

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE INDEX

EIGHTH EDITION



Ideas that change your world | www.fcpp.org

September 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Executive Summary	04
Introduction	05
Findings – Transparency Index	06
Methodology	07
Conclusions and Future Steps	11
Tables	12
Bibliography	19
Endnotes	19

Report Authors:

Brianna Heinrichs, Policy Analyst

Steve Lafleur, Senior Policy Analyst

Media Inquiries and Information:

Deb Solberg

Tel: (403) 919-9335

Development Inquiries:

Samantha Leclerc

Tel: (403) 400-6862

Thank you to Matthew Sinclair, Nicolas Allarie, Erik Henningsmoen and Thao Lam for their research assistance and efforts on this project.

Disclaimer:

The opinions expressed in this paper are exclusively those of the independent author(s) and do not reflect the opinions of the Frontier Centre for Public Policy, its Board of Directors, staff and/or donors.

ISSN # 1491-78 ©2015

Research conducted by the Frontier Centre for Public Policy is conducted under the highest ethical and academic standards. Research subjects are determined through an ongoing needs assessment survey of private and public sector policymakers. Research is conducted independent of Frontier Centre donors and Board of Directors and is subject to double-blind peer review prior to publication.

ABOUT THE FRONTIER CENTRE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

The Frontier Centre for Public Policy is an innovative research and education charity registered in both Canada and the United States.

Founded in 1999 by philanthropic foundations seeking to help voters and policy makers improve their understanding of the economy and public policy, our mission is to develop the ideas that change the world.

Innovative thought, boldly imagined. Rigorously researched by the most credible experts in their field. Strenuously peer reviewed. Clearly and aggressively communicated to voters and policy makers through the press and popular dialogue.

That is how the Frontier Centre for Public Policy achieves its mission.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The Frontier Centre for Public Policy has completed the eighth edition of its Local Government Performance Index (LGPI). The Transparency Index (TI) ranks the top 100 Canadian cities on the quality of their financial reporting over the 2013 financial year.
- Since the project began, TI scores have vastly increased across the country as cities improve their accounting. For instance, almost all large cities now include figures for depreciation in their financial statements, and many cities provide citizens with a more detailed breakdown of expenses.
- Five Albertan cities share first place in the TI with Port Coquitlam in British Columbia and Mississauga in Ontario: Medicine Hat, St. Albert, Lethbridge, Calgary and Edmonton.
- Niagara Falls received a zero because its 2013 financial statements are not yet available (as of July 7, 2015). The auditing of the City's financial statements for 2012 was not finished until November of 2014, whereas most cities have their financial statements audited within a year.
- Excluding Niagara Falls, Kawartha Lakes and Charlottetown are in last place nationally, with Windsor and Cape Breton close behind. Grande Prairie is in last place among the cities evaluated in Western Canada.
- Moncton ranks first among the cities in the Atlantic provinces, with Fredericton taking second place.
- The actual fiscal performance of cities is not evaluated, but the LGPI Web site serves as a springboard for further research. The LGPI's site compiles the financial statements of municipalities and allows users to compare cities on a variety of financial metrics.

Please visit the website at www.lgpi.ca.

INTRODUCTION

The Frontier Centre for Public Policy launched the Local Government Performance Index (LGPI) in 2007. The project is designed to inform citizens about the performance of their local governments and to encourage municipalities to adopt best practices in finance.

There are presently two fundamental parts of the LGPI: the Transparency Index (TI) and a Web site tool that enables users to compare financial data points between cities. The LGPI includes 100 cities, consisting of the provincial and territorial capitals and the country's most populated municipalities. The LGPI is unique because it makes data on the performance of Canada's municipalities available in one easily accessible location. Data from annual reports and consolidated financial statements are uploaded to the LGPI Web site so that members of the public, governments, the media and researchers can view information for multiple cities.

The TI assesses the quality of a city's annual financial reports and ranks them relative to each other. It was created because many Canadian municipalities had poor reporting standards, which prevented Canadians from accessing timely and easy-to-understand information about their local governments. Transparency is important in a democracy. For citizens to hold elected officials accountable for their behaviour, they must know what the officials are doing and how they are spending money. Over time, municipalities have improved significantly in this area. By shining a light on poor practices, the LGPI has likely helped to pressure local governments into adopting best practices.

The TI is not a ranking of a municipality's financial performance. Cities that rank high on it may have large amounts of debt and may not spend money as efficiently as cities with a lower score. The Index considers factors such as the timeliness of an independent auditor's report and the detail in the annual report. The ranking criteria are in the section on methodology below.

The second component of the LGPI, the Web site tool, allows users to compare the 100 cities in the database on a number of metrics including revenue from taxation and spending on public safety. These metrics are not aggregated into an overall score, since doing so presents many methodological challenges. Ranking cities with widely divergent economic, demographic and geographical characteristics based on simple financial performance metrics can be misleading. For one thing, some cities are single-tier municipalities, while others are part of an upper-tier or regional municipality. Cities face unique challenges that require different amounts and types of resources. For example, Winnipeg will likely have to spend more on mosquito control than most cities; Victoria may need to spend more on disaster preparedness; Halifax may need to spend more on snow removal; and Toronto likely needs to spend more than most on mass transit. Aggregated financial metrics can obscure these realities.

The LGPI provides users with financial data in both per household and absolute dollar figures to help them compare their local governments to those in other cities and to track performances over time. Though the financial data in the Web site tool does not always allow for easy comparisons of financial performance, making that data easily available puts pressure on local governments to keep their financial houses in order.

Local governments play an important role in Canada, providing many of the essential services that residents and businesses rely on every day. Some municipalities control billions of dollars' worth of assets, and many households pay thousands of dollars in local taxes each year to fund their municipalities' ongoing activities. By incorporating best practices, local governments can improve the quality of life for their citizens in a tangible way. The LGPI promotes an enhanced quality of life for Canadians through better governance.

FINDINGS – TRANSPARENCY INDEX

Since the project began in 2007, TI scores have vastly increased across the country as cities improve their accounting. For instance, almost all large cities now include figures for depreciation in their financial statements. Many cities provide citizens with a more detailed breakdown of expenses than they did in the past, though a few cities still provide minimal information.

Although some cities publish colourful reports with impressive graphic design and others stick to basic black and white text, Frontier researchers focus on the quality of the content. Cities receive a higher score if they provide commentary on their expenses that references specific dollar amounts, makes comparisons with previous years and gives reasons for discrepancies between budgeted and actual amounts. A recent C.D. Howe publication criticizes the fact that it is often difficult to compare a municipality's annual financial report against its budget even though the two documents are a city's major publications for its yearly financial cycle.¹ The timeliness of the independent auditor's report also affects a city's score.

The following are some of this year's highlights:

- Excluding Niagara Falls, Kawartha Lakes and Charlottetown are in last place nationally, with Windsor and Cape Breton close behind. Grande Prairie is in last place among the cities evaluated in Western Canada.
- Moncton is in first place among the cities in the Atlantic provinces, with Fredericton taking second place.
- Tables with the rankings of all 100 cities are located at the end of this report.
- Five Albertan cities share first place in the TI with Port Coquitlam in British Columbia and Mississauga in Ontario: Medicine Hat, St. Albert, Lethbridge, Calgary and Edmonton.
- Niagara Falls received a score of zero because its 2013 financial statements are not yet available (as of July 7, 2015). The auditing of the City's financial statements for 2012 was not finished until November of 2014, whereas most cities have their financial statements audited within a year.

METHODOLOGY

Gathering Cities' Financial Data

First, Frontier researchers gather the consolidated financial statements and/or annual financial reports for all 100 cities. They then enter data from each city's financial statements into the Web site under four categories: Financial Position, Revenue, Expenditure and Expenditure by Object.

Because detailed guidelines for financial annual reports are not standardized across Canada, and cities have flexibility in the line items they present, some line items do not fall properly within the existing options under these four categories. Researchers can choose to place figures under "Other" to ensure that the total dollar figures for expenses and revenue match the original financial statements.

Core spending is spending on public goods and natural monopolies. Non-core spending is either expenditure that is devoted to a service for which people have alternatives in natural markets or expenditure that is not directly related to the provision of any service.

The following is a list of the current financial data points:

Financial Position

- Capital assets
- Financial assets total
 - Holdings in council-controlled operations
 - Financial assets other
- Long-term debt
- Employee future benefit liability
- Financial liabilities total
- Financial assets – financial liabilities

Revenue

- Developer contributions
- Investment income
- Other

- Net taxes
- Total grants from other governments
 - Federal grants
 - Provincial grants
- Remitted to second-tier local government
- User charges
- Total revenue

Expenditure

- Total non-core expenditure
 - Civic corporations
 - Grants
 - Other
 - Recreation and culture
 - Total social services
 - Health services
 - Social and family services
 - Social housing
 - Miscellaneous social program-related expenditure
 - General government total
 - Democracy costs
 - General government
- Total core expenditure
 - Environmental services
 - Planning and development
 - Public works
 - Utility operations
 - Solid-waste disposal
 - Public safety total
 - Fire
 - Police
 - Miscellaneous public safety-related items
 - Total of transportation-related items
 - Transit
 - Transportation
 - Depreciation
- Total expenditure (non-core + core)

Expenditures by Object

- Grants
- Interest expense
- Other
- Salaries and benefits
- Goods and services total
 - Contracted services
 - Goods
 - Miscellaneous goods and services-related items
- Depreciation
- Total expenditure by object

LGPI researchers then enter population data for each city, both the number of persons and the number of households. The figures for 2012 and 2013 are estimates based on census data from 2006 and 2011 and the average growth experienced by cities between these years.

Many of the services provided by a municipality, as well as much of the revenue collection, are related to the number of dwellings and not the actual population. Therefore, the Frontier Centre decided to show per household figures rather than per person figures for the LGPI. The provincial average figures are also next to the dollar per household figures to show Web site users how a city compares with the other cities evaluated in a province.

Transparency Index

The financial data entered in the previous step has no impact on a city's score in the TI, but the same financial statements or annual reports are examined.

Some cities publish only their consolidated financial statements, while other cities, particularly the larger ones, publish only annual reports. Annual reports generally include more information than simply the audited financial statements that are required by law. Some cities refer to the annual report as a "financial report." Some cities release both an annual report and a separate document of only their consolidated financial statements. This may be in recognition

of the fact that some people do not wish to sift through the extra information provided in annual reports in order to get to the financial statements. For a few cities in the Index that publish both, the annual reports leave out the consolidated financial statements but provide the additional commentary found in many cities' annual reports. If cities publish both, Frontier researchers collect and upload both a city's annual report and its consolidated financial statements.

All projects involve some key assumptions, and the premise of the LGPI is that voters should be able to monitor the financial performance of their municipalities with minimal effort, and this means they should be able to gain a solid understanding of their municipalities' finances using only a city's annual report and its attached audited financial statements. While cities are often required by their provincial governments to provide additional financial reports throughout the year, and cities may provide citizens with additional information elsewhere or upon request, a Chartered Professional Accountants Canada publication states, "[A]nnual financial statements are designed to be read and understood on a stand-alone basis."ⁱⁱ In other words, one should be able to assess the performance of a municipality from the contents of its annual financial statement without having to consult additional sources, though additional sources can be useful for more-detailed evaluation.

In 1986, the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) started the Canadian Award for Excellence in Financial Reporting Program. The Program was designed to encourage local governments to "go beyond the minimum requirements of generally accepted accounting principles ... to prepare comprehensive annual financial reports that evidence the spirit of transparency and full disclosure."ⁱⁱⁱ The GFOA also created the Popular Annual Financial Reporting Award Program to promote annual financial reports that are "easily understandable to the general public and other interested parties without a background in public finance."^{iv} Where the LGPI differs from an award program like that of the GFOA is that it reports on the spectrum of municipal performance, not just on the cities that have done the best.

It should be noted that cities' scores are partially a reflection of their provincial government, which legislates some requirements regarding their municipalities' financial reporting. Some provincial governments grant cities more freedom than others do. For example, Quebec cities all share remarkably similar scores, as the provincial government

effectively standardized the way cities report their finances. The financial report is drawn up using forms from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Regions and Land Occupancy.⁹

Cities' scores are based on the following ranking system:

Timeliness of audit opinion /4

If the audit opinion was in the first two months following the end of the financial year (Jan/Feb) = 4 points

If the audit opinion was in the third/fourth month (Mar/Apr) = 3 points

If the audit opinion was in the fifth/sixth month (May/Jun) = 2 points

If the audit opinion was in the seventh/eighth month (Jul/Aug) = 1 point

Receipt of accounting award /2

If a city received an accounting award for its financial reporting the previous year and displays it, it receives two points. An example would be an award from the Government Finance Officers Association.

Additional Commentary and Statistics /8

This is the most subjective aspect of the TI. Cities receive zero to eight points for the additional commentary they provide on their financial statements. Two points are given if there is any additional commentary, including notes accompanying the financial statements. In recent years, no city has received fewer than two points. Three or four points are awarded for further useful commentary, perhaps plans for the city or what each city department has to offer. Cities earn between five and eight points if there is commentary to help readers understand more about the city's expenditures. Five points mean minimal or vague reference to expenditures, with six points meaning cities provided more numerous or more concrete references. Seven points mean specific dollar amounts were discussed for this year and a previous year, while eight points mean a city presented actual dollar figures in its commentary, made comparisons to a previous year and provided explanations for increased spending or variances from the budget or previous year.

Capital Assets Reported /8

A full eight points are given if cities include a schedule of their tangible capital assets that includes the amortization and net book value of assets under different categories such as buildings, land and machinery. A city gets four points if it only reports a figure for tangible capital assets.

Capital Assets Depreciated/Funded /4

Cities are awarded four points if they provide a figure for depreciation/amortization in their financial statements such as in the Statement of Cash Flows or Statement of Net Assets.

Expenditures by Object Reported /1

Cities are awarded one point if they include an Expenditures by Object section. For example, cities break down expenses into "salaries, wages, benefits," "contracted & general services" and "interest on long-term debt" rather than by department.

Goods/Contracted Services Separate /1

If cities have an Expenditures by Object section, they receive another point if they separate Goods & Services into separate line items.

Depreciation Recorded (Object) /1

If cities have an Expenditures by Object section, they are awarded another point if they included amortization/depreciation as a line item.

Expenditure Line Items Defined /2

Cities obtain two points if they provide definitions for their line items. For example, under "Segmented Information," cities might explain what each city department or service does. Some cities provide more detail than others do, and in cases of extremely vague or short definitions, cities might be assigned only one point.

Historical Trend Statistics Given /2

Cities receive two points if they provide readers with some historical trends and statistics. This often takes the form of a "Five-year Review."

The following is the basis of a city's ranking in the TI:

Timeliness of audit opinion	/4
Receipt of accounting award	/2
Additional Commentary and Statistics	/8
Capital Assets Reported	/8
Capital Assets Depreciated/Funded	/4
Expenditures by Object Reported	/1
Goods/Contracted Services Separate	/1
Depreciation Recorded (Object)	/1
Expenditure Line Items Defined	/2
Historical Trend Statistics Given	/2
Total	/33

Once the data are entered for the TI, the Web site automatically adds up the scores, and Web site visitors can see how municipalities rank in comparison with each other.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE STEPS

The Frontier Centre is updating its ranking criteria for the TI, which will likely be out of 50 or 100 points instead of 33. The change is a reflection of the fact that cities have raised the bar, and currently, the major differentials in score are based on the quality of commentary that cities include alongside their financial statements and the timeliness of their audit opinion or use of historical statistics. Some exceptions for other current measures exist. For example, some cities do not disaggregate goods and services when reporting expenditures. The TI is useful for discovering cities that are reporting poorly relative to other cities, but the scoring criteria should be updated to allow the cities doing the best job to stand out. We hope that by continually updating our metrics, we can encourage municipalities to keep up with evolving best practices. Improving transparency is good for democracy and for public policy outcomes.

HIGHEST AND LOWEST RANKING CITIES

Most Transparent	Score	Least Transparent	Score
Calgary	32	Niagara Falls	0
Edmonton	32	Charlottetown	17
Lethbridge	32	Kawartha Lakes	17
Medicine Hat	32	Cape Breton	18
Port Coquitlam	32	Windsor	18
Mississauga	32	Whitby	19
St. Albert	32	Grande Prairie	19
		Barrie	19

BRITISH COLUMBIA CITIES

City	Timeliness of audit opinion	Receipt of accounting award	Additional commentary and statistics	Capital assets reported	Capital assets depreciated/ funded	Expenditures by object reported	Goods/ services separate	Depreciation recorded (object)	Expenditure line items defined	Historical trend statistics given	TOTAL SCORE
Abbotsford	3/4	2/2	7/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	30/33
Burnaby	3/4	0/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	30/33
Chilliwack	3/4	0/2	4/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	23/33
Coquitlam	3/4	2/2	4/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	28/33
Delta	3/4	0/2	4/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	26/33
Kamloops	3/4	0/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	30/33
Kelowna	3/4	2/2	7/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	31/33
Langley Township	2/4	0/2	6/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	27/33
Maple Ridge	3/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	31/33
Nanaimo	3/4	0/2	4/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	26/33
New Westminster	3/4	0/2	4/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	26/33
Port Coquitlam	3/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	32/33
Prince George	2/4	0/2	6/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	25/33
Richmond	2/4	2/2	6/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	29/33
Saanich	2/4	2/2	6/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	28/33
Surrey	2/4	2/2	6/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	29/33
Vancouver	3/4	0/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	30/33
Victoria	3/4	2/2	6/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	29/33

ONTARIO CITIES

City	Timeliness of audit opinion	Receipt of accounting award	Additional commentary and statistics	Capital assets reported	Capital assets depreciated/ funded	Expenditures by object reported	Goods/ services separate	Depreciation recorded (object)	Expenditure line items defined	Historical trend statistics given	TOTAL SCORE
Ajax	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Aurora	1/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Barrie	1/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	19/33
Brampton	2/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	31/33
Brantford	2/4	0/2	4/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	25/33
Burlington	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Caledon	2/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	31/33
Cambridge	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	22/33
Chatham-Kent	0/4	0/2	4/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Clarington	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Greater Sudbury	2/4	2/2	7/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	30/33
Guelph	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Halton Hills	1/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	22/33
Hamilton	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	23/33
Kawartha Lakes	0/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	0/2	0/2	17/33
Kingston	2/4	0/2	6/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	25/33
Kitchener	2/4	0/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	1/2	2/2	27/33
London	1/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Markham	3/4	2/2	7/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	31/33
Milton	2/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	31/33
Mississauga	3/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	32/33
Niagara Falls	0/4	0/2	0/8	0/8	0/4	0/1	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/2	0/33
Newmarket	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Norfolk County	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Oakville	2/4	2/2	7/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	30/33
Oshawa	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Ottawa	1/4	0/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	28/33

ONTARIO CITIES (CONT'D)

City	Timeliness of audit opinion	Receipt of accounting award	Additional commentary and statistics	Capital assets reported	Capital assets depreciated/ funded	Expenditures by object reported	Goods/ services separate	Depreciation recorded (object)	Expenditure line items defined	Historical trend statistics given	TOTAL SCORE
Peterborough	1/4	0/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	28/33
Pickering	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Richmond Hill	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Sarnia	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
St. Catharines	1/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Toronto	1/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	30/33
Vaughan	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Waterloo	2/4	0/2	6/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	1/2	2/2	25/33
Welland	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Whitby	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	0/2	0/2	19/33
Windsor	1/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	1/2	0/2	18/33

PRAIRIE CITIES

City	Timeliness of audit opinion	Receipt of accounting award	Additional commentary and statistics	Capital assets reported	Capital assets depreciated/ funded	Expenditures by object reported	Goods/ services separate	Depreciation recorded (object)	Expenditure line items defined	Historical trend statistics given	TOTAL SCORE
Calgary	3/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	32/33
Edmonton	3/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	32/33
Grande Prairie	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	0/2	0/2	19/33
Lethbridge	3/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	32/33
Medicine Hat	3/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	32/33
Red Deer	3/4	0/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	30/33
Regina	2/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	30/33
Saskatoon	2/4	0/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	29/33
St. Albert	3/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	32/33
Strathcona County	3/4	0/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	0/2	1/2	27/33
Winnipeg	2/4	0/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	28/33
Wood Buffalo	3/4	0/2	5/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	27/33

ATLANTIC CITIES

City	Timeliness of audit opinion	Receipt of accounting award	Additional commentary and statistics	Capital assets reported	Capital assets depreciated/ funded	Expenditures by object reported	Goods/ services separate	Depreciation recorded (object)	Expenditure line items defined	Historical trend statistics given	TOTAL SCORE
Cape Breton	1/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	0/2	0/2	18/33
Charlottetown	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/2	17/33
Fredericton	3/4	0/2	7/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	28/33
Halifax	1/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Moncton	3/4	2/2	6/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	29/33
Saint John	1/4	0/2	5/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	22/33
St. John's	0/4	0/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	25/33

QUEBEC CITIES

City	Timeliness of audit opinion	Receipt of accounting award	Additional commentary and statistics	Capital assets reported	Capital assets depreciated/ funded	Expenditures by object reported	Goods/ services separate	Depreciation recorded (object)	Expenditure line items defined	Historical trend statistics given	TOTAL SCORE
Blainville	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Brossard	3/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Drummondville	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Gatineau	3/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Granby	3/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Laval	1/4	0/2	3/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	22/33
Levis	3/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Longueuil	3/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Montreal	3/4	0/2	5/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	25/33
Quebec	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Repentigny	3/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Saguenay	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Saint-Hyacinthe	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu	3/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	21/33
Saint-Jerome	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Shawinigan	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Sherbrooke	2/4	0/2	5/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	23/33
Terrebonne	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33
Trois-Rivieres	2/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	20/33

TERRITORIES

City	Timeliness of audit opinion	Receipt of accounting award	Additional commentary and statistics	Capital assets reported	Capital assets depreciated/ funded	Expenditures by object reported	Goods/ services separate	Depreciation recorded (object)	Expenditure line items defined	Historical trend statistics given	TOTAL SCORE
Iqaluit	3/4	0/2	2/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	0/2	22/33
Whitehorse	2/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	31/33
Yellowknife	2/4	2/2	8/8	8/8	4/4	1/1	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	31/33

ENDNOTES

ⁱBenjamin Dachis and William B.P. Robson, "Baffling Budgets: Canada's Cities Need Better Financial Reporting," C.D. Howe Institute Commentary No. 397, January 2014. Accessed April 23, 2015 at http://www.cdhowe.org/pdf/Commentary_397.pdf.

ⁱⁱJohn Hughes and Alex Fisher, "Reading Financial Statements – What Do I Need to Know? Common Questions Answered," Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada, 2014. Accessed April 23, 2015 at <https://www.cpacanada.ca/~media/Site/business-and-accounting-resources/docs/Reading%20Financial%20Statements%20-%20%20What%20do%20I%20need%20to%20know.pdf>.

ⁱⁱⁱGovernment Finance Officers Association, "Canadian Award for Financial Reporting Program (CAnFR Program)." Accessed April 23, 2015 at <http://www.gfoa.org/canfr>.

^{iv}Government Finance Officers Association, "Popular Annual Financial Reporting Award Program (PAFR Program)." Accessed April 23, 2015 at <http://www.gfoa.org/pafr>.

^vMunicipal Code of Québec, Chapter C-27.1 S. 176. Accessed April 20, 2015 at http://www2.publicationsduquebec.gouv.qc.ca/dynamicSearch/telecharge.php?type=2&file=/C_27_1/C27_1_A.html.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dachis, Benjamin, and William B.P. Robson. "Baffling Budgets: Canada's Cities Need Better Financial Reporting." C.D. Howe Institute Commentary No. 397, January 2014. Accessed April 23, 2015 at http://www.cdhowe.org/pdf/Commentary_397.pdf.

Government Finance Officers Association. "Canadian Award for Financial Reporting Program (CAnFR Program)." Accessed April 23, 2015 at <http://www.gfoa.org/canfr>.

Government Finance Officers Association. "Popular Annual Financial Reporting Award Program (PAFR Program)." Accessed April 23, 2015 at <http://www.gfoa.org/pafr>.

Hughes, John, and Alex Fisher. "Reading Financial Statements – What Do I Need to Know? Common Questions Answered." Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada, 2014. Accessed April 23, 2015 at <https://www.cpacanada.ca/~media/Site/business-and-accounting-resources/docs/Reading%20Financial%20Statements%20-%20%20What%20do%20I%20need%20to%20know.pdf>.

Municipal Code of Québec. Chapter C-27.1 S. 176. Accessed April 20, 2015 at http://www2.publicationsduquebec.gouv.qc.ca/dynamicSearch/telecharge.php?type=2&file=/C_27_1/C27_1_A.html.

