Consolidated Clause in Economic Development and Parks Committee Report 3, which was considered by City Council on June 14, 2006.

5a

Consideration of Requests for Additional City-to-City Relationships Under the International Alliance Program (All Wards)

City Council on June 14, 2006, postponed consideration of this Clause to its next regular meeting on June 27, 2006.

City Council on May 23, 24 and 25, 2006, postponed consideration of this Clause to its special meeting on June 14, 2006.

The Economic Development and Parks Committee recommends that City Council adopt the staff recommendations in the Recommendations Section of the report (April 5, 2006) from the General Manager of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism.

Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to analyze various requests to establish formal friendship relationships between Toronto and Lisbon, Montego Bay, Monaco and Manila.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no financial implications resulting from the adoption of this report.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

(1) Council not adopt any additional relationships at this time and that staff continue to respond to City-to-City partnership and friendship opportunities, in the context of the Council-approved program objectives and guidelines, through an annual report to the Economic Development and Parks Committee; and

(2) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.
Background:

Early in 2005, City Council approved a revised framework, a set of criteria and guidelines for the International Alliance Program. It also directed staff to review the existing relationships and provide recommendations for the assignment of cities. Further to Council direction, staff undertook an extensive review of Toronto’s city-to-city relationships and reassessed them based on the new Council-approved policy framework. In October 2005, staff recommended to the Economic Development and Parks Committee (EDPC) a revised list of Partnership and Friendship Cities that could be managed within the current budget capacity. City Council adopted, at its December 5, 6 and 7, 2005 meeting, as Partnership Cities: Chicago, Chongqing, Frankfurt, and Milan; and as Friendship Cities: Amsterdam, Warsaw, Kyiv, Sagamihara, Ho Chi Minh City, and Quito. In addition, an expanded program that could be managed if additional resources were allocated to the program through the budget process was proposed. Council did not approve, during the Operating Budget debate, March 29 to March 30, 2006, the additional budget necessary to reclassify Amsterdam and Warsaw to a Partnership City nor add Thessaloniki or Volgograd as Friendship Cities.

This report has been prepared in response to Council’s request from its January 31, February 1 and 2, 2006 meeting to establish new Friendship City Relationships with Lisbon, Montego Bay, Monaco and Manila. The analysis of these proposed relationships is based on the criteria for assessing Partnership Cities and Friendship Cities adopted by Council December 5, 6 and 7, 2005, and the budget constraints exercised in regards to program expansion.

Comments:

Proposal for New Friendship City Relationships

The method and process adopted to assess new city-to-city relationships is as follows:

Principles for all New Relationships:

(i) there can be no more than one relationship per region;
(ii) the prospective city cannot have a relationship with another Canadian City;
(iii) community groups that have committed to Friendship Cities are responsible for raising funds in support of exchanges;
(iv) the City must be in a country with which the Federal government has some form of a relationship;
(v) proposals may be submitted to the General Manager of Economic Development; Culture and Tourism;
(vi) proposals will be compiled and assessed and recommendations made to Council once annually and coinciding with the budget process.

Each Friendship City must meet the following criteria:

(i) be sponsored by a Member of Council;
(ii) be co-sponsored by a community association/group or an individual member of the community who will be responsible for all the activities with the friendship city;
(iii) demonstrate support and commitment from the Friendship city in terms of community interest and active participation;

(iv) be a community of interest supported by an active community in Toronto and in the friendship city; and

(v) follow the international policy framework put forward by the Chief Administrative Officer and approved by City Council in May 2002.

Process for Assessing Requests for Friendship Cities:

(i) a profile of the prospective city must be submitted and strong consideration will be given to compatibility of the cities in such areas as size of population, culture, business, geographic location, and government structure;

(ii) a list of individuals and/or community groups both in the City of Toronto and in the prospective city who have a sincere desire to actively support and commit to a long-term relationship must be submitted as evidence for a strong relationship which would endure changes in elected government officials;

(iii) documentation of a minimum of two exchanges that have occurred between the City of Toronto and the prospective city (since amalgamation) must be submitted as part of any proposal;

(iv) all proposals will be assessed on a case by case basis;

(v) proposals must be brought forward by a member of Council willing to sponsor the Friendship City and must be co-signed by the Council sponsor, community groups willing to actively support the Friendship, and a Council representative from the prospective city; and

(vi) all proposals will be directed to the General Manager of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism for an evaluation based on the criteria outlined.

Once all documentation is submitted to Economic Development, staff will review the proposal to determine if it is complete and if the criteria have been met. If the proposal is deemed to have met all the criteria, a recommendation in favour of the relationship will be forwarded to City Council consideration. As indicated, proposals are brought to Council once annually to coincide with the budget process.

Results of Analysis:

Table 1 has been prepared as a summary of the key information related to each city under review.
Analysis of Proposed Friendship Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>GDP per capita</th>
<th>Economic Structure</th>
<th>Other Sister Cities in Region?</th>
<th>Other Canadian Twin City?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>$21,620</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montego Bay</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>$5,052</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>32,409</td>
<td>$31,725</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lisbon, Portugal

Lisbon is the capital city of Portugal and has a municipal population of 560,000 and a metropolitan population of 2.7 million. Although Lisbon has strong community support and acceptable compatibility with Toronto in demographics and economic structure, the City of Toronto already has four partner and friendship cities in Europe (Milan, Frankfurt, Warsaw and Kyiv), and adding one more European city to an already unbalanced international portfolio is not recommended. It should be noted, however, that existing citizen-to-citizen and business-to-business relationships between Toronto and Lisbon are very strong. These community and business relationships have developed in the absence of formal sister-city linkages and should remain strong in the future. This assessment is certainly not a rejection of those ties or a lack of desire for the communities to continue to share, grow and prosper to the mutual benefit of both cities.

Montego Bay, Jamaica

Montego Bay, Jamaica is a tourist destination with a population of 82,800. Although Toronto has a sizeable Jamaican community, and the City of Toronto does not currently have a sister city relationship in the Caribbean region, Montego Bay lacks compatibility with Toronto in terms of population size and economic structure.

Monte Carlo, Monaco

Monaco is a city of 32,409 in Europe. The city is a high-end tourist destination. In addition to lacking any compatibility with Toronto in terms of demographics and economic structure, Monaco does not meet the criteria that there can be no more than one relationship per region for prospective cities.

Manila, Philippines

Manila is the capital city of the Philippines and has a municipal population of 1.6 million and a metropolitan population of 11.3 million. Manila does not meet the criteria for friendship city status as there is already a friendship city, Ho Chi Minh City, in the ASEAN region. In addition, Manila already has a sister city relationship with Winnipeg, further disqualifying it from consideration.
Conclusion from the Assessment:

Using the Friendship City criteria adopted by Council, to evaluate the suitability and eligibility of the proposed cities, staff found that none qualify for a Friendship City relationship with the City of Toronto. It is recommended, therefore, that the requests be denied.

Budget Considerations for New Partner and Friendship City Relationships

In the International Alliance Program Realignment Report adopted by Council at its meeting of December 5, 6, and 7, 2005, staff supported an expanded sister-city program in which two existing friendship cities would be reclassified to partner city status and two new cities added as friendship cities. The budget request for the expanded program with additional cities was not adopted through the budget review process. Even if cities were put forward that satisfied the criteria for friendship city status, without additional program funding for those cities, it is not possible to service them adequately. Staff note that for additional cities to be added to partner or friendship city program, additional program money and staff resources would need to be added as a prerequisite to addition.

Conclusions:

The City of Toronto achieves its international goals through a number of mechanisms including, but not limited to, formal relationships under the International Alliance Program. When appropriately applied and adequately funded and resourced, formal relationships can be one of the many valuable mechanisms used to enhance Toronto’s international relations. Toronto might wish to broaden the program to include more cities from across different parts of the globe; however, additional resources commensurate with the increase in relationships are necessary to support the program properly. The program recommended by staff in the report adopted in December 2005 consumes all available resources. Staff will continue to engage with local communities and with other cities around the world and to assess interest in establishing formal relationships. When and if proposals for new relationships are ready for recommendation, staff will report to Economic Development and Parks Committee once annually and coinciding with the budget process. It is also important to reiterate that relationships between cities, communities and businesses can flourish without formal status.
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