

January 22, 2020



EVALUATION OF ELECTION PROPOSAL COSTING 2019



OFFICE OF THE PARLIAMENTARY BUDGET OFFICER
BUREAU DU DIRECTEUR PARLEMENTAIRE DU BUDGET

The Parliamentary Budget Officer (PBO) supports Parliament by providing economic and financial analysis for the purposes of raising the quality of parliamentary debate and promoting greater budget transparency and accountability.

Lead Analyst:

Jason Jacques, Senior Director, Costing and Budgetary Analysis

Contributors:

Mark Mahabir, Director of Policy (Costing) and General Counsel

Nancy Beauchamp, Carol Faucher, Jocelyne Scrim and Rémy Vanherweghem assisted with the preparation of the report for publication.

For further information, please contact pbo-dpb@parl.gc.ca

Yves Giroux

Parliamentary Budget Officer

ADM001

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	2
2. Election Proposal Costing 2019: The Plan	3
3. Overview of the 120 Day Costing Period	5
4. Assessment	6
4.1. What Worked	6
4.2. What Needs to Change	8
Appendix A: Legislative Framework	11
Appendix B: Lessons Learned from the 2019 Election Proposal Costing Service	16
Appendix C: Proposed Legislative Amendments	18
Notes	20

Executive Summary

In 2017, the Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer (PBO) was provided with a legislative mandate to estimate the financial cost of the election proposals of political parties upon request (Appendix A).

Over four months in 2019 (June 24 to October 20), PBO successfully costed over 200 requests from political parties. Over 100 were ultimately published by the PBO.

PBO has undertaken a comprehensive review of the content and process underpinning Canada's first Election Proposal Costing (EPC) service. This review is informed by our experience, as well as consultations with political parties, journalists, the Federal Public Service and the academic community.

Overall, there is a consensus that the EPC service provided to political parties enhanced the credibility of the democratic process. At the same time, some adjustments are desirable.

This report offers nine recommendations:

- Eight recommendations build on effective practices (Appendix B).
 - Seven of these are administrative in nature and can be implemented under the existing remit of the PBO.
 - One recommendation (clarifying the legislative framework) will require Parliament to approve legislative amendments to the *Parliament of Canada Act* (Appendix C).
- In addition, there is one recommendation regarding how PBO could tailor the EPC process to accommodate a shorter time period as would be the case if the current Parliament is dissolved before the next fixed election date.

1. Introduction

In June 2017, Parliament enacted the *Budget Implementation Act, 2017, No.1*, which amended the *Parliament of Canada Act* to give the Parliamentary Budget Officer (the PBO) and the Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer (PBO) a new mandate to estimate the financial cost of election campaign proposals.

Section 79.21 of the *Parliament of Canada Act* provides the broad rules of engagement between PBO and political parties (Appendix A). However, it left many practical details to be determined.

Following consultation with political parties, PBO published a detailed operational framework regarding the approach to delivering this new mandate.¹ A core aspect of this framework was a commitment to review Canada's first legislated election proposal costing service.

This document presents the results of the review of PBO's experience during the 2019 federal election and feedback from stakeholders (such as political parties, the media, the academic community and the Federal Public Service).² Importantly, it also offers recommendations, including potential legislative amendments to the *Parliament of Canada Act* to enhance the transparency, relevance and quality of work for political parties and the democratic process.

2. Election Proposal Costing 2019: The Plan

PBO's plan for the 2019 EPC service had an overarching objective of enhancing public confidence in the election process. To that end, three key principles were adopted which framed the delivery of the service.

1. *Equity.* PBO's limited resources would be divided equally among all parties with representation in the House of Commons. This notionally translated to approximately 2,600 hours of analyst time for each political party during the 120-day costing period.
2. *Transparency.* The estimates published by PBO should have sufficient detail to allow an informed and motivated individual to understand the core cost drivers that influence the figures. In practice, this included a detailed listing of all key assumptions and a willingness to respond to any inquiries regarding how PBO arrived at the numbers.
3. *Credibility.* PBO would only provide political parties with cost estimates it deemed to be credible. This meant that proposals from political parties had to be sufficiently detailed to allow PBO to prepare quantitative analysis.

Beyond the confidential cost estimating service outlined in legislation, PBO also agreed (at the behest of political parties) to publish complimentary analytical products to support them in costing their platforms. This included a 10-year Economic and Fiscal Baseline, as well as an online application to estimate the impact of new spending proposals on public debt interest costs. While PBO did not cost the platforms themselves, these additional analytical products permitted political parties to generate an internally consistent fiscal framework.

PBO deemed information access and collaboration with the Federal Public Service to be a critical success factor for the EPC service. To that end, consistent with the legislation, PBO sought to negotiate Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) with federal departments and agencies. These MoUs outlined the types of data access and analytical support that the PBO could request, as well as the administrative terms under which the support would be provided. PBO was ultimately able to conclude four MoUs prior to the 120-day costing period and one during the costing exercise.³

Finally, the PBO also developed an internal control framework to ensure the confidentiality of all requests. This included two complimentary aspects:

1. *Compartmentalization of Information.* Requests and data were compartmentalized on a “need-to-know” basis. This meant that only the relevant analyst and the senior management team would be aware of each request.
2. *Anonymization.* All requests from political parties were anonymized before being allocated to PBO staff. In addition, all interactions with political parties were intermediated by a single point of contact in the PBO to ensure the identity of the requestor was kept confidential from the analyst assigned to the request.

Comprehensive details regarding the EPC 2019 Operational Plan are presented on the PBO Website.

3. Overview of the 120 Day Costing Period

The PBO's costing service officially began on June 24, 2019 and requests were received from political parties from that date. The volume of requests intensified over the course of the summer, culminating in 216 requests from political parties and 115 cost estimates from 5 parties published on our website.⁴

The demand for PBO cost estimates was more than double the original forecast. The gap between the forecast and actual demand is primarily attributable to an underestimation of the iterative process in political platform development. Specifically, the demand estimates were based on the number of final proposals presented in the 2011 and 2015 political platforms. This failed to account for the significant number of proposals developed by political parties that were ultimately not included in the official platforms.

Notwithstanding the high demand for the costing service, PBO was able to accommodate virtually all requests in a timely manner. This achievement was attributable to several factors. Most notably, PBO staff were more productive than anticipated. The 30 analytical staff were able to cost a wide range of policy proposals (many novel) in a remarkably short period. In addition, political parties demonstrated significant flexibility regarding priority-setting amongst their proposals, allowing the PBO to ensure that resources could be targeted to meet planned announcement dates of platform proposals. Finally, the Federal Public Service (in particular Finance Canada, Employment and Social Development Canada and Statistics Canada) were able to furnish timely access to data and, in some cases, thoughtful analysis.

The PBO received its last costing request following Thanksgiving Day, October 14th and published the final cost estimate shortly before the election.

Overall, the PBO costed roughly half of all the measures with a potential financial impact that were published by the parties during the campaign.

4. Assessment

The following section enumerates the plurality of views expressed by stakeholders, advice from other jurisdictions that undertake similar work and the PBO's own experience with the 2019 EPC service. A summary of all points is contained in Appendix B.

4.1. What Worked

The Economic and Fiscal Baseline

There was a general consensus that the PBO should continue to publish an Economic and Fiscal Baseline that could be used by political parties to build their platforms. While it is recognized that a "forecast is a forecast" and subject to error, allowing parties to have access to a common starting point is generally viewed as beneficial.

Some stakeholders noted that the 10-year forecast horizon seemed unrealistic and unnecessary, and that five years would be sufficient. This would be consistent with the fiscal frameworks published by political parties which contained time horizons of 5 years or less.

Recommendation #1: Continue to publish an Economic and Fiscal Baseline but consider limiting its time horizon to five years.

Online Tools

Stakeholders, political parties in particular, were very satisfied with the complimentary on-line tools offered by the PBO. These included the Ready Reckoner (to estimate the fiscal impacts of changes in key personal income tax parameters) and the Public Debt Interest Cost Calculator.

PBO was encouraged to expand its on-line offerings, as well as provide training sessions regarding the use of these tools.

Recommendation #2: The PBO should consider expanding the range of scenarios that can be evaluated via online tools and engage in additional outreach with stakeholders to broaden familiarity.

Memoranda of Understanding

Stakeholders generally acknowledged that the ability of the PBO to negotiate Memoranda of Understanding with federal departments and agencies improved the quality and timeliness of analysis provided to political parties. Federal Public Service stakeholders noted that an explicit written agreement provided certainty regarding the terms of engagement during the EPC period and “kept everyone honest”.

Recommendation #3: The PBO should expand the use of MoUs with the Federal Public Service beyond the EPC period, as well as broaden their use across federal departments and agencies.

Scope of Analysis

About half of stakeholders expressed the view that the PBO’s decision to limit the scope of analysis to static costs and, in some cases behavioural responses, was reasonable. In contrast, the other half of stakeholders held the view that the PBO analysis was too circumscribed and should be extended to include other factors, including distributional analysis and dynamic effects.

All stakeholders recognized that the existing capacity of the PBO was insufficient to include distributional and dynamic impacts for the high number of requests received during the 2019 Election campaign.

Recommendation #4: For the next EPC period, the PBO will undertake additional research regarding the behavioural responses to policy changes, where feasible. The PBO will also offer political parties distributional analysis when doing so requires little additional resources.

Confidentiality Protocols

All stakeholders noted that the confidentiality protocols employed by the PBO were effective and avoided leaked data or information.

Some stakeholders suggested that the confidentiality protocols could be less stringent to enhance the quality of timeliness of cost estimates. At the same time, most political parties reinforced that they perceived the downside risk of an inadvertent leak to be severe and therefore endorsed maintaining the current approach.

Recommendation #5: The confidentiality framework used by the PBO in EPC 2019 should be maintained.

4.2. What Needs to Change

Legislative Clarity

Notwithstanding extensive consultations with Finance Canada and the Privy Council Office regarding the legislative framework for Election Proposal Costing (EPC), several areas of uncertainty arose during the 120-day costing period. These primarily related to the legal obligation of the Federal Public Service to respond to our requests for information access and assistance.

For example, at the outset of the EPC service, questions were raised by the Federal Public Service regarding whether our interactions with departments and information requested during EPC would remain confidential or be subject to release under the *Access to Information Act*. In addition, some separate agencies initially interpreted the legislation to prohibit their collaboration with the PBO during the EPC period through a memorandum of understanding.

Recommendation #6: The existing legislative framework should be clarified to ensure its spirit and intent can be fulfilled, and to clarify that organizations that are not departments are also covered. A list of proposed legislative amendments is presented in Appendix C.

The Time Budget

As noted earlier, PBO notionally allocated approximately 2,600 hours of analyst time (that is, a Time Budget) to each of the six political parties with representation in the House of Commons at the time of dissolution. As well, PBO published a detailed calculation methodology to determine the hours of effort required to complete a cost estimate.

Several problems with this approach became evident early in the 120-day costing period. Most notably, some political parties indicated they limited the number of requests they submitted early in the period because of concerns regarding limited resources. This led to an underutilization of the costing service for the first month (that is, the PBO had excess capacity).

More problematically, the 2,600-hour budget did not account for the passage of time. Hence, political parties attempting to preserve their time raised the possibility that when they ultimately decided to submit requests the PBO would be overwhelmed.

Finally, the methodology to calculate the effort required to cost proposals generally overestimated the actual effort required. This led to unnecessary disagreements and considerable time wasted negotiating with political parties regarding how many hours should be charged for a particular estimate.

Ultimately, the PBO decided to waive the notional Time Budget. At the end of July, political parties were apprised that they should submit as many requests as they desired, but also clearly indicate the relative priority amongst those requests and the target completion date (or planned announcement date). The PBO management team allocated the Office's resources in an equitable manner, taking into consideration parties' prioritizations.

Recommendation #7: The Time Budget for the next EPC service should be simplified and managed with greater flexibility.

Envelope Costings

As outlined in the PBO's detailed operational guidance, a policy proposal requires several key operational parameters for an estimate to be provided. These include, among others, the implementation date, the rate or amount offered, the end date, etc.

In some instances, parties asked the PBO to cost proposals that consisted of predetermined, or fixed, amounts to attain certain policy objectives, indicating they deemed it valuable to have the PBO confirm these costings. PBO decided to list these proposals in a table with the mention that no analysis had been undertaken to assess whether the amounts would be sufficient to attain the stated policy objective, and that no independent costing was required for fixed envelopes. While some stakeholders criticized this approach, the caveat that no analysis had been undertaken, together with the presentation in a table format rather than the traditional two-pager, should limit potential confusion on the level of PBO analysis performed for these proposals. This approach mirrors that of the Australian Parliamentary Budget Office.

Most stakeholders were critical of this approach, noting that publishing a list of fixed envelopes created confusion regarding the probity of these numbers compared to actual PBO cost estimates. Several stakeholders noted that most of the public were unable to discern the difference between the two. As such, it hindered the overall credibility of the EPC service.

Recommendation #8: The presentation and communication of the Envelope List should be revisited for the next EPC exercise.

Considerations for an Early Federal Election

The PBO's current approach to EPC assumes that there will be a full 120 days to undertake the work. In the context of a minority Parliament, this may not be the case. Parliament may be dissolved before the next fixed election date on October 16, 2023. In such a situation, the time available to cost proposals would be considerably shortened and the PBO would be unable to cost a similar volume of requests as in 2019.

To accommodate shorter timelines, several stakeholders suggested that the PBO will need to focus on those proposals that are most relevant to the voters' decisions. Some stakeholders suggested that the PBO adopt a materiality threshold. That is, the PBO would need to deem that a proposal will likely cost above a certain dollar amount before a full costing is undertaken. This is a practice used in the Netherlands.

Recommendation #9: In the case of a federal election held before the next fixed election date, the PBO should consider establishing a materiality threshold.

Appendix A: Legislative Framework

Parliament of Canada Act

Mandate — general election

79.21 (1) During the period described in subsection (2), the Parliamentary Budget Officer shall, at the request of an authorized representative or a member, estimate the financial cost of any election campaign proposal that the authorized representative's party or the member is considering making.

Period

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1), the period begins on the 120th day before the date fixed under section 56.1 or 56.2 of the [Canada Elections Act](#) and ends on the day before the date of the next general election. However, if Parliament is dissolved before that 120th day, the period begins on the day on which Parliament is dissolved and ends on the day before the date of the next general election.

Request

(3) A request referred to in subsection (1) shall be made in writing and describe the proposal for which an estimate is requested, including relevant details and objectives.

Additional information

(4) The Parliamentary Budget Officer may, in writing, request additional information from an authorized representative of the party on behalf of which an estimate was requested or from the member who made a request for an estimate.

Ministerial agreement

(5) A minister who presides over a *department* within the meaning of paragraph (a) of the definition *department* in section 2 of the [Financial Administration Act](#) may, at the request of the Parliamentary Budget Officer, personally agree that his or her department will provide assistance to the Parliamentary Budget Officer in preparing estimates under subsection (1) during the period described in subsection (2).

(7) A minister who, under subsection (5), agrees that his or her department will provide assistance shall

(a) instruct his or her deputy to make any arrangements that his or her deputy considers necessary for the provision of the assistance, including, at

the deputy's discretion, arrangements respecting the terms under which the assistance is to be provided; and

(b) abstain from any personal involvement in the provision of the assistance.

Confidentiality

(8) If the Parliamentary Budget Officer makes a request to a deputy referred to in paragraph 7(a) for assistance in preparing an estimate under subsection (1), the Parliamentary Budget Officer shall not disclose to the deputy or any other person in the department the identity of the party on behalf of which the estimate was requested or the identity of the member who made the request for an estimate.

(9) Except for the purposes of subsection (10), information that is obtained or created in the provision of assistance referred to in subsection (8) shall not be disclosed to any person other than the Parliamentary Budget Officer.

(10) In order to provide assistance referred to in subsection (8), a person in a department may provide information to and obtain information from a person in another department if

(a) the other department is also a *department* within the meaning of paragraph (a) of the definition *department* in section 2 of the [Financial Administration Act](#); and

(b) the minister who presides over the other department has also agreed to provide assistance under subsection (5).

Withdrawal of request

(11) An authorized representative of the party on behalf of which the estimate was requested or the member who made the request may withdraw it, in writing, before a report containing the estimate is provided to an authorized representative or the member. If a request is withdrawn, the Parliamentary Budget Officer shall discontinue work on the request and shall not disclose the request or the estimate.

(12) The Parliamentary Budget Officer shall provide a report containing the estimate to an authorized representative of the party on behalf of which the estimate was requested or to the member who made the request.

(13) An authorized representative of the party on behalf of which an estimate was requested or the member who made a request shall notify the Parliamentary Budget Officer, in writing, if the proposal for which the estimate is requested has been publicly announced.

Report made public

(14) The Parliamentary Budget Officer shall make a report available to the public as soon as feasible after the report has been provided to the

authorized representative or the member under subsection (12) and the Parliamentary Budget Officer has been notified that the policy proposal has been publicly announced. However, the Parliamentary Budget Officer shall not make the report available to the public on or after the date of the general election.

Estimate not completed

(15) If, in the Parliamentary Budget Officer's opinion, he or she does not have sufficient time or information to complete a requested estimate within the period described in subsection (2), the Parliamentary Budget Officer shall notify an authorized representative of the party on behalf of which the estimate was requested or the member who made the request, in writing, that he or she is discontinuing work on the estimate and that it will not be completed.

Publication of request and statement

(16) If the Parliamentary Budget Officer discontinues work on a request under subsection (15) and the request is for an estimate of the financial cost of a proposal that has been publicly announced, the Parliamentary Budget Officer shall, before the end of the period described in subsection (2), publish the request and a statement of the reasons why the request could not be completed.

Definitions

(17) The following definitions apply in this section.

authorized representative means the leader of a recognized party in the House of Commons on the day before the first day of the period described in subsection (2) or a person authorized in writing by the leader for the purposes of this section. (représentant autorisé)

member means a person who is a member of the House of Commons on the day before the first day of the period described in subsection (2) but who is not a member of a recognized party on that day. (membre)

Definitions

79.3 The following definitions apply in sections 79.4 to 79.5.

department has the same meaning as in any of paragraphs (a), (a.1) and (d) of the definition department in section 2 of the Financial Administration Act. (ministère)

head has the same meaning as in section 3 of the Access to Information Act. (responsable d'institution fédérale)

parent Crown corporation has the same meaning as in subsection 83(1) of the Financial Administration Act. (société d'État mère)

Access to information

79.4 (1) Except as provided by any other Act of Parliament that expressly refers to this subsection, the Parliamentary Budget Officer is entitled, by request made to the head of a department or of a parent Crown corporation, to free and timely access to any information under the control of the department or parent Crown corporation that is required for the performance of his or her mandate.

Exception

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in respect of any information

(a) the disclosure of which is restricted under section 19 of the Access to Information Act;

(b) that is protected by solicitor-client privilege or professional secrecy of advocates and notaries or by litigation privilege;

(c) the disclosure of which is restricted under any provision of any other Act of Parliament set out in Schedule II to the Access to Information Act; or

(d) that is a confidence of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada as defined in subsection 39(2) of the Canada Evidence Act.

Refusal to provide access to information

79.41 If he or she refuses to provide access to information requested under subsection 79.4(1), the deputy minister of the department concerned or the person who occupies any other similar position for the federal institution or parent Crown corporation, as the case may be, shall provide the Parliamentary Budget Officer with a written justification for the refusal.

Notification

79.42 If the Parliamentary Budget Officer is of the opinion that he or she has not been provided with free or timely access to information requested under subsection 79.4(1), he or she may so notify the Speaker of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Commons or any appropriate committee of the Senate, of the House of Commons or of both Houses of Parliament.

Confidentiality

79.5 The Parliamentary Budget Officer, and every person referred to in subsections 79.11(3) and (4), shall not disclose any information that comes to their knowledge under subsection 79.21(9) or section 79.4, unless the disclosure is essential for the performance of the Parliamentary Budget Officer's mandate and, in the case of information referred to in subsection 79.21(9), the minister's deputy has consented to the disclosure.

Access to Information Act

Schedule II

Parliament of Canada Act

subsection 79.21(9)

Appendix B: Lessons Learned from the 2019 Election Proposal Costing Service

What Didn't Work and How Should it be Fixed?		
<i>What was it?</i>	<i>What was the problem?</i>	<i>How do we fix it?</i>
Legislative Ambiguity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After the 120-day period began, new questions were raised regarding the applicability of the <i>Access to Information Act</i>. Questions were also raised by separate agencies regarding their obligation (or ability) to respond to EPC requests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify legislation.
The Time Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overly detailed time budget difficult to administer consistently. Actual effort varied significantly from effort calculated from the guidelines. Time budget dissuaded some political parties from submitting requests. Time budget did not have a parameter for the elapsing 120-day period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update the time budget to reflect decay rates (that is, available resources will be reduced as time passes). Methodology needs to be simplified.
Envelope Costings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treating envelope costings as "estimates" created administrative burden and uncertainty regarding what was a PBO cost estimate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify approach to fixed envelope costings.

What Did Work and Should be Maintained/Enhanced?		
<i>What was it?</i>	<i>What was the benefit?</i>	<i>How do we build upon it?</i>
The Economic and Fiscal Baseline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided a common baseline to all political parties (happy clients) along with a common set of assumptions for preparing cost estimates (consistent modelling parameters). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Truncate the EPC baseline to 5 years.
Online Tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political parties were broadly happy with the Ready Reckoner and Public Debt Interest Cost Calculator, which provided them a common set of tools to cost platforms and prepare a preliminary assessment of potential requests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand online tools and offer additional training sessions.
Memoranda of Understanding with Government Departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where they were in place, the Memoranda of Understanding provided clarity regarding expectations and respective responsibilities. This expedited the PBO's interactions with the Federal Public Service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand use of MoUs.
Scope of Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By focussing on the static impacts and (where appropriate) behavioural analysis, the PBO was able to produce credible work in a timely manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake additional research regarding behavioural responses. • Offer distributional analysis if requested by political parties and considered feasible.
Confidentiality Protocols	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PBO's confidentiality framework was implemented as planned and there were no leaks of confidential information. This contributed to trust and confidence on the part of clients. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain same approach for next time.

Appendix C: Proposed Legislative Amendments

Access to Information during the EPC service and confidentiality:

Pursuant to 79.4 of the *Parliament of Canada Act*, the Parliamentary Budget Officer is entitled, upon request to a head of a department or of a parent Crown corporation, to information under the control of the department or parent Crown corporation. To maintain the confidentiality of the identity of the requestor and of the details of the request during the EPC service as required by subsection 79.21(6) of that act, such requests were made to the deputy minister rather than to the Minister. To ensure this procedure can be used for future election periods we propose that subsection 79.4(1) be amended to the following:

79.4 (1) Except as provided by any other Act of Parliament that expressly refers to this subsection, the Parliamentary Budget Officer

a) for the purpose of subsection 79.2(1) is entitled, by request made to the head of a department or of a parent Crown corporation, or

b) for the purpose of subsection 79.21 is entitled, by request made to the deputy head of a department or to the head of a parent Crown corporation,

to free and timely access to any information under the control of the department or parent Crown corporation.

Access to information and Arrangements for Assistance

Pursuant to subsections 79.21(5) and (7) of the *Parliament of Canada Act* a minister who presides over a *department* within the meaning of paragraph (a) of the definition *department* in section 2 of the *Financial Administration Act* may instruct his or her deputy to make any arrangements for the provision of assistance to the Parliamentary Budget Officer. Unfortunately, we were unable to conclude arrangements with certain agencies due to the exclusion of agencies from the definition of department in subsection 79.21(5). We propose that subsection 79.21(5) of the *Parliament of Canada Act* be amended to the following:

79.21(5) A minister who presides over a *department* within the meaning of paragraphs (a), (a.1) and (d) in the definition of *department* in section 2 of the *Financial Administration Act* may, at

the request of the Parliamentary Budget Officer, personally agree that his or her department will provide assistance to the Parliamentary Budget Officer in preparing estimates under subsection (1) during the period described in subsection (2).

Access to taxpayer information

Pursuant to paragraph 79.4(2)(c) of the *Parliament of Canada Act* and section 241 of the *Income Tax Act* and section 295 of the *Excise Tax Act* the Parliamentary Budget Officer is unable to obtain taxpayer information from the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA). During the EPC service the office obtained anonymized taxpayer information from both Statistics Canada and from the CRA. Although we were able to obtain data to fulfill all of the requests received from political parties, in certain cases the data was difficult to access due to restrictions imposed on the disclosure of data by Statistics Canada. We propose changes to subsection 241(4) of the *Income Tax Act* and subsection 295(5) of the *Excise Tax Act* to allow for the disclosure of taxpayer information by the Canada Revenue Agency to the Parliamentary Budget Officer for the purpose of his or her mandate.

New subparagraph 241(4)(d)(i.1)

(i.1) to the Parliamentary Budget Officer for purposes of section 79.2 or 79.21 of the *Parliament of Canada Act*.

New subparagraph 295(5)(d)(x)

(x) to the Parliamentary Budget Officer for purposes of section 79.2 or 79.21 of the *Parliament of Canada Act*.

Notes

1. Estimating the Financial Cost of Campaign Proposals: A Framework. Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer. 2018. Located at: https://www.pbo-dpb.gc.ca/web/default/files/Documents/General/CampaignFramework_EN_FI_NAL.pdf
2. The findings of this review are informed by consultations with political parties, journalists, academics, the Federal Public Service and other jurisdictions that undertake similar work.
3. Memoranda of Understanding were signed with Finance Canada, Employment and Social Development Canada, National Defence, Statistics Canada and Agriculture and AgriFood Canada. Located at: <https://www.pbo-dpb.gc.ca/en/election-proposal-costing>.
4. Publication figures do not include “envelope” requests, which the PBO deemed to be insufficiently detailed to properly cost.