



Notice of Meeting and Meeting Agenda Governance Committee

Wednesday, July 6, 2016

1:30 PM

6th Floor Boardroom

**J. Ranns (Chair), M. Alto (Vice Chair), D. Blackwell, A. Finall, D. Howe, W. McIntyre,
C. Plant, S. Price, G. Young, B. Desjardins (Board Chair, ex-officio)**

1. Approval of Agenda

2. Adoption of Minutes

2.1. [16-793](#) Minutes of the June 1, 2016 Governance Committee Meeting

Recommendation: That the minutes of the June 1, 2016 Governance Committee meeting be adopted as circulated.

Attachments: [2016-06-01 Minutes](#)

3. Chair's Remarks

4. Presentations/Delegations

5. Committee Business

5.1. [16-784](#) Meeting Procedures - Circulation of Amendments

Recommendation: That the Governance Committee receive this report for information.

Attachments: [Staff Report: Meeting Procedures-Circulation of Amendments](#)
[Report from the April 6th Governance Committee Meeting](#)

5.2. [16-794](#) Service Review Options

Recommendation: That the Governance Committee recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:
That the CAO be directed to carry out enhanced divisional service planning as part of the 2017 financial planning and budgeting process to identify potential service adjustments that would realign, reallocate or reduce service activities using a bottom up approach, with an aim to improve efficiency, internally or cross departmentally.

Attachments: [Staff Report: Service Review Options](#)

5.3. [16-792](#) Service Review Template

Recommendation: That the Governance Committee receive the service review template for information.

Attachments: [Staff Report: Service Review Template](#)
[Appendix A: Service Review Template](#)

6. New Business

7. Adjournment

Next Meeting: September 7, 2016

To ensure quorum, please advise Pat Perna (250-360-3642) if you or your alternate CANNOT attend.

**Meeting Minutes
Governance Committee**

Wednesday, June 1, 2016

1:30 PM

6th Floor Boardroom

PRESENT:

Directors: J. Ranns (Chair), M. Alto (Vice Chair), D. Blackwell, A. Finall, D. Howe, W. McIntyre, C. Plant, S. Price, G. Young, B. Desjardins (Board Chair, ex-officio)
Staff: R. Lapham, Chief Administrative Officer, B. Reems, Corporate Officer, P. Perna, Committee Clerk (Recorder)
Others: Director S. Brice

The meeting was called to order at 1:33 pm.

1. Approval of Agenda

**MOVED by Director Price, SECONDED by Director McIntyre,
That the agenda for the June 1, 2016 Governance Committee be approved as
circulated.
CARRIED**

2. Adoption of Minutes

2.1. [16-672](#) Minutes of the May 4, 2016 Governance Committee Meeting

**MOVED by Director Blackwell, SECONDED by Director Howe,
That the minutes of the May 4, 2016 Governance Committee meeting be adopted
as circulated.
CARRIED**

3. Chair's Remarks

The Chair introduced Mr. Paul Thorkelsson, Chief Administrative Officer, District of Saanich, who was presenting the "Operational Bottom Up Approach" to assist with the Committee's determination of what type of service review should be done.

4. Presentations/Delegations

4.1. [16-681](#) Presentation: Mr. Paul Thorkelsson, Chief Administrative Officer, District of Saanich, Re: "The Bottom-Up Operational and Efficiency Review"

Mr. Thorkelsson spoke to a PowerPoint Presentation and the following items in response to questions from the committee:

* a service review is an opportunity to make a positive impact on an organization

* the Regional District of Nanaimo's service review was bottom-up and used no additional resources other than existing positions; was more cost effective than

a traditional top-down review; used resources from the LGMA; and did not reduce staff positions, but some were reorganized

- * in conducting the review, the Regional District of Nanaimo performed a broader search of how things are being done, if the things should be done, and if there were other ways to do them
- * the best suggestion is to spend the time and figure out what works with the individual organization and to take a customizable approach

5. Committee Business

5.1. [16-682](#)

Service Review Discussion

(Attached are the attachments from the April 6th Governance Committee meeting for reference)

Discussion ensued on the following:

- * necessary to spend time on deciding what type of review to perform
- * provision of a template of areas to help focus the discussion
- * difference of size and make-up between the regional districts posing a difference in the process
- * options based on the Chief Administrative Officer's view of the organization in terms of its make-up and areas that are more ready for a focused review versus a broader view
- * staff and financial capacity to perform a review
- * experts on the LGMA Teamwork Program asked to assist
- * follow-up with the Regional District of Nanaimo on a post-service review
- * clarity of purpose and intent and what the committee is hoping to achieve

**MOVED by Director Blackwell, SECONDED by Director Alto,
That the Chief Administrative Officer be directed to provide a report to the
Governance Committee outlining options for the Committee's focus to perform a
service review.**

CARRIED

5.2. [16-683](#)

Meeting Procedures - Amendments to Motions

S. Brice left at 2:41.

B. Reems provided clarification of what the courts deem business of the organization and will provide the ombudsperson report highlighting the relevant sections to the committee.

**MOVED by Board Chair Desjardins, SECONDED by Director Plant,
That it be recommended to the Capital Regional District Board:
That amendments to motions only be presented at a meeting.**

CARRIED

OPPOSED: Young

5.3. [16-675](#)

Terms of Appointment to Committees and Other Boards

**MOVED by Director Blackwell, SECONDED by Director Finall,
That the Governance Committee recommend to the Capital Regional District
Board:**

1. That the following terms of appointment be amended to a two-year period, beginning in January 2017, to coincide with the Local Government Election

cycle:

- a. Arts Committee (committee members)
 - b. Greater Victoria Coalition to End Homelessness (member representatives)
 - c. Greater Victoria Harbour Authority (member representative)
 - d. Island Corridor Foundation (member representative)
2. That the following organizations be requested to amend their constating documents to allow for a two-year term for the CRD Board representatives to coincide with the Local Government Election cycle:
- a. Capital Regional Housing Corporation
 - b. Greater Victoria Labour Relations Association
 - c. Royal McPherson Theatre Society (Councillor Directors)
3. That it be suggested to the Leadership Council of the Greater Victoria Coalition to End Homelessness that Capital Regional District Board Director appointees serve for a two-year term.
4. That staff be directed to prepare amendments to the following Capital Regional District Commission Bylaws to amend the terms of appointment to two years to coincide with the Local Government Election cycle:
- a. Peninsula Recreation Commission (municipal council representatives)
 - b. Regional Housing Trust Fund Commission (council representatives and Electoral Area Directors)
 - c. Saanich Peninsula Wastewater Commission (municipal council representatives and resident volunteers)
 - d. Traffic Safety Commission (CRD Director)

CARRIED

6. New Business

None.

7. Adjournment

MOVED by Director Blackwell, **SECONDED** by Board Chair Desjardins,
That the June 1, 2016 Governance Committee be adjourned at 3:08 pm.
CARRIED

Chair

Recorder



Making a difference...together

**REPORT TO GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 2016**

SUBJECT Meeting Procedures – Circulation of Amendments

ISSUE

To confirm procedures regarding the circulation of proposed amendments prior to meetings.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting of March 2, 2016, the Governance Committee directed staff to advise on best practices for Directors to circulate proposed amendments to a staff recommendation included on a meeting agenda prior to a meeting.

Staff wrote a report that went to the April 6 Governance Committee meeting recommending that amendments to motions only be presented at a meeting and this recommendation was put forward to the CRD Board for consideration. The CRD Board considered the recommendation at its April 13 meeting, and following discussion referred the matter back to the Governance Committee. The Committee considered the matter at its June 1 meeting, and passed the same motion recommending to the Board that amendments only be presented at a meeting. The Board discussed the recommendation and once again referred the matter back to the Governance Committee for further review and discussion.

The staff recommendation was aimed at limiting email discussion between Directors prior to a meeting to ensure that all Board business is advanced in meetings that are open and accessible to the public. During discussion on the motion at the Committee and Board meetings, it was suggested that this concern could be addressed by establishing a process that would have Directors provide proposed amendments to the Corporate Officer in advance of a meeting for circulation and publication on the agenda so that the public would have access to the information in an open and transparent fashion that is consistent with the intent of the governing legislation. The matter was referred back to the Committee following discussion at the Board about this alternative process.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1:

That the Governance Committee receive this report for information.

Alternative 2:

That the Governance Committee recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:

That staff be directed to prepare an amendment to the CRD Procedures Bylaw to provide for a process of circulating proposed amendments in advance of a meeting by providing the Corporate Officer with written notice of the proposed amendment no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting.

IMPLICATIONS

Alternative 1

If this alternative is adopted, the matter would be forwarded to the CRD Board with the recommendation that was previously adopted by the Governance Committee: that amendments to motions only be presented at a meeting.

There are no implications arising from this alternative as it represents the status quo. There is currently no established process (administrative or bylaw based) for circulating amendments in advance of a meeting.

Alternative 2

Circulating amendments before meetings presents some practical challenges. There would be increased administrative responsibilities for staff associated with receiving amendments and publishing them with the electronic agenda package. This could be mitigated by providing a deadline for submission of the proposed amendments of 48 hours in advance of a meeting. The 48-hour deadline is the same timeline for receipt of delegation requests, and if the information were received at the same time, staff could avoid duplication of effort by processing the amendment material concurrent with the delegation requests.

In the event that more than two proposed amendments are received, the process could lead to additional challenges for a Chair in terms of meeting management. While the amendments could be listed chronologically on the agenda in order of time received, it would be up to the Chair to sort out the order of presentation at a meeting. Depending on the nature of the issue and scope of the amendments, the task could be difficult, particularly if the decision is based on a reading of the circulated amendments and does not flow from the course of discussion.

The motion to amend is applicable to pending motions only. The recommendations listed on a staff report do not always become pending motions, as members are free to move listed alternatives or propose different wording. Under Robert's Rules of Order, an amendment must be relevant (or "germane") to the motion it seeks to amend. It is up to a Chair to rule on whether an amendment is relevant to a main motion. If amendments are provided in advance, they would be placed on a public agenda without an assessment as to whether they are in order. Although a Chair could address any out of order amendments at the meeting, the proposed amendment would first have been circulated on a public agenda.

In some cases, the circulation of amendments in advance could unduly complicate matters or detract from the flow of a meeting. In his book, *The Complete Handbook of Business Meetings*, Professional Registered Parliamentarian Eli Mina argues that amendments should not be introduced too quickly, even though parliamentary rules permit the introduction of amendments before a motion is discussed. He argues that "if an amendment is introduced too quickly, the focus of the discussion shifts away from the main motion, with members subsequently agonizing over precise wording and failing to focus on underlying principles and overall intent" (pg. 213). In Mina's view, a chair should ask that amendments be held back until there has been some discussion of the main motion to avoid distraction and wasting meeting time.

Notwithstanding the above-noted challenges, this alternative provides the benefit of circulating information in advance of a meeting and does satisfy concerns about conducting Board business in an open and transparent manner.

CONCLUSION

While both alternatives satisfy the open meeting requirements of the governing legislation, there are additional challenges associated with circulating amendments in advance of a meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Governance Committee receive this report for information.

Submitted by:	Brent Reems, MA, LLB, Senior Manager Legislative & Information Services
Concurrence:	Robert Lapham, MCIP, RPP, Chief Administrative Officer



Making a difference...together

**REPORT TO GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2016**

SUBJECT Meeting Procedures – Amendments to Motions

ISSUE

To confirm procedures regarding displaying amendments to motions at meetings and the circulation of amendments via email.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting held March 2, 2016, the Governance Committee directed staff to determine how best to display amendments to motions on screen during a meeting. Over the past several months, there have been instances at committee and Board meetings where multiple amendments were proposed to complex main motions. To assist the Board members in their deliberations, it was recommended that staff display the motion and document any amendments on the main screen.

In addition staff was also requested to advise on best practices for directors to communicate proposed amendments to a proposed staff recommendation or Notice of Motion prior to a meeting. The Board and committee meeting agendas are typically published on the Friday prior to the Wednesday meeting. The agendas include staff reports and recommendations and on occasion, a Notice of Motion from a fellow Board member. Upon reviewing the agenda in preparation for the meeting, Directors in some instances, have emailed a proposed amendment to recommendations to fellow Board and committee members in advance of the meeting. The intent of this is to provide advance notice of an amendment the Director will present at the meeting and an opportunity for the Board/committee member to consider the amendment.

Section 22 of the CRD Board Procedures Bylaw No. 3828, (the “Procedures Bylaw”) outlines how motions shall be managed at meetings (Appendix A).

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1:

That the Governance Committee recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:

1. That, upon request by the Chair and where feasible, any amendments to recommendations/motions be displayed on the main screen;
2. That amendments to motions only be presented at a meeting.

Alternative 2:

That the report be referred back to staff for further review.

IMPLICATIONS

Displaying Amendments:

As previously noted, over the past several months there have been instances at committee and Board meetings where multiple amendments were proposed to complex main motions. On two

occasions, staff have accommodated a request by committee members to display a complex motion on the main screen to assist members with deliberations. This is an administrative practice that in staff's view, does not require an amendment to the Procedures Bylaw. Depending on the meeting room and staff resources available, it may not always be possible to provide this additional service at the meeting. In addition, depending on the complexity of the motion or the amendment, it may not always be necessary to display this information on the main screen. As such, it is recommended that upon request and where feasible to provide this service, that any amendments to recommendations/motions be displayed.

It is recommended that the request to display a motion and amendment on the main screen be made by the Chair. The CRD Procedures Bylaw states that in cases not provided for under the Bylaw, the Newly Revised Robert's Rules of Order, 11th edition, 2011, apply to the proceedings of the Board and CRD committees and commissions (except to the extent that the rules are not applicable in the circumstances and not inconsistent with the CRD Procedures Bylaw or governing legislation). Under Robert's Rules, it is the duty of the Chair to see that a motion is put into suitable form. The rules provide that the Chair should not admit a motion that the secretary would have to paraphrase for the record. The rules also state that the Chair – either on his/her own initiative or the secretary's request – can require that any main motion or amendment be put in writing before the Chair states the question.

Under the recommended process, a member could initiate a request by asking the Chair, but it would ultimately be up to the Chair to approve the request and in turn make the request of staff.

Staff are working towards identifying options to allow for the Board agenda, including recommendations, to be displayed on the main screen during meetings. This will assist the members of the public in following along at a meeting.

Emailing Amendments:

Amendments to staff recommendations to be considered at an upcoming meeting, as well as general comments about the staff report, have been emailed by Directors to their fellow members in advance of the meeting. This creates the potential for discussion to occur via email on the motion outside of the formal meeting setting.

In 2012, the Office of the Ombudsperson published the "Open Meetings: Best Practices Guide for Local Governments" and identified one of the cornerstones of open and transparent government as the requirement for local governments to conduct meetings that are open and accessible to the public. The report is based on provisions of the *Community Charter* which provide that meetings must be open to the public unless closed in accordance with the legislation. An email discussion on a matter does not lend itself to open and transparent government and could be considered to be a meeting if a quorum of the members are present, the matter being discussed forms the basis of the Board's business and is being moved in a way toward the possible application of the Board's authority. If the latter is the case, a challenge may arise as to the validity of the "meeting" as proper notice would not have been given.

During orientation sessions with the Board, members are advised against these types of email discussions for the reasons noted above but also because the email discussions would preempt discussion and debate at the meeting.

Section 22(4) of the Procedures Bylaw states "*An amendment to a motion does not require notice....Amendments must be strictly relevant to the main motion and not alter in a material way or be contrary to the principle embodied in the main motion.*" If the matter brought forward

is not germane to the main motion and introduces a new matter, the Chair may refer the item to an appropriate standing committee or rule it as a Notice of Motion to be considered at a subsequent meeting. This additional time will also give staff an opportunity to consider any implications of the proposed amendment.

Advances in information technology (such as the electronic agenda system) and the speed of modern communication present both opportunities and challenges for local government elected officials and Board governance procedures. While the issues covered in this report can be addressed without making changes to the Board Procedures Bylaw, there are areas of the Bylaw that have been impacted by changes in information technology – such as the correspondence provisions, use of technology for presentations and debate and electronic participation at meetings – that would benefit from the Governance Committee’s review and deliberation.

CONCLUSION

When requested and where possible, staff will display amendments to motions on the main screen. In addition, in keeping with the requirement for local governments to conduct meetings that are open and accessible to the public, it is recommended that amendments to motions not be circulated via email in advance of a meeting but rather presented at the meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Governance Committee recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:

1. That, upon request by the Chair and where feasible, any amendments to recommendations/motions be displayed on the main screen;
2. That amendments to motions only be presented at a meeting.

Submitted by:	Brent Reems, MA, LLB, Senior Manager Legislative & Information Services
Concurrence:	Robert Lapham, MCIP, RPP, Chief Administrative Officer

SS:br

Attachments: Appendix A – CRD Board Procedures Bylaw No. 3828 – Section 22

APPENDIX A

Excerpt – CRD Board Procedures Bylaw No. 3828

Motions

22. (1) Motions shall be phrased in a clear and concise manner so as to express an opinion or achieve a result.
- (2) The Chair may divide a motion containing more than one subject if the Chair feels this would produce a fairer or clearer result and the same shall be voted on in the form in which it is divided.
- (3) A motion to adjourn the meeting or to adjourn the debate shall always be in order.
- (4) An amendment to a motion does not require notice. Only one amendment to an amendment shall be allowed at one time and the same shall be dealt with before the amendment is decided. Amendments must be strictly relevant to the main motion and not alter in a material way or be contrary to the principle embodied in the main motion.
- (5) Any Member desiring to bring before the Board any new matter, other than a point of order or privilege, shall do so by way of motion; provided, however, that any new matter of major import, which may require further information than could or would normally be available to the Board at such meeting, may be referred to a Board Standing Committee agenda by the Chair, or may be ruled by the Chair as a notice of motion and shall be dealt with as provided by section 22(6).
- (6) Any Member may give notice of a motion to the Board by either of the following methods:
 - (a) providing the Corporate Officer with a written copy of such motion during a meeting of the Board, and the Corporate Officer shall, upon the Member being acknowledged by the Chair and the notice of motion being read to the meeting, include it in the minutes of that meeting as notice of motion and shall add the motion to the agenda of the next regular Board meeting, or to the agenda of a special Board meeting scheduled for that purpose; or
 - (b) providing the Corporate Officer with a written copy of such motion, no later than seven working days prior to the scheduled meeting, and the Corporate Officer shall add the motion to the agenda for said meeting.
- (7) Despite section 22(6), the notice of motion shall be added to the agenda in accordance with section 12(2).



Making a difference...together

REPORT TO GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 2016

SUBJECT Service Review Options

ISSUE

To consider options for a service review including enhanced divisional service planning as part of the 2017 financial planning and budgeting process.

BACKGROUND

The Capital Regional District (CRD) has an established Financial Planning process that includes the preparation of annual Service Plans that are reviewed by Commissions, Committees and the Board to inform and guide the development of annual budgets and enable long term financial, work program and work force planning.

The CRD Service Plans outline core service information including key service drivers such as trends, service levels, workforce considerations and performance measures. These plans also highlight divisional initiatives and implications for the overall work program and budget for a specific area. The process provides the opportunity to review work programs and make service amendments as necessary and financial implications are identified as either having an annual or continuous impact, increasing or decreasing the cost of service delivery.

The *Local Government Act* requires the CRD to approve an updated 5 year Financial Plan and annual budget prior to the end of March each year. Therefore, the timing of the review of Service Plans needs to occur early in the planning cycle to provide for the necessary approvals and the preparation of budget estimates. Fees and charges bylaws developed in consultation with Commissions and rate payers also need to be amended and adopted at the beginning of each year to enable the collection of adjusted operating revenue.

At its meeting of April 6, 2016 the Governance Committee received a comprehensive report detailing methods for conducting service reviews. The guide for informal service reviews published by the Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development (the "Ministry"), "*Regional Service Reviews: An Introduction*" was provided, together with other information on how other regional districts have undertaken service reviews. A list of the CRD services and their functions (indicating whether they are mandated) was also included. The Committee subsequently received a presentation from Dr. Robert Bish on his research for "*Governing Greater Victoria: The Role of Elected Officials and Shared Services*" and from Mr. Paul Thorkelsson on how the Regional District of Nanaimo conducted an informal service review.

At the June 1, 2016 meeting of the Governance Committee the CRD CAO was directed to report back on options for the Committee's focus to perform a service review. The direction was suggested in consideration of the length of time, staff time, resources and general capacity required to perform a review and discussion about what areas of the organization might be ready for a broader or more focused review. The Committee also requested a template to help focus the discussion with the aim of clarifying what the Committee is hoping to achieve.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1:

That the Governance Committee recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:

That the CAO be directed to carry out enhanced divisional service planning as part of the 2017 financial planning and budgeting process to identify potential service adjustments that would realign, reallocate or reduce service activities using a bottom up approach, with an aim to improve efficiency, internally or cross departmentally.

Alternative 2:

That the Governance Committee recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:

That the Committee direct staff to prepare a terms of reference to retain a consultant to complete a comprehensive service review and report back on staff time, financial and process implications.

IMPLICATIONS

In accordance with the guidelines provided by the Ministry, the CAO's observations and recommendations are as follows:

Defining the Problem:

The Committee has not defined the problem or what is to be included in a potential review, and has requested options to narrow the focus from the CAO.

It has been noted that Service Plans and the subsequent budget and staffing impacts are currently evaluated by Commissions and Standing Committees without formal direction from the Board to influence recommendations. Discussion at the Governance and Finance Committee acknowledges that CRD *Local Services* and *Sub-Regional Services* benefit from the more direct involvement of participants and rate payers who have varying degrees of delegated authority from the Board. New direction from the Finance or Governance Committees in the established process and mandate of sub-regional or electoral area Commissions would likely require reconsideration of the delegated authority that has been granted. The current process allows the Board to accept or reject Committee or Commission recommendations when the preliminary or final service plans and budget are brought forward for approval.

For the services reporting through Standing Committees, as the Chairs of Committees form the Finance Committee, financial and budgetary objectives raised at the Finance Committee are able to be brought forward by staff working with the Chairs when Service Plans and financial implications are discussed. Focused work on Service Plans and the budget generally occurs within the 4th quarter with year- end adjustments in the 1st quarter prior to final budget approval in March.

The most timely and manageable approach to enhancing the review of services would be to direct Department General Managers to engage with all of their staff to identify potential service adjustments beyond the current scope of service planning. The objective would be to identify ways to realign, reallocate or reduce service activities using a bottom up approach, with an aim to improve efficiency, internally or cross departmentally. An additional level of analysis would be included in the Service Plan template to be completed in the 3rd quarter. As with the existing service planning process, recommendations would be vetted by the Executive Leadership Team. The regional CAOs, who meet regularly, and potentially others sourced through the Local Government Management Association would be invited to contribute ideas from their experience,

to support the review. The work and progress would also be discussed at the Labour Management Committee prior to Commission and Committee review in the 4th quarter.

Constructing Fact Sheets:

The Committee has received a list of CRD Services identifying participants and requisitions as well as a list of Establishment Bylaws. All of the CRD Service Plans are circulated to the Committees and Board annually together with a series of Annual Reports.

Developing Options:

In addition to the option of enhancing the existing service planning process, other options such as a consultant led core service review, stakeholder or community driven process, or targeted area review process are available. These other processes would require a significant commitment of staff time or other resources, a comprehensive terms of reference describing the process, roles and scope as well as considerable length of time to plan, carryout and implement. The other alternative is to maintain the status quo, which is the existing service review and financial planning process.

An enhanced service planning process could be implemented within the current service review and financial planning cycle without a significant impact on staff resources.

Evaluating Options:

In considering the options available it has been recognized that the CRD is currently engaged in a number of large initiatives, placing a significant demand on staff resources. In addition, the Provincial Government is undertaking work on the 'Capital Integrated Services and Governance Initiative' which is gathering facts, engaging stakeholder organizations and facilitating dialogue between local governments on service delivery in the region.

The existing service review process provides a framework that can accommodate a more detailed analysis of service delivery without placing too significant a burden on staff resources and would be effective and timely. Enhancing this process to use more of a bottom up approach could identify ways to improve efficiency, internally or cross departmentally.

Reaching a Decision:

As the existing service review process informs the 5 year Financial Plan and budget, in order to be implemented within the current financial planning cycle, the enhanced process needs to be approved by the Board. To enable bottom up participation across the organization, the recommendations should be brought forward from this report. Alternatively, it is likely that a different approach would not be implemented until the next financial planning cycle.

Documenting the Results:

The existing service review process is documented year over year, and integrates a response to Board and Corporate Priorities. The process also identifies the resources necessary to maintain core services apart from new initiatives. The enhanced process could highlight potential adjustments that would identify ways to realign, reallocate or reduce service activities.

ORGANIZATIONAL AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

A service review will require time and money and will have a significant impact on the allocation of resources and organizational performance. As outlined in this report, the Provincial Government has commenced a consultation process and study about the integration of services and governance in the CRD. Therefore, defining the problem or issue through a public survey or stakeholder engagement about CRD services could lead to confusion about the purpose and

intent of the work. In addition, based on experience of other local governments, while a consultant-lead review would be independent, it could be costly and is unlikely to be completed within the current financial planning cycle. As it appears the focus of the Committee is on an informal review rather than a statutory review of services, it is recommended that a bottom up review be directed operationally by the CAO in response to the goals and objectives of the Board. This option would not require significant financial resources or a budget amendment.

Other options for the focus of a review would be to consider regional services versus sub-regional and local services. The focus of the review could be limited to regional services or corporate services, as for the most part sub-regional and local services have Commissions advising on service levels and budgets with delegated authority from the Board. CRD regional and corporate services are evaluated with performance and priority setting directed through Standing Committees.

CONCLUSION

Enhancing the existing service review and budgeting process utilizing a more 'bottom up approach' with an aim to improve efficiency, internally or cross departmentally, could be implemented immediately and provide recommendations within the current financial planning cycle. This process would utilize the existing processes and reporting and minimize the impact on staff and financial resources. The enhanced process would include the opportunity for ideas to be generated from CAOs in the region and possibly from other parts of BC.

The CRD Finance Committee could provide overall direction leading into the service plan review process for 2017 by endorsing recommendations from the CAO to implement an enhanced process including bottom up engagement with all staff and discussion with regional CAOs. An alternative approach would require preparation of terms of reference including clear identification of scope, purpose and objectives, the amount of resources and budget to be allocated, a timeline and deliverables.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Governance Committee recommend to the Capital Regional District Board:

That the CAO be directed to carry out enhanced divisional service planning as part of the 2017 financial planning and budgeting process to identify potential service adjustments that would realign, reallocate or reduce service activities using a bottom up approach, with an aim to improve efficiency, internally or cross departmentally.

Submitted by:	Robert Lapham, MCIP, RPP, Chief Administrative Officer
---------------	--



Making a difference...together

**REPORT TO GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 2016**

SUBJECT **Service Review Template**

ISSUE

To provide a service review steps template for the Committee's consideration.

BACKGROUND

At its last several meetings the Governance Committee has discussed the subject of service review and has explored options to conduct a review of CRD services. Appendix A is a service review template to facilitate the Committee's ongoing discussion. The template sets out five key questions or issues that can be used to guide decision-making or discussion. The template is informed by the service review information provided by the Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development, *Regional Service Reviews: An Introduction* and the service review information previously presented to the Committee.

CONCLUSION

The template is provided to facilitate the Governance Committee's ongoing service review discussion.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Governance Committee receive the service review template for information.

Submitted by:	Brent Reems, MA, LLB, Senior Manager Legislative & Information Services
Concurrence:	Robert Lapham, MCIP, RPP, Chief Administrative Officer

Attachments: Appendix A (Service Review Template)

Appendix A – Service Review Steps Template

1. Define the Problem. Determine the issues the review will address and the objectives of the review.

2. Approve the Scope of Review. Establish the scope of review in relation to the issues that need to be addressed and the services or divisions that will be included in the review.
 - A. *Scope of Review*

 - B. *Services to be Reviewed*

3. Time and resources. Determine how much time the review will take and the amount of resources that must be devoted (staff and monetary) relative to the scope and issues to be addressed.
 - A. *Timeline*

 - B. *Resources*

4. Determine Method of Review. Establish how the services are to be reviewed and determine whether the process will be bottom-up or consultant-led, and the level of stakeholder engagement.

5. Deliverables. Determine whether the Committee can, at this early stage, identify any concrete deliverables flowing from a review (examples might be a final report and recommendations).