



CITY OF ST. ALBERT ADMINISTRATIVE BACKGROUNDER

SMART CITY STRATEGY RE-PRIORITIZATION - FINANCIAL BENEFIT AND CORPORATE EFFICIENCY

On September 6, 2016, Councillor Mackay provided notice in accordance with Section 23 of Procedure Bylaw 35/2009 of intent to bring forward the following motion:

That Administration amend the Smart City Master Plan strategy prioritization criteria to double the weighting of the "financial benefit" 20 points, and "corporate efficiency" 20 points categories, re-conduct a strategy prioritization analysis, and amend the Smart City Master Plan as required.

On September 6, 2016, Councillor Hughes provided notice in accordance with Section 23 of Procedure Bylaw 35/2009 of intent to bring forward the following motion:

That the financial benefit weighting is increased from 10 points to 20 points in the Prioritization methodology.

BACKGROUND:

This backgrounder is a response to both motions above as the response is relevant to both.

If these motions are carried by Council, Administration would amend the Smart City Master Plan strategy prioritization criteria to double the weighting of the "financial benefit" 20 points, and/or the "corporate efficiency" 20 points categories, re-prioritize the remaining strategies, and amend the design and order of the Smart City Master Plan as required.

Within the proposed Smart City Master Plan, a detailed strategy prioritization methodology was utilized. The methodology, referenced on pages 21 and 137 of the full Master Plan, is based on six distinct categories weighted at the same level (10 points each), with a final category for dependencies and impact – the expected level of positive change and far reaching benefit - weighted higher (20 points).

The former Smart City Steering Committee used this methodology for the Master Plan as it represented a balanced and targeted approach to prioritization, and recognized that Smart City projects should offer a mix of benefits to the municipality and to the community – from financial, to service delivery, to economic development,

and so forth. If any of the categories were rated lower based on the Committee's lengthy analysis, the strategy's score and priority would be lower in comparison to others.

The doubling of categories related to financial benefit and/or corporate efficiency would increase the emphasis on direct and indirect financial outcomes (cost savings, cost avoidance, productivity, partnerships, etc.) and decrease the relative emphasis on other factors (economic development support, service delivery, stakeholder alignment, and implementation ease).

Prioritization affects the timing of when the proposed strategies would be considered, in addition to the correlation and synergies or interdependencies of the various strategies. But, unless a specific strategy is eliminated, the plan is to consider all the recommended strategies regardless of prioritization. Ultimately, all deliverables requiring net new resources, whether financial, capital, or human resources, would be brought to Council at the applicable point in time for final consideration.

Increasing Weighting of Both Financial Benefit and Corporate Efficiency

Based on a preliminary review of the effect of a reprioritization Master Plan (doubling both the financial benefit and the corporate efficiency categories), there would be five shifts in relative priority – for example, open government / open data would fall in priority as it does not often generate specific financial benefit to a municipality, while applying technologies to minimize power and other resource use would rise in priority. While these and other shifts would occur, most strategies would still remain in their current prioritization band (high priority, medium priority, low priority).

The table below shows a comparison of the previous weighting and new weighting based on a scenario where the financial benefit and corporate efficiency categories are doubled to 20-point weightings. An indicator is provided beside any strategy that would rise or lower in overall priority (for example, F.3 Open Government/Open Data Foundation was a high priority strategy that would drop to medium priority in a revised scenario).

Strategy	Short Description	Rank (Current)	Rank (Revised)	Priority Change?
A.1	Municipal Network Connectivity	1	1	-
C.1	Intelligent Transportation System	2(T)	5	-
F.1	Sensor Network & Connected Assets	2(T)	2(T)	-
A.2	Internet Connectivity (Resident / Visitor)	2(T)	6	-
F.3	Open Government / Open Data Foundation	5(T)	11	⬇️
E.2	Emergency Response & Safety Technologies	5(T)	2(T)	-
A.3	Municipal Innovation & Idea Sharing	5(T)	4	-

Strategy	Short Description	Rank (Current)	Rank (Revised)	Priority Change?
B.4	Collaborative Innovation & Testing	8	8(T)	
E.3	Digital City Services & Public Engagement	9(T)	8(T)	-
C.2	Real-Time Travel & Parking Information	9(T)	8(T)	-
D.1	Resource Minimization & Development Innovation	11(T)	7	
F.2	Advanced Analytics & Business Intelligence	11(T)	12	-
B.1	Internet Connectivity (Business)	13(T)	15(T)	-
C.3	Transit Technologies & Services	13(T)	13	-
B.3	Smart Economic Reputation & Supports	15(T)	17(T)	
A.4	Community Innovation, Digital Literacy & Co-Creation	15(T)	15(T)	-
F.5	Smart City Operations Centre & Data Hub	17	14	
C.4	Future Transportation Trends & Modes	18(T)	20	-
D.2	Sustainable Energy Solutions	18(T)	17(T)	-
F.4	Municipal Purchasing Innovation	20	17(T)	-
B.2	Smart Business Services & Recognition	21	21	-
E.1	Public Amenity and Event Technology Integration	22	22	-

Table Legend:

- Strategy: Connection to Strategy # in Smart City Master Plan
- Short Description: Brief Description of Strategy in Smart City Master Plan
- Rank (Current): Current prioritization of strategy within Smart City Master Plan.
 - (T) specifies a tie between rankings.
- Rank (Revised): Potential prioritization of strategy if criteria weighting is adjusted.
 - (T) specifies a tie between rankings.
- Priority Change:
 - Red arrow means the strategy would drop one prioritization category – for example, High Priority to Medium Priority, or Medium Priority to Low Priority.
 - Green arrow means the strategy would rise one prioritization category – for example, Low Priority to Medium Priority, or Medium Priority to High Priority.

Increasing Weighting of Financial Benefit Category

Based on a preliminary review of the effect of a reprioritization Master Plan (doubling the financial benefit category only), there would be only one shift in relative priority – the open government / open data strategy would fall in priority as it does not often generate specific financial benefit to a municipality. The strategy would be grouped with the other strategies tied with it in rank. All other strategies would still remain in their current prioritization band (high priority, medium priority, low priority).

A table comparing the previous weighting and new weighting is provided below. Again, an indicator is provided beside the strategy that would fall in overall priority.

Strategy	Short Description	Rank (Current)	Rank (Revised)	Priority Change?
A.1	Municipal Network Connectivity	1	1	-
C.1	Intelligent Transportation System	2(T)	5(T)	-
F.1	Sensor Network & Connected Assets	2(T)	3(T)	-
A.2	Internet Connectivity (Resident / Visitor)	2(T)	2	-
F.3	Open Government / Open Data Foundation	5(T)	8(T)	⬇
E.2	Emergency Response & Safety Technologies	5(T)	3(T)	-
A.3	Municipal Innovation & Idea Sharing	5(T)	5(T)	-
B.4	Collaborative Innovation & Testing	8	7	-
E.3	Digital City Services & Public Engagement	9(T)	11	-
C.2	Real-Time Travel & Parking Information	9(T)	8(T)	-
D.1	Resource Minimization & Development Innovation	11(T)	8(T)	-
F.2	Advanced Analytics & Business Intelligence	11(T)	12(T)	-
B.1	Internet Connectivity (Business)	13(T)	14	-
C.3	Transit Technologies & Services	13(T)	12(T)	-
B.3	Smart Economic Reputation & Supports	15(T)	15(T)	-
A.4	Community Innovation, Digital Literacy & Co-Creation	15(T)	15(T)	-
F.5	Smart City Operations Centre & Data Hub	17	17(T)	-
C.4	Future Transportation Trends & Modes	18(T)	19(T)	-
D.2	Sustainable Energy Solutions	18(T)	17(T)	-
F.4	Municipal Purchasing Innovation	20	19(T)	-
B.2	Smart Business Services & Recognition	21	21	-
E.1	Public Amenity and Event Technology Integration	22	22	-

Report Date: October 03, 2016

Author(s): T. Peter and G. Coulman

Committee/Department: Innovation & Technology Services

General Manager: M. Pungur-Buick

Interim City Manager: C. Jardine