

Full Integration	
Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>Future State Service Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improves client outcomes by maximizing benefits to clients while on the waitlist or within housing and through integrated intake process Improves data and information sharing, particularly around service demands and alternative service supports/offerings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer barriers for use of shared data systems (e.g. YARDI) with Housing Operations Supports coordinated local eligibility policy informed by broader understanding of local needs and data Aligns with citizen service expectations (clients don't understand why we can't share information and reduce burdens related to submitting duplicate income statements, for example) Supports innovation within integrated service delivery to meet local needs (e.g. integrated teams) More closely aligns with other municipal models and therefore easier to leverage best and emerging practices/innovation within the human services sector Service integration supports tenant transitions to self-sufficiency Supports the implementation of coordinate housing access systems directed by the provincial government (i.e. LTAHS) and federal government (i.e. Reaching Home) <p>Financial Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligns with provincial policy that supports service integration and coordination based on need: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Housing Renewal Strategy and legislative amendments Auditor General's Recommendations related to Social Housing Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy Ontario Housing Policy Statement Human services integration Aligns with provincial decisions to integrate funding envelopes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New funding policy – single-transfer payments Canada-Ontario Community Housing Initiative (COCHI) Ontario Priorities Housing Initiative <p>Maximum use of resources and systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improves opportunities to describe and justify budget needs, updating and answering questions on housing landscape/pressures, to Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E.g. Council can be actively involved in service system management Aligns housing services within a local system management approach to the delivery of all social services Retains 'healthy tension' between the Community Resource Unit and Housing Operations, balancing tenants support with desire to avoid accumulating debt due to arrears owed Strategic and nimble use of mobilizing personnel and resources where shared service requirements exist across programs (ERO, CPO, Intake), and based on changing local needs Allows for consistent access to expertise across corporation (i.e. IT, HR, Public Health) Supports integration of CPCs within human services planning and service delivery Common organizational philosophy and vision developed collaboratively Collective planning/strategy/development (NR planning, NRH, Finance, Community Services) to support maximizing investments in affordable housing that allow for the greatest ROI Broad team for cross training and development (across the entire corporation) supports sense of inclusion and opportunities for upwards mobility Less extensive change management involved (e.g. doesn't require roles to be split, can maintain good relationships amongst staff and with provider community) Reflects learning in the housing system (build off municipal innovation and emerging practices) Enhanced/improved staff delegation of authority (e.g. HR processes, purchasing authority, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some policy changes (e.g. procurement, etc.) which may limit previous levels of flexibility (e.g. to procure services for asset/property maintenance) Change management still required for legal, HR, finance, etc. Labour relations - some employees will transition to a unionized environment, and therefore they may have different perceptions of the benefits or drawbacks of unionization Loss of NRH brand/profile in the community

Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ability to leverage flexible funding to support expansion of CPC supports to other providers or private landlords• Improves ability to capitalize/respond effectively to future funding opportunities (e.g. supportive housing)• Improves ability to recruit and retain staff within housing sector as model is aligned with learning and development in other municipalities▪ Supports opportunities for human services integration (e.g. common intake, warm hand offs between programs, coordinated access)▪ Offers ability to follow/track the client through the system through streamlined information sharing across programs• Better positioned to respond to changes local needs across human services• Advances planning and implementation oversight of Affordable Housing Strategy• Aligns long-term asset planning for public housing stock with fulsome understanding of current and future local needs• Increases profile of housing at many tables (CLT, LAMS, CAO tables)• Institutionalized roles and relationships not relying on agreements and personalities• Creates new opportunities to understand local community through housing needs analysis that extends beyond the waitlist as the sole measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Potential confusion regarding Board vs. Council governance roles as NRH as a corporation which holds assets would still exist• Perception of a possible diminished role of housing within the larger entity of municipal government• Possible effects on employee morale for those positions that get red circled in the transition

Hybrid Model	
Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • Improves client outcomes • Improves ability to offer additional services while on waitlist through integrated intake process • Improves data and information sharing, particularly around service demands and alternative service supports/offering • Supports coordinated local eligibility policy informed by broader understanding of local needs and data • Aligns with citizen service expectations (clients don't understand why we can't share information and reduce burdens related to submitting duplicate income statements, for example) • Aligns with provincial policy that supports service integration and coordination based on need: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Community Housing Renewal Strategy and legislative amendments ○ Auditor General's Recommendations related to Social Housing ○ Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy ○ Ontario Housing Policy Statement ○ Human services integration • Aligns with provincial decisions to integrate funding envelopes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New funding policy – single-transfer payments ○ Canada-Ontario Community Housing Initiative (COCHI) ○ Ontario Priorities Housing Initiative • Supports innovation within integrated service delivery to meet local needs (e.g. integrated teams) • More closely aligns with other municipal models and therefore easier to leverage best and emerging practices/innovation within the human services sector • Service integration supports tenant transitions to self-sufficiency • Enables a streamlined and coordinated approach to system planning and new development based on local needs • Supports the implementation of coordinate housing access systems directed by the provincial government (i.e. LTAHS) and federal government (i.e. Reaching Home) • Offers more opportunity for integrated discussion and justification of budget needs for housing services and in relation to other Community Services, to Council • Aligns housing services within a local system management approach to the delivery of all social services • Retains 'healthy tension' between the Community Resource Unit and Housing Operations within NRH as a housing provider • Enables coordinated strategic planning for decisions to be made at the system level not just at the program level • More closely aligns with provincial models and therefore easier to leverage best practices and innovation in the sector • Offers some reduction in duplication of services: coordinated landlord engagement strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPC is not integrated with other support services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Limited opportunities to leverage broader resources for CPCs (within the Community Services Department and across the corporation – e.g. Public Health Mental Health) • Lose relationship between Housing Operations and Service Manager policy, which could impact capital supports to providers • Collaboration between Community Services and NRH (Housing Operations and CRU) is dependent on relationships between existing staff • Info and data sharing is split with Housing Operations • Smaller teams of staff present a risk of siloing services and less capacity for development and cross-training • Performance indicators not aligned with serving those with greatest need (within Housing Operations as a separate entity) • Loss of NRH brand/profile in the community • Segregation of housing from other services results in decreased integration, only serves to shift the existing collaboration barriers • Impact to reporting processes and admin processes where both sides of the NRH business are required to collaborate • Reduced ability to plan and collaborate between programs and capital (i.e. BCA, RFPs) • Inequity of support from region and council for programs and operations • Significant change management required <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Both organizations would require access to the same data base (YARDI) ○ Budget would need to be split up and realigned/transferred ○ New operating and shared service agreements ○ Split/divided roles challenging to navigate and require new processes, job descriptions, etc. for both organizations

Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Supports opportunities for human services integration (e.g. common intake, warm hand offs between programs, coordinated access)▪ Offers ability to follow/track the client through the system through streamlined information sharing across programs• Better positioned to respond to changes local needs across human services• Opportunity to broaden Community Services’ relationship with provider community• Improves ability to capitalize/respond effectively to future funding opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Less able to apply support service housing dollars to community housing providers as CRU is outside of Community Services• Not fully aligned with evolving learning and development in the housing sector and therefore may be less able to attract staff• Possible risk of bias in favour of the client may ignore the needs/sustainability of NRH Housing Operations or other providers – e.g. service priorities may become too focused on eviction prevention and outweigh housing operations ability to maintain stock, maintain reserves, etc.• Perceived risk that Community Services will be overly focused on high-risk populations and those in extreme poverty and lose sight of broader affordable housing strategy (e.g. support for mixed income housing projects)• Most significant change management considerations (compared to other models)

Status Quo	
Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A ‘healthy tension’ between the Community Resource Unit and Housing Operations ensures NRH as a housing provider balances tenants support with desire to avoid accumulating debt due to arrears owed • Service Manager policy (local rules, priorities, waiting list system decisions, etc.) is created and amended based on NRH’s experience as a housing provider operationalizing/adhering to such policy • Less red tape exists as it relates to purchasing services for asset and property maintenance, and new development of NRH-owned stock compared to Regional procurement by-law requirements • NRH has a standalone identity and reputation as a housing organization in the community • Long-standing relationships with other housing providers • Skilled and committed staff • Flexibility of movement and development of staff in-house • Staff seek to collaborate to overcome structural barriers (e.g. Affordable Housing Working Group) • Consistent approach to service delivery on both sides of the NRH business • Existing in house capital program and asset management plan • Housing service level standards controlled by the ACT is better managed by one entity • Does not require splitting or dividing of roles or workload 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waitlist system management and Service Manager policy lacks alignment with service delivery across all other human services and system policy (particularly within income-tested programs such as Ontario Works and childcare fee subsidy) • Limited ability to share client data to support integrated service delivery and system planning • Limited opportunities to leverage broader resources (within the Community Services Department and across the corporation – e.g. Public Health Mental Health) • Difficulty in describing and justifying budget needs, updating and answering questions on housing landscape/pressures, to Council in light of current structure as an ABC • NRH strategic planning process is isolated from broader Council strategic planning • Some duplication of services exist between NRH and Community Services: client support services to prevent eviction, and landlord engagement strategy • Collaboration between NRH and Community Services is dependent on relationships between existing staff as integration is not structurally engrained • Poor model to respond to requirements to implement coordinated access (i.e. Reaching Home and LTAHS) • Not aligned with provincial policy that supports service integration and coordination based on need: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Community Housing Renewal Strategy and legislative amendments focus on helping tenants become economically sufficient, making it easier to predict and calculate rent, shortening waitlist, helping people in greatest need, and making community housing safer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.g. Exempt income for full-time students to encourage households to enroll in post-secondary education ▪ E.g. Waitlist applicants will receive one housing offer instead of three ▪ E.g. Asset testing of waitlist applicants ○ Auditor General’s Recommendations related to Social Housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.g. Integrate employment/educational supports to tenants to better enable transitions out of social housing ▪ E.g. Prioritize those most in need by developing a new needs-based eligibility and prioritization process ○ Long-Term Affordable Housing Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.g. Implement a more coordinated access system for people in need as waitlist systems operate separately from parallel systems providing access to other forms of housing assistance (both financial and non-financial) ○ Ontario Housing Policy Statement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.g. Demonstrate how progress will be made in moving toward integrated human services planning and delivery, as improved integration of housing and homelessness services with other human services will result in better outcomes for the people • Not aligned with provincial decisions to integrate funding envelopes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New funding policy – single-transfer payments ○ Canada-Ontario Community Housing Initiative (COCHI) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Funding to Service Managers can be used for both community housing providers and supportive housing providers who offer integrated housing and support services ○ Ontario Priorities Housing Initiative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Funding to Service Managers can be used for new affordable rental construction, community housing repair, etc. – in addition to support services that will keep people housed and prevent homelessness.

Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through continued dialogue with providers, and informed by CPC work in relationship with NRH Housing Operations, would like to expand CPC supports to other community housing providers • Cross-staff learning and development opportunities • Review and update the shared service agreement between the Region and NRH • Increased reports to council • Take better advantage of regional training and education opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evolving provincial policy continues to identify human service integration as a key objective as it supports improved client outcomes and service efficiency • There is a perception of conflict of interest with funding allocation (whether NRH funds it's own corporation as a housing provider vs. decisions to fund other providers) • A structurally challenging model to receive and reallocate single transfer payment from the province which is designated for income-tested programs – childcare fee subsidy, housing and social assistance • Integration of additional provincial funding envelopes for housing and support services will also be increasingly difficult to discern how to separately allocate monies between NRH and Community Services • Significant focus on affordable housing with limited capital investment – need to focus more on planning/finance and collaborative strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.g. 3 year funding letter (IAH-E has ended) • Relationship between NRH and Community Services is an agreement-based model which is vulnerable to staff and priority changes • Poverty populations facing further funding reductions must be considered in needs-based model • Difficulty recruiting as not fully aligned with evolving learning and development in the housing sector and therefore may be less able to attract staff • Possible inability to capitalize/respond effectively to future funding opportunities