Deloitte.

# Report of the Independent Fairness Commissioner

City of Winnipeg

Report on Compliance – Proposed land exchange with Qualico Developments (Winnipeg) Ltd. - Acquisition

November 7, 2019

Deloitte.

**INDEPENDENT ASSURANCE REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH FRAMEWORK**
**City of Winnipeg**
**Proposed land exchange with Qualico Developments (Winnipeg) Ltd. - Acquisition**

To: City Council

**Scope**

We have undertaken a reasonable assurance engagement of the proposed real estate transaction described in Section 1 of this report (the "Transaction") to determine whether the Transaction was undertaken by the City of Winnipeg's Planning, Property and Development Department ("PP&D") in compliance with version 1.04 of the framework referenced in Section 1 of this report (hereinafter referred to as the "Compliance Framework").

**Management's responsibility**

The Compliance Framework as well as compliance of the Transaction with the Compliance Framework are the responsibility of PP&D's Management. Management is also responsible for such internal controls as it determines necessary to enable City of Winnipeg's compliance with the specified requirements.

**Our responsibility**

Our responsibility is to express a reasonable assurance opinion on the City of Winnipeg's compliance based on the evidence we have obtained. We conducted our reasonable assurance engagement in accordance with Canadian Standard on Assurance Engagements 3531, Direct Engagements to Report on Compliance. This standard requires that we plan and perform this engagement to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the entity complied with the specified requirements, in all significant respects.

Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance, but is not a guarantee that an engagement conducted in accordance with this standard will always detect a significant instance of non-compliance with specified requirements when it exists. Instances of non-compliance can arise from fraud or error and are considered significant if, individually or in the aggregate, they could reasonably be expected to influence the decisions of users of our report. A reasonable assurance compliance reporting engagement involves performing procedures to obtain evidence about the entity's compliance with the specified requirements. The nature, timing and extent of procedures selected depends on our professional judgment, including an assessment of the risks of significant non-compliance, whether due to fraud or error.

Our reasonable assurance engagement included examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting compliance with the applicable criteria of the Compliance Framework and included: 1) performing corroborative interviews with City of Winnipeg employees and representatives who were responsible for conducting the Transaction; 2) examining documentation provided by City of Winnipeg employees; and 3) reperforming transaction specific calculations, where applicable. We performed our audit procedures based on discussions with PP&D Management and information available as at November 1, 2019. We believe the evidence we obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our opinion.

**Our independence and quality control**

We have complied with the relevant rules of professional conduct/code of ethics applicable to the practice of public accounting and related to assurance engagements, issued by various professional accounting bodies, which are founded on fundamental principles of integrity, objectivity, professional competence and due care, confidentiality and professional behaviour. The firm applies Canadian Standard on Quality Control 1, Quality Control for Firms that Perform Audits and Reviews of Financial Statements, and Other Assurance Engagements and, accordingly, maintains a comprehensive system of quality control, including documented policies and procedures regarding compliance with ethical requirements, professional standards and applicable legal and regulatory requirements.

**Opinion**

In our opinion, except for the compliance exceptions noted in Section 2, PP&D is in compliance, with the individual criteria of the Compliance Framework (version 1.04) for the Transaction noted above in all significant respects. We do not provide a legal opinion on City of Winnipeg's compliance with the specified requirements.

**Restriction on use**

This report was prepared for the City of Winnipeg and City Council for the purpose of City Council's ultimate determinations related to the above noted transaction, and although it may be made publically available, readers are cautioned that this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

Deloitte LLP

Chartered Professional Accountants
Winnipeg, Manitoba
November 7, 2019

# Section 1 – Compliance Framework, the Transaction, and Management's responsibility

**Compliance Framework**
City Council ("Council") created the role of the Independent Fairness Commissioner ("IFC") for the purpose of ensuring that real estate transactions and management services ("Transactions") are performed in a fair, transparent and open manner. Under the direction of Council, the City Auditor has engaged Deloitte LLP ("Deloitte") to provide certain services as part of the IFC role through the performance of compliance audits in accordance with the assurance standards of the Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada ("CPA Canada"). To ensure Council's objectives for the IFC are addressed, a Compliance Framework was developed under the oversight of PP&D (also referred to as "Management") through consideration of applicable City of Winnipeg by-laws, policies and procedures including PP&D's internal Real Estate Transaction Management Framework ("RETMF"). The Compliance Framework is to be used as the basis for the performance of compliance audits of selected Transactions, and can be subject to revision by PP&D based on evolving requirements. Further background information regarding the Compliance Framework is in Appendix 1.

**The Transaction**
The proposed transaction is the acquisition of lands as shown on Misc. Plan 14216/8 (the "Precinct G Lands") for potential future development of either a lab facility or maintenance facility. The scope of the Compliance Audit includes only the compliance aspects of the Transaction outlined in the associated Administrative Report, and excludes any prior or ongoing Transaction related activities, where applicable. Management represents that the complexity of this transaction has been deemed to be "complex" for the purposes of this compliance audit.

**Management responsibility and assertion**
Transaction documentation has been prepared by PP&D based on information available at November 1, 2019. The Compliance Framework and applicable criteria is the responsibility of PP&D and has formed the basis of the compliance audit conducted by Deloitte on the Transaction. PP&D is responsible for ensuring the fairness, transparency, and openness of any proposed or completed transactions and the compliance of transactions with the Compliance Framework. Further, as discussed in Appendix 2 of this report, PP&D has made certain representations regarding the information provided to Deloitte to support the performance of the independent compliance audit. Deloitte's responsibility is to express an opinion on PP&D's compliance with the Compliance Framework based on the results of their independent audit procedures performed as outlined in Appendix 1 to the report.

Yours truly,



**Planning, Property and Development Department**
**City of Winnipeg**

# Section 2 – Exceptions noted and Management's unaudited response

**Exceptions noted**
The criteria within the Compliance Framework was subject to audit procedures performed by Deloitte for the purposes of determining compliance to support our independent auditors' report, as discussed in Appendix 2. Included in the table below is a summary of the exceptions noted in testing the compliance of the Transaction with the Compliance Framework, the associated criteria, and the unaudited responses to these exceptions prepared by Management. The City Auditor has requested responses from PP&D for each exception noted and provided the responses to Deloitte for inclusion in the report. Management's responses are unaudited, and have been included to provide commentary by the City of Winnipeg, to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development ("SPCPDHDD") and/or Council.

A complete listing has been included in Appendix 2 of those criteria for which exceptions were noted, criteria that were deemed to not be subject to audit, and criteria deemed by Management to not be applicable to the Transaction.

| Summary of exceptions noted | | Related criteria |
|---|---|---|
| **Reporting documentation incomplete** | The following sections of the Acquisitions Checklist per Appendix C of the RETMF were not completed at the date of Transaction review:<br>• Risk and complexity tool (partially complete); and<br>• Owner signs term sheet (partially complete). | 1.03 |
| **File documentation incomplete** | The engagement letter between the City of Winnipeg and the external appraiser was not in the most current template maintained by the City Legal Services, as required by Appendix D of the RETMF. | 2.07 |

| Unaudited Management response to exceptions noted |
|---|
| The engagement letter on file between the City and the external appraiser was entered into prior to the current template we now use as required by Appendix D of the RETMF. |

# Appendix 1 – Scope of services requested

**Introduction**
As outlined in Section 1 of the report, and to address Council's objectives for the IFC, a Compliance Framework was developed under the oversight of PP&D. The Compliance Framework development process also included assistance from Deloitte and the City Auditor in the form of consultation as to the sufficiency and appropriateness of the Compliance Framework for PP&D's ultimate determinations. The version of the Compliance Framework utilized for the purposes of this compliance audit is Version 1.04 dated August 28, 2019 as made available by Management. The Transaction is to be presented to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development ("SPCPDHDD") and/or Council for approval. Council has adopted the Executive Policy Committee's recommendation that the compliance audit of Transactions will occur prior to presentation to SPCPDHDD and/or Council. Accordingly, Deloitte has been engaged to perform the compliance audit of Transactions while in progress, the results of which will be reported directly to SPCPDHDD through the City Auditor and Deloitte.

**Scope of services requested of Deloitte by the City of Winnipeg**
Deloitte has been engaged to perform an independent audit of the Transaction's compliance with the Compliance Framework noted above as follows:

a. Produce an independent auditor's report on whether the Transaction is in compliance with the relevant criteria outlined within the Compliance Framework;
b. Submit the results of the compliance audit and specific Auditor's Report to the City Auditor.
c. Report specific findings and compliance exceptions within the Auditor's Report based on the Compliance Framework where applicable.
d. Prior to performance of a specific compliance audit of a transaction,
    i. declare any conflict of interest in connection with the specific transaction; and
    ii. obtain management's representation of the complexity rating of the transaction, based on specific guidance retained by the City and in consultation with the Contract Administrator.
e. Attend the SPCPDHDD's regular meeting and/or any agreed upon special meetings in person where the independently prepared auditor's report will be tabled so as to answer questions regarding the report.

Deloitte's audit procedures to determine compliance with the stated criteria within the Compliance Framework included testing on a sample basis of the evidence supporting compliance with the applicable criteria of the Compliance Framework and included: 1) examining documentation provided by City of Winnipeg employees; 2) reperforming transaction specific calculations, where applicable; and 3) performing corroborative interviews with City of Winnipeg employees and representatives who were responsible for carrying out the Transaction.

For criteria identified to not be in compliance and related exceptions noted, the report provides these findings and, where applicable, management comments related to the compliance exceptions. Any identified instances of non-compliance in relation to the Transaction are detailed in Appendix 2 of this report. Management's unaudited responses to the compliance exceptions, if any, are included in Section 2 of the report. Responses regarding the cause of non-compliance, where provided, are prepared by PP&D. Observations regarding the impact on the fairness, transparency, and openness of the Transaction, where provided, would be prepared by PP&D and/or the City Auditor.

# Appendix 2 – Findings and compliance exceptions noted

**Background information provided by the Independent Auditor**

The Compliance Framework referenced in Appendix 1 above forms the basis of the criteria for Deloitte's independent audit of the Transaction. The Compliance Framework is presented in two components as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Objectives** | Summarized objectives of the IFC and RETMF as considered and defined in the applicable by-laws, policies, procedures, and the RETMF. |
| **Criteria** | Specific requirements that a real estate transaction is expected to comply with in order to be considered fair, transparent and open. Criteria were developed in consideration of specific statements or requirements within by-laws, policies, procedures, and the RETMF. Management's ultimate determination of applicable criteria is based on the nature of the transaction, property type, and transacting party. |

Our audit procedures to determine compliance with the stated Criteria within the Compliance Framework included testing on a sample basis of the evidence supporting compliance with the applicable Criteria of the Compliance Framework and included: 1) examining documentation provided by City of Winnipeg employees; 2) reperforming transaction specific calculations, where applicable; and 3) performing corroborative interviews with City of Winnipeg employees and representatives who were responsible for carrying out the Transaction.We performed our procedures based on discussions with Management and information available as at November 1, 2019. Any compliance exceptions pertaining to individual Criteria noted by Deloitte during the performance of our audit procedures are identified below.

**Management's representations provided to the Independent Auditor**
As discussed in Section 1 of this report, Management has represented that to the best of their knowledge and belief, the following:

- All information presented to Deloitte has been presented fairly and accurately, and in a manner that would not create judgements requiring interpretation that could result in a change in conclusion as to the compliance of the Transaction with the Compliance Framework;
- All documents prepared and provided to Deloitte for review were prepared in the course of conducting the Transaction;
- Deloitte has been provided access to all relevant documents, information, and City employees or representatives who possess information related to the Transaction, and within the stated period to meet the City's requirements to determine compliance;
- Criteria deemed as not applicable to the Transaction are identified in sub-section C of this appendix; and
- The complexity rating of the transaction based on the review completed by PP&D is complex.

**Findings and compliance exceptions noted**
The findings and compliance exceptions noted through the performance of Deloitte's audit procedures have been presented in the following categories:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **A.** | **Exceptions noted** | The table outlines only those Criteria defined in the Compliance Framework that are applicable to the Transaction and for which we have noted exceptions in compliance. The exceptions have been organized in the table by the Objective reference number, and included in the second column are those Criteria where instances of non-compliance have been identified. The third column contains a description of the exception noted. |
| **B.** | **Criteria not subjected to audit** | The table outlines those Criteria that could not be subjected to audit on the basis of Management's representation that the related activities have not been performed based on the rationale provided. |
| **C.** | **Criteria not applicable to the Transaction** | During the course of our test procedures performed, Management has represented and confirmed that the Criteria referenced in this table are not applicable to the Transaction, and have therefore not been included in the scope of our audit. |

It should be noted that Criteria for which no compliance exceptions were noted are not included in the tables below. The Compliance Framework should be referenced for a complete listing and description of all applicable Criteria included within the Compliance Framework as at the date specified above.

## A. Exceptions noted

### 1. Information reported to Council or delegate with respect to the transaction was complete

| | Criteria | Exceptions noted |
|---|---|---|
| **1.03** | The complete reporting checklist (as outlined in Appendix C of the RETMF) which corresponds to the transaction type has been fully completed, including all attachments noted to be evidenced in file. Rationale for the notation of any particular item within the checklist as "N/A" has been included. | The following sections of the Acquisitions Checklist per Appendix C of the RETMF were not documented at the date of Transaction review:<br>• Risk and complexity tool (partially complete); and<br>• Owner signs term sheet (partially complete). |

### 2. An appraisal of the property has been performed by a qualified individual, in an acceptable format, as needed

| | Criteria | Exceptions noted |
|---|---|---|
| **2.07** | If an external appraiser was used, the engagement to prepare an external appraisal report with respect to the property was documented through a signed written engagement letter using the most current template maintained by City Legal Services (as at the date of engagement). | File documentation did include an engagement letter between the City of Winnipeg and the external appraiser, but it was not in a template maintained by the City Legal Services, as required by Appendix D of the RETMF. |

## B. Criteria not subjected to audit

### 4. Transaction approval has been granted by an appropriate individual based on the delegations of authority outlined in the Delegation of Authority - January 28, 2009 Council minutes

| | Criteria | Representations or rationale provided |
|---|---|---|
| **4.01** | Transaction approval has been granted by an appropriate individual based on the delegations of authority outlined in Delegation of Authority - January 28, 2009 Council minutes. | The Transaction has not yet been provided to Council for approval. |

### 6. Property, Planning, and Development has been authorized to commence negotiations for the acquisition or disposal of land, and completed site inspections as appropriate

| | Criteria | Representations or rationale provided |
|---|---|---|
| **6.01** | The Board of Commissioners has authorized PP&D to commence negotiations for all land acquisitions, except in instances where an approved Capital Project clearly identifies the land acquisition (in which case PP&D has received a request from the associated Department). | Management has represented that as the proposed land exchange meets condition four in the "Offers to Purchase City-Owned Property Policy" from December 6, 2006. As such, the August 1, 1979 policy pertaining to the authority to negotiate land acquisitions was deemed not applicable by management and as such, this criterion could not been subject to audit. |

### 7. An Environmental Site Assessment ("ESA") was completed as required

| | Criteria | Representations or rationale provided |
|---|---|---|
| **7.01** | A determination was made and documented by a qualified environmental professional (as defined within Appendix M of the RETMF) as to whether an ESA was required. | As represented by management in the Transaction Administrative Report, an ESA has not yet been completed and is planned for completion prior to the close of the Transaction. As such we could not subject criteria 7.01 to 7.04 to audit. |
| **7.02** | If determined to be required pursuant to criterion 7.01, a Phase I ESA was conducted by a qualified environmental professional (as defined within Appendix M of the RETMF), in accordance with CSA standard Z768-01 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (as evidenced by a representation to this effect). | |
| **7.03** | If recommended in the Phase I ESA, a Phase II ESA has been conducted by a qualified environmental professional (as defined within Appendix M of the RETMF) according to CSA standard Z769-00 Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (as evidenced by a representation to this effect). | |
| **7.04** | All ESAs have been reviewed by a qualified individual with experience in interpreting results and recommendations in the ESA, or has otherwise been reviewed or consulted with either a member of Public Works or a member of the Water and Waste Department's environmental protection program. Documentation evidencing this review has been retained within the file. | |

### 10. Alternative properties and procurement methods were considered in selecting the property

| | Criteria | Representations or rationale provided |
|---|---|---|
| **10.01** | A search was undertaken to identify alternative property locations and purchase/lease opportunities available. In cases where multiple opportunities were identified by this search, a comparative analysis was undertaken to evaluate the most economical option. This analysis was reviewed and communicated with the requesting department. | File docuementation included evidence that the Department of Water and Waste has stated a need for the identified property. Management has represented that based on this evidence, an alternative property analysis was not required and as such, this criterion could not be subject to audit. |

## 16. Where land declared surplus had previously been transferred by a Developer to the City, that land has first been offered back to that Developer

| | Criteria | Representations or rationale provided |
|---|---|---|
| **16.01** | Where (1) a Community Committee has taken transfer of lands instead of cash payment pursuant to the 10% dedication requirement in the subdivision of lands, (2) the Community Committee may subsequently declare said lands surplus for the purpose of sale, and (3) the developer has expressed an interest in the purchase of said lands, then the property has been first offered to the developer at a price determined by the Committee on Finance in accordance with Committee on Finance policy, August 13, 1979. | File documentation did not clarify how the property was acquired. As such, criteria 16.01 could not be subject to audit. |

## C. Criteria not applicable to the Transaction

| Objective | Criteria not applicable |
|---|---|
| **1.** Information reported to Council or delegate with respect to the Transaction was complete. | 1.02 |
| **2.** An appraisal of the property has been performed by a qualified individual, in an acceptable format, as needed. | 2.02, 2.03, 2.12 |
| **3.** Consultation and communication with internal City stakeholders such as City departments, the Ward Councilor, and utility agencies has been solicited prior to the execution of the transaction. | 3.01, 3.02 |
| **5.** All land has either been declared surplus or is planned to be declared surplus concurrently with the approval of sale by the Chief Administrative Officer and/or Council, based on the applicable Delegation of Authority. | 5.01 |
| **6.** PP&D has been authorized to commence negotiations for the acquisition or disposal of land, and completed site inspections as appropriate. | 6.02, 6.03 |
| **7.** An Environmental Site Assessment ("ESA") was completed as required. | 7.05, 7.06 |
| **8.** A competitive procurement process was conducted when prescribed by the RETMF. | 8.02, 8.03, 8.04, 8.05 |
| **11.** Where land is to be expropriated, compliance with the Expropriation Act has been considered and verified by City Legal Services. | 11.01, 11.02, 11.03, 11.04, 11.05, 11.06, 11.07, 11.08 |
| **12.** Unsolicited offers for the purchase of City owned property have been pursued only when the conditions established by Council have been met. | 12.01 |
| **13.** Any offer for the purchase of City-owned property was only acted on by PP&D if it was provided in the form of a formal written offer. | 13.01 |
| **14.** Acquisitions of privately owned property containing dilapidated structures are accompanied by a program of rehabilitation, redevelopment, or improvement. | 14.01, 14.02 |
| **15.** Specific policies relating to transactions involving property under the purview of the Parks & Recreation division have been observed. | 15.01, 15.02 |
| **17.** Other policies related to the general process for the sale of land have been adhered to. | 17.01, 17.02 |
| **18.** The policies pertaining to acquisitions and dispositions of specific types of property have been adhered to. | 18.01, 18.02, 18.03, 18.04, 18.05, 18.06, 18.07, 18.08, 18.09, 18.10 |
| **19.** The policies pertaining to specific types of transaction have been adhered to. | 19.01, 19.02, 19.03, 19.04 |