



INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER REPORT FOR DECISION

INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER ANNUAL REPORT – 2012

Date:	September 25, 2012
To:	City Council
From:	Integrity Commissioner
Wards:	All
Reference Number:	

SUMMARY

The Integrity Commissioner reports annually to Council on the work of the office. This report describes the work of the Office of the Integrity Commissioner from July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Integrity Commissioner recommends that City Council:

- 1) Adopt recommended amendments to the *Code of Conduct Complaint Protocol for Members of Council*, the *Code of Conduct Complaint Protocol for Members of Local Boards (restricted definition)* and the *Code of Conduct Complaint Protocol for Adjudicative Boards* to reflect amendments to the *Public Inquiries Act, 2009, S.O. 2009, c. 33, Sch. 6*.
- 2) Adopt recommended amendments to the *Code of Conduct Complaint Protocol for Members of Council* (“*Complaint Protocol*”) to reflect Council Amendments to the Constituency Services and Office Budget Policy (formerly the “*Councillor Expense Policy*”) providing for use of a member’s expense budget to pay for legal fees for members of Council who have received an informal or formal complaint under the *Complaint Protocol*.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Receipt of this report will have no financial impact.

DECISION HISTORY

Section 162(1) of the *City of Toronto Act, 2006* (“COTA”) requires the Integrity Commissioner to make “periodic reports to Council.” Section 3.7 of the *Toronto Municipal Code* requires that an Accountability Officer (which includes the Integrity Commissioner) report annually to Council on the activities of the office and the discharge of the officer’s duties.

On June 1, 2011, the *Public Inquiries Act 2009*, S.O. 2009, c. 33, Sch. 6 (“PIA”) was amended. The prior version of the *PIA* organized the powers of certain officials, including an Integrity Commissioner, to hold inquiries under Parts I and II of the *PIA*. These Parts are referred to in the *Code of Conduct Complaint Protocol for Members of Council* and the *Code of Conduct Complaint Protocol for Members of Local Boards (Restricted Definition), including Adjudicative Boards* (the “*Complaint Protocols*”). The amendments to the *PIA* replace Parts I and II with sections 33 and 34. The requested amendments will update the terminology in the *Complaint Protocols* to be consistent with the *PIA*.

On July 11, 12 and 13, 2012, Council approved amendments to the Councillor Expense Policy, now called the Constituency Services and Office Budget Policy. These changes require an amendment to the *Complaint Protocol* to allow members to claim legal fees for an initial consultation as expenses related to informal and formal complaints. Council requested the Integrity Commissioner to review and report to Council on corresponding changes to the *Complaint Protocol*.

COMMENTS

Introduction

This is the eighth Annual Report made by the office of the Integrity Commissioner for the City of Toronto. In 2011 – 2012, Councillors and members of local and adjudicative boards have continued to make use of the confidential advice role of the office in matters ranging from perceived conflicts between public and private interests, acceptance of benefits, receipt of funding for community events and participation in fundraising activities.

Over this past year, the number of complaints brought to the office for resolution or investigation increased significantly. Formal complaints increased 122 % from last year.¹ Informal complaints and resolutions increased by over 187.5%.² In addition to these responsibilities, there have been ongoing education opportunities about the work of the office, both within the City of Toronto and beyond. The Integrity Commissioner has continued to meet biannually with other Integrity Commissioners across the province. Although the City of Toronto was the first municipality in Ontario to appoint an Integrity Commissioner, many other large and small municipalities across

¹ An increase of 11 formal complaints (9 in 2010-2011 to 20 in 2011-2012)

² An increase of 30 informal complaints (16 in 2010-2011 to 46 in 2011-2012)

the province have now taken this step. As of June 30, 2012, twenty two municipalities have appointed Integrity Commissioners.

ACTIVITIES OF THE INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER: JULY 1, 2011 - JUNE 30, 2012

A. OUTREACH AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT

The Integrity Commissioner contributed to a number of policy projects over the past year concerning accountability mechanisms at the City of Toronto.

Accountability Framework Policy Work

Over the past year, the Integrity Commissioner met with the other Accountability Officers, representatives from the City Clerk's office and the City Manager's Office to create a records retention protocol to take into account confidentiality, independence and accountability. A draft directive for the protection of Accountability Officers information was reviewed in June, 2012 and is in the process of being finalized for implementation. In addition, purchasing protocols for the office of the Integrity Commissioner and other Accountability Officers are also in the process of being created.

Public Inquiries Act

In 2009, the Province of Ontario enacted the *PIA*, (*Public Inquiries Act*, 2009, S.O. 2009, c. 33, Sch. 6 ("*PIA 2009*") which came into force on June 1, 2011. As a result of these amendments and the powers available under the *PIA, 2009*, the Integrity Commissioner's office, along with the Lobbyist Registrar, sought a legal opinion on a number of questions, including the application of sections 33 and 34, the necessary amendments to City policy by virtue of the *PIA, 2009* and commentary on the use of discretion, duty to suspend an inquiry, and summons and enforcement power under the *PIA, 2009*.

In consideration of the changes to *PIA, 2009*, I recommend an amendment to the City's *Complaint Protocols* to replace "Parts I and II" with "sections 33 and 34," to update both *Complaint Protocols* and ensure consistency of terminology.

Constituency Services and Office Budget Policy

The Office of the City Clerk included this office in its consultations on the proposed changes to the Councillor Expense Policy. At City Council's meeting of July 11, 12 and 13, 2012, the "Councillor Expense Policy" was renamed the "Constituency Services and Office Budget Policy."

Under Article XV of the *Code of Conduct*, Councillors are required to adhere to Council policies, including the Constituency Services and Office Budget Policy. At the Council meeting on July 11, 12 and 13, 2012, Council passed the amended policy which applies to all Councillors.

City Council amended the last bullet of Section 5 (Allowable Expenses – Legal Fees) in the current Councillor Expense Policy dated May 2012 by deleting,

“Fees related to first consultation for Code of Conduct investigations (limit \$500)”

This provision was replaced with the following allowable expense:

“Fees related to informal complaints (part A) and formal complaints (part B) of the Code of Conduct Complaint Protocol for Members of Council”

City Council made the change to the policy retroactive to January 1, 2012. A copy of the Constituency Services and Office Budget Policy may be found at the following link: http://www.toronto.ca/city_council/pdf/office-budget-policy.pdf.

City Council requested the Integrity Commissioner review and report to Council on suggested corresponding changes in the *Complaint Protocol*. The relevant section is s. 11(1) of the *Complaint Protocol*. I recommend that Council approve the elimination of the clause entitled “Note: Office budget eligible legal expenses.” (shown in grey below)

Payment of Costs

11. (1) Subject to this section and Council’s policy on office expense budget use, claims for reimbursement by a member of Council for costs under this section shall be processed under the *Indemnification Policy for Members of Council*.

[Note: Office budget eligible legal expense

A member who is the subject of an Integrity Commissioner investigation may charge against the member’s office budget the cost of an initial legal consultation of up to one hour for a maximum reimbursement of \$500.00.]

- (2) A complainant and a member who are parties to a complaint under this procedure shall each be reimbursed for actual and reasonable legal and related expenses up to a maximum of:
- (a) \$5,000; or
 - (b) \$20,000, if the Integrity Commissioner has elected to investigate the complaint by exercise of the powers of a commission under Parts I and II of the *Public Inquiries Act*.
- (3) In the case of an application under the *Judicial Review Procedure Act* for judicial review of actions taken on a complaint against a member of council by the Integrity Commissioner, Council:
- (a) where a member made the judicial review application, the member is eligible for reimbursement of legal costs, including additional legal costs in a successful application, that are not

covered by the costs awarded by the court, up to a maximum of \$20,000.

- (b) a member may apply for reimbursement of the legal costs of intervention in a judicial review application where the member's interests are at stake, up to a maximum of \$20,000.
- (4) Council may consider the reimbursement of costs above the limit in subsections (2) and (3) on a case by case basis.
- (5) Costs may be provided in advance in an investigation, if the Integrity Commissioner is of the opinion that the use of a lawyer by one or more of the parties would facilitate the carrying out of the investigation, and subsections (6) and (7) do not apply to the advance costs paid under this subsection.
- (6) Costs shall only be reimbursed under this section to the complainant, if the Integrity Commissioner concludes that the complaint is not frivolous, vexatious or made in bad faith and the Integrity Commissioner's conclusion is not overturned on judicial review.
- (7) Costs shall only be reimbursed under this section to the member:
 - (a) if the Integrity Commissioner concludes that there has been no contravention of the Code of Conduct by the member or that the member is not blameworthy as described in section 7, and the Integrity Commissioner's conclusion is not overturned on judicial review; or
 - (b) where Council receives the Integrity Commissioner's report on a violation and determines that it should not take any action.
- (8) Any award of costs under subsection (7) shall be contingent on a report from the City Solicitor in consultation with the Integrity Commissioner

Toronto Public Service Project: “Doing It Right”

In 2012, City staff embarked on a project, “Doing It Right” to support a respectful, ethical and safe workplace. The Integrity Commissioner was consulted by City Ethics Champions and key members of the City Manager’s office, Human Resources and Strategic Communications. These meetings led to the creation of various supports for staff and a web supported set of tools and information for the public service. This initiative will be launched in the fall of 2012.

The Integrity Commissioner provided information for inclusion in the referral section of the website about the role of the office and how it can provide confidential complaint resolution with staff and members of Council or members of Local and Adjudicative Boards.

City Sponsorship Policy

The office was consulted concerning proposed amendments to the City Donations Policy which is anticipated to be before Council this fall. The Integrity Commissioner and the Lobbyist Registrar met with representatives of the Toronto Office of Partnerships to discuss the revisions proposed and consider the relationship of the proposed policy to the *Code of Conduct* and the *Lobbying By-law*.

Social Media Policy

In last year’s annual report, the issue of whether social media ought to be the subject of policy changes for Councillors was raised. The use of social media to exchange information about and with members of public institutions is growing. The accessibility and speed of the interchanges via social media requires the attention of members of Council in light of their obligations for appropriate communication.

This past year has seen few complaints relating to social media use by members of Council. One complaint received in this reporting period concerned a social media posting. Other municipalities, including Toronto, include social media policies for staff as part of their information technology “acceptable use” policies. At this stage, I do not recommend amendments to the *Code of Conduct*. To date, the provisions of the *Code of Conduct* have proven applicable to traditional forms of communication and to online social media.

I recommend to Council that it waits to assess the influence of social media on the work of members of Council. Members appreciate that their obligations under Article XIV (Discreditable Conduct) of the *Code of Conduct* extend to social media use. Caution is advisable when using methods of communication that are less formal and more open to “off the cuff” comments.

Decorum in Council

Over the past year, and in response to concerns raised by the Speaker about decorum in Council, a meeting was convened by the Integrity Commissioner with the retired Speaker of the House of Commons, the Honourable Peter Milliken, and the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the City Clerk

and the City Solicitor for the City of Toronto. The discussion ranged from practical ways to keep order in lengthy meetings, the nature of the Procedures By-law in use at City Council and the desirability of improving the quality of debate.

Interpretation Bulletin: Lobbying and Elections

On July 23, 2012, the Integrity Commissioner and Lobbyist Registrar issued a joint interpretation bulletin, “Lobbying and Municipal Elections at the City of Toronto.” This bulletin is intended to provide a guideline both for members of Council and to Lobbyists about their roles in relation to election fundraising well in advance of an election period.

Electronic access to this Interpretation Bulletin is available via the website for the Integrity Commissioner at: <http://www.toronto.ca/integrity/resources.htm#005> and on the Lobbyist Registrar’s website at: http://www.toronto.ca/lobbying/pdf/interpretation%20bulletin_municipal_elections.pdf

B. ADVICE

Members of Council and Members of Local Boards and Adjudicative Boards continued to look to the Office of the Integrity Commissioner for advice on a range of topics. The most common areas of request for advice were gifts and benefits, use of influence and questions around conflicts between public and private interest. Councillors and their staff received telephone, e mail and in-person advice, depending on the nature of the inquiry.

TABLE 1

**Members of Council
Members of Local and Adjudicative Boards
Advice Sought and Provided**

	2010-2011	2011-2012
Members who Sought Advice:		
Informal Advice:	36	38
Formal Written Advice:	88	60
Total:	184	119

Members of the public also continue to use the services of the office. The office handles requests for information about how to make a complaint, delivery of complaints in formal and informal formats, information about the *Code of Conduct*, and where appropriate, referrals to other offices or institutions. Although some calls and correspondence are complaint driven, not every contact with this office by a staff member or a citizen takes the form of a complaint. Many of these conversations are for information, referrals or to clarify roles and responsibilities.

TABLE 2
Citizen and Staff Inquiries

	2010-2011	2011-2012
Citizen:	283	276
Staff:	82	53
Total:	365	329

In addition to receiving direct requests for advice and information, the Integrity Commissioner's website (<http://www.toronto.ca/integrity/index.htm>) continues to be visited. The website provides viewers with access to the *Code of Conduct*, City protocols and policies, annual reports to Council and information for officials. In the past year, there has been an increase of nearly 7,000 visits to the site over last year's visits, and 16,000 visits more than 2010. This represents a 57% increase over two years. We have made changes to the web site this year to make navigation and access to information easier. In addition, our web site now provides links to the office's quarterly business expense reports (for travel, training and hospitality) and to our "PCard"³ purchases.

TABLE 3
**Office of the Integrity Commissioner Website Tracking
Number of Visits**

2009 – 2010	2010 – 2011	2011 - 2012
27,811	36,876	43,863

Sample Advice Responses

As in other years, samples of advice are summarized, anonymized, and included to provide further information as to how the *Code of Conduct* is being applied and interpreted.

- Q.** May an elected official accept sports tickets and an invitation to an event in a private box where the tickets are being provided by a client of a registered lobbyist?

³ A PCard (or "Purchasing Card") is a special credit card, issued by a bank, under the authority of each Division Head for the City. The PCard is issued in accordance with the City of Toronto's Financial Control By-Law and the Signing Authority for the City of Toronto. Monthly charges are billed directly to the City of Toronto's Accounts Payable unit and paid for by the City of Toronto. Each card is assigned mandated restrictions such as Transaction and Monthly credit limits. Benefits of the PCard Program include supplies that are needed are received without delay, the City saves time and money by consolidating paperwork and suppliers receive timely payment.

- A. No. The *Code of Conduct* (Article IV – Gifts and Benefits) prohibits gifts or benefits from a registered lobbyist or a client. If the elected official attends the event at his/her own expense, he/she should ensure that any conversations are in compliance with the Lobbying By Law. The Lobbyist Registrar is available to provide advice in advance of any contacts which could result in lobbying activity. The link to the Lobbyists Registrar’s web site is: (<http://www.toronto.ca/lobbying/index.htm>)
- Q. May a Councillor accept lodging and transportation for a spouse on a trip to a conference where the Councillor is attending and speaking in an official capacity? (The donor is not a registered lobbyist or a client of a registered lobbyist.)
- A. The *Code of Conduct* (Article IV – Gifts and Benefits) permits acceptance under paragraph (f) of the Article. Any expenses covered for the Councillor’s spouse are deemed to be a gift/benefit to the Councillor. As a result, both the Councillor and his/her spouse may accept the lodging and transportation reimbursement.
- Q. May an elected official speak at community meetings about a local issue which will affect a close family member?
- A. The *Code of Conduct* has a provision that relates to Use of Influence and friends or family members (Article VIII). Where the Councillor has friends or family who may be personally affected, there are a number of ways to avoid the appearance of the use of influence of office, including involving a neighbouring Councillor, on issues where there may be a conflict or an appearance of conflict.
- Q. I have decided to apologize to a citizen for a thoughtless comment. What should I consider including in my apology?
- A. Apologies are an effective way of resolving disputes or misunderstandings at an early stage, or in resolving a complaint. There are a number of resources available from the office of the Integrity Commissioner, including a short guide for Councillors and Members of Local and Adjudicative Boards. An effective apology expresses sincere regret for the specific conduct, does not minimize or excuse, and it is not contingent on the complainant. Finally, where appropriate, it explains why such behavior will not happen again.

C. COMPLAINTS & INVESTIGATIONS

The *Complaint Protocol* sets out the procedure to follow for informal or formal complaints. The *Complaint Protocol* is available on line at: <http://www.toronto.ca/integrity/pdf/complaint-protocol.pdf>.

The number of all complaints received during this reporting period is set out below and compared to the volume of complaints for last year. There have been significant increases in

both formal and informal complaints. This has led to a larger number of ongoing/pending investigations this year than in the past.

Informal complaints are resolved by letter, discussion or meetings without engaging the formal process or requiring a report to Council. Formal complaints are brought by way of sworn affidavit under Part B of the *Complaint Protocol*. City Council has the responsibility of considering and imposing appropriate sanctions where it finds that a breach of the *Code of Conduct* has taken place.

TABLE 4

Complaints Received

	<u>2010-2011</u>	<u>2011 - 2012</u>
Formal Complaints Received:	9	20
Informal Complaints Received:	16	46
Total Complaints Received:	25	66

The disposition and source of formal complaints received during the last reporting period are shown in Tables 5 and 6.

TABLE 5

**Status of Formal Complaints:
July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012**

	<u>2010-2011</u>	<u>2011 - 2012</u>
Rejected as Beyond Jurisdiction	0	1
Dismissed on the Merits	6	3
Sustained and Reported to Council	0	1
Settled, Withdrawn or Abandoned	0	4
Rejected as Frivolous or Vexatious, Made in Bad Faith or Without Substance	0	2
Still Under Investigation/Deferred	3	10
Total:	9	21

TABLE 6**Source of Formal Complaints Received During Reporting Period
July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012**

Complaints by Staff:	2
Complaints by Members of the Public:	13
Complaints by Members:	4
References from Council:	1
Total:	20

TABLE 7**Formal Complaints Received During Reporting Period
July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012
By Office**

Complaints About:	
Members of Council and Mayor	20
Members of Local Boards	0
Members of Adjudicative Boards	0
Total Complaints Received:	20

During this reporting period, I completed one investigation which resulted in a report to Council on the *Code of Conduct*. The “Report on Code of Conduct Violation” was considered by Council at its meeting of February 6 and 7, 2012. This related to a verbal incident between Councillor Ford and a member of the public in the Council Chamber on July 13, 2011. An informal resolution to the complaint had been proposed in the form of a written apology from the Councillor. An apology was drafted by the Councillor, but it was not accepted by the complainant because the letter did not apologize for the conduct. During the debate in Council over the item, Councillor Ford rose and issued another apology. Council determined Councillor Ford's apology to be sufficient and received the report. A copy of this report and Council's

decision is available on the Integrity Commissioner's website at:

<http://www.toronto.ca/integrity/integrity-reports.htm>

At the February 6 and 7, 2012 Council meeting, a report was provided to Council to request a deadline be imposed for Mayor Ford to comply with Council's decision of August 25, 26 and 27, 2010. A link to the report and to Council's decision is available at:

<http://www.toronto.ca/integrity/integrity-reports.htm> and

<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2012.CC16.6>.

Legal proceedings are presently pending in the Superior Court of Justice about the application of the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act* (the "MCIA") to the matter. In the event that the court's decision provides City Council with guidance on the relationship between the *Code of Conduct*, the *COTA* and the *MCIA*, this may require future consideration by Council of the *Code of Conduct*. The outcome of the proceeding will be monitored for that purpose.

Dismissed Complaints

As in prior years, an anonymized sample of dismissed complaints is provided to City Council.

1. A member of Council complained that another member of Council had obtained and distributed copies of confidential material in contravention of the *Code of Conduct* and the *Public Appointments Policy*. An investigation revealed that the Councillor had not distributed copies of materials in breach of either the *Code of Conduct* or the *Policy*. In the course of examining the *Public Appointments Policy*, it appeared that a review of the language in the sections concerning confidentiality and protection of privacy should be undertaken, given that some of the provisions are vague and internally inconsistent. The City Clerk is committed to a review of the *Policy* with a view to strengthening and clarifying the confidentiality provisions.
2. A member of the public complained that a member of Council had not made a full accounting of the member's office expenses, therefore failing to abide by the *Constituency Services and Office Budget Policy* (formerly *Councillor Expense Policy*) and breaching the *Code of Conduct* (Article XV - Failure to Adhere to Council Policies and Procedures). A review of the member's expenses and reports to the Clerk's office for the purpose of public disclosure revealed that the expenses had been reported accurately and that there had been no breach of the *Councillor Expense Policy* or the *Code of Conduct*.
3. A member of the public complained that a member of Council violated Article XIV (Discreditable Conduct) of the *Code of Conduct* as a result of comments made in public. A review of the comments and their context revealed no breach of Article XIV.

In addition to these complaints, two formal complaints were withdrawn against two members of Council after a written apology was delivered to the complainant in each matter. In each case,

the complaint had arisen as a result of communications between the members and the complainants.

Informal Complaints

The significant increase in the use of the informal complaint mechanism demonstrates its utility in a variety of situations. In this past year, informal complaints have been resolved in a number of ways, including the use of one-way communications to express concerns, letters of explanation or apology from members, and in some cases, in person meetings with a member of the public and a member of Council.

All informal complaints are tracked and outcomes are recorded. Results for this reporting period indicate successful resolution (defined by engagement and finality) in 40% of the informal complaints, resolution (by way of engagement by the citizen directly) in 55% of the informal complaints and finally, no outcome attained (engagement not pursued by citizen) in 5% of the informal complaints.

Following the Integrity Commissioner's participation as a speaker at the New York City Global Partners Public Integrity Summit in June, 2012, "*Public Integrity: Anti-Corruption Strategies, Economic Development and Good Governance*," the Integrity Commissioner prepared a Best Practice Initiative on Informal Complaint Resolution for inclusion on the New York City web site. A link to the site is found at:

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/unccp/gprb/html/bphome/home.shtml>

The use of formal and informal complaint processes provide a variety of ways for citizen, staff and fellow members of Council to raise concerns and resolve matters. A high degree of participation by members of Council in informal processes speaks to the efficacy and flexibility of this type of solution.

Deferred Complaints

One formal complaint made in 2010 continues to be deferred, on notice to both the complainant and the member, based on concurrent civil proceedings.

D. GIFTS AND BENEFITS REPORTING

The Integrity Commissioner's office received 31 Donor Declaration Forms for Council Member-Organized Community Events from the office of the City Clerk in this reporting period. These forms are required to be filed with the Office of the Clerk for "in kind" and cash donations to community events. This form is used to ensure that donations are kept within the allowable annual limit of \$10,000, to ensure that any donations received are for specific events and that Article IV (Gifts and Benefits) in the *Code of Conduct* is being followed by members of Council. When the donation does not fall within the exceptions provided by the *Code of Conduct*, the member is advised so that the donation can be returned. In the past year, one member was required to return a donation for a community event after the status of the donor as the client of a registered lobbyist was confirmed.

Members of Council are encouraged to consult with the office of the Lobbyist Registrar prior to accepting a donation for a community event to check the status of potential donors.

E. EDUCATION & OUTREACH

During this reporting period, the Integrity Commissioner attended meetings, made presentations and issued bulletins on the work of the office as follows:

- July 6, 2011: “The Role of Integrity Commissioner” - Presentation to the Mayor and Members of Council of the City of Mississauga, Mississauga, Ontario
- July 14, 2011: “Donations to Council Member-Organized Community Events” and “The Gifts and Benefits Provision of the Code of Conduct” - Joint presentation to Members of Council staff with Lobbyist Registrar and Council and Support Services
- September 20, 2011: “Ontario Anti-Corruption Laws” - Presentation to Visiting Judges of High Court of Federal Capital Territory, Nigeria
- November 4, 2011: “Code of Conduct for Members of Adjudicative Boards” - Presentation and discussion with City of Toronto Committee of Adjustment
- November 15, 2011: “Ethical Leadership at the City” - Presentation and discussion with Council and Support Services staff
- November 17, 2011: “Confidentiality and Access to Information” - Presentation at Integrity Commissioners of Ontario meeting in Richmond Hill
- November 25, 2011: “Supporting the Values of the Toronto Public Service” - Presentation at Extended Senior Management Team meeting
- January 24, 2012: “Encouraging Respectful and Productive Debate at Council” - Hosted working meeting with Peter Milliken, former Speaker of the House of Commons and Toronto Council Speaker, Toronto Council Deputy Speaker, Toronto City Clerk and City Solicitor
- November 25, 2011: “Supporting the Values of the TPS” - Presentation to the Extended Senior Management Team, Cluster A meeting, hosted by Deputy City Manager
- January 10, 2012: “Donations to Council Member-Organized Community Events” - Joint Memorandum issued with Lobbyist Registrar to Members of Council
- February 8, 2012: “Code of Conduct for Members of Adjudicative Boards” - Presentation to Property Standards Committee
- February 28, 2012: “Code of Conduct for Members of Adjudicative Boards” - Presentation to Sign Variance Committee

- March 23, 2012: “Municipal Integrity Regimes in Ontario: The Implications of Ethics Regimes for Municipal Governments” - Presentation at Commons Institute Conference, Toronto, Ontario
- April 24, 2012 - Hosted meeting of Integrity Commissioners across Ontario. Other Accountability Officials’ presentations included “Neutrality in Investigations” and “Confidentiality and MFIPPA”
- April 25, 2012: “Supporting the Values of the TPS” - Presentation to the Extended Senior Management Team, Cluster B meeting
- June 6 – 8, 2012: “Public Integrity: Anti-Corruption Strategies, Economic Development and Good Governance” - Speaker at New York City International Public Integrity Summit meeting, New York City, New York
- June 12, 2012: “Role of Women in Government” - Speaker at Toronto Regional Champion Campaign Protégé Program

F. BUDGET

The 2012 approved budget for the Integrity Commissioner's office is \$211 thousand, excluding any “COLA” adjustments. The expenses of the office during this reporting period are detailed in Appendix 1, attached to this report.

G. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In the year ahead, I plan to continue encouraging the use of the Integrity Commissioner’s office as a resource for members of Council and an accessible place for the public, members and staff to approach for complaint resolution. The investigation of open complaints will continue, with a view to decreasing the inventory of open files. A balance between investigation and prevention will continue to be an ongoing goal.

An interesting idea arose this past year at the City of Toronto’s spring meeting of Ontario Integrity Commissioners. A representative from the Information and Privacy Commissioner’s office discussed Dr. Ann Cavoukian’s (Ontario’s Information and Privacy Commissioner) concept of embedding privacy into technology, “Privacy by Design.” This led to a conversation about how “Integrity by Design” could become a useful approach to consider how to further “build in” integrity into City processes and synchronize systems with desirable behavior. This is an idea I plan to explore in the year ahead. I wish to acknowledge Dr. Cavoukian for her insights and willingness to share ideas with Integrity Commissioners which may prove helpful in the municipal accountability context.

CONCLUSION

This has been a busy year for the office. Investigations of formal complaints and informal resolutions have increased. The advice and information functions of the office continue to be used and appear to be appreciated by those who make contact with us. We have been pleased to be part of the ongoing efforts by the City of Toronto, led by the City Manager's office, to develop the “Doing It Right” initiative.

The office has been ably supported by the City Clerk’s office and has continued to benefit from the on-site administrative support provided by Wendy Wilson, who carries out her duties with professionalism, attention to detail and good humour. Finally, I wish to recognize City Council for engaging in debate around the issues, seeking dialogue with the office, and demonstrating its willingness to support integrity at the municipal level.

CONTACT

Janet Leiper
Integrity Commissioner
Tel: 416-397-7770/Fax: 416-696-3615
Email: jleiper@toronto.ca

SIGNATURE

Janet Leiper, Integrity Commissioner

ATTACHMENTS

**Appendix 1: Integrity Commissioner's Office Budget and Expenditures
July 2011- June 2012**