













Ministry: Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)

ECO Comment: The OMAFRA carried out some of its *EBR* responsibilities well this year, continuing to post high quality notices on the Registry and doing a better job of responding to the ECO's requests for proof of consideration of its Statement of Environmental Values. The ECO also continued to have a productive working relationship with the OMAFRA's *EBR* co-ordinator, who was proactive in seeking advice from our office on Environmental Registry matters and was co-operative with requests from the ECO. Unfortunately, the OMAFRA failed to post its one decision notice in








2016/2017 as soon as reasonably possible, taking 2 months to give notice to the public that it had finalized an important policy on pollinator health. Further, at the end of the reporting year, one of the OMAFRA's proposals on the Environmental Registry was outdated; with very few open proposals on the Environmental Registry, the OMAFRA should be able to ensure that all notices are kept up to date by posting updates or decision notices promptly. Finally, the ECO encourages the OMAFRA to conclude its now overdue review of soil management in agricultural operations in 2017/2018.

Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry			The OMAFRA continues to post high quality notices on the Environmental Registry. Notices are well written, free of jargon and clearly set out what feedback is being solicited from the public.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The OMAFRA is not required to post instrument notices on the Environmental Registry.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry			The OMAFRA only posted one decision notice in 2016/2017, but it was not posted until two months after the ministry finalized the policy in question.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date			The OMAFRA only had three open proposals on the Environmental Registry at the end of 2016/2017, but one of them was outdated. The OMAFRA remedied this outdated proposal by posting a decision notice in August 2017.
Handling of applications for review and investigation	N/A	N/A	The OMAFRA did not conclude any applications for review under the <i>EBR</i> in 2016/2017. The OMAFRA is not prescribed for applications for investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Avoiding overdue applications for review			The OMAFRA has one open application for review, but it has failed to complete that review within a reasonable time.
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)			The OMAFRA responded promptly to all 3 of the ECO's requests for proof of SEV consideration in 2016/2017, representing a significant improvement since 2015/2016.
Co-operation with ECO requests			OMAFRA staff were particularly co-operative with the ECO in 2016/17, pro-actively engaging the ECO on issues that they knew were of interest to our office (e.g., inviting the ECO to a workshop on soil health). The ministry's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator was also pro-active in seeking assistance from ECO staff on Environmental Registry matters, and was quick to respond to a request from ECO staff to add a link to the <i>Pollinator Health Action Plan</i> in the Environmental Registry decision notice. The OMAFRA's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator also attended an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Economic Development and Growth / Infrastructure (MEDG/MOI)

ECO Comment: During 2016/2017, the MEDG and the MOI (formerly joined as MEDEI) were prescribed separately under the *EBR*. The ECO appreciated the MOI's briefings this year on water/wastewater infrastructure asset management and looks forward to co-operating further with both ministries in 2017/2018 as they become established as separate *EBR*-prescribed ministries. In 2016/2017, the MOI posted



good quality notices on the Environmental Registry, although the ministry should ensure that it describes the anticipated environmental impacts of its proposals and includes regulatory impact statements for proposed regulations. The ECO encourages the MOI to continue to keep proposals up to date and to post decision notices promptly.

Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry			The MOI posted two proposals and one decision on the Environmental Registry in 2016/2017. Generally, the content of the MOI's notices was still very good. However, the ministry could have better explained the anticipated environmental impacts of the proposals, and should consider including regulatory impact statements for proposed regulations. The ECO also believes the ministry should have provided more time for the public to comment on one relatively complex regulation proposal, as it did for its other regulation proposal.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	Neither the MEDG nor the MOI are required to post instrument notices on the Environmental Registry.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The MOI posted one decision notice in 2016/2017. However, as the decision related to ongoing policy development, and not a discrete decision or document, the ECO could not ascertain whether the notice was posted promptly after the ministry made the decision. The ECO urges the ministry to clearly indicate the date of its decisions in decision notices.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date			The MOI had two open proposal notices on the Environmental Registry at the end of 2016/2017, but neither of those notices were out of date.
Handling of applications for review and investigation	N/A	N/A	Neither the MEDG nor the MOI are prescribed for applications for review or investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Avoiding overdue applications for review	N/A	N/A	Neither the MEDG nor the MOI are prescribed for applications for review or investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)		N/A	The ECO requested proof of SEV consideration from the MOI one time in 2016/2017. The consideration document was provided by the ministry.
Co-operation with ECO requests			The MOI experienced some challenges in responding to the ECO's communications after its split from MEDEI. However, the ministry's responsiveness improved over the reporting year, and the MOI ultimately provided the ECO with a helpful briefing on water/wastewater infrastructure asset management. At the ECO's request, the MEDG's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator also attended an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Education (EDU)

ECO Comment: The EDU has a relatively low *EBR* workload. There was little material with which the ECO could evaluate the EDU's execution of its *EBR* responsibilities in 2016/2017, as the ministry did not












post any notices on the Environmental Registry. The ECO is pleased that the EDU has become prescribed for purposes of receiving applications for review under the *EBR*.

Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The EDU did not post any policy, act or regulation notices in 2016/2017.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The EDU is not required to post instrument notices on the Environmental Registry.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The EDU did not post any decision notices in 2016/2017.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date	N/A	N/A	The EDU did not have any open proposals on the Environmental Registry at the end of 2016/2017.
Handling of applications for review and investigation	N/A	N/A	In the 2016/2017 reporting year, the EDU was not prescribed for applications for review or investigation under the <i>EBR</i> . However, the ECO is pleased that in September 2017 the EDU became prescribed for applications for review under the <i>EBR</i> in response to our recommendation.
Avoiding overdue applications for review	N/A	N/A	The EDU was not prescribed for applications for review under the <i>EBR</i> during the 2016/2017 reporting year.
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)	N/A	N/A	The ECO did not request proof of SEV consideration from the EDU in 2016/2017.
Co-operation with ECO requests			The ECO did not make any specific information requests of the EDU in the 2016/2017 reporting year. However, the ECO is pleased that in September 2017 the EDU became prescribed for applications for review under the <i>EBR</i> in response to our recommendation. Also, at the ECO's request, the EDU's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator attended an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Energy (ENG)

ECO Comment: Generally, the ENG executed its *EBR* responsibilities well in 2016/2017. The ministry continued to post good quality notices to the Environmental Registry, but should make the improvements outlined below. The ENG ensured that all of its proposals on the Environmental Registry were up to date at the end of the reporting year, and documented its consideration of its Statement of Environmental Values for its environmentally significant decisions. The ENG was also helpful in responding to











the ECO's requests for information and assistance, and the ENG's *EBR* co-ordinator was responsive to suggestions from ECO staff on Environmental Registry matters. However, the ENG continued to routinely post decision notices late, depriving the public of the right to prompt notice of the ministry's decisions that affect the environment. Posting decision notices is a routine administrative matter, and the ECO encourages the ENG to commit to do so within 2 weeks of making a decision.







Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry			The ENG continues to post generally good quality notices on the Environmental Registry in terms of describing proposals and decisions, and including links. However, the ministry should ensure that it avoids the use of undefined acronyms, and considers including regulatory impact statements for regulation proposals.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The ENG is not required to post instrument notices on the Environmental Registry.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry			The ENG rarely gives prompt notice of its decisions on the Environmental Registry. In 2016/2017, the ministry frequently took several months after a new regulation was filed to notify the public about the ministry's decision on the regulation.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date			The ENG no longer has any outdated notices on the Environmental Registry.
Handling of applications for review and investigation			The ENG concluded one application for review in 2016/2017. The ministry has shown improvement in responding to the applicants' concerns and explaining its decision on the application in greater detail.
Avoiding overdue applications for review	N/A	N/A	The ENG did not have any open applications for review at the end of 2016/2017.
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)		N/A	In almost every case, the ENG responded promptly to the ECO's 5 requests for proof of SEV consideration in 2016/2017.
Co-operation with ECO requests			ENG staff were co-operative with the ECO's requests for information this year, in particular by providing a helpful briefing on energy and water reporting for the broader public sector. The ministry's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator responded promptly to the ECO's request to update an Environmental Registry notice about net metering to notify the public of an additional consultation opportunity. The ENG's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator also attended an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Environment and Climate Change (MOECC)

ECO Comment: The MOECC has the highest *EBR* workload of all ministries. This year the MOECC discharged its *EBR* obligations very well, improving performance in several categories. In particular, the ECO commends the MOECC for clearing over 94% of its backlog of outdated proposals from 2015/2016; the ECO urges the MOECC to remedy its remaining outdated notices and to keep all of its proposals up to date. Posting late decision notices contributed to the ministry's poor results in the promptness category; the ECO encourages the ministry to post all decision notices within 2 weeks of making the decision going forward. The MOECC's new practice of posting status updates on applications for review, and providing

in-person updates to applicants, is commendable and should be adopted by all ministries; however, actually completing some of those reviews remains shamefully slow, with the important issue of cumulative health effects in Aamjiwnaang still outstanding from 2009. The ministry should conclude all remaining overdue reviews in 2017/2018. The ECO is pleased that the MOECC responded more promptly this year to the ECO's requests for proof of consideration of its Statement of Environmental Values. Finally, the ECO thanks MOECC staff for being consistently helpful and responsive to the ECO's many requests for information and briefings, and for being highly engaged in improving the ministry's *EBR* performance.













Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry			The MOECC continues to post high quality notices on the Environmental Registry for policies, acts and regulations.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry			The MOECC's instrument notices are generally of high quality, although the ministry could do a better job in some cases of explaining the anticipated environmental impacts of proposals. While the MOECC now regularly includes links to most finalized instruments in decision notices, it still routinely fails to provide links to draft instruments in proposal notices.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry			As in 2015/2016, the MOECC again posted fewer than half of the decision notices the ECO assessed within 2 weeks of the decision date. The ministry's strong efforts in 2016/2017 to remedy its outdated proposals (necessitating late decision notices) may be responsible, at least in part, for the ministry's low score in this category.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date			The MOECC remedied the bulk of its large number of outdated proposals in 2016/2017, bringing the ministry's total number of outdated proposals down from 686 in 2015/2016 (representing 23.5% of the ministry's open proposals at the end of that year) to 39 in 2016/2017 (representing just 3.2% of the MOECC's open proposals at the end of the reporting year).
Handling of applications for review and investigation			The MOECC concluded 6 applications for review and 11 applications for investigation in 2016/2017. The ministry generally handled these applications well.

Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Avoiding overdue applications for review			The MOECC concluded 3 overdue applications for review in 2016/2017, and was close to concluding 2 other overdue applications at the end of the reporting year. The MOECC has one more long overdue application that it should conclude as soon as possible. In 2016/2017, the MOECC started posting regular status updates for its undertaken applications for review on the Environmental Registry.
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)			The ECO made 106 requests for SEV consideration documents from the MOECC in 2016/2017. The MOECC responded by providing the requested documentation promptly in most cases, with its response rate increasing by almost 12% since 2015/2016.
Co-operation with ECO requests			The MOECC stood out this year as particularly co-operative with the ECO's requests for information in 2016/2017. The ministry provided helpful briefings on a number of topics, including source water protection, environmental approvals and the renewable fuel standard for gasoline. The ministry was responsive and forthcoming with information and facilitated discussions between ministry experts and ECO staff. The ministry's EBR co-ordinator also attended an EBR compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Government and Consumer Services – Technical Standards and Safety Authority (MGCS-TSSA)

ECO Comment: The TSSA, housed within the MGCS, is responsible for a substantial number of notices on the Environmental Registry. The TSSA took a first step toward improving its historically poor decision notices for instruments in 2016/2017 by ensuring that it explains what decision was made; however, the ECO continues to encourage the TSSA to include links to copies of the draft and final instruments themselves in order to ensure that the public has enough information to provide informed comments and to provide access to the full details of the final decision. The TSSA also



did a good job of remedying its outdated proposals, but should update or post decisions for its small number of remaining outdated proposals in 2017/2018; once all outdated notices are remedied, the ECO expects that the TSSA's overall performance in the promptness category will improve significantly given the TSSA's usually prompt posting of decisions. Finally, the ECO is encouraged by the TSSA's commitment to improving its performance of its *EBR* obligations, evidenced by the *EBR* co-ordinator's frequent contact with the ECO.

Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry			The TSSA posted just one decision notice for a policy, act or regulation in 2016/2017. The notice was generally clear and understandable. However, the TSSA should avoid heavy use of acronyms and ensure that it explains how the public's comments affected the ministry's final decision.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry			The TSSA's instrument decision notices have improved over the course of 2016/2017; most significantly, by the end of the reporting year the TSSA was consistently explaining what it decided for each instrument proposal. However, TSSA notices still do not provide any links to the draft or final instruments themselves, which significantly interferes with the ability of the public to provide effective comments.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry			In general, the TSSA posts decision notices for instrument proposals extremely promptly. However, in 2016/2017 the TSSA posted decisions for a number of old, outdated proposals; these late decision notices are responsible for the TSSA's lower score in this category.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date			The TSSA posted decision notices for the majority of its outdated proposals by the end of 2016/2017. However, 2 outdated notices remained at the end of the year, representing 40% of the TSSA's open notices on the Environmental Registry, which is still unacceptable.
Handling of applications for review and investigation	N/A	N/A	The MGCS-TSSA did not conclude any applications for review or investigation under the <i>EBR</i> in 2016/2017.
Avoiding overdue applications for review	N/A	N/A	The MGCS-TSSA did not have any open applications for review under the <i>EBR</i> at the end of 2016/2017.
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)			The MGCS-TSSA responded promptly to the ECO's single request for proof of SEV consideration in 2016/2017, maintaining its record of good performance in this category.
Co-operation with ECO requests			Through its <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator, the MGCS-TSSA worked hard to improve its <i>EBR</i> performance in 2016/2017, frequently contacting ECO staff to seek advice on Environmental Registry matters, and working to improve its instrument decision notices. The MGCS-TSSA's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator also attended an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Health and Long-Term Care (MOHLTC)

ECO Comment: The MOHLTC has a relatively low *EBR* workload. There was little material with which the ECO could evaluate the MOHLTC's execution of its *EBR* responsibilities in 2016/2017, as the ministry did not post any notices on the Environmental Registry and was not responsible for any applications. The ECO is happy to report that the MOHLTC's *EBR* co-ordinator attended an *EBR* compliance information session in September 2016. Going forward, the ECO encourages the MOHLTC to contact our office for any assistance in understanding and complying with



its *EBR* responsibilities, including: ensuring that it posts clearly written and sufficiently detailed notices of any environmentally significant proposals on the Environmental Registry for public consultation; giving prompt notice of its decisions on such proposals on the Registry; handling any applications for review in accordance with *EBR* requirements; and considering its Statement of Environmental Values when making those decisions. The MOHLTC is also encouraged to co-operate with any ECO requests for information.

Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The MOHLTC did not post any policy, act or regulation notices in 2016/2017.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The MOHLTC is not required to post instrument notices on the Environmental Registry.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The MOHLTC did not post any decision notices in 2016/2017.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date	N/A	N/A	The MOHLTC did not have any open proposals on the Environmental Registry at the end of 2016/2017.
Handling of applications for review and investigation	N/A	N/A	The MOHLTC did not conclude any applications for review under the <i>EBR</i> in 2016/2017. The MOHLTC is not prescribed for applications for investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Avoiding overdue applications for review	N/A	N/A	The MOHLTC did not have any open applications for review under the <i>EBR</i> at the end of 2016/2017.
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)	N/A	N/A	The ECO did not request proof of SEV consideration from the MOHLTC in 2016/2017.
Co-operation with ECO requests			At the ECO's request, the MOHLTC's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator did attend an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation (MIRR)

ECO Comment: The MIRR has a relatively low *EBR* workload. There was little material with which the ECO could evaluate the MIRR's execution of its *EBR* responsibilities in 2016/2017, as the ministry did not post any notices on the Environmental Registry. The ECO is happy to report that the MIRR's *EBR* co-ordinator attended an *EBR* compliance information session in September 2016. Going forward, the ECO encourages the MIRR to contact our office for any



assistance in understanding and complying with its *EBR* responsibilities, including: co-operating with any ECO requests for information; ensuring that it posts clearly written and sufficiently detailed notices of any environmentally significant proposals on the Environmental Registry for public consultation; giving prompt notice of its decisions on such proposals on the Registry; and considering its Statement of Environmental Values when making those decisions.

Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The MIRR did not post any policy, act or regulation notices in 2016/2017.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The MIRR is not required to post instrument notices on the Environmental Registry.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The MIRR did not post any decision notices in 2016/2017.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date	N/A	N/A	The MIRR did not have any open proposals on the Environmental Registry at the end of 2016/2017.
Handling of applications for review and investigation	N/A	N/A	The MIRR is not prescribed for applications for review or investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Avoiding overdue applications for review	N/A	N/A	The MIRR is not prescribed for applications for review or investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)	N/A	N/A	The ECO did not request proof of SEV consideration from the MIRR in 2016/2017.
Co-operation with ECO requests			The ECO did not make any specific information requests of the MIRR in the 2016/2017 reporting year. However at the ECO's request, the MIRR's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator attended an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Labour (MOL)

ECO Comment: The MOL has a relatively low *EBR* workload. There was little material with which the ECO could evaluate the MOL's execution of its *EBR* responsibilities in 2016/2017, as the ministry did not post any notices on the Environmental Registry. The ECO is happy to report that the MOL's *EBR* co-ordinator attended an *EBR* compliance information session in September 2016. Going forward, the ECO encourages the MOL to contact our office for any









assistance in understanding and complying with its *EBR* responsibilities, including: co-operating with any ECO requests for information; ensuring that it posts clearly written and sufficiently detailed notices of any environmentally significant proposals on the Environmental Registry for public consultation; giving prompt notice of its decisions on such proposals on the Registry; and considering its Statement of Environmental Values when making those decisions.







Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The MOL did not post any policy, act or regulation notices in 2016/2017.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The MOL is not required to post instrument notices on the Environmental Registry.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The MOL did not post any decision notices in 2016/2017.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date	N/A	N/A	The MOL did not have any open proposals on the Environmental Registry at the end of 2016/2017.
Handling of applications for review and investigation	N/A	N/A	The MOL is not prescribed for applications for review or investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Avoiding overdue applications for review	N/A	N/A	The MOL is not prescribed for applications for review or investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)	N/A	N/A	The ECO did not request proof of SEV consideration from the MOL in 2016/2017.
Co-operation with ECO requests			The ECO did not make any specific information requests of the MOL in the 2016/2017 reporting year. However, at the ECO's request, the MOL's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator attended an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Municipal Affairs/Housing (MMA/MHO)

ECO Comment: During 2016/2017, the MMA and the MHO (formerly joined as MMAH) were prescribed separately under the *EBR*. The MMA continued to post generally high quality policy, act and regulation notices, but the ministry's instrument notices still fail to include links to applicable Official Plans and other key supporting documents. The ministry should also ensure that the decision date is clear in all decision notices. The MMA's performance declined in the promptness category and in keeping its notices up to date; in fact,

the ministry appears to have made little effort to remedy its outdated proposals and allowed additional notices to become outdated. On a more positive note, the MMA responded helpfully to the ECO's information requests this year, and promptly provided proof that it considered its Statement of Environmental Values when making decisions that affect the environment. The ECO looks forward to co-operating further with both MMA and MHO in 2017/2018 as they become established as separate *EBR*-prescribed ministries.









Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry			The MMA maintained a high quality of policy, act and regulation notices on the Environmental Registry in 2016/2017. However, the ministry could do a better job explaining the effect of the public's comments on final decisions. The ministry should also more consistently explain the potential environmental impacts of its proposals, and include regulatory impact statements for proposed regulations as required by the <i>EBR</i> .
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry			The MMA's instrument notices routinely lack links to the draft or final instruments themselves. Links to the applicable Official Plans in proposal notices for provisional consent under the <i>Planning Act</i> , and for proposed Official Plans or amendments to Official Plans should be included. The MMA also regularly fails to describe the potential environmental impacts of proposed instruments.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry			The MMA continues to delay giving notice of its policy, act and regulation decisions on the Environmental Registry, in several cases taking over 5 months to post decision notices after regulations were filed. The MMA posted instrument decision notices somewhat more promptly, posting about two-thirds of instrument decision notices within 2 weeks of the decisions being made (based on the instruments for which the ECO could ascertain the decision date).
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date			The MMA did little to address its outdated proposals on the Environmental Registry in 2016/2017, and in fact allowed some additional proposals to become outdated. At the end of the reporting year, over 10% of the MMA's open proposal notices on the Environmental Registry had been on the Registry for over 2 years without an update or decision. However, the ministry addressed all outdated proposals for the 2016/2017 reporting year in August 2017.









Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Handling of applications for review and investigation			The MMA concluded one application for review in 2016/2017. Although the ministry's decision to deny the request was valid based on <i>EBR</i> criteria, the ministry did a poor job of explaining how its decision related to the applicants' key concerns. The ministry also missed the statutory deadline for providing its decision to the applicants.
Avoiding overdue applications for review	N/A	N/A	The MMA did not have any open applications for review at the end of 2016/2017.
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)			The MMA provided proof of SEV consideration to the ECO in response to all 8 of the ECO's requests, and responded promptly in all cases.
Co-operation with ECO requests			The MMA responded to the ECO's requests for information about water efficiency and water reuse in the <i>Ontario Building Code</i> and in provincial land use planning policies. The MMA's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator also attended an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF)

ECO Comment: The MNRF has one of the highest EBR workloads in every category. The MNRF maintained its high quality of policy, act and regulation notices this year, but some instrument notices – in particular *Aggregate Resource Act* instruments – continued to be routinely deficient. The ECO is encouraged that the MNRF posted significantly more of its decisions promptly this year, and remedied a large number of its outdated proposals. The ECO urges the MNRF to remedy its remaining outdated proposals this year and to keep proposals up to date going forward. The ECO is also pleased to see an improvement in the MNRF's handling of applications, and that the ministry

no longer has any overdue reviews. However, we were disappointed that the MNRF resisted our requests for proof of consideration of its Statement of Environmental Values (SEV) for a large number of decisions this year; the MNRF's SEV itself states that it “will document how the SEV was considered each time a decision is posted on the Environmental Registry.” The ECO expects that the MNRF will consider and document its consideration of its SEV for all of its environmentally significant decisions going forward. Likewise, the ECO looks forward to greater co-operation from the MNRF with ECO information requests in 2017/2018.







Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry			The MNRF continues to post high quality notices for policies, acts and regulations, doing a good job of explaining what is proposed and describing environmental impacts. However, the ministry continues to incorrectly complete the “purpose” section of proposal notices. The MNRF's notices would also be more helpful if they included hyperlinks when referring to related Environmental Registry notices.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry			The MNRF's notices for <i>Aggregate Resources Act</i> and <i>Endangered Species Act, 2007</i> instruments still lack links to the draft or final instruments themselves, and only include minimal information about geographic location of the instruments. The notices also often do not adequately describe the public's comments or the effect of public participation on the final decision. (See Chapter 1.5.3 of this Report).
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry			Despite its low score, the MNRF made a significant improvement in posting decisions on the Environmental Registry promptly, with 3 times as many notices being posted within 2 weeks of a decision being made as in 2015/2016. The ministry's continued low score in this category in 2016/2017 is attributable in part to the number of late decision notices that the MNRF posted this year to remedy outdated proposals.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date			The MNRF posted updates or decision notices for a significant number of outdated proposals in 2016/2017. However, at the end of the reporting year, 24% of the ministry's open proposals on the Environmental Registry were still more than two years old without any update or decision, which is unacceptable.








Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Handling of applications for review and investigation			In 2016/2017, the MNRF concluded 1 application for review and 2 applications for investigation. The ministry handled those applications well, but continued to miss some statutory deadlines for responding to the applications.
Avoiding overdue applications for review			During 2016/2017, the MNRF concluded its one overdue application identified in last year's <i>EBR</i> report card. At the end of this reporting year, none of the MNRF's open applications were overdue.
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)			In 2016/2017, the MNRF failed to provide SEV consideration documents in response to over 25% of the ECO's requests, instead providing its rationale for why SEV consideration and/or documentation was not required. The ECO disagrees with the ministry's position and considers those cases to be a failure by the MNRF to consider its SEV.
Co-operation with ECO requests			The MNRF provided quick and helpful responses to some special requests by the ECO (in particular, in providing a status update on the ministry's aggregates policy framework, and in extending a comment period for an <i>Aggregate Resources Act</i> instrument). However, more generally, the MNRF did not meet the ECO's expectations for responsiveness to routine information requests, responding slowly or, in some cases, not at all. The MNRF did provide some helpful briefings on various topics (e.g., aggregates, wolves and protected areas), but not without extra effort by ECO staff. At the ECO's request, the MNRF's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator did attend an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Northern Development and Mines (MNDM)

ECO Comment: The MNDM executed most its *EBR* responsibilities well again in 2016/2017, and made notable improvements in some categories. The small number of policy, act and regulation notices posted this year meant that the MNDM's score for quality of notices declined as a result of one particularly poor quality notice. Going forward, the ECO urges the MNDM to ensure that every notice it posts is clearly written, describes the environmental significance of the proposal, and includes links to key supporting information. Similarly, while the MNDM made some improvements to the geographic information in *Mining Act* instrument notices at the very end of 2016/2017, the ministry's instrument notices should include

more details and links to key supporting information in order to ensure that members of the public can provide informed comments. The ECO commends the MNDM for being the only ministry to meet or exceed our expectations in both the promptness of posting decision notices category and in keeping notices up to date. The ministry made admirable efforts to remedy all of its outdated proposals, and at the end of the reporting year all of the MNDM's open proposals were up to date. The ECO appreciates our good working relationship with the MNDM's *EBR* co-ordinators, who have been highly engaged in improving the ministry's *EBR* performance.









Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry			The MNDM posted 3 notices for policies, acts and regulations this year. While two of the MNDM's notices were generally clear and understandable, the third was difficult to follow. The notices also lacked information about potential environmental impacts.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry			The MNDM's instrument notices are generally short on details and never include links to proposed or final instruments or other supporting information. In the last months of the 2016/2017 year, the MNDM made some modest but much-needed improvements to the description of geographic location by including the URL for CLAIMaps (mndm.gov.on.ca/en/mines-and-minerals/applications/claimaps) (inexplicably, not hyperlinked) plus, in some cases, landmark descriptors such as the distance to the nearest city. The unlinked URL is better than nothing because it allows the public, with effort, to locate the precise location of specific instruments by using the mining claims map, if they happen to be aware of that specific instrument. However, the URL does not provide the public with location information that would show up on a search of the <i>EBR</i> , and therefore cannot be used to provide location-specific alerts, which would be far more useful.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry			The MNDM posted many instrument decisions promptly. However, the ECO could not evaluate the promptness of many instrument decision notices as the issuance date of many instruments was not clear.

Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date			The MNDM posted updates or decision notices for all outdated notices, so that all of the ministry's notices on the Environmental Registry were up to date at the end of the reporting period.
Handling of applications for review and investigation		N/A	The MNDM concluded one application for investigation, complying properly and thoroughly with its responsibilities under the <i>EBR</i> .
Avoiding overdue applications for review	N/A	N/A	The MNDM did not have any open applications for review under the <i>EBR</i> at the end of 2016/2017.
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)			The MNDM provided proof of SEV consideration to the ECO in response to all 3 of the ECO's requests, and was very prompt in its responses.
Co-operation with ECO requests			The MNDM's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinators were pro-active in seeking assistance from ECO staff, and were co-operative in response to ECO staff communications about Environmental Registry matters. An MNDM <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator also attended an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS)

ECO Comment: The MTCS discharged some of its *EBR* obligations very well this year, maintaining a high quality in both of its notices posted on the Environmental Registry and making significant improvements in responding to the ECO's requests for











proof of consideration of its Statement of Environmental Values. Again this year the MTCS did not have any outdated notices on the Environmental Registry. However, the ministry should make a greater effort to give the public prompt notice of its decisions.

Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry			The MTCS posted two decisions in 2016/2017, maintaining its high quality of notices in both cases. In particular, the MTCS provided excellent summaries of public comments submitted on the corresponding proposals, and how the ministry's final decisions related/responded to those comments.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The MTCS is not required to post instrument notices on the Environmental Registry.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry			The MTCS did not post either of its decision notices within 2 weeks of making the decision; while notice of one decision was posted within 4 weeks, it took the ministry 3 months to give notice of the other.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date	N/A	N/A	The MTCS did not have any open proposals on the Environmental Registry at the end of 2016/2017.
Handling of applications for review and investigation	N/A	N/A	The MTCS is not currently prescribed for applications for review or investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Avoiding overdue applications for review	N/A	N/A	The MTCS is not currently prescribed for applications for review or investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)			The ECO requested proof of SEV consideration from the MTCS for both of the decisions that the ministry posted in 2016/2017. In both cases the ministry promptly supplied the ECO with SEV consideration documents.
Co-operation with ECO requests			The ECO did not make any specific information requests of the MTCS in the 2016/2017 reporting year. However, the MTCS's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinators attended an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Transportation (MTO)

ECO Comment: The MTO continued to discharge its *EBR* responsibilities very well in 2016/2017, again posting consistently high quality notices on the Environmental Registry and responding promptly to the ECO's requests for proof of consideration of its Statement of Environmental Values. The ECO is pleased the MTO followed our recommendation and remedied



all of its outdated proposals, and that all of the ministry's proposals on the Registry were up to date at the end of 2016/2017. The ECO encourages the MTO to keep proposal notices up to date going forward, and to post all decision notices promptly after making decisions.

Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry			The MTO posted generally high quality notices on the Environmental Registry in 2016/2017. The ministry should ensure that it more consistently describes the effects of public consultation on its decisions, and includes links to all relevant documents.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The MTO is not required to post instrument notices on the Environmental Registry.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry			The MTO posted several decision notices for outdated proposals in 2016/2017 (in some cases dating back to 2008). These late decision notices are responsible for the ministry's poor result in this category.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date			The MTO remedied all of its remaining outdated notices on the Environmental Registry in the 2016/2017 reporting year.
Handling of applications for review and investigation	N/A	N/A	The MTO did not conclude any applications for review under the <i>EBR</i> in 2016/2017. The MTO is not prescribed for applications for investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Avoiding overdue applications for review	N/A	N/A	The MTO did not have any open applications for review under the <i>EBR</i> at the end of 2016/2017.
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)			The MTO provided proof of SEV consideration to the ECO in response to all 6 requests, and was generally very prompt in its responses.
Co-operation with ECO requests			The ECO did not make any specific information requests of the MTO in the 2016/2017 reporting year. However the MTO's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinators attended an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Ministry: Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS)

ECO Comment: The TBS is a newly prescribed ministry and, to date, there is little material with which the ECO can evaluate the TBS's *EBR* performance. Nevertheless, we are pleased that the ministry has so far performed its few *EBR* obligations well by posting a high quality notice of its Statement of Environmental Values on the Environmental Registry. The ECO also commends the TBS for amending its draft Statement of Environmental Values in response to comments from the ECO to specify that climate change mitigation and adaptation will be part of the government decision-making process. Going forward, the ECO encourages the TBS to ensure that its decision notices clearly state the date that the decision was made so that the ECO may determine whether the decision notice was

posted as soon as reasonably possible, as required by the *EBR*. The ECO is happy to report that the TBS's *EBR* co-ordinator attended an *EBR* compliance information session in September 2016. Going forward, the ECO encourages the TBS to contact our office for any assistance in understanding and complying with its *EBR* responsibilities, including: co-operating with ECO requests for information; posting clearly written and sufficiently detailed notices of any environmentally significant proposals on the Environmental Registry for public consultation; giving prompt notice of its decisions on such proposals on the Registry; and considering its Statement of Environmental Values when making those decisions.

Category	Result	Trend	ECO Comments
Quality of notices for policies, acts and regulations posted on the Environmental Registry		N/A	The TBS posted a proposal and decision for its Statement of Environmental Values in 2016/2017. The TBS's first notices as a prescribed ministry were clearly written, straightforward and included links to the proposed and final documents.
Quality of notices for instruments posted on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The TBS is not required to post instrument notices on the Environmental Registry.
Promptness of posting decision notices on the Environmental Registry	N/A	N/A	The ECO could not ascertain when the TBS decided to finalize its Statement of Environmental Values, and so we are unable to evaluate the TBS' performance in this category.
Keeping notices on the Environmental Registry up to date	N/A	N/A	The TBS did not have any open proposals on the Environmental Registry at the end of 2016/2017.
Handling of applications for review and investigation	N/A	N/A	The TBS is not prescribed for applications for review or investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Avoiding overdue applications for review	N/A	N/A	The TBS is not prescribed for applications for review or investigation under the <i>EBR</i> .
Considering Statements of Environmental Values (SEVs)	N/A	N/A	The ECO did not request proof of SEV consideration from the TBS in 2016/2017.
Co-operation with ECO requests		N/A	The ECO did not make any specific information requests of the TBS in the 2016/2017 reporting year. However, the TBS's <i>EBR</i> co-ordinator also attended an <i>EBR</i> compliance information session at the ECO's offices in September 2016.

Quality of Performance

Meets or exceeds expectations and legal obligations



Needs improvement



Unacceptable: failure to comply with legal obligations and/or frustrating the environmental rights granted to the public by the *EBR*

Trend

Overall quality of performance unchanged since 2015/2016



Overall quality of performance has improved since 2015/2016



Overall quality of performance has declined since 2015/2016

N/A (not applicable): The ministry is not prescribed for purposes of this category of *EBR* performance, or the ministry did not execute any responsibilities under this category in the reporting year.

Individual ministry comments on their *EBR* Report Cards can be viewed online at eco.on.ca.