



1593 Four Mile Creek Road  
P.O. BOX 100, Virgil, ON L0S 1T0  
905-468-3266 • FAX: 905-468-2959

---

[www.notl.com](http://www.notl.com)

---

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Municipal Accommodation Tax Committee

**FROM:** Kyle Freeborn, Director of Corporate Services/Treasurer

**DATE:** 2025-02-18

**SUBJECT:** Summary Report of Municipal Accommodation Tax Funding Criteria

---

Staff have prepared a summary report of the committee work completed and approved in principle of the Municipal Accommodation Tax Committee on the following pages. If approved via email, the following materials will be forwarded to Council for consideration and approval.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "K. Freeborn", is written over the signature line.

**Kyle Freeborn, CPA, CMA**  
**Director of Corporate Services/Treasurer**

# **Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report**

## **1. Project Overview**

- Town Staff partnered with Optimus SBR to support the Municipal Accommodation Tax (MAT) Committee in prioritizing the allocation of municipal MAT revenues and the development of MAT spending criteria.
- The goal was to identify project types for funding, exclude non-aligned projects, and develop evaluation criteria to guide funding decisions.
- As of December 10, 2024, the MAT Committee has developed and approved the MAT spending criteria summarized below in principle.

## **2. MAT Funding**

- The MAT was approved by Town Council on June 20, 2022, which applied a 2% tax to the room rate of Transient Accommodation Providers with five or more rooms. The rate approved increased to 3% effective January 1, 2024, and 4% January 1, 2025.
- On October 24, 2023, the scope of MAT was updated to include all accommodation providers.
- Funds collected will be placed in a special reserve until spending criteria are developed, except for funds used to administer the program and the 50% share allocated to the eligible tourism entity – Tourism Niagara-on-the-Lake.

## **3. MAT Collected and Disbursed**

- As of December 31, 2024, the Town has collected the following amounts under the MAT Program.
  - 2022: \$453,148.77 (50% Town/Tourism NOTL = \$226,574)
  - 2023: \$1,505,503 (50% after Town administration costs Town/Tourism NOTL = \$742,488.90)
  - 2024: \$2,497,694 YTD (50% after staffing costs Town/Tourism NOTL = \$1,248,847)
- The Town disbursed \$500,000 in 2024 to the Niagara-on-the-Lake Museum for an existing commitment to their capital improvement at the Museum project.
- The Town's current reserve balance sits at approximately \$1,717,910 as of the end of 2024 but is still subject to change with closing the books for fiscal 2024 year-end.

## **4. MAT Funding Exclusions:**

- The MAT Committee recommends that the following items not be funded:
  - Projects with no clear tourism-related benefit (e.g., general Town infrastructure not tied to tourism.)
  - Initiatives intended solely to stabilize municipal taxes or replace existing budgeted items.
  - High-risk projects lacking defined stakeholder benefits or measurable outcomes.
  - "Slush funds" or discretionary grants without accountability mechanisms.

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

- Salaries, except for administrative roles tied to managing MAT projects.

### 5. MAT Funding Streams

The MAT Committee has recommended three streams of available funding for internal and external projects:

- **Infrastructure Projects:** 20% for internal Town infrastructure projects, addressing the invisible burden tourism places on the Town's infrastructure. This portion is to be managed by Town Staff without strict reporting requirements on fund usage beyond normal reporting on usage and approval within the Town's budget cycle, Staff will allocate the funds to various projects, subject to Council approval.
- **Minor Stream:** 20% for small projects under \$100,000, evaluated on a rolling basis. This stream would be open to the public and Town Departments for application.
- **Major Stream:** 60% for large projects over \$100,000, evaluated on a competitive basis at set times throughout the year, with funds being allocated based on the most impactful proposals – based on the following Major Stream criteria evaluation. This stream would be open to the public and Town Departments via an application.

For illustrative purposes, the following amounts at the beginning of 2025 could be allocated to the various streams based on a reserve balance of \$1,717,910:

- \$343,582 for Town Infrastructure Projects
- \$343,582 under the Minor Stream for projects under \$100,000.
- \$1,030,746 under the Major Stream for projects over \$100,000.

The MAT Committee is recommending the formation of a new MAT Committee, which would fulfill the role of MAT oversight, vetting applications for adherence to criteria/established protocol, and making recommendations to the Council on applications.

#### Key Evaluation Criteria:

- **Infrastructure Projects:** These are generally expected to be allocated to projects that address the impacts of tourism on Town infrastructure, like roads, sidewalks, public spaces, and facilities heavily used by tourists.
- **Minor Stream**
  - **Strategic Alignment:** Must align with at least one pillar of the Strategic Plan, and once enacted, the Tourism Strategy
  - **Clear Tourism Benefits:** Projects must provide evident benefits to tourism, with secondary benefits to residents viewed favourably.
  - **Realistic Cost Estimates:** Proposals require realistic cost breakdowns with controls to prevent overruns.
  - **Evaluation Process:** Based on a Pass/Fail and Yes/No Assessment, primarily handled by staff with recommendations to a MAT Committee with criteria outlined in **Figure I**.

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

- A more thorough explanation of each individual criteria can be found in **Appendix A.**

**Figure I: Minor stream Evaluation Criteria:**

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting
Alignment with existing/ planned Town Plans	Alignment with at least 1 pillar of the <b>Town Strategic Plan</b>	Pass/Fail	Mandatory
	Alignment with at least 1 pillar of the <b>Tourism Strategy</b>	Pass/Fail	Mandatory
	Some level of alignment with the Town's <b>Climate Change Action Plan</b>	Pass/Fail	Important, not mandatory
Clear Benefit to Tourism	Benefits to one or more sectors of Tourism	Pass/Fail	Mandatory
Other Expected Benefits	Identification of other groups who will receive benefit	Ranking (1-5)	High
Realistic Cost Evaluation	Evidence that costs are realistic and controls in place to manage growth/expansion	Pass/Fail	Mandatory
Ownership	Clearly accountable Individual or Organization to <b>Develop</b> the proposal	Pass/Fail	Mandatory
	Clearly accountable Individual or Organization to <b>Implement</b> the proposal	Pass/Fail	Mandatory
	Clearly accountable Individual or Organization to <b>Operate</b> the proposal	Pass/Fail	Mandatory
Alignment with other initiatives	Alignment with other initiatives that would amplify the outcome	Yes/No	High
Discrete Work	Is the initiative a unique piece of work or does it depend on other initiatives	Yes/No	High
Realistic Timeline	Is there a clear and realistic timeline of less than 1 year from start to completion?	Pass/Fail	Mandatory

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

- **Major Stream**
  - **Mandatory Criteria**
    - Must align with at least one pillar of the Town's Strategic Plan. Future alignment with the Tourism Strategy will be mandatory once finalized.
    - Ownership: Clear accountability for development, implementation, and ongoing operations.
  - **Scored Criteria ranked 1-5 based in the following areas:**
    - Cost and Benefit Analysis (ROI): Evaluates whether the benefits outweigh the costs.
    - Benefits to Tourism and Residents: Assesses direct and indirect impacts on tourism and community.
    - Synergies: Looks at integration with existing projects, resource-shaping potential, and collaborative opportunities.
    - Risk Assessment: Considers cost of implementation, the likelihood of achieving stated goals, and project dependencies.
  - Criteria outlined in a table format in **Figure II**.
  - A more thorough explanation of each criteria is provided in **Appendix B**.

**Figure II: Major Stream Evaluation Criteria:**

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting
Alignment with existing/planned Town Plan	Alignment with at least 1 pillar of the <b>Town Strategic Plan</b>	Pass/Fail	Mandatory
	Alignment with at least 1 pillar of the <b>Tourism Strategy</b>	Pass/Fail	Mandatory
	Some level of alignment with the Town's <b>Climate Change Action Plan</b>	Pass/Fail	Important, not mandatory
Benefits	Cost & Benefit Analysis (Return on Investment)	Ranking (1-5)	High
	Benefits to Tourism Industry	Ranking (1-5)	Medium
	Benefits to Residents of the Town	Ranking (1-5)	Medium
Synergies	Integration with Existing Projects	Ranking (1-5)	High
	Resource Sharing Potential	Ranking (1-5)	Medium
	Collaborative Opportunities	Ranking (1-5)	Low
	Enhancement of Existing Services	Ranking (1-5)	Medium
Risk Assessment	Cost of Implementation	Ranking (1-5)	Mandatory
	Achievement of Goals	Ranking (1-5)	Medium
	Dependencies	Ranking (1-5)	Medium
Ownership	Clearly Accountable Individual or Organization to <b>Develop</b> the proposal	Pass/Fail	Mandatory

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

	Clearly Accountable Individual or Organization to <b>Implement</b> the proposal	Pass/Fail	Mandatory
	Clearly Accountable Individual or Organization to <b>Operate</b> the proposal	Pass/Fail	Mandatory

### Intake Process Highlights

- Proposals for the Minor and Major Stream would be submitted through a centralized point, reviewed initially by Staff within Corporate Services, and then escalated to the MAT Committee and/or Council as needed.
- Senior Staff or Council Members must endorse proposals to ensure legitimacy.

### Appendix II of Report CS-25-006 – MAT Committee Facilitation Support

**Summary Report 2** contains a more thorough overview of the MAT Committee's work and timelines.

### Next Steps

- **Council Review and Approval:** Council will consider the MAT Committee's recommendations for spending criteria and if agreeable, approve them.
- **Program Development:** Should Council approve the criteria and framework, Staff will further develop the MAT Investment Program, designing and developing policies, grant applications, intake process and evaluation forms for the Minor and Major Streams, and make recommendations to Council to ensure adequate resources exist to deliver the program.
- **Legal Considerations:** Additional steps to include legal review for a grant-based approach. Careful consideration of Section 106 of the Municipal Act needs to be considered, as well as who retains ownership of completed projects so that the public can access these benefits into the future.

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix A – Minor Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
Alignment with existing/planned Town Plan	This set of criteria ensures that the funding request aligns with the Town’s broader goals and plans that are already in place.			
	Town Strategic Plan	Pass/Fail	Mandatory	Mandatory alignment with at least 1 pillar of the Corporate Strategy, ideally multiple pillars.
	Town Tourism Strategy (when enacted)	Pass/Fail	Mandatory	Mandatory alignment with at least 1 pillar of the Tourism Strategy, ideally multiple pillars.

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
	Town Climate Change Action Plan	Pass/Fail	Important, not mandatory	<p>At least some level of alignment is important.</p> <p>If a proposal aligns well with the CCAP, this should be seen as a benefit and should earn additional “points” towards its review/success.</p>

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix A – Minor Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
Clear Benefit to Tourism	Understanding the benefits the proposed funding request is promising for the tourism sector.			
	Benefits to one or more sectors of tourism	Pass/Fail	Mandatory	Clear benefits to at least one tourism sub-sector will be critical for a request to be considered. If there is no clear benefit to the tourism industry, the request will not be considered further (in its current form).

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
Other Expected Benefits (e.g., residents)	Understanding the benefits of the proposed funding request to other groups, ensuring that there are no negative outcomes for stakeholders.			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification of other groups who will receive benefit</li> </ul>	Ranking (1 – 5)	High	<p>While not mandatory, identifying other groups who will benefit as a result of the funding proposal is important to consider.</p> <p>If no other groups are identified, there may be a desire/need to have the Town negotiate the proposal to determine if/how the proposal can be amended to generate additional benefits.</p>



## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix A – Minor Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
Realistic cost evaluation	Evaluating the cost of the funding request, ensuring that it is in the appropriate evaluation stream, and that the estimates itself are realistic and will not continue to grow/expand due to a lack of controls in place.			
	Evidence that the proposed cost is realistic and that there are controls to manage growth/expansion.	Pass/Fail	Mandatory	<p>All funding proposals must be submitted with a realistic cost estimate. This should include an overview of the major cost drivers, rough cost breakdowns (e.g., materials costs, reasonable estimate at labour costs, etc.)</p> <p>If the funding request does not provide a cost estimate, it should be rejected as it is unclear if it will belong in the appropriate evaluation stream.</p> <p>If, in the eyes of the Town, the funding request does not have a realistic cost estimate, or if additional detail is required, the Town may choose to either reject the funding request, or it can elect to negotiate with the proponent to receive additional information prior to making a final decision.</p>

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix A – Minor Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
Ownership	This set of criteria ensures that ownership of the proposed activity/item/solution is thought through and identified.			
	Development: Clearly Accountable Individual or Organization	Pass/Fail	Mandatory	Is there a clear individual or group who will own the development of the proposed item/solution/activity?
	Implementation: Clear Accountable Individual or Organization	Pass/Fail	Mandatory	Is there a clear individual or group who will own the implementation activities, ensuring the idea is successfully implemented?
	Ongoing Operations: Clear Accountable Individual or Organization	Pass/Fail	Mandatory	Is there a clear individual or group who will own the ongoing operations of the request.  Note: if the request does not require any ongoing operations (e.g., it is implemented and then requires no ongoing maintenance, support, or review) this is not seen as required).

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix A – Minor Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
Alignment with other Initiatives	Reviewing the funding request to understand if/how it may align with other items that are either in place today or are expected to be in place in the near term.			
	Is there alignment with other initiatives that would amplify the effect/outcome of either initiative?	Yes/No	High	<p>While not mandatory, if there are other possible projects that have been completed, or are in the process of being completed, that this project can align with and/or amplify, this should be considered a benefit.</p> <p>If there are no other initiatives that this item aligns with, this does not disqualify the funding request, but will not be seen as beneficial as those that do align with others.</p>

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix A – Minor Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
<b>Discrete work</b>	While the above criteria evaluates if there are opportunities to align with other initiatives, this section evaluates if the work is its own unique item, or if it is a broader suite of activities. While not mandatory, this can help to identify if this funding request should be grouped with others for a larger impact and/or if the funding request is being placed in this funding request in a potentially inappropriate manner (i.e., breaking up a competition-level request into smaller chunks to receive a less stringent review).			
	Is the initiative its own unique piece of work, or does it depend on other initiatives?	Yes/No	High	<p>While not mandatory, if a funding request is dependent upon other tourism activities for its successful completion/implementation, this should be considered by the Town. For example, if the request relies on a regularly occurring event (e.g., assuming that bicycle tours of the wineries/the Town continue), this can be seen as a minor point.</p> <p>However, if the request relies on other possible initiatives being approved or major capital investment by the Town in other possible activities, this should be considered and may negatively impact the evaluation of the request.</p>

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix A – Minor Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
Realistic Timeline	Evaluating if the funding request can realistically be completed in within a calendar year, which would limit risk to the Town.			
	Is there a clear and realistic timeline of less than 1 year from start to completion?	Pass/Fail	Mandatory	<p>Funding requests should not require multiple calendar years to be completed, as this increases risk for cost overruns and/or negative impacts to ownership and the achievement of the request goals.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to those funding requests that are multi-phased (i.e., creation/implementation/ongoing operations). If ongoing operations are expected to extend beyond a calendar year (e.g., in perpetuity), this should not be viewed negatively.</p>

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix B – Major Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
<b>Corporate Strategy (Strategic Plan)</b>	Alignment with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Vibrant &amp; Complete Community</li> <li>○ Good Governance</li> <li>○ Enrich Community Assets, Environment &amp; Infrastructure</li> </ul>	Pass/Fail	Mandatory	Mandatory alignment with at least 1 pillar of the Corporate Strategy, ideally multiple pillars.
<b>Tourism Strategy</b>	<i>Note: when the Tourism Strategy is released, a similar structure compared to the Corporate Strategy should be incorporated.</i>	Pass/Fail	Important until developed	Alignment with at least 1 pillar of the Tourism Strategy (once developed and approved) will be mandatory, with the expectation of aligning with multiple pillars where possible.  During the transitional period, flexibility may be applied until the strategy is fully approved.

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix B – Major Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
<b>Climate Change Adaptation Plan</b>	Alignment with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Integrate Climate Change into Plans, Policies, By-Laws and Standards</li> <li>○ Build Urban Forest Resiliency</li> <li>○ Reduce Flooding Risks</li> <li>○ Incorporate Climate Change in Design and Construction</li> <li>○ Minimize Health and Safety Risks to Community Members</li> <li>○ Support Public Awareness and Education</li> </ul>	Pass/Fail	Important, not mandatory	At least some level of alignment is important.  If a proposal aligns well with the CCAP, this should be seen as a benefit and should earn additional “points” towards its review/success.

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix B – Major Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
<b>Benefits</b>	<p>This section contemplates the overarching benefits that the funding request is proposing to offer to various stakeholders, including the Town, the local tourism sector, and residents. While no criteria presented is marked as “Mandatory”, if items are absent or poorly presented, consideration should be given to the need for further edits, negotiation, or if the request should be dismissed. However, given the competition manner of the Major Stream, it is expected that those funding requests that are lacking in detail or benefits will score lower than others, and will likely be unsuccessful in their funding request.</p>			
	Cost & Benefit Analysis (ROI)	Ranking (1-5)	High	<p>Does the estimated cost of the project outweigh the expected benefits to be enjoyed by the Town.</p> <p>Higher ranking funding requests should provide a clear cost and benefit analysis, outlining cost drivers, having relatively accurate costs identified, and having benefits defined at multiple levels (tourism industry, Town, residents, experiences, environment, etc.). Those funding requests that are missing this information should rank low (i.e., 1).</p> <p>NOTE: This suggests that proposals should have, at a minimum, an estimated cost (with assumptions to validate/justify costs), as well as expected benefits to various stakeholders (tourists, industry [including potential sub-strata of the industry], residents). Costs can be further reviewed/estimated during the staff-level review of a funding proposal.</p>



## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix B – Major Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
	Benefit to Tourism Industry	Ranking (1-5)	Medium	<p>Understanding that the tourism industry has multiple sub-components, there are two methods which can be considered for scoring points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The more aspects of the tourism industry that will receive benefits, as well as the expected impact of the benefit, the higher the proposal ranks.</li> <li>2. Separate point systems for each potential sub-group, which are then added and averaged to give the overall ranking for this sub-criteria.</li> </ol>
	Benefit to Residents of the Town	Ranking (1-5)	Medium	<p>Recognizing that residents should receive <i>some</i> benefit, and there should be no negative impact to residents, this should be scored based on the level of benefit expected.</p> <p>If negative impacts are expected, this should call into consideration the proposal altogether and/or precipitate the negotiation of the proposal.</p> <p>Higher ranking funding requests should have multiple clearly defined benefits for residents of the Town.</p>

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix B – Major Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
<b>Synergies</b>	This section reviews the full suite of potential synergies that funding requests may achieve if approved and implemented. These are not considered mandatory but are seen as important considerations that can improve the effectiveness of the proposed solution.			
	Integration with Existing Projects	Ranking (1-5)	High	If the project dovetails with or builds on an existing project, the project will receive a higher score, as it can have greater impacts than a standalone project or task.
	Resource Sharing Potential	Ranking (1-5)	Medium	If the execution of the project can allow for a sharing of resources with other ongoing projects, reducing the need for hiring exclusive resources, this will be seen as a benefit and will score higher than projects with unique needs.
	Collaborative Opportunities	Ranking (1-5)	Low	Identifying opportunities where the project – either once completed or while in progress – can either enhance existing tourism activities, or it can create future opportunities for collaboration to result in a bigger tourism impact for NOTL.
	Enhancement of Existing Services	Ranking (1-5)	Medium	Does the project, once complete, further enhance the offerings of existing services in the Town? Does this negatively impact the tourism or day-to-day services for Town residents?

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix B – Major Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
<b>Risk Assessment</b>	This set of criteria are designed to understand the level of risk the proposed funding request will require the Town to incur. These explore items related to cost of the solution, the likelihood that the expected benefits can be achieved, and the reliance of the request on other initiatives and/or activities.			
	Cost of Implementation	Ranking (1-5)	Mandatory	<p><i>Separate from ROI.</i></p> <p>Understanding the cost of the project and determining if the cost is commensurate with what would be seen as reasonable and expected. Understanding the cost drivers and, to a degree of certainty, the actual costs expected in implementation and ongoing operation of the proposed funding request.</p> <p>Those projects that have a lower implementation cost, as well as those that have greater detail in the costs presented, should score higher.</p>

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix B – Major Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
	Achievement of Goals	Ranking (1-5)	Medium	<p>Is there a clear and realistic manner in which the proposed goals/outcomes of the funding request will be realized? Are the proposed benefits/outcomes aligned with realistic expectations, or are there large assumptions made that distort the realistic outcomes/goals.</p> <p>Funding requests with clear, realistic and achievable goals will score higher than those funding requests that exaggerate their likely outcomes.</p>
	Dependencies	Ranking (1-5)	Medium	<p>What dependencies are required to ensure that the project is successfully completed by the Town?</p> <p>Projects with less dependencies will score higher compared to those with more dependencies, as it will indicate the ability for a project/activity to be completed in a discrete, structured manner.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to identify if there are dependencies that are required to achieve broader impacts or outcomes.</p> <p>Care should be given to not misconstrue a <i>collaboration opportunity</i> with a required dependency for success.</p>

## Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake - Summary MAT Funding Criteria Report

### Appendix B – Major Stream Criteria

Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Evaluation	Weighting	Notes:
<b>Ownership</b>	This set of criteria are designed to ensure that the funding request has thought through the ownership of the proposed activity/item/solution from all necessary stages – development, implementation, and ongoing operations. The need for clear ownership is considered mandatory, and if these are not provided, the Town can determine if further negotiation is appropriate, or if the request should be dismissed outright, allowing the proponent to resubmit at a later date, to be considered in a future round of competition.			
	Development: Clearly Accountable Individual or Organization	Pass/Fail	Mandatory	Is there a clear individual or group who will own the development of the proposed item/solution/activity?
	Implementation: Clear Accountable Individual or Organization	Pass/Fail	Mandatory	Is there a clear individual or group who will own the implementation activities, ensuring the idea is successfully implemented?
	Ongoing Operations: Clear Accountable Individual or Organization	Pass/Fail	Mandatory	Is there a clear individual or group who will own the ongoing operations of the request.  Note: if the request does not require any ongoing operations (e.g., it is implemented and then requires no ongoing maintenance, support, or review) this is not seen as required).