



**Ottawa Police Service Board  
Policy and Governance Committee  
Minutes**

**Meeting #:** 20  
**Date:** April 4, 2025  
**Time:** 9:30 am  
**Location:** Electronic Participation

**Present:** Councillor Cathy Curry, Dave Donaldson, Michael Polowin

**Others:** S. Fakirani, P. Henschel, H. Sayah, R. Ben Guedria, S. Yasseen, Acting Chief S. Bell, Deputy Chief T. Ferguson, Deputy Chief P. Burnett, J. Steinbachs, R. Drummond

1. Confirmation of Agenda

**That the Ottawa Police Service Board's Policy and Governance Committee confirm the agenda of the 4 April 2025 meeting.**

**Carried**

2. Confirmation of Minutes

2.1 Minutes #19 of 19 August 2025

**That the Ottawa Police Service Board's Policy and Governance Committee confirm Minutes #19 of the 19 August 2024 meeting.**

**Carried**

3. Declarations of Interest

No Declarations of Interest were filed.

4. Items of Business

4.1 Governance Review: Scope and Approach

Executive Director 's report

The Committee discussed that refining committee and Board processes is not meant to limit discussions or public engagement but to improve efficiency.

The Committee asked for an update on the dashboard that would allow for easier tracking of projects. The Service regularly publishes its crime and social disorder data, noting that they are expanding to include more metrics related to police service operations.

The Service reported on the progress made with the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) being developed. They are focusing on selecting KPIs that have baseline data and can be effectively measured. Although there are about 2,000 possible measures, they aim to focus on the most relevant and feasible ones. They aim by May to have a draft ready for approval and will start circulating it for feedback. Additionally, a new dashboard with year-to-date crime statistics will be available next week.

The Service outlined the development of 4 dashboards: strategic goals, operational data, KPIs on strategic projects (to be ready by the May

meeting), and year-to-date crime statistics. It was noted that setting targets requires a form of action to achieve the desired outcome. The importance of consulting both the Board and the community in the next steps of the process was discussed.

The Committee cautioned that reducing the frequency of monthly meetings could result in longer agendas, but this will be a Board decision. The Service highlighted the need to implement a delegation of authority, if any Board meetings are removed, as some decisions require escalation to the Board regularly.

The Executive Director explained that the revised calendar was meant to serve as the Board's schedule for the upcoming years and not just for this year. It was noted that reducing meetings in the second half of the year is not practical due to the budget cycle. To implement the new calendar this year, the May meeting would need to be canceled with reports due in May shifted to June. However, he noted that the Board will likely want to approve the final strategic plan in May.

It was discussed that the minimum scope is just to get started as the more extensive scope for the governance review requires additional staff in the Board office. It was noted that this is a very important first step which will evolve over the years and the focus is on streamlining the process from committees to Board approval.

The Service pointed out that the amended recommendation does not address the operational needs that require frequent attention from the Board. The Service highlighted the challenge of appointing police officers, noting the short time between completing training and being sworn in and a 2-month gap between meetings is not feasible from that perspective.

The Executive Director advised that the minimum scope would ensure regular review of legislated and other routine reports and if issues arise, the Chair can always call a meeting, either through e-polling or in-person/virtual sessions. It was noted that the Board could consider delegating authority in the future to address recurring issues such as appointments.

The recommendation was amended based on the Committee's discussion.

**That the Ottawa Police Service Board's Policy and Governance Committee recommend the following to the Board:**

- 1. That the Board direct its Executive Director to work with OPS staff regarding the governance review work as described as “minimum scope” in the report entitled “Governance Review: Scope and Approach” prepared for the April 4, 2025, OPSB Policy and Governance Committee**
- 2. That the Board direct its Executive Director to inform the Board as soon as any policy templates are designed for all Police Service Boards by the Inspectorate of Policing regarding the new Act so that the Board can review and potentially adopt.**
- 3. That the Board approve the Calendar as outlined in Appendix A of the report entitled “Governance Review: Scope and Approach” prepared for the April 4, 2025, OPSB Policy and Governance Committee with the following inclusions for each month's Board meeting agenda:**
  - A) A standing item on every Board agenda that would enable the Chief of Police to review the Strategic Plan Dashboard with the Board to review the progress made on the current Strategic Plan and associated KPIs.**
  - B) A standing item on every Board agenda that would enable the Chief of Police, or relevant staff, to review the current major projects chart (to be created and colour coded – red, yellow, green regarding progress status) with the Board.**
  - C) A section entitled “Consent Agenda” under which any unanimously passed motions arising from any of the Board's committees that have taken place since the last Board meeting would be listed for a more efficient approval by the Board and with the understanding that any Board member can request, at the approval of the main agenda, that any motion on the list could be removed for further discussion and become part of the main agenda for the meeting.**

**Carried as amended**

#### 4.2 Inquest into the Death of Abdirahman Abdi: Recommendations

Executive Director 's report

**ACTION:** The Committee asked that the Service provide regular updates to the Board on the progress of each recommendation from the Coroner's inquest verdict and developing a dashboard to track the progress.

The Service advised that since February, a team led by Acting Staff Sergeant Devon Archer has been dedicated to addressing the recommendations and improving the Service's overall mental health response. A report will be presented to the Board in April outlining the work plan to address the recommendations, but it won't include specific progress on each one. By early fall, the Board will receive a detailed report on the specific recommendations and the progress made.

The Committee discussed working with existing advisory committees to engage with the community for continual community input into policies before creating new advisory groups. The Committee expressed concerns about the use of a volunteer advisory committee in sensitive matters as it could become influence by lobbying.

The Committee asked if the Service would continue to engage with external researchers from York university to analyze the use of force data. The Service advised that the intention is not to engage with them this year, but they plan to do so in future years.

The Committee asked what formal tracking is required under the Section 81 recommendation. It was suggested that the committee review past Section 11 reports to assess whether they meet the Service's needs or if more detailed reports are necessary. The Committee discussed the importance of tracking when Section 81 is triggered and looking at past reports to determine whether the format is sufficient or if more detail is required. The Service explained that legislation requires the Chief to initiate an investigation following an SIU incident, focusing on conduct, policy, or service related to the event. The investigation results in a report, and the Section 11 (now Section 81) report summarizes those findings and is provided to the Board. It was agreed that reviewing past reports is useful and further discussion is required to ensure the Board is receiving the necessary details.

The Committee inquired when they should expect to receive the policy regarding reporting requirements for committee review.

It was recommended that summaries are provided to the Board for investigation reports as the full report will have a lot of personal details which will result in privacy concerns. The Board can also decide if they require more details and request it from the Service.

**ACTION:** The Committee asked the Executive Director to report back to the Committee on a tracking process to ensure that the Board receives these reports.

The Committee asked if there is a timeline for incorporating the information about addressing inquest recommendations for new Board members onboarding. The Executive Director advised that the inquest recommendations are already included informally in the new member orientation package, but the practice could be formally enshrined in the policy. He asked whether it would be more beneficial to update the existing policy or to conduct a broader review of the entire Board training policy.

**ACTION:** The Committee agreed to work with the Executive Director to review the Board training package.

It was noted that many other institutions are given their own recommendations in the coroner's report. The Committee inquired if the actions taken by others will be made available so that the Board can see what's being done externally. It was noted that there is no follow up by the Coroner on the implementation of recommendations in order to examine the steps taken by other groups, however, responses to jury recommendations from every organization will be posted publicly.

**ACTION:** The Committee asked the Service to engage with the York University research experts to analyze the recommendations and report back to the Board. The Committee discussed the importance of having the researchers' analysis as they include a human rights lens to statistics.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that the Board will respond to the verdict recommendations, stating that they will comply with the 3 Board-related recommendations and will closely monitor the remaining ones.

**That the Ottawa Police Service Board's Policy and Governance Committee receive this report for information and discussion.**

**Received**

4.3 Review of Board Policy CR-28 Assistance in the Provision of Policing

Executive Director 's report

The Service inquired how frequently the board would like to receive updates and noted that requests for assistance from units like the Ontario Provincial Police Public Order Unit or a surveillance team in Toronto fall under this policy. The format could be a longer-term quarterly reporting system or immediate reporting on each request.

The Executive Director advised that the notice to the Board is a legislated requirement, including both the content and timing. The Chief must provide the Board with notice each time temporary assistance is requested from another Service. However, there could also be additional quarterly or annual reporting to review trends and the overall picture.

**ACTION:** The Service agreed with an annual reporting format to review trends that will be tracked year over year.

**ACTION:** The Committee requested receiving a snapshot of the number and type of requests quarterly which will be incorporated into the quarterly performance report.

It was noted that the Chief is also required to inform the Board of any changes to the circumstances initially described in the notice. It was noted that the Board does not have the authority to approve a temporary assistance request, however, the Board is required to assess how the notices will affect adequate and effective policing. The Executive Director explained that the policy introduces two levels of assessment for requests for assistance. If the Chief determines the request involves a "critical point" requiring the Board's immediate attention, it could lead to a special meeting. For routine requests, the Executive Director would conduct a preliminary review, share it with the Board, and the Board could either agree with the assessment or choose to engage further by having a meeting or discussing the matter with the Chief.

A question was asked as to whether the proposed policy aligns with the guidance received from the Inspector General regarding critical points, or if this is related to another policy. The Executive Director explained that the introduction of the "critical point" definition in the policy serves a specific purpose: to help determine whether the Board needs to engage immediately with an issue or defer it to the next meeting. This approach has been described as a best practice by the Inspectorate of Policing. The definition is largely adapted from the Toronto and Halton models, which were recently presented as best practices. He noted that a more in-depth critical points policy should be developed as part of the broader review of the Major Events policy.

**That the Ottawa Police Service Board's Policy and Governance Committee recommend the approval of the amended policy attached to this report.**

**Carried**

- 5. Other Business
- 6. Consideration of Motion to Move In Camera

**That the Ottawa Police Service Board's Policy and Governance Committee adjourn the public portion of its meeting to move In Camera to discuss one matter involving information explicitly supplied in confidence to the Board by Canada, a province or territory or a Crown agency of any of them, a municipality or a First Nation, pursuant to section 44(2)(g) of the Community Safety and Policing Act.**

**Carried**

- 7. Adjournment  
The meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.
- 8. Next Meeting  
Thursday, May 8, 2025 - 11:00 AM