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RE: RESOLUTIONS PROCESS REVIEW
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3. BACKGROUND & PROCESS TO DATE

The resolutions process review was initiated by resolution 2008-B137, which requested that each Area Association prioritize and submit only their top 5 resolutions for debate at Convention; that the UBCM Executive be asked to bring forward a maximum of 25 member resolutions for debate at Convention; and that UBCM develop a tracking system for resolutions.

Resolution 2008-B137 was forwarded to the UBCM Executive in December of that year. In light of the fact that local government elections were held in November 2008, the Executive realized that it would be challenging for 43% of newly elected officials to provide input and feedback on options for changing the resolutions process when they had not yet had the opportunity to take part in a UBCM Convention resolutions session. Consequently, instead of putting forward options at the 2009 Area Association meetings, it was decided that a policy paper be prepared for member consideration at the 2009 Convention.

The 2009 policy paper was considered and endorsed by the membership, including the following 2 recommendations:

That the membership endorse the proposed course of action that will see the development of options for amending the resolutions process to be presented at the 2010 Area Associations for feedback and direction; and

That based on the direction from the membership, recommendations may be forthcoming to the 2010 UBCM Convention to amend the UBCM resolutions process.

Since the 2009 Convention, UBCM has worked to develop options for improving the resolutions process based on a review of the delegate feedback from past Conventions, resolutions processes since 2003, UBCM Bylaws, and Executive Policies. Also, sixteen (16) interviews were conducted in November and December 2009 with Past Presidents and the current President, former Executive Director, and former and current Resolutions Committee members to gather their opinions on the resolutions process and provide comment on the draft options for changing the process.
Further background information on the resolutions process review can be found in the 2009 Policy Paper on the UBCM Resolutions Process (Appendix A).

4. MEMBER CONSULTATION

To date, member consultation has included interviews with select individuals involved in the resolutions process, and discussions with Executive members at the November 2009 and January 2010 meetings. Written comments were received from the SILGA Executive identifying problems with the current system and possible solutions. The membership has also indirectly provided input into this discussion paper, through their delegate feedback forms from previous Conventions.

Direct consultation with the entire membership is taking place through the distribution of this discussion paper, a presentation of the options at the Area Association conferences, and a survey. The goal is to present a policy paper at the 2010 Convention for member consideration.

This discussion paper is being circulated at this time, to give members an opportunity to review the information before the Area Association conferences.

A UBCM Executive member and staff person will present the discussion paper at the Area Association conferences. There will be a question and answer period where members can ask for clarification on the options presented in the paper.

The survey is the main forum for members to provide feedback into the resolutions process (attached as Appendix B). Please note that the purpose of the Area Association sessions is to present and clarify the options in the paper, while the survey provides an opportunity for members to comment on the options. Survey responses (either online or hard copy) must be received by UBCM by May 30, 2010.

Both documents are available online as of March 15 at this address: http://www.ubcm.ca/EN/main/resolutions/policy-areas/governance/resolutions-process-review.html

Comments provided from the member survey will inform the 2010 policy paper on the resolutions process and the proposed changes to the resolutions sessions. Following the 2010 Convention, UBCM will evaluate the impact of the changes made to the resolutions session and review the delegate feedback from Convention to determine whether or not further changes are needed for 2011. Since only a small number of Convention feedback forms are received each year, UBCM would encourage attendees to fill out evaluations so they can provide input into the 2011 resolutions sessions.
5. **UBCM RESOLUTIONS PROCESS**

Based on a review of Convention feedback, research on past resolutions sessions, the 2009 policy paper, interviews conducted in November and December of 2009, discussions with the 2009/2010 Executive and Resolutions Committee members, and a review of the Executive Policies, Bylaws and Conference Rules and Procedures for Handing Resolutions, the following theme areas emerged which formed sections of this discussion paper:

A) **Principles**

Items in this section reflect the core values of the organization and the expressed desire of the Executive that these values would remain in place to ensure that UBCM continues to provide a common voice for local government and meets the goals and vision as identified in the UBCM mission statement.

B) **Proposed Changes for 2010**

This section outlines proposed changes to the processing of resolutions and the Convention program for 2010. These changes are suggested to address the feedback received from our members and the Executive on the resolutions process.

C) **Proposed Changes for 2011**

The options in this section are proposed for 2011, as they require further research; affect other parts of Convention (i.e. electronic voting affects elections); or require more feedback from members.

In addition to the principles, proposed changes for 2010 and proposed changes for 2011, another key theme that emerged from the research was the desire to undertake changes to the resolutions process in an incremental fashion. One interviewee commented that the resolutions process “is a good one” and that “phased recommendations are needed and should be re-evaluated after each year because you don’t want to mess up a good thing”.

**A) PRINCIPLES**

The two principles identified below reflect the core values of the organization and the desire of the Executive that these values remain in place to continue to meet UBCM’s mandate, goals, values and visions.

**Convention Will Continue to Have a Resolutions Session**

This core principle, to retain the resolutions session at Convention, was expressed in several of the interviews, with one interviewee in particular noting, “that having no resolutions session at Convention is equivalent to saying that we’re going out of business”.

As noted in the 2009 policy paper, UBCM’s resolutions process was compared with the processes of our provincial and territorial local government association counterparts. It was found that while most of the other associations have
somewhat similar processes for submitting resolutions, there was variation in how the resolutions were processed once received by the associations.

For example, there is no resolution session at the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) Annual Conference. Resolutions submitted to AMO, which require action, are either referred to the relevant Task Force (if within their policy portfolio) or directly to the Board of Directors with analysis and recommendations from AMO policy staff.

At the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, resolutions are considered at the March and September meetings, and (or if specifically requested by the sponsor), at the Annual Conference. Relevant standing committees provide comments on the resolutions and determine if the resolution is compatible with existing policy. It is during the March meeting, if requested by the sponsor, that standing committees will recommend which resolutions should be submitted to the Annual Conference – based on their national municipal significance. Then the full board must concur that the resolution should be submitted to the Annual Conference. Select resolutions are packaged by Standing Committees in a Consent Agenda, which is voted on as a single item.

UBCM considered these and other models of receiving and processing resolutions across Canada, and determined that continuing to offer a resolutions session at the annual Convention was necessary to ensure that the advocacy agenda of the organization remains based on the debate and direction provided by all members through the resolutions sessions.

Therefore, the UBCM Executive has indicated support for ensuring that resolutions sessions continue to be a part of the annual Convention.

**No Limit on Resolutions Accepted from Members**
Resolution 2008-B137 specifically requested that each Area Association be asked to prioritize and submit only their top 5 resolutions for debate at Convention and that the UBCM Executive be asked to bring forward a maximum of 25 member resolutions. This would result in a total of 50 resolutions.

The options suggested in resolution 2008-B137 were considered by the Executive and the interviewees as possible amendments to the resolutions process. The large majority of those interviewed were not in support of limiting the number of resolutions. While several agreed that the number of resolutions at Convention needed to be reduced and prioritized, they did not support the options presented in the resolution 2008-B137.

Many of those interviewed noted that one of the major benefits of UBCM membership was the ability to submit unlimited resolutions to Convention for debate. Since this option would limit the number of resolutions, members may consider a key benefit of UBCM membership was no longer offered.

Several interviewees also commented on the role of Area Associations. While some from the interview process felt this was a good opportunity to increase the profile of Area Associations, others questioned their ability to prioritize
resolutions and the process they would use, observing that Area Associations currently “act primarily to feed resolutions to UBCM”. Many felt uncomfortable letting their Area Associations choose their 5 resolutions for Convention. Specifically, one interviewee observed that some Area Associations could be challenged to develop a process for establishing and implementing a fair system to select 5 resolutions.

Of those interviewed who supported the idea of limiting the number of resolutions, as proposed in resolution 2008-B137, they differed on the number of resolutions that should be submitted. One supported the original suggestion (5 from each Area Association, 25 from Executive); one suggested 10 or 20 from each Area Association (and 25 from the Executive), and a third was in favour of a total of 30 resolutions (5 from each area association, and 5 from the UBCM Executive). Also suggested was that each of the resolutions be accompanied by a background paper from the sponsor, indicating that the resolution met the province-wide criteria before being admitted to UBCM, so that more work and thought would go into the drafting of each resolution. It was noted that this would be a good way for the membership to learn about the issue and return home with more education about province-wide issues.

An alternative option to the proposed changes in resolution 2008- B137 was suggested by one of the interviewees, that unlimited resolutions still be accepted from the membership but the Area Associations could prioritize 5 resolutions each that would be dealt with first at Convention. This would put 25 resolutions (5 from each Area Association) for debate first, perhaps in the A category. Of those interviewees that were presented with this new option, all were supportive though one cautioned that these resolutions should be high priority and provincially relevant.

UBCM acknowledges the need to prioritize and reduce the number of resolutions debated at Convention and will continue to explore options. UBCM recognizes that members see their ability to submit resolutions as a benefit of membership and UBCM is not willing to remove that privilege.

B) PROPOSED CHANGES FOR 2010

Over the years, several processing and on-site event changes have been made to meet the growing needs of the organization. This includes adding Cabinet Panels, speeches from party leaders, adding or removing time from the resolutions session, introducing a tradeshow, etc. The membership has clearly indicated that changes to the resolutions process are required, therefore, the changes identified in this section are proposed for 2010. The impact of these changes would be evaluated after Convention and further adjustments would follow in 2011 if necessary.
**Process Issues**

**Placement and Grouping of Resolutions in Resolutions Book**

In recent years, many resolutions have been submitted that have not made it to the Convention floor for debate, though they were submitted on time and printed in the Resolutions Book. This has led members to question how resolutions are categorized in the book, as this affects whether or not their resolutions get debated.

The current order of resolutions in the Resolutions Book is:

- Extraordinary and /or Special Resolutions (when required)
- A resolutions (priority issues)
- B1 resolutions (resolutions that are already UBCM policy, grouped by subject category)
- B2 resolutions (new issues within the jurisdiction of local government, grouped by subject category)
- B3 resolutions (new issues outside the jurisdiction of local government, grouped by subject category)
- C resolutions (resolutions that have been consolidated, referred to policy papers, referred to special sessions at Convention, referred to Special Resolutions, or referred back to an Area Association)

From delegate comments and the SILGA feedback, it was suggested that resolutions should be placed in the book in the order they were received, and /or prioritized if they have been vetted and supported by an Area Association.

After several discussions on the re-organization of the Resolutions Book, UBCM has proposed that resolutions be grouped:

- first, by the recommendations of the Resolutions Committee (endorse, not endorse, no recommendation, etc.)
- second, within each group, resolutions endorsed by Area Associations would be printed first; followed by resolutions submitted directly to UBCM

In other words, the resolutions would be printed in the 2010 Resolutions Book in the following order:

1. Extraordinary and /or Special Resolutions (when required)
2. A resolutions- priority issues
3. B1- resolutions that are already UBCM policy
4. B2- new issues within the jurisdiction of local government
   a. Endorse or endorse with proposed amendment (as recommended by Resolutions Committee)
      i. endorsed by Area Association
      ii. submitted directly to UBCM

---

1 In order of receipt.
b. not endorse (as recommended by Resolutions Committee)
   i. endorsed by Area Association
   ii. submitted directly to UBCM

c. no recommendation (as recommended by Resolutions Committee)
   i. endorsed by Area Association
   ii. submitted directly to UBCM

d. other recommendations as appropriate

5. B3- new issues outside the jurisdiction of local government
   
   Same order as for B2 resolutions

6. C- resolutions that have been consolidated, are in policy papers for Convention, referred to special sessions at Convention, or referred to Special Resolution section.

A key difference between the current and proposed placement and grouping of resolutions is that resolutions would no longer be categorized by subject area.

Instead, priority in the Resolutions Book would be given to those resolutions that had been considered by an Area Association. In existing policy, members are encouraged to submit their resolutions to their Area Associations. With the new ordering of resolutions in the Resolutions Book, those members who work through their Area Associations are rewarded by having their resolutions placed in the book before those that were not considered by an Area Association.

Resolutions should be submitted directly to UBCM only if an issue arises after the Area Association meeting dates or if the resolution is not endorsed by the Area Association. As some Area Association meetings are held earlier than others, UBCM will work with Area Associations to determine the order of receipt of resolutions.

This change would require an amendment to the Executive Policies and the Conference Rules and Procedures for Handling Resolutions.

**Move Grouped Resolutions as a Block (from the B2 and B3 sections)**

This change is suggested to expedite the resolutions session, by voting on the B2-a and B3-a grouped resolutions as a block. This is the block that the Committee would recommend for endorsement.

This is another key difference between the current and proposed procedures for handling resolutions at Convention. B2 and B3 resolutions now have 4 sub-groups each, of which the first sub-group ‘a’ would be considered as a block. These are resolutions that are recommended as ‘endorse’ or ‘endorse with proposed amendment’ by the Resolutions Committee. Staff are also researching whether or not resolutions can be further categorized by subject area.
For block consideration of B2-a and B3-a, UBCM would use the same procedures that are now used for the B1 block. Thus, as with the B1 block, resolutions in the grouped B2-a and B3-a blocks could be removed and considered individually by a member wanting to speak in opposition or propose an amendment.

Using the new ordering system for B2 and B3 resolutions, this means that:

a. Endorse or endorse with proposed amendment (as recommended by Resolutions Committee)
   i. endorsed by Area Association
   ii. submitted directly to UBCM

b. not endorse (as recommended by Resolutions Committee)
   i. endorsed by Area Association
   ii. submitted directly to UBCM

c. no recommendation (as recommended by Resolutions Committee)
   i. endorsed by Area Association
   ii. submitted directly to UBCM

d. other recommendations as appropriate

In order to consider grouped B2-a and B3-a resolutions as a block, an amendment is required to the Conference Rules and Procedures for Handling Resolutions. To amend the Conference Rules, a Special Resolution must be submitted which would state that only those who wish to speak in opposition or propose an amendment to a resolution that the Committee has recommended for endorsement as a block, may request that it be removed from that block and entered for individual consideration.

No Resolutions with the Recommendation with ‘Pending Clarification from Sponsor’
Though UBCM already works with sponsors to clarify their resolutions when necessary, some are still not fully understood by the print deadline for the Resolutions Book, due to a lack of background information submitted or difficulties obtaining additional information from sponsors. In the past, since these resolutions were received by the June 30 deadline, they have been printed in the resolution book with the Resolutions Committee recommendation ‘no recommendation pending clarification from sponsor’.

Consideration of these resolutions adds to the number of resolutions that require individual debate. For many of these resolutions, if UBCM could obtain the requested information, these resolutions could possibly be added to the B1 block or other categories.

Therefore, the Committee proposes that for the 2010 Convention, UBCM staff will continue to request clarification from sponsors, as required, up to the
resolutions deadline of June 30. If there is no response from the sponsor, 1 week after UBCM staff’s request for clarification, the resolution would not be printed in the Resolutions Book and would not be considered at Convention. Resolutions would be kept on file and included in the resolutions cycle for the following year.

**On Site Event Changes**

**Additional Time for Resolutions Session**
Members appeared to be split on this issue. Some have requested that UBCM add more time, especially if the rest of the process remained the same, in order to get through more resolutions. One delegate noted that since resolutions are the “meat and potatoes” of the organization, that it should take precedence over elections, provincial meetings and the tradeshow, and that enough time should be allocated at Convention so that every resolution can be heard. Others noted that attendance at resolutions sessions is already low, and thought that adding more time would further discourage delegates from attending. One comment suggested that UBCM, “do it smarter, in less time”.

In 2009, there was 6 hours dedicated to the resolutions session, though this amount of time has varied between 5.25 - 6.5 hours over the last few years. The Resolutions Committee considered all the comments on time allocated for resolutions and proposed that for 2010, the session be given 6.5 hours - the maximum time that has been allocated for resolutions in the past. In addition to the proposed changes to the processing of resolutions, and the onsite event changes, an extra 30 minutes may be enough to work through all the resolutions submitted.

**Dedicated Blocks of Time for Resolutions Sessions- Minimum 1 Hour**
Noted by SILGA, and echoed by the UBCM Executive and several members, is that the resolutions session is interrupted too often with election and party leader speeches, nominations for elections, and breaks.

As per the UBCM Bylaws, nominations for elections must take place on the morning and afternoon of the 1st day of Convention; the morning and afternoon of the 2nd day of Convention; and the morning of the 3rd day of Convention. Election and party leader speeches are not mentioned in the bylaws but can be arranged around the resolutions sessions.

The resolutions session could run dedicated blocks of time for resolutions without interruptions from election nominations, election speeches or party leader speeches. This program change is proposed for 2010.

**Provincial Meetings & Resolutions Sessions**
Delegates point out that they juggle competing interests at Convention, between attending meetings with provincial government officials, attending the resolutions sessions, and visiting the tradeshow.

Some delegates feel that the resolutions session is the “work of the Convention”, and there should be no other meetings or distractions during this time. Others
note that meetings with the Province are their primary reason for attending the conference, particularly the smaller communities.

UBCM recognizes the competing demands and proposes to advise the Province of the timing of the resolution sessions with the idea that this may result in less provincial meetings scheduled during the resolutions session.

**If No Opposing Speaker, Call the Question**
Delegate feedback from 2009 clearly stated that too much time was spent on just a few issues and that too many of the same speakers were commenting on every resolution.

This option would attempt to address this issue. It was unanimously supported by those interviewed and was based on the policies of similar organizations that do not allow speakers to speak in support of a resolution unless there is first a member speaking in opposition or proposing an amendment. If there is no opposition or proposed amendment to a resolution, then the question is called.

If members voted to make this change, then the procedures for debate of individual resolutions would be modified as follows:

1. Chair introduces resolution by reading number and title
2. Resolutions Committee member reads the enactment clause(s) and Resolutions Committee recommendation
3. Chair asks if anyone wishes to speak in opposition
4. If no opposing speakers, then Chair calls the question
5. If a delegate wishes to speak in opposition, then Chair invites sponsor to introduce resolution (3 minutes), followed by opposing speaker (2 minutes)
6. Debate consists of alternating speakers for or against
7. Once there are no more alternating speakers, then the question would be called

Also, if this option were introduced, a separate microphone for the sponsor and the opposing speaker could be established so that the Chair could easily identify if there is a member who wishes to speak in opposition.

This option requires amendments to the bylaws and to the Conference Rules and Procedures. To amend bylaws, an Extraordinary Resolution with the proposed change must be submitted to the Executive Director 75 days prior to Convention.

**C) PROPOSED OPTIONS FOR 2011**
Members are asked to consider the options in this section and provide feedback in the survey, which is attached as Appendix B, and is also available on the UBCM website. The options in this section would be considered for the 2011 Convention, as they require more research and feedback from the membership.
Resolutions Already Policy Not Debated at Convention
This option would remove the B1 block of resolutions from the resolutions session at Convention and the Resolutions Book.

Currently B1 resolutions are those that align with existing UBCM policy. They are considered and voted on as a block at Convention. If a member wishes to speak in opposition or propose an amendment to a resolution in the B1 block, the member may remove the resolution from the block for individual consideration.

In this option, B1 resolutions would not be debated at Convention and would not be printed in the Resolutions Book. These resolutions would be brought to the Executive for endorsement and would have the same status as resolutions that were endorsed by the membership at Convention. Staff would notify the sponsor that the resolution aligns with current UBCM policy, would be endorsed by the Executive and would be placed in the database for advocacy purposes.

Resolution Follow Up/ Tracking
Resolution 2008-B137’s third enactment clause requested that “UBCM develop a tracking system and report back annually as to the progress made on resolving the concerns brought forward by UBCM member local governments through resolution”.

The current process for following up on resolutions is to post the provincial responses on the UBCM website and officially convey, by formal letter, to the local government sponsor the provincial and federal responses, as well as responses from other organizations. In addition, resolutions and responses as received are added to the searchable resolutions database available on the UBCM website. Further, a summary of successful legislative and regulatory changes brought about by resolutions is printed in UBCM’s Annual Report. As well, members can contact UBCM’s Information and Resolutions Coordinator to inquire about the status of responses.

If members would like UBCM to provide additional follow up and tracking for resolutions, they can offer their suggestions in the member survey.

Reducing and Prioritizing Resolutions
One of the intents of resolution 2008-B137 was to reduce the number of resolutions debated at Convention and ensure that those resolutions debated have province-wide importance and are high priority issues.

Though UBCM does not wish to limit the number of resolutions submitted by members, there are options that can be explored to prioritize resolutions such as the earlier suggestion that would allow Area Associations to choose 5 resolutions each for debate first at Convention.

Area Associations can also play a role in reducing the number of resolutions that are debated at Convention. They can vet resolutions from their members to ensure they address priority issues and are provincially relevant. If they are not, Area Associations can work with sponsors to amend the resolutions before
conveying them to UBCM; they can choose to ‘not endorse’ those resolutions; or they can undertake their own advocacy efforts on regional issues.

**Reducing Speaker Time**
Currently, sponsors are allowed 3 minutes and other speakers are given 2 minutes. Reducing the time for sponsors and other speakers would save a small amount of time in the resolutions session. UBCM asked the interviewees if speaker time should be reduced to 2 minutes for the sponsor and 1 minute for other speakers. Many felt 1 minute was too short for speakers but supported a change to 2 minutes for the sponsor and 2 minutes for other speakers. A bylaw amendment would necessary to implement this change.

**Official Convention Moved to Earlier in the Week or Full Week**
This suggestion was proposed to increase attendance at the resolutions sessions by scheduling it at the beginning of the week.

Officially, the 3 days of Convention fall on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, with resolutions debated during this time. The official Convention, and therefore the resolutions, could be moved to Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, with Monday and Friday for study sessions and workshops.

In addition to moving the official Convention earlier in the week, the Convention Committee is also exploring the idea of offering the official Convention for 5 days, rather than 3 days. Bylaw amendments are necessary to extend the Convention to 5 days.

**Specify Time at which Resolutions ‘Off the Floor’ May be Debated**
Members have expressed frustration that the current procedures enable a resolution introduced ‘off the floor’ and admitted for debate, to be debated immediately. The concern is that immediate debate of a resolution ‘off the floor’ changes the previously agreed upon order of debate of resolutions and disrupts the flow of debate.

This option would specify a time and date during Convention for debate of resolutions admitted ‘off the floor’. A sponsor could still introduce a resolution ‘off the floor’ at any time, and the membership would vote immediately on whether to admit the resolution for debate. If admitted for debate, however, the resolution would not be debated immediately, but would be tabled for consideration at a specific time later in the Convention (i.e. Friday morning). This would allow debate of resolutions printed in the Resolutions Book to continue in a more efficient manner, while ensuring that the resolution admitted “off the floor” would be debated.

This option would require a Special Resolution to amend to the Conference Rules and Procedures. Staff are also researching whether or not this option requires a bylaw amendment.
**Increase Threshold Required for Majority Vote**

Currently, a favourable 3/5 (60%) majority vote is required to adopt Extraordinary or Special Resolutions; admit resolutions ‘off the floor’ for debate; and to amend the order of consideration of resolutions.

This option would increase the majority threshold from 3/5 to 3/4, making it easier for the Chair and the scrutineers to determine, both visually and mathematically, a 3/4 majority rather than a 3/5 majority. If so, a resulting benefit would be shorter times required to determine whether or not the required majority had voted in favour of a motion.

Increasing the majority vote to three-fourths also streamlines the UBCM Bylaws, as section 12 (d) currently states that a three-fourths majority vote of the Executive is needed to call Special Conventions.

This option requires amendments to the UBCM Bylaws.

---

**6. OTHER ISSUES**

A number of other issues were raised and placed in this section as some are already at the discretion of the membership and others will be addressed separately from the resolutions process review as they affect other areas of the Convention (i.e. electronic voting).

**Resolutions ‘Off the Floor’ at Convention**

Member frustration with resolutions ‘off the floor’ at Convention has been mentioned in delegate feedback.

The current process allows for regular resolutions (those submitted to the Area Associations/UBCM by June 30), late resolutions and resolutions off the floor. The regular resolution process is detailed earlier in the paper.

Late resolutions are those received after the June deadline but before the Friday noon preceding the date of the Convention. These resolutions are included in the Report on Resolutions Received After the Deadline, handed out to all delegates in their registration packages. Only those late resolutions deemed to be emergency in nature- that is, addressing issues that arose after the June 30 deadline are admitted for debate. Late resolutions that are admitted for debate are considered individually, but can only be considered once the consideration of all section A resolutions has concluded.

Resolutions are sometimes presented ‘off the floor’ at Convention. A resolution off the floor may be admitted for debate if 3/5 of voting delegates present vote in favour of allowing the resolution to be considered. It is up to the membership to allow these resolutions off the Convention floor to be debated.

If the membership wishes to maintain the flow of the resolutions process, then they should vote *against* allowing it for debate. If members decide that the issue
is truly of an emergency nature and must be addressed, then they should vote to allow the resolution for debate.

As there have been, and may in the future, be important resolutions off the floor, UBCM is not comfortable removing this part of the resolutions process particularly because members have the ability to determine whether or not these resolutions are debated at Convention.

**Motions to Amend the Order of Consideration of Resolutions**

There have been cases where, during the resolutions session, a member requests that their resolution be considered at the present moment. (ie. if the membership is debating resolution B87 and a member requests that their resolution B198 be considered following B87).

This requires a motion to amend the order of consideration of resolutions and is permitted only if 3/5 of voting delegates present vote in favour of allowing the resolution.

If members do not wish that another member’s resolutions be considered out of order, they should vote against the motion.

**Rules of the Resolutions Process**

Particularly at the 2009 Convention, but relevant to other past Conventions, some delegates were unsure about the rules for the resolutions process, resulting in the need for clarification by the chair and slow progression in the session. Part of the unfamiliarity could be due to many of the delegates being newly elected in 2008.

Currently, at the beginning of the resolutions session, the chair of the Resolutions Committee reads the conference rules and procedures for handling resolutions. This information is also printed in the Resolutions Book.

Member feedback has suggested that the reading of conference rules should be eliminated as it is time consuming. It may be true that this takes time away from debate, however, given that many delegates do not know the rules of the process even with the reading by the Chair and information printed in the book, removing the reading by the Chair could, in fact, further slow down the process.

Delegates are asked to be familiar with the process before the resolutions session begins. The Resolutions Book with the conference rules is distributed 30 days before the start of Convention and this is an opportunity to review the information. UBCM staff can also be approached if delegates have questions on the process.

**Attendance**

Delegates, in their feedback, often comment on the low attendance at the resolutions session. Many are disappointed, noting that resolutions are the “meat and potatoes” section of the conference, and UBCM should find a way to make sure all delegates are present. Some attribute low attendance to the inefficiencies in the process; or “all the political grandstanding”; or that ministerial meetings and the tradeshow are scheduled at the same time as the policy session.
UBCM can play a limited role in encouraging delegates to attend resolutions. We can improve the efficiency of the session; schedule resolutions so that there are no other workshops or clinics at the same time; notify the Province as to the when the resolutions sessions are held; adjust the opening of the tradeshows so that it does not open during the resolutions session, drawing attendees away from the resolutions; and request that the Local Government Leadership Academy continue to emphasize the importance of attending resolutions sessions to newly elected and returning local government officials.

However, we cannot request that members do not meet with Ministers during the resolutions session, because we are aware, that for some communities, this is the primary reason they attend Convention. We could encourage members not to schedule their provincial meetings during a resolutions session and we could notify the Province as to when our resolutions sessions are held with the idea that less provincial meetings are held at this time. As for the tradeshows, we require the revenue from the participants to finance Conventions in Vancouver. We do not want to jeopardize this revenue, as we want to keep the costs for Convention as low as possible for our delegates.

Some members have suggested that UBCM provide incentives to attend, such as drawing for a free trip on Air Canada during the resolutions session. This has been considered, however, we do not want to take more time away from the debate to offer prizes as we are challenged enough to get through as many resolutions as possible.

And, since the primary purpose for gathering all locally elected officials together is to create policy for our advocacy agenda, we can only trust that officials recognize this purpose, prioritize this part of the Convention, and participate at their own will because they want to be involved in creating policies that benefit all local governments in BC.

**Training for Resolutions Committee**

Many of those interviewed commented on the Chairs, and the chairing of the resolutions session, as their personal styles influence the efficiency of the process. Those interviewed said that a strong chair is needed, that chairs need to be consistent in their styles, and they need to know the process. Therefore, in addition to the proposed changes, UBCM will be providing training for Resolutions Committee members.

**Electronic Voting**

Electronic voting is favoured by some members as way to speed up the process by counting standing and majority votes quickly. UBCM is conducting research on options for electronic voting including system purchase versus rental, and personnel and technological requirements.
7. **NEXT STEPS**

This discussion paper offers several options for amending the resolution process. There are 2 core principles, 7 proposed changes for 2010, and 7 proposed changes for 2011. Six other issues were also addressed.

This discussion paper is being circulated at this time, to give members an opportunity to review the information before the Area Association conferences. There will be a question and answer period at the Area Association presentations where members can ask UBCM for clarification on the options presented in the paper.

The survey is the main forum for members to provide feedback into the resolutions process (attached as Appendix B). Please note that the purpose of the Area Association sessions is to present and clarify the options in the paper, while the survey provides an opportunity for members to comment on the options. Survey responses (either online or hard copy) must be received by UBCM by May 30, 2010. The online version can be found here: [http://www.ubcm.ca/EN/main/resolutions/policy-areas/governance/resolutions-process-review.html](http://www.ubcm.ca/EN/main/resolutions/policy-areas/governance/resolutions-process-review.html)

An evaluation on the changes to the resolutions process will take place after the 2010 Convention, and there may be further changes for 2011. Again, UBCM encourages Convention delegates to fill out their Convention evaluations, as this information is used to adjust the program from year to year.

8. **RECOMMENDATION**

That members review the discussion paper and provide feedback in the survey (Appendix B).
Appendix A: 2009 Resolutions Policy Paper

TO: UBCM Members

FROM: UBCM RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE
Mayor Sharon Gaetz, Chair
Mayor Mary Sjostrom, Vice Chair
Councillor Barbara Steele
Mayor Malcolm Brodie
Mayor Christopher Causton

DATE: September 17, 2009

RE: UBCM RESOLUTIONS PROCESS:
DISCUSSION ON SCOPE AND OPTIONS

1. Decision Request

That the membership authorize the Resolutions Committee to:
• develop options with respect to amending the existing resolutions process for member consideration;
• seek feedback and direction from members at the 2010 Area Association meetings on the options; and
• based on feedback from members, as necessary, prepare recommendations to be brought forward for full member consideration at the 2010 UBCM Convention to amend the existing resolutions process.

2. Introduction

The purpose of this policy paper is to respond to the feedback from members on the resolutions process. The catalyst for the development of this paper was the referral of resolution 2008 - B137 sponsored by the AKBLG Executive, to the UBCM Executive.

The AKBLG resolution reads as follows:

B137 PRIORITIZING AND TRACKING RESOLUTIONS

WHEREAS there are hundreds of resolutions being debated and voted on at the annual Union of B.C. Municipalities Convention;

AND WHEREAS there is no clear method of tracking the resolutions to determine the outcome of our concerns after our resolutions have been presented to the appropriate party:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that each Area Association be requested to prioritize their top five resolutions from within their Area Association for consideration by the UBCM;
AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the UBCM Executive bring forward a maximum of 25 resolutions of province-wide importance for debate at the UBCM Convention;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the UBCM develop a tracking system and report back annually as to the progress made on resolving the concerns brought forward by UBCM member local governments through resolution.

When B137 was considered by the UBCM Executive during the December 2008 meeting, the following course of action was endorsed:

That staff draft a policy paper for circulation to Executive members in January 2009 for comments and approval, with the goal of submitting the policy paper to Area Associations beginning in February 2009.

In light of the fact that November 2008 was a local government election year, the Executive decided to revise its original recommendation for dealing with the AKBLG resolution. Board members realized that it would be challenging for 43% of new local elected officials to provide input and feedback on options for changing the resolutions process when in fact, they had not yet had the opportunity to take part in a UBCM Convention resolutions session. Consequently, instead of putting forward options at the 2009 Area Association meetings, it was decided that this policy paper be prepared for member consideration at the 2009 Convention. This paper is designed to determine the level of comfort from the membership about possible options for amending the existing resolutions process.

What follows in this paper is more of a scoping document that seeks UBCM member support on a direction and process to consider options for possibly amending the resolutions process. This paper considers the proposal put forward by AKBLG as well as feedback from the membership. While considering the information in this paper, members need to identify what they see as the problems with the existing process, consider possible amendments and determine what the priorities are for UBCM.

- Is it to give priority to some resolutions over others? Is it to reduce the number of resolutions submitted to UBCM? If so, does this require a greater role to be played by Area Associations and the UBCM Executive in prioritizing?

- Is it to ensure that resolutions are categorized in a manner that eliminates debate on repeat issues? Are we comfortable not including repeat resolutions in the Resolutions Book? Do we want to continue to admit them to the floor for debate?

- Is it to expand the time at the resolutions policy session to ensure all resolutions get debated on the floor? Are delegates willing to reduce the time allocated for other workshops and sessions to allow for more resolutions debate?

- Is it to develop a better tracking system of endorsed resolutions? What other means can UBCM use besides the on-line tracking system and conveyance of provincial and federal government responses to sponsors, to make members aware of the status of their resolutions?
No matter what priorities are agreed upon, it is imperative that we, as an Executive Committee take the time to consult with the membership. We need to thoroughly discuss options and ensure that whatever approach is decided upon, we have the support of the membership.

3. History and Background of the UBCM Resolutions Process

While the UBCM membership has considered and debated resolutions annually since the organization was founded over 100 years ago, the process for debating and addressing resolutions has evolved and grown with the organization.

Since the early 1970s, the Executive has played a role in categorizing resolutions submitted to conventions. In 1982, members endorsed a special resolution that formally adopted the use of Sections “A”, “B” and “C” that continues to this day. Over the years amendments and modifications, as well as additional policies and guidelines, for categorizing and handling resolutions have been added but there have been few changes to the resolutions process since the mid-1980s.

As the policies and procedures for dealing with resolutions evolved, the number of resolutions submitted annually to UBCM for consideration at Convention has increased. The average number of resolutions submitted during the 1970s was 142, compared to an average of 198 between 2000 to the present. It is relevant to note that in 2008 and in 2009, members submitted 226 resolutions.

4. Member Feedback on the UBCM Resolutions Process

After each UBCM Convention, delegates are sent an evaluation form and asked to rate and comment on various aspects of the convention. As part of the research work for this paper, an analysis of delegate feedback on the resolutions process was undertaken over the period of 2003-2008. The results of this feedback indicate a trend in the types of comments received.

- *Number of Resolutions Considered and / or Conveyed*

Consistently, delegates have indicated that too many resolutions come up for consideration at Convention, and subsequently for conveyance to the provincial and federal governments and other organizations. Some delegates go further and question the relevance of many resolutions to communities across the province, or they point out that some resolutions duplicate existing UBCM policy or policy directions.

The consideration of large numbers of resolutions, including resolutions that restate existing policy, brings some delegates to question the quality of discussion and debate that takes place during policy sessions at Convention. Others suggest admitting or selecting only a fixed number of resolutions for consideration and debate.
• Repeat Resolutions or Topics

Related to the question of the number of resolutions considered and conveyed is the issue of repeat resolutions or topics. Where possible, the Resolutions Committee attempts to indicate in its comments and recommendations whether an issue has already been addressed, and whether further action might be required.

However, this does not address situations in which UBCM member local governments feel that their concerns on particular issues have not been addressed. Local governments may also be dissatisfied by the way in which an issue has been addressed, or they may question the pace at which change or solutions are being implemented. In all of these cases, it seems that members submit similar resolutions for consideration, year after year, as one way to express dissatisfaction with a lack of response. In fact there have been instances where resolutions have been consistently endorsed for over 10 years before provincial action is taken (ie. traffic fine revenue sharing).

• Member Communication on Endorsed Resolutions

Additional feedback has noted that there needs to be better communication of what happens to resolutions once endorsed at UBCM, and that this might go towards addressing the issue of repeat resolutions. If local governments have a sense that issues are moving forward, or at least that work is being done, then they might be less likely to submit resolutions that duplicate existing policy positions. This also speaks to the last enactment clause noted in the AKBLG resolution which seeks the establishment of a tracking process that would report out on the progress or lack thereof of endorsed resolutions.

• Time Allocated to Policy Sessions

Each year delegates provide UBCM with extensive feedback and very divided opinions on whether enough, or too much time is allocated to policy sessions. A great number of delegates expressed the need for more time to be allotted to policy sessions, to allow for better debate and to ensure that each resolution receives careful consideration. Others alluded to the tension between the time allotted to policy sessions and the number of resolutions to be considered, and suggested that either more time should be allotted or the number of resolutions be reduced.

Some delegates made the general observation that the time scheduled for policy sessions is fairly limited, when considered in the context of the overall Convention program. A common suggestion has been to devote one entire day of Convention to resolutions, with no other events or meetings scheduled during that time. A variant on this is the suggestion to have one long policy session, of unspecified length. Others favour more firm and granular scheduling of specific resolutions, policy papers or blocks of resolutions for consideration within the policy sessions. This would involve setting firm time periods for specific (possibly smaller) blocks of resolutions and when they will come up for discussion.
Each year, delegates point out that they juggle competing interests, between attending meetings with ministers and provincial staff, and attending policy sessions. Some have suggested that delegates and provincial ministers/staff should not be allowed to schedule meetings during policy sessions, and that the Convention program and procedures should be adjusted to make sure that the policy sessions are the priority and the sole event, whenever they appear in the schedule. This would also encompass the existing practice of closing the tradeshow during policy sessions.

Apart from those who want to amend the convention program to ensure that delegates focus their time on policy sessions there is another portion of the membership that consistently suggests that too much time is already allocated to policy sessions at Convention; that these sessions are too long; and that the amount of time scheduled for policy sessions should be reduced.

While the above reflects the predominant issues raised, the following identifies other matters that have also been expressed by delegates:
• resolutions dealt with as a block – some are concerned that individual debate is stifled while others would prefer that repeat resolutions do not get admitted to the floor for debate at all.
• resolutions off the floor – concerns have been raised that resolutions off the floor bypass the normal resolutions process. However, it is important to note that whether or not a resolution is admitted off the floor is truly in the delegates hands. The bylaws provide that a three-fifths majority of the members must support a motion to permit a resolution to come off the floor.
• chairing – while some have commended chairs on trying to keep the debate moving, others have expressed concern that not enough debate has been permitted by chairs to address what are deemed to be controversial issues.

5. Resolutions Processes in Other Jurisdictions

As part of this scoping exercise, we looked to our provincial counterparts to compare resolutions processes. While most other associations have somewhat similar processes for submitting resolutions, the variation is evident in how the resolutions are processed once received by the associations. The following highlights some of these variations between three associations.

At the extreme end of the spectrum is the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO). AMO does not have a resolutions session at their Annual Conference. Resolutions submitted to AMO are either referred to the relevant Task Force (if within their policy portfolio) or to the Executive (no Task Force for a policy issue). Resolutions that are referred to the AMO Executive are considered by board members at regular board meetings. There is no Resolutions Committee, however at the Convention each of the Task Forces present reports to delegates providing them with status reports on specific policy portfolios.

When a resolution is in keeping with existing AMO policy, no action is taken, as advocacy is already underway and the sponsoring local government is so
advised. If a resolution is regional or local in nature in scope, staff works to establish communication between the sponsor and the relevant ministry or agency. In the case where a resolution addresses a new issue or requests a change to existing policy, staff prepares a report for consideration and decision by the Executive. This staff report would include member feedback and relevant Task Force comments where appropriate. The Executive decides on the course of action – if it is endorsed it becomes part of the policy advocacy agenda for the coming year, if it is not endorsed then no action is taken.

Somewhat similar to AMO, the FCM board considers resolutions at their March and September meetings, or if specifically requested by the sponsor, at the Annual Conference. Relevant standing committees provide comments on the resolutions and determine if the resolution is compatible with existing policy. It is during the March meeting that standing committees will recommend which resolutions should be submitted to Annual Conference – based on their national municipal significance. Then the full board must concur that the resolution should be submitted to the Annual Conference. Select resolutions are packaged by Standing Committees in a “Consent Agenda” which is voted on as a single item. Once adopted, all resolutions contained in the Consent Agenda become FCM policy.

In Alberta, the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association (AUMA) empowers its Municipal Governance Committee (Resolutions Committee) to review resolutions and recommend to the Executive that resolutions consistent with previously endorsed policy be returned to sponsors with the appropriate explanation. As well, the same Committee assesses each endorsed resolution following Convention in the context of existing AUMA policy and then recommends to the Executive which resolutions it should focus on as priority issues. Endorsed resolutions are considered to have an active life of 3 years.

These are just a few comparisons from other jurisdictions that help to put our resolutions process in a broader national context.

6. Options for Consideration

Based on the requests put forward in the AKBLG Executive resolution, feedback from delegates attending UBCM resolutions sessions and the practices in other jurisdictions, below are some sample options that will be explored with members during the spring Area Association meetings. For ease of reference the same categories as those employed in section 4 of this paper have been used.

A. **Number of Resolutions Considered and / or Conveyed**

A1. **Prioritize Resolutions**

One option would envision a greater role for the Area Associations and the UBCM Executive in prioritizing resolutions in an effort to limit the number of resolutions to be debated at Convention. In the proposal by the AKBLG Executive, the request is to have each of the Area Associations only submit 5
resolutions and the UBCM Executive to pick 25 resolutions. This would see a total of 50 resolutions brought forward for consideration at a UBCM Convention, approximately one-quarter of the resolutions that are presently received by UBCM each year. If the AKBLG resolution had been endorsed at the UBCM Convention last year, the Executive would have been faced with advising Area Associations to only submit 5 resolutions and for the UBCM Executive to pick 25 resolutions to go forward for debate at this 2009 Convention. Would this have been viewed as fair?

With respect to this option, delegates would need to consider if they are comfortable with this new role to be played by their Area Association and the UBCM Executive. Are 50 resolutions enough? Does the membership have a comfort level in asking their Area Association to pick 5 and the UBCM Executive to pick 25 resolutions? What implications would this have for the Resolutions Book? Would all resolutions get printed and only 50 be recommended for debate?

A2. Limit the Number of Resolutions Submitted to UBCM

Another option might be to advise members that they are only permitted to submit one resolution per year. This would limit the number of resolutions to the number of members. We note that while this may not reduce the number of resolutions drastically, there are members that do not submit resolutions while others consistently submit between 5-10 resolutions every year. The role of the Area Associations would need to be considered in this option. Presently UBCM accepts resolutions from members as well as Area Associations based on what is endorsed at the Area Association conferences. Would UBCM continue to accept resolutions from Area Associations? Or could the Area Associations be used to vet members individual resolutions at their Annual Meetings with their recommendations noted in the UBCM Resolutions Book - as is present practice - but not allow them to submit resolutions for inclusion in the Resolutions Book? Another consideration is resolutions sponsored from Area Association Executives. Under this option, that too, would not be permitted.

A3. No Resolutions Debate at Convention

At the extreme would be an option to follow the lead from AMO and not hold resolutions sessions at the annual conference. AMO receives resolutions from members throughout the year that are referred to specific Task Forces or the Executive for their consideration. These Task Forces then bring forward policy papers to the Convention that would contain specific policy directions based on the resolutions received from the membership throughout the year and whether or not these resolutions are consistent with existing policy. In keeping with this process of no resolutions, AMO does not entertain resolutions off the floor. Would our membership be comfortable empowering UBCM’s Executive Committees reviewing resolutions; dealing with resolutions year round; and no resolutions debate at Convention?
B. **Repeat Resolutions or Topics**

B1. **Previously Endorsed Resolutions Not Debated**

One option would be to return to the procedures in place in 1972 which put previously endorsed resolutions into an addendum within the Resolutions Book with the recommendation to not admit for debate. Presently B1 resolutions are considered as a block, but this block continues to go to the floor for consideration, and there still is the opportunity for a delegate to pull a resolution from the block for individual consideration.

B2. **Previously Endorsed Resolutions Referred to Relevant Committee**

Another option might be to not include previously endorsed resolutions in the Resolutions Book but refer them to the relevant UBCM Committee or the Executive for consideration and possible endorsement if they are in keeping with existing policy. This option would limit member’s ability to speak to their resolutions and garner attention to an issue that might legitimately be creating a continued problem for many communities.

C. **Member Communication**

C1. **Tracking Endorsed Resolutions**

The AKBLG Executive resolution that seeks the establishment of a tracking process that would report out on the progress or lack thereof of endorsed resolutions. Presently, following Conventions all endorsed resolutions are conveyed to the provincial or federal government, FCM or relevant association or organization for a response. Each sponsor is provided with a copy of the responses to their resolutions. In the case of Province, the Ministry of Community and Rural Development receives all resolutions, coordinates the various provincial ministry responses and UBCM receives an extensive report in early spring from the Minister, which is shared with the members and posted online.

As well, UBCM maintains a resolutions database that is publicly accessible on our website. The database contains resolutions dating back to 1985. Each resolution record identifies if the resolution was endorsed and the relevant provincial and/or federal response to the resolution. There are over 3500 records on this database. With respect to this option, we would seek feedback on how we could better track endorsed resolutions. With over 3500 records, how would it be possible to appropriately staff the follow up required to track each resolution?

It is also important to note that this database needs to be viewed as more than just a tracking mechanism for determining if the Province has responded to our endorsed resolutions. The database is what allows us to define ourselves as a policy-driven organization. It is used internally by staff on a consistent basis to
assist us in identifying where our membership stands on a variety of policy matters and assists us in our day-to-day enquiries not only from government staff but the membership and public as well.

C2. Annual Reporting on Resolutions

The AKBLG resolution also speaks to reporting “back annually as to the progress made on resolving the concerns brought forward by UBCM member local governments through resolution.” Each year the UBCM distributes to the membership an Annual Report and Resolutions Book. This book is designed to update the membership on the status of a variety of policy matters that have been addressed by the Executive and its relevant committees over the past year. This Annual report provides an overview of both provincial and federal policy advocacy work that has been undertaken. As well the Resolutions Committee report within the Annual Report does highlight where progress has been made (amendments to legislation or regulation) to address a request that has been put forward by UBCM members through the resolutions process.

This is an area where the Executive Committee would welcome further feedback and comment from the membership. Beyond the existing process for tracking, it is not clear what other actions we could take with the existing staff resources to enhance the tracking process.

D. Time Allocated to Policy Sessions

D1. Add more time for resolutions debate
D2. Reduce time allocated for resolutions debate

Each year at the UBCM Convention, there are 6 – 7 hours dedicated to resolutions debate. This time allocation has remained fairly consistent despite the fact that the number of resolutions has continued to increase. The Convention Committee reviews the program elements each year but the challenge is to ensure that there continues to be adequate time for workshops, keynote addresses and speeches that have become part of the established UBCM Convention program. We note that the bylaws provide for a three day Convention, Wednesday to Friday, so the Committee must ensure that the business sessions (Annual meeting, resolutions /policy sessions) occur within those three days. Would delegates prefer to see full day-long resolutions sessions as has been suggested in some of the feedback? Are delegates willing to forego other learning opportunities (workshops, clinics) for extended resolutions debate time?

As noted, some members feel that too much time is taken on resolutions sessions. Members have referenced that repeat debate on previously endorsed policy positions, wastes time and would prefer that debate be focused on new resolutions. The debate around how much time is allocated to resolutions sessions is directly linked to the outcome of the discussions on the previous options. For instance, if there is direction from the membership to have the Area Associations and Executive prioritize resolutions as proposed then we would not need 6-7 hours to debate 50 resolutions.
7. Implications of Change

The previous section has highlighted some options that members may wish to consider when UBCM undertakes to consult with delegates at the 2010 Area Association Meetings. However, we recognize that there are other ideas and options that members may wish to explore and we are open to your suggestions. It is also important to consider the broader implications of changing the resolutions process in the overall context of how UBCM operates and what it means to be a member of UBCM.

For example, one of the privileges of UBCM membership is that members can sponsor and bring forward a resolution to the UBCM for consideration at the UBCM Convention. If as a result of this process, the decision is made to provide more authority to the Area Associations and Executive to prioritize resolutions or to limit the number of resolutions that a member can submit, are we removing one of the fundamental privileges of UBCM membership? The UBCM Convention provides a huge media opportunity for some communities to raise the profile and get the attention that they are looking for to get action on issues that are impacting them.

UBCM is very fortunate to also have a good working relationship with the Ministry of Community and Rural Development. This relationship allows us the ability to convey all our resolutions to the Minister who is then responsible for pulling together the responses from the various ministries over a period of six months. This task is becoming harder and harder to accomplish within the designated time frame as the number of resolutions continues to grow. It has also been noted that UBCM is the only provincial association that has this type of formalized relationship with their provincial government. The question is how long can UBCM continue to expect the Province to respond to all of our resolutions, when will capacity be reached? Would it make sense to limit and prioritize the number of resolutions sent to the Province and concentrate on getting results on a few, instead of responses to all with possibly limited success?

As with any process, there are pros and cons to change. With respect to the UBCM resolutions process we must carefully weigh them in the context of the benefits that we have with the existing process. Could the existing process be better? Probably yes, but we need to identify how much we can change without jeopardizing some of the basic principles associated with being a UBCM member. As noted, the purpose of this paper is to generate discussion and seek direction to move forward and identify some potential options for amending the present UBCM resolutions process. This paper is the first step. The Committee will be bringing forward more detailed options in the spring and will be seeking your guidance and direction.

8. Recommendations

That the membership endorse the proposed course of action that will see the development of options for amending the resolutions process to be presented at the 2010 Area Associations for feedback and direction; and
That based on the direction from the membership, recommendations may be forthcoming to the 2010 UBCM Convention to amend the UBCM resolutions process.
Appendix B: Member Survey on the Resolutions Process Review

This survey is open to locally elected officials and offers members an opportunity to provide feedback on the resolutions process. Please refer to the discussion paper for background information on the survey questions. The survey results will inform the 2010 policy paper on the resolutions process, which will be presented to the membership for consideration at the 2010 Convention.

You can:
- Print the survey and send it to UBCM c/o Marylyn Chiang, 60-10551 Shellbridge Way, Richmond BC V6X 2W9
- Or fill in the online survey http://ubcm.ca/EN/main/resolutions/policy-areas/governance/resolutions-process-review.html (navigate to UBCM Resolutions Process Survey)

Survey responses (both online and hard copy) must be received by May 30, 2010. For questions about this survey please contact Marylyn Chiang, mchiang@ubcm.ca or 604 270 8226 x110.

Thank you for your input!

Resolutions
1. What are your primary reasons for attending Convention?

2. What do you think the purpose of the resolutions session is?

3. Why do you send in resolutions?

4. Do you attend the resolutions session?
Proposed Changes for 2010
The questions in the following sections are based on the premise that UBCM has, as a foundation of the resolution process, two principles that reflect the core values of the organization and the expressed desire of the Executive that these values would remain in place to ensure that UBCM continues to provide a common voice for local government and meets the goals and vision as identified in the UBCM mission statement. The first principle is that Convention will continue to have a resolutions session, and the second is that UBCM will not limit the number of resolutions submitted by members.

Option: Placement and Grouping of Resolutions in the Resolutions Book

6. Please comment on the proposed order for placing and grouping resolutions in the Resolutions Book.

Option: Move Grouped Resolutions as a Block

7. Please comment on the proposed change to move B2-a, B3-a grouped resolutions as a block, with the option for delegates to remove a resolution from the block if they wish to speak in opposition or propose an amendment to a resolution.
Option: No Resolutions with the Recommendation ‘No Recommendation Pending Clarification from Sponsor’
8. Please comment on the proposal to not include resolutions in the Resolutions Book with the recommendation ‘no recommendation pending clarification from sponsor’.

Option: Additional Time for Resolutions Session
9. Please comment on the proposal to add more time to the 2010 resolutions sessions. (In 2009, 6 hours were allocated for resolutions. For 2010, 6.5 hours would be allocated for resolutions).

Option: Dedicated Blocks of Time for Resolutions
10. Please comment on the proposal to dedicate blocks of time for resolutions, without interruptions from election nominations, election speeches or party leader speeches.

Option: Provincial Meetings & Resolutions Sessions
11. Please comment on the proposal to inform the Province as to when the resolutions sessions are held, in an effort to reduce the number of provincial meetings scheduled during the resolutions sessions.
Option: If No Opposing Speaker, Call the Question

12. Please comment on the proposal to introduce a new policy that allows debate on resolutions only if there is first a member who wishes to speak in opposition or propose an amendment.

13. Please comment on the proposal to introduce separate microphones for the sponsor and the opposing speaker.

Proposed Changes for 2011

Option: Resolutions Already Policy Not Debated at Convention

14. Should UBCM omit resolutions that are already in line with existing UBCM policy from Convention (B1 block resolutions) and the Resolutions Book?

15. If your resolution was determined to be existing UBCM policy, would you be satisfied with a letter saying that your resolution was endorsed by the Executive, would be kept active for 3 years and that UBCM would continue working on this issue? If not, what else would you like UBCM to do?
Option: Resolution Follow Up/Tracking
16. Are you satisfied with the current process for following up and tracking of resolutions? Why or why not?

17. If you are not satisfied with the current process for following up and tracking of resolutions, what else would you like UBCM to do?

Option: Reducing and Prioritizing Resolutions
18. Is there a need to prioritize resolutions for debate, above and beyond what is being proposed for 2010?

19. Should UBCM request that Area Associations select 5 priority resolutions each, for debate first at Convention?

20. How else would you like resolutions to be prioritized?

Option: Reduce Speaker Time
21. Should speaker times be reduced? (currently sponsors are given 3 minutes and speakers are given 2 minutes)
22. If so, how much time should be given to the sponsor?

23. If so, how much time should be given to the speaker?

Option: Official Convention Moved to Earlier in the Week or Full Week
24. Should the Official Convention be moved to earlier in the week? (ie. Tuesday to Thursday for resolutions, Monday and Friday for study sessions/workshops, etc)

25. Should the Official Convention be called for the entire week?

Option: Specify Time at which Resolutions ‘Off the Floor’ May be Debated
26. Should resolutions ‘off the floor’ be addressed on a specific time and date during Convention (ie. Friday morning)?

Option: Increase Threshold Required for Majority Vote
27. Should the threshold required for a majority vote be increased? (Currently, a 3/5 (60%) majority is required. This option would increase the threshold to 3/4 (75%).

Other
28. What other improvements should UBCM make to the resolutions process?
29. Have we missed anything?

Respondent Data

30. Name (Information will be kept confidential):

_________________________________________________________

31. Position Held (Mayor, RD Chair, Councillor, etc):

_________________________________________________________

32. Area Association of which you Local Government is a member

_________________________________________________________

33. Number of Conventions you have attended:

_________________________________________________________