



# Evaluation of the *Contraventions Act* Program

## Final Report

January 2026

Evaluation Branch  
Internal Audit and Evaluation Sector

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Chief Audit and Evaluation Executive would like to thank the Evaluation Working Group, evaluation team and individuals who contributed insights and input to this evaluation. Evaluation participants included employees from the Department of Justice Canada, representatives from other federal departments and agencies, provincial and municipal partners, court managers, enforcement officers, and academics.

## ACRONYMS

AMP	Administrative monetary penalty
Department of Justice Canada	Justice Canada
EWG	Evaluation Working Group
FY	Fiscal Year
PIP	Program Information Profile



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1	Purpose of the Evaluation .....	1
1.2	Evaluation Scope .....	1
<b>2</b>	<b>EVALUATION METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>2</b>
2.1	Overview .....	2
2.2	Consideration of GBA Plus and Diversity and Inclusion .....	2
2.3	Constraints, Limitations and Mitigation .....	2
<b>3</b>	<b>OVERVIEW OF THE CONTRAVENTIONS ACT PROGRAM</b> .....	<b>3</b>
3.1	Program overview .....	3
3.2	Governance structure .....	5
3.3	Resources .....	6
<b>4</b>	<b>EVALUATION FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>6</b>
4.1	Relevance of the <i>Contraventions Act</i> regime .....	6
4.2	Effectiveness .....	13
4.3	Efficiency .....	19
<b>5</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>21</b>
5.1	Conclusions .....	21
5.2	Recommendations .....	22
	<b>Appendix A: Evaluation Issues and Questions</b> .....	<b>23</b>



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Methodologies.....	2
Table 2: Constraints, limitations and mitigation strategies .....	3
Table 3: Allocated resources associated with the <i>Contraventions Act</i> Program .....	6
Table 4: Enforcement options.....	10
Table 5: Actual expenditures associated with the <i>Contraventions Act</i> Program .....	19

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

This report presents the findings and recommendations for the Evaluation of the *Contraventions Act* Program (hereafter the Program). The evaluation was undertaken as part of the Department of Justice Canada's (Justice Canada) 2021-22 to 2025-26 Integrated Audit and Evaluation Plan and was conducted in accordance with the Treasury Board's *Policy on Results* (2016).

## 1.2 Evaluation Scope

The evaluation covered five fiscal years (FY) from 2020-21 to 2024-25. A review of available information as well as consultations with senior officials regarding key issues and topics related to the program informed the scope of the evaluation.

Building on findings from previous evaluations of the program, a particular focus was placed on the relevance of the *Contraventions Act* itself. More specifically, the Act has been in place for more than 30 years and, during that time, significant changes have occurred in the range of activities that federal departments and agencies are undertaking, and the associated enforcement means that they require. Also, the use of other tools and the integration of new technologies to facilitate the enforcement of regulatory offences have transformed the environment in which the *Contraventions Act* operates. Just as importantly, after three decades of sustained efforts to secure the participation of all jurisdictions in the contraventions regime, it is still not operational in Alberta and Saskatchewan or in the territories.

In addition to the relevance of the contraventions regime, the evaluation served to provide an updated overview of the extent to which it has effectively and efficiently achieved its intended objectives in the jurisdictions where the regime is operational.

## 2 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Overview

The following methods were used to address the evaluation questions:

**Table 1: Methodologies**

Methodology	Description
Document Review	The document review covered all reports provided by participating provinces and municipalities, along with publicly available information on the <i>Contraventions Act</i> , and other enforcement mechanisms.
Administrative Data Review	The data provided by participating provinces and municipalities was reviewed. This included data on the number of contravention tickets issued under the various federal legislation and regulations, along with financial data on activities undertaken in relation to official languages.
Key Informant Interviews	A total of 27 key Informant Interviews were conducted involving a total of 40 individuals. This included key informants from Justice Canada (program representatives and counsel in Legal Services Units), other federal departments and agencies using the contraventions regime, participating provinces and municipalities, court managers, enforcement officers, and academics.

Evaluation questions can be found in Appendix A.

An Evaluation Working Group (EWG) composed of Justice Canada representatives from the Policy Sector's Programs Branch provided advice during the design and implementation of the evaluation. The EWG coordinated access to documents and data, and provided feedback on evaluation products (i.e., the evaluation plan, preliminary findings and the draft evaluation report).

### 2.2 Consideration of GBA Plus and Diversity and Inclusion

The Program is about the implementation of a ticketing system to better support a fair and efficient enforcement of federal regulatory offences. It was determined that Gender-based analysis (GBA) Plus considerations were not relevant to the evaluation process.

### 2.3 Constraints, Limitations and Mitigation

The following table describes the constraints and limitations faced by the evaluation, along with the mitigation strategies that were applied.

**Table 2: Constraints, limitations and mitigation strategies**

Constraints / limitations	Mitigation strategy
There were gaps in performance information provided by participating provinces and municipalities. These gaps are further discussed in sub-section 4.2.4.	The evaluation used qualitative information to provide insights on the performance of the program and the gaps in performance information has been specifically explored as part of this evaluation.
Only limited insights could be gathered from the provinces that do not participate in the contraventions regime.	Some of the enforcement officers and their managers operate in both provinces where the contraventions regime is operational and in provinces where it is not operational. During their interviews, they addressed the challenges related to this uneven application of the <i>Contraventions Act</i> .
There were challenges in identifying and engaging individuals from some categories of key informants, notably the enforcement officers.	A snowball approach was used, which allowed key informants to help identify other key informants who could offer valuable insights for the evaluation.

### 3 OVERVIEW OF THE CONTRAVENTIONS ACT PROGRAM

#### 3.1 Program overview

The primary purpose of the *Contraventions Act* Program is to establish a prosecution regime that reflects the nature of regulatory offences (as opposed to criminal offences). This prosecution regime rests on two pillars: the *Contraventions Act* and the *Contraventions Act* Fund.

##### The *Contraventions Act*

The *Contraventions Act* (the Act) allows the federal government to designate federal regulatory offences as contraventions, which may be enforced by means of tickets, instead of being systematically prosecuted under the summary conviction process established in the *Criminal Code*. The objectives of the Act are:

- to provide an additional procedure that may be used for the prosecution of contraventions, which reflects the distinction between criminal offences and statutory offences; and
- to alter or abolish the consequences in law of being convicted of a contravention, in light of that distinction.

The distinction between criminal and regulatory offences has practical consequences. While criminal offences are concerned with “seriously wrongful acts violating common standards of decency and humanity”, regulatory offences “are not necessarily wrong in themselves but (they are) prohibited for expediency”.<sup>1</sup> Most criminal offences are contained in a limited number of statutes, notably the *Criminal Code*. As for regulatory offences, they are contained in countless acts and regulations that are enacted at the municipal, provincial, and federal levels, and they cover a wide range of areas such

<sup>1</sup> Law Reform Commission of Canada. (1976). *Report – Our Criminal Law*. Ottawa, p. 11

as traffic and parking, licencing, the environment and habitat protection, recreational fishing and hunting, transport, dangerous goods, commercial and industrial activities, fisheries and agriculture, and public health, to name but a few of those areas.

All levels of government have implemented procedural frameworks to support the enforcement of these offences. Criminal offences are prosecuted through the summary conviction process, or by indictment in the case of more serious criminal offences. Regulatory offences are typically enforced using a ticketing system, or administrative monetary penalties (AMP), which are further discussed in section 4.1 of this report.

For an extended period, the federal government essentially relied on the summary conviction process to prosecute the regulatory offences for which its various departments and agencies were responsible and, as such, it stood in contrast to provincial and municipalities that were using a ticketing or an AMP regime. Having this summary conviction process as the sole option for all federal regulatory offences was seen as inefficient, which led to the adoption, in 1992, of the *Contraventions Act*.

The *Contraventions Act* includes two mechanisms for implementing a ticketing regime for federal contraventions:

- First, it provides for the eventual creation of an autonomous and comprehensive federal procedural framework to process federal tickets. These provisions of the Act cover all the key components of an autonomous federal ticketing regime, including the completion and service of contravention tickets; the commencement of proceedings and the options available to defendants; the designation of the proper courts; the trial procedures and other related aspects of the enforcement of these federal tickets. These provisions were adopted in 1992, but they have yet to come into force through an Order of the Governor in Council. As a result, they remain available, should the government ever decide to implement such an autonomous federal regime.<sup>2</sup>
- Second, the Act makes it possible for the federal government to use existing provincial ticketing regimes to process federal contraventions. The amending provisions allowing for that option were adopted in 1996, and they establish the following two key steps:
  - That the required amendment to the *Application of Provincial Laws Regulations* be made to authorize the use of a provincial ticketing scheme.
  - That an agreement be signed with the relevant provincial government, in conformity with the *Contraventions Act*.

Once these two steps are completed, enforcement officers can start issuing contraventions tickets, which will be directed to the applicable provincial ticketing system for enforcement purposes. Nothing compels a provincial government to sign an agreement under the *Contraventions Act*, making this option entirely dependent on the will of a provincial government to sign such an agreement.

Since the second option has been the only one available, all contravention tickets issued to date have been enforced using the existing ticketing system in provinces where the regime is operational. This includes all provinces except Saskatchewan and Alberta. In addition, the contraventions regime is not yet operational in the three territories and on other federal lands, such as First Nation reserves.

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that these provisions have been exempted from the application of the *Statutes Repeal Act*, by motions to that effect adopted in Parliament.

In the absence of the contraventions regime, federal offences designated as contraventions must be prosecuted under the *Criminal Code* summary conviction process.

### **The Contraventions Act Program**

The *Contraventions Act* Program consists of a range of coordinated responsibilities undertaken by Justice Canada, which are necessary for the implementation and the administration of the contraventions regime. These responsibilities include the provision of legal services in matters related to ticketing procedures; the designation of federal offences as contraventions; the required amendments to applicable regulations; the negotiation of agreements; the determination of appropriate measures related to language rights; the management of the regime in provinces; and the management of the transfer payment program referred to as the *Contraventions Act* Fund. Justice Canada also manages the FPT working groups, which are responsible for the implementation and administration of the contraventions regime in provinces and municipalities, and the Justice Department Study Group, comprised of Legal Services Units counsel.

The *Contraventions Act* Fund supports the implementation of measures that aim to ensure that provincial or municipal governments have the capacity to deliver services related to federal contraventions in a manner consistent with applicable language rights found in the *Criminal Code* (judicial services) and the *Official Languages Act* (extrajudicial services). These measures include the hiring of bilingual court personnel, language training, bilingual signage and documentation, as well as the costs that provinces or municipalities incur to manage and report on these funded activities.

### **3.2 Governance structure**

Two groups within the Policy Sector's Programs Branch at Justice Canada contribute to the ongoing management of the *Contraventions Act* Program:

- The Legal Services Division leads the negotiation of agreements with provinces and municipalities to enable the use of their ticketing schemes for the prosecution of federal contraventions. This includes any required amendment to the *Application of Provincial Laws Regulations*. In addition, the Division provides ongoing support to the Programs Branch, federal client-departments including their respective enforcement authorities, agencies as well as provincial counterparts. The Division provides legal services and advice on matters related to ticketing procedures, designating new federal offences as contraventions and required amendments to the *Contraventions Regulations*. The Division also supports training activities for enforcement officers, which are typically delivered in collaboration with provincial authorities and the Public Prosecution Service of Canada. Finally, the Division provides assistance on the creation and implementation of administrative monetary penalty (AMP) regimes, which may under some circumstances, play a complementary role to the contraventions regime.
- The Programs Branch's Innovation, Analysis and Integration Directorate is primarily responsible for the ongoing management of the *Contravention Act* agreements funding component signed with participating provinces and municipalities. This includes management of the financial support provided to provincial and municipal governments, through the *Contraventions Act* Fund, to support the provision of services in both official languages. The Directorate monitors and collects all reports provided in accordance with *Contraventions Act* agreements.

### 3.3 Resources

Table 3 includes the allocated resources associated with the *Contraventions Act* Program during the period covered by this evaluation. The majority of the resources is allocated to the contributions provided to participating provinces and municipalities for the delivery of bilingual services in the context of federal contraventions.

**Table 3: Allocated resources associated with the *Contraventions Act* Program**

Categories	FY 2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25
Operational costs <sup>1</sup>	\$388,320	\$514,191	\$511,520	\$707,068	\$1,242,261
Contributions <sup>2 3</sup>	\$9,094,900	\$6,458,000	\$7,662,362	\$6,947,282	\$6,037,220
Total	\$9,483,220	\$6,972,191	\$8,173,882	\$7,654,350	\$7,279,481

1. Operational costs include internal costs related to salaries and benefits, operations and maintenance, and other internal activities related to the *Contraventions Act* Program.  
2. Contributions are allocated based on agreements signed with provincial/municipal governments for the delivery of bilingual services related to federal offences designated as contraventions.  
3. The contribution amounts reflect in-year budget transfers and show resources available for use at the end of the FY.  
Source: Justice Canada financial data

It is important to note that Justice Canada does not provide a direct financial contribution to provincial or municipal governments to cover expenditures related to the processing of federal contraventions. Instead, current *Contraventions Act* agreements include clauses that allow provincial and municipal governments to retain the required portion of fines collected to cover these costs. Any surplus in fines collected is shared equally between the federal and provincial/municipal governments.

## 4 EVALUATION FINDINGS

### 4.1 Relevance of the *Contraventions Act* regime

#### 4.1.1 The contraventions regime meets the needs of federal departments and agencies

The contraventions regime continues to meet the needs of federal departments and agencies enacting regulatory provisions, and of the authorities responsible for their enforcement. The AMP regimes are also well designed to support the enforcement of a range of regulatory offences, and they are increasingly used by municipal, provincial, and federal governments. Both regimes offer strengths and limitations and, as such, may play a complementary role. It is important for Justice Canada to further clarify how it intends to support the coexistence of these regimes.

#### The needs of federal departments and agencies

As noted in section 2.1, the *Contraventions Act* was initially adopted to provide a much-needed alternative to the summary conviction process. This was in line with other similar initiatives, such as the adoption of the *Provincial Offences Act* in Ontario in 1979, which replaced the procedures included in the provincial *Summary Convictions Act*.<sup>3</sup> In each case, the goal was to limit the involvement of the

<sup>3</sup> See Law Commission of Ontario. (2011). *Modernization of the Provincial Offences Act: Final Report*.

judicial system by allowing enforcement authorities to use, when available and appropriate, a ticketing system to enforce regulatory offences. In practical terms, this meant adding a critical component to the toolkit available to enforcement officers, while keeping the option of proceeding under the summary conviction process when circumstances call for more severe penalties.

More than 30 years after its adoption, the *Contraventions Act* continues to fill the critical role of providing a procedural framework that reflects the nature of federal regulatory offences. During interviews, enforcement officers and representatives from federal departments and agencies emphasized the fact that the range of regulatory offences continues to grow, as issues related to public health (e.g., the COVID-19 pandemic), the environment, trade and commerce, the management of federal properties, and other areas under federal jurisdiction become ever more complex.

The following examples of offences designated as contraventions illustrate the nature of regulatory offences:

- Paragraph 17(1) of the *Maritime Provinces Fishery Regulations*: “Possessing more salmon taken by angling than the specified yearly quota”.
- Paragraph 4(1) of the *National Historic Parks General Regulations*: “Damaging flora, fauna or a natural object”.
- Par. 14(b) of the *Airport Traffic Regulations*: “Operate motor vehicle in restricted area without valid identification”.
- Sec. 289 of the *National Defence Act*: “Knowingly make false answer to question put by enrolment officer”.
- Par. 13(1) of the *Commercial Vehicle Drivers Hours of Service Regulations*: “Drive without required off-duty time”.

In order for regulatory provisions to achieve their intended purpose, they must be enforced through reasonable and appropriate means.

### **The current tools for enforcement**

In addition to the contraventions regime, there are only two other options currently available to enforce federal regulatory offences: the summary conviction process and the AMP regime.

#### The summary conviction process

The summary conviction process used to stand as the only option to prosecute federal regulatory offences. Previous evaluations and other studies have documented the fact that it arguably represents the least effective and efficient procedural framework that could be used to enforce a multitude of federal regulatory offences, particularly when no aggravating factors are associated with the occurrence of an offence.<sup>4</sup>

Since it was designed for regulatory offences, where severe penalties including imprisonment are at play, the summary conviction process involves many steps, safeguards, and stakeholders, in addition

---

<sup>4</sup> See Law Reform Commission of Canada. (1976). *Report – Our Criminal Law*, and Justice Canada. (2010). *Contraventions Act Evaluation: Final Report*.

to relying heavily on the judicial system. Among other things, this process requires enforcement officers to gather detailed information to be shared with Crown prosecutors to determine whether charges will be laid. When charges proceed, enforcement officers must file the required information at the courthouse to be reviewed and signed by a provincial judge or a justice of the peace. Enforcement officers also prepare summons to be signed by the judge or the justice of the peace ordering the charged individuals to appear in court. If the charged individuals opt for a trial, enforcement officers must provide the required information and assistance to the Crown, which may require several meetings, in addition to being available to serve as witnesses in court. And in the end, if a person is found guilty under the summary conviction process, they end-up with a criminal record, which may, among other things, limit their ability to secure employment and to travel.

A previous evaluation described the important roadblocks that enforcement officers face when using summary conviction process:

“Convincing the Crown to proceed with a charge related to a federal statutory offence may prove challenging. Resources to prosecute are limited and case loads are significant, so the notion of spending time and resources to prosecute someone who killed three or four migratory birds over the prescribed limit may not be seen as a priority by the Crown. Even if the Crown agrees to proceed with the charge, the presiding judge may not share the opinion that this is time well spent by the court. A number of enforcement officers consulted as part of this evaluation recounted reactions from judges who expressed frustration with having to deal with these statutory offences.”

During interviews, enforcement officers emphasized that the summary conviction process remains a relevant option when the circumstances call for a person to be accountable to the court system and to face penalties greater than what the contraventions regime allows. This is the case when dealing, for instance, with repeat offenders, offenders that show recklessness in contravening with regulatory provisions, or when an enforcement officer wishes to proceed with multiple charges. These, however, remain the exception, not the rule.

#### The administrative monetary penalty (AMP) regime

To further the goal of achieving efficiencies in enforcing regulatory offences, an increasing number of municipal, provincial, and federal authorities are turning to the AMP regime. A key feature of this regime is that it moves the entire enforcement process of regulatory offences out of the judicial system.<sup>5</sup> Instead of relying on that judicial process, the regulatory authority establishes its own administrative process to promote compliance with the provisions for which it is responsible. In that context, a person who is found to have contravened a regulatory provision must pay a penalty that is meant to deter prohibited behaviours and “to compensate the state for harm done to it”.<sup>6</sup>

For an AMP regime to be used, it must first be authorized by a statute or regulation, which empowers the regulatory authority to impose monetary penalties. On that basis, enforcement officers deliver what

---

<sup>5</sup> One exception is when a person or entity turns to the courts for a judicial review to ensure that the administrative decision was made lawfully, fairly, and reasonably, an unlikely scenario considering the costs of a judicial review compared to the typical fine imposed in relation to a regulatory offence. Another exception could be included in the statute or regulations creating the AMP regime, which may allow for a decision to be reviewed by the courts.

<sup>6</sup> See Law Reform Commission of Canada. (1976). *Report – Our Criminal Law*, and Justice Canada. (2010). *Contraventions Act Evaluation: Final Report*.

is typically referred to as a notice of violation to a person or entity that has contravened a regulatory provision covered by the AMP regime and designated as a *violation*. The person or entity receiving the notice may decide to pay the penalty, or they may request a review. While the review process may vary across AMP regimes, it must provide an opportunity for the person or entity to be heard, normally by an administrative officer, who may modify or remove the penalty altogether. While some form of appeal may be allowed, it would normally be of an administrative nature, keeping the entire process out of the realm of the judicial system. By now, the courts have recognized the validity and constitutionality of these AMP regimes, including the fact that they do not inherently contravene Charter rights.<sup>7</sup>

An appealing dimension of an AMP regime is the fact that it can be tailored to the environment in which a municipal, provincial or federal entity operates. A municipal AMP regime set up to deal with large volumes of parking violations will be different than a federal AMP regime dealing with highly technical matters predominantly involving corporate entities and engaging high penalties. That inherent flexibility of AMP regimes is also what makes them difficult to fully grasp. At the time of this report, there were no definitive statistics on the number of AMP regimes in Canada, but Justice Canada had identified more than 60 AMP regimes involving federal departments and agencies, and there is an increasing number of them being established by municipal and provincial governments.

---

<sup>7</sup> See *Guindon v. Canada*, 2015 SCC 41, [2015] 3 S.C.R. 3.

## Summary

Ultimately, each enforcement regime offers benefits, and they come with their own challenges. Table 4 provides a summary of those for each of the three options for enforcing federal regulatory offences.

**Table 4: Enforcement options**

	<b>Summary conviction process</b>	<b><i>Contraventions Act</i></b>	<b>Administrative monetary penalties</b>
<b>Key advantages</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offers a wider range of penalties, including imprisonment.</li> <li>• Forces the alleged offender to face the courts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offers a ticketing system that reflects the nature of regulatory offences.</li> <li>• Provides preset fine amounts.</li> <li>• Allows enforcement officers to use a tool they are already familiar with.</li> <li>• Ensures that the penalty is proportionate to the nature of the offence.</li> <li>• Allows for a centralized approach, where Justice Canada oversees the regime.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offers an enforcement option that is administrative in nature and does not engage the judicial system.</li> <li>• Is increasingly used by municipal, provincial, and federal authorities.</li> <li>• Offers a wider range of penalties.</li> </ul>
<b>Associated challenges</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May constitute a disproportionate process considering the nature of regulatory offence.</li> <li>• May face resistance from the prosecution and from judges.</li> <li>• Forces enforcement officers to spend time in the courts instead of conducting enforcement activities.</li> <li>• Imposes a criminal record on those found guilty of a regulatory offence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relies on provincial governments, which has led to the regime not being operational in Saskatchewan and Alberta, as well as in the territories.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typically requires the authority using the AMP regime to establish and manage that regime.</li> <li>• Makes it more difficult for the federal government to have a consistent and coordinated approach to all the AMP regimes in place.</li> </ul>

### **The need for an integrated approach for the enforcement of regulatory offences**

The establishment of the contraventions regime and of the AMP regimes served the same fundamental purpose. They provide a procedural framework that is well suited for regulatory offences, recognizing the fact that these offences do not normally require the resource-intensive framework applied to the summary conviction process. Both regimes are meant to better equip federal departments and agencies, along with enforcement officers, in ensuring the effective and appropriate enforcement of these regulatory offences. Finally, they both offer Canadians a procedure that is fair and, as stated in the *Contraventions Act*, that alters or abolishes the consequences in law of being convicted of a contravention, in light of the distinction between criminal and regulatory offences.

The two regimes are complimentary; however, their coexistence within the federal government requires further considerations.

First, AMP regimes represent a decentralized approach to the enforcement of regulatory offences, leaving each federal department or agency with the responsibility of establishing and managing its AMP regime. At this point, there is no centralized centre of expertise on AMP regimes. Justice Canada Programs Branch's Legal Services Division provides some expertise and assistance on the AMPs, but its focus remains on the *Contraventions Act*.

Evaluation findings point to the need for AMP regimes to be administered efficiently and with some consistency across the federal government. In the absence of a coordinated approach, there is a risk of having duplication of efforts or inconsistencies. Determining which offences should be enforced through an AMP regime, the level of penalty to be imposed, the review process to be offered to those receiving notices of violation are all areas where a more coordinated approach would serve federal departments and agencies turning to this type of enforcement regime.

Moreover, as more provinces and municipalities turn to AMP regimes to replace traditional ticketing systems, their operational capacity to process tickets issued under the *Contraventions Act* may be affected. A case in point is the City of Ottawa, which has historically collaborated with Justice Canada to process, among other things, contravention tickets issued on federal lands located in Ottawa. Until recently, the City of Ottawa has been using the prosecution regime found in the *Provincial Offences Act* – a framework compatible with the *Contraventions Act* – to process municipal tickets. As a result, it had the capacity and systems to efficiently add federal contravention tickets to its operations. However, since June 2025, the City of Ottawa has implemented an AMP regime that deals with all municipal parking violations occurring on its territory. Thus, processing federal contraventions tickets is raising practical and operational challenges, as the former infrastructure of the City of Ottawa to process tickets is being replaced by a separate AMP regime. It is worth noting that the objective of the City of Ottawa is to expand the use of this AMP regime to other municipal regulatory offences. It is reasonable to assume that this type of issue could occur in other jurisdictions in Canada.

A challenge for the enforcement of federal offences is that municipal or provincial AMP regimes cannot be incorporated the same way that ticketing regimes have been. AMP regimes vary considerably in their structure and operations, and they are found at both the municipal and provincial levels. Incorporating existing AMP regime would also replicate the dependency on other authorities, which has proven difficult with the *Contraventions Act*.

Evaluation findings indicate that it would be important for Justice Canada to articulate how it intends to support the use of the procedural frameworks found in the *Contraventions Act* and in all the federal statutes and regulations that have established AMP regimes. This would include an analysis of the impact of AMP regimes in provinces and municipalities on their operational capacity to process contraventions tickets.

#### 4.1.2 The *Contraventions Act* Fund is aligned with some federal priorities, but it is not aligned with the Action Plans for Official Languages

The *Contraventions Act* Fund is essential to ensure that the prosecution of offences designated as contraventions is done in accordance with all applicable language rights. To support a fully integrated management of all components of the *Contraventions Act* Program, the Fund should be removed from the cyclical federal action plans on official languages.

In its *Quality of Life Framework*, the federal government has identified a number of priority areas, including the need to build “confidence in access to fair and equal justice”.<sup>8</sup> The contraventions regime, by supporting a fair and appropriate enforcement of regulatory offences, is contributing to this federal priority.

To date, the *Contraventions Act* Fund has also been included in successive action plans on official languages. The Fund is a necessary component of the *Contraventions Act* Program to ensure that all applicable language rights contained in the *Criminal Code* and the *Official Languages Act* are applied to any procedures related to federal contraventions, regardless of the provincial scheme being used. More specifically, the *Contraventions Act* Fund ensures that language rights are respected in relation to the issuing and processing of contraventions tickets, in line with the Part IV obligations of the *Official Languages Act*.<sup>9</sup>

However, its support focusses on service delivery and does not extend to the enhancement of the vitality of Official Language Minority Communities, which is a core objective of the action plans on official languages. While the Fund is essential to the ongoing management of federal tickets issued under the *Contraventions Act*, it does not contribute to the measures required under Part VII of the *Official Languages Act*, and does not align with the goals of these action plans.<sup>10</sup>

The 2017 evaluation of the *Contraventions Act* Program “found no substantive rationale for integrating the Fund in the Roadmap (for Canada’s Official Languages 2013–2018), and evidence indicates that keeping the Fund within the Roadmap is, in fact, counterproductive.”<sup>11</sup> By doing so, the Fund is included in an accountability and renewal framework that does not reflect its nature and purpose.

Both the 2021 evaluation of the *Contraventions Act* Program and the 2023 horizontal evaluation of the *Action Plan for Official Languages* reached similar conclusions. The *Contraventions Act* Fund sustains the federal contraventions system and ensures that language rights are respected. It does not align with the Action Plan’s goal of supporting the vitality of official language minority communities, and is the primary Action Plan component that does not fit with its objectives.<sup>12,13</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Government of Canada. (2021). *Quality of Life Framework for Canada*.

<sup>9</sup> Part IV of the *Official Languages Act* establishes the right of any member of the public to communicate and receive available services from federal institutions in their official language of choice, including when services are made available by other organizations on their behalf.

<sup>10</sup> Part VII of the *Official Languages Act* sets the Government of Canada’s commitment to enhance the vitality of Official Language Minority Communities and to foster the recognition and use of English and French in Canadian Society.

<sup>11</sup> Justice Canada. (2017). Evaluation of the *Contraventions Act* Program: Final Report, p. 23.

<sup>12</sup> Justice Canada. (2021). Evaluation of the *Contraventions Act* Program

<sup>13</sup> Canadian Heritage. (2023). *Horizontal Evaluation of the Action Plan for Official Languages 2018-2023: Investing in Our Future*

During the period covered by this evaluation, Parliament adopted significant changes to the *Official Languages Act*, including paragraph 2.1 (1) stating that “the Minister of Canadian Heritage shall, in consultation with the President of the Treasury Board, develop and maintain a government-wide strategy that sets out the overall official languages priorities.” In practical terms, this means that action plans on official languages, which were traditionally viewed as specific initiatives, are now part of an ongoing responsibility attributed to Canadian Heritage. This new structure for these actions plans creates an opportunity for Justice Canada to address the artificial distinction between the *Contraventions Act* and the Fund, and the fact that this Fund must remain fully integrated in the management process of the *Contraventions Act*, and not of action plans on official languages.

## 4.2 Effectiveness

### 4.2.1 The *Contraventions Act* Program supports the effective enforcement of federal regulatory offences

During the period covered by the evaluation, the contraventions regime supported the enforcement of a wide range of regulatory offences related to various areas of federal jurisdiction. However, the current gaps in performance data are limiting the ability of the federal government to fully assess the extent to which the regime is used. Another significant challenge is the fact that the regime is not operational in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

#### The benefits achieved with the contraventions regime

The contraventions regime benefits enforcement officers by making a critical tool available in support of their work. A key consideration is the fact that the regime does not take anything away from the toolbox of enforcement officers. It simply adds a component that is well suited to the nature of their work.

As noted during interviews, in executing their mandate, these enforcement officers must respond to a variety of circumstances that call for different courses of action. In some cases, issuing a warning is all that is needed to promote compliance with some regulatory provisions. In other cases, when the circumstances associated with an offence are far more serious, proceeding with the summary conviction process found in the *Criminal Code* provides an opportunity to seek a greater fine and serves to illustrate the seriousness of the matter. However, both the warnings and the summary conviction process stand as the exception rather than the norm. Regulatory offences are still offences, and issuing warnings, which have no consequences in law, has limited use. As for the summary conviction process, it is primarily designed to prosecute more serious offences.

Regulatory offences are of a different nature, and as noted by the Supreme Court of Canada, they “involve a shift of emphasis from the protection of individual interests and the deterrence and punishment of acts involving moral fault to the protection of public and societal interests.”<sup>14</sup> For this reason, the procedural framework offered by the *Contraventions Act*, or by an AMP regime, finds a far greater application in enforcing these offences.

By removing a significant portion of the prosecution process outside the judiciary system, the *Contraventions Act* is also benefiting the courts, which, in many parts of the country, are struggling to address the volume of files assigned to them. Only when individuals wish to challenge the

---

<sup>14</sup> R. v. Wholesale Travel Group Inc. [1991] 3 SCR 154.

contravention tickets they received do the courts become significantly involved and historical data confirm that this represents a small portion of tickets issued.

Ultimately, and as stated in the Act itself, the contraventions regime is meant to benefit Canadians by providing a procedural framework that alters or abolishes the consequence in law of being convicted of a contravention.

### **The range of federal regulatory offences designated as contraventions**

Having the *Contraventions Act* regime available is an important step, but just as important is ensuring that the range of regulatory offences designated as contraventions continues to respond to the requirements of enforcement authorities.

Previous evaluations stressed the importance of broadening the scope of offences designated as contraventions. In particular, the report from the evaluation conducted in 2021 noted that “building on the progress made to date, evaluation findings confirm that increasing the number of offences covered by the contraventions regime is a priority for many enforcement authorities.”<sup>15</sup>

Findings gathered as part of the current evaluation indicate that Justice Canada has achieved a level of designation of regulatory offences as contraventions that largely meets the needs of federal departments and agencies using the regime. There will always be a need to constantly monitor, expand, and adjust the range of designated offences to reflect new regulatory provisions that may be enacted, but the evaluation did not identify significant gaps.

### **Tickets issued during the evaluation period**

At the time of the evaluation, only limited data was available on the number of tickets issued in the various provinces and municipalities that participate in the contraventions regime. With these gaps in data, which are further discussed in sub-section 4.2.4 of this report, it is not possible to provide an overall portrait of the extent to which the regime has been used.

The data that is available indicates that contravention tickets have been issued in relation to key areas of federal jurisdiction, such as federal ports and marine activities, environmental protection, the railways, the transportation of dangerous goods, fisheries, migratory birds, and national parks. More specific to the period covered by the evaluation, contravention tickets were also issued under the *Quarantine Act* for a series of offences related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

### **Key challenges**

#### The regime is not operational in all provinces

Ever since the *Contraventions Act* was enacted, an ongoing challenge has been to ensure its implementation across Canada. Over time, Justice Canada has invested considerable efforts to sign agreements with provincial governments to enable the use of their procedural framework to prosecute federal regulatory offences designated as contraventions. The last province to join the regime is Newfoundland and Labrador, which completed the necessary steps during the fiscal year 2018-19. During interviews, representatives from the province, as well as enforcement officers operating in that

---

<sup>15</sup> Justice Canada. (2021). *Evaluation of the Contraventions Act Program: Final Report*, p. 9.

province, emphasized the benefits that have come from having the regime operational in the province. Enforcement officers can use the regime to enforce a range of offences, particularly those related to fisheries, and the court system has enhanced its ability to operate in both official languages.

The two remaining provinces where the regime is not operational are Saskatchewan and Alberta. Successive evaluations of the *Contraventions Act* Program have documented the negative impacts that result from this situation. As noted in the 2021 evaluation:

- The provincial courts in these two jurisdictions must divert their limited resources to address the prosecution of federal offences, while these offences could easily be dealt through the contraventions regime.
- Enforcement authorities operating in these two provinces are lacking a critical tool to achieve their mandate.
- Citizens who are alleged to have committed offences designated as contravention, if found guilty, are exposed to greater fines and end up with a criminal record.<sup>16</sup>

Before that, the 2017 evaluation of the Program noted that the ongoing inability to secure the participation of Alberta and Saskatchewan “has lost any provisional dimension, and has turned into a systemic flaw (un *vice de fond*).”<sup>17</sup>

Two main options were identified to address this systemic issue: an increased reliance on AMP regimes, or the establishment of an autonomous contraventions regime in accordance with the *Contraventions Act*, which would require investments in time and resources. Some combination of the two options could also be considered. What remains problematic is the option of the status quo, which does not align with the goal of ensuring a consistent enforcement of federal regulatory offences.

#### Ongoing support and training

Another challenge noted during the interviews conducted as part of this evaluation is the fact that each participating province has its own procedural framework applicable to regulatory offences. As a result, while some federal regulatory offences designated as contraventions may be readily enforced through the ticketing system in one province, enforcement officers in another province may find it easier, or more convenient, to continue proceeding through the summary conviction process.

This serves as an important reminder that providing ongoing training, tailored to each provincial regime, is critical to ensure that the contraventions regime can achieve its full potential. This is particularly important when new offences are designated as contraventions, as they may involve different enforcement authorities, and a transition period is to be expected before all key stakeholders in the enforcement chain are comfortable using the contraventions regime.

During interviews, key informants noted that Justice Canada has a limited capacity to provide ongoing training, including the training needed as a result of turnover among enforcement officers. While training activities are offered, they are provided based on the availability of resources within Justice Canada and multiple training partners, such as client-departments Legal Services Units counsel,

---

<sup>16</sup> Justice Canada. (2021). *Evaluation of the Contraventions Act Program: Final Report*, p. 12.

<sup>17</sup> Justice Canada. (2017). *Evaluation of the Contraventions Act Program: Final Report*, p. 26

Public Prosecution Service of Canada prosecutors, provincial court services representative and prosecutors.

### Maintaining the adequacy of fines

Ensuring that the fines associated with each regulatory offence are adequate is an ongoing challenge. There is no standard formula for determining these fines. Instead, a myriad of factors must be weighed, including fine levels for offences of the same nature included in other federal, provincial, or municipal statutes or regulations. Also, the level of fine must reflect the nature and scope of the offence and its anticipated impact. As noted in a study commissioned by Justice Canada, increasing fine levels is not always the appropriate strategy to achieve the desired compliance:

“The real-world impact of higher fines on offending is much more complex than the relationship predicted by rational choice theory. Though some studies find that fine increases can significantly reduce the likelihood of offending, others show that these increases are only effective up to a point or not effective at all. There are also instances when higher fine amounts may backfire or increase offending behaviour.”<sup>18</sup>

Despite ongoing efforts from Justice Canada to include increased fine amounts in regulatory amendment mandates, evaluation findings confirm that this challenge remains. While some enforcement officers urged for fines to be increased, others noted that some offences have fines that are too high, limiting their ability to readily enforce these provisions.<sup>19</sup> Each case has its specific characteristics. As a result a systemic approach is required to ensure that fines are reconsidered on a cyclical basis, through a process that involves enforcement officers and that considers factors such as inflation and practices among provinces and municipalities for offences of a similar nature.

It is the responsibility of each department or agency responsible for a statute or regulations to ensure that the fine levels are adequate. Justice Canada, however, provides valuable expertise and supports client departments in this process. As a result, increasing fine amounts has become an ongoing initiative.

#### **4.2.2 The *Contraventions Act* Fund enhances the capacity to deliver services and activities in accordance with applicable language rights**

The *Contraventions Act* Fund is providing the necessary support to ensure that all language rights applicable to the prosecution of offences designated as contraventions are upheld. The current range of activities supported meets the needs of the provinces and the municipalities supported by the Fund. In addition, the Fund has contributed to the overall capacity of the judicial system to operate in both official languages.

#### **Activities supported through the *Contraventions Act* Fund**

The *Contraventions Act* Fund provides financial support to participating provinces and municipalities to ensure that all applicable language rights included in the *Criminal Code* and in the *Official*

<sup>18</sup> The Behavioural Insights Team. (2024). *The Contraventions Act Program: Using behavioural science to identify evidence-based criteria for setting fine levels*, p. 4.

<sup>19</sup> One example is the set of federal offences contained in the *Quarantine Act* that are designated as contraventions. The fines for these offences vary from \$825 to \$5,000. During interviews, some key informants noted that a high proportion of the tickets in the highest range of offences have been challenged in court.

*Languages Act* are respected in the administration and prosecution of federal offences designated as contraventions.<sup>20</sup> Activities supported through the Fund typically include:

- bilingual signage and other required equipment (such as bilingual websites, toll-free lines for bilingual services, or video/audio links to provide bilingual services at a distance)
- printing of bilingual tickets
- hiring of bilingual judges or justices of the peace, and other court personnel (such as those working in the court registry)
- accommodation expenses for out-of-province bilingual judges when required
- language training for judges and court personnel

During interviews, representatives from participating provinces and municipalities indicated that this support is meeting their needs. The primary challenge they face is recruiting and retaining the bilingual personnel in these positions. Otherwise, these courts have successfully implemented the activities for which they have received funding.

It was also noted during interviews that the impacts of the Fund went beyond the administration and prosecution of federal offences designated as contraventions. Through the Fund, the courts' capacity to offer services in both official languages was increased, whether as part of criminal proceedings, or in other settings where language rights are applicable.

#### **4.2.3 Program activities are aligned with their intended outcomes**

The logic model currently included in the Program Information Profile of the *Contraventions Act* Program adequately reflects its activities and intended outcomes.

The evaluation provides an opportunity to assess the extent to which the activities covered by the *Contraventions Act* Program are adequately aligned with the Program's intended outcomes as described in its Program Information Profile (PIP).

The most recent PIP for the Program was prepared in 2021, and the Program logic model that it contains strongly reflects the range of activities undertaken by the Program and its intended impacts on federal departments and agencies, enforcement authorities, the court system, and Canadians. It presents an integrated articulation of the legal activities undertaken to support the *Contraventions Act*, and the critical role played by the *Contraventions Act* Fund to ensure that all applicable language rights are respected.

---

<sup>20</sup> New Brunswick, Quebec, and the City of Ottawa do not require assistance under the *Contraventions Act* Fund since they already provide bilingual judicial and extrajudicial services to individuals engaged in their respective provincial ticketing scheme.

#### 4.2.4 Performance information is lacking in quality and consistency

The performance information collected during the evaluation period is incomplete, which significantly limits the ability to appropriately monitor, manage and evaluate the activities of the *Contraventions Act* Program.

In accordance with their agreement with Justice Canada, participating provinces and municipalities<sup>21</sup> commit to providing, on an annual basis, some key performance information, including the following items:

- Number of tickets issued specifying the Act or regulations under which the offences were committed;
- Number of tickets for which the fine was paid voluntarily;
- Number of trials requested in French;
- Number of trials requested in English;
- Number of trials held in French;
- Number of complaints concerning non-compliance with the applicable language rights.
- Fine amount remitted to Canada

This performance information serves the ongoing management of the Program. This data includes valuable insights on the level of activities based on the various statutes and regulations that include designated offences, in addition to monitoring the level of activities throughout the various regions where the *Contraventions Act* is operational.

Evaluation findings point to significant challenges in relation to the performance data currently received by Justice Canada. Performance data is missing from a number of participating provinces and municipalities, and for a number of fiscal years. Some of these challenges result from the systems in place in some of these provinces or municipalities that are not programmed to readily provide this information. Further processing of the data generated by some of these systems is required in order to provide data required as part of the *Contraventions Act* agreements.

While such shortcomings were noted in previous evaluations of the Program, the issues identified in relation to the current evaluation period are more significant. The gaps in data are greater and, in some cases, a closer review of the data provided indicated that some of the offences reported were, in fact, based on provincial statutes or regulations, but they may have been issued by federal enforcement officers (as allowed under some statutes or regulations).

In light of these findings, Justice Canada and its provincial and municipal partners should further assess the factors that contribute to these data issues and identify strategies to ensure that the required data is, in fact, collected with accuracy and timeliness.

---

<sup>21</sup> The agreement between Justice Canada and the government of Quebec was signed in 2000, and it has not been included in the renewal process applied to the other participating provinces. It also includes a different set of reporting requirements.

## 4.3 Efficiency

### 4.3.1 The COVID-19 pandemic led to fluctuations in program costs

The period covered by the evaluation was marked by an overall increase in program expenditures. The COVID-19 pandemic led to fluctuations in the costs incurred by participating provinces and municipalities. First, the pandemic disrupted the conduct of some funded activities. This was followed by increased court activities to process tickets and hold proceeding related to the wider range of offences that were designated as contraventions, including new provisions in the *Quarantine Act*.

#### Overall cost of the Program

The overall cost of the Program has increased during the evaluation period. As indicated in Table 5, the total cost (including both operational costs and contributions to participating provinces and municipalities) went from \$5.1 million in 2020-21 to \$7.3 million in 2024-25.

**Table 5: Actual expenditures associated with the *Contraventions Act* Program**

Categories	FY 2020-21	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	FY 2024-25
Operational costs <sup>1</sup>	\$316,819	\$697,018	\$620,810	\$939,847	\$1,281,173
Contributions <sup>2</sup>	\$4,809,227	\$4,579,471	\$5,895,594	\$5,408,420	\$6,037,220
Total	\$5,126,046	\$5,276,489	\$6,516,404	\$6,348,267	\$7,318,393

1. Operational costs include internal costs related to salaries and benefits, operations and maintenance, and other internal activities related to the *Contraventions Act* Program.  
2. Contributions are allocated based on agreements signed with provincial/municipal governments for the delivery of bilingual services related to federal offences designated as contraventions.  
Source: Justice Canada financial data

Over the evaluation period, the Programs Branch's Legal Services Division team increased from 1.5 to 4.4 full-time employees. During that same period, a new collective agreement for legal counsel was implemented, which also contributed to higher operational costs.

#### Allocation to provincial and municipal partners

A key driver behind the fluctuations in program expenditures is the COVID-19 pandemic, which led to the disruption of activities undertaken by the participating provinces and municipalities. In accordance with the terms of the agreement they signed with Justice Canada, these provinces and municipalities are reimbursed for the actual expenses incurred in any given fiscal year up to the maximum amount established in their agreement.

Financial information from the first three years covered by the evaluation period (FY 2020-21 to FY 2022-23) indicates that the actual expenditures incurred by the provincial and municipal partners receiving financial assistance from the *Contraventions Act* Fund were systematically lower than the allocated budget included in their agreements. This reflected the fact that some of the planned activities, such as training and in-person operations of the courts, were reduced or cancelled as a result of the pandemic. As more normal operations resumed, so was the ability to undertake these activities, which led to the higher levels of costs during the later part of the period covered by the evaluation.

During interviews, representatives from provincial governments and court managers noted that the challenges faced in recruiting and retaining bilingual staff members constitute another factor that leads to fluctuations in actual costs incurred in accordance with their agreements.

Finally, the agreements also allow the participating provinces and municipalities to transfer up to 20% of the funds provided from one class of expenditure to another (e.g., from training activities to purchasing equipment). During interviews, representatives from provincial or municipal partners noted that this flexibility is helpful in ensuring that the funded activities reflect emerging needs or circumstances.

#### **4.3.2 The current Program delivery approach is effective**

<p>The current delivery of the Program is effective, as it is based on cost-recovery model that limits the requirement for direct investments. The funding provided by the <i>Contraventions Act</i> Fund is the main source of additional resources, and this support is essential to ensure that the applicable language rights are upheld.</p>
---

The current approach to delivering the *Contraventions Act* Program offers benefits, while also featuring limitations. As documented in this report, one of the shortcomings of the Program is that the contraventions regime is still not operating in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

On the upside, one of the key strengths of the Program is the fact that it is administered on a cost recovery basis. Fines collected through contravention tickets serve to cover the administrative costs incurred by provincial and municipal partners, and any surplus once these costs have been considered is split equally between the federal government and the participating province or municipality. The only direct costs to Justice Canada are those related to the internal work undertaken by the Policy Sector of Justice Canada, and the financial assistance provided through the *Contraventions Act* Fund, which reflects that language requirements contained in the *Criminal Code* and the *Official Languages Act*.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Conclusions

This evaluation confirms the ongoing relevance of the contraventions regime. As federal departments and agencies continue to tackle new and complex issues requiring regulatory frameworks, it is essential that those responsible for the enforcement of these provisions be adequately equipped. Having an appropriate procedural framework that reflects the nature of these regulatory offences serves all key stakeholders. It provides assurance to the departments and agencies enacting these regulatory provisions that they are, in fact, achieving their intended results by being adequately enforced. It allows enforcement officers to focus their time and energy on monitoring and enforcing these provisions instead of being entangled in judicial proceedings. It allows the court system to avoid diverting its resources to prosecuting offences that could be dealt with through a ticketing system. Finally, it provides a fair process to those served with a contravention ticket to either pay the fine or challenge it and in a manner that adequately reflects the distinction between a criminal offence and a regulatory offence.

The evaluation points to an increasing use of AMP regimes. Both the AMP and the contraventions regimes serve complementary purposes, and they enhance the toolbox of enforcement officers. However, their fundamental differences in nature and structure raise challenges for the federal government. Having a more integrated approach to manage the contraventions regime and to monitor and support the use of AMP regimes would contribute to a clearer vision of how the federal government intends to enforce regulatory offences for which its various departments and agencies are responsible. As part of this process, Justice Canada could clarify the role that it can undertake to support that vision.

Evaluation findings also stress the importance of addressing the situation in Saskatchewan and Alberta where the contraventions regime is not yet operational, to ensure that federal regulatory offences can be enforced in a fair and consistent manner across Canada. This may involve the implementation of the federal autonomous regime described in the *Contraventions Act*, a greater reliance on AMP regimes, or a combination of both.

To further support the effective management of the Program, it is important to address the fact that the *Contraventions Act* Fund is not aligned with federal action plans on official languages and, as a result, its management should be fully integrated into the *Contraventions Act* Program. Having this artificial distinction between the Fund and the *Contraventions Act* creates unnecessary challenges in managing the Program, including the renewal of financial resources, and the accountability process. As these action plans on official languages are becoming a permanent requirement under the *Official Languages Act*, it creates an opportunity to address this longstanding issue.

The evaluation confirms that the *Contraventions Act* Program is contributing to a more effective enforcement of regulatory offences designed as contraventions. However, the significant gaps identified in the performance information limit the ability to fully document these results. Considering that this is a mature program, it is important to identify and address the current limitations that have led to these issues.

## 5.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings described in this report, the evaluation offers the following four recommendations:

**Recommendation 1:** The Programs Branch should develop options to support a federal coordinated approach to the enforcement of federal regulatory offences that considers both the contraventions and the AMP regimes, and the need to achieve a consistent enforcement approach throughout Canada, including Alberta, Saskatchewan, and the territories.

**Recommendation 2:** The Programs Branch should make efforts to obtain the removal of the *Contraventions Act* Fund from the federal action plans on official languages.

**Recommendation 3:** The Programs Branch should work with participating provinces and municipalities to identify and address issues related to the reporting of the required performance data identified in the *Contraventions Act* administration and enforcement agreements.

## Appendix A: Evaluation Issues and Questions

### Issue #1: Relevance

- 1.1 To what extent is the contraventions regime, as established by the *Contraventions Act*, adequately meeting the needs of federal departments and agencies in supporting their enforcement activities?
- 1.2 How is the *Contraventions Act* Program aligned with current federal priorities, including the *Action Plan for Official Languages 2023–2028*?

### Issue #2: Effectiveness

- 2.1 To what extent has the *Contraventions Act* Program contributed to enforcing federal statutory offences in an efficient and reliable manner?
- 2.2 What has been the impact of the *Contraventions Act* Fund on the ability of provincial authorities to deliver judicial and extrajudicial services in both official languages, in accordance with the *Official Languages Act* and the language provisions of the *Criminal Code*?
- 2.3 What factors contributed to, or constrained the Program's achievement of expected outcomes?
- 2.4 Are the activities covered by the *Contraventions Act* Program adequately aligned with the program's intended outcomes, as identified in the Program Information Profile (PIP)?
- 2.5 To what extent is the current performance information associated with the *Contraventions Act* Program supporting the efficient monitoring of the program's implementation?

### Issue #3: Efficiency

- 3.1. How efficient is the current process for allocating the financial support provided to participating jurisdictions through the *Contraventions Act* Fund?
- 3.2 Are there other approaches that could be considered to optimize the delivery of the *Contraventions Act* Program?