

Supplementary Information Tables

[Sources of Respendable and Non-Respendable Revenue](#)

[User Fees and External Fees Reporting](#)

[Status Report on Projects Operating with Specific Treasury Board Approval](#)

Details on Transfer Payment Programs

- [Contribution in Support of Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat](#)
- [Contributions in Support of Sustainable Ecosystems](#)
- [Habitat Stewardship Program for Species at Risk](#)
- [Grant to the Canada Foundation for Sustainable Development Technology – NextGen Biofuels Fund™](#)
- [Initiatives of the Action Plan on Clean Water - Freshwater Programs](#)

Up-Front Multi-Year Funding

- [Sustainable Development Technology Canada \(SDTC\) – both NextGen Biofuels Fund™ \(NGBF\) and Sustainable Development Tech Fund™](#)
- [Federation of Canadian Municipalities \(FCM\) Green Municipal Fund \(GMF\)](#)
- [Nature Conservancy of Canada \(NCC\)](#)
- [Canadian Foundation for Climate and Atmospheric Sciences \(CFCAS\)](#)
- [Clayoquot Biosphere Trust \(CBT\)](#)

Horizontal Initiatives

- [Canadian Group on Earth Observations \(CGEO\)](#)
- [Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem Initiative \(GLBEI\)](#)
- [Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan \(FCSAP\)](#)

[Greening Government Operations](#)

[Response to Parliamentary Committees and External Audits](#)

[Internal Audits and Evaluations](#)

Sources of Respendable and Non-Respendable Revenue

Respendable Revenue

Program Activity	2009–10 Actual (\$ millions)	2010–11 Actual (\$ millions)	2011–12 (\$ millions)			
			Main Estimates	Planned Revenue	Total Authorities	Actual
1.1 Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat						
Information products	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Realty (accommodation)	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.2
Scientific and professional services	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.2
Regulatory services	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.2
Subtotal	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	1.6	0.7
1.2 Water Resources						
Information products	6.8	7.4	2.2	2.0	2.2	6.8
Realty (accommodation)	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
Scientific and professional services	10.4	10.0	15.4	14.3	15.4	9.4
Subtotal	17.9	17.6	17.6	16.3	17.6	16.4
1.3 Sustainable Ecosystems						
Realty (accommodation)	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.8	0.4
Scientific and professional services	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0
Subtotal	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.4
1.4 Compliance, Promotion and Enforcement – Wildlife						
Information products	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Realty (accommodation)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0

Subtotal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
2.1 Weather and Environmental Services for Canadians						
Information products	2.2	2.0	0.8	0.8	1.2	1.0
Realty (accommodation)	0.1	0.7	1.1	1.1	1.6	0.5
Scientific and professional services	1.5	1.4	2.6	2.5	3.8	1.1
Subtotal	3.8	4.1	4.6	4.5	6.6	2.6
2.2 Weather and Environmental Services for Targeted Users						
Information products	36.3	32.6	28.4	26.6	25.6	32.1
Realty (accommodation)	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miscellaneous	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Scientific and professional services	3.5	3.0	13.8	13.0	12.5	3.2
Subtotal	39.9	35.7	42.2	39.6	38.2	35.3
3.1 Substances and Waste Management						
Information products	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Realty (accommodation)	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Scientific and professional services	2.0	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.6
Regulatory services	1.8	1.4	1.9	2.0	1.9	1.4
Reporting services	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Subtotal	3.9	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.0
3.2 Climate Change and Clean Air						
Realty (accommodation)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Regulatory services	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Scientific and professional services	1.6	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.8
Subtotal	1.6	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9

3.3 Compliance, Promotion and Enforcement – Pollution						
Realty (accommodation)	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Scientific and professional services	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
4.1 Internal Services						
Information products	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Realty (accommodation)	0.6	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Scientific and professional services	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal	1.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Total Respendable Revenue	69.2	62.2	68.6	64.7	68.6	58.5

Note: Totals may differ between and within tables due to rounding of figures.

Non-Respendable Revenue

Program Activity	2009–10 Actual (\$ millions)	2010–11 Actual (\$ millions)	2011–12 (\$ millions)	
			Planned Revenue	Actual
1.1 Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat				
Licences and permits	3.1	2.3	4.0	3.2
Proceeds from the disposal of surplus Crown assets	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1
Regulatory services	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Miscellaneous	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.5
Realty (accommodation)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third-party agreements	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal	3.4	2.7	4.0	3.9
1.2 Water Resources				
Information products	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.3
Proceeds from the disposal of surplus Crown assets	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.2
Miscellaneous	0.4	1.1	0.1	2.1
Royalties	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Third-party agreements	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.1
Scientific and professional services	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0
Realty (accommodation)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal	1.1	1.8	1.9	2.7
1.3 Sustainable Ecosystems				
Miscellaneous	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Proceeds from the disposal of surplus Crown assets	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third-party agreements	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Subtotal	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3

1.4 Compliance, Promotion and Enforcement – Wildlife				
Proceeds from the disposal of surplus Crown assets	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miscellaneous	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fines	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
2.1 Weather and Environmental Services for Canadians				
Information materials	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Realty (accommodation)	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Proceeds from the disposal of surplus Crown assets	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1
Miscellaneous	1.1	0.3	0.2	0.8
Royalties	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0
Scientific and professional services	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
Subtotal	1.5	0.5	0.4	0.9
2.2 Weather and Environmental Services for Targeted Users				
Information products	0.4	0.1	1.8	0.1
Proceeds from the disposal of surplus Crown assets	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miscellaneous	2.8	3.1	1.5	3.3
Products	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Scientific and professional services	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0
Subtotal	3.2	3.2	4.9	3.4
3.1 Substances and Waste Management				
Proceeds from the disposal of surplus Crown assets	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miscellaneous	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.2
Subtotal	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.3
3.2 Climate Change and Clean Air				
Proceeds from the disposal of surplus Crown assets	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.2

Miscellaneous	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.2
Scientific and professional services	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Subtotal	1.0	1.0	0.1	0.3
<i>3.3 Compliance, Promotion and Enforcement – Pollution</i>				
Proceeds from the disposal of surplus Crown assets	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Miscellaneous	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
Royalties	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1
<i>4.1 Internal Services</i>				
Proceeds from the disposal of surplus Crown assets	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2
Miscellaneous	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.3
Subtotal	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.5
Total Non-Respendable Revenue	11.3	10.1	11.3	12.5

Note: Totals may differ between and within tables due to rounding of figures.

User Fees and External Fees Reporting

User Fees and Regulatory Charges (*User Fees Act*)

User Fee: Fees charged for the processing of access requests filed under the *Access to Information Act*

Fee Type: Other products and services (O)

Fee-setting Authority: *Access to Information Act* (ATIA)

Year Last Modified: 1992

Performance Standards

A response is provided within 30 calendar days following the receipt of a request. The response time may be extended pursuant to section 9 of the ATIA. A notice of extension must be sent within 30 days after the receipt of a request.

The *Access to Information Act* provides further details:
<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/A-1/index.html?noCookie>

Performance Results

Environment Canada received 1421 requests in 2011–2012.

The Department processed 1425 requests, including some carried over from previous years, and carried 168 requests forward to 2012–2013.

The Department was able to complete 77% of requests within 30 days or less. Of all completed requests, 91% were completed within legislated deadlines.

2011–12 (\$ thousands)			Planning years (\$ thousands)		
Forecast Revenue	Actual Revenue	Full Cost *	Fiscal Year	Forecast Revenue	Estimated Full Cost
9.5	12.8	1,107.0	2012–13	13.0	1,110.0
			2013–14	13.5	1,120.0
			2014–15	14.0	1,130.0

* Under review.

Other Information

Under the *Access to Information Act*, fees under \$25 may be waived when deemed to be in the public interest. Fees waived during 2011–2012 represented \$4,130.

User Fee: Cap Tourmente National Wildlife Area – Admission Fees

Fee Type: Regulatory (R)

Fee-setting Authority: *Canada Wildlife Act, s. 12, Wildlife Area Regulations*

Date Last Modified: 2003

Performance Standards

Verbal surveys on client satisfaction with the quality of services, infrastructures and facilities are conducted every year for groups and visitors using interpretation services.

Performance Results

Findings indicate a strong level of satisfaction with the quality of the services and the quality of infrastructures and facilities maintenance.

2011–12 (\$ thousands)			Planning Years (\$ thousands)		
Forecast Revenue	Actual Revenue	Full Cost *	Fiscal Year	Forecast Revenue	Estimated Full Cost*
155.0	128.4	389.0	2012–13	125.0	389.0
			2013–14	120.0	389.0
			2014–15	115.0	390.0

* Under review.

Other Information

The total number of visitors to the Cap Tourmente National Wildlife Area has decreased in recent years.

Service standards, performance results and the consultation process will be strengthened in 2012–2013.

User Fee: Cap Tourmente National Wildlife Area – Hunting Permits

Fee Type: Regulatory (R)

Fee-setting Authority: *Canada Wildlife Act, s. 12; Wildlife Area Regulations*

Date Last Modified: 2001

Performance Standards

A survey on client satisfaction with the quality of services, infrastructures and facilities was conducted in 2005 with individual hunters.

Annual monitoring of the number of applications made by hunters for a hunting permit compared to availability.

Performance Results

Findings of the survey conducted in 2005 indicate that hunters were very satisfied with the quality of services and the quality of infrastructures and facility maintenance.

In 2011–2012, the public expressed much interest at a provincial hunting and fishing convention where the hunting services offered at the Cap Tourmente National Wildlife Area were promoted at a booth. This resulted in an increase in hunter applications of 6% over 2010–2011.

2011–12 (\$ thousands)			Planning Years (\$ thousands)		
Forecast Revenue	Actual Revenue	Full Cost *	Fiscal Year	Forecast Revenue	Estimated Full Cost *
45.0	46.4	85.0	2012–13	48.1	85.0
			2013–14	48.1	85.0
			2014–15	48.1	85.0

* Under review.

Other Information

Service standards, performance results and the consultation process will be strengthened in 2012–2013.

Revenue is forecast to remain steady in the next few years, since demand for the hunting services offered is expected to remain the same.

User Fee: Migratory Bird Program – Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permit

Fee Type: Regulatory (R)

Fee-setting Authority: *Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994, s. 12; Migratory Bird Regulations C.R.C., c.1035*

Year Last Modified: 1998 – SOR/98-314

Performance Standards

The total cost of a Migratory Game Bird Hunting (MGBH) Permit is \$17. Of that \$17, \$8.50 is the fee for the permit and \$8.50 is the cost of the Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp that must be affixed to the permit to make it valid. MGBH permits are available as of August 1 at Canada Post offices and from select provincial and private vendors.

The performance standards are to ensure that an adequate number of permits are available for distribution for the open season and that individuals acquiring a permit can obtain one within a reasonable time.

Performance Results

Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permits were available within the prescribed time period. Canada Post analyzed its sales information from previous years to tailor the distribution of the MGBH permits so that the sales outlets received the required quantities.

A Canada Post helpline is available for inquiries about where to get permits. Outlets that need to replenish their stocks can obtain additional permits from the main distribution centre. Private vendors can also obtain additional permits within 3 to 5 days from Environment Canada to meet demand.

Hunters or their representatives must go to a vendor's location in person to purchase their MGBH permits. The permits are available within minutes after completing the transaction.

2011–12 (\$ thousands)			Planning Years (\$ thousands)		
Forecast Revenue	Actual Revenue	Full Cost *	Fiscal Year	Forecast Revenue	Estimated Full Cost
1,200.0	1,593.4	1,500.0	2012–13	1,500.0	1,500.0
			2013–14	1,500.0	1,500.0
			2014–15	1,500.0	1,500.0

* Under review.

Other Information

The Full Cost and Estimated Full Cost include the production, distribution and management of the MGBH permit sales. As well, they include the cost of the harvest survey that is associated with the permit (survey stub that is attached to the permit, mailings, data entry, data analysis, etc.).

A review of the cost of the Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permit program is underway. This review will determine whether there are any additional program costs that should be included. An assessment will consider what percentage of the costs for the program should be recovered from the revenue collected via the user fees.

Income from the sale of migratory game bird hunting permits is deposited directly into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

User Fee: Migratory Bird Program – Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp

Fee Type: Regulatory (R)

Fee-setting Authority: *Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994, s. 12; Migratory Bird Regulations C.R.C., c.1035*

Year Last Modified: 1991

Performance Standards

The retail value of the Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamps is \$8.50 per stamp. For a migratory Game Bird Hunting Permit to be valid, it must have this stamp affixed. As well, the stamp is available in philatelic form for collectors.

The philatelic stamp is packaged in a booklet and is not valid for postage. The price of the philatelic Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp ranges from \$8.50 for a single stamp, \$34 for a block of 4 stamps, and \$136.00 for a sheet of 16 stamps. A limited number of booklets signed by the artist whose painting was used for the stamp are also available for \$20 each. The philatelic stamps are available as of April 1 at Canada Post offices and from Wildlife Habitat Canada (WHC).

The performance standard is to ensure that an adequate number of stamps are available for both the MGBH permits and philatelic purposes.

Performance Results

At the beginning of the 2011 fiscal year, a sufficient number of Wildlife Habitat Conservation stamps were available to meet purchase and Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permit requirements. No complaints were received concerning the availability of philatelic stamps.

2011–12 (\$ thousands)			Planning Years (\$ thousands)		
Forecast Revenue	Actual Revenue	Full Cost *	Fiscal Year	Forecast Revenue	Estimated Full Cost
1,100.0	1,618.4	1,812.9	2012–13	1,550.0	2,200.0
			2013–14	1,550.0	2,200.0
			2014–15	1,550.0	2,200.0

*Under review.

Other Information

All revenues generated from the sales of Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamps are directed to Wildlife Habitat Canada (WHC). The Full Cost is calculated as the direct contribution to WHC of the actual revenues generated from the stamp sales (affixed to the MGBH permit and philatelic), PLUS the costs of producing and distributing those stamps.

The Estimated Full Cost is set to the maximum amount that may be contributed to WHC from the stamp revenues, plus \$200,000 for the production, distribution and management of the stamp program.

There are currently no talks underway to increase the price of Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamps.

User Fee: Disposal at Sea Permit Application Fee

Fee Type: Regulatory (R)

Fee-setting Authority: *Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999* (CEPA 1999), ss. 135(1); *Disposal at Sea Regulations*

Date Last Modified: 2001

Performance Standards

Under the application fee, each application is reviewed according to Schedule 6 of CEPA 1999 and the *Disposal at Sea Regulations*. This involves public notice, an application that provides detailed data, scientific review, and the payment of fees. Each permit is published in the *Canada Gazette* and is issued to the permit holder within 120 days of applying if the application is complete and there are no issues from other stakeholders.

Performance Results

Met service standard of permit issuance within 120 days of receipt of a complete application on 85% of delivered permits.

The service standard was not met for permits that involved dredging or disposal in the newly designated Killer Whale critical habitat. These permits required extra time for coordination with Fisheries and Oceans Canada to ensure that disposal operations would not destroy critical habitat. For further details see www.ec.gc.ca/seadisposal.

2011–12 (\$ thousands)			Planning Years (\$ thousands)		
Forecast Revenue	Actual Revenue	Full Cost*	Fiscal Year	Forecast Revenue	Estimated Full Cost
200.0	220.0	1,021.0	2012–13	200.0	1,021.0
			2013–14	200.0	1,021.0
			2014–15	200.0	1,021.0

* Under review.

User Fee: Disposal at Sea Permit Fee

Fee Type: Regulatory (R)

Fee-setting Authority: *Financial Administration Act (FAA), para. 19.1(a); Disposal at Sea Permit Fee Regulations*

Date Last Modified: 2010

Performance Standards

The permit holder has access to a permitted site and the ability to dispose of 1000 m³ of dredged or excavated material for each \$470 paid. The collected revenue is used by the Disposal at Sea Program to operate a representative national disposal site monitoring program that allows the client group as a whole to continue to have access to suitable disposal sites and to demonstrate that the resource is being used sustainably.

Performance Results

Met service standards. Permit holders disposed of dredged and excavated material authorized by their permits. Representative monitoring was carried out in accordance with monitoring guidelines.

For further details see www.ec.gc.ca/seadisposal/.

2011–12 (\$ thousands)			Planning Years (\$ thousands)		
Forecast Revenue	Actual Revenue	Full Cost *	Fiscal Year	Forecast Revenue	Estimated Full Cost
1,000.0 *	994.9 **	1,228.4	2012–13	1,000.0	1,100.0
			2013–14	1,100.0	1,100.0
			2014–15	1,200.0	1,100.0

* Under review.

**The variation between the Forecast Revenue and the Actual Revenue was largely due to the designation of Killer Whale critical habitat on the West Coast that caused some difficulty and delay in issuing permits. As a result, the program had to refund some of the fees as the permits were not delivered in time to be used, and some permit applications were never even received as a result of the ongoing difficulties.

Other Information

The revenue associated with this user fee is variable and difficult to estimate in advance for the following reasons: dredging/disposal is cyclical and varies from year to year; there is a small client base with a few clients that account for very large volumes; and the permits are refundable, at any time, for any unused part.

User Fee: Aviculture, Taxidermist and Eiderdown Permits

Fee Type: Regulatory (R)

Fee-setting Authority: *Migratory Bird Convention Act, 1994, s. 12; Migratory Bird Regulations*

Year Last Modified: Prior to 1978

Performance Standards

These permits are issued by Environment Canada's regional offices for a fee of \$10 each. The applicants must submit an application for such permits and meet certain requirements. For example, in the case of an aviculture permit request, applicants must demonstrate that they will wing-clip/pinion or keep the birds in an enclosure to prevent mixing with wild populations. Each region can attach specific conditions to each permit. Permits generally expire on December 31 of the year issued.

The performance standard is to review all applications received and issue permits, or notify applicants of the reasons for denying a permit, within 30 days of receiving the application.

Performance Results

All applications were processed within the 30-day time frame unless site inspections were required. In those cases (representing 10% of all applications), an additional 30 to 60 days were required to process the application.

2011–12 (\$ thousands)			Planning Years (\$ thousands)		
Forecast Revenue	Actual Revenue	Full Cost *	Fiscal Year	Forecast Revenue	Estimated Full Cost
12.9	13.4	69.2	2012–13	13.0	69.0
			2013–14	13.0	69.0
			2014–15	13.0	69.0

* Under review.

Other Information

There were 1018 aviculture, 292 taxidermy and 3 eiderdown permits issued, for a total of 1313 permits with a fee of \$10 each.

User Fee: New Substances Fee Regulations

Fee Type: Regulatory (R)

Fee-setting Authority: *Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999, s. 328; New Substances Notification Regulations (NSNR)*

Year Last Modified: 2002

Performance Standards

All new substances notification submissions receipts are acknowledged by letter, email or fax within 10 days.

All new substances notification submissions are reviewed (assessed) for their potential to adversely affect human health or the environment and a decision is taken, within the regulatory deadline, to minimize such effects.

Performance Results

100% of the 487 new substances notification submissions were acknowledged by letter, email or fax within 10 days of their receipt.

100% of the 487 new substances notification submissions were triaged and reviewed within the established period.

Of the 487 new substances notification submissions, 32 were assessed as substances of concern. Consequently, the New Substances Program published, in the *Canada Gazette*, 12 Ministerial Conditions and 20 Significant New Activity notices.

2011–12 (\$ thousands)			Planning Years (\$ thousands)		
Forecast Revenue	Actual Revenue	Full Cost	Fiscal Year	Forecast Revenue	Estimated Full Cost
\$350	\$468	\$3,269	2012–13	\$410	\$3,269
			2013–14	\$365	\$3,269
			2014–15	\$325	\$3,269

Other Information

Note that the Actual Revenue is shared between Environment Canada (2/3) and Health Canada (1/3). In 2011–2012, Environment Canada kept \$311,905 and Health Canada received \$155,952.

User Fee Totals

	2011–12 (\$ thousands)			Planning Years (\$ thousands)		
	Forecast Revenue	Actual Revenue	Full Cost *	Fiscal Year	Forecast Revenue	Estimated Full Cost
Subtotal: Regulatory	4,062.9	5,082.9	9,374.5	2012–13	4,846.1	9,633.0
				2013–14	4,896.1	9,633.0
				2014–15	4,991.1	9,634.0
Subtotal: Other Products and Services	9.5	12.8	1,107	2012–13	13.0	1,110.0
				2013–14	13.5	1,120.0
				2014–15	14.0	1,130.0
Total	4,072.4	5,095.7	10,481.5	2012–13	4,859.1	10,733.0
				2013–14	4,909.6	10,753.0
				2014–15	5,005.1	10,764.0

* Under review.

External Fees (*Policy on Service Standards for External Fees*)

External Fee	Service Standard	Performance Results	Stakeholder Consultation
Cap Tourmente National Wildlife Area – Admission Fees	Verbal surveys on client satisfaction with the quality of services, infrastructures and facilities.	High level of satisfaction.	Over the next few years, public consultations on a new management plan for the Cap Tourmente National Wildlife Area will be undertaken and will provide feedback from user groups on many aspects of the NWA, including prices, infrastructure and services.
Cap Tourmente National Wildlife Area – Hunting Permits	Client survey in 2005 on client satisfaction with the quality of services, infrastructures and facilities. Annual monitoring of the number of user applications for a hunting permit.	High level of satisfaction. Increase of hunter applications by 6% compared with 2010–2011.	The hunting activity at the Cap Tourmente National Wildlife Area is communicated to the general public through written media, the Web and participation at hunting conventions. This has resulted in the number of applications for guided hunting surpassing what is allowable and in an increase in the number of applications for the self-guided hunting. A formal survey on client satisfaction with the quality of services, infrastructures and facilities will be conducted in 2012.
Disposal at Sea Permit Application Fees	Under the application fee, each application will be reviewed according to Schedule 6 of the <i>Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999</i> (CEPA 1999) and the <i>Disposal at Sea Regulations</i> . This involves public notice, applications that provide detailed data, scientific review, and the payment of fees. Each permit will be	Met service standard of permit issuance within 120 days of receipt of a complete application on 85% of issued permits. Service standard was not met on permits that involved dredging or disposal in newly designated Killer Whale critical habitat. These	Application fees set in 1993 were rolled over in 2001. Regulatory impact assessment statements and multi-stakeholder consultations were conducted before each regulation was enacted. The last review was conducted in 2003 and the

	<p>published in the <i>Canada Gazette</i> and issued to the permit holder within 120 days of applying if the application is complete and there are no issues from other stakeholders.</p>	<p>permits required extra time for coordination with Fisheries Oceans Canada to ensure that disposal operations would not destroy critical habitat. Advice was provided to applicants to assist with timely permit reviews.</p>	<p>resulting report concluded that no change to fees was required. All consultations between 1993 and 2003 involved discussion papers, public meetings and final reports.</p> <p>For further details, see www.ec.gc.ca/iem-das.</p>
<p>Disposal at Sea Permit Fees</p>	<p>The permit holder has access to a permitted site and is permitted to dispose of 1000 m³ of dredged or excavated material for each \$470 paid. The collected revenue is used by the Disposal at Sea Program to operate a representative national disposal site monitoring program that allows the client group as a whole to continue to have access to suitable disposal sites and to demonstrate that the resource is being used sustainably.</p>	<p>Met the service standards. Permit holders disposed of dredged and excavated material as authorized by their permits. Representative monitoring was carried out in accordance with monitoring guidelines.</p>	<p>Multi-stakeholder consultations were carried out from 1996 to 1998 for setting the permit fee.</p> <p>There was general acceptance for the fee, but there was some concern for how it would be set. Permit holders indicated that they preferred a proportional volume-based fee.</p> <p>As well, Environment Canada committed to holding regular meetings with permit holders, to reporting, and to reviewing the fee three years after implementation. The review was conducted in 2003 and its report concluded that no change to the fee was required. Further consultations were undertaken between 1993 and 2003 involving discussion papers, public meetings and final reports.</p> <p>For further details see www.ec.gc.ca/iem-das.</p>

<p>Migratory Bird Program – Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permit</p>	<p>Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permits are available as of August 1 at Canada Post offices and from select provincial and private vendors. An adequate number of permits are made available for distribution for the duration of the hunting season in each province or territory. Permits are to be issued to a requester within minutes of the purchase.</p> <p>Other information: Income from the sale of Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permits is deposited directly into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.</p>	<p>Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permits were available within the prescribed time period and were issued within minutes.</p> <p>An assessment is underway of permit fees collected versus the cost of the program.</p>	<p>There have been no recent consultations and no consultations are planned for 2012–2013.</p>
<p>Migratory Bird Program – Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp</p>	<p>The Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp is used on the MGBH permit and for philatelic purposes.</p> <p>The performance standard is to ensure that an adequate number of stamps are available to affix to the Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permits. As well, the stamps in philatelic form are made available.</p> <p>Collectors can purchase the philatelic Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamps at Canada Post outlets and from Wildlife Habitat Canada. There are currently no talks underway to increase the price of Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamps.</p>	<p>A sufficient number of Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamps were available to meet philatelic requirements and Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permit requirements. Customers were able to purchase the philatelic Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamps.</p> <p>No complaints were received concerning the availability of stamps.</p>	<p>No consultations are planned for 2012–2013.</p> <p>All revenues generated from the sales of the Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp are directed to Wildlife Habitat Canada (WHC).</p>
<p>Migratory Bird Program – Aviculture, Taxidermist and Eiderdown Permits</p>	<p>These permits are issued by Environment Canada's regional offices at a cost of \$10 each, following a review of applications and renewal requests received from the</p>	<p>All applications were processed within the prescribed 30-day time frame, unless site inspections were required. In these cases</p>	<p>Since revenues and costs are negligible and as no complaints were received, there are currently no plans to hold consultations.</p>

	<p>public. Applicants must meet certain criteria to be eligible.</p> <p>The performance standard is to review all incoming applications and to either issue a permit or advise the applicant of the reason the application was denied within 30 days of receipt.</p>	<p>(representing 10% of all applications), an additional 30 to 60 days were required to process the applications.</p> <p>As these inspections are under the purview of Environment Canada's Environmental Enforcement Directorate, processing time depends entirely on the officers' workloads.</p>	
<p>New Substances Fee Regulations</p> <p>Note: This is a joint service with Health Canada's New Substances Assessment and Control Bureau of the Safe Environments Directorate</p>	<p>All new substances notification submissions receipt are acknowledged by letter, email or fax within 10 days.</p> <p>All new substances notification submissions are reviewed (assessed) for their potential to adversely affect human health or the environment and decisions are taken within the regulatory deadline to minimize such effects.</p>	<p>100% of the 487 new substances notification submissions were acknowledged by letter, email or fax within 10 days of their receipt.</p> <p>100% of the 487 new substances notification submissions were triaged and reviewed within the established period.</p> <p>Of the 487 new substances notification submissions, 32 were assessed as substances of concern.</p> <p>Consequently, the New Substances Program published, in the <i>Canada Gazette</i>, 12 Ministerial Conditions and 20 Significant New Activity notices.</p>	<p>The <i>New Substances Notification Regulations</i> (Chemicals and Polymers) were published in the <i>Canada Gazette</i>, Part II, in September of 2005.</p> <p>The improvement strategy for the management of new substances, the Charter and service standards were developed and published in 2006.</p> <p>Similarly, a survey of submitters (notifiers) was developed in 2004 and implemented to determine areas for improvement in the program.</p> <p>A second survey of notifiers was conducted in fiscal year 2009–2010. The results of the two surveys will be used as a point of reference for program improvement.</p>

<p>Haying and Grazing (CWS Agricultural Activity)</p>	<p>Permits for applications that include all the required information / documentation are issued within 90 days of receipt.</p> <p>Permits are issued for a period of less than one year and expire on December 31 of the year issued. The fee structure for haying and grazing is based upon the current rates used by Saskatchewan Ministry of Environment and the Saskatchewan Ministry of Agriculture to ensure “equal service for equal fee” between departments is achieved.</p> <p>A standing request list— Notice of Interest—that has been established is searched to identify applicants interested in the activity, e.g., haying, grazing, crops. If no interest is shown, then a call for applications is made through ads in local papers or other suitable means.</p> <p>Interested persons are asked to fill out a Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS) agricultural activity application form. Application forms are reviewed to determine the most suitable candidates and reference checks of the candidates are conducted. Prospective grazing patrons must also submit a grazing plan that is reviewed and refined if required.</p>	<p>95% of permits are issued within 90 days of receipt.</p> <p>Federal lands are monitored to ensure permit conditions are being met, the grazing plan is being followed, and habitat management goals (e.g. maintaining native plant community and habitat for wildlife and reducing weed and exotic species invasion) are achieved through the activity.</p> <p>The applicant understands the permit is for one season only and that if any of the conditions of the permit are not respected, the permit may be immediately revoked by the Minister. If results are achieved, however, the permit will be granted in subsequent years (subject to annual review).</p>	<p>This fee is minimal, has not been increased in over 10 years, and no increase is anticipated.</p> <p>Stakeholder consultation on fee-setting is not necessary.</p> <p>As the most suitable applicants are contacted to confirm their interest in obtaining a permit and discussions are held to ensure the applicants understand and agree to all conditions that will be on the permit, stakeholder feedback is received in a just-in-time way.</p>
---	--	--	---

<p>Biosphère (Montréal) – Admission Fees Fees (including tax) are: Adult: \$12 Students (18 and older): \$8 Ecological House visits: \$2 Youth (17 and under): Free (does not apply to organized groups)</p>	<p>Throughout the year, visitors to the Biosphère have access to visitor services and interpretation services in the exhibition halls, guided activities on various environmental subjects, and educational workshops designed especially for groups, as well as maintained facilities (exhibition halls, rest areas, lookouts, parking, etc.)</p>	<p>According to visitors' written comments, which are gathered daily, and evaluation sheets completed by group leaders, a majority of visitors were very satisfied with their individual or group visit experience, and with the other services.</p>	<p>When a group visits, the group leader (e.g. the teacher) must complete an assessment of the services received.</p> <p>For visits by individuals, a sample survey will be conducted in 2012–2013.</p>
---	--	--	---

Status Report on Projects Operating with Specific Treasury Board Approval

Project	Original Estimated Total Cost (\$ millions)	Revised Estimated Total Cost (\$ millions)	Actual Cost Total (\$ millions)	2011-12 (\$ millions)				Expected Date of Close-out
				Main Estimates	Planned Spending	Total Authorities	Actual	
Program Activity								
UPS replacement – Dorval facility (effective project approval) (project implementation phase)	\$10.6	\$15.4	\$1.8	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0	Project cancelled in May 2011-2012, but final close-out costs delayed to fiscal year 2012-2013

Details on Transfer Payment Programs

Name of Transfer Payment Program: Contributions in support of Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat

Start Date: June 10, 2010

End Date: Ongoing

Description: Contributions in support of Sustainable Ecosystems are proposed in order to encourage and support individuals and organizations engaged in activities to manage ecosystem resources in a manner consistent with ecosystem sustainability.

Strategic Outcome(s)

Canada's natural environment is conserved and restored for present and future generations.

Results Achieved

Projects under Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat addressed one or more of the *following priorities related to biodiversity conservation*:

- a) Individuals and organizations are increasingly engaged in priority activities related to the conservation of wildlife, in particular migratory birds and species at risk.
- b) Increased Aboriginal participation in wildlife and habitat conservation. Key areas of focus in this respect include the provision of funding to the National Aboriginal Council on Species at Risk (almost \$1 million annually), and to the Aboriginal Fund for Species at Risk (\$1.6 million annually).
- c) New knowledge and data produced by collaborating organizations contribute to the conservation of migratory birds, species at risk and their habitat. Activities undertaken by partners including monitoring of priority species (notably migratory birds) as well as support to organizations such as the conservation data centres across the country that provide important data storage functions.
- d) Priority habitats for migratory birds and species at risk are conserved by partners through stewardship and protection. The North American Waterfowl Management Plan is a key partnership program that supports this activity. The \$2 million in funding provided by the Department acts as leveraged funding that supports a much more substantive investment by federal and non-federal partners (in both Canada and the United States) in habitat conservation efforts.
- e) Threats limiting priority species at risk and migratory bird populations are mitigated or avoided by partners.
- f) Increased collaboration within Canadian and international research and policy communities related to Environment Canada's biodiversity priorities.
- g) Compliance with the requirements of the Agreement on International Humane Trapping Standards. Annual contributions of just over \$ 250,000 are made to the Fur Institute of Canada in support of this result area.

This work has led to the participation of individuals and organizations in activities contributing to the achievement of shared and important environmental objectives in relation to biodiversity conservation in Canada.

**Program Activity: 1.1 Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat
(\$ millions)**

	2009–10 Actual Spending	2010–11 Actual Spending	2011–12 Planned Spending	2011–12 Total Authorities	2011–12 Actual Spending	Variance(s)
Total Grants						
Total Contributions*	n/a	\$15.2	\$13.6	\$12.9	\$12.9	\$0.7
Total Other Types of Transfer Payments	n/a	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Program Activity(ies)*	n/a	\$15.2	\$13.6	\$12.9	\$12.9	\$0.7

* Note: Environment Canada’s transfer payment programs were redesigned in 2010–2011 mid-year to align with the Department’s revised 2010–2011 Program Activity Architecture (PAA). Therefore, 2010–2011 Actual Spending is not entirely comparable with 2011–2012 Actual Spending.

Please see the 2010–2011 Departmental Performance Report for expenditures related to the old class of Transfer Payment Programs.

Comments on Variance(s): n/a

Audits Completed or Planned: n/a

Evaluations Completed or Planned: Evaluation to be completed by March 31, 2015.

Engagement of Applicants and Recipients

Environment Canada has been working closely with stakeholders involved in biodiversity conservation for many years and relationships with the recipients are well established. Environment Canada engages applicants and recipients under this program for two reasons: the applications are related to specific program elements; or single or named recipients are identified for their unique ability to achieve targeted program results.

The Department employs one or a combination of the following initiatives to provide access to the program in a clear, understandable and usable manner: publicity in news media, information provided on the departmental website, letter-writing activities, and meetings with targeted recipient communities. Administrative requirements have been tailored to evaluated risk levels and efficiency is being addressed through simplified agreement templates.

Details on Transfer Payment Programs

Name of Transfer Payment Program: Contributions in support of sustainable ecosystems

Start Date: June 10, 2010

End Date: Ongoing

Description: Contributions in support of sustainable ecosystems are proposed in order to encourage and support individuals and organizations engaged in activities to manage ecosystem resources in a manner consistent with ecosystem sustainability.

Strategic Outcome(s): Canada's natural environment is conserved and restored for present and future generations.

Results Achieved

Projects under sustainable ecosystems addressed one or more of the elements of an ecosystem approach: 1) integrated planning and decision making; 2) action to improve the environment and 3) knowledge generation and assessment for decision making. EC worked with a wide range of recipients to carry out this work.

- Several agreements (34 with associated EC spending of \$2.7 million) advanced the objective of engaging government, citizens and stakeholders in the management and implementation of ecosystem-based management plans such as those for the Great Lakes (Remedial Action Plans in Areas of Concern and Lakewide Management Plans) and for the St. Lawrence (St. Lawrence Action Plan and the Areas of Prime Concern (ZIP) Program).
- Another set of agreements (86 with associated EC spending of \$4.6 million) supported projects that were directed to implementing environmental remediation, protection and conservation projects required to meet the goals and objectives identified in ecosystem-based management plans or to achieve ecosystem objectives. These were carried out across the country, often by community groups. The main programs, the Great Lakes Sustainability Fund, the St. Lawrence Plan Community Interaction Program and the Atlantic Coastal Action Program were all successful in achieving environmental benefits such as fish and wildlife habitat rehabilitation, biodiversity conservation, contaminated sediment assessment and remediation, improvements in municipal wastewater effluent quality or nearshore water quality, better understanding the impacts of climate change on coastal zones and sustainable uses of the ecosystem.
- A few other agreements focused on the improvement of ecosystem and wildlife science or on ecosurveillance and education.

This work has led to the participation of individuals and organizations in activities contributing to the achievement of shared and important environmental objectives in key ecosystems in Canada.

Program Activity: 1.3 Sustainable Ecosystems

(\$ millions)

	2009–10 Actual Spending	2010–11 Actual Spending	2011–12 Planned Spending	2011–12 Total Authorities	2011–12 Actual Spending	Variance(s)
Total Grants						
Total Contributions	\$0	\$6.9	\$8.1	\$7.9	\$7.9	\$0.2
Total Other Types of Transfer Payments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Program Activity(ies)	\$0*	\$6.9	\$8.1	\$7.9	\$7.9	\$0.2

It is important to note that Environment Canada's transfer payment programs were redesigned in 2010–2011 mid-year to align with the Department's revised 2010–2011 Program Activity Architecture (PAA), which resulted in a new class of transfer payment programs: Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat; Water Resources, Sustainable Ecosystems, Weather and Environmental services, Substances and Waste Management; and Climate Change and Clean Air.

Please see the 2010–2011 Departmental Performance Report for expenditures related to old class of transfer payment programs.

Comment(s) on Variance(s): Not required

Audits Completed or Planned: n/a

Evaluations Completed or Planned: Evaluation to be completed by March 31, 2015.

Engagement of Applicants and Recipients: Environment Canada has been working closely with stakeholders in key Canadian ecosystems for many years, and relationships with recipients are good. Under this program, EC engages applicants and recipients in two ways: the applications are related to specific program elements; or single or named recipients are identified for their unique ability to achieve targeted program results.

In 2011–2012, EC employed one or a combination of the following means to provide access to the program in a clear, understandable and useable manner: information provided on the departmental website and on the Canada–Quebec website, calls, letters and meetings with targeted recipient communities. To improve effectiveness, EC administrative requirements were tailored according to risk level, and simplified agreement templates are now being used by the program.

Details on Transfer Payment Programs

Name of Transfer Payment Program: Habitat Stewardship Program (HSP) for Species at Risk

Start Date: August 20, 2000

End Date: Program is ongoing. In March 2012, a portion of HSP funding (\$4 million), which was to sunset, was renewed.

Description: The purpose of the HSP is to contribute to the recovery of endangered and threatened species, and other species of concern, and to prevent other species from becoming a conservation concern, by engaging Canadians in conservation actions to benefit wildlife. HSP fosters partnerships among organizations interested in the recovery of species at risk and provides funding for implementing activities that protect or conserve habitats for species at risk. It enables non-governmental organizations, landowners, the private sector, Aboriginal organizations, educational institutions, community groups, and other levels of government to plan, manage and complete projects that will achieve the program goal.

Strategic Outcome(s)

Canada's natural environment is conserved and restored for present and future generations.

Results Achieved

From April 2011 to March 2012, the Habitat Stewardship Program (HSP) for Species at Risk contributed \$11.5 million to 195 new projects and 13 previously approved multi-year projects, addressing terrestrial and aquatic species-at-risk issues in all provinces and territories. The HSP directed \$34 million (program plus matching funds) to projects addressing both habitat conservation and threat mitigation issues. These stewardship activities benefited more than 300 *Species at Risk Act* (SARA) -listed or Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC)-assessed species through increased awareness of species at risk and through the development of strategies, guidelines and practices or the completion of monitoring, surveying and inventorying studies.

A total of 2,272 landowners participated in conservation activities, leading to the securement of 7,259 hectares (ha) of habitat through legally binding measures, and leading to the protection of an additional 33,263 hectares (ha) through newly established non-binding agreements, and 321,963 hectares (ha) through renewed, non-binding measures. Nearly 13,790 hectares (ha) of habitat and 590 kilometres (km) of shoreline were improved through vegetation planting, exotic species removal and other habitat improvement activities.

Overall, since its inception in 2000, HSP has contributed over \$117 million to 2,050 projects, leveraging an additional \$283 million in matching funds from project partners.

Program Activity: Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat						
(\$ millions)						
	2009–10 Actual Spending	2010–11 Actual Spending	2011–12 Planned Spending	2011–12 Total Authorities	2011–12 Actual Spending	Variance(s)
Total Grants						
Total Contributions	\$12.1	\$12.0	\$11.8	\$11.5	\$11.5	\$0.3
Total Other Types of Transfer Payments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Program Activity(ies)	\$12.1	\$12.0	\$11.8	\$11.5	\$11.5	\$0.3

Comments on Variance(s): As a result of the evaluation done by the ADM's Committee on Species at Risk of overall SARA priorities, \$175 K was reallocated to other SARA priorities during 2011–2012. Additional variance results from normal program operational slippage and the withdrawal or cancellation of some projects in the fourth quarter due to delayed approvals, so that final expenditures can vary yearly.

Audits Completed or Planned: n/a

Evaluations Completed or Planned: n/a

Engagement of Applicants and Recipients: n/a

Details on Transfer Payment Programs

Name of Transfer Payment Program: Grant to the Canada Foundation for Sustainable Development Technology (SDTC) for the NextGen Biofuels Fund™ (NGBF)

Start Date: April 1, 2007

End Date: September 30, 2027 (the last appropriation by Parliament will be in fiscal year 2014–2015, with the last disbursement by SDTC by March 31, 2017)

Description: The \$500 million NGBF is one of two funds managed by SDTC. It supports the establishment of first-of-kind large demonstration-scale facilities for the production of next-generation renewable fuels. As sponsoring departments for the federal government, Environment Canada (EC) and Natural Resources Canada (NRCan) provide federal oversight to SDTC to ensure that it complies with the two funding agreements and the founding legislation. Under the NGBF, SDTC provides grants with conditional repayment terms to eligible recipients for the establishment of facilities that involve both non-conventional technologies and non-traditional feedstocks, and that are built in Canada using representative Canadian feedstock. Selection is based on the technology's (rather than the plant's) potential for environmental and other benefits (social or economic).

Of the \$500 million in total funding, \$200 million is statutory, with the remaining \$300 million being appropriated funding that is spread over 7 fiscal years, beginning in 2008–2009 and ending in 2014–2015. The funding is equally divided between EC and NRCan.

While the spending listed below captures the funds transferred from EC to the foundation, the actual planned disbursements to NGBF projects in 2012–2013 are \$3.4 million (based on update in April 2012). According to the 2012 Corporate Plan, SDTC plans to allocate \$500 million by the end of December 2012 and to disburse \$500 million to NGBF projects between 2012 and March 31, 2017.

Strategic Outcome(s): Threats to Canadians and their environment from pollution are minimized.

Results Achieved: Except for a contribution of \$130,000 for front-end development costs to the Enerkem project, no major allocations from the NGBF were made in 2011. The NGBF has received four applications for funding and two indications of interest, which would take up the entire fund. Some 24 high-potential candidates are aligned with promising technology rollouts, while more than 100 companies are being tracked.

Program Activity: 3.2 Climate Change and Clean Air (\$ millions)						
	2009–10 Actual Spending	2010–11 Actual Spending	2011–12 Planned Spending	2011–12 Total Authorities **	2011–12 Actual Spending	Variance(s)
Total Grants*						

Total Contributions	\$0	\$0	\$25.0	\$20.0	\$0	\$25.0
Total Other Types of Transfer Payments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Program Activity(ies)	\$0	\$0	\$25.0	\$20.0	\$0	\$25.0

*These grants are EC's portion of the payment made to SDTC based on cash flow statements received from the Foundation. Funding is divided equally between EC and NRCan. From the \$25.0 million reprofiling, \$5.0 million has been put forward to compensate Environment Canada for the new funding requirements as detailed in the 20011–2012 EC Supplementary Estimates (C).

Comment(s) on Variance(s): The \$25 million that was appropriated by Parliament for the NGBF in 2011–2012 was reprofiled forward to 2013–2014. In addition to this \$25 million, \$37.5 million for the NGBF was previously reprofiled from 2010–2011 to 2012–2013.

No payments were made to SDTC in 2011–2012. The NGBF had an opening balance of \$63.7 million, as of December 31, 2010. Accordingly, SDTC had on hand the funds that it had estimated as its requirement for the period from January 1, 2011, to March 31, 2012. Actual spending by SDTC was significantly less than its estimates in cash flow statements, because the anticipated payments to projects have been delayed by the proponents (see also "Up-Front Multi-Year Funding" for SDTC.)

Audits Completed or Planned: There was no performance audit in fiscal year 2011–2012, except for the standard financial audit required for the financial data in the Annual Report. A value-for-money (performance) audit may be conducted by the federal government at least once every five years.

Evaluations Completed or Planned: There were no evaluations in fiscal year 2011–2012. According to the terms of the NGBF funding agreement, three interim evaluations will be performed by an independent third party selected by the Foundation (November 30, 2012, November 30, 2017, and November 30, 2022); a final evaluation is due by September 30, 2027. SDTC's preparations for the November 30, 2012, NGBF evaluation are underway. The federal government may choose to evaluate the Foundation at any time to determine whether it is meeting its objectives.

Engagement of Applicants and Recipients: The NGBF has received four applications for funding and two indications of interest, which would take up the entire fund. Some 24 high-potential candidates are aligned with promising technology rollouts, while more than 100 companies are being tracked.

Details on Transfer Payment Programs

Name of Transfer Payment Program: Initiatives of the Action Plan on Clean Water – Freshwater Program - Contributions

Start Date: April 1, 2008

End Date: March 31, 2013

Description: The objective of this class contribution is to enable the remediation of contaminated sediment in eight Areas of Concern (AOCs), to fully restore and remove these sites from the list of Great Lakes AOCs, and advance clean-up efforts to restore Lake Winnipeg and Lake Simcoe. Transfer payments made under the Program will be in the form of contributions to a broad range of entities to support the remediation of contaminated sediment in Great Lakes AOCs, and/or rehabilitation measures that reduce nutrient loads to Lake Winnipeg and Lake Simcoe and their tributaries, including domestic or international non-profit organizations, provincial and municipal governments, regional conservation authorities, Canadian individuals, businesses, post-secondary institutions, First Nations and Aboriginal organizations and associations.

Strategic Outcome(s)

Canada's natural environment is conserved and restored for present and future generations.

Results Achieved

Under the Lake Winnipeg Basin Stewardship Fund, in 2011–2012, nine new projects were funded in support of wetlands restoration, riparian enhancements, livestock beneficial management practices, and research into phosphorus recovery from wastewater sludge and the effective use of riparian zones. Funding for a sensitive habitat inventory and mapping of foreshore areas culminated in the development of recommended shoreline management guidelines in the southern basin of Lake Winnipeg.

Throughout the program period, \$2.4 million was allocated in Grants and Contributions (G&C) funding to 41 projects across Manitoba, Saskatchewan and northwest Ontario. Projects were supported by 272 partners investing \$5.8 million in cash and in-kind contributions. Results achieved include 6,492 kilogram/year in phosphorus reduction, 31 kilometres (km) of exclusion fencing installed to restrict waterway access for 7,000 livestock, 548 hectares (ha) of wetlands created or restored, and 38 kilometres (km) of stream/lake bank stabilized.

Budget 2012 announced a five-year renewal of the Lake Winnipeg Basin Initiative.

Under the Lake Simcoe Clean-up Fund, in 2011–2012 projects were managed through contribution agreements totalling \$6.4 million. This is part of an overall investment of \$30 million over five years, announced in February 2008 to restore Lake Simcoe. In total, over the 2007–2012 program period, \$22.87 million was allocated in G&C funding to 47 different recipients through 158 successful projects supported by 195 different partners, leveraging \$28.5 million, which included \$6 million in cash and in-kind investments from individual property owners. There were 91 habitat and non-point source improvement projects, which were funded to support the implementation of over 350 agricultural and

urban best management practices, which included third-party agreements completing over 600 additional restoration projects. Initial estimates of the total phosphorus reduction achieved are 2.2 tonnes/year.

Budget 2012 announced renewal of the Lake Simcoe program.

The Great Lakes Contaminated Sediment Implementation Program funds the implementation of sediment remediation in eight Great Lakes Areas of Concern (AOCs). Sediment management plans have been implemented in three AOCs (Bay of Quinte, Niagara River and Detroit River). As well, plans have been completed for two AOCs (Hamilton Harbour and Peninsula Harbour), and sediment management studies are underway in three AOCs (Thunder Bay, St. Marys River and St. Clair River). Work is continuing in each of these AOCs.

Program Activity: Sustainable Ecosystems						
(\$ millions)						
	2009-10 Actual Spending	2010-11 Actual Spending	2011-12 Planned Spending	2011-12 Total Authorities	2011-12 Actual Spending	Variance(s)
Total Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Contributions	6.6	8.0	7.5	7.4	7.4	.1
Total Other Types of Transfer Payments	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Program Activity(ies)	6.6	8.0	7.5	7.4	7.4	.1

Comments on Variance(s): Funding for projects carried out in Lake Simcoe was slightly lower than anticipated in 2011-2012. Recipients were unable to fully utilize all funds that were approved for their projects for a range of operational reasons and the final amounts were reduced during the negotiation of agreements, or when submitting the final invoices, or when projects were cancelled.

Audits Completed or Planned: None are planned at this time.

Evaluations Completed or Planned: An evaluation of Freshwater Initiatives (Action Plan on Clean Water—Lake Simcoe, Lake Winnipeg, Great Lakes Contaminated Sediment Remediation) was completed in November 2011, as per the Program Evaluation Plan developed by Environment Canada’s Audit and Evaluation Branch. Evaluation results indicate achievement of immediate outcomes, progress being made towards intermediate outcomes, demonstrated program efficiency and economy, and continued program relevancy.

Engagement of Applicants and Recipients

Lake Winnipeg Stewardship Fund: Throughout the program period, potential applicants from an identified stakeholders list were invited to submit letters of intent and proposals for funding consideration, in addition to engagement through the Lake Winnipeg Basin Stewardship Fund Web page. Meetings were held with requesting organizations to discuss potential proposals and identify deficiencies in project scope and information. Additional outreach to stakeholders and recipients was conducted through participation in stakeholder conferences and forums, notably the Manitoba Conservation Districts Association and the Red River Basin Commission annual conferences. Ongoing engagement of funding recipients was achieved through project site visits and project updates and reporting.

Lake Simcoe Clean-up Fund: The Lake Simcoe Clean-Up Fund engaged 47 different recipients and an additional 195 different partners in 160 projects in the Lake Simcoe basin.

Great Lakes Contaminated Sediment Remediation Program: Funding recipients are targeted based on their demonstrated ability to deliver activities that achieve the program's objectives. Discussions are held with program applicants to ensure that project proposals align with priority deliverables to implement sediment management options in the eight Great Lakes Areas of Concern. Ongoing engagement of funding recipients is achieved through project site visits and project updates and reporting.

Up-Front Multi-Year Funding

Name of Recipient: Sustainable Development Technology Canada (SDTC)

Start Date: March 2001 for the Sustainable Development Technology Fund (SD Tech Fund™) and April 2007 for the Next-Generation Biofuels Fund (NextGen Biofuels Fund™ or NGBF)

End Date: June 2015 for the SD Tech Fund™ and September 2027 for the NGBF (Please note that, on June 7, 2012, Treasury Board approved Funding Agreement Four for the SD Tech Fund™, which extends the end date to December 2017)

Total Funding: \$1.05 billion (\$550 million for SD Tech Fund™ and \$500 million for NGBF) shared equally between Environment Canada (EC) and Natural Resources Canada (NRCan). EC's share is one half of \$1.05 billion, specifically \$525 million. (Please note that on June 7, 2012, Treasury Board approved Funding Agreement Four for the SD Tech Fund™, which provides the SD Tech Fund™ with an additional \$40 million. This increases the total grant to SDTC to \$1.09 billion, of which \$590 million is for the SD Tech Fund™.)

Description: SDTC is a not-for-profit foundation created by the Government of Canada, with a series of federal grants that now total to \$1.09 billion as of June 2012. As sponsoring departments for the federal government, EC and NRCan provide federal oversight for SDTC to ensure that it complies with the two funding agreements and the founding legislation. NRCan is the federal SDTC lead.

SDTC manages two separate funds: the SD Tech Fund™ (consisting of \$590 million in up-front funding, as of June 2012) to provide financial support to projects that have the potential to advance sustainable development, including technologies to address climate change, clean air and water and soil quality issues; and the NGBF (\$500 million) to provide financial support towards the establishment of facilities producing next-generation renewable fuels at large demonstration-scale. SDTC-funded projects are active in all major Canadian economic sectors, including energy exploration and production, power generation, energy utilization, transportation, agriculture, forestry and wood products and waste management.

Strategic Outcome(s): Threats to Canadians and their environment from pollution are minimized.

Summary of Results Achieved by the Recipient:

i) SD Tech Fund™: In 2011*, under the SD Tech Fund™, SDTC approved 25 projects for funding, with SDTC providing \$65 million. Disbursements increased from \$58 million in 2010 to \$82 million in 2011 and, as more projects are completed, disbursements are projected to continue increasing to \$90 million—115 million in 2012 and \$85 to 110 million in 2013. In 2011, 22 projects were completed.

Since its inception, the SD Tech Fund™ has awarded grants totalling \$560 million for 228 projects with a total project value of \$2.0 billion and the potential for 7 to 17 megatonnes (Mt) of CO₂ emission reductions annually by 2015. As of December 2011, \$313 million had been disbursed. A total of 63 projects have been completed since the Foundation's inception.

As required by legislation, SDTC submitted the annual report documents on time to EC and NRCan and posted these on the SDTC website, making them available to the public.

- ii) NGBF: Except for a contribution of \$130,000 for front-end development costs to the Enerkem project, no major allocations from the NGBF were made in 2011. NGBF has received four applications for funding and two indications of interest, which would take up the entire fund. Some 24 high-potential candidates are aligned with promising technology rollouts, while more than 100 companies are being tracked.

During an update in April 2012, SDTC reported that it intends to commit the entire NGBF fund by the end of 2013 and to disburse the project funds entirely by the end of 2016.

* Unless specified otherwise, SDTC yearly results and data refer to calendar year as per the SDTC annual reports.

Program Activity: Climate change and Clean Air (\$ millions)					
2009-10 Actual Spending *	2010-11 Actual Spending	2011-12 Planned Spending	2011-12 Total Authorities**	2011-12 Actual Spending	Variance(s)
\$0	\$0	\$25.0	\$20.0	\$0	\$25.0

*These grants are EC’s portion of the payment made to SDTC based on cash flow statements received from the Foundation. Funding is divided equally between EC and NRCan.

**From the \$25.0 million reprofiling, \$5.0 million has been put forward to compensate Environment Canada for the new funding requirements as detailed in the 2011-2012 EC Supplementary Estimates (C).

Comments on Variance(s): All funds to the SD Tech Fund™ were paid out in prior years. All of the above financial data pertains to the NGBF only and represents EC’s share. The \$25 million that was appropriated by Parliament for NGBF in 2011-2012 was reprofiled forward to 2013-14. In addition to this \$25 million, \$37.5 million for NGBF was previously reprofiled from 2010-2011 to 2012-2013.

No payments were made to SDTC in 2011-2012. The NGBF had an opening balance of \$63.7 million, as of December 31, 2010. Accordingly, SDTC had on hand the funds that it had estimated as its requirement for the period January 1, 2011, to March 31, 2012. Actual spending by SDTC was significantly less than its estimates in cash flow statements because the anticipated payments to projects have been delayed by the proponents (see also transfer payment programs for SDTC).

Significant Evaluation Findings by the Recipient during the Reporting Year and Future Plan: There were no evaluations in fiscal year 2011-2012. According to the terms of the SD Tech Fund™ funding agreement, the next evaluation by the recipient is due in 2015. According to the terms of the NGBF funding agreement, three interim evaluations will be performed by an independent third party selected by the Foundation (November 30, 2012, November 30, 2017 and November 30, 2022); a final evaluation is due by September 30, 2027. SDTC’s preparations for the November 30, 2012 NGBF evaluation are underway. The federal government may choose to evaluate the Foundation at any time to determine whether it is meeting its objectives.

Significant Audit Findings by the Recipient during the Reporting Year and Future

Plan: A standard financial audit was completed as required for the financial data in the SDTC Annual Report. A value-for-money (performance) audit for the SD Tech Fund™ was completed by the government in fiscal year 2009–2010 and the final report was issued in July 2011. The report was generally positive but identified two issues that were subsequently resolved through the new Funding Agreement Four approved by the Treasury Board Secretariat on June 7, 2012.

Link to Recipient's Site: www.sdte.ch

Up-Front Multi-Year Funding

Name of Recipient: The Green Municipal Fund (GMF)

Start Date: February 2000

End Date: In perpetuity

Total Funding: \$550 million shared equally between Environment Canada (EC) and Natural Resources Canada (NRCan). EC's share is one half, specifically \$275 million.

Description: The Green Municipal Fund (GMF) is a \$550-million revolving fund, administered by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM), that supports grants, loans and loan guarantees to encourage investment in environmental municipal projects. The Government of Canada endowed the FCM with a total of \$550 million for this initiative through a series of budget decisions from 2000 to 2005.

The GMF was established to have a positive impact on the health and the quality of life of Canadians by reducing greenhouse gas emissions; improving local air, water and soil quality; and promoting renewable energy by supporting environmental studies and projects within the municipal sector. Eligible projects may fall into one or more of the following categories: energy, water, waste, sustainable transportation, brownfields or integrated community projects. Of the total, \$150 million is to be used exclusively to support brownfield remediation and redevelopment.

The amount of GMF financing available to municipalities is directly related to the environmental benefits and/or innovation of the projects undertaken, with grant-loan combinations of up to 80% of eligible costs available for capital projects with exceptional environmental benefits.

The FCM has created two advisory bodies: the GMF Council and the Peer Review Committee, as stipulated in the GMF Funding Agreement between the FCM and the Government of Canada. The Council's role is to assist the FCM Board of Directors, the decision-making body for the GMF, in approving projects proposed by municipalities. The 15-member GMF Council includes five federal members: two from Environment Canada, two from Natural Resources Canada and one from Transport Canada. All federal members are appointed by the FCM Board of Directors based on recommendations from the Minister of the Environment. Environment Canada peer reviewers provide the GMF and federal council members with expert environmental science and clean technology advice. They also review and analyze funding proposals and help evaluate the environmental outcomes of funded projects.

Strategic Outcome(s): Threats to Canadians and their environment from pollution are minimized.

Summary of Results Achieved by the Recipient: The 2011–2012 GMF Annual Report is not yet available. It is expected to be available in July or August 2012 on the FCM website: <http://www.fcm.ca/home/about-us/corporate-resources/annual-reports.htm>

Based on the 2010–2011 GMF Annual Report, since the inception of the GMF in 2000, the FCM has committed to disbursing \$550 million to support 875 green initiatives across

Canada. These GMF-supported initiatives have the potential to leverage over \$3 billion in economic activity in more than 430 communities. Of the 875 initiatives funded to date, 150 have been capital projects, of which 40 have been completed and have reported environmental results. Together, these 40 capital projects have reduced annual greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by approximately 175,000 tonnes (t) per year, reduced air pollutant emissions by over 313,000 kilograms (kg) per year, diverted from landfill over 215,000 tonnes (t) of waste per year, made over 67 hectares (ha) of previously unusable land available for use, improved the quality of over 122,000 cubic metres (m³) of soil, treated over 36 million cubic metres (m³) of water per year, and reduced water consumption by over 147,000 cubic metres (m³) annually.

In the absence of the 2011–2012 GMF Annual Report, the GMF's most recent Annual Statement of Plans and Objectives (ASPO) 2011–2012 provides the expected results for fiscal year 2011–2012, which include the following:

Grants for Sustainable Community Plans, Feasibility Studies and Field Tests

As of March 31, 2009, the FCM must aim to commit \$6 to \$8 million in grants for sustainable community plans, feasibility studies and field tests. In fulfillment of this requirement, FCM was to make a minimum total of \$6 million available for feasibility studies, field tests and sustainable community plans in 2011–2012.

Loans and Grants for Capital Projects

The FCM offers a combination of grants and low-interest loans in support of capital projects. Grants are only offered in combination with loans. Under the Funding Agreement, the FCM must aim to commit \$50 to \$70 million per year in loans. Up to March 31, 2009, the FCM was to commit \$7 to \$10 million per year in grants to capital projects, and \$5 to \$6 million thereafter.

In the 2005 funding agreement, the FCM committed to lending or guaranteeing loans totalling \$150 million for brownfield projects by March 31, 2012. In fulfillment of these requirements, a minimum total of \$ 85 million was to be available for brownfield projects in 20011-2012.

A minimum total of \$5 million was to be available in grants for capital projects. This amount must be allocated in proportion to the funding levels targeted for loans. Under the provisions of the Funding Agreement, brownfield projects are not eligible for grants.

Performance Measures

To measure and demonstrate the qualitative, quantitative, short-term and long-term success of the GMF, the planned activities for outlined in the ASPO for 2011–2012 included the following:

- **Streamlining operations:** Establish the prospect, application, contract and disbursement process so that it is defined by an indicator, a standard timeline and performance reporting, and facilitates access and participation for both rural and urban municipalities and across regions.
- **Determining and understanding the needs of the GMF target audience:** Focus activities and develop products so that they are aligned with client needs.
- **Measuring outcomes:** Measure and demonstrate the qualitative, quantitative, short-term and long-term success of the GMF.
- **Leveraging for greater impact:** Collaborate with stakeholders (e.g. other funding agencies, NGOs, governments, service providers) for mutual benefit and greater overall impact reflected in projects, plans and studies approved for funding by the FCM.

- **Building capacity:** Deliver knowledge, training and networking activities that leverage the GMF to accelerate the implementation, communication and replication of sustainability initiatives in Canadian municipalities.
- **Focused marketing:** Design and implement highly targeted, customer-based messaging and sales activities that speak to the direct needs of our priority markets.
- **Integrating communications:** Ensure that targeted/core priority messages are infused, supported and integrated into all GMF points of touch, both internally and externally.
- **Funding brownfield projects:** Continue to provide best efforts to achieve \$150 million in funding by 2012.

Program Activity: Climate Change and Clean Air (\$ millions)					
2009–10 Actual Spending	2010–11 Actual Spending	2011–12 Planned Spending	2011–12 Total Authorities	2011–12 Actual Spending	Variance(s)
-	-	-	-	-	-

Comments on Variances: All funds to the GMF were paid out in prior years.

Significant Evaluation Findings by the Recipient During the Reporting Year and Future Plan: Section 11.05 of the Funding Agreement stipulates that the FCM agrees to obtain and make public and forward to each minister, for tabling in Parliament, an independent review using recognized evaluation standards on the following timelines: an initial review within six months following March 31, 2009; and subsequent reviews every five years from the date of the first review. The next independent review will take place starting in 2014.

Significant Audit Findings by the Recipient during the Reporting Year and Future Plan: Section 11.07 of the Funding Agreement stipulates that the FCM agrees to have carried out an independent performance (value-for-money) audit to ensure the economy, efficiency and effectiveness with which funds have been used. An initial review must be carried out within six months following March 31, 2009, and subsequent reviews every five years from the date of the first review. The next independent performance audit will take place starting in 2014.

Link to Recipient’s Site: www.fcm.ca/home/programs/green-municipal-fund.htm

Up-Front Multi-Year Funding

Name of Recipient: Nature Conservancy of Canada (NCC)

Start Date: March 2007

End Date: In perpetuity (until the total funding is expended)

Total Funding: \$225 million

Description: The Nature Conservancy of Canada works to ensure the long-term protection of biodiversity by working with private landowners and managers to secure ecologically significant lands that have been identified as priorities for conservation action. To that effect, the Conservancy acquires and preserves land through one of four methods: land purchase, land donations, conservation easements or relinquishment of rights. It also ensures support for the ongoing management and restoration of the habitat it secures. The goal of the program is to secure 200,000 hectares (ha) of private land for conservation.

Strategic Outcome(s): Canada's natural capital is restored, conserved and enhanced

Summary of Results Achieved by the Recipient: As of the end of March 2012, the Conservancy had drawn \$200.9 million under the federal allocation (equivalent to 89% of the total Natural Areas Conservation Program funding available). As of the end of the fourth year, the Conservancy and its partners had raised more than \$141 million in matching funds and pledges from private and other public sources, and received donations of conservation lands and easements valued at \$150 million from private landowners, for a total of over \$291 million. The Conservancy and its partners have already reached the goal to match the federal investment of \$225 million over the life of the program. The Conservancy and its partners have now secured more than 330,000 hectares (ha) of land, through more than 907 land transactions. These lands are found in every province and provide habitat for at least 126 species at risk.

Program Activity: Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat (\$ millions)					
2009–10 Actual Spending	2010–11 Actual Spending	2011–12 Planned Spending	2011–12 Total Authorities	2011–12 Actual Spending	Variance(s)
29.3	21.7	0.0	33.7	33.7	(33.7)

Comments on Variance(s): This conditional grant was fully accounted for in the 2006–2007 fiscal year. Payments made under the grant are based on the Conservancy's fiscal year, which commences on July 1. Instalments under the grant were \$70.2 million in 2007–2008, \$46.1 million in 2008–2009, \$29.3 million in 2009–2010, \$21.7 million in 2010–2011 and \$33.7 million in 2011–2012.

Significant Evaluation Findings by the Recipient during the Reporting Year and Future Plan: The fourth annual progress report spanning April 1, 2007, to June 30, 2011, was received from the Conservancy on February 16, 2012, and was deemed to be

satisfactory. As per the requirements of the grant, a program evaluation, covering the dates from initiation until March, 2012, was submitted on June 20, 2012. The objectives of the evaluation were to measure the overall performance of the Conservancy in achieving the outcomes identified in the Agreement; and to assess the economy, efficiency and effectiveness with which funds have been used. The evaluation found that the program has been successful and several recommendations were directed to the Conservancy for future program implementation in the event that the program is renewed.

Significant Audit Findings by the Recipient during the Reporting Year and Future

Plan: A financial audit, dated June 30, 2011, was conducted by Ernst & Young to inform the fourth annual progress report on the program, spanning July 1, 2010, to June 30, 2011. The auditor's report indicated that "...the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Fund as at June 30, 2011, and the revenue and expenses in the NCC and Other Qualified Organizations (except Ducks Unlimited Canada) columns in the statement of operations and changes in unrestricted net assets for the period from March 30, 2007 to June 30, 2011 and for the year ended June 30, 2011."

Link to Recipient's Website: www.natureconservancy.ca

Up-Front Multi-Year Funding

Name of Recipient: Canadian Foundation for Climate and Atmospheric Sciences (CFCAS)

Start Date: February 2000

End Date: March 31, 2012

Total Funding: \$110 million. A one-time \$60 million grant to be disbursed over six years was received in 2001, and a second grant of \$50 million to be disbursed by the end of March 2011 was received in 2004. The Minister of the Environment approved a one-year no-cost extension to CFCAS's mandate, which allowed the Foundation to operate until March 31, 2012.

Description: The Canadian Foundation for Climate and Atmospheric Sciences (CFCAS) was the main funding body for university-based research on climate, atmospheric and related oceanic work in Canada. It was established in 2000 as an autonomous foundation, and in 2001 attained charitable status. In 2009, its mandate was extended from March 2011 to March 2012.

Its purpose was to invest strategically in excellent university-based research on climate and atmospheric sciences to

- provide relevant scientific information to support federal policy making
- generate better knowledge regarding climate change and its impacts on the natural environment
- provide results to help Canada respond to its international environmental commitments
- ensure a supply of skilled human resources to meet future environmental challenges

Strategic Outcome(s)

Canadians are equipped to make informed decisions on changing weather, water and climate conditions.

Summary of Results Achieved by the Recipient

Granting Activities (from CFCAS 2011-2012 Annual Report)

In April 2011, CFCAS awarded additional supplements to the Global Ocean-Atmosphere Prediction and Predictability (GOAPP) and Canadian Network for the Detection of Atmospheric Change (CANDAC) networks to allow them to retain essential personnel or network support functions. A further supplement was awarded to the GOAPP in June 2011. The supplements totalled \$38,320.

In March 2012, CFCAS awarded \$965,000 in grants to consortia whose work builds on that of previous CFCAS-funded networks and projects. Ten research grants and two outreach grants were awarded. The Foundation's grant fund is now exhausted.

Program Activity: Weather and Environmental Services for Canadians (\$ millions)					
2009-10 Actual Spending	2010-11 Actual Spending	2011-12 Planned Spending	2011-12 Total Authorities	2011-12 Actual Spending	Variance(s)
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Comments on Variance(s): n/a

Significant Evaluation Findings by the Recipient during the Reporting Year and Future Plan: n/a

Significant Audit Findings by the Recipient during the Reporting Year and Future Plan: The 2011-2012 auditor's report stated that, in the auditor's opinion, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the CFCAS as at March 31, 2012 and the results of its operations and its cash flows for the year ended in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles. The auditor reported no difficulties during the audit.

Link to Recipient's Site: <http://www.cfcas.org>

Up-Front Multi-Year Funding

Name of Recipient: Clayoquot Biosphere Trust

Start Date: February 2000

End Date: In perpetuity

Total Funding: \$12 million

Description: Creation of an endowment fund for the Clayoquot Biosphere Trust (CBT), the cornerstone of the Clayoquot Sound UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. The CBT will use the income from the endowment fund to support local research, education and training in the Biosphere Reserve region.

Strategic Outcome(s): Canada's natural environment is conserved and restored for present and future generations.

Summary of Results Achieved by the Recipient:

During 2011–2012, the CBT achieved the following results:

- Built a regional network of food access and food security partners
- Develop school board approved Sustainability Studies Grade 11-12 curriculum to be delivered in local high schools;
- Implemented a Board-led, multi-year fund development plan to support the work of the CBT as a community foundation;
- Granted more than \$155,000 to support research, education and community programs through a range of funding streams;
- Developed the framework for a sustainability snapshot that brings together social, environmental, economic, and cultural data to be released in October 2012;
- Increased marketing and promotion of the Biosphere Reserve to raise its profile and secure additional individual and corporate donations for CBT priorities
- Engaged more than 60 volunteers from throughout the Clayoquot Sound region on projects and committees; and
- Conducted a thorough bylaw review updating the governing documents to provide concise definitions and direction for board and staff.

Program Activity: Sustainable Ecosystems: Education and Engagement (1.3.3.4)

Actual Spending 2009-10	Actual Spending 2010-11	Planned Spending 2011-12	Total Authorities 2011-12	Actual Spending 2011-12	Variance (s)
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Horizontal Initiatives

Name of Horizontal Initiative: The Canadian Group on Earth Observations is a collection of federal departments participating in the international Group on Earth Observations (GEO).

Name of Lead Department(s): Environment Canada is the lead department by virtue of the identification of the ADM of the Meteorological Service of Canada as the GEO Principal.

Lead Department Program Activity: Weather and environmental services for Canadians.

Start Date: July 2003.

End Date: Ongoing.

Total Federal Funding Allocation (from start date to end date): Provided through existing resource envelope and in-kind contributions from federal departments.

Description of the Horizontal Initiative (including funding agreement): The GEO is implementing the Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS), which seeks to create free and open access to Earth observations for decision and policy-makers in all countries. In so doing, users such as Environment Canada and other participating departments will be better able to more accurately predict the future state of planet Earth and better warn citizens of the onset of hazardous conditions. See the GEO website for more details, at <http://www.earthobservations.org/>.

Shared Outcome(s)

- Enhancing access to Global Earth Observation data and science to meet Canadian environmental and socio-economic monitoring requirements
- Maximizing the effectiveness of Canadian investments in Earth observation networks, both domestic and international
- Improving evidence-based decision making in operational and policy domains based on coordinated, comprehensive and sustainable Earth observations

Governance Structure(s)

Coordination is achieved through the newly created ADM-level Federal Committee on Geomatics and Earth Observations (FCGEO), a DG-level shadow committee; and through ad hoc working-level committees and task groups.

Performance Highlights

Environment Canada

Canada is working with the United States Group on Earth Observations (US GEO) on joint projects, such as the binational group for the Great Lakes Observing System (GLOS), which is working to improve monitoring and data sharing in the Great Lakes basin. Work continues to establish similar groups in the Prairies and the Rocky Mountains for better understanding

of the water cycle and better predictions of drought, flood and water quality conditions. This is connected to Global Drought Monitoring Initiative efforts. At the November 2011 GEO Plenary in Istanbul, the international community reaffirmed member countries' commitment to the GEOSS. At this plenary, for the first time, Canada was elected to the Executive Committee and will serve a two-year term representing the Americas' caucus. During 2011–2012, Canada has actively contributed to global efforts in forest carbon tracking and in the Joint Experiment for Crop Assessment and Monitoring (JECAM). The Canadian Space Agency (CSA) will assume the chairmanship of the Committee on Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS) in 2012.

Canada also plays a key role in the GEO Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group, with EC providing a co-chair and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) acting as Co-Chair of the Evaluation Team performing the third evaluation of GEO results, which focused on the progress made in the strategic targets for agriculture, biodiversity and ecosystems.

Interdepartmental international activities related to GEO, geomatics and related domains are being better coordinated through the efforts of the Federal Committee on Geomatics and Earth Observations (FCGEO). Co-chaired by AAFC and Natural Resources Canada (NRCan), this ADM-level committee formed in 2011–2012 is focused on ensuring coherent Canadian positions and representation at related international fora as well on establishing a federal geospatial platform to increase the interoperability, availability and usefulness of geospatial data for decision and policy-makers.

Federal Partners	Federal Partner Program Activity	Names of Programs for Federal Partners	Total Allocation (from start date to end date) (\$ thousands)	2011-12 (\$ thousands)			
				Planned Spending	Actual Spending	Expected Results	Results Achieved
Environment Canada	Weather and environmental services for Canadians	Meteorological Service of Canada		In-kind contributions of \$100K salary and \$50K O&M resources envelope (A-based) \$38K G&C	\$75K salary \$25K O&M \$88K G&C	- Bilateral projects with U.S., including international test beds and research projects - Coordination of Canadian inputs and positions for international 2011 GEO Plenary in Turkey - CGEO departments are engaged in Earth observation data issues and policy development	See above
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada		Science and Technology		In-kind To be determined	Not available	Not available	AAFC was actively involved in the development of the GEO-GLAM (Global Agricultural Monitoring) work plan and the Joint Experiment for Crop Assessment and Monitoring (JECAM).
Canadian Space Agency		Earth Observations		In-kind To be determined	In-kind (planning and coordination) and some O&M (\$10K)	Not available	CSA provided data dissemination, coordination and planning support to GEO activities related to global monitoring via satellites in forestry (Global Forest Observation Initiative), agriculture (GEO-GLAM) and disaster management projects either directly (RADARSAT data provided to disaster response pilots in Caribbean

							and Namibia) and through its membership and leadership in CEOS.
Fisheries and Oceans Canada		Science and Technology		In-kind To be determined	Not available	Not available	See above
Natural Resources Canada		Mapping Information Branch		In-kind To be determined	Not available	Not available	See above
		Canadian Forest Service		In-kind	\$125K salary \$20K O&M	<p>a) Global Observation of Forest and Land Cover Dynamics panel (GOFC-GOLD). Fire Early Warning System</p> <p>b) GOFC; fire extraction from NIRST (New Infrared Sensor Technology)</p> <p>c) Input on Global Forest Observation Initiative (GFOI) methods and science</p>	<p>a) Prototype in place</p> <p>b) Fire emissivity; fire extraction algorithm ongoing</p> <p>c) Contributions to GFOI methods and guidance document to support international Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) efforts</p>
		Total			200K salary 55K O&M 88K G&C		

Comments on Variances: In general, Environment Canada expenditures in terms of Salary and O&M for GEO were reduced as a result of limited capacity being redirected to other priorities and efforts to reduce travel. In terms of Grants and Contributions, in the past DFAIT used to make a contribution of \$50,000 to GEO, which that department stopped doing a couple of years ago. Environment Canada has been able to find room in its Grants and Contributions budget to continue to keep the Canadian contributions at \$88,000 since that time.

Results Achieved by Non-Federal Partners: Not applicable

Contact Information:

Michael Crowe
Director, Strategic Integration
Meteorological Service of Canada
Environment Canada
141 Laurier Ave. West
Ottawa ON K1A 0H3
613-943-5580

Horizontal Initiatives

Name of Horizontal Initiative: Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem Initiative

Name of Lead Department(s): Environment Canada

Lead Department Program Activity: Sustainable Ecosystem

Start Date: April 1, 2010 (Great Lakes Action Plan, Phase V (GLAPV) Departmental resources envelope (A-Based) as of Budget 2010)

End Date: Not applicable

Total Federal Funding Allocation (from start date to end date): End Date not applicable – \$8 million per year

Description of the Horizontal Initiative (including funding agreement):

The Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem Initiative is Environment Canada's mechanism for coordinating efforts to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem, and ensure delivery of federal commitments as expressed in the Canada-U.S. Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. Environment Canada uses the Canada-Ontario Agreement (COA) Respecting the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem to engage other federal departments and Ontario in delivering Canada's Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement commitments.

Environment Canada's Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem Initiative (GLBEI) reflects Budget 2010 investments targeted at continuing the work under the Great Lakes Action Plan to improve the ecological integrity of the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem. The GLAPV is allocated \$8 million per year to continue the environmental restoration of key aquatic Great Lakes Areas of Concern. Federal departments also use the departmental resources envelope (A-Base) to support their efforts towards achieving COA results.

Shared Outcome(s): The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement establishes broad, long-term objectives for Canada and the United States in restoring and protecting the Great Lakes. The COA provides a short-term plan for achieving Canada's Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement commitments. Through the COA, federal and provincial agencies are guided by a shared vision of a healthy, prosperous and sustainable Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem for present and future generations. The COA also establishes a common purpose and shared goals, results and commitment in four priority areas: restoration of Areas of Concern; reduction of harmful pollutants; achievement of lakes and basin sustainability; and coordination of monitoring, research and information.

Governance structure(s): Eight federal departments are engaged in delivering GLBEI results under the COA: Environment Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Natural Resources Canada, Parks Canada, Transport Canada, Infrastructure Canada and Health Canada.

The COA Management Committee is the senior federal-provincial management body responsible for setting priorities, establishing strategies to ensure delivery of the COA, and developing

common positions and joint action plans for representing Canadian interests and engaging in cooperative initiatives with the United States agencies and the International Joint Commission.

Planning, prioritization and allocation of GLAPV monies is managed through the Ontario Regional office of Environment Canada with the advice of the GLAPV Workplan Review Team. Members of the GLAPV Workplan Review Team consist of representatives from Environment Canada and Fisheries and Oceans Canada receiving GLAPV funds. The GLAPV Workplan Review Team reviews proposed projects and activities, developing and regularly updating a coordinated federal workplan based on priorities required to support Great Lakes Action Plan implementation.

Performance Highlights

Federal Partners	Federal Partner Program Activity	Names of Programs for Federal Partners	Total Allocation (start date to end date) (millions)	2011-12 (millions)			
				Planned Spending	Actual Spending	Expected Results	Results Achieved
Environment Canada	Sustainable Ecosystems	COA	\$40 M GLAPV, plus depart'l resources envelope (A-Base)	\$7.0 M GLAPV, plus \$1.2 M depart'l resources envelope (A-Base)	\$7.0 M GLAPV, plus \$1.2 M depart'l resources envelope (A-Base)	All COA results, except Ann. 2-3.2	See below
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Sustainable Aquatic Ecosystems	COA	\$3.7 M GLAPV, plus \$4.7 M depart'l resources envelope (A-Base), plus \$40.5 M depart'l resources envelope (A-Base) for Sea Lamprey control	\$756.8 K GLAPV, plus \$930 K depart'l resources envelope (A-Base) towards Areas of Concern, plus \$8.1 M depart'l resources envelope depart'l resources envelope (A-Base) for Sea Lamprey control	\$756.8 K GLAPV, plus \$930 K depart'l resources envelope (A-Base) towards Areas of Concern, plus \$8.1 M depart'l resources envelope (A-Base) for Sea Lamprey control	Ann. 1-2.4 Ann. 1-2.6 Ann. 3-1.2 Ann. 3-1.3 Ann. 3-1.4 Ann. 3-3.1 Ann. 3-3.2 Ann. 3-4.1 Ann. 3-4.2 Ann. 3-5.1 Ann. 4-1.1 Ann. 4-2.2.	See below
		Sea Lamprey Control Program					
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	Environmental Sustainability	Growing Forward	\$57 M for environment and climate change from April 1, 2008, to March 31, 2013	\$9,180 K	\$7,080 K	Ann. 1-1.2 Ann. 1-2.2 Ann. 2-2.3 Ann. 3-1.2 Ann. 3-1.4 Ann. 3-2.2 Ann. 4-1.1 Ann. 4-2.2	See below

Federal Partners	Federal Partner Program Activity	Names of Programs for Federal Partners	Total Allocation (start date to end date) (millions)	2011-12 (millions)			
				Planned Spending	Actual Spending	Expected Results	Results Achieved
Natural Resources Canada	Canada is a world leader on environmental responsibility in the development and use of natural resources	Port Hope Long-term Low-level Radioactive Waste Mgmt Project	Depart'l resources envelope (A-Base) and C-Base.	\$356.5 K	\$375.4 K	Ann. 1-2.3 Ann. 3-1.4 Ann. 3-2.4	See below
		CFS Forest harvesting in riparian zones					
	Ecosystem risk management: Canada understands and mitigates risks to natural resource ecosystems and human health	CFS understanding and mitigating risks to aquatic biodiversity					
Parks Canada	Heritage Resources Conservation	COA	Depart'l resources envelope (A-Base)	No COA Allocation	No COA Allocation	Ann. 3-1.1 Ann. 3-1.2 Ann. 3-1.3 Ann. 3-2.2 Ann. 3-3.2 Ann. 3-3.3 Ann. 4-1.1 Ann. 4-2.2.	See below
	Public Appreciation and Understanding						
Transport Canada	Environmental Protection and Remediation; the Canadian Ballast Water Program	COA	Depart'l resources envelope (A-Base)	\$519.0 K	\$517.0 K	Ann. 3-1.3 Ann. 3-2.1 Ann. 3-4.1 Ann. 3-4.2	See below
Infrastructure Canada	Infrastructure funding program	Building Canada Plan (Building Canada Fund; Provincial-Territorial Base Fund and Gas Tax Fund), Green Infrastructure Fund Sunsetting programs (CSIF, MRIF).	No COA allocation	No COA allocation	No COA allocation	INFC supports the objectives of the COA with particular emphasis on Annex items Ann. 1-1.1 Ann. 1-2.1.	See below
Health Canada	Regions and Programs Bureau –	COA	Depart'l resources envelope (A-Base)	No depart'l resources envelope	No COA allocation	Ann. 2-3.2	See below

Federal Partners	Federal Partner Program Activity	Names of Programs for Federal Partners	Total Allocation (start date to end date) (millions)	2011-12 (millions)			
				Planned Spending	Actual Spending	Expected Results	Results Achieved
	Ontario Region			(A-Base) funding. COA Commitment incorporated in CMP initiatives.			
Total GLAPV, plus departmental funding				\$7.8 M GLAPV	\$7.8 M GLAPV		

Results Achieved in 2011-2012:

Specific Results by Department:

Environment Canada

The Department continued its work to achieve progress in the restoration of Great Lakes Areas of Concern:

- In May 2011, Canada and Ontario declared the Jackfish Bay Area of Concern (AOC) to be an area in recovery. An AOC may be designated as an Area in Recovery when all remedial actions have been completed in the AOC; however, additional time is needed for the recovery of beneficial uses. The status report confirmed that significant improvement had occurred since the area was originally listed as an AOC; however, more time is needed for natural recovery, a process that will be measured by the area in recovery monitoring program established in 2011-2012.
- A Stage 2 Remedial Action Plan report for the Canadian portion of the Detroit River AOC was released in January 2012. The report is a comprehensive assessment of the current status of beneficial use impairments in the AOC, an evaluation of the remedial actions to restore beneficial uses carried out from 1998-2008, and recommendations regarding the remaining remedial actions: their priority, timelines and agency/organization responsible.
- A four-year sediment transport monitoring study in the Trent River (flowing into the Bay of Quinte—an AOC)—was completed. The sediment management option selected was monitored, and natural recovery and measures were implemented to restrict activity that might disturb sediments in the river.

Environment Canada continued its work to reduce the release of harmful substances through a variety of activities and projects:

- A commitment to facilitate the sharing of information between Canada and Ontario's respective chemicals management plans was implemented and quarterly meetings were held to support this initiative. Toxics reduction efforts previously undertaken through the Great Lakes Binational Toxics Strategy (GLBTS) have now been integrated into the federal Chemicals Management Plan risk management strategies.
- After over 10 years of binational effort, 2011-2012 marked a transition year for the GLBTS as negotiations continued to amend the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, which is expected to create a new process for the selection, identification and development of control strategies for existing and emerging chemicals of concern.

Work continued to achieve a better understanding of, and reporting on the Great Lakes Ecosystem status and trends. Environment Canada worked collaboratively with universities and other government and non-governmental agencies on many projects with the following results:

- In 2011–2012, the State of the Great Lakes Ecosystem Conference was held. Over 50 draft indicator reports and the draft Great Lakes Ecosystem Status and Trends summary report were presented at this conference, the ninth conference held since 1994. The conference and associated report continues to be an effective means of developing binational agreement on **the state of the lakes and communicating this information to stakeholders and the public.**
- The annual Lakewide Management Plans (LaMPs) reports were published for each of the Great Lakes, providing a yearly update on the accomplishments and challenges, and identifying the next steps to take to achieve each lake's ecosystem goals and objectives.
- Implementation began of the Lake Superior Aquatic Invasive Species Complete Prevention Plan to prevent new aquatic invasive species (AIS) from becoming established in the Lake Superior ecosystem. The Plan sets out key recommended actions to be taken by both the United States and Canada and outlines a list of AIS vectors and pathways to be addressed.

Fisheries and Oceans Canada

Work continued to conduct science to enhance and protect fish habitats; to control the established invasive species to reduce their effects on fisheries and the ecosystem; and to assess the risk and protect against new invaders. Fisheries and Oceans Canada

- Provided monitoring and science to support the delisting of Areas of Concern, including the Bay of Quinte, Toronto Harbour, Hamilton Harbour, the Detroit River and the St. Clair River. Results include Biotic Integrity and Habitat Productivity indices for nearshore fish populations; fish habitat classification and supply models to measure the success of habitat restorations; long-term assessments of lower-trophic levels and food web status; and ecosystem models for evaluating cumulative effects.
- Delivered an integrated program of Sea Lamprey management in the Great Lakes in collaboration with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, under the direction of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission. Results include successful lampricide treatments in tributaries and connection channels in lakes Ontario, Erie, Huron and Superior to suppress invasive Sea Lampreys and to protect and restore native fishes. Achieved suppression targets for abundances of adult Sea Lampreys in lakes Ontario and Superior and made progress toward targets in Lake Huron. Continued research and development of new alternative Sea Lamprey control methods including field trials of Sea Lamprey pheromones.
- Carried out risk assessments of potential aquatic invasive species, including a binational risk assessment of Asian Carp; evaluated the impact of aquatic invasive species on Great Lakes ecosystems; and monitored ballast water management to establish its effectiveness in eliminating importation of new species through this vector.

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

The department continued its work to improve beneficial agriculture management practices with the involvement of the Great Lakes farming community in numerous projects:

- Under agreement with Ontario, the department delivered the Canada–Ontario Environmental Farm Plan and Canada–Ontario Farm Stewardship Program to farmers, resulting in the province-wide implementation of 438 peer-reviewed environmental farm plans and 1859 on-farm beneficial management practice projects in 2011–2012.

Natural Resources Canada

Work continued towards the achievement of the sustainable development of Canada's energy, forestry and mineral metals resources within the Great Lakes Basin, including:

- Enhanced policies and practices to mitigate forestry impacts on creeks and rivers.
- Enhanced utilization of herbicides on forests to reduce impacts on aquatic organisms.
- Federal funding approval for the implementation of clean-up activities based on detailed remediation designs for contaminated sites, including the Port Hope Harbour, and for the construction of a new long-term waste management facility to manage the Port Hope area's historic low-level radioactive wastes.

Parks Canada

The Agency delivers the National Parks and National Marine Conservation Areas Programs and works to develop and maintain a viable protected areas network in the Great Lakes Basin that is relevant to Canadians. The Agency

- Led federal participation in environmental assessments of Niagara-on-the-Lake sewage plant upgrade and the Kingston (Cataragui) river crossing.
- Monitored coastal fish populations in the Fathom Five National Marine Park of Canada.
- Monitored coastal streams in the Pukaskwa National Park of Canada.

Transport Canada

Work continued to ensure compliance with *Canada Shipping Act* regulations related to the ecosystem health of the Great Lakes. Transport Canada undertook a wide variety of inspection, monitoring and training programs. The department

- Boarded vessels entering the Great Lakes to ensure compliance with ballast water regulations
- Carried out biological analysis and evaluation of vessels targeted in the Joint Boarding Program. Analysis indicated the program is very effective in decreasing the risk of discharge of AIS in ballast water. No AIS attributed to ships have been found in the Great Lakes since 2006 when the Canadian regulations came into force
- Supported Canadian firms interested in the development of ballast water technology programs compliant with the International Marine Organization's Ballast Water and Sediments Management standards. Two firms in the program—Trojan and Degussa—have produced type-approved ballast water management systems available on the world market.
- It should be noted that Canada has ratified the International Marine Organization's outstanding pollution prevention Conventions from 2007 and has put in place a regulatory regime to enforce them.

Infrastructure Canada

Work continued toward providing funding to eligible infrastructure projects in support of federal objectives such as a cleaner environment, which includes improved wastewater treatment:

- Since 2007, the Government of Canada has announced over \$537 million for wastewater infrastructure in the Great Lakes watershed, through the Building Canada Fund, the Green Infrastructure Fund, and the Infrastructure Stimulus Fund. Of this amount, approximately \$383 million in federal funding has been committed toward treatment projects that result in improved municipal wastewater effluent.

- In 2011–2012, Infrastructure Canada focused on moving a number of large-scale projects towards implementation. This includes \$248.6 million announced through the Building Canada Fund – Major Infrastructure Component and the Green Infrastructure Fund, in support of 8 major infrastructure projects located in communities near the Great Lakes. Among these initiatives, approximately \$178 million is supporting major projects to improve the quality of municipal wastewater effluent in the following Areas of Concern: the St. Lawrence River, Hamilton Harbour and Nipigon Bay.

Health Canada

The department continued its work to enhance environmental health knowledge within the Great Lakes Basin that can be integrated into policies to address risks to human health by all levels of government:

- Health Canada supported and facilitated the development of environmental public health networks in the Great Lakes Basin.
- The Great Lakes Public Health Network (GLPHN) supported 230 federal-provincial-municipal government staff members with 6 environmental health webinars, providing background documents of scientific knowledge, and 10 monthly e-newsletters to date. United States participation through the Great Lakes Human Health Network was also supported

Comments on variances (if applicable):

ENVIRONMENT CANADA: Dedicated Great Lakes funding (GLAPV) is received only by Environment Canada and Fisheries and Oceans Canada, which also each contribute departmental resources envelope (A-Base) funding towards achieving results under the COA. All other partners to the COA (federal and provincial) achieve COA results via departmental funding.

PARKS CANADA: Figures for planned and actual spending are not available as Parks Canada financial coding systems are not designed to separate out Great Lakes-specific activities.

HEALTH CANADA: Health Canada supports work for the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem Initiative through the joint Environment Canada/Health Canada Chemicals Management Plan. Specific resource figures are not available as this spending is not tracked separately in Health Canada's financial system.

INFRASTRUCTURE CANADA: Federal infrastructure funding programs do not include an allocation specific to the COA. Projects that are to be funded may be determined through a competitive, merit-based process, through joint federal-provincial discussions; or the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities may accept an annual capital plan describing these.

Results achieved by non-federal partners (if applicable):

Contact information:

Jennifer McKay
Great Lakes Environment Office
Environment Canada
416-739-5712

Appendix – COA Results Statements

PRIORITY 1 – AREAS OF CONCERN

- Result 1.1 – Reduce microbial and other contaminants and excessive nutrients from industrial or municipal wastewater to achieve delisting targets in Nipigon Bay and St. Lawrence River (Cornwall) AOCs.
- Result 1.2 – Reduce microbial and other contaminants and excessive nutrients from rural non-point sources to meet delisting criteria in the St. Lawrence River (Cornwall) AOC.
- Result 1.3 – Contaminated sediment management strategies developed for the Wheatley Harbour AOC and implemented in the St. Lawrence River (Cornwall) AOC.
- Result 1.4 – Plans in place and being implemented to rehabilitate fish and wildlife habitats and populations to meet delisting targets in the Wheatley Harbour and St. Lawrence River (Cornwall) AOCs.
- Result 1.5 – Informed, effective collaboration amongst government, communities and individuals to prioritize and complete actions required for delisting and confirming environmental recovery in Nipigon Bay, Jackfish Bay, Wheatley Harbour and St. Lawrence River (Cornwall) AOCs.
- Result 1.6 – Environmental monitoring and reporting to document improvements and track environmental recovery.
- Result 2.1 – Reduce microbial and other contaminants and excessive nutrients from municipal sewage treatment plants, combined sewer overflows, urban stormwater and industrial wastewater towards delisting targets in St. Marys River, St. Clair River, Detroit River, Niagara River, Hamilton Harbour, Toronto and Region, and Bay of Quinte AOCs.
- Result 2.2 – Reduce microbial and other contaminants and excessive nutrients from rural non-point sources towards achieving RAP delisting criteria in St. Clair River, Detroit River, Niagara River, Hamilton Harbour, and Toronto and Region AOCs.
- Result 2.3 – Progress made in developing sediment management strategies to reduce ecological and human health risk from contaminated sediments in Thunder Bay, Peninsula Harbour, St. Marys River, St. Clair River, Detroit River, Niagara River, Hamilton Harbour, Port Hope and Bay of Quinte AOCs.
- Result 2.4 – Long-term management plans being developed and priority actions for delisting being implemented for rehabilitation and protection of fish and wildlife habitats and populations in St. Marys River, St. Clair River, Detroit River, Niagara River, Hamilton Harbour, Toronto and Region, and Bay of Quinte AOCs.
- Result 2.5 – Informed, effective collaboration amongst government, communities and individuals to prioritize and complete actions required for delisting and confirming environmental recovery in AOCs.
- Result 2.6 – Identify monitoring needs, undertake required studies and evaluate results to assess environmental recovery and support remediation strategies in AOCs.

PRIORITY 2 - HARMFUL POLLUTANTS

- Result 1.1 - Reduction in releases of Tier 1 substances beyond the 2005 achievements towards the goal of virtual elimination.
- Result 2.1 - Reduction in releases of Criteria Air Pollutants.
- Result 2.2 - Coordinated activities to reduce releases from municipal wastewater.
- Result 2.3 - Develop and initiate a program for the Sound Management of Chemical Substances in the Great Lakes Basin.

- Result 3.1 - Improved understanding of the sources, fate and impacts of harmful pollutants in the Great Lakes Basin.
- Result 3.2 - Human Health risks from harmful pollutants are understood and addressed in the Great Lakes Basin

PRIORITY 3 - LAKE AND BASIN SUSTAINABILITY

- Result 1.1 - Increased awareness and appreciation of the Great Lakes and their contributions to social, economic and environmental well-being.
- Result 1.2 - Increased stewardship actions that work towards a balance between human well-being and prosperity, and healthy aquatic ecosystems.
- Result 1.3 - Sustainable use of land, water and other natural resources to provide benefits from the Great Lakes now and in the future.
- Result 1.4 - Enhanced knowledge about beneficial and harmful impacts of human activities on Great Lakes aquatic ecosystems and resources
- Result 2.1 - Reduce microbial and other contaminants and excessive nutrients from industrial and municipal wastewater, combined sewer overflows and urban stormwater sources consistent with actions specified in binational Lakewide Management Plans (LaMPs) and binational lake action plans.
- Result 2.2 - Reduce microbial and other contaminants and excessive nutrients from rural sources by undertaking actions specified in the binational Lakewide Management Plans and binational lake action plans.
- Result 2.3 - Identification of contaminated sediment and development of sediment management plans to reduce the release and impact of sediment-bound contaminants on the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem.
- Result 2.4 - Enhanced knowledge about beneficial and harmful impacts of human activities on Great Lakes water quality.
- Result 3.1 - Great Lakes aquatic ecosystems and habitats are protected, restored and sustained consistent with binational Great Lakes planning.
- Result 3.2 - Progress on rehabilitation of Great Lakes native species to restore the health of aquatic ecosystems, consistent with binational Great Lakes planning.
- Result 3.3 - Enhanced knowledge about beneficial and harmful impacts of human activities on Great Lakes aquatic ecosystems, habitats and species.
- Result 4.1 - Implementation of the "National Action Plan to Address the Threat of Aquatic Invasive Species" in the Great Lakes.
- Result 4.2: Enhanced knowledge about the harmful impacts of aquatic invasive species on Great Lakes aquatic ecosystems, food webs and species.
- Result 5.1 - The impacts of climate change on the Great Lakes ecosystem composition, structure, and function, including biodiversity (organisms and their habitat), water quality and quantity, human health and safety (including access to clean drinking water), social well being and economic prosperity are understood by governments and the Great Lakes community.
- Result 6.1 - The potential risks to Great Lakes drinking water intakes are identified and assessed, and early actions to address risks are undertaken
- Result 6.2 - Develop knowledge and understanding of water quality and quantity issues of concern to the Great Lakes as drinking water sources.

PRIORITY 4 - COORDINATION OF MONITORING, RESEARCH AND INFORMATION

- Result 1.1 – Responsive and comprehensive monitoring and research programs.
- Result 2.1 – Improved reporting on environmental conditions, changes and progress
- Result 2.2 – Increased sharing of data and information among governments, organizations and Basin residents.

Horizontal Initiatives

Name of Horizontal Initiative: The Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan (FCSAP), approved March 2005 (followed from the two-year Federal Contaminated Sites Accelerated Action Plan (FCSAAP))

Name of Lead Department(s): Environment Canada (EC) and Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat (TBS)

Lead Department Program Activity: Substances and Waste Management (EC); Management Frameworks (TBS)

Start Date of the Horizontal Initiative: FCSAP was approved in 2005, with funding of \$3.5 billion over 15 years. The first phase of the program ended March 31, 2011. The second phase of the program has been approved, and will run through to March 31, 2016.

End Date of the Horizontal Initiative: FCSAP is expected to continue for 15 years (from 2005), to March 31, 2020. However, the current policy approval for Phase II ends March 31, 2016.

Total Federal Funding Allocation (start to end date): \$2,737.5 million (including PWGSC accommodations charges) to March 31, 2016

Description of the Horizontal Initiative (including funding agreement): The Federal Contaminated Sites Action Plan (FCSAP) provides a long-term mechanism to address federal contaminated sites presenting the highest human health and ecological risks. At the end of March 2011, federal contaminated sites represented a financial liability of approximately \$4.354 billion. Although responsibility for the actual management and remediation of federal contaminated sites rests with responsible custodial departments, the overall program is administered jointly by Environment Canada and the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat.

Shared Outcome(s): Reduce federal financial liability and risks to human health and the environment, including fish habitat. Increase public confidence in the overall management of federal real property through the effective risk management or remediation of individual federal contaminated sites.

Governance Structure(s): The Federal Contaminated Sites Assistant Deputy Ministers Steering Committee is supported by a Director Generals Committee, the Contaminated Sites Management Working Group (CSMWG) and the FCSAP Secretariat (Environment Canada), which provides overall program coordination.

Performance Highlights: Environment Canada developed, in collaboration with the Treasury Board Secretariat and 16 other participating federal entities, a proposal for FCSAP program renewal that was approved by Cabinet in June of 2011. Fiscal year 2011–2012 was the first year of the second phase of the program, which will run through to March 31, 2016. Assessment activities were undertaken at 831 sites and completed at 249 of these sites; remediation activities were undertaken at 417 sites and remediation was completed at 21 of these sites. Several key program tools were developed during 2011–2012 to improve decision making, performance measurement and reporting.

Federal Partners	Federal Partner Program Activity	Names of Programs for Federal Partners	Total Allocation (from start date to end date) (\$ thousands)	2011-12 (\$ thousands)			
				Planned Spending	Actual Spending	Expected Results *	Results Achieved
Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada	Federal Administration of Reserve Land	Contaminated Sites Management Program	188,406	11,334	11,238		See below
	Federal Administration of Reserve Land	Contaminated Sites	1,107,928	106,601	94,897		See below
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	Internal Services	Contaminated Sites	7,276	342	272		See below
Canada Border Services Agency	Internal Services	Infrastructure and Environment	3,490	0	0		n/a
Canadian Food Inspection Agency	n/a	n/a	184	0	0		n/a
Correctional Service Canada	Custody	Facilities / Asset Management Services	14,146	2,543	\$1,917		See below
Environment Canada	Substances and Waste Management	Asset Remediation and Disposal	57,221	4,355	\$3,102		Custodian
		Contaminated Sites	74,671	6,490	6,357		Secretariat Expert Support
Fisheries and Oceans Canada	Internal Services	Contaminated Sites – FCSAP projects	94,885	3,847	3,763		Custodian
	Sustainable Aquatic Ecosystems	FCSAP Expert Support	31,122	1,955	1,830		Expert Support
Health Canada	First Nations and Inuit Health	First Nations and Inuit Health Protection	7,445	70	63		Custodian
	Environmental Risks to Health	Healthy Environments Consumer Safety Branch	62,749	4,235	\$4,178		Expert Support
Industry Canada	Communications Research Centre Canada	Contaminated Site Management Program	162	54	54		See below
Jacques Cartier and Champlain Bridges Incorporated	Management of federal bridge, highway and tunnel infrastructure, and properties in the Montréal area	n/a	23,890	1,078	0		See below
Marine Atlantic Inc.	Corporate Management	FCSAP (projects)	120	0	0		n/a
National Capital Commission	Real Asset Management	Land and Real Asset Management	31,829	6,389	1,661		See below

National Defence	Environmental Protection and Stewardship	Contaminated Sites Program	576,147	65,019	51,982		See below
National Research Council Canada	Internal Services	Environmental Operations	5,257	139	130		See below
Natural Resources Canada	Internal Services	The provision of relevant and timely policy analysis and advice for decision making on government priorities and departmental responsibilities	28,859	304	251		See below
Parks Canada	Heritage Resources Conservation	Active Management and Restoration	51,551	2,915	1,389		See below
Public Works and Government Services Canada	Accommodation and Real Property Assets Management Program	FCSAP (projects)	109,300	8,539	4,470		See below
		FCSAP (expert services)	8,850	700	677		See below
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	Corporate Infrastructure/ Internal Services	FCSAP (projects)	25,605	924	611		See below
Transport Canada	Environmental Stewardship	Environmental Programs	204,467	13,097	7,397		See below
Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	Management Frameworks	Assets and Acquired Services	5,386	527	523		See below
Total (excluding PWGSC accommodations charges; totals may not add due to rounding)			2,720,945	241,458	196,763		See below

*** Expected Results:** No information for expected results was available for the 2011–2012 Report on Plans and Priorities because the FCSAP program renewal was developed and approved by Cabinet in June 2011.

Results Achieved and Comments on Variance(s): In 2011–2012, the FCSAP federal partners spent 81% (\$196.8 million) of the available funding; reprofiled, carried forward or cash-managed 17% (\$39.9 million) to future years, and lapsed 2% (\$4.8 million). Details below.

Federal Partner	Results Achieved for 2011–12	Comments on Variance(s)
Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada – Southern Program	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada’s (AANDC’s) Southern Program completed the assessment of 46 sites. An additional 5 sites had ongoing assessment activities and 78 sites had ongoing remediation activities.	Additional funds: \$646K was carried forward from previous years and \$219K was received from AANDC’s Northern Program. Adjustments: \$27K was cash-managed internally. \$69K lapsed (\$40K program management funding and \$29K remediation funding).
Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada – Northern Program	Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada’s (AANDC’s) Northern Program completed the assessment of 45 sites and the remediation of 3 sites. An additional 38 sites had ongoing assessment activities and 70 sites had ongoing remediation activities.	\$11.1M was reprofiled to 2012–2013. \$219K was transferred to AANDC’s Southern Program.
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada completed the assessment of 3 sites. An additional 2 sites had ongoing remediation activities.	Minor lapse in assessment funds due to project costs coming in lower than estimated. Lapse in remediation funds due to not being able to complete a planned remediation project late in the fiscal year.
Correctional Service Canada	Correctional Service Canada completed the assessment of 28 sites and the remediation of 6 sites.	\$626K was internally cash-managed into 2012–2013.
Environment Canada – Custodian	Environment Canada completed the assessment of 8 sites. An additional 6 sites had ongoing assessment activities and 6 sites had ongoing remediation activities.	\$800K has been reprofiled for a major project. As for the remaining \$453K, the actual spending was less than planned for the same major project.
Environment Canada – Secretariat	In its role of managing the FCSAP program, Environment Canada continued to provide program oversight and administration (including reviewing project submissions for eligibility, maintaining the priority list of eligible projects and tracking program expenditures at mid year and year end). In collaboration with the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat and 16 other participating federal entities, a proposal	\$133K was lapsed due to the delay in receiving 2011–2012 funding until the program was renewed at mid year.

Federal Partner	Results Achieved for 2011–12	Comments on Variance(s)
	<p>for FCSAP program renewal was developed and approved by Cabinet in June 2011. The Secretariat also prepared the Treasury Board Submission, which was approved in September 2011.</p>	
<p>Environment Canada – Expert Support</p>	<p>In its role as an expert support department for the FCSAP program, Environment Canada provided scientific guidance and expert advice to custodial departments for the management of their sites so that risks to the environment are reduced or minimized. Environment Canada</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordinated and reviewed the site classifications for more than 170 sites to ensure that they are eligible for FCSAP remediation/risk management funding - Initiated an on-line training program with the Canada School of Public Service to increase accessibility of training for program partners - Developed guidance and tools to assist custodians with the managing and prioritizing of their sites 	
<p>Fisheries and Oceans Canada – Custodian</p>	<p>Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) undertook work at 434 assessment sites and at 80 remediation/risk management sites in 2011–2012.</p>	<p>DFO Custodian received \$305K from DFO Expert Support during mid-year review. \$200K was transferred to FCSAP remediation/risk management.</p> <p>\$84K was lapsed, \$74K of which is due to staffing delays and \$10K is due to invoices coming in lower than expected for assessment and remediation/risk management activities.</p>
<p>Fisheries and Oceans Canada – Expert Support</p>	<p>In its role as an expert support department for the FCSAP program, Fisheries and Oceans Canada provided scientific and technical advice to custodial departments with respect to the management of federal contaminated sites that may be impacting, or have the potential to impact, fish or fish habitat. Fisheries and Oceans Canada</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Developed guidance material and provided training on the management of FCSAP aquatic sites to custodial organizations (e.g. FCSAP Aquatic Sites Framework, the Aquatic Sites Classification System and Ecological Risk Assessment 	<p>Staffing delays caused an inability to access all resources.</p>

Federal Partner	Results Achieved for 2011–12	Comments on Variance(s)
	<p>statements of work)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reviewed project submissions to ensure that the potential impacts to fish and fish habitat had been appropriately considered - Reviewed and evaluated FCSAP projects to ascertain if, and to what level, the risk to fish and fish habitat had been reduced as a result of custodial actions 	
Health Canada – Custodian	Health Canada undertook remediation/risk management activities at 1 site during FY 2011–2012.	\$70K of assessment funds from 2010–2011 were carried forward and reallocated to remediation; project costs were less than anticipated.
Health Canada – Expert Support	<p>In its role as an expert support department for the FCSAP program, Health Canada provided guidance, training and expert advice on human health risk assessments, risk management and public involvement to custodial departments under the FCSAP program. Health Canada</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conducted site visits and reviewed site-related documents submitted under the FCSAP program - Reviewed site submissions in order to determine the eligibility for funding 	Staffing delays caused an inability to access all resources.
Industry Canada	Industry Canada had ongoing assessment activities at 1 site.	
Jacques Cartier and Champlain Bridges Incorporated	Jacques Cartier and Champlain Bridges Incorporated had ongoing remediation activities at 3 sites.	Major revenue from the provincial partner. Balance paid using regular budget. \$1.1M was reprofiled to 2012-2013.
National Capital Commission	The National Capital Commission completed the assessment of 60 sites and 6 sites had ongoing remediation activities.	\$3M was reprofiled into 2013–2014. \$1.7M of internal cash management was redirected into 2012–2013.
National Defence	<p>National Defence completed the assessment of 33 sites and the remediation of 2 sites.</p> <p>An additional 86 sites had ongoing assessment activities and 66 sites had ongoing remediation activities.</p>	<p>\$10M was reprofiled into 2013–2014 and \$3M was lapsed.</p> <p>The reasons for variance were numerous, including work conducted for less than estimated; the use of internal funds; weather conditions that affected the amount of work completed; departmental approval processes that delayed delegation of FCSAP funds; and a bridge to access a site that was washed away too late in the fiscal year to rebuild.</p>

Federal Partner	Results Achieved for 2011–12	Comments on Variance(s)
National Research Council Canada	National Research Council Canada completed the assessment of 1 site. An additional 3 sites had ongoing remediation activities.	The majority of lapsed funds are associated with lower-than-expected expenditures in the project management portion of the funding.
Natural Resources Canada	Natural Resources Canada had ongoing assessment activities at 4 sites and ongoing remediation activities at 1 site.	Project costs came in under budget.
Parks Canada	Parks Canada completed the assessment of 3 sites and the remediation of 6 sites. An additional 7 sites had ongoing assessment activities and 31 sites had ongoing remediation activities.	Funds were carried forward.
Public Works and Government Services Canada – Custodian	Public Works and Government Services Canada completed remediation at 1 site. An additional site had ongoing assessment activities and 21 sites had ongoing remediation activities.	Forecasted remediation work could not be completed due to late timing of funds.
Public Works and Government Services Canada – Expert Support	In its role as an expert support department for the FCSAP program, Public Works and Government Services Canada developed project management tools and training, innovative technology profiles, and demand forecast analysis for sharing with the private sector as well as ongoing analysis of procurement issues.	Consultant contract could not be completed.
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	<p>The Royal Canadian Mounted Police as custodian completed the assessment of 19 sites under FCSAP. Assessment work will continue outside the FCSAP program at 10 of these sites, and 9 sites were closed.</p> <p>Remediation was also completed under FCSAP at 2 sites. These sites will require additional work outside the FCSAP program.</p> <p>An additional 2 sites had ongoing remediation activities.</p>	<p>The variance is explained by a total of \$240K of projects not going through: approximately \$93K of unspent remediation funds and \$148K of unspent assessment funds.</p> <p>For remediation projects, the variance is due to several projects. One project (approximately \$20K) was determined to be ineligible for FCSAP expenditures. Two projects came under budget, for a total of approximately \$23K. Finally, the management of one project resulted in the work being paid with departmental funds (approximately \$51K).</p> <p>For assessment projects, \$148K was not spent, as the project to which the funds were allocated was identified too late ineligible for FCSAP funds.</p> <p>Finally, regarding program management funding, the RCMP carried forward \$76K from 2010–2011 into 2011–2012. There is a planned carry forward of \$72K into 2012–2013.</p>

Federal Partner	Results Achieved for 2011–12	Comments on Variance(s)
Transport Canada	<p>Transport Canada completed the assessment of 3 sites and the remediation of 1 site.</p> <p>An additional 26 sites had ongoing remediation activities.</p>	<p>The \$5.7M variance was carried forward to future years.</p> <p>Factors contributing to the variance include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a \$1M project that did not proceed, as further studies were required to determine the best remedial approach - delays due to the federal government contracting process, a reduced field season in the North, variances in contract tender prices, additional delineation required before the remediation project could proceed, and reductions in project scope, all of which impacted project costs
Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	<p>The Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat supports Environment Canada in the management of the FCSAP program through the provision of policy advice and guidance to ensure that the ongoing implementation of the FCSAP is undertaken in a manner consistent with Treasury Board policies on the management of federal real property and federal contaminated sites.</p> <p>In this role, TBS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supported Environment Canada in the development of a proposal for FCSAP program renewal that was approved by Cabinet in June of 2011 and a Treasury Board Submission that was approved in September 2011, in consultation with 16 participating federal entities - Maintained the Federal Contaminated Sites Inventory - Supported the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development audit of federal contaminated sites (report to be tabled in May 2012) - Coordinated planning for the May 2012 Federal Contaminated Sites National Workshop 	

Results Achieved by Non-Federal Partners (if applicable): n/a

Contact Information:

FCSAP Secretariat
Compliance Promotion and Contaminated Sites Division
15th floor, Place Vincent Massey
351 St. Joseph Blvd.
Gatineau QC K1A 0H3
819-934-8153

Greening Government Operations

Overview

The Greening Government Operations (GGO) supplementary table applies to departments and agencies bound by the *Federal Sustainable Development Act*, the *Policy on Green Procurement*, or the *Policy Framework for Offsetting Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Major International Events*.

Notes

- "RPP" refers to the Report on Plans and Priorities and represents planned or expected results.
- "DPR" refers to the Departmental Performance Report and represents actual results.
- "Departments" refers to departments and agencies.
- "FY" refers to fiscal year.

Green Building Targets

As of April 1, 2012, and pursuant to departmental strategic frameworks, new construction and build-to-lease projects, and major renovation projects, will achieve an industry-recognized level of high environmental performance.¹		
Performance Measure	RPP	DPR
Target Status	On Track	
Number of completed new construction, build-to-lease and major renovation projects in the given fiscal year, according to the departmental strategic framework (<i>optional in FY 2011-2012</i>)	Under Development	0
Number of completed new construction, build-to-lease and major renovation projects that have achieved an industry-recognized level of high environmental performance in the given fiscal year, according to the departmental strategic framework (<i>optional in FY 2011-2012</i>)	Under Development	0
Existence of a strategic framework (<i>optional for RPP 2011-2012</i>)	To be completed in 2011-12	Yes: Completed Oct. 2011

¹ High environmental performance is demonstrated by achieving LEED NC Silver, Green Globes Design 3 Globes, or equivalent.

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. Environment Canada (EC) completed its Green Building Strategic Framework in October 2011. Under target 8.1, the framework outlines the following:
 - the minimum level of environmental performance: 3 Green Globes or LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) NC (New Construction) / CI (Commercial Interiors) Silver
 - the appropriate threshold (dollar value and floor area): \$1M and 400 m²
 - the applicable building types: all departmental custodial buildings
 - the industry-recognized assessment and verification tool(s) to be used: Green Globes or LEED
- ii. As the Green Building Strategic Framework was in development in 2011, no (0) projects were assessed using Green Globes or LEED NC/CI in accordance with the framework in 2011–2012.
- iii. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: EC has developed a Green Building Strategic Framework that outlines considerations for this target.

As of April 1, 2012, and pursuant to departmental strategic frameworks, existing Crown buildings over 1000 m² will be assessed for environmental performance using an industry-recognized assessment tool.²			
Performance Measure		RPP	DPR
Target Status		On Track	
Number of buildings over 1000 m ² , according to the departmental strategic framework (<i>optional in FY 2011–2012</i>)		Under Development	18
Percentage of buildings over 1000 m ² that have been assessed using an industry-recognized assessment tool, according to the departmental strategic framework (<i>optional in FY 2011–2012</i>)	FY 2011–12	Under Development	0
	FY 2012–13	72%	
	FY 2013–14	28%	
Existence of a strategic framework (<i>optional for RPP 2011–2012</i>)		To be completed in 2011–12	Yes: Completed Oct. 2011

² Industry-recognized assessment tools are BOMA BEST, Green Globes, or equivalent.

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. EC completed its Green Building Strategic Framework in October 2011. Under target 8.2, the framework outlines the following:
 - the minimum level of assessment: BOMA (Building Owners and Managers Association) BEST (Building Environmental Standards) Level 1
 - the appropriate threshold (dollar value and floor area): 1000 m²
 - the applicable building types: all departmental custodial, Crown-owned buildings over 1000 m²
 - the industry-recognized assessment tool(s) to be used: BOMA BEST
 - that certification will be sought
- ii. As the Green Building Strategic Framework was in development in 2011, no (0) buildings were assessed using the BOMA BEST assessment tool in accordance with the framework in 2011–2012.
- iii. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: EC has developed a Green Building Strategic Framework that outlines considerations for this target.

As of April 1, 2012, and pursuant to departmental strategic frameworks, new lease or lease renewal projects over 1000 m², where the Crown is the major lessee, will be assessed for environmental performance using an industry-recognized assessment tool³.

Performance Measure	RPP	DPR
Target Status	On Track	
Number of completed lease and lease renewal projects over 1000 m ² in the given fiscal year, according to the departmental strategic framework (<i>optional in FY 2011–2012</i>)	Under Development	0
Number of completed lease and lease renewal projects over 1000 m ² that were assessed using an industry-recognized assessment tool in the given fiscal year, according to the departmental strategic framework (<i>optional in FY 2011–2012</i>)	Under Development	0
Existence of a strategic framework (<i>optional for RPP 2011–2012</i>)	To be completed in 2011–12	Yes: Completed Oct. 2011

³ Industry-recognized assessment tools are BOMA BEST, an appropriately tailored BOMA International Green Lease Standard, or equivalent.

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. EC completed its Green Building Strategic Framework in October 2011. Under target 8.3, the framework outlines the following:
 - the minimum level of assessment: BOMA (Building Owners and Managers Association) BEST (Building Environmental Standards) Level 1
 - the appropriate threshold (dollar value and floor area): 1000 m²
 - the applicable building types: all departmental custodial, direct leased buildings over 1000 m²
 - the industry-recognized assessment tool(s) to be used: BOMA BEST
 - that certification will be sought
- ii. As the Green Building Strategic Framework was in development in 2011, no (0) buildings were assessed using the BOMA BEST assessment tool in accordance with the framework in 2011–2012.
- iii. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: EC has developed a Green Building Strategic Framework that outlines considerations for this target.

As of April 1, 2012, and pursuant to departmental strategic frameworks, fit-up and refit projects will achieve an industry-recognized level of high environmental performance.⁴		
Performance Measure	RPP	DPR
Target Status	On Track	
Number of completed fit-up and refit projects in the given fiscal year, according to the departmental strategic framework (<i>optional in FY 2011–2012</i>)	Under Development	0
Number of completed fit-up and refit projects that have achieved an industry-recognized level of high environmental performance in the given fiscal year, according to the departmental strategic framework (<i>optional in FY 2011–2012</i>)	Under Development	0
Existence of a strategic framework (<i>optional for RPP 2011–2012</i>)	To be completed in 2011–12	Yes: Completed Oct. 2011

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. EC completed its Green Building Strategic Framework in October 2011. Under target 8.4, the framework outlines the following:

⁴ High environmental performance is demonstrated by achieving LEED CI Silver, Green Globes Fit-Up 3 Globes, or equivalent.

- the minimum level of environmental performance: 3 Green Globes or LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) EBOM (Existing Buildings: Operations and Maintenance) Silver
- the appropriate threshold (dollar value and floor area): \$1 million and 400 m²
- the applicable building types: all departmental custodial buildings
- the industry-recognized assessment and verification tool(s) to be used: Green Globes or LEED

ii. As the Green Building Strategic Framework was in development in 2011, no (0) projects were assessed using Green Globes or LEED EBOM in accordance with the framework in 2011–2012.

iii. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: EC has developed a Green Building Strategic Framework that outlines considerations for this target.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Target

The federal government will take action now to reduce levels of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from its operations to match the national target of 17% below 2005 by 2020.			
Performance Measure		RPP⁵	DPR
Target Status		On Track	
Departmental GHG reduction target: Percentage of absolute reduction in GHG emissions by FY 2020–2021, relative to FY 2005–2006		17%	17%
Departmental GHG emissions in FY 2005–2006, in kilotonnes of CO ₂ equivalent		22.6	22.6
Departmental GHG emissions in the given fiscal year, in kilotonnes of CO ₂ equivalent	FY 2011–12	23.3	22.3
	FY 2012–13	23.2	
	FY 2013–14	23.0	
	FY 2014–15	22.7	
	FY 2015–16	21.9	
	FY 2016–17	21.1	
	FY 2017–18	20.2	
	FY 2018–19	19.4	
	FY 2019–20	19.1	
	FY 2020–21	18.8	
Change in departmental GHG emissions from FY 2005–2006 to the end of the given fiscal year, expressed as a percentage	FY 2011–12	+2.6%	-0.1%
	FY 2012–13	+2.5%	
	FY 2013–14	+1.7%	
	FY 2014–15	+0.3%	
	FY 2015–16	-3.4%	
	FY 2016–17	-7.0%	
	FY 2017–18	-10.7%	
	FY 2018–19	-14.4%	
	FY 2019–20	-15.7%	
	FY 2020–21	-17.0%	
Existence of an implementation plan to reduce GHG emissions			Yes – completed Oct. 2011

⁵ These targets are as they appear in the 2011–2012 Report on Plans and Priorities GHG Emissions Table.

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. Targeted GHG emissions sources include facilities and fleet.
- ii. EC monitors and reports GHG emissions on 93% of owned floor space and the entire fleet inventory. The quantification of emissions for the remainder of the floor space is impracticable due to the effort involved in obtaining complete and accurate data. EC owns many small structures located in remote areas, such as National Wildlife Areas and upper air stations.
- iii. Due to program growth since the baseline year, EC's emissions as of 2010–2011 increased for its facilities.
- iv. EC's implementation plan to reduce GHG emissions includes site-specific targets and actionable measures focused on specific categories (e.g. operations).
- v. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected – as per the mandatory implementation strategies for target 8.5 in the Federal Sustainable Development Strategy (FSDS), the Department has done the following:
 - reported baseline GHG emissions
 - set a departmental GHG target
 - developed and put into action its Reduction of GHG Strategy and Implementation Plan, which outlines how the Department will achieve its 2020–2021 GHG reduction target
 - demonstrated that GHG emissions are on a downward trend. Although much of the reduction in 2011–2012 can be attributed to the warmer-than-normal winter (reduced energy consumption), increased engagement and energy awareness is a contributing factor

Surplus Electronic and Electrical Equipment Target

By March 31, 2014, each department will reuse or recycle all surplus electronic and electrical equipment (EEE) in an environmentally sound and secure manner.

Performance Measure		RPP	DPR
Target Status		On Track	
Existence of an implementation plan for the disposal of all departmentally generated EEE (<i>optional for RPP 2011–2012</i>)		Anticipated completion by September 2012	Draft document developed Final copy anticipated by September 2012
Total number of departmental locations with an EEE implementation plan fully implemented, expressed as a percentage of all locations, by the end of the given fiscal year	FY 2011–12	33% (2/6)	33% (2/6)
	FY 2012–13	66% (4/6)	
	FY 2013–14	100% (6/6)	

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. **Definition of "location":** For the purpose of this DPR, departmental locations will be defined as regions.
- ii. **Number of locations:** EC is located within six regions across Canada.
- iii. **Implementation strategies:** In FY 2011–2012, EC drafted an EEE implementation plan that outlines all considerations as required by the mandatory implementation strategies for this target in the Federal Sustainable Development Strategy. A final version is anticipated by September 2012.
- iv. In parallel, the information technology (IT) section of the Department is working on a national approach via the implementation of a national distribution centre for all IT end users' devices-related equipment. This approach addresses new and life-cycling of old equipment.
- v. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: The Department is on track to achieve 100% of locations with an EEE implementation plan fully in place by March 31, 2014.

Printing Unit Reduction Target

By March 31, 2013, each department will achieve an 8:1 average ratio of office employees to printing units. Departments will apply the target where building occupancy levels, security considerations and space configuration allow.

Performance Measure		RPP	DPR
Target Status		On Track	
Ratio of departmental office employees to printing units in fiscal year 2010–2011, where building occupancy levels, security considerations and space configuration allow (<i>optional</i>)		Data not currently available	
Ratio of departmental office employees to printing units at the end of the given fiscal year, where building occupancy levels, security considerations and space configuration allow	FY 2011–12	5:1	6.5:1
	FY 2012–13	8:1	
	FY 2013–14	8:1	

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. **Definition of Printing Units:** For this target, EC defines "printing units" as network printers and multi-functional devices. In upcoming years, EC will work to include other categories such as desktop printers, scanners, fax machines and/or photocopiers as departmental inventories progress and improve.
- ii. EC includes all departmental employees, instead of just office employees, and will track its calculation using annual data from a departmental human resource inventory. Printing units will be tracked using departmental inventory data.
- iii. A number of accommodation moves have allowed for the implementation of

printer rationalization, thereby decreasing the need for network printers.

- iv. EC has installed an enterprise solution to centrally report on printer distribution across the organization. This will help better address key areas of concerns while having solid reporting and measurable data.
- v. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: EC is on track to achieve its target of an 8:1 average ratio of office employees to printing units by March 31, 2013.

Paper Consumption Target

By March 31, 2014, each department will reduce internal paper consumption per office employee by 20%. Each department will establish a baseline between 2005–2006 and 2011–2012, and applicable scope.

Performance Measure		RPP	DPR
Target Status		On Track	
Number of sheets of internal office paper purchased or consumed per office employee in the baseline year selected, according to the departmental scope (<i>optional in RPP 2011–2012</i>)		Data not available	4742:1
Cumulative reduction (or increase) in paper consumption, expressed as a percentage, relative to the selected baseline year (<i>optional for RPP 2011–2012</i>)	FY 2011–12	To be developed	0.3%
	FY 2012–13	10%	
	FY 2013–14	20%	

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. In FY 2011–2012, EC determined the baseline year, baseline paper consumption quantities, tracking methodology and applicable scope. More effort will be placed on implementation strategies to reduce paper consumption in 2012–2013, with the goal of achieving a 10% reduction in 2012–2013 and 20% by March 31, 2014.
- ii. EC has had a number of best practices in use for many years, including default duplex printing (i.e. installation of new printers are set on duplex as default) as well as printer rationalization, which contributes to less paper being consumed as fewer printers are employed and used. Other activities include the use of ECollab, an e-document management and collaboration tool that enables better collaboration, improved information management across the Department and offers significant improvement in how we create, store, organize, find and manage documents electronically.
- iii. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: EC is on track to achieve a 20% reduction in paper consumption by March 31, 2014.

Green Meetings Target

By March 31, 2012, each department will adopt a guide for greening meetings.		
Performance Measure	RPP	DPR
Target Status	Achieved	
Presence of a green meetings guide (optional for RPP 2011-2012)	Yes – updated August 2007	Yes – adopted August 2007

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. EC developed the Green Meeting Guide and has encouraged its use in all types and levels of meetings since it was released. It is also applied to major events hosted by EC.
- ii. Evidence that the green meeting guide has been adopted:
 - EC is reallocating low-usage videoconferencing (VC) equipment and redistributing it to frequent departmental travellers so as to increase monthly average usage.
 - EC has increased its personal and boardroom VC equipment to address the needs of departmental travellers.
 - EC is in the process of deploying a new generation of laptops that enable desktop-to-desktop videoconferencing.
 - The Green Meetings Guide is referenced in several locations on EC's intranet site.
 - Over 100 videoconferencing locations across Canada are accessible to EC employees so that they can have virtual meetings or attend presentations with colleagues throughout the Department.
- iii. Roles and responsibilities: DG of Assets, Contracting and Environmental Management is target lead.
- iv. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: EC has adopted a green meetings guide.

Green Procurement Targets

As of April 1, 2011, each department will establish at least 3 SMART green procurement targets to reduce environmental impacts.

By April 1, 2012, Environment Canada will utilize green consolidated procurement instruments for 95% of its standard office desktop computer purchases.		
Performance Measure	RPP	DPR
Target Status	Achieved	
Number of standard office desktop computer units purchased using green procurement instruments that meet the target relative to the total number of all standard office desktop computer units purchased	To be completed in 2011-12	19.2/20
Progress against measure in the given fiscal year	95%	96%

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. This target meets all criteria of a SMART target—that is, **s**pecific, **m**easurable, **a**chievable, **r**elevant and **t**ime-bound.
- ii. EC will make its standard office desktop computer purchases from PWGSC’s standing offer (SO) for IT equipment. The SO provides equipment that meets internationally recognized and multi-faceted environmental standard such as EPEAT Silver, as well as a number of environmental considerations that include levels of hazardous materials content, energy efficiency, design for end of life/disassembly, reduced packaging, supplier environmental performance and extended life of computer assets.
- iii. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: The Department has achieved its target.

By March 31, 2014, Environment Canada will achieve a 90% reduction in bottled water purchases from 2007–2008 levels.

Performance Measure	RPP	DPR
Target Status	On Track to Exceed	
Departmental expenditures on bottled water purchased in 2007–2008	149K	6.7K
Progress against measure in the given fiscal year	50% reduction	95% reduction

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. This target meets all criteria of a SMART target—that is, **s**pecific, **m**easurable, **a**chievable, **r**elevant and **t**ime-bound.
- ii. By March 31, 2011, a departmental policy on bottled water will be implemented to support the elimination of supplemental bottled water purchases where potable water is already being supplied through the building’s infrastructure.
- iii. **Scope:** This target is applicable throughout EC and applies to all buildings where employees occupy a full-time place of work.
- iv. **Exceptions to this target:** Bottled water purchased for field work or in remote locations, scientific experimentation, emergencies, travel status as outlined in the National Joint Council Travel Directive and for hospitality as per the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat Hospitality Policy.
- v. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: As a result of implementing a policy on bottled water, the Department is on track to exceed its reduction target.

By March 31, 2014, 90% of copy paper purchases will contain a minimum of 30% recycled content and have a forest certification or EcoLogo^M or equivalent certification.

Performance Measure	RPP	DPR
Target Status	On Track	
Dollar value of paper purchases meeting the target relative to the total dollar value of all paper purchases in the given year of reporting	Data not available	179K of 214K
Progress against measure in the given fiscal year	70% of purchases	83.6%

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. The data for this target are complementary to the data supplied from PWGSC for the paper consumption target.
- ii. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: The Department is on track to achieve its target of 90% of copy paper purchases containing a minimum of 30% recycled content. 99% of the Department’s purchases have a forest certification.

As of April 1, 2011, each department will establish SMART targets for training, employee performance evaluations, and management processes and controls as they pertain to procurement decision making.

Training for select employees		
By March 31, 2014, 90% of designated material managers and procurement personnel will have taken a recognized training course on green procurement offered by the Canada School of Public Service (CSPS) or any other federal department.		
Performance Measure	RPP	DPR
Target Status	On Track	
Number of designated material managers and procurement personnel who have taken the course relative to the total of all designated material managers and procurement personnel who must take a recognized training course on green procurement offered by the CSPS or any other federal department	To be developed by March 31, 2011	17-32
Progress against measure in the given fiscal year	50%	53%

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. This target meets all criteria of a SMART target—that is, **s**pecific, **m**easurable, **a**chievable, **r**elevant and **t**ime-bound.
- ii. By March 31, 2011, an internal assessment will be completed to determine the type of positions that should take the training, and then to determine the total number of employees impacted, minus those who have already taken the course, to indicate the departmental target population (determining baseline information).
- iii. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: The Department is on track to ensuring that 90% of designated material managers and procurement personnel have taken a recognized training course in green procurement.

Employee performance evaluations for managers and functional heads of procurement and materiel management

As of April 1, 2014, environmental considerations will be incorporated into 100% of all the performance evaluations of designated functional heads of procurement and materiel management.

Performance Measure	RPP	DPR
Target Status	On Track	
Number of performance evaluations of designated functional heads of procurement and materiel management that incorporate environmental considerations, relative to the total number of performance evaluations of all designated functional heads of procurement and materiel management	To be developed by March 31, 2011	2
Progress against measure in the given fiscal year	50%	50%

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. By March 31, 2011, an internal assessment will be completed to determine the positions that should incorporate environmental considerations in performance evaluations, to then determine the total number of employees impacted, minus those employees who already have environmental considerations incorporated in their performance evaluations (determining baseline information).
- ii. The two positions identified (reported) are filled positions; two others (not reported) were vacant in 2011–2012.
- iii. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: The Department achieved its set target of 50% for 2011–2012.

Management processes and controls

By March 31, 2014, a minimum of four designated management processes and controls, as they pertain to procurement, will have incorporated environmental considerations.

Performance Measure	RPP	DPR
Target Status	Achieved	
Number of management processes and controls that pertain to procurement that have environmental considerations	3	4
Progress against measure in the given fiscal year	4	4

Strategies and/or Comments

- i. Comment: this will always be a dynamic, variable number as year-round planning and departmental priorities vary from year to year. Increasingly, program areas or enabling services find it necessary to incorporate management frameworks to continually measure and monitor progress in the current results-oriented environment.
- ii. Management processes and controls identified: IT Assets Management Policy, Integrated Investment Planning process, and Accommodations Investment Planning and Accommodations Framework.
- iii. Rationale for traffic light indicator selected: The Department has a minimum of four management processes and controls in place, pertaining to procurement, that incorporate environmental considerations.

Response to Parliamentary Committees and External Audits

Response to the Auditor General (including to the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development)

Auditor General

June 2011

Chapter 3 – Internal Audit: examined guidance and oversight provided to the internal audit function of departments and agencies by the Office of the Comptroller General. The audit also looked at a sample of internal audit activities to determine whether 24 of the largest departments had established independent audit committees.

A recommendation made to all departments had already been implemented by Environment Canada. The audit may be found at

http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_oag_201106_03_e_35371.html

Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development

October 2011

Chapter 1 – Climate Change Plans Under the *Kyoto Protocol Implementation Act*: examined whether climate change plans include all the information required by the Act and analyzed progress made in implementing the plans and in meeting Canada's greenhouse gas emissions target under the Kyoto Protocol, and followed up on Environment Canada's progress in meeting commitments made in response to the audit published in 2009.

Five recommendations were made to Environment Canada in this audit and the audit and the Department's response may be found at

http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_cesd_201110_01_e_35760.html#appa

Chapter 2 – Assessing Cumulative Environmental Effects of Oil Sands Projects: examined whether the federal government has considered the cumulative environmental effects of major oil sands projects in northern Alberta, in accordance with the environmental assessment process established by the Act.

No recommendation was made to Environment Canada in this audit. The audit may be found at

http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_cesd_201110_02_e_35761.html#appa

December 2011

Chapter 2 – Environmental Science: examined how Environment Canada manages the quality of its science activities and communicates scientific evidence to decision makers. It also examined strategic and operational planning for science in support of departmental priorities and outcomes.

Four recommendations were made to Environment Canada in this audit and the audit and the Department's response may be found at

http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_cesd_201112_02_e_36030.html#appa

Chapter 3 – Enforcing the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999*: examined whether Environment Canada's enforcement program was managed to adequately enforce compliance with CEPA 1999. It assessed whether the Department has applied a risk-based approach to plan its enforcement activities and target the greatest threats to human health and the environment; enforced the law in a fair, predictable, and consistent way, as the Act requires; measured the results of its enforcement activities; and acted on identified opportunities for improvement.

Six recommendations were made to Environment Canada in this audit and the audit and the Department's response may be found at

http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_cesd_201112_03_e_36031.html#appa

Chapter 5 – A Study of Environmental Monitoring: was conducted to develop an inventory of systems the federal government uses to monitor the state of the environment; to identify the challenges associated with environmental monitoring; and to highlight good environmental monitoring practices. It will serve as a basis for criteria for future audits of environmental monitoring conducted by the federal government.

No recommendation was made in this study. The study may be found at

http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_cesd_201112_05_e_36033.html#hd3a

May 2012

Chapter 1 – *Kyoto Protocol Implementation Act*: examined progress made in implementing the government's climate change plans and whether Canada is on track to meet its Kyoto Protocol obligations.

No recommendation was made in this audit. The audit may be found at

http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_cesd_201205_01_e_36773.html#appa

Chapter 2 – Meeting Canada's 2020 Climate Change Commitments: examined whether Environment Canada had established an implementation plan designed to meet the 2020 national GHG emission reduction target.

Two recommendations were made to Environment Canada in this audit and the audit and the Department's response may be found at

http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_cesd_201205_02_e_36774.html#appa

Chapter 3 – Federal Contaminated Sites and Their Impacts: examined how the federal government manages and reports actions taken to address the contaminated sites in its inventory, including the financial impact of environmental damage arising from them.

Two recommendations were made to Environment Canada in this audit and the audit and the Department's response may be found at

http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_cesd_201205_03_e_36775.html#appa

External audits conducted by the Public Service Commission of Canada or the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages

Public Service Commission

October 2011

Chapter 11 – Audit of Environment Canada: examined whether Environment Canada had an appropriate framework, systems and practices in place to manage its appointment activities and whether appointments and appointment processes complied with the *Public Service Employment Act* (PSEA), the *Public Service Employment Regulations* (PSER), the Public Service Commission (PSC) Appointment Framework and other governing authorities.

Five recommendations were made to Environment Canada in this audit and the audit and the Department's response may be found at

<http://www.psc-cfp.gc.ca/adt-vrf/rprt/2011/ar-rv/11-ec/index-eng.htm#a5>

Internal Audits and Evaluations Internal Audit Table

Internal Audits (current reporting period)

Name of Internal Audit	Internal Audit Type	Status	Completion Date
Management of Additional Funding Received through Canada's Economic Action Plan – Part 2	Financial Management	Completed	December 2011
Risk Management	Risk Management	Completed	January 2012
Governance of Information Management	Governance and Information Management	Completed	January 2012
Information Technology Financial Control	Financial Control	Completed	January 2012
Service to Marine Transportation	Financial Management	Completed	March 2012
PeopleSoft	Information Systems and HR Management	In progress	August 2012 (anticipated)
Grants and Contributions	Financial Management	In progress	September 2012 (anticipated)
Life Cycle Management of Assets	Asset Management	In progress	December 2012 (anticipated)
Corporate Accountability and Administrative Renewal / Internal Control over Financial Reporting	Information Systems, Financial Management and Financial Reporting	In progress	December 2012 (anticipated)
Capital Assets Maintenance and Renewal	Asset Management	In progress	March 2013 (anticipated)

Evaluations Table

Evaluations (current reporting period)

Name of Evaluation *	Program Activity	Status	Completion Date **
Biodiversity Policy and Priorities	Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat	In progress	September 2012 (anticipated)
Species at Risk	Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat	Completed	May 2012
Migratory Birds Program	Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat	Postponed	n/a
Protected Areas Program – Plan	Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat	Completed	n/a
Health of the Oceans Initiative ***	Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat	Completed	May 2012
Advancing Conservation Interests in the Northwest Territories – Plan	Biodiversity – Wildlife and Habitat	Completed	n/a
Regulatory Improvements for Major Resource Projects **	Sustainable Ecosystems	Completed	February 2012
Environmental Damages Fund Plan	Sustainable Ecosystems	Completed	n/a
Action Plan on Clean Water Freshwater Initiatives	Sustainable Ecosystems	Completed	November 2011
Government of Canada’s Investment in the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Games **	Weather and Environmental Services for Canadians	Completed	February 2012
Services to Marine Transportation Program	Weather and Environmental Services for Targeted Users	Completed	July 2011
Chemicals Management Plan **	Substances and Waste Management	Completed	November 2011
Waste Reduction and Management Program	Substances and Waste Management	Completed	February 2012
Contaminated Sites Program – Plan	Substances and Waste Management	Completed	n/a
Transportation Sector Emissions	Climate Change and Clean Air	In progress	September 2012 (anticipated)
Security and Prosperity Partnership	Climate Change and Clean Air	Completed	July 2011

Name of Evaluation *	Program Activity	Status	Completion Date **
(SPP) Pilot Project on Reducing Emissions from Vehicles and Engines (PPRE)			
National Vehicle Scrappage Program	Climate Change and Clean Air	Completed	July 2011
International Climate Change and Clean Air Partnerships Program (Montreal Protocol) ****	Climate Change and Clean Air	In progress	September 2012 (anticipated)
Contributions for Canada's Share of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation Budget	Climate Change and Clean Air	In progress	September 2012 (anticipated)
Implementation of Performance Measurement Provisions of 2009 Federal Evaluation Policy	N/A	Ongoing	N/A

*All approved 2011–2012 evaluation reports that were led by Environment Canada (EC) can be found at the following link: <http://www.ec.gc.ca/ae-ve/default.asp?lang=En&n=4CE4B2F6-1>.

** Completion date refers to the date the report was approved by EC's Deputy Minister. For interdepartmental evaluations, these dates may not reflect the date of approval from other departmental Deputy Heads.

*** Horizontal evaluations led by other federal departments can be found on the lead department's website. These include the following evaluations:

- The Health of the Oceans Initiative, led by Fisheries and Oceans Canada
- Regulatory Improvements for Major Resources Projects, led by Natural Resources Canada
- The Government of Canada's Investment in the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Games, led by Canadian Heritage
- The Chemicals Management Plan, led by Health Canada

**** The majority of the program spending under this Program Activity element is addressed in the Evaluation of the Clean Air Agenda: International Actions Theme (2010) and the current Evaluation for Contributions for Canada's Share of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation Budget (noted in the table above). As a result, this evaluation focuses on the remaining spending which addresses EC's work under the Montreal Protocol.