	1	6%
SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	75 – 99	7, 10	2	12%
COMPLETE	100	-	-	-
TOTAL			17	100%

Conclusion

Management has assessed all but one of the 17 recommendations in this audit as having been completely implemented. According to Management's comments, this assessment is, in general, the result of the following:

- Approval on June 11, 2008 of the City Manager's report on the Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process; and,
- The Deputy City Clerk's report on the Informal Inquiry Process to the Member Services Sub-Committee on July 7, 2008 and subsequent discussion at that meeting.

These reports fail to address the recommendations as follows:

1. Although the City Manager's report provides some improved protocols for the operation of the formal inquiry process, it does not speak to the need to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of the process in achieving its mandate. Furthermore, the Report does not provide improved protocols or a defined process for informal inquiries (see Appendix 1).
2. The Report on the Informal Inquiry Process from the Deputy City Clerk to Member Services Sub-Committee contains nothing related to informal inquiries. It does not identify issues, and it does not recommend any process improvements. It does not discuss the need to establish oversight in the process, nor does it identify key indicators that should be tracked in order to conduct appropriate monitoring (see Appendix 2).
3. The minutes of Member Services Sub-Committee meeting held July 7, 2008 (see Appendix 3), indicate that the discussion did not fully consider the issues with the current process, the need for oversight, the need to consider how to fulfill resource requirements, or the benefits to be derived from tracking and monitoring relevant data. The Committee considered the Report on the Informal Inquiry Process. However, given the lack of content in the report, the extent to which the Committee's consideration of the report was effective in assessing the issues with the current process, and whether the process is in need of improvement is questionable.
4. It is important to note that this audit was undertaken largely because of concerns raised by a number of members of Council regarding the current process for tracking requests. Similar concerns also arose in past audits including Surface Operations in 2006 and Real Estate Management in 2005. As such, the assertion in the Member Services Sub-Committee minutes from July 2008 that "the Auditor General was the only person making this point" clearly demonstrates misinformation. Management has assessed that the recommendations have been completely implemented, however, management's responses, along with the evidence reviewed demonstrate a lack of action toward implementation. As such, the issues raised in the 2007 audit remain unresolved.

Overall Management Response

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's conclusion, and his assertion that the steps taken to address the original recommendations "demonstrate a lack of action toward implementation".

The following process improvements have been implemented ensuring the ongoing logging, monitoring and reporting of formal inquiries. The City Manager's Report on the Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process (ACS2008-CMR-OCM-0001) as approved by Council on June 11, 2008, implemented the *Outstanding Motions - Departmental Log* to log and monitor formal inquiries, the bi-monthly reporting to Council of outstanding inquiries, default deadlines with the expectation that all formal inquiries be responded to at the next Committee/Council meeting and if this is not possible, communication to the Councillor and Committee/Council Co-ordinator indicating when the response can be expected. Further, the Mid-Term Governance Review added the additional step that Council Inquiries be placed on the relevant Standing Committee agenda prior to their listing on a Council agenda to enable the relevant Standing Committee to request further action if necessary.

The action taken on informal inquiries included the tabling and consideration of the Informal Inquiry Process (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076) report at the Member Services Sub-Committee on July 7, 2008. The Auditor General's comments that the tabled report was lacking in content and failed to identify any issues with the current process and whether the process was in need of improvement, is unwarranted as the report on the Informal Inquiry Process (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076) included both the City Manager's Report on Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Processes (ACS2008-CMR-OCM-0001) and the Auditor General's 2007 Audit of the Council Request Tracking Process as supporting documents, ensuring that the Member Services Sub-Committee reviewed all of the issues identified by the Auditor General.

The Member Services Sub-Committee fully considered the recommendations identified within the 2007 Audit of the Council Request Tracking Processes within the context of the Report on the Informal Inquiry Process (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076), and the direction provided by the Member Services Sub-Committee was that no further action be taken by staff on informal inquiries. The decision by Member Services Sub-Committee meant that staff did not proceed with the Auditor General's recommendations suggesting the implementation of structured logging, tracking, and monitoring of informal inquiries. Individual departments continue to use various internal methods to ensure that Councillor requests and inquiries are answered.

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 du processus de suivi des demandes du Conseil municipal de 2007 était prévu dans le Plan de vérification du Bureau du vérificateur général de 2009.

Les constatations principales de la vérification initiale de 2007 sont les suivantes :

- La Ville doit améliorer ses processus visant la gestion des demandes des conseillers;
- La vérification visait à mesurer l'efficacité du processus suivi par le personnel de la Ville pour assurer le traitement des demandes officielles et non officielles des membres du Conseil;
- Le processus actuel ne semble pas fiable; il manque d'uniformité et il est souvent nécessaire de relancer le personnel pour obtenir des réponses, notamment dans le cas des demandes non officielles;
- La vérification montre qu'actuellement la vaste majorité des demandes des conseillers sont non officielles et sont acheminées directement au personnel des services concernés;
- Les délais de réponse aux demandes de renseignements devraient être établis et contrôlés de façon systématique;
- Une étape doit être prévue où le personnel, après avoir évalué l'ampleur de la tâche, indiquerait le temps nécessaire pour répondre à la demande;
- Un ensemble convenu de normes municipales devrait être élaboré afin d'éclairer et d'orienter le personnel chargé de répondre à ces demandes.

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	1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17	12	70 %
ACTION AMORCÉE	25 - 49	2, 3	2	12 %
COMPLÉTÉE EN PARTIE	50 - 74	16	1	6 %
PRATIQUEMENT COMPLÉTÉE	75 - 99	7, 10	2	12 %
COMPLÉTÉE	100	-	-	-
TOTAL			17	100 %

Conclusion

La direction a évalué que toutes les 17 recommandations de cette vérification sauf une ont été complètement mises en œuvre. Selon les commentaires de la direction, cette évaluation découle, de façon générale, de ce qui suit :

- L'approbation, le 11 juin 2008, du rapport du directeur municipal sur le processus de suivi des demandes et des motions du Conseil;
- Le rapport de la greffière adjointe sur le processus des demandes non officielles au Sous-comité des services aux membres le 7 juillet 2008 et la discussion qui en a suivi à cette réunion.

Ces rapports omettent de traiter les recommandations comme il est indiqué ci-dessous :

1. Bien que le rapport du directeur municipal propose quelques améliorations aux protocoles en ce qui concerne le fonctionnement du processus de suivi des demandes officielles, il n'aborde pas la question du contrôle de l'efficacité et de l'efficience du processus dans l'atteinte de résultats. De plus, le rapport ne soumet pas d'améliorations aux protocoles ou de processus déterminé en ce qui concerne le processus des demandes non officielles (voir l'annexe 1).
2. Le rapport sur le processus de suivi des demandes non officielles de la greffière adjointe présenté au Sous-comité des services aux membres ne présente aucun élément lié aux demandes de renseignements non officielles. Il ne cerne pas les questions et ne recommande aucune amélioration au processus. Il ne traite pas du besoin d'établir une surveillance du processus, ni ne déterminer les indicateurs clés dont on devrait assurer le suivi afin d'effectuer un suivi adéquat (voir l'annexe 2).
3. Le procès-verbal de la réunion du Sous-comité des services aux membres qui s'est tenue le 7 juin 2008 (voir annexe 3) indique que la discussion n'a pas entièrement abordée les questions relatives au processus actuel, le besoin d'une surveillance, le besoin d'étudier la manière de satisfaire aux exigences en matière de ressources ou les avantages qui découleraient du suivi et du contrôle des données pertinentes. Le Comité a étudié le rapport sur le processus des demandes non officielles. Toutefois, étant donné le manque de contenu du rapport, on doute de la mesure dans laquelle l'étude du rapport par le Comité était efficace pour évaluer les questions liées au processus et à la nécessité d'améliorer ledit processus.
4. Il est important de noter que cette vérification a été entreprise en grande partie en raison des préoccupations soulevées par plusieurs conseillers concernant le processus actuel de suivi des demandes de renseignements. Des inquiétudes similaires ont également surgi lors de vérifications antérieures, notamment celles concernant les Opérations de surface en 2006 et la Gestion des biens immobiliers en 2005. En soi, l'affirmation dans le procès-verbal de la réunion de

juillet 2008 du Sous-comité des services aux membres que « seul le vérificateur général a soulevé ce point » est la preuve claire d'une désinformation. La direction a évalué que les recommandations avaient été toutes mises entièrement en œuvre; cependant, les réponses de la direction, ainsi que les éléments probants examinés, démontrent qu'aucune mesure n'a été prise en vue de la mise en œuvre. Par conséquent, les questions exposées dans la vérification de 2007 restent sans réponse.

Réponse générale de la direction

La direction n'est pas d'accord avec la conclusion du vérificateur général et sa déclaration stipulant que les démarches entreprises afin de satisfaire aux recommandations « démontrent qu'aucune mesure n'a été prises en vue de la mise en œuvre ».

Les améliorations au processus suivantes ont été mises en place, assurant la consignation, le contrôle et la notification des demandes de renseignements officielles. Le Rapport du directeur municipal sur le processus de suivi des demandes de renseignements et des motions du Conseil (ACS2008-CMR-OCM-0001), tel qu'il a été approuvé par le Conseil le 11 juin 2008, a établi l'instauration du Registre des services – Motions en suspens afin de consigner et de surveiller les demandes officielles, la production de rapports bimensuels au Conseil concernant les demandes en suspens, ainsi que les dates limites par défaut, escomptant une réponse à toutes les demandes officielles à la réunion suivante du comité en question ou du Conseil et, si ce n'est pas possible, une communication au conseiller et au coordonnateur du comité en question ou du Conseil indiquant à quelle date on peut s'attendre à une réponse. En outre, l'examen de mi-mandat sur la gouvernance a entraîné l'ajout d'une autre étape visant à ce que les demandes du Conseil soient mentionnées à l'ordre du jour du comité permanent pertinent avant qu'elles soient placées sur celui du Conseil afin de permettre audit comité de demander la prise d'autres mesures, le cas échéant.

Les mesures prises en ce qui a trait aux demandes non officielles comprenaient le dépôt et l'étude du Rapport sur le processus des demandes non officielles (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076) au Sous-comité des services aux membres le 7 juillet 2008. Les commentaires du vérificateur général indiquant que le rapport déposé manquait d'éléments et ne parvenait pas à cerner les enjeux relatifs au processus actuel et à définir si le processus devait être amélioré, sont injustifiés puisque le Rapport sur le processus des demandes non officielles (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076) incluait le Rapport du directeur municipal sur les processus de suivi des demandes officielles et des motions du Conseil (ACS2008-CMR-OCM-0001) et la vérification de 2007 du vérificateur général sur le processus de suivi des demandes du Conseil en tant que documents d'appui, assurant ainsi l'étude par le Sous-comité des services aux membres de tous les enjeux décelés par le vérificateur général.

Le Sous-comité des services aux membres a étudié en détail les recommandations dégagées dans la vérification de 2007 sur le processus de suivi des demandes du Conseil dans le contexte du Rapport sur le processus des demandes non officielles, et la directive fournie par le Sous-comité des services aux membres était qu'aucune autre mesure ne devait être prise par le personnel relativement aux demandes non officielles. La décision du Sous-comité des services aux membres signifiait que le personnel n'avait pas à procéder aux recommandations du vérificateur général suggérant la mise en œuvre de la consignation, du suivi et de la surveillance structurés des demandes non officielles. Chaque service continue d'utiliser diverses méthodes internes afin de veiller à ce que l'on réponde aux demandes des conseillers et aux demandes de renseignements.

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 2007 Audit of the Council Request Tracking Processes was included in the Auditor General's 2009 Audit Plan.

The key findings of the original 2007 audit included:

- City must improve its processes for managing requests from Councillors;
- The audit was undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the City's process for responding to both formal and informal requests from Council;
- The current process does not seem reliable, lacks consistency and requires follow-up on items, particularly informal requests, to obtain a response;
- The audit shows that currently the vast majority of requests from Councillors are informal and are routed directly to staff within departments;
- Timeframes for responding to inquiries should be set and monitored on a consistent basis;
- An interim reply step is needed to confirm timeframes once staff has had an opportunity to consider what will be involved in responding; and,
- An agreed upon corporate set of standards should be developed to provide clarity and direction for staff responding to these requests.

2 KEY FINDINGS OF THE ORIGINAL 2007 AUDIT OF THE COUNCIL REQUEST TRACKING PROCESSES

Councillors are not satisfied with the existing process for handling inquiries. They indicate that they find the inquiries process does not seem reliable, lacks consistency in that the process changes depending on the department and specific staff involved, and that they must often follow up on items, particularly informal requests, to obtain a response. Some have also raised concern that the process should be somewhat more restrictive to prevent more complex, time-consuming inquiries and requests coming from a single Councillor. The Councillors consulted feel that the associated time and cost implications are not being considered and should be.

Concerns identified by the audit team which relate specifically to the formal meeting process include:

- Timeframes for responding to inquiries should be set and monitored on a consistent basis;
- An interim reply step is needed to confirm timeframes once staff has had an opportunity to consider what will be involved in responding;

- Written inquiries are sometimes submitted after some Councillors and staff have left the meeting and at times are not read into the minutes;
- Verbal direction is given in the course of discussion on items, some of which may involve the tabling of a motion and as such the City Clerk's Branch could provide a more complete service by ensuring that directions are captured in the records/minutes and confirming follow-up action via email after the meeting (i.e., as is done for inquiries); and,
- The process currently does not facilitate the consideration of the time and cost implications of inquiries; more complex inquiries involving significant staff time should be reconsidered by the relevant Committee and Council as a whole before proceeding.

The formal process for inquiries is one option for Councillors and this is where the City Clerk's staff plays a role. As indicated above, the vast majority of requests from Councillors are informal and are routed directly to staff within departments. Some are communicated by email, memo or letter, and others via telephone calls or in-person conversations. Staff point out that the advantage of an informal request is less process. Responses can be emailed directly to the requester as opposed to formal inquiries which normally require the preparation of a full report which must be routed through the formal meeting process. The difficulty arises with the volume of requests and the associated workload involved in tracking, researching and responding to them.

In reviewing samples of formal and informal requests as part of this audit, it became apparent that many requests routed through the informal process should actually be dealt with as formal inquiries. For example, matters that pertain to the interpretation, changing or creation of policies, and issues that require internal consultation or a multi-departmental response are more complex and take more time than should be the case for an informal request. Given the nature of some inquiries and the associated time and cost implications, some inquiries and requests from individual Council Members should involve tabling a motion to obtain direction from the Committee or Council. For example, cases that involve changing or creating policy that will affect the public; the creation of a framework or vision for a possible program or service or significant procedural change; and matters that require public consultation or the completion of extensive research.

The process, as it stands, works as well as it does due to the high level of staff commitment at all levels across the Corporation. In order to handle the current volume of inquiries from a broader, integrated and more informed perspective, there is a need for some level of formality and structure. For example, there is a need to define "formal" versus "informal" inquiries to clarify when each is appropriate. In addition, corporate protocols regarding where inquiries should be directed, target response dates and an interim reply mechanism are needed. There is also a need to ensure that departmental tracking systems capture the appropriate

data in order to enable monitoring and reporting on service levels as well as opportunities to streamline the work involved in responding to requests.

An agreed upon corporate set of standards for inquiry services would provide clarity, direction and benchmarking capability. A corporate body charged with oversight responsibilities for inquiry and request processes could provide the leadership and support that is currently lacking. Without the introduction of corporate leadership, tools and resources to improve the management of inquiries, problems that surface will continue to be addressed sporadically by staff, to the extent possible, on a case by case basis.

Given the nature of the work to be done and the respective mandates, experience and skills of the City Clerk's Branch and other corporate service groups, it is felt that the BTS Department would be in an ideal position to provide the required leadership. This will involve working in close consultation with the City Clerk's Branch on aspects pertaining to the formal inquiry process.

3 STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF 2007 AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

2007 Audit Recommendation 1

That management define "formal" and "informal" inquiries and requests to clarify what each of these avenues are intended to be used for (i.e., see Appendix B of the full audit report for a sample outline).

2007 Management Response to Recommendation 1

Management disagrees with this recommendation.

Management believes the definition of a "formal" inquiry is already defined and refers to an enquiry, which is filed in writing at a Committee or Council meeting (See Section 31 of the Council & Committee Procedure By-law).

In management's opinion, any other inquiry would be regarded as "informal". If Council wishes to further define categories and approaches to informal inquiries (e.g., casework, policy, etc.) and investigate establishing response standards around informal inquiries, management recommends that the Member Services Committee be asked to undertake this work.

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

Implementation of this recommendation is 100% complete.

The definition of a formal inquiry is included in the Procedure By-law - Section 31, No. 206-462. Member Services Committee considered a report on informal inquiries at its meeting on July 7, 2008. No further direction was provided to staff at that time with regard to informal inquiries.

Management: % complete

100%

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 1

A definition of formal inquiry was not observed in By-Law No. 2006-462 updated July 2009, which governs the proceedings of Council and its Committees, nor was there a distinction between formal and informal inquiry. As such, this recommendation has not been addressed.

Management explained that a formal inquiry refers to an inquiry filed in writing at a Committee or Council meeting. This description is not sufficient to categorize an inquiry as formal or informal in order to determine the appropriate procedure to follow to submit the inquiry. (I.e., whether or not it should be filed in writing at a Committee or Council meeting.) Considering the magnitude of the difference in number of formal (314) and informal (14,344) requests submitted annually, and considering that an "informal request" can take up to three months for a response, it appears that inquiries that should be submitted formally are being treated as informal inquiries. This recommendation is encouraging a definition of "formal inquiry" and "informal inquiry" based on characteristics of the inquiry (such as expected level of effort in terms of time and resource requirements) so that the appropriate process to follow to submit and resolve the inquiry is clear.

OAG: % complete

0%

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 1 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that there has been little or no action taken to implement this recommendation.

Management continues to assert that the only definition of a formal inquiry is one that is submitted in Committee or Council within Section 31 of the Procedure By-law, as follows:

31. Inquiries and Answers

- (1) Any inquiry made at a meeting of Council, or a Committee thereof, shall be submitted in writing, and referred to the City Manager, appropriate Deputy City Manager or Chief Corporate Services Officer for response;
- (2) The City Manager, the appropriate Deputy City Manager or Chief Corporate Services Officer shall respond in writing to the inquiry and the response shall be distributed to all members of Council or the Committee at which the inquiry was made;
- (3) The Clerk shall communicate to Council on a quarterly basis the status of outstanding inquiries, including the name of the Councillor originating the inquiry and the department responsible for an answer.

Guidance can also be found in the practices adopted by City Council on June 11, 2008 and further amended by City Council as part of the Mid-Term Governance Review on June 10, 2009.

With regard to informal inquiries (i.e., those presented outside of the Standing Committee and Council process), Member Services Committee considered both the staff report and the Auditor General's report and chose not to recommend any further definition of informal inquiries.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

Management: % complete *100%*

2007 Audit Recommendation 2

That management identify the types of inquiries that must be tabled as a motion at Committee or Council.

2007 Management Response

Management disagrees with this recommendation.

It is a Councillor's right to raise any matter to a Committee or Council that they wish to raise.

On February 8, 2008, the Long-Range Financial Plan Sub-Committee (LRFP) tasked the City Manager, the City Solicitor and the City Clerk to develop and recommend improvements to inquiry and motion 'management' by staff. By the time this report is published, the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and City Council will have addressed those recommendations.

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

Implementation of this recommendation is 100% complete. At its meeting of June 11, 2008 Council approved a report from the City Manager outlining a new formal inquiry and motion tracking process.

Management: % complete *100%*

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 2

The City Manager's Report on the Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process dated May 27, 2008 recommends that formal inquiries be tabled at Council if the inquiry is determined to be "significant", and if after reviewing what would be required to produce a response, the Councillor wishes it to proceed. However, the determination of whether an inquiry is "significant" occurs "following the formal tabling of an inquiry at the Committee or Council meeting." As such, the Report only considers "formal" inquiries. Historically, in excess of 14,000 inquiries made annually were not considered to be formal. The process to determine which inquiries are significant does not consider or include the characteristics of these

informal inquiries. As well, the absence of appropriate guidance on which inquiries should follow the formal process (see recommendation 1) leaves a substantial gap in clarity of the types of inquiries that should be tabled as a motion. Furthermore, the Report does not provide guidance on how to determine whether an inquiry is significant. The definition refers to subject matter and implications to staff to respond to the inquiry in a reasonable amount of time. However, standards on the amount of time that is reasonable have not been set. Similarly, there is no indication of the types of subject matter that would deem an inquiry to be “significant”.

Management’s response that Councillors have the right to raise any matter to a Committee or Council that they wish to raise is not relevant to this recommendation. The recommendation in no way suggests removing a Councillor’s right to raise a matter to Council or Committee.

OAG: % complete

40%

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 2 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General’s follow-up audit finding that action has been initiated to implement this recommendation but it is not yet considered complete.

Management disagrees with the Auditor General’s assertion that, “Management’s response that Councillors have the right to raise any matter to a Committee or Council that they wish to raise is not relevant to this recommendation”, as the original recommendation from the Auditor General was “that management identify the types of inquiries that must be tabled as a motion at Committee or Council” [emphasis added].

Management further disagrees that the categorization of inquiries is necessary to determine if an inquiry qualifies (in scope, level of effort) as formal or informal prior to its submission in writing. Management continues to assert that it is a Councillor’s right to raise any matter with staff they wish to raise regardless of scope or level of effort required, and that the only formal inquiry is one that proceeds through the Committee and Council process.

Should staff determine, on occasion, that a timely response to an informal inquiry cannot be provided within existing resources; the Councillor would be informed and would then have the option to raise the inquiry through the formal process adopted by City Council on June 11, 2008.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

Management: % complete

100%

2007 Audit Recommendation 3

That management establish corporate protocols, target response dates and an interim reply step in order to tighten the management of inquiries as per recommendations related to “Effectiveness” (Recommendations 5-7).

Management Response to Recommendation 3

Management agrees with this recommendation.

Management agrees that the protocols regarding formal inquiries should be improved. As indicated above, the City Manager, City Solicitor and the City Clerk were tasked to develop and recommend improvements to inquiry and motion ‘management’ by staff at the February 8, 2008 LRFP meeting. By the time this report is published, the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and City Council will have addressed those recommendations.

Management believes that, given the wide variety of informal inquiries, it would be ineffective to develop protocols without having a thorough understanding of what Councillors want and need in each given area. Management believes that, should Council wish to further define categories and approaches to informal inquiries (e.g., casework, policy, etc.) and investigate establishing response standards around informal inquiries that the Members Services Committee be asked to undertake this work with staff.

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

Implementation of this recommendation is 100% complete. At its meeting of June 11, 2008 Council approved a report from the City Manager outlining a new formal inquiry and motion tracking process. An inquiry log and related protocols have been established. Member Services Sub-Committee considered a report on informal inquiries at its meeting on July 7, 2008. No further direction was provided to staff at that time with regard to informal inquiries.

Management: % complete **100%**

OAG’s Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 3

A new formal inquiry and motion tracking process is described in the City Manager's Report, as indicated above. The Report recommends some improvements related to this recommendation such as requiring Council requests and responses to be captured in agenda, and requiring the deadline for the response to be logged. However, the Report fails to establish standards for appropriate target response times; does not recommend a preliminary search for previous similar inquiries prior to pursuing a new inquiry; and does not establish an interim reply step. The Report recommends bi-monthly status reporting to Council. However, this is inconsistent with the By-law which requires quarterly reporting.

The Report recommends that if Council wishes to track informal inquiries, the Member Services Sub-Committee should be tasked to undertake this with staff to review current approaches, investigate defining categories and establishing response standards and tracking for informal inquiries. The Report provides examples of areas that could be examined. Although a Report on the Informal Inquiry Process (Ref No. ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076) was considered at the July 7, 2008 Member Services Sub-Committee meeting, the report is lacking in content. As such, there is no evidence that the investigations on the informal inquiry process recommended in the City Manager's Report took place. The Report on the Informal Inquiry Process does not consider the current process for handling informal inquiries; it does not identify benefits or issues with the current process; and it does not consider areas for potential improvement. Management has indicated that no further direction was provided to staff with regard to informal inquiries at the time the Report on the Informal Inquiry Process was considered. However, the minutes of the meeting demonstrate misinformation and lack of understanding of the issues and of the audit recommendation. There is no evidence that Management or the Member Services Sub-Committee considered this recommendation.

OAG: % complete

30%

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 3 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that action has been initiated to implement this recommendation but it is not yet considered complete.

Bi-monthly reporting on outstanding inquiries, approved by City Council on June 11, 2008, has been in place since September 16, 2008. Further, the Mid-Term Governance Review added the additional step that Council Inquiries be placed on the relevant Standing Committee agenda prior to their listing on a Council agenda to enable the relevant Standing Committee to request further action if necessary. While the Procedure By-law has not yet been changed to formally reflect the practice, it will be amended as part of the full Governance Review to take place at the end of this Term of Council.

Management disagrees that Member Services Sub-Committee consideration of this item "demonstrate(s) misinformation and lack of understanding of the issues and of the audit recommendation". The Member Services Sub-Committee fully considered this recommendation within the context of the Report on the Informal Inquiry Process, which included both the City Manager's Report on Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Processes and the Auditor General's report on the 2007 Audit of the Council Request Tracking Processes as supporting documents.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

Management: % complete

100%

2007 Audit Recommendation 4

That management revise the Procedure By-law to incorporate the changes outlined in the recommendations above.

Management Response to Recommendation 4

Management agrees with this recommendation.

The Procedure By-law is regularly updated to reflect changes.

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

Implementation of this recommendation has not yet begun. Any revisions to the Procedure By-Law will occur at the Mid-Term Governance Review, which is scheduled for Q1 2009.

Management: % complete

100%

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 4

By-Law No. 2006-462 was updated July 2009 and includes two additions to Section 31. One requires the inquiry to identify the requested timeframe for a response; the other requires the inquiry to be listed at the relevant Standing Committee prior to the response being listed for Council. The revisions to the By-Law do not encompass the recommendations approved in the City Manager's Report. As well, the updated By-Law is inconsistent with the City Manager's Report in that it requires quarterly status reporting rather than bi-monthly reporting as is required by the City Manager's Report.

OAG: % complete

10%

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 4 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that there has been little or no action taken to implement this recommendation. Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be substantially complete.

Management recognizes that the timelines for status reporting have not yet been changed to bi-monthly to reflect the changes approved by City Council on June 11, 2008. The Procedure By-law was updated with the Mid-Term Governance Review with two additions to Section 31, reflecting the changes that govern Council and Committee and management acknowledges that the reporting change should have been included at that time.

Although the new timelines have not been formally incorporated into the Procedure By-law, the Council-approved practice of providing updates continues to

occur bi-monthly and the necessary revisions to the Procedure By-law will occur as part of the full Governance Review to take place at the end of this Term of Council.

Council approves overarching policies, by-laws or mandates. Internal processes such as those reflected in the City Manager's Report on Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Processes constitute staff protocols which are not included in the Procedure By-law.

Management: % complete *90%*

2007 Audit Recommendation 5

That management establish corporate protocols for direct staff responses, including:

- **First point of entry in departments, i.e., Deputy City Manager (DCM) or Strategic Initiatives and Business Planning (SIBP) office of department;**
- **Directing inquiries from the Mayor's and City Manager's offices for appropriate transfer to departments;**
- **Under which circumstances staff should refer requests to a higher level;**
- **What sorts of department-specific policies and guidelines may be necessary;**
- **The kinds of requests that are to be documented and tracked (i.e., all informal requests unless they can be immediately responded to and involve a specified number of minutes or less of staff time); and**
- **In documenting requests, the data that is to be captured (i.e., include corporate standards for analysis of trends and annual reporting purposes).**

Management Response to Recommendation 5

Management agrees with this recommendation.

Management agrees that if Council wishes to establish service standards and reporting for processing informal inquiries, corporate protocols will be established. Management is recommending that Member Services Committee be tasked with reviewing this report and providing its recommendations for review and input into the development of a process for informal inquiries.

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

Implementation of this recommendation is 100% complete. Member Services Committee considered a report on informal inquiries at its meeting on July 7, 2008. A member moved that staff develop guidelines for the different categories of informal inquiries. The vote on the motion failed by a margin of 5-1.

Management: % complete *100%*

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 5

Management's representation of the status of this recommendation references the failed motion to develop guidelines for the different categories of informal inquiries

that was tabled during the Member Services Sub-Committee after considering a report on informal inquiries. However, the report is lacking in content, and more specifically has no content related to an analysis, investigation, or consideration of the potential issues or benefits of the informal inquiries process. The report does not demonstrate a review or consideration of the needs of staff or the needs of Council in the informal inquiry process. Given the lack of relevant content in the report that was considered during the meeting, the extent to which the Committee's consideration of the report was effective in assessing the issues with the current process, and whether the process is in need of improvement is questionable.

The minutes of the Member Services Sub-Committee meeting during which the motion was defeated demonstrate misinformation and a lack of understanding of the issues present in the current informal inquiry process, as well as a lack of understanding of this recommendation. For example:

1. During the meeting, it was noted that there are many kinds of informal inquiries. The question was posed whether such things as questions to the Clerk's Office regarding Councillors' budget and office issues were included in this definition. This question serves to demonstrate that a more clearly defined definition is needed. Furthermore, given that it was evident early in the meeting that a lack of clarity existed in the definition of an informal inquiry, there is concern that the discussion that took place during the remainder of the meeting was based on varying ideas of the subject matter.
2. It was noted that there was frustration on the part of Councillors' Offices with staff for not understanding the timelines and that there was frustration on the part of staff concerning Councillors asking the same question at several levels, the result being that several people are inadvertently doing the same work. However, these issues were not addressed when it was then questioned why protocols were needed if nothing was wrong. To this regard, it was suggested that an acknowledgement of receipt of inquiry would provide staff with an understanding of the timeline. Although acknowledgement of receipt would need to be combined with pre-established standards to be effective in providing staff with an understanding of the timeline, that this procedure was suggested as a possible solution to an issue that was raised indicates that there are relevant issues with the current process.
3. It was stated, and agreement was voiced that the system is not broken. However to state that the system is not broken contradicts the indication that was made during the same meeting that duplicate requests were being made at various levels, and frustration with timelines was experienced. As well, several areas for improvement were stated both in the City Manager's Report and in the Audit Report. For example:
 - Councillors indicated they're unsure of whom to approach for inquiries;
 - A concern that inquiries are overlooked;

- Lack of confidence that a reliable process is in place to ensure that all the inquiries are acted upon;
 - A general concern about time and cost implications not being considered; and,
 - Concern over the number of requests and the impact on departments' workload.
4. It was stated that any Councillor who is unhappy with the results of an informal inquiry can access the formal inquiry process. To do so would create inefficiencies for staff in duplication of work. If the results of informal inquiries are insufficient on a regular basis, this would indicate a need to make a change in order to reduce the number of insufficient responses. To know whether this need is present, key indicators would need to be identified, tracked, and monitored as is suggested in this recommendation.
 5. It was raised that if staff answered questions, there would be fewer inquiries. This is a plausible statement that would be substantiated by a tracking system and monitoring that would indicate whether the same question is being asked multiple times and whether time to respond to certain questions is excessive. An investigation into the cause of the issues in the current informal inquiry process (as is suggested in this recommendation) would reveal the sources of the problems and would be a first step into improving results.
 6. It was noted that most staff get back to Councillors quickly and that those who do not are the ones that should be dealt with. As above, it is plausible that there may be a problem only with certain staff. However, this could be presented as fact rather than speculation if indicators were tracked and monitored (as is suggested in this recommendation), such as type of questions, workload and response time. Pre-established standards for response times for various types of inquiries (as is suggested in recommendation 3 and 6) would serve as a benchmark against which to measure whether the problem lies with specific staff. The results of the analysis could be used to identify the problem areas and improve them. Consideration should be given to the idea that there may be a process inefficiency causing delayed responses for certain individuals. For example, it is plausible that one individual is tasked with the majority of difficult types of responses, or lengthy inquiries. A major benefit to designing an efficient and effective process, and tracking and analyzing data is to have meaningful information to use to identify problem areas and implement solutions.
 7. It was suggested that the real problem was frivolous inquiries in lieu of doing homework. A solution presented was to avoid frivolous inquiries through "peer pressure." Using peer pressure as a solution to operational issues is not a best practice.

8. It was raised that all Councillors' inquiries are legitimate. The legitimacy of inquiries is not in question, and was not raised as a finding or incorporated in a recommendation of this audit. This comment therefore, demonstrates misinformation and misunderstanding of the issues and of the audit recommendation.
9. The need for individuals to be able to talk "off the record" and have informal discussions was voiced. However, this is a concern that could be addressed in the development of informal inquiries procedures through the definition of an informal inquiry, or through determining the kinds of requests that are to be documented and tracked (e.g., all informal requests unless they can be immediately responded to and involve a specified number of minutes or less of staff time) as is suggested in this recommendation. Consideration should be given both to the need to talk off the record and have informal discussions, as well as to the level of effort required by staff to resolve a request raised through informal discussions or off the record conversations.
10. It was stated that the Auditor General suggested that all requests should be formalized. This is not the case, and demonstrates further misinformation, and misunderstanding.
11. It was stated that the Auditor General was the only individual making this point (re: a need to investigate the process for informal inquiries), and that the Auditor General was looking to create a paper trail. It must be noted that the Auditor General has a duty to be independent and objective in carrying out his charge. The issues raised, and the recommendations presented in this audit were a result of detailed audit procedures including consultations with relevant stakeholders including members of Council, benchmarking with other municipalities, and reviewing the quantity of formal and informal requests processed. The claim that the Auditor General was the only individual making this point is therefore, clearly, misinformed.

There is no evidence that the Member Services Sub-Committee examined areas of the informal inquiry process that may be in need of improvement, as was recommended in the City Manager's Report. There is no evidence that the Sub-Committee considered or addressed this recommendation.

OAG: % complete _____ *0%*

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 5 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that there has been little or no action taken to implement this recommendation.

The action taken on informal inquiries included the tabling of the Informal Inquiry Process (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076) report at the Member Services Sub-Committee on July 7, 2008. The Auditor General's comments that the tabled report was lacking

in content and failed to identify any issues with the current process, and whether the process was in need of improvement is unwarranted as the report on the Informal Inquiry Process (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076) included both the City Manager's Report on Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process (ACS2008-CMR-OCM-0001), and the Auditor General's 2007 Audit of the Council Request Tracking Processes as supporting documents, ensuring that the Member Services Sub-Committee reviewed all of the issues identified by the Auditor General.

The Member Services Sub-Committee fully considered the recommendations identified within the 2007 Audit of the Council Request Tracking Processes within the context of the Report on the Informal Inquiry Process, and the direction provided by the Member Services Sub-Committee was that no further action be taken by staff on informal inquiries. Given the variability of the nature of informal inquiries the sentiment among Councillors was that it is important for Councillors to retain the flexibility to contact staff directly at whatever level of the organization they deem appropriate to obtain the information they require in order to facilitate timely responses to their inquiries.

The decision by Member Services Sub-Committee meant that staff did not proceed with the Auditor General's recommendations suggesting the implementation of structured logging, tracking and monitoring of informal inquiries. Individual departments continue to use various internal methods to ensure that Councillor requests and inquiries are answered.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

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

2007 Audit Recommendation 6

That management develop a practice of default deadlines for all inquiries (refer to Appendix B of the full audit report for a possible framework), including:

- **Setting different response times for various categories of requests;**
- **Providing a quick response option for formal inquiries that do not require a report to Committee/Council; and**
- **Providing an interim reply step (i.e., to re-set timelines, discuss workload implications and/or staff request for motion to proceed).**

Management Response to Recommendation 6

Management agrees with this recommendation.

As indicated above, the City Manager, City Solicitor and the City Clerk were tasked to develop and recommend improvements to inquiry and motion 'management' by staff at the February 8, 2008 LRFP meeting. By the time this report is published, the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and City Council will have addressed those recommendations.

Management agrees that, if Council wishes to establish service standards and reporting for processing informal inquiries, corporate protocols will be established. Management is recommending that Member Services Committee be tasked with reviewing this report and providing its recommendations for review and input into the development of a process for informal inquiries.

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

Implementation of this recommendation is 100% complete. At its meeting of June 11, 2008 Council approved a report from the City Manager outlining a new formal inquiry and motion tracking process. An inquiry log and related protocols have been established. Member Services Sub-Committee considered a report on informal inquiries at its meeting on July 7, 2008. No further direction was provided to staff at that time with regard to informal inquiries.

Management: % complete

100%

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 6

Default deadlines, standards, and guidelines have not been developed. Response times for various categories of requests have not been set. As indicated above (see recommendation 5), the report on informal inquiries that was considered by the Member Services Sub-Committee is lacking in identifying issues with and areas of improvements for the informal inquiry process. As indicated above (see recommendation 5) the minutes of the meeting of the Member Services Sub-Committee during which no further direction was provided to staff with regard to informal inquiries demonstrate misinformation and misunderstanding of the issues with the current informal inquiry tracking process and with the recommendations made in this audit report. Improvements have been made as follows:

- By Law No. 2006-462 updated July 2009 now requires that "the inquiry identify the requested timeframe for a response";
- The City Manager's Report requires the Committee/Council Co-ordinator to note the deadline in the Inquiry Tracking Database;
- The City Manager's Report requires inquiries to be delineated into "Standard" - which can be responded to using existing resources and information within a reasonable amount of time, or "Significant"- in terms of subject matter or implications for staff to prepare a quality response within a reasonable amount of time; and,
- The City Manager's report requires bi-monthly reporting of status and assigns responsibility to the Department Head to inform the Councillor and Coordinator if deadlines are going to be missed.

OAG: % complete

0%

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

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that there has been little or no action taken to implement this recommendation.

Default deadlines have been implemented as per the City Manager's Report. The expectation is that all formal inquiries will be responded to at the next Committee/Council meeting, if this is not possible, the Branch Director is to provide an interim reply to the Councillor and Committee/Council Co-ordinator indicating when the response can be expected. If the inquiry is deemed "significant" the Branch Director is to provide a memo, by the next Committee/Council meeting, to the Councillor and Committee/Council Co-ordinator.

The direction provided by the Member Services Sub-Committee on July 7, 2008, was that no further action be taken by staff regarding setting up additional processes for informal inquiries. Therefore, no structured tracking and targeted deadlines have been implemented for informal inquiries. Individual departments continue to use various internal methods to ensure that Councillor requests and inquiries are answered.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

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

2007 Audit Recommendation 7

That management consider ways to enhance the process for interim reporting of the status of formal inquiries including:

- **Emailing bi-weekly or monthly updates on outstanding items and ETA dates; and,**
- **How quarterly outstanding inquiries reports are provided to Council (i.e., an agenda item or just distributed).**

Management Response to Recommendation 7

Management agrees with this recommendation.

As indicated above, the City Manager, City Solicitor and the City Clerk were tasked to develop and recommend improvements to inquiry and motion 'management' by staff at the February 8, 2008 LRFP meeting. By the time this report is published, the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and City Council will have addressed those recommendations.

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

Implementation of this recommendation is 100% complete. At its meeting of June 11, 2008 Council approved a report from the City Manager outlining a new formal inquiry and motion tracking process. An inquiry log and related protocols have been established.

Management: % complete *100%*

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 7

The City Manager's Report includes process improvements that address this recommendation. However, indication of a requirement to email bi-weekly or monthly updates on outstanding items or ETA dates was not observed.

The relevant improvements recommended in the City Manager's Report include:

- Increased frequency of status reporting to Council from quarterly to bi-monthly;
- Status update will be formally placed on the Committee or Council agenda at the second meeting of every second month in the form of an information item (vs. and information previously distributed item); and,
- Access to all formal inquiries and responses will be expanded to include the relevant staff in the Mayor's office, departmental offices and members of Council and their staff.

OAG: % complete *75%*

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 7 as of Winter 2010

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

Council approved a standard of bi-monthly reporting at its meeting of June 11, 2008 and this standard is being met. Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

Management: % complete *100%*

2007 Audit Recommendation 8

That management identify corporate standards for the key information that should be captured by departmental systems to enable analyzing trends (i.e., volumes, sources, types of requests, complexity, staff time involved, response rates), identifying opportunities for efficiency gains, reducing the volume of requests, and reporting on the inquiry process from a corporate performance perspective.

Management Response to Recommendation 8

Management agrees with this recommendation.

A formal process already exists for casework inquiries through 3-1-1. With respect to informal inquiries that relate to the legislative function of a Councillor, management believes that establishing standards is best handled in consultation with the Member Services Committee.

If Council directs, management is recommending that these recommendations be tabled before the Member Services Committee for review and input into the development of a process for informal inquiries, where desired.

Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 8 at December 31, 2008

Implementation of this recommendation is 100% complete. Member Services Sub-Committee considered a report on informal inquiries at its meeting on July 7, 2008. A member moved that staff develop guidelines for the different categories of informal inquiries. The vote on the motion failed by a margin of 5-1.

Management: % complete **100%**

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 8

The City Manager's report requires consideration of subject matter and resource requirements in defining an inquiry as "standard" or "significant", however no guidance is provided as to the type of subject matter that differentiates the inquiry as significant.

A template is used for logging Council Inquiries and Motions, however the template does not speak to volumes, types of requests, complexity, staff time or other measures that could be used to enable analyzing trends.

Management indicated a formal process exists for casework inquiries (i.e., requests to Councillors from constituents) through 3-1-1. However this recommendation does not suggest a formal process be put in place for casework inquiries. It suggests the identification of information required to make knowledge based management decisions on efficiency and performance, and to produce useful and relevant reports on the performance of the inquiry process.

Management indicated a process for informal inquiries should be tabled before the Member Services Sub-Committee. As above, this does not speak to the recommendation. That the Sub-Committee considered whether or not a process should be put in place for informal inquiries does not speak to the consideration of the type of information required for trend analysis, efficiency gains, etc. As well, as stated in the previous recommendations, the minutes of the Member Services Sub-Committee demonstrate misinformation and misunderstanding of the key issues, and of the audit recommendations (see recommendation 5 for more details).

Management considers this recommendation to be 100% implemented, but neither management's response to the recommendation, management's representation of the status of implementation, nor the documents provided address this recommendation.

OAG: % complete

0%

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 8 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that there has been little or no action taken to implement this recommendation.

The Member Services Sub-Committee, in accordance with its mandate and Council's delegation, considered this recommendation within the context of the Report on the Informal Inquiry Process (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076), which included both the City Manager's Report on Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process (ACS2008-CMR-OCM-0001) and the Auditor General's report on the 2007 Audit of the Council Request Tracking Processes as supporting documents.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

Management: % complete

100%

2007 Audit Recommendation 9

That management develop plans for the implementation of the necessary information systems and tools, working in collaboration with ITS and operating and administrative staff including:

- Implementing MAP systems at the branch level within departments; and,
- Reviewing existing and required tools within the Mayor's and City Manager's offices.

Management Response to Recommendation 9

Management agrees with this recommendation.

Management agrees that technology could assist in the tracking process of formal inquiries. The City Clerk is investigating an electronic process in collaboration with the IT Services Branch.

If Council directs, management will review these recommendations in consultation with the Member Services Committee.

Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 9 at December 31, 2008

Implementation of this recommendation is considered 100% complete. All formal inquiries and responses are located in a shared area. Staff understands the benefit of a centralized tracking system for formal inquiries and are currently investigating

an electronic process (connected to an electronic agenda process) in collaboration with IT. An IT project charter is anticipated in Q1 2009.

Management: % complete **100%**

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 9

Management indicated that an IT project charter is anticipated in Q1 2009, however evidence of this was not provided.

The City Manager's report requires the use of a tracking system, however evidence of this was not provided.

Management responded that this recommendation is 100% completed, and that all formal inquiries and responses are located in a shared area. However, this recommendation does not suggest the use of a shared area, and a shared area does not fully address the issues that this recommendation is meant to alleviate through the implementation of information systems, including:

- Inability to reference previous similar requests to gain efficiencies and avoid duplication of effort in responding to current requests;
- Lost or forgotten hallway or phone requests; and,
- Requests directed to an inappropriate area.

OAG: % complete **0%**

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 9 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that there has been little or no action taken to implement this recommendation.

An ITS Project Charter (IT002506) was created in Q2 2009 which includes the requirement to track motions within the Council Agenda Building Tool. This project is still in the ITS development phase and is expected to be operational in Q1 2011.

In the interim, City Manager's Office staff implemented a tracking system in 2008 using MS Excel. The *Outstanding Motions - Departmental Log* is located in a shared drive and is accessible to all departmental/branch leads and Council/Committee Coordinators. These staff are able to review existing and completed motions to determine if similar work has previously been requested/completed. Leads provide regular status updates using the *Outstanding Motions - Departmental Log*, which are then provided to the Council/Committee Coordinator for distribution to Council on a bi-monthly basis.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

Management: % complete **100%**

2007 Audit Recommendation 10

That management clarify which inquiries and requests are to be logged (i.e., all requests for which a written record or paper trail exists via email, memo, letter or inquiry form).

Management Response to Recommendation 10

Management agrees with this recommendation.

Management confirms that all formal inquiries are logged.

With regard to informal inquiries, if Council directs, management will review these recommendations in consultation with the Member Services Committee.

Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 10 at December 31, 2008

Implementation of this recommendation is 100% complete. At its meeting of June 11, 2008 Council approved a report from the City Manager outlining a new formal inquiry and motion tracking process. An inquiry log and related protocols have been established. Member Services Sub-Committee considered a report on informal inquiries at its meeting on July 7, 2008. No further direction was provided to staff at that time with regard to informal inquiries.

Management: % complete *100%*

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 10

The City Manager's Report, approved by Council indicates which inquiries should be logged, but does not consider inquiries other than those that have been formally tabled at Committee or Council. The Report states: "Following the formal tabling, the first point of entry and logging of the inquiry form from the City Clerk's Branch will be to the City Manger's Office..."

As well, for all motions the Report states: "motions will be logged and tracked by Clerk's, using the Inquiries Tracking tool"

OAG: % complete *75%*

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 10 as of Winter 2010

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

The City Manager's Report confirmed that all formal inquiries would be logged and this is currently done using the *Outstanding Motions - Departmental Log*. The decision by Member Services Sub-Committee on the Informal Inquiry Process (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076) report confirmed that informal inquiries would not be logged, thus clear direction exists in that only formal inquiries are logged.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

Management: % complete

100 %

2007 Audit Recommendation 11

That management research the feasibility of and options available for developing a Corporation-wide knowledge database that:

- Allows staff across departments to log new inquiries and requests;
- Provides appropriate access privileges to facilitate the identification of previous like inquiries and requests; and the sharing of potentially relevant existing information, reports and contacts between groups;
- Facilitates searching for previous requests and responses within a department and ideally across departments; and,
- Incorporates built-in quality control mechanisms regarding the reliability of information (i.e., levels of sign-off on reports, memos, etc.).

Management Response to Recommendation 11

Management agrees with this recommendation.

If Council directs, management will review these recommendations in consultation with the Member Services Committee.

Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 11 at December 31, 2008

Implementation of this recommendation is considered 100% complete. All formal inquiries and responses are located in a shared area. Staff understand the benefit of a centralized tracking system for formal inquiries and are currently investigating an electronic process (connected to an electronic agenda process) in collaboration with IT. An IT project charter is anticipated in Q1 2009.

Management: % complete

100%

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 11

Management indicated that an IT project charter is anticipated in Q1 2009, however evidence of this was not provided.

The City Manager's report requires the use of a tracking system, however evidence of this was not provided.

Management responded that this recommendation is 100% completed, and that all formal inquiries and responses are located in a shared area. However, this recommendation does not suggest the use of a shared area, and a shared area does not fully address the issues that this recommendation is meant to alleviate through the implementation of a corporate wide knowledge database.

OAG: % complete**0%****Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 11 as of Winter 2010**

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that there has been little or no action taken to implement this recommendation.

An ITS Project Charter (IT002506) was created in Q2 2009 which includes the requirement to track motions within the Council Agenda Building Tool. This project is still in the ITS development phase and is expected to be operational by Q1 2011.

In the interim, City Manager's Office staff implemented a tracking system in 2008 using MS Excel. The *Outstanding Motions - Departmental Log* is located in a shared drive and is accessible to all departmental and branch leads, who are able to review existing and completed motions to determine if similar work has previously been requested/completed.

Concerning informal inquiries, the direction provided by the Member Services Sub-Committee on July 7, 2008, was that no further action be taken by staff on developing new processes and tools for informal inquiries; as such, no structured logging, tracking and sharing of inquiries and responses has been developed or implemented. Individual departments continue to use various internal methods to ensure that Councillor requests and inquiries are answered.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

Management: % complete**100%****2007 Audit Recommendation 12**

That management consider a phased approach, giving priority to:

- **All inquiries and requests from Council Members as a first step; and,**
- **The needs of departments with interrelated responsibilities (e.g., Public Works and Services, and Planning, Transit and the Environment with respect to environmental issues).**

Management Response to Recommendation 12

Management agrees with this recommendation.

If Council directs, management will review these recommendations in consultation with the Member Services Committee.

Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 12 at December 31, 2008

Implementation of this recommendation is considered 100% complete. The intent of this recommendation is captured within the formal inquiry tracking system, which was approved by Council on June 11, 2008. Member Services Sub-

Committee considered a report on informal inquiries at its meeting on July 7, 2008. No further direction was provided to staff at that time with regard to informal inquiries.

Management: % complete *100%*

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 12

Management indicated the intent of this recommendation is captured in the formal inquiry tracking system (City Manager's Report). However the Report does not discuss a phased approach except in identifying "Significant inquiries" based on subject matter as well as resources. The Report does not speak to significant inquiries in the context of priority, but rather in assessing the need for the inquiry to be tabled as a motion prior to pursuing the matter.

OAG: % complete *0%*

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 12 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that there has been little or no action taken to implement this recommendation.

All Committee and Council inquiries are considered to have equal priority, with the difference in process dependent on the relative significance of each inquiry, specifically whether the inquiry can be responded to within current work plans and resources. Leads provide regular status updates using the *Outstanding Motions - Departmental Log* which are then provided to the Council/Committee Coordinator for distribution to Council on a bi-monthly basis.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

Management: % complete *100%*

2007 Audit Recommendation 13

That management identify required fields and information to be logged into systems to consider the effects on staff workload and avoid excessive data collection.

Management Response to Recommendation 13

Management agrees with this recommendation.

If Council directs, management will review these recommendations in consultation with the Member Services Committee.

Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 13 at December 31, 2008

Implementation of this recommendation is 100% complete. At its meeting of June 11, 2008 Council approved a report from the City Manager outlining a new formal

inquiry and motion tracking process. These elements were included in the newly established protocols.

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

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 13

Required fields and information to be logged is not captured in the formal inquiry tracking process except that the deadline date is to be logged. There is no indication in the City Manager's Report, or in other documents provided that level of effort or other effects on staff workload should be logged. Evidence was not observed that information to be captured was identified to avoid excessive data collection.

OAG: % complete ***0%***

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 13 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that there has been little or no action taken to implement this recommendation.

The Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking process adopted by City Council on June 11, 2008 defines standard inquiries as those that can be completed in the prescribed timelines within existing resources. It further defines significant inquiries as those that cannot be responded to in a timely manner with existing resources. There is a separate process for each type of inquiry. Further, the process includes staff checking with the author of the inquiry (or mover of the motion) to ensure that staff understands the intent of the inquiry/motion in order to avoid excessive data collection. As the level of effort is substantially defined by the nature of the inquiry and further verification with the appropriate elected official is in place to ensure that the data collected meets the intent, management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

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

2007 Audit Recommendation 14

That management assign corporate oversight responsibility for the management of inquiry and request processes to the BTS Department.

Management Response to Recommendation 14

Management agrees with this recommendation.

Management confirms that the City Clerk will continue to have oversight responsibility for formal inquiries raised through the legislative process.

If Council directs, management will review the recommendations regarding informal inquiries in consultation with the Member Services Committee.

Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 14 at December 31, 2008

Implementation of this recommendation is 100% complete. At its meeting of June 11, 2008 Council approved a report from the City Manager outlining a new formal inquiry and motion tracking process. New protocols ensure greater corporate oversight of inquiries. Member Services Sub-Committee considered a report on informal inquiries at its meeting on July 7, 2008. No further direction was provided to staff at that time with regard to informal inquiries.

Management: % complete **100%**

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 14

Management's response indicates the new protocols in the City Manager's Report ensure greater corporate oversight of inquiries. While having a documented process in place contributes to improved accountability and communication to Council, the Report fails to address several key areas of oversight that this recommendation seeks to address. The Report does not identify who has responsibility in dealing with formal and informal inquiries; it does not establish standards, targets, or criteria that guide performance, nor does it require the monitoring and reporting of trends and service levels. The Report does not describe how problems within the system will become known, nor does it assign responsibility to pursue process improvement opportunities. The City Manager's report, therefore, does not provide sufficient evidence that this recommendation has been addressed related to formal inquiries.

Management's response refers to the informal inquiries discussion by the Member Services Sub-Committee. However, a discussion of the need for oversight of the informal inquiry process was not observed in the minutes of this meeting. The Report on Informal Inquiries is lacking in content, and more specifically does not contain an assessment of the need for oversight of informal inquiries. That the Member Services Sub-Committee considered this report in the meeting therefore, does not provide sufficient evidence that this recommendation has been addressed related to informal inquiries.

OAG: % complete **0%**

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 14 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that there has been little or no action taken to implement this recommendation.

The City Manager's Report provides corporate oversight responsibility for formal inquiries in the implementation of the *Outstanding Motions - Departmental Log* and the approved standards of prescribed timelines for communication to Councillors.

In addition, the Member Services Sub-Committee, in accordance with its mandate and Council's delegation, considered this recommendation within the context of the Report on the Informal Inquiry Process (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076), which included both the City Manager's Report on Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process (ACS2008-CMR-OCM-0001) and the Auditor General's report on the 2007 Audit of the Council Request Tracking Processes as supporting documents.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

Management: % complete *100%*

2007 Audit Recommendation 15

That management establish a mandate to provide leadership and support to the Corporation as outlined by the recommendations contained in this report.

Management Response to Recommendation 15

Management agrees with this recommendation.

If Council directs, management will review these recommendations in consultation with the Member Services Committee.

Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 15 at December 31, 2008

Implementation of this recommendation is 100% complete. At its meeting of 11 June 2008, Council approved a report from the City Manager outlining a new formal inquiry and motion tracking process. An inquiry log and related protocols have been established.

Management: % complete *100%*

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 15

The City Manager's Report does not contain a mandate. The Report describes improved protocols in the formal inquiry process, but does not include a description of a mandate to provide leadership and support to the Corporation.

OAG: % complete *0%*

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 15 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that there has been little or no action taken to implement this recommendation.

The City Clerk's Office has the mandate for the formal inquiries process, and leadership is provided by the City Manager's Office by virtue of their positions.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

Management: % complete *100%*

2007 Audit Recommendation 16

That management work in close collaboration with the City Clerk's Branch in developing protocols and tools with respect to inquiries that are routed through the formal meeting process.

Management Response to Recommendation 16

Management agrees with this recommendation.

As indicated above, the City Manager, City Solicitor and the City Clerk were tasked to develop and recommend improvements to inquiry and motion 'management' by staff at the February 8, 2008 LRFP meeting. By the time this report is published, the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and City Council will have addressed those recommendations.

Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 16 at December 31, 2008

Implementation of this recommendation is 100% complete. At its meeting of 11 June 2008, Council approved a report from the City Manager outlining a new formal inquiry and motion tracking process. An inquiry log and related protocols have been established.

Management: % complete **100%**

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 16

The City Manager's Report includes protocols for the operations of the formal inquiries process. The Report does not include adequate protocols for tracking and monitoring the process in order to identify whether the process is functioning to expectations, or to identify areas of weakness and opportunities for improvements.

OAG: % complete **50%**

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 16 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that action has been initiated to implement this recommendation but it is not yet considered complete.

Throughout the development and implementation of the City Manager's Report, the City Clerk's branch worked collaboratively with the City Manager and the City Solicitor to bring forward new formal inquiry protocols and tools that would dovetail into existing motion procedures.

The issue of the effectiveness of the new process was raised as part of the informal interviews with elected officials that occurred as part of the Mid-Term Governance Review process. As a result of those interviews and subsequent recommendations in the Mid-Term Governance Report, responses to Council Inquiries are now listed

on relevant Standing Committee agendas prior to being brought to Council. Furthermore, the Formal Inquiry and Motion processes will form part of the regular Governance review which occurs cyclically, at the midpoint and end of each Term of Council.

Management: % complete

100%

2007 Audit Recommendation 17

That management determine resource requirements for the assumption of these responsibilities and explore options for proceeding within existing resources including:

- Reviewing existing resources within BTS and the City Clerk's Branch;
- Exploring the possible secondment of a resource from within the City Clerk's Branch to work under BTS leadership for a fixed term to lend expertise and to facilitate changes with respect to the formal inquiries process;
- Exploring the possible transfer or secondment of a resource from among the SIBP groups in the operating departments of the City; and,
- Consideration of staff and contract resource possibilities.

Management Response to Recommendation 17

Management agrees with this recommendation.

If Council directs, management will review these recommendations in consultation with the Member Services Committee.

Management Representation of the Status of Implementation of Recommendation 17 at December 31, 2008

Implementation of this recommendation is considered 100% complete. Further exploration of resource requirements was not pursued, as it was not directed by Council. At its meeting of 11 June 2008, Council approved a report from the City Manager outlining a new formal inquiry and motion tracking process. An inquiry log and related protocols have been established. Member Services Sub-Committee considered a report on informal inquiries at its meeting on July 7, 2008. No further direction was provided to staff at that time.

Management: % complete

100%

OAG's Follow-up Audit Findings regarding Recommendation 17

The following inconsistencies are noted in management's response and representation of the status of implementation to this recommendation:

1. Management agreed with this recommendation;
2. Management indicated that further exploration of resource requirements was not pursued (i.e., that implementation of this recommendation has not been undertaken); and,

3. Management represented that this recommendation has been completely implemented (100%).

Management's response refers to the City Manager's Report that was approved by Council. However, the Report does not contain discussion of resource requirements, nor does it explore options for proceeding within existing resources. The City Manager's Report therefore, is not relevant to this recommendation.

Management's response refers to an inquiry log and related protocols that have been established. As above, an inquiry log and related protocols are not relevant items to consider in addressing this recommendation, which seeks a knowledge based, and analytical approach to appropriately attaining and assigning resource requirements.

Management's response goes on to refer to the report on informal inquiries that was considered at the Member Services Sub-Committee meeting of June 11, 2008, and states that no further direction was provided at that time. As has been stated several times throughout this document, the report on informal inquiries is lacking in content, and more specifically does not contain any discussion of the benefits or the need to determine resource requirements, or to explore options for proceeding within existing resources. That the report was considered during the meeting therefore is not relevant to this recommendation. That further direction was not provided at that time also lacks relevance to this recommendation.

No evidence was provided that indicates a consideration of this recommendation, or that indicates Council decision that the implementation of this recommendation is not necessary.

OAG: % complete *0%*

Management Representation of Status of Implementation of Recommendation 17 as of Winter 2010

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's follow-up audit finding that there has been little or no action taken to implement this recommendation.

The Member Services Sub-Committee, in accordance with its mandate and Council's delegation, considered this recommendation within the context of the Report on the Informal Inquiry Process (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076), which included both the City Manager's Report on Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process (ACS2008-CMR-OCM-0001), and the Auditor General's report on the 2007 Audit of the Council Request Tracking Processes as supporting documents.

The Member Services Sub-Committee did not recommend any changes to the current processes for dealing with informal inquiries. Therefore, the additional recommendations related to informal inquiries in the Auditor General's original report were not adopted and no additional staff resources were required.

Management considers implementation of this recommendation to be complete.

Management: % 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	1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17	12	70%
ACTION INITIATED	25 – 49	2, 3	2	12%
PARTIALLY COMPLETE	50 – 74	16	1	6%
SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE	75 – 99	7, 10	2	12%
COMPLETE	100	-	-	-
TOTAL			17	100%

5 CONCLUSION

Management has assessed all but one of the 17 recommendations in this audit as having been completely implemented. According to Management's comments, this assessment is, in general, the result of the following:

- Approval on June 11, 2008 of the City Manager's report on the Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process; and,
- The Deputy City Clerk's report on the Informal Inquiry Process to the Member Services Sub-Committee on July 7, 2008 and subsequent discussion at that meeting.

These reports fail to address the recommendations as follows:

1. Although the City Manager's report provides some improved protocols for the operation of the formal inquiry process, it does not speak to the need to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of the process in achieving its mandate. Furthermore, the Report does not provide improved protocols or a defined process for informal inquiries (see Appendix 1).
2. The Report on the Informal Inquiry Process from the Deputy City Clerk to Member Services Sub-Committee contains nothing related to informal inquiries. It does not identify issues, and it does not recommend any process improvements. It does not discuss the need to establish oversight in the process, nor does it identify key indicators that should be tracked in order to conduct appropriate monitoring (see Appendix 2).
3. The minutes of Member Services Sub-Committee meeting held July 7, 2008 (see Appendix 3), indicate that the discussion did not fully consider the issues with the current process, the need for oversight, the need to consider how to fulfill

resource requirements, or the benefits to be derived from tracking and monitoring relevant data. The Committee considered the Report on the Informal Inquiry Process. However, given the lack of content in the report, the extent to which the Committee's consideration of the report was effective in assessing the issues with the current process, and whether the process is in need of improvement is questionable.

4. It is important to note that this audit was undertaken largely because of concerns raised by a number of members of Council regarding the current process for tracking requests. Similar concerns also arose in past audits including Surface Operations in 2006 and Real Estate Management in 2005. As such, the assertion in the Member Services Sub-Committee minutes from July 2008 that "the Auditor General was the only person making this point" clearly demonstrates misinformation. Management has assessed that the recommendations have been completely implemented, however, management's responses, along with the evidence reviewed demonstrate a lack of action toward implementation. As such, the issues raised in the 2007 audit remain unresolved.

Overall Management Response

Management disagrees with the Auditor General's conclusion, and his assertion that the steps taken to address the original recommendations "demonstrate a lack of action toward implementation".

The following process improvements have been implemented ensuring the ongoing logging, monitoring and reporting of formal inquiries. The City Manager's Report on the Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process (ACS2008-CMR-OCM-0001) as approved by Council on June 11, 2008, implemented the *Outstanding Motions - Departmental Log* to log and monitor formal inquiries, the bi-monthly reporting to Council of outstanding inquiries, default deadlines with the expectation that all formal inquiries be responded to at the next Committee/Council meeting and if this is not possible, communication to the Councillor and Committee/Council Co-ordinator indicating when the response can be expected. Further, the Mid-Term Governance Review added the additional step that Council Inquiries be placed on the relevant Standing Committee agenda prior to their listing on a Council agenda to enable the relevant Standing Committee to request further action if necessary.

The action taken on informal inquiries included the tabling and consideration of the Informal Inquiry Process (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076) report at the Member Services Sub-Committee on July 7, 2008. The Auditor General's comments that the tabled report was lacking in content and failed to identify any issues with the current process and whether the process was in need of improvement, is unwarranted as the report on the Informal Inquiry Process (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076) included both the City Manager's Report on Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Processes (ACS2008-CMR-OCM-0001) and the Auditor General's 2007 Audit of the Council

Request Tracking Processes as supporting documents, ensuring that the Member Services Sub-Committee reviewed all of the issues identified by the Auditor General.

The Member Services Sub-Committee fully considered the recommendations identified within the 2007 Audit of the Council Request Tracking Processes within the context of the Report on the Informal Inquiry Process (ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076), and the direction provided by the Member Services Sub-Committee was that no further action be taken by staff on informal inquiries. The decision by Member Services Sub-Committee meant that staff did not proceed with the Auditor General's recommendations suggesting the implementation of structured logging, tracking, and monitoring of informal inquiries. Individual departments continue to use various internal methods to ensure that Councillor requests and inquiries are answered.

6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

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

Appendix 1

2. COUNCIL INQUIRY/MOTION TRACKING PROCESS

PROCESSUS DE SUIVI DES DEMANDES DE RENSEIGNEMENTS ET DES MOTIONS DU CONSEIL MUNICIPAL

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

That Council approve

1. **The Formal Inquiry and Motion Tracking Process be adopted as outlined in this report; and**
2. **Members Services Committee be tasked with identifying issues and recommending any process improvements for informal inquiries.**

RECOMMANDATIONS DU COMITÉ

Que le Conseil approuve :

1. **le processus de suivi des demandes de renseignements et des motions officielles soit adopté tel qu'exposé dans le présent rapport; et**
2. **le Comité des services aux membres soit chargé de cerner les questions relatives aux demandes de renseignements non officielles et de recommander, à ce sujet, des améliorations au processus de suivi.**

DOCUMENTATION

1. City Manager's report dated 27 May 2008 (ACS2008-CMR-OCM-0001).

Report to/Rapport au :

**Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee
Comité des services organisationnels et du développement économique**

and Council / et au Conseil

27 May 2008 / le 27 mai 2008

**Submitted by/Soumis par : Kent Kirkpatrick,
City Manager/Directeur des services municipaux**

*Contact Person/Personne ressource : Leslie Donnelly, Deputy City Clerk/Greffière adjointe
City Clerk's Branch/Direction du greffe
(613) 580-2424 x28857, leslie.donnelly@ottawa.ca*

City Wide/à l'échelle de la Ville

Ref N°: ACS2008-CMR-OCM-0001

COUNCIL INQUIRY/MOTION TRACKING PROCESS

SUBJECT:

**PROCESSUS DE SUIVI DES DEMANDES DE RENSEIGNEMENTS
ET DES MOTIONS DU CONSEIL MUNICIPAL**

OBJET :

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend to Council that:

- 1. The Formal Inquiry and Motion Tracking Process be adopted as outlined in this report; and**
- 2. Members Services Committee be tasked with identifying issues and recommending any process improvements for informal inquiries.**

RECOMMANDATIONS DU RAPPORT

Que le Comité des services organisationnels et du développement économique recommande au Conseil que :

- 1. Le processus de suivi des demandes de renseignements et des motions officielles soit adopté tel qu'exposé dans le présent rapport; et**

2. **Le Comité des services aux membres soit chargé de cerner les questions relatives aux demandes de renseignements non officielles et de recommander, à ce sujet, des améliorations au processus de suivi.**

BACKGROUND

During the February 8, 2008 meeting of the Long-Range Financial Plan (LRFP) Sub-Committee, a number of issues were raised regarding the formal and informal inquiries directed to the administration by elected officials. Some of issues specifically identified included:

- the need to improve response times and accountability for formal and informal inquiries;
- identifying the number of resources being directed towards responding to informal inquiries; and
- identifying where formal and/or informal Councillor inquiries could shift the City's workplan.

Similar issues were identified for Committee and Council motions.

As a result of the discussion, the City Manager, City Solicitor and City Clerk were tasked to develop and recommend clear and consistent guidelines for the inquiry and motion process, and report through the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee with recommendations.

In response, staff is proposing protocols for Council's consideration for the following three separate but related categories:

1. Formal Inquiries arising out of Standing Committees and Council;
2. Formal Motions approved by Standing Committee and/or Council; and
3. Informal Inquiries from members of Council to staff.

In each case, the recommended process attempts to incorporate clear accountabilities, ensure that staff are responsive to Councillors, that Councillors are aware of the resources required to respond to inquiries and that Council's overall workplan and priorities are understood, without being unduly process-heavy or inflexible.

At the February 27, 2008 City Council meeting, Councillor Hunter further identified the need to formalize staff directions as part of the record of Committee and Council meetings, and this report also incorporates recommendations to address that issue.

DISCUSSION

1. **Formal Inquiries arising out of Standing Committees and Council**

The definition of a "formal" inquiry is an inquiry which is filed in writing at a Committee or Council meeting (Section 31 of the By-law No. 206-462 - A by-law of the City of Ottawa to govern the proceedings of the Council and its Committees and to repeal By-law No. 2005-431 – i.e. the *Procedure By-law* - Reference Document 1).

It is a member of Council's right to raise any matter to a Committee or Council that they wish to raise. However, to be considered a formal inquiry, it must be in accordance with the process set out in the *Procedure By-law*.

Current Process

The current process is managed by the City Clerk's Branch through the City Council and Standing Committee Coordinators. A written inquiry must be submitted before the end of a Committee or Council meeting to be formally raised and read into the record of the meeting minutes. Immediately following the meeting, the Coordinator prepares the inquiry form and sends it to the appropriate Department Head(s) and Branch Director(s) for response. Directions with respect to the distribution of the response to the inquiry are noted in the form for action by the applicable department. Although a record of all inquiries and responses are maintained and monitored by the City Clerk's office, the responsibility for responding to the inquiry and ensuring the Clerk's office is aware of the response rests with the assigned Branch Director and Department Head.

In accordance with section 31 (3) of the *Procedure By-law*, a quarterly report to Council is presented on all outstanding inquiries.

Recommended Process

While the majority of majority of formal inquiries raised at Standing Committee and Council are responded to within a reasonable amount of time, the concerns identified with the existing process included:

- No clear timelines for response have been established, so accountability for responses is hampered;
- No mechanism exists for staff to identify when responding to a request will require additional resources that cannot be accommodated within the existing workplan; and
- The response to the inquiry does not form part of the formal record.

To address these issues, staff are recommending a change to the current inquiry intake process as follows:

All inquiries:

- Following the formal tabling of an inquiry at the committee or Council meeting, the first point of entry and logging of the inquiry form from the City Clerk's Branch will be to the City Manager's Office with a copy to the applicable Department Head (through the Strategic Initiative and Business Planning Unit).
- The City Manager, or his designate, in consultation with the applicable Department Head, will review the inquiry to determine if it falls within the category of

- (i) a *standard inquiry* that can be responded to using existing resources and information within a reasonable amount of time; or
- (ii) a *significant inquiry* in terms of either the subject matter of the inquiry and/or the implications for staff to prepare a quality response within a reasonable amount of time.

Process for Standard Inquiries

Where an inquiry can be responded to using existing resources and information within a reasonable amount of time, the recommended process is:

1. If the response can be ready for the next Committee/Council meeting, the Branch Director will prepare the response in accordance with the Department's practices.

The response will be sent to the Councillor, copied to all members of Council and the Committee/Council Co-ordinator, who will formally list the response under correspondence on the Committee agenda.

2. If the response will be ready for a future meeting, the Branch Director will send a memo to the Councillor and the Committee/Council Co-ordinator indicating when the response can be expected.

The Committee/Council Co-ordinator will note the deadline in the Inquiry Tracking database. It is the responsibility of the Branch Director to inform the Councillor and the Co-ordinator if deadlines are going to be missed.

The response will be prepared according to the Department's normal practice. When ready, the response will be sent to the Councillor, copied to all Councillors and the Committee/Council Co-ordinator, who will formally list the response under correspondence on the Committee/Council agenda.

Process for Significant Inquiries

Where an inquiry cannot be responded to using existing resources and information within a reasonable amount of time, the inquiry would be deemed significant. The recommended process for significant inquiries is:

1. The Branch Director would prepare a memo to the Councillor, copying Council and the Committee/Council Co-ordinator, outlining what would be required for the inquiry to be answered. This would be listed on the next Committee/Council Agenda as correspondence.
2. If the Councillor wished the inquiry to proceed, s/he would move the inquiry as a motion.

At the present time, all formal inquiries and responses are located in a shared area accessible to applicable staff in the City Clerk's Branch. Staff understand the benefit of a centralized tracking system for formal inquiries and are investigating an electronic process (connected to an electronic agenda process) in collaboration with the Information Technology Services Branch. In the interim, access to all formal inquiries and responses will be expanded to include the relevant staff in the Mayor's office, departmental offices and members of Council and their staff.

2. Formal Motions approved by Standing Committee and/or Council

As with formal inquiries, Motions must be tabled with the applicable committee or Council under the "Notice of Motion" section. (Document 1 - the *Procedure By-law* - Section 55) At the following meeting, the Motion is located under the "Motions of which Notice has Been Given Previously", at which time the City Manager or the applicable Department Head must provide any relevant information with regard to the impact and implications should the Motion be considered and approved.

In accordance with Section 80 of the *Procedure By-law* (Document 1), there are rules with respect to a motion or recommendation to approve or direct the expenditure of funds or the raising of revenue over and above an estimate or revenue measure previously approved by Council.

On occasion, Motions are considered by Committee and/or Council without first going through the Notice of Motion requirement. In this case, waiver of the rules of procedure is required.

Current Process

Currently, there is no formal process for tracking motions once they are approved. Each Department manages their Committee/Council disposition, normally through their advanced legislative agenda process. A record of all motions exists only in meeting minutes, and the responsibility for acting on motions rests with the assigned Branch Director and Department Head.

Recommended Process

Some of the concerns identified with the existing process included:

- Motions are not tracked, so there is no mechanism of ensuring they have been acted on;
- Staff sometimes interpret motions without checking the intent with the mover, resulting in outcomes that were not intended;
- Where no clear timelines for acting on the motion have been established, accountability for action is reduced; and
- Although most motions are referenced in staff reports responding to the motion, this is a practice rather than a protocol.

In addition, while the majority of motions raised at Standing Committee and Council can be responded to within a reasonable amount of time using existing resources, there are motions approved by Council that will require enough resources to shift work already approved in a branch workplan. There is currently no mechanism to address this issue.

To address these issues, staff are recommending a change to the current motion process as follows:

All motions:

- Motions will now be logged and tracked by Clerk's, using the Inquiries Tracking tool.
- Council reports will include the originating motion within the responsive report.
- Following the adoption of a Motion at Standing Committee or Council, the first point of entry and logging of the motion form from the City Clerk's Branch will be to the Deputy City Manager/Executive Director's Office (through the Strategic Initiative and Business Planning Unit) with a copy to the applicable Branch Director.
- The Deputy City Manager, or designate, in consultation with the applicable Branch Director, will review the motion to determine if it can be accommodated within existing budgets and workplans.

Process for Motions Within Existing Workplans

1. The Branch Director will review the motion and notify the Committee/Council Co-ordinator of how and when the motion will be responded to (e.g. staff report by Fall 2008).
2. The Co-ordinator will add this to the Inquiry/Motion Tracking tool.
3. The Branch Director will clearly tie the response to the motion once final, notifying the Co-ordinator.

Process for Motions that Cannot be Accommodated Within Existing Resources/Workplans

1. The Branch Director/Department will notify the Committee/Council Co-ordinator that the motion cannot be accommodated within existing resources/workplans, and indicate that a White Paper will be provided to the relevant Standing Committee/Council meeting within one month's time, ideally at the next meeting. This White Paper is not intended to generate a reconsideration of Council's intent. Rather, it should allow Council to determine where this new priority fits within the context of all other Branch/Departmental priorities in terms of timelines and resources.

The White Paper, therefore, will outline all the relevant issues surrounding the implementation of the motion, including the impact on the Branch's current workplan and any resource issues. It will provide options regarding the potential for timeline changes and/or resource adjustments for Committee/Council's

consideration.

2. If the White Paper is prepared in response to a Standing Committee motion that has not gone to Council, any recommendations arising from the White Paper will need to also be approved by Council (as it takes the Branch away from existing workplans).

Tracking Formal Inquiries and Motions

Bi-monthly updates on outstanding items and the estimated target date and status will replace the current quarterly reporting. This bi-monthly status update will be formally placed on the Committee or Council agenda, at the second meeting of every second month. This will be in the form of an information item vs. an information previously distributed item (so that waiver of the rules of procedure to discuss the information report is not required).

At the present time, all formal inquiries and responses are located in a shared area accessible to applicable staff in the City Clerk's Branch. Staff understand the benefit of a centralized tracking system for formal inquiries and are investigating an electronic process in collaboration with the Information Technology Services Branch. In the interim, access to all formal inquiries and responses will be expanded to include the relevant staff in the Mayor's office, departmental offices and members of Council and their staff.

It is anticipated that this will be in place by the end of the summer.

3. Informal Inquiries from members of Council to staff

As illustrated in the presentations to the LRFP Sub-Committee on February 8, 2008, a majority of the over 14,000 inquiries raised by members of Council are raised through a variety of means such as verbal or e-mail request directly to the Departmental staff, through the 3-1-1 system or other venues. Any inquiry that is not raised through the formal council process is defined as "informal", and therefore fall under a different process for intake, action, tracking, reporting and monitoring.

Informal inquiries take a variety of forms and are presented for a variety of reasons. Forms can range, for example, from a 'hallway chat' to a brief discussion off-line at Council or Committee to an email sent by elected representatives' staff to a call to 311 to a formal meeting with an elected representative. Reasons can range, for example, from constituency casework to information required on an 'issue of the day' to more detailed information required on a staff report prior to consideration to information required by an elected official wishing to bring a new policy forward. Most departments have developed internal processes for responding to informal inquiries from elected representatives, but these are not consistent across departments, nor do they necessarily account for all forms of inquiries.

While issues have been raised generically regarding informal inquiries (slow response times, inconsistent responses to similar questions, inappropriately sharing responses or not sharing responses, duplication of effort for cases referred to 311 and the department head, etc.), it is

difficult for staff to recommend a single process that would be appropriate for all types of informal inquiries.

Further, staff believes that, given the wide variety of informal inquiries, it would be ineffective to develop protocols without having a thorough understanding of what is wrong with what is happening now in each category and what Councillors want and need in each given category. It is recommended that, if Council wishes to track informal inquiries, the Member Services Sub-Committee be asked to undertake this work with staff to review current approaches to informal inquiries (e.g. casework, policy, etc) and investigate defining categories and establishing response standards and tracking for informal inquiries. Examples of areas that could be examined by the Members Services Committee include (but are not limited to) the development of a corporate-wide knowledge database that would provide many functions such as logging and maintenance, sharing of information for previous like inquiries, facilitate searching mechanisms and incorporates built-in quality control mechanisms regarding the reliability of information.

It is believed that once consultation is undertaken with the Members Services Committee, staff would be in a better position to further investigate technological options as well as develop the appropriate processes and protocol to manage those informal inquiries the Committee recommends be tracked.

Staff direction from Committee/Council

At the February 27, 2008 City Council meeting, Councillor Hunter identified the need to formalize staff directions as part of the record of Committee and Council meetings. Immediately following the adoption of this report by Council, it is recommended that all directions to staff be formally noted in the minutes.

Staff do not have a recommendation regarding whether staff direction should be incorporated as part of the Inquiry/Motion tracking. If Council wishes, it could be captured and reported on for Council's information.

CONSULTATION

As this is an internal matter, no public consultations were required.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Document 1: *Procedure By-Law* (By-Law 2006-462) – Held on file with the City Clerk

DISPOSITION

Following the adoption of this report, Clerk's staff will work with Information Technology staff to put the process in place by the fall. Any changes required to the *Procedure By-law* will be incorporated as part of the Mid-term Governance Review.

Appendix 2

Report to/Rapport au :

**Member Services Sub-Committee
Sous-comité des services aux membres**

27 June 2008 / le 27 juin 2008

Submitted by/Soumis par : Leslie Donnelly, Deputy City Clerk

*Contact Person/Personne ressource : Leslie Donnelly, Deputy City Clerk
City Clerk's Branch/Direction du greffe
(613) 580-2424 x28857, Leslie.Donnelly@ottawa.ca*

Ref N°: ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076

INFORMAL INQUIRY PROCESS

SUBJECT:

**OBJET : PROCESSUS DES DEMANDES DE RENSEIGNEMENTS NON
 OFFICIELLES**

REPORT RECOMMENDATION

That the Member Services Sub-Committee consider this report as directed by Council at its meeting of June 11, 2008.

RECOMMANDATION DU RAPPORT

Que le Sous-comité des services aux membres examine ce rapport tel qu'il a été demandé par le Conseil municipal à sa réunion du 11 juin 2008.

BACKGROUND

On June 11, 2008, City Council considered the staff report entitled "Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process". The Member Services Sub-Committee was directed to consider the Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process report as per the following recommendation:

That Council approve

- 1. The Formal Inquiry and Motion Tracking Process be adopted as outlined in this report; and**
- 2. Members Services Committee be tasked with identifying issues and recommending any process improvements for informal inquiries.**

City Council also received the Auditor General's detailed "Audit of the Council Request Tracking Processes" on June 11, 2008 and tabled the reports for public delegations. This report is directly related to the Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process report.

DISCUSSION

The Member Services Sub-Committee was directed to consider the Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process report in order to identify issues and recommend any process improvements for informal inquiries.

CONSULTATION

The attached reports involved consultation with staff and Members of Council.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications in considering this report.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Document 1 – Council Inquiry/Motion Tracking Process

Document 2 – Audit of the Council Request Tracking Processes (*held on file with the City Clerk*)

DISPOSITION

The City Clerk's Branch will execute any decision of the Member Services Sub-Committee.

Appendix 3

Member Services Sub-Committee
Sous-comité des services aux membres

MINUTES 2 / PROCÈS-VERBAL 2

Monday 7 July 2008, 10:00 a.m.
le lundi 7 juillet 2008, 10 h

Colonel By Room, 110 Laurier Avenue West
Salle Colonel By, 110, avenue Laurier ouest

Present / Présent : Councillors / Conseillers R. Chiarelli, A. Cullen,
D. Deans, E. El-Chantiry, P. Feltmate, M. McRae

Absent / Absent : Councillor / Conseillère C. Leadman (Regrets /
excuses)

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
DÉCLARATIONS D'INTÉRÊT

No declarations of interest were filed.

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR/VICE-CHAIR
ÉLECTION DE PRÉSIDENT/VICE-PRÉSIDENT

Moved by Councillor M. McRae

That Councillor P. Feltmate be elected as Chair and that Councillor R.
Chiarelli be elected as vice-chair.

CARRIED

2. INFORMAL INQUIRY PROCESS
PROCESSUS DES DEMANDES DE RENSEIGNEMENTS NON OFFICIELLES
ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0076

Leslie Donnelly, Deputy City Clerk explained that this matter was referred to the Member Services Sub-Committee by City Council at their June 11, 2008 meeting. The Auditor General has recommended that a process for informal inquiries be investigated. Ms. Donnelly noted there are many kinds of informal inquiries including emails, phone calls, and hallway chats. There are no one-size fits all. Ms. Donnelly requested that the Sub-Committee provide some direction on whether Members of Council would like to have a process of tracking informal inquiries.

Councillor Cullen noted that this matter had been referred to the Member Services Sub-Committee to determine which kinds of inquiries need to be

tracked or is the system working now. The Councillor queried whether establishing a process for informal inquiries would turn them into a type of formal inquiry. He further suggested that any councillor who is unhappy with the results of an informal inquiry can access the formal inquiry process. Councillor Cullen felt that the informal process was working and was happy to receive the report.

Councillor Chiarelli agreed with Councillor Cullen regarding a formal tracking process. The Councillor felt there was a need for individuals to be able to talk off the record and have informal discussions.

Councillor Deans agreed with merits of a formal process. The Councillor noted that there are times when a Councillor may want to make an inquiry and would like to maintain a certain level of privacy regarding the inquiry. She further noted that there presently does not exist any guidelines and that such guidelines are necessary for staff to understand the process.

Moved by Councillor D. Deans:

BE IT RESOLVED that staff be directed to develop guidelines for the different categories of informal inquiries and that these guidelines be brought forward to Member Services Committee in early 2009.

Councillor Chiarelli noted that both local school boards started developing rules for inquiries and now the board requires a majority vote to simply make an inquiry. The Councillor felt that creating a formal process was a slippery slope and that the real problem was frivolous inquiries in lieu of doing homework. He suggested the solution may be to avoid frivolous inquiries through "peer pressure."

Councillor Chiarelli suggested that improvements could be made to the way Inquiries are presented to Council. He suggested that in the title of the inquiry document, there could be a two or three word description of the subject. The Deputy City Clerk indicated that she would take this as direction.

Pierre Pagé, City Clerk, confirmed that the City Clerk's Office always responds to the Councillor who made the inquiry, unless told otherwise. If staff believed there would be a benefit in circulating the response more widely, staff would request permission from the Councillor. The City Clerk agreed to circulate a reminder to staff regarding this protocol.

Councillor McRae asked how inquiries are handled now and what the reason for the change was.

The City Clerk noted that with formal inquiries, a response was required by the next Council meeting.

Ms. Donnelly noted that the impetus for this discussion came out of a debate during the administrative reviews at the Long Range Financial Planning Sub-Committee ("LRFP"). The issues regarding formal inquiries were raised at the LRFP meeting and a protocol was adopted by Council to address those issues. Ms. Donnelly briefly described the process for formal inquiries.

Ms. Donnelly continued that the issue with informal inquiries was part of the Auditor General's Audit of the Council Request Tracking Process. He suggested that an IT process or bank of responses be put together. All requests should be formalized. Not a council direction or staff. She noted there are many kinds of informal inquiries and then posed the question of whether such things as casework and questions to the Clerk's Office regarding Councillors' budget and office issues were included in this definition. She noted that the Auditor General was the only individual making this point.

The City Clerk suggested that formalizing informal inquiries could lead to more staffing requirements.

Councillor McRae felt that the current system is not broken. She suggested that it is a slippery slope of bureaucracy, with staff deciding if it is formal or informal. She suggested that a message be forwarded to the City Manager and all Deputy City Managers that if a Councillor asks a question an answer must be provided. The Councillor maintained that if staff answered questions there would be fewer inquiries.

Councillor Cullen spoke to Councillor Deans' motion. The Councillor did not support the motion and advised that if he believed an issue to be sensitive, he informs staff. Further, the Councillor indicates when he would like the information sent directly to him or that it should be circulated to all Members of Council. He felt that it is the responsibility of the Councillor to indicate what should be done with the information. Councillor Cullen was not prepared to support the motion and suggested that the Auditor General was looking to create a paper trail. He noted that once you formalize informal inquiries they are no longer informal. The Councillor believes that it creates unnecessary work and you do not achieve what you want to.

Councillor Chiarelli stated his agreement with Councillor Cullen.

Councillor Deans remarked that given the wide variety of informal inquiries, we are not going to formalize the process. She felt that some guidelines would help to keep them informal. The Councillor understood the concerns about creating a formalized process and was looking to continue to allow informal inquiry process. However, the Councillor felt there was a need to establish guidelines to ensure that the informal process can continue.

Ms. Donnelly sought some clarification from the Committee. She noted that there was frustration on the part of Councillors' Offices with staff for not understanding the timelines and that there was frustration on the part of staff concerning Councillors asking the same question at several levels, the result being that several people are inadvertently doing the same work. Ms. Donnelly suggested that practices are useful to both groups for clarity. For example, an acknowledgement of receipt of inquiry would provide staff with an understanding of the timeline and this could be simple and not onerous to do. She was relieved to see the 2009 timeline in Councillor Dean's motion, as staff's hope would be to work on this after the Mid-term Governance Review.

Councillor Deans asked the Deputy City Clerk if she thought it was a beneficial thing to do to which Ms. Donnelly replied only if Councillors feel this is important on their end.

Councillor McRae asked why develop protocols if nothing wrong. She noted that most of the Sub-Committee thought there was nothing wrong with the process and that Councillor Hunter was not in the room.

Ms. Donnelly confirmed that Councillor Hunter only wanted the directions recorded in the minutes.

Councillor McRae concluded that the system is not broken. Councillors simply want answers as fast as they can have them. She noted that most staff do get back to Councillors quickly and that those who do not are the ones that should be dealt with.

Councillor El-Chantiry asked if do Councillors get the answers in an informal way without grandstanding in a public way. Ms. Donnelly responded that this process had been addressed in the council-approved protocol. The Councillor then inquired as to how many of these inquiries are not legitimate. Ms. Donnelly replied that all Councillors' inquiries are legitimate though she indicated that a significant portion of them is casework.

Councillor Chiarelli agreed with Councillor McRae's point about the system not being broken. He also believed that a formal process opens up the issue of privacy. The Councillor maintained that the current process systematically protects privacy and confidentiality of Councillors' ideas in the development phase. Further, to a member of the public, some issues may be highly private (i.e. Making a complaint. The system prevents members of the public from embarrassment and protects privacy. The Councillor continued that unless there is a severe problem, Councillors do not want to formalize the process and invade the public's privacy.

Councillor Brooks inquired as to the mandate of the Member Services Sub-Committee and do recommendations from Sub-Committee have to go to the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee. The Councillor also wanted to know when Motion 35/23 would be dealt with. Chair Feltmate advised that these questions would be dealt with in the subsequent item.

Councillor Deans suggested that her motion was not at odds with the concerns raised by the other Committee members. She asked the City Clerk if he thought it necessary for staff to report.

Mr. Pagé replied that he would not be coming back with a report but stressed that current protocols require that issues remain with Councillor unless they say otherwise and encourages staff to report back quickly on an issue. Councillor Deans asked if he felt there was value in the motion on the table. Mr. Pagé replied that he did feel that there was value.

Chair Feltmate and the Deputy City Clerk clarified the issue regarding Councillor Hunter and directions being reflected in the minutes that had been approved at Council.

The City Clerk indicated that he would send out a notice to staff regarding inquiry protocols including confidentiality. He further confirmed that the description of the inquiry would be included in the inquiry title.

Moved by Councillor D. Deans

BE IT RESOLVED that staff be directed to develop guidelines for the different categories of informal inquiries and that these guidelines be brought forward to Member Services Committee in early 2009

LOST

YEAS (1): D. Deans

NAYS (5): R. Chiarelli, A. Cullen, E. El-Chantiry, P. Feltmate, M. McRae

That the Member Services Sub-Committee consider this report as directed by Council at its meeting of June 11, 2008.

CARRIED

3. CODE OF CONDUCT - VERBAL UPDATE AND REFERRAL FROM COUNCIL
CODE DE CONDUITE - MISE À JOUR VERBALE ET REPORT DU CONSEIL
ACS2008-CMR-CCB-0077

Leslie Donnelly provided a verbal update on the status of the Code of Conduct, indicating that the process was approximately one month behind schedule.

Councillor McRae suggested that this item be deferred to the next meeting to coincide with consideration of the Code of Conduct. Councillor Cullen clarified that when staff come back they will address the motion with respect to Councillors' travel.

Councillor McRae suggested that it was not prudent to have this issue dealt with all over the place in pieces. She clarified that deferral was only for the first clause of the recommendation.

Moved by Councillor M. McRae:

That the following be deferred to the next meeting of the Member Services Sub-Committee

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT as part of a Code of Conduct for City Council a policy be developed that addresses invitations to members of Council from foreign governments for all-expense paid trips.

CARRIED

With respect to the second clause of the recommendation, (Be It Further Resolved That further trips of this nature require the endorsement of City Council until such time as a Code of Conduct has been established and approved) Councillor Cullen noted that the Committee would be stopping a current custom and inquired whether the Committee actually had the authority to do so. The Councillor wondered if the Committee had the authority to say a Councillor could not accept an invitation from another government or a private organization.

Mr. Pagé remarked that his suspicion was that the Councillor was correct. He pointed out that the Mayor, under the Municipal Act, may accept trips

or not, or may ask the Deputy Mayor to represent the City. He was not convinced that the Committee could prevent the Mayor from doing his job. He suggested that the recommendation may not be in order nor enforceable.

Councillor Chiarelli concurred with Councillor Cullen. He believed that Council Members, including the Mayor, need to be free to pursue and receive such invitations. He provided the example of the Olympics and suggested that Ottawa cannot be the only city that doesn't let their mayor attend.

The Councillor also advised that there is a global protocol regarding how international travel is paid for. Specifically, if the trip happens to the benefit of both municipalities, then both municipalities pay. If the receiving municipality gets most of the benefit, the receiving municipality pays. Councillor Chiarelli provided a further example of the City of Ottawa inviting people to speak (i.e. 20/20) the City has paid for travel. The Councillor didn't see that it would be advisable to branch out of this protocol while staff develop a code of conduct. The Councillor asked that the recommendation be ruled out of order.

Chair Felmate ruled the following out of order:

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT further trips of this nature require the endorsement of City Council until such time as a Code of Conduct has been established and approved.

4. COUNCIL MEMBERS' ITEMS
POINTS SOUMIS PAR DES MEMBRES DU CONSEIL

Ms. Donnelly noted that there was interest expressed in having Ottawa host an event at the 2008 AMO Conference. However, having consulted with AMO, the program is now closed. Staff could pursue the opportunity of doing something at next year's conference, which will also be in Ottawa.

Moved by Councillor A. Cullen:

That staff be directed to pursue with AMO the opportunity of holding an event at the 2009 AMO Conference.

CARRIED

That the Member Services Sub-Committee receive a verbal presentation on the following item:

* AMO Conference

RECEIVED

ADJOURNMENT
LEVÉE DE LA SÉANCE

The Committee adjourned the meeting at 10:45 a.m.

Original signed by Leslie Donnelly
Original signed by Councillor Peggy Feltmate

Committee Coordinator

Chair

??

??

??

??

MEMBER SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES 2

7 JULY 2008

2

SOUS-COMITE DES SERVICES AUX MEMBRES

PROCES-VERBAL 2

LE 7 JUILLET 2008

Notes: 1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.

Nota : 1. Le soulignement indique qu'il s'agit d'une nouvelle recommandation ou d'une recommandation modifiée approuvée par le Comité.