

Executive Summary of the Electoral Audit  
of the Fifteen 2010 Mayoral Candidates for  
City of Calgary, Alberta, Canada



Electoral Audit Completed by the Foundation for  
Democratic Advancement (October, 2010)

Purpose: Determine a ranking and grades for the fifteen 2010 mayoral candidates for the City of Calgary, in terms of the better representative of the citizens of Calgary as a whole.

The purpose of this non-partisan, independent determination is to give the citizens of the City of Calgary an informed, objective perspective of the 2010 Calgary mayoral candidates.

The views in this electoral audit are the views of the Foundation for Democratic Advancement (FDA). Also, the electoral audit is an example of a way to inform the public in their selection of political representatives. Moreover, the audit is a way to hold political candidates and representatives further accountable, and improve the democratic system by placing emphasis on substance/ideas.

The 2010 fifteen Calgary mayoral candidates are as follows:

Amanda Liu  
Barb Higgins  
Barry Erskine  
Bob Hawkesworth  
Bonnie Devine  
Craig Burrows  
Dan Knight  
Gary Johnston  
Joe Connelly  
Jon Lord  
Naheed Nenshi  
Oscar Fech  
Richard William McIver  
Sandra Hunter  
Wayne Stewart

The FDA and its members and volunteers are in no way affiliated with any of the candidates in this audit.

The audit represents an independent assessment by the FDA of the fifteen Calgary mayoral candidates based on objectivity, transparency, and non-partisanship. The FDA's assumes no responsibility or liability for any errors in the calculation of its audit results or inaccuracies in its research of the candidates. The citizens of Calgary will decide themselves who is the new mayor of Calgary.

Amanda Lui, Sandra Hunter, Gary Johnston, Oscar Fech have been removed from the FDA audit due to lack of information on these candidates. The FDA tried to attain information necessary to the audit of these candidates.

Methodology for the audit of the Calgary mayoral candidates:

## Section 1:

Establish the criteria for the mayor position. Leadership was identified as a key competency, as defined by ability to identify issues and act on them, vision, strength to carry through, independent yet team player, and strong communication with peers and public. Moreover, business and communication skills were also identified as essential to the mayor position.

## Section 2:

Identify the basic priorities of the citizens of Calgary as a whole for its municipal government. Use those basic priorities to assist in the audit of the mayoral candidates. (The FDA assessed the public's opinion on various issues.)

Basic priorities of the citizens of Calgary:

1. Budget
2. Taxes
3. Accountability of elected officials
4. Growth rate of city
5. Affordable housing
6. Public transit
7. Traffic issues
8. Accountability of elected officials
9. Miscellaneous policies

## Section 3:

Backgrounds of the mayoral candidates. Evaluate the candidates' political, professional, and volunteer/extracurricular backgrounds, based on their relevance to leading the Calgary City Council and the City as a whole.

## Section 4:

Vision of the mayoral candidates. Evaluate the candidates' visions based on their relevance to the public's basic priorities and overall scope in terms of the future of the City of Calgary.

## Section 5:

Incumbency record of the mayoral candidate (if relevant). Evaluate the candidate's incumbency record based on performance in terms of policies, responses to citizen's changing needs and circumstances, and the candidate's overall leadership ability.

## Section 6:

Evaluate the key policies of the mayoral candidates based on the basic priorities of the citizens of Calgary as a whole.

The key policies to be evaluated are as follows:

Budget: (Evaluation criteria: sound, fiscal management of public revenue and expenditure, and fair distribution of government expenditure to all sectors of the City.)

Taxes: (Evaluation criteria: city tax levels which are in the better interests of Calgarians as whole)

Accountability of elected officials: (Evaluation criteria: soundness and comprehensiveness of measures to further hold elected officials accountable.)

Growth of City: (Evaluation criteria: soundness and comprehensiveness of plan on the growth of the city which is better interests of Calgarians; what is the maximum size without compromising quality of life?)

Affordable housing: (Evaluation criteria: soundness and comprehensiveness of plan to increase affordable housing without overly burdening the tax payers.)

Public transit: (Evaluation criteria: soundness and comprehensiveness of plan to improve public transit through expansion, quality, and frequency of service.)

Traffic issues: (Evaluation criteria: soundness and comprehensiveness of plan to improvement in traffic issues such as parking rates and traffic congestion.)

Miscellaneous policies: (Evaluation criteria: degree to which the policies add or detract from the better interest of the Calgary public as a whole.)

Weighting and scoring:

The categories for backgrounds, visions, incumbency, and each policy section will have a score range of 0 out of 10. The miscellaneous policy section will receive an overall score of 0 out of 10.

Hence, the policy category will have the greater weight in the audit.

The background section will be divided in three scores of 0 out of 10 for political, professional, volunteer experience, but the overall score will be combined to 0 out of 10.

Electoral auditors will do their own scoring, and then share the results with each other, and make any adjustments to the scores. The purpose of approach is to minimize the noise in a group dynamic.

As mentioned, the assigned scores for each category will be based on the combination of the individual scores of the electoral audit team. The scores of members of the audit team have equal weight. All scores must be based on stated and documented reasons and soundness. The Chief Electoral Auditor has the right to question the reasons and their soundness by members of the audit team. Members of the audit have the right to raise concerns with the rationale for scores by other members. The Chief Electoral Auditor has the final say in areas of disagreement, and may remove scores of a member if the rationale is unsound.

FDA Electoral Audit Team:

Chief Electoral Auditor:

Mr. Stephen Garvey, Founder and Executive Director of the FDA (BA, MA)

Electoral Auditors:

Mr. Franklin Nyiawung (BSc, MSc)

Mr. Kevin Lemieux (Hons. Political Science BA)

Mr. Asongafeh Ndobegang (MA International Politics)

Observer:

Mr. Kenneth Xu (BA, Chinese political experience)

Surveyor:

Ms. Courtney Killam (4<sup>th</sup> year university studies)

**Information sources:**

Media articles and analysis of mayoral candidates.

Candidates' policy statements, including policy promises, and visions. The FDA attended the October 6<sup>th</sup> Mayoral forum at the South Centre Mall, and met some of the candidates following the forum.

The FDA questioned the Mayoral candidates on a need basis related to policy, vision, and background information.

---

# Table of Contents:

Background of Candidates

Vision of Candidates

Seven policy areas:

Budget

Taxes

Accountability of elected officials

Growth of City

Affordable housing

Public transit

Traffic

Miscellaneous

Audit Results

Analysis

Conclusion

## Background of Candidates

Evaluation:

Basis for evaluation: Leadership--identifies issues and act on them, vision, strength to carry through, independent yet team player, and strong communication with public.

Scores:

	Political	Professional	Volunteer/extracurricular
Barb Higgins	0/10	4/10	9/10
Barry Erskine	8/10	6/10	7/10
Bob Hawkesworth	9/10	6.5/10	9/10
Bonnie Devine	0/10	1/10	1/10
Craig Burrows	7/10	6/10	8/10
Dan Knight	0/10	7/10	6/10
Joe Connelly	7/10	7.5/10	7/10
Jon Lord	9/10	7.5/10	9/10
Naheed Nenshi	0/10	6.5/10	8/10
Richard McIver	8/10	6.5/10	9/10
Wayne Stewart	0/10	8/10	5/10

Rationals:

Barb Higgins no elected political experience; no mgmt background; no practical experience for the mayor position; very active in community over 21 years with significant organizations.

Barry Erskine 5 terms as Alderman; no mayoral and provincial political experience; no mgmt background; volunteer part of Alderman position; focus on environmental issues.

Bob Hawkesworth exposed to both municipal and provincial political experience; lengthy experience as Alderman; university degrees; pro-active, and experience relevant to mayoral position; wide ranging volunteer experience on municipal issues.

Bonnie Devine no elected political experience; limited experience related to mayoral position; limited volunteer experience related to mayoral position.

Craig Burrows less political experience than Hawkesworth, but relevant political experience; relevant professional experience related to being mayor; focused on wide ranging volunteer interest, though less time frame than Hawkesworth.

Dan Knight no elected political experience; business background and diverse business experience; volunteer experience not as comprehensive as Burrows.

Joe Connelly defeated Burrows in a 2007 Alderman contest; only 1 term as Alderman and no other elected political experience; business background which is more comprehensive and entails higher positions than Knight.

Jon Lord exposed to both municipal and provincial elected political experience, lengthy terms as Alderman; strong business background; extensive and comprehensive volunteer background.

Naheed Nenshi no elected political experience; strong formal education and limited direct business experience; diverse range of volunteer experience.

Richard William McIver no elected provincial political experience; limited business and practical experience related to the mayor position; diverse range of volunteer experience.

Wayne Stewart no elected political experience; well-rounded business and non-profit experience; high business positions; environmental experience; less volunteer involvement than most other candidates.

## Vision for the City of Calgary:

### Evaluation:

Basis for evaluation: Leadership--identifies issues and act on them, vision, strength to carry through, independent yet team player, and strong communication with public.

### Scores

Barb Higgins	7.5/10
Barry Erskine	5/10
Bob Hawkesworth	6.5/10
Bonnie Devine	5/10
Craig Burrows	6/10
Dan Knight	6/10
Joe Connelly	7/10
Jon Lord	7/10
Naheed Nenshi	7/10
Richard McIver	7/10
Wayne Stewart	7/10

### Rationals:

Barb Higgins comprehensive and clear; states means to achieve vision; one dimensional.

Barry Erskine narrow, short-term.

Bob Hawkesworth idealistic; does not articulate how the City will be great for everyone.

Bonnie Devine vague.

Craig Burrows limited, vague.

Dan Knight missing issues; idealistic reliance on direct democracy.

Joe Connelly comprehensive and clear; less comprehensive than Higgins

Jon Lord more concise than Connelly; does not state priorities.

Naheed Nenshi narrow, limited, not comprehensive; states framework; more to City than ideas.

Richard McIver idealistic, not realistic; unclear how Calgary could become economic heart of Canada.

Wayne Stewart focused, better clarity than McIver; defines standard to achieve vision.

# Policies

## Budget

Evaluation:

Basis for evaluation: sound, fiscal management of public revenue and expenditure, and fair distribution of government expenditure to all sectors of Calgary

Scores:

Barb Higgins	6/10
Barry Erskine	6/10
Bob Hawkesworth	4/10
Bonnie Devine	1/10
Craig Burrows	6/10
Dan Knight	5.5/10
Joe Connelly	5.5/10
Jon Lord	8/10
Naheed Nenshi	0/10
Richard McIver	6/10
Wayne Stewart	6.5/10

Rationals:

Barb Higgins more clear policy than Knight.

Barry Erskine not as focused, concise as Stewart; minimal connection to finances.

Bob Hawkesworth status quo on the City's finances.

Bonnie Devine no connection to financial mgmt.

Craig Burrows not as comprehensive as Stewart; no fiscal restraint.

Dan Knight vague; needs more focused, concise budget policy.

Joe Connelly vague; needs to be more clear.

Jon Lord most comprehensive budget policy; clearly identifies the urgency of the City Budget; proposes concrete steps to dealing with budget issues

Naheed Nenshi no stated budge policy

Richard McIver vague; only a means to collect information on the City's budget.

Wayne Stewart cost effective programs; more focused, comprehensive than other candidates.

## Taxes

### Evaluation:

Basis for evaluation: city tax levels which are in the better interests of Calgarians as whole

### Scores:

Barb Higgins	5/10
Barry Erskine	4/10
Bob Hawkesworth	5/10
Bonnie Devine	5/10
Craig Burrows	0/10
Dan Knight	4/10
Joe Connelly	5/10
Jon Lord	6/10
Naheed Nenshi	0/10
Richard McIver	5.5/10
Wayne Stewart	5/10

### Rationals:

Barb Higgins vague; does not support policy claims.

Barry Erskine no tax policy; reliant on commissioners; not responsible.

Bob Hawkesworth status quo on City taxes.

Bonnie Devine vague.

Craig Burrows no stated policy.

Dan Knight shift responsibility to public; not willing to take stand on taxes.

Joe Connelly vague.

Jon Lord clear policy to re-examine taxes and related taxes from the City; unclear what and how he will ensure there are no tax increases—policy needs articulation.

Naheed Nenshi no stated policy.

Richard McIver lacks substance; understands process for City's taxes.

Wayne Stewart vague.

## Accountability of Elected Officials

Evaluation:

Basis for evaluation: measures to further hold elected officials accountable

Scores:

Barb Higgins	5/10
Barry Erskine	2/10
Bob Hawkesworth	8/10
Bonnie Devine	5/10
Craig Burrows	7/10
Dan Knight	7.5/10
Joe Connelly	5/10
Jon Lord	7/10
Naheed Nenshi	7/10
Richard McIver	5/10
Wayne Stewart	5/10

Rationals:

Barb Higgins good ideas; vague.

Barry Erskine very vague; not focused.

Bob Hawkesworth comprehensive.

Bonnie Devine good ideas; public accessibility good.

Craig Burrows comprehensive.

Dan Knight not as comprehensive as Burrows; supports recall of mayor and alderman; greater citizen involvement.

Joe Connelly narrow scope.

Jon Lord not clear enough on public accessibility.

Naheed Nenshi greater transparency on elected officials; no recall policy.

Richard McIver narrow scope.

Wayne Stewart narrow scope.

## **Growth of City**

Evaluation:

Basis for evaluation: plan on the growth rate of the city which is better interests of Calgarians; what is the maximum size without compromising quality of life.

Scores:

Barb Higgins	5/10
Barry Erskine	5/10
Bob Hawkesworth	5/10
Bonnie Devine	0/10
Craig Burrows	3/10
Dan Knight	6/10
Joe Connelly	3/10
Jon Lord	5/10
Naheed Nenshi	7/10
Richard McIver	6.5/10
Wayne Stewart	3/10

Rationals:

Barb Higgins means for growth policy; needs to articulate growth policy; no concrete policy.

Barry Erskine good ideas; no plan.

Bob Hawkesworth needs to articulate policy.

Bonnie Devine no stated policy.

Craig Burrows no connection between his ideas and building a sustainable city.

Dan Knight emphasis on community involvement.

Joe Connelly no connection between his ideas and growth policy.

Jon Lord clear pro-growth policy; though more articulation to reconcile growth and sustainability.

Naheed Nenshi focuses on communities and their quality of life; 60 year plan; contradiction between strong emphasis on business development and sustainable communities.

Richard McIver not as articulated as Nenshi.

Wayne Stewart no connection with growth policy; no articulation of policy.

## Affordable housing

Evaluation:

Basis for evaluation: increase in affordable housing without overly burdening the tax payers

Scores:

Barb Higgins	2/10
Barry Erskine	4/10
Bob Hawkesworth	0/10
Bonnie Devine	6/10
Craig Burrows	5/10
Dan Knight	0/10
Joe Connelly	0/10
Jon Lord	2/10
Naheed Nenshi	3/10
Richard McIver	2/10
Wayne Stewart	2/10

Rationals:

Barb Higgins narrow scope.

Barry Erskine more comprehensive than Higgins.

Bob Hawkesworth no stated policy.

Bonnie Devine most comprehensive plan of candidates.

Craig Burrows not as comprehensive and concrete as Devine.

Dan Knight no stated policy.

Joe Connelly no stated policy.

Jon Lord 2/10 not as comprehensive as Erskine.

Naheed Nenshi more about zoning and building codes and rules.

Richard McIver not as comprehensive as Erskine; narrow, limited.

Wayne Stewart not as comprehensive as Erskine; narrow, limited.

## Public Transit

Evaluation:

Basis for evaluation: improved public transit through expansion and frequency of service

Scores:

Barb Higgins	6/10
Barry Erskine	3/10
Bob Hawkesworth	7/10
Bonnie Devine	1/10
Craig Burrows	7/10
Dan Knight	7/10
Joe Connelly	0/10
Jon Lord	0/10
Naheed Nenshi	7/10
Richard McIver	0/10
Wayne Stewart	7/10

Rationals:

Barb Higgins cover some of transit issues.

Barry Erskine weak; no connection to transit issues.

Bob Hawkesworth comprehensive.

Bonnie Devine very weak; undeveloped.

Craig Burrows innovative.

Dan Knight comprehensive.

Joe Connelly no stated policy.

Jon Lord no stated policy.

Naheed Nenshi addresses a lot of transit issues.

Richard McIver no stated policy.

Wayne Stewart comprehensive.

## Traffic Issues

Evaluation:

Basis for evaluation: improvement in traffic issues facing the city

Scores:

Barb Higgins	7/10
Barry Erskine	2/10
Bob Hawkesworth	7/10
Bonnie Devine	0/10
Craig Burrows	5/10
Dan Knight	6.5/10
Joe Connelly	5/10
Jon Lord	6.5/10
Naheed Nenshi	9/10
Richard McIver	4/10
Wayne Stewart	0/10

Rational:

Barb Higgins comprehensive.

Barry Erskine narrow; no explanation.

Bob Hawkesworth no parking policy; status quo.

Bonnie Devine no stated policy.

Craig Burrows not comprehensive.

Dan Knight not as comprehensive as Higgins; limited to parking issues.

Joe Connelly not comprehensive.

Jon Lord innovative; telework for example; pilot projects on reducing traffic; no parking policy

Naheed Nenshi very comprehensive.

Richard McIver keep high parking rates in City; vague; limited concrete policies.

Wayne Stewart no stated policy.

## Miscellaneous Policies:

Evaluation:

Basis for evaluation: the degree to which the policies add to or detract from the better interest of the Calgary people as a whole.

Scores:

Barb Higgins	7/10
Barry Erskine	no score
Bob Hawkesworth	8/10
Bonnie Devine	5/10
Craig Burrows	6/10
Dan Knight	no score
Joe Connelly	5/10
Jon Lord	7/10
Naheed Nenshi	7/10
Richard McIver	no score
Wayne Stewart	8/10

Rationals:

Barb Higgins focuses on two important issues: public safety and culture/art development.

Barry Erskine no policies identified.

Bob Hawkesworth comprehensive on the environment.

Bonnie Devine vague; a lot of ideas.

Craig Burrows important issues; not comprehensive

Dan Knight no policies identified.

Joe Connelly vague.

Jon Lord focuses on building sports facilities throughout Calgary; comprehensive.

Naheed Nenshi overlap with other policies; needs to be more comprehensive.

Richard McIver no policies identified.

Wayne Stewart comprehensive.

# Audit Results

## Backgrounds

Political Exper. Professional Exper. Volunteer/Extracurricular Exper.

Barb Higgins	0/10	4/10	9/10
Barry Erskine	8/10	6/10	7/10
Bob Hawkesworth	9/10	6.5/10	9/10
Bonnie Devine	1/10	1/10	1/10
Craig Burrows	7/10	6/10	8/10
Dan Knight	0/10	7/10	6/10
Joe Connelly	7/10	7.5/10	7/10
Jon Lord	9/10	7.5/10	9/10
Naheed Nenshi	0/10	6.5/10	8/10
Richard McIver	8/10	6.5/10	9/10
Wayne Stewart	0/10	8/10	5/10

## Totals for Background

Barb Higgins	13/30 (43.3%)
Barry Erskine	21/30 (70%)
Bob Hawkesworth	24.5/30 (81.6%)
Bonnie Devine	3/30 (10%)
Craig Burrows	21/30 (70%)
Dan Knight	13/30 (43.3%)
Joe Connelly	21.5/30 (71.6%)
Jon Lord	25.5/30 (85%)
Naheed Nenshi	14.5/30 (48.3%)
Richard McIver	23.5/30 (78.3%)
Wayne Stewart	13/30 (43.3%)

	Background	Vision
Barb Higgins	4.3/10	7.5/10
Barry Erskine	7/10	5/10
Bob Hawkesworth	8.2/10	6.5/10
Bonnie Devine	1/10	5/10
Craig Burrows	7/10	6/10
Dan Knight	4.3/10	6/10
Joe Connelly	7.2/10	7/10
Jon Lord	8.5/10	7/10
Naheed Nenshi	4.8/10	7/10
Richard McIver	7.8/10	7/10
Wayne Stewart	4.3/10	7/10

Totals for Background and Vision:

Barb Higgins	11.8/20
Barry Erskine	12/20
Bob Hawkesworth	14.7/20
Bonnie Devine	6/20
Craig Burrows	13/20
Dan Knight	10.3/20
Joe Connelly	14.2/20
Jon Lord	15.5/20
Naheed Nenshi	11.8/20
Richard McIver	14.8/20
Wayne Stewart	11.3/20

Policies

	Budget	Taxes	Account.	Growth	Housing	Transit	Traffic	Miscell.
Barb Higgins	6/10	5/10	5/10	5/10	2/10	6/10	7/10	7/10
Barry Erskine	6/10	4/10	2/10	5/10	4/10	3/10	2/10	no score
Bob Hawkesworth	4/10	5/10	8/10	5/10	0/10	7/10	7/10	8/10
Bonnie Devine	1/10	5/10	5/10	0/10	6/10	1/10	0/10	5/10
Craig Burrows	6/10	0/10	7/10	3/10	5/10	7/10	5/10	6/10
Dan Knight	5.5/10	4/10	7.5/10	6/10	0/10	7/10	6.5/10	no score
Joe Connelly	5.5/10	5/10	5/10	3/10	0/10	0/10	5/10	5/10
Jon Lord	8/10	6/10	7/10	5/10	2/10	0/10	6.5/10	7/10
Naheed Nenshi	0/10	0/10	7/10	7/10	3/10	7/10	9/10	7/10
Richard McIver	6/10	5.5/10	5/10	6.5/10	2/10	0/10	4/10	no score
Wayne Stewart	6.5/10	5/10	5/10	3/10	2/10	7/10	0/10	8/10

Totals for Policies:

Barb Higgins	42/80
Barry Erskine	26/70
Bob Hawkesworth	44/80
Bonnie Devine	23/80
Craig Burrows	39/80
Dan Knight	36.5/70
Joe Connelly	28.5/80
Jon Lord	41.5/80
Naheed Nenshi	40/80
Richard McIver	29/70
Wayne Stewart	36.5/80

Total scores

Barb Higgins	53.8/100
Barry Erskine	38/90
Bob Hawkesworth	58.7/100
Bonnie Devine	29/100
Craig Burrows	52/100
Dan Knight	46.8/100
Joe Connelly	42.7/90
Jon Lord	57/100
Naheed Nenshi	51.8/100
Richard McIver	43.8/90
Wayne Stewart	47.8/100

Overall grade and ranking:

1. Bob Hawkesworth	58.7/100	58.7% (D+)
2. Jon Lord	57/100	57% (D+)
3. Barb Higgins	53.8/100	53.8% (D)
4. Craig Burrows	52/100	52% (D)
5. Naheed Nenshi	51.8/100	51.8% (D)
6. Richard McIver	43.8/90	48.6% (F)
7. Wayne Stewart	47.8/100	47.8% (F)
8. Joe Connelly	42.7/90	47.4% (F)
9. Dan Knight	46.8/100	46.8% (F)
10. Barry Erskine	38/90	42.2% (F)
11. Bonnie Devine	29/100	29% (F)

## Analysis:

The FDA audit team reached consensus on all aspects of the audit scoring.

Only five of the eleven mayoral candidates audited received a passing grade. The passing grades of the five candidates were barely satisfactory, with Hawkesworth receiving the highest grade of 58.7% (D+).

Also, Hawkesworth received the highest overall policy grade of 55%.

The low mayoral scores are fairly consistent with other FDA audits such as the 2010 British General election audit and the 2008 Alberta provincial election audit:

### 2010 British Election Audit Ranking

1. Nick Clegg, Liberal Democrat 67.8% (C+)
2. David Cameron, Conservative 65.8% (C+)
3. Gordon Brown, Labour 63.4% (C)

### 2008 Alberta Provincial Election Audit Ranking

1. Wildrose Alliance 63.5% (C)
2. Alberta Liberals 63.2% (C)
3. Social Credit 49.3% (F)
4. PC Alberta 43.6% (F)
5. Separation Party 43.1% (F)
6. Alberta's NDP 41.8% (F)
7. Communist Party 26.8% (F)
8. Alberta's Greens 20% (F)
9. Alberta Party 17.1% (F)

Though Jon Lord received the highest score for background (85%), when coupled with his vision and policies, it translated in him finishing in second, behind Hawkerworth who received the second highest background score (81.6%). In contrast, Barb Higgins received a score of 43.3% for her background, and yet she finished third place overall. The separation between Hawkesworth and Lord came down to Hawkesworth having slightly stronger policies. And the difference between Hawkesworth and Higgins came down primarily to Hawkesworth having a stronger background. And Higgins had more consistent policies than Burrows and Nenshi.

McIver though an apparent front runner in the local polls, had weak and inconsistent policies, and therefore, he received a failing grade.

## Conclusion:

The audit results for the Calgary mayoral candidates are disappointing, since only five of the eleven candidates received a passing grade and the passing grades themselves were barely satisfactory.

Hawkesworth is the FDA's better representative for Calgary. Though he is followed closely by Lord and then Higgins, Burrows and Nenshi.

The mediocre results do not bode well for the next three years of Calgary municipal politics.

The FDA recommends that the new Calgary mayor be given a limited mandate by the Calgary public through a minority percentage of the actual vote.

As of October 14th, Hawkesworth withdrew his candidacy for mayor, in favor of supporting the mayor candidacy of Higgins, and Stewart withdrew his candidacy, in favor of supporting the candidacy of Nenshi. (Apparently, based on recent polls, Hawkesworth and Stewart felt their chances of becoming mayor were unlikely.)

So with Hawkesworth and Stewart no longer in the Calgary mayor race, the FDA audit results are adjusted to the following:

1. Jon Lord 57/100 57% (D+)
2. Barb Higgins 53.8/100 53.8% (D)
3. Craig Burrows 52/100 52% (D)
4. Naheed Nenshi 51.8/100 51.8% (D)
5. Richard McIver 43.8/90 48.6% (F)
6. Joe Connelly 42.7/90 47.4% (F)
7. Dan Knight 46.8/100 46.8% (F)
8. Barry Erskine 38/90 42.2% (F)
9. Bonnie Devine 29/100 29% (F)

Jon Lord is the FDA's better representative for Calgary, with a 3.2% margin over Higgins, and then followed closely by Burrows and Nenshi.

As of October 17th, Burrows withdrew his candidacy for mayor, in favor of supporting the mayor candidacy of McIver. (Apparently, based on recent polls, Burrows felt his chances of becoming mayor was unlikely.)

So with Burrows no longer in the Calgary mayor race, the FDA audit results are adjusted to the following:

1. Jon Lord 57/100 57% (D+)
2. Barb Higgins 53.8/100 53.8% (D)
3. Naheed Nenshi 51.8/100 51.8% (D)
4. Richard McIver 43.8/90 48.6% (F)
5. Joe Connelly 42.7/90 47.4% (F)
6. Dan Knight 46.8/100 46.8% (F)
7. Barry Erskine 38/90 42.2% (F)
8. Bonnie Devine 29/100 29% (F)

Jon Lord is the FDA's better representative for Calgary, with a 3.2% margin over Higgins, and then followed closely by Nenshi and McIver.

The separation between Lord and Higgins comes down to Lord's stronger background, in which he received the FDA's highest grade for background (85%), while Higgins received 43% for her background. (The FDA's background audit entailed analysis of political, professional, and volunteer experiences.) Though Hawkesworth who had a background grade of 81.6% is now supporting Higgins, does not overcome the background discrepancy between Lord and Higgins, because only one person can be mayor. Yet Hawkesworth has the potential to be a valuable advisor to Higgins. Moreover, Burrows with a background score 70% would be less valuable to McIver who received a background score of 78.3%, and the same is the case for Stewart who received a background score of 43.3% and Nenshi a score of 48.3%.

Clearly, in terms of leadership, a key component of being mayor, Higgins has the most to gain from the support of Hawkesworth. In terms of policies, there is no clear advantage to Higgins, Nenshi, or McIver in terms of the support from Hawkesworth, Stewart, and Burrows. Though overall, McIver overtook Nenshi through his partnership with Burrows, and Higgins expanded her margin over McIver and Nenshi, and closed the gap on Lord.

To illustrate, the FDA combined the scores of the three teams of candidates:

Higgins/Hawkesworth	53.8/100	58.7/100	112.5/100	(56.25%)
Nenshi/Stewart	51.8/100	47.8/100	99.6/200	(49.8%)
McIver/Burrows	43.8/100	52/100	95.8/190	(50.4%)

Overall Scores and Ranking of Aligned and Non-aligned Candidates:

1. Jon Lord (57%) (D+)
2. Higgins/Hawkesworth (56.25%) (D+)
3. McIver/Burrows (50.4%) (D)
4. Nenshi/Stewart (49.8%) (F)
5. Joe Connelly 42.7/90 47.4% (F)
6. Dan Knight 46.8/100 46.8% (F)
7. Barry Erskine 38/90 42.2% (F)
8. Bonnie Devine 29/100 29% (F)