

**A Proposal for a Restructured Parks and Recreation Field
in Canada**

**Submitted by: The Partnership Agreement Renewal Task Group
(PARTG)**

Submitted on: August 18th, 2008

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Structure of the Field	2
Roles and Mandates	2
Membership	3
The Board of Directors	4
The Officers	5
Elections.....	5
Governance	5
Staffing.....	5
Financing the Two Levels.....	5
Member Services	6
Advantages for the Field.....	7
Summary	7
Appendix A - Questions and Answers.....	A-1
Appendix B - Proposed Communications Plan	B-1
Appendix C - Proposed Transition Team	C-1
Appendix D – Members of PARTG	D-1

Introduction

PARTG was created in 2007 by the CPRA and its Provincial/Territorial Partners to improve the relationship between them in a way that would better serve the parks and recreation field in Canada. The original mandate was to focus on the various national/provincial-territorial partnership agreements and recommend improvements. However, as our work progressed, it became clear that many of the parties wanted to talk about a more thorough review of the relationship and broader levels of structural and operational improvements. That led to a discussion about restructuring the formal organizational elements of the field to effect the improvements. With this final report, we believe we have fulfilled our expanded mandate.

The intent of this report is to outline as complete an understanding of a proposed new structure and relationship as we (the PARTG) can. However, we have a conundrum. When we distributed an earlier draft of this paper, we got conflicting reactions. Some partners commented that they needed more detail on how the proposal would work so that they could determine whether or not to support it. Others said that if this proposal were implemented, a new Board in a restructured CPRA will make its own decisions, and therefore any detail in the proposal was invalid conjecture. We felt both sets of input were valid.

Because we needed to do our own due diligence to convince ourselves of the merit of the proposal, we made a number of assumptions about what could happen if the proposal proceeds toward acceptance and implementation. This conjecture, which is nothing more than what **could** happen, not what **will** happen, is included within an appendix as a series of hypothetical questions and answers; not to pre-empt decisions a future Board might make, but to ensure ourselves that there is at least one appropriate path forward that has merit. For those that want that detail (about what could happen, not necessarily what will happen) they should refer to Appendix A. For those that believe the detail is not necessary because a new Board will make its own decisions, please consider Appendix A as supporting information only, not as core to the body of the proposal.

Readers who are new to these discussions and have not participated in the process may wish to first read some background papers that led up to this report. With one exception, they have been translated into Canada's both official languages, and are available from the CPRA office. These documents include:

- Partnership Agreement Renewal Task Group – Terms of Reference, Dec. 2007
- Discussion Paper on CPRA-PT Partnership Draft, March 3rd 2008
- Backgrounder for April 17th Workshop in Vancouver, April 7th 2008
- Notes from April 17th Partnership Workshop, April 23rd 2008 (in English only)
- Draft Outline of Proposed New Relationship, June 23rd 2008

It is important to note that as of August 18th, 2008, this is simply a proposal from a task group trying to find a better way to serve the field. No organization has yet committed to any part of it.

It is also important to put this document into the context of an anticipated future process. Our intent is to use our best efforts to take this process as far as we can by October of 2008; hopefully to the point where all parties can decide if they wish to support it and agree, in principle, to a new relationship with a new structure. We hope this might occur around the World Leisure Congress in Quebec City. If that happens, we anticipate that another body, called a Transition Team herein for purposes of discussion, will take over and fine tune details, answering any outstanding

questions and moving the process further through the implementation of these ideas. It would include representatives from some of the P/T Partners as well as from CPRA. Finally, any outstanding issues and questions remaining as the new structure is implemented, will be decided by the new Board of Directors of the new CPRA.

So, with all those caveats, here is a summary of a proposed new relationship and structure.

Structure of the Field

The parks and recreation field in Canada will continue to have organizations at two levels. (For present purposes, we have ignored within-province/territory regional and local associations, but this should not be construed as meaning that we consider them unimportant. Indeed, this level of organization is most important, but not part of our terms of reference.)

At the national level there will be a new organization called the Canadian Parks and Recreation Alliance (CPRA). It will replace the existing Canadian Parks and Recreation Association, which will be altered to create the new Alliance (hereinafter referred to as the Alliance or as the new CPRA). There will also be other national and international organizations interested in and concerned with the parks and recreation movement, and it is hoped that the new CPRA can continue to build linkages to and relationships with them as noted in several sections below. However, the Alliance will be considered to be the “voice for the parks and recreation field” at the national level in Canada. In general terms, the existing CPRA would be altered to become an alliance of provincial/territorial bodies; much like the Lifesaving Society of Canada, or most of the national sport governing bodies. It would continue to be a not-for-profit society with charitable status.

In each province or territory there would also be at least one organization which represents the field (hereinafter referred to as the P/T Associations). Each will build linkages to other allied organizations within its jurisdiction, but it will be positioned to be the “voice for the parks and recreation field” within that province or territory. With one exception, these organizations exist now and have been partners with CPRA in the past.

In the new model, there will be a much stronger and seamless connection between the two levels. In fact they will be positioned to be two parts of a whole, rather than separate, relatively unconnected entities.

This new interconnected structure reflects the reality of the *1978 Federal-Provincial Sport, Fitness and Recreation Ministers' Conference* which confirmed the primacy of the provinces and territories in the field of recreation. That has not changed. The national collective voice of recreation and parks must incorporate and reflect views and positions of the P/T Associations whose members operate within this provincial and territorial primacy.

Roles and Mandates

What the field needs at the provincial and territorial level will vary by jurisdiction and over time. Each of the P/T Associations will play roles which are appropriate to what its jurisdiction needs at any given point in time. Such organizations will all endeavour to act as the “voice of the field” in their respective jurisdictions, but how they respond to this challenge will depend on conditions within the respective provinces and territories. At a minimum, each will find its own balance

between advocacy (what its members can do for the Association) and provision of membership services (what the Association can do for the members). In effect, no changes are recommended at the provincial/territorial level.

What the field needs at the national level is an alliance of P/T Associations with the following primary mandates:

- Advocate for the field nationally (on issues of major concern in much or all of the country),
- Promote a national research agenda (to support advocacy and to improve the practices in the field),
- Develop and ratify national policies and standards (where a national standard, best practice, or approach is appropriate and helpful),
- Liaise and collaborate with other national and international organizations that are aligned with or share parts of the CPRA mandate (to expand its influence and relevance, and support its national advocacy role),

In addition, the new Alliance may also engage in the following activities, depending on decisions of its own Board of Directors and available resources;

- Provide a national clearing house of important information regarding the field (this is largely communication within the field and among members),
- Provide support for and nurture the creation of P/T Associations where they need help,
- Identify and facilitate synergies between P/T Associations (where one can help or support others),
- Host national forums on topics that will support its research and advocacy roles,
- Manage an awards program (a recognition of and advancement of best practices and people).

Both of the above sets of roles relate to an outward oriented organization that is working to support and further the field in general and to influence others outside the field.

The CPRA may also play some roles that are more inward focused. These services meet the needs of people volunteering and working within the field and are intended to improve it from the inside. In that respect, the new Alliance will identify needs for member services, may develop programs and projects to meet those needs, and will seek the most appropriate means of delivering those services. Of course any provision of membership services needs to be coordinated with and must support the efforts of the P/T Associations which are also delivering membership services.

In wrestling with this duality of outward oriented roles and inward focused roles, we believe that the outward focus (represented by the first four bullets above) needs to be prioritized by the new Alliance. Efforts to advocate cannot be jeopardized by the need to deliver member services.

Membership

No changes are proposed to P/T Association memberships. Each of the twelve existing P/T Associations (and a new one that may be added in future) will continue to have members and will control who their members are. (Hereafter, reference will be made to 13 P/T Associations.)

As stated previously, the new CPRA will be an alliance of P/T Associations. Therefore, it will have (potentially) thirteen voting members. In addition, it will have three types of non voting Associate Members;

1. The first category of Associate Members will be **Corporate Members**. The 56 current corporate members of the existing CPRA will be inaugural members of this category. Future members will be added as they can be recruited. Generally, any corporate entity wishing to align itself with the mandate of the new CPRA and/or sell its services to the field nationally will be eligible for membership in this category.
2. The second category of Associate Members will be **Organizations**. Any private, public, or non profit organization wishing to align itself with the mandate of the new CPRA will be eligible for membership in this category.
3. A third category of Associate members will be **Individuals**. Any individual interested in the objects and mandate of the new CPRA, but is not a member of a P/T Association, will be eligible for membership in this category

The new Board of Directors will set the fee structure for the categories of membership, but the first year's fees for the Corporate Members will remain as they are currently so that their membership for this and next year can be confirmed as soon as possible. The membership fees for the remaining categories of Associate Members will be determined by the new Board, but it is assumed they would be somewhat nominal.

Total membership of the CPRA will be 13 voting members and potentially many more Associate Members. Collectively, they will represent the entire parks and recreation field in Canada and its many constituents.

The Board of Directors

The Board of Directors of the new CPRA will consist of one representative from each of the P/T Associations that wish to be members. That means a total of potentially 13 Directors, each representing one voting member. The term for all board members will be two years.

For its primary outward oriented roles of advocacy, research, policy and links to other organizations, it will approve budgets and Business Plans, set priorities, and review progress made on each business plan. It will also set topics for national forums and identify any national policies that need to be created and new Business Plans that need to be prepared.

For its inward oriented membership services, the Board will review the existing services of the existing CPRA and adjust them over time. It will approve annual Business Plans for each service and determine how the services are to be delivered. Some services may be a collaborative activity between two or more P/T Partner members who want a service in their jurisdiction (e.g. HIGH FIVE™). Others may be truly national (e.g. Everybody gets to play™). Some may be delivered by a third party in a contractual arrangement (e.g. Canadian Playground Safety Institute) while others may be delivered directly by the Alliance (so long as they are structured so as not to compete for staff time with the outward focused activities) or by one of the P/T Associations on behalf of the Alliance.

The Officers

Every national organization requires a small group of Officers to lead and provide direction for the organization. Responsible to the Board, the Officers of CPRA will fill four positions; each with a two year term. The positions will be staggered so that two members are appointed in one year and the other two in the next year.

One of the Officers will be the President of the new Alliance, while the other three will be Vice Presidents. The portfolios of the Vice Presidents will be determined by the Board for each term.

Elections

The Boards of each of the P/T Association members would determine who would sit as their representative on the CPRA Board of Directors for a two-year term. After an initial phase in period, half of the P/T Associations would nominate a representative each year and the remaining half the next year.

The Officers would be appointed by the Board of Directors at a regular meeting as a result of a nominating process of a Committee of the Board. This Nominating Committee would identify candidates that met specific leadership competency and skill set requirements identified for Officers.

Governance

While the Board would ultimately have high level control over the general direction of the organization, the role of the Officers would be to make sure that direction is implemented. The staff would be accountable to the Officers who would, in turn, be accountable to the Board.

The Board would use a distributed leadership model of governance, where some P/T Association members might contribute expertise and resources where they are well positioned to do so, and others would benefit from that expertise, program, resource or approach.

Staffing

The CPRA would retain a small core staff which focuses on the core mandate of the Alliance led by a strong CEO.

The staff would operate within a business planning framework and would be required to have a business plan approved by the Board of Directors for all initiatives.

Financing the Two Levels

Each of the P/T Associations would continue to operate their associations as they do now and finance them as they see fit. There would be no change in how P/T Associations are financed at the provincial/territorial level.

P/T Associations would pay an annual fee for membership in CPRA. That fee would be determined by a formula which would recognize the unique structure of its general membership, and the ability to pay of each P/T Association member.

The new CPRA would derive its revenues from membership fees, from services it provides and from grants, just as the existing CPRA does now. However, the proportions of three categories of revenue might vary from what they have been in the past. The membership fees are referred to above. They would need to be sufficient to provide the primary benefits which the P/T Associations have identified as most needed in the Alliance; namely advocacy, national policy/standards, research, networking with other national and international organizations, and acting as a clearing house of national information.

The second category of revenue relates to net surpluses from the provision of services that the new CPRA either provides nationally (e.g. a national conference or national forum, or CPSI program or Everyone gets to playTM Program) or specifically in a subset of jurisdictions to support members in those jurisdictions (no current examples).

Any revenues the Alliance derives from grants would have to be targeted to support specific research or policy initiatives, or specific member programs or services.

The revenue that the new Alliance derives from membership fees should be sufficient to finance a base level of staff and office resource required to deliver on the outward oriented national advocacy role, national research role and national policy role. All inward oriented services or programs should more than pay for themselves, and provide a net surplus to augment the above roles.

Financial Disclosure

At the commencement of the new CPRA, the intent would be for it to be debt free. Of course, its financial position would need to be completely clear and transparent before any P/T Association determines whether or not it wishes to become a member of the new Alliance. It is important that any existing liabilities be clarified and their costs considered in light of any downstream benefits. Full disclosure and transparency will ensure that the new Alliance is not negatively impacted by any existing CPRA liabilities. No P/T Association will be required to assume any liabilities as a result of becoming a member of the new Alliance.

Member Services

The new CPRA will identify the needs of members for service and projects and may develop services and initiatives to meet those needs.

Current services that will need to be reviewed will include:

- Making All Recreation Safe,
- Canadian Playground Safety Institute (CPSI),
- Everybody gets to playTM,
- Pond to Podium,
- National Symposium.

In future, services could be added or deleted as needs change.

Any current agreements or contracts which the existing CPRA has concerning the delivery of its services will be respected by the new CPRA for the terms of those agreements. For example, the existing CPRA has recently approved the licensing of its CPSI program to a third party provider. In return, it will receive a large up front payment and ongoing licensing fees. That agreement, once signed, will endure and continue to be an asset of the new CPRA with full disclosure of all its details.

Advantages for the Field

PARTG believes there are many advantages that result from this new relationship and structure.

The advantages to the P/T Associations include having direct influence on the national agenda and priorities without being involved in recruiting new CPRA members. All of the administrative nuisances that had been reported to PARTG (e.g. maintaining membership data bases at two levels) would cease.

The advantages to the Corporate Members would be the vastly increased constituency to which goods and services could be marketed, and the synergies of sponsorship on two levels.

The advantages to other Associate Members include the vastly increased constituency to which they can be aligned and the more effective advocacy in which they can be involved.

The advantages to the existing CPRA include:

- Transitioning to a more financially sustainable national organization,
- Vastly increased constituency (more than double) represented by the 13 members,
- Elimination of costs to market to potential members, maintain membership data base, pay for the expense of Board meetings, and time spent maintaining the partnerships and their associated challenges; all diversions from its core mandate,
- Simplified approach to communicating with the field (i.e. utilizing the communicating methods and processes of the P/T Associations),
- A business plan approach which increases accountability and focus of the organization,
- An enhanced ability to link strategically to key public sector bodies (e.g. the Inter-provincial Sport and Recreation Council, the Canadian Parks Council, etc.).

Summary

The PARTG members are pleased to submit this wide ranging proposal for restructuring CPRA and improving its relationship with its P/T Partners for consideration of all parties in the field and their members.

Appendix A - Questions and Answers

PARTG has prepared this Q & A to illustrate what could happen if this proposal were implemented. It recognizes that these answers are more illustrative than prescriptive, but are provided to show what is possible within the recommended path forward for the parks and recreation field in Canada. It should be clear that these answers are not prescribed as part of the proposal which is summarized in the main body of this document.

Q1 The report refers to the “duality” of the existing CPRA and the new Alliance. What is the difference between this inward orientation and an outward orientation?

Answer: This distinction between our national organization’s outward and inward orientations deserves some consideration by all parties. John Kennedy’s famous saying distinguishing between “what you can do for your country” and “what your country can do for you” captures this duality.

In our view there are some national organizations which are primarily outward oriented (e.g. Greenpeace). Members join those organizations to support their advocacy efforts as opposed to any expectation of services back to the members to benefit them directly. There are also many national organizations (e.g. Canadian Institute of Planners) which primarily focus on the professional interests of their members whose primary expectation is service back to them, as opposed to influencing others.

Many national organizations are hybrids of the above duality, and they attempt to do both. Some, like the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, are comprised of members with very similar needs and interests (they are all Canadian municipalities) and this makes it easier to both advocate on their behalf, influencing others (e.g. the Government of Canada), and to provide services back to their members which have similar needs. Other organizations, like the existing CPRA, have been comprised of volunteers, practitioners and elected individuals as well as public, not for profit and private organizations. This diversity of membership doesn’t necessarily complicate the advocacy side of the organization, but the variety of self interests makes it more complicated to serve them with member services in a way that truly meets their needs. Certainly it creates challenges in terms of the balance between being outward oriented vs. inward focussed. For example, CPRA has, in the past, stated clearly in its Strategic Plan that it wants to set advocacy as a high priority. However, when a less important but more urgent member service, like the upcoming national conference, requires staff time, it can sometimes create conflicts in the balance that are difficult to manage.

Q2 What about Exclusivity?

Exclusivity is the notion that in two or three provinces there are other provincial parks or recreation organizations that may wish to join the CPRA and be aligned with it. The existing P/T Association in that jurisdiction may want the right to exclusively represent the jurisdiction at the new CPRA table. If that were to happen, how would such a possibility be resolved?

Answer: As with all these issues, the new Board would decide. However, in the opinion of PARTG, there are several scenarios. If a province or territory currently has no provincial or territorial association which is the “voice of the parks and recreation field” in that jurisdiction,

then the new CPRA will endeavour to assist it to form one. Once formed, it will automatically be eligible for membership within the new CPRA. The only situation where this is the case is in Nunavut, where the existing CPRA has been working with local parks and recreation interests supporting them to create a territorial association. Once formed, it would be eligible to be a member of the Alliance.

Of course, when a province or territory already has a “voice of the field” that is a P/T Association member, and any other association within that jurisdiction wishes to become an Associate Member of either that P/T Association or the new CPRA, it would be encouraged to do so. In BC for example, as in many other provinces, there exists a provincial Recreation Facilities Association. It can be aligned with the new CPRA in three ways. It could either be aligned with the BCRPA which would be the P/T voting member for BC. It could be aligned with its national counterpart, the Canadian Recreation Facilities Council, which could become an Associate Member of the new CPRA. Or, it could become an Associate member of the new CPRA directly.

It is also clear that if an existing P/T Association in a province or territory does not wish to join the Alliance, the new CPRA would conceivably be free to negotiate with another organization within that jurisdiction and make it a P/T Association member of the Alliance. For example, if PRO decided not to join the new Alliance, the new CPRA could engage in discussions with the Ontario Parks Association to see if it wished to become the “voice for parks and recreation” in Ontario within the Alliance.

However, if a province or territory already has a P/T Association member, and another association within that province or territory applies to become a voting P/T Association member of the new CPRA, there is no opportunity for that to happen. Instead, the other association would be encouraged to become an associated member of the P/T Association, or its national counterpart could also be an Associate Member of the CPRA, or it could join the Alliance directly as an Associate member. For example, PRO would have the first right of refusal to become the P/T Association from Ontario as it has been a valued CPRA P/T Partner for many years. If it elected not to become a member, the new CPRA could approach the Ontario Parks Association. If, however, PRO elected to become a member of the new Alliance for Ontario, the only way for the Ontario Parks Association to come into the new CPRA fold would be for it to align itself with PRO, or for its parent national body, the Canadian Parks Council, to become an Associate Member of CPRA, or for it to become an Associate member of the new CPRA.

As the new CPRA wishes to be inclusive, rather than exclusive, it would encourage one or more of those three options so that members of the Ontario Parks Association could be represented and served by the new Alliance in this hypothetical example, but not as a voting P/T Association member.

Q3 How will individuals within the field gain access to decision making at the national level?

Answer: The short answer is – just like they do now. More specifically, within this proposal anyone within the field anywhere in Canada who is a member of a P/T Association that is a member of the new Alliance would have the right to:

- Approach the President of their respective P/T Association and make them aware of their concerns,

- Approach their representative on the Board of Directors of the new CPRA and make them aware of their views or concerns,
- Approach the Board of the new CPRA as a whole or the Officers to make their views known,
- Apply to the Nominating Committee to be considered when it nominates Officers for the Alliance,
- Attend any of the national forums, round tables or national conferences to influence the agenda of the CPRA.

Q4 How will the financial formula for membership fees work?

Answer: The new Board of Directors would determine what it is and how it works. But it might take advice from a Transition Team.

In the most recently completed fiscal year, operating revenues for CPRA came from grants, membership services, and membership fees. However, with the recent decision to license a third party entity to deliver at least one of the member services, the size of that budget would be much smaller next year. The new CPRA may also wish to pursue ways in which charitable donations can become a regular feature of its finances.

PARTG doesn't know what the future holds, nor what a new Board would decide. However, it is assumed that CPRA would continue to apply for and receive grants where they are available and where the new Board feels they are aligned with either its core services or its needed membership services. The Alliance would also continue to realize surpluses from some membership services (directly or in terms of licensing fees). The intent would be to increase membership fee revenue from about \$70,000 per year at present to perhaps two or three times that level. If that were to happen, it would require that the smallest P/T Partners would pay a few thousand dollars each for membership, while progressively larger organizations would pay significantly more; perhaps up to a few tens of thousands of dollars each.

Q5 Which member services would the Alliance provide?

Answer: Again, the simple answer is that the new Board would determine which services were provided by the Alliance, just as it does now. Initially, it would review all existing member services and determine which it wished to maintain. On an ongoing basis, it would have to survey its members to determine needs, decide which services are required to meet the needs, and build a business plan for each that could include which agency delivers the service. However, PARTG, in its due diligence, had to make some assumptions to show what could be delivered. We assumed the following services delivered by the field with national coordination:

- National policy and research forums -financed by attendees and sponsors,
- National conference (if feasible and relevant) – financed by attendees and sponsors/partners,
- CPSI – delivered by a third party organization under a licensing agreement,
- Making All Recreation Safe – financed with support of the Federal Government,
- Everybody gets to play™ – financed with support of the Federal Government,
- Communications to members – financed by membership fees.

Q6 How many staff might there be at the Alliance headquarters?

Answer: That would be up to the new Board of Directors of course, but it would definitely include a strong CEO focused on the strategic positioning of the Alliance. After that, there would be options, and they could include one or more senior positions like communications, policy analysis, or operations (tied, perhaps, to the Vice-Presidential portfolios) as well as a minimum of one office support position. This core team could be augmented on a permanent, part time, or contract basis with staff responsible for specific member services or special initiatives and programs.

Q7 What about corporate members and their sponsorship of the Alliance?

Answer: The new Board of Directors would have to decide on sponsorship opportunities. However, a sponsorship protocol could be developed by a Task Force representing the P/T Associations, the Corporate Members, and CPRA staff. The protocol would need to be ratified by the new CPRA Board. It would deal with the potential synergies and potential conflicts between corporate sponsorships at both levels of operation (i.e. national level and P/T level) to ensure that the interests of corporate members are served as well as the interests of the field in general and its major P/T and Alliance players).

Q8 What is “distributed leadership” and how does it relate to programs or initiatives of the Alliance?

Answer: Distributed Leadership is a governance model that is focussed on creating collective responsibility for leadership action and activity rather than relying exclusively on those in formal positions of authority. Its focus would be on creating a shared context for learning and developing leadership and strategic capacity across the Alliance.

The intent of the new Alliance is to encourage flexible ways of working together to produce a synergy that has not been optimized in the past. It is also about using and leveraging the available resources of the P/T Associations wherever possible. For example, in addition to its membership fee, a P/T Partner might, from time to time, negotiate other amounts it will pay to the new CPRA in return for securing certain services or supports. Also, certain P/T Associations may benefit more than others from certain projects within the national research agenda (an update of the National Benefits Survey, where some provinces might wish to have an “oversample” in their jurisdiction) and might negotiate financial support for it separately.

There might also be projects that are initiated by a few P/T Associations by themselves and not through the Alliance (i.e. arrangements around the HIGH FIVE™ Program) which would be made as they are now, between members of the Alliance, not by the Alliance as a whole.

Also, a specific P/T Association member might be well positioned to develop a business plan for a new member service, or to lead a task group on a specific topic in which it has expertise or recent experience. All these things would be pursued by the collective leadership of the Alliance.

Q9 Will we still need the semi annual P/T Partner meetings?

Answer: Likely not. The agendas of those meetings will likely be expanded to become the agenda of the Board of the Directors of the new CPRA. While there may be one or more caucuses of the Board, where a subset of P/T Associations with like interests come together to discuss issues of mutual concern, the national voice and advocacy work will be conducted around the Board table with all thirteen (potential) members present and represented by a Director.

Q10 Would there continue to be a national conference?

Answer: Of course the new Board would decide on this issue also. Perhaps it would decide that the national conference should continue as is. Or, perhaps it would decide that it be replaced with a more focussed event called a national forum, or a national round table, on a specific topic or topics that relate to a national policy area or the national research agenda. That is a decision best left to the new Board after further consideration of the impacts of all alternatives.

Q11 The body of the report refers to a (business plan) approach for all member services and initiatives. What does that mean?

Answer: Each business plan will clearly show the magnitude and type of need and the market within which it exists. It will also identify optional services and projects which might meet the need and it would evaluate each prospective option. Finally, the plans will include a recommended optimum service or project and the cost to develop the service or project. Standard elements of each business plan will also include how it will be financed, alternative ways of delivering the service (including by P/T Association members, by the new CPRA or by a third party), performance measures, review mechanisms, cash flow projections, risk analysis, milestones and phasing.

Q12 What about meetings of the Board and Officers?

Answer: The Board will likely meet twice per year in person, just as the P/T Partners have met in the past few years. Additional meetings will be held electronically as needed. Each P/T Association would have one vote at the Board table. However, as has been the case in recent P/T Partner meetings, a staff person will be able to sit at the table and support the official P/T Association representative to the Board

The Officers might meet quarterly, four times each year in person, and more often electronically. Two of the four meetings would be at the same time as the Board of Directors (immediately before) and two would be between those two Board meetings.

It is proposed that each P/T Association would finance the participation of its representative at the Board meetings, although there may be a process for assisting smaller P/T Associations to do so. Meetings of Officers would be financed through the Alliance budget.

Q13 Why should we pursue a major retrofitting of the existing CPRA corporate structure?

PARTG feels that we have an opportunity to modernize the structure of our field, make it more effective and bring those entities that share common needs and desires together. We believe we need a stronger and clearer connection between our field's provincial/territorial level of organization and our national level of organization. Too much time has been wasted in the past maintaining a dysfunctional relationship between these two levels.

We also believe in financial sustainability and relevance, both of which are enhanced with this proposal.

Appendix B - Proposed Communications Plan

Some Key Messages

1. PARTG is a joint P/T Association - CPRA process, led by volunteers trying to find a better relationship between the P/T Associations and the CPRA. This collective group, not any one party is driving this process.
2. While PARTG can prepare proposals and attempt to improve them with input from all impacted groups and individuals, only the groups themselves and their memberships can make decisions about whether they want to participate in what's being proposed. No group or individual will be forced to comply with any new structure or new way of doing things.
3. There are other things going on independent of, but parallel with, the PARTG process and these are outside of our control or mandate. For example, an agreement between CPRA and a third party about how CPSI will be delivered will proceed separately from our proposals (although the principle of the existing CPRA being debt free is included within the current version of the proposal for a restructured new CPRA).

Some Communications Principles

1. Any documents produced by PARTG will first be agreed to by a majority of PARTG voting members, then translated into both of Canada's official languages, before being distributed to all P/T Partners and the existing CPRA.
2. All documents will be treated as proposals to the 13 P/T and national partners.
3. PARTG will communicate officially with all 13 partners.
4. The partners will communicate with their members.
5. The Proposal can only go so far. It cannot answer exactly what will happen. In many cases, it can only suggest what could happen. A new Board will decide what actually happens.

Recommended Communications Strategies

1. PARTG will produce a copy of a final proposal for a renewed partnership relationship by August 18th, 2008.
2. Once it is translated, it will be distributed to the 13 partner organizations.
3. All 13 partners will be encouraged to share the proposal with their members, and post it on their websites and/or make it available in other forms.
4. The existing CPRA Board will be encouraged to immediately decide if it endorses the proposal as worthy of being voted on by its existing members.
5. If so, the existing CPRA Board will create a notice of resolution to its members for altering its constitution and by-laws and will forward this notice to its members for consideration at its AGM in October.
6. Once that notice goes out, PARTG will request two hours on the agenda of the P/T Partners meeting in October prior to the CPRA AGM. This time would be used to review the proposal and clarify both it and potential next steps. It could also be used to potentially create support for the resolution at the AGM.
7. PARTG would also request a session with the CPRA members at the World Leisure Congress before the CPRA AGM to explain and discuss the proposal and its implications.

Follow on Strategy

1. Having fulfilled its mandate, PARTG would cease to exist immediately following the CPRA AGM.
2. If the resolution passes, a Transition Team would be appointed by the P/T Associations and the existing CPRA to continue the work of moving forward. It should include some senior staff of the various partners as well as elected representatives of small and large P/T Associations and the existing CPRA.
3. The Transition Team would chart a course forward from that point until at least the first meeting of the new Board of Directors, and possibly after that point.
4. The status quo would remain (i.e. the existing CPRA Board, staff and budget would remain) until the P/T Associations have formally joined the Alliance and a new has been Board elected. A new Board, once elected would appoint officers and begin to make decisions.

Appendix C - Proposed Transition Team

PARTG recommends that if this proposal is acceptable to the members of the existing CPRA, a Transition Team would be created in October of 2008 to assist in implementing the change process. That would mean formally approaching all the P/T Associations in an attempt to recruit them as members of the new CPRA. That Team would also engage in a number of activities as follows:

- Review CPRA's recently endorsed Operational Audit,
- Develop a step by step approach for implementing the transition from the existing CPRA to the new Alliance,
- Create a schedule for implementing each of those steps,
- Create transparency within the existing CPRA budget to clearly show any outstanding liabilities and their implications,
- Create a new budget for the transition year and the first operational year for the new Alliance,
- Develop a new formula for P/T Association membership fees,
- Develop a staffing plan,
- Recruit a new CEO for the Alliance when appropriate.

PARTG believes that the Transition Team should include:

- Some senior staff members of the P/T Associations most committed to **contributing to** the new Alliance,
- At least one staff member of the existing CPRA,
- Elected leaders of the existing CPRA,
- Elected leaders of some P/T Associations.

Appendix D – Members of PARTG

Task Group

Don May, representing Parks and Recreation Ontario

Jamie Shanks, representing Recreation New Brunswick

Jennifer Reynolds, representing CPRA Board, Co-Chair

Jim Marvel, representing CPRA Board, Co-Chair

Norm Campbell, representing Saskatchewan Parks and Recreation Association

Tim Burton, representing Alberta Recreation and Parks Association

Consultants to the process:

Brian Johnston, PERC

Don Hunter, Don Hunter Consulting