

JOINT COUNCILS MEETING

October 26th, 2021

Record of Decision v2

#	Topic / Discussion	Decision / Action
	Welcome remarks by Mark Burns, PSSDC Co-Chair, on behalf of the Co-Chairs followed by roll call.	
1.	<p><u>ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:</u></p> <p>A) Approval of Record of Decision from February 23, 2021, Joint Councils meeting. Record of Decision of Joint Councils' meeting of February 23, 2021 approved without changes.</p> <p>B) Acceptance of October 26th, 2021 Joint Councils Agenda. Joint Councils' meeting agenda of October 26, 2021 approved. No comments or questions raised.</p>	<p><u>Decision #1:</u> Record of Decision of the Joint Councils' meeting of February 23, 2021 approved without changes.</p> <p><u>Decision #2:</u> Agenda of October 26th, 2021 Joint Councils' meeting approved without changes.</p>
2	<p><u>DATA DRIVEN INTELLIGENCE WORKING GROUP</u> (Refer to TABs 2A & 2B)</p> <p>Michael Taylor, DDI Working Group federal Co-Chair, stated that the Data Driven Intelligence Working Group was requested by the Joint Councils to conduct research on "Insight into the public's acceptance of government use of data". Insight into the public's acceptance of government use of data is needed to inform future direction around intergovernmental data use in Canada. As well as provide foundational material for a future project to investigate and outline options to address legislative, policy and data sharing barriers to integrated and seamless service delivery across levels of government. Davis Pier Consulting was contracted to do this work.</p> <p>Greg Lypowy and Eliza-Jane Stringer from Davis Pier Consulting gave a presentation on key findings in the report. The report is being tabled at Joint Councils for members' feedback. The final report will be circulated to members, the one in the meeting package is for review.</p> <p>The DDI Working Group Co-Chairs, Michael Taylor, Kelly Fuessel and Andrew Satterthwaite, encouraged members to read the full report. The presentation deck is only a quick overview of the report.</p> <p>The following are the key recommendations from the report.</p> <p><u>Theme 1: Understanding levels of public trust</u></p>	<p><u>Action Item #1A:</u> The ICCS Secretariat to send out to members a request for feedback on the report tabled by the DDI Working Group on "Insights into Public Acceptance of Government Use of Data". Feedback to be submitted by November 1st.</p> <p><i>(Action Item completed. Message sent to JC members on October 26th)</i></p> <p><u>Action Item #1B:</u> Data Driven Intelligence Working Group Co-Chairs to report back on specific recommendations and roadmap of future activities to be</p>

<p>A. Engage with the public across Canada to better understand their levels of acceptance of government data use</p> <p>B. Encourage governments to establish formal monitoring of Canadians' levels of public acceptance of data use and sharing</p> <p><u>Theme 2: Strengthening the relationship between government and the public</u></p> <p>C. Support government to promote transparency to build / regain trust</p> <p>D. Encourage governments to allow citizens to opt into a "tell us once" approach, where data may be shared with other government departments for a set of agreed uses</p> <p>E. Advocate for the prioritization of Indigenous Data Sovereignty by government organizations</p> <p><u>Theme 3: Improving internal government operations</u></p> <p>F. Encourage governments to establish centralized Data Authorities</p> <p>G. Educate public servants on what information they can and cannot share (secondary usage) and the requirements for consent, according to privacy legislation in their jurisdiction</p> <p>H. Encourage and support F/P/T/M legislative reform to enable the secondary uses of data not currently allowed</p> <p><u>Members' Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linda Maljan (NT) inquired if the researchers have any findings about people's level of comfort or interest in seeing the common client registry and the use of single sources of information being used for multiple channels. <p>Greg Lypowy (Davis Pier) responded that nothing specifically came out on that. Citizens would prefer that government sets up a central repository of their information, so they don't have to provide their personal information multiple times.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kelly Fuessel (DDI WG co-chair, SK) added that it is about the solution, what they should be doing differently in response to asking once or "Tell Us Once" approach, how they would achieve that and what kind of solution would be considered? How would people interpret the use of their data by the government? What type of solution should be in place to respond to what they heard out of the report? Registries could be an option. Ima Okonny (Chief Data Officer, ESDC/Service Canada) stated that there is an intersection of trust such as people perception about data and data use, there is strong trust element that is beyond data and use of that. In the example that the consultant used, did they see any intersectionality about youth, marginalized youth and vulnerable population, a link to that perception on trust? Did they see any singular patterns in that segment of the population? <p>Eliza-Jane Stringer (Davis Pier) responded that there is an intersection of trust and comfort level when it comes to youth. There is lots of trust in terms of usage. Marginalized populations have low levels of trust. It is an interesting one with the youth because of their comfort level with technology and online services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Denis Skinner (PSCIOC co-chair, TBS) inquired about the kind of findings in the research, there are some expectations that certain population have less trust and maybe that is expected, but what is the opposite of inclusivity. <p>Eliza-Jane Stringer (Davis Pier) responded that findings around privacy and trust speak about people being comfortable in making trade offs around personal data sharing if they can get quicker or easier service in return. There is another example around the use of contact tracing and people being comfortable with this in the benefit of public health. There are various situations where people see personal data sharing for their own benefit and therefore willing to share.</p>	<p>undertaken by the group and/or Councils to support this work going forward.</p> <p><u>Action Item #1C:</u></p> <p>Data Driven Intelligence Working Group Co-Chairs to provide a final copy of the report "Insights into Public Acceptance of Government Use of Data" once members' feedback has been incorporated.</p>
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ima Okonny (Chief Data Officer, ESDC/Service Canada) inquired if they saw the perception of data in service delivery in terms of trust in government and the openness to allow the government to share citizens' data with private companies. Was that linked to the ability to offer services? How do they perceive government ability to do what they say they are doing in terms of service delivery? <p>Eliza-Jane Stringer (Davis Pier) responded that there are international studies and findings related to trust, where delivery could be an impediment to fulfilling that trust and to share. The level of comfort and ability to deliver on what was promised is associated with trust and comfort level.</p> <p>Greg Lypowy added that this ties to the recommendation they made around <i>enhancing government transparency of use of information</i>, tell people about the info and how it has been collected and used. That goes a long way to building trust, allowing citizens to feel they understand on how data is being used and this creates trust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ima Okonny (Chief Data Officer, ESDC/Service Canada) inquired if the consultant had asked a different question, would they expect to see or have similar findings? Trust is the core regardless to what questions they ask; wouldn't they get the same findings? Was that particular to data? <p>Eliza-Jane Stringer mentioned that it is intuitive, but consultants would require more research on this topic.</p> <p>Greg Lypowy added that it is not something they heard or explored, it is based on various things, including consent. Consent is one area worth investigating further and it would be something to look at what kind of consent is needed. They noticed that consent and privacy notices are required to be re-written to allow people to understand them and to know what is going on. They always make the recommendation for reading the privacy notice or a consent that is not understandable by the people who would sign or put a check mark on it. There are many good examples in government readable, understandable consent and privacy notices that could build upon trust, authorize to get the consent, and allow people who are giving the consent to understand what they are signing up for.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alex Coleman (Citizen Centric Services CoP co-chair, ON) inquired if there was a difference in the trust level based on different generations in the study. With the pandemic and the technology, it may show different trends in the future. <p>Eliza-Jane Stringer (Davis Pier) responded that in terms of generations in general, there is higher levels of trust in the younger population. Part of that was around the levels of trust the younger generation have in technology and understanding data sharing.</p> <p>Greg Lypowy (Davis Pier) stated that there were examples in the report that showed the demographic of 16- to 24-year-old, having less concern of data sharing online than other groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael Taylor (Data Driven Intelligence WG co-chair, TBS) inquired as to what other research would be useful to build upon this work. <p>Greg Lypowy (Davis Pier) responded that one area is looking at consent and the concept of consent. Data sharing within the government is also an important one. Finding ways to foster and looking at changing regulations/legislation, what they must do to make it easier to share information. The report identifies those jurisdictions that are currently changing legislation. In Nova Scotia, for example, there is work on creating a standard data sharing protocol across social policy departments, it is complex, they also need to get to questions of secondary use of information collected. That is another area that could be explored.</p>	
--	--

<p>Eliza-Jane Stringer (Davis Pier) added that the information collected and available was around data consent for immediate purpose, however, there is less literature or research on data sharing specifically for providing citizen's data for multiple uses. Data sharing in the context of the Canadian population geographically as well as demographically, looking at the smaller or underserved population in the behavioural literature, understanding the behavioural and the levels of consent across different groups in comparison to Australia or USA. Looking at the Canadian context to better understand Indigenous population, LGBTQ community and other groups.</p> <p>Greg Lypowy added that it would be interesting to ask a question around what uses of data are more plausible than others? Looking at findings for use of collection of data for intelligence gathering or for preventing fraud or for policy development, is there is a more direct ask for government use of data sharing? The government openness to use information across departments and levels of government. What is the acceptance of use of data for planning online services related to RMV or planning health care services, maybe there is a direction that they might want to pursue?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Bennett (PSSDC co-chair, ESDC/Service Canada) stated that it would be interesting to find out more around expanding secondary use of data. Where does the government want to use secondary data and how does the public feel about it. There is a lot to consider in terms of policy making. It would be a strong public interest consideration for expanding use of data and the question is how do you go about this? • Michael Taylor (DDI WG Co-Chair) suggested developing a roadmap for future work or activities to build on this work. • Jackie Stankey (AB) suggested data breaches as a future item coupled with trust, both within the public and private sectors. Another future area for consideration may be an environmental scanning of what governments are doing in terms of punitive or penalties on data breaches in the private sector with the proliferation of online shopping and moving into digital. <p>Greg Lypowy (Davis Pier) responded that it would be interesting to scan the industry looking at the citizens and talk about what industry (private sector) is doing with their data, and what should be done around that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kelly Fuessel (DDI WG Co-Chair) noted the need to ensure that the investment made by the Joint Councils for this work gets its full value so that the report informs future direction around intergovernmental data use in Canada. As well as provide foundational material for a future project to investigate and outline options to address legislative, policy and data sharing barriers to integrated and seamless service delivery across levels of government. He recommended that the Councils' working groups and communities of practice examine what has been found, interpret it and report back on how they would apply that in going forward and what that would mean for them. That is the benefit of this research on the citizens' perception of the information provided to all the service delivery channels that they offer and support. It is important to take into consideration what has been found to determine what needs to be changed or altered. The group proposes to come back to Joint Councils with a roadmap on next steps and on engaging the working groups of the Councils on this discussion going forward. • Andrew Satterwhite (DDI WG Co-Chair) stated that one of the key focus when they started this research was to facilitate data sharing within governments. There are two lines of research: 1. on actual public perception. They had some authors from the DDI WG and from Stats Canada to assist with this, and 2. to address the legislative barriers directly and put forward a roadmap that could be applicable to all levels of government for changes of legislation that would enable public servants to share data. He recommended the idea of recognizing the list of how and what government wants to share data for and making that public. 	
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael Taylor (DDI WG Co-Chair) suggested that the Data Driven Intelligence WG will take away the report and bring it back with specific recommendations for this group: the roadmap and defining the areas of focus. They didn't have enough research on the international comparatives. He thanked Greg and Eliza-Jane for the presentation and the great work they've done. • Maria Luisa Willan (ICCS) noted that the secretariat will recirculate the report to members for feedback. Then Davis Pier will finalize the report with all suggested changes (within scope of project). The final report will be shared back with members. <p>Denis Skinner thanked Davis Pier for the presentation and the DDI WG Co-Chairs for leading this work.</p>	
3	<p><u>MCKINSEY: FUTURE OF WORK: TRENDS, CHALLENGES, RISKS & PATH FORWARD</u> <i>(Refer to TAB 3)</i></p> <p><u>McKinsey Team:</u> Kevin d'Entremont, Associate Partner/Director Rob Palter, Senior Partner, Global Co-Head of McKinsey's Real Estate Practice Megan McConnell, Partner, Public Sector Future of Work Leader Phil Kirshner, Senior Expert, Workplace Strategy and Change Leader Maria McKay, Advisor</p> <p>Rob Palter and team led a presentation on the Future of Work: Trends, Challenges, Risks and Path Forward. The presentation focused on the following themes including considerations for public sector organizations.</p> <p>The Workforce Trends and business and people implications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Automation, technology enablement drives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Lower emphasis on physical and repetitive tasks — Increased emphasis cognitive, emotional, and digital skills • Shift away from "individuals and positions" to "skills and tasks" • Adoption of new models to assess and develop skills • Renewed commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion <p>How Work Happens Implications of hybrid work for Public Sector organizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-imagining what work truly needs to be done onsite vs. offsite and creating collaborative remote working or hybrid on-site / offsite models • Increasing flexibility to meet workforce expectations on parity between consumer and workplace experiences • Changing the way outcomes, outputs, and productivity are measured <p>The Workplace Strategies for managing real estate and Government real property</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If government organizations are going to have in-person work, it has to count • Solving around onboarding, community, and "collisions" required for innovation and sustainment of culture • Evolving to prioritize resiliency and access to talent, often by moving away from main offices toward a more diverse office construct across the country <p><u>Members' Discussion:</u></p>	<p><i>No action items identified at the meeting.</i></p>

- Tracy Wood (PSCIOC co-chair, PEI) thanked the McKinsey team for the presentation. She noted that in her jurisdiction, they recognize that it is not just about technology or people or space, but it is about all those things put together. In PEI they formed a multidisciplinary team to look at how they are going to re-envision the workforce within the public service and they created activity hubs where they look at space and technology as the tools. The tools are the true value, and it is the outcome that they are trying to get to.
- Colin McDonald (MB) inquired about the economic impact especially if the public sector moves to this new model. In MB they occupy a lot of space downtown and there is concern on how this translates into economic impact to the city, and to rural communities. There is a significant shift and a balance to be considered of the economic impact. Numerous private sector employers are vacating the downtown core, significant shift in the whole economic base. Some consideration for economic impact should be taken into account as part of this discussion.

Rob Palter (McKinsey) responded that it is a fundamental question from an economical development standpoint but also from a tax perspective. There is a big issue at the municipal level, with occupancy in Class A office space in central business districts in Canada. There is a school of thought of whether those buildings worth less than they thought they are worth, then the municipal tax would go down. This has a big impact on small businesses. This shift is also causing migration of people. Some smaller cities would get a big growth which is driven by people who moved from big cities. There are some pros and cons to be explore further.

- Tracy Wood commented that with that comes the competitive nature of salaries, small jurisdictions comparing with others. The salary rates are different, competing as a public sector is difficult. She asked if they found something similar in their research.

Rob Palter responded that the question is more related to labour laws. He mentioned that in the USA, there are several companies that inquired their employees if they wanted to work remotely and if they want to live in a city that is away from head office, they welcome and embrace this, but this pays less.

Megan McConnell (McKinsey) mentioned that in the USA, they are thinking of having the same rate in a big city as in a small one. They are thinking to have it based on where they live and on the taxes they pay. There are numerous HR and Tax policies that need to be created when they offer those jobs across the country and that would be governed by laws and regulations and others in the private sector based on the market.

- Melanie Robert (Canada Open Government WG co-chair, TBS) inquired about how to use this moment of having an inclusive public service. She inquired if they have seen who has benefited most from this flexible approach to work and what members should be mindful of in planning for the future of work. Some of the segments of the populations could benefit more from flexibility than others, there is also the danger for people who can go to work and have a two-tier system, of those that are part of the “club” (in the office) and those that are not (remote work). Any findings on this?

Megan McConnell responded that there are 2 sides: 1. the access to talent: it would reduce the opportunity for the public sector to access different kinds of talent that it couldn't have been accessed before, (they haven't known about various jobs) and 2) if there was this mandate and you would be in a physical office you didn't want to move, because of the family or other aspects. The pandemic has released some of the requirements on education, (for those with the college degree, they would have been asked to prove what they can do with the job output and the delivery on their output). Employers could hire employees who don't have a 4-year college degree - that they wouldn't have hired before. There is various data.

McKinsey completed the “Women in the Workplace” report in the USA looking at the social and public sectors. Women are feeling more burnt out than ever, yet they have been shouldering more of the emotional weight of the pandemic, they been stepping up to lead, drive culture, to do all things virtually and that has not been rewarded or even acknowledged. They have more responsibilities at work and home under the flexible model and it’s not being recognized in the workplace. There are some tactical things that could be implemented, for example:

- 1) All important personnel strategy, promotion discussions, and meetings should be scheduled at least 3 weeks in advance for people to have in their calendar and for the most part that can be done. And if there's an emergency then everybody is making any effort to have that and if there is an exception, those strategic discussions should be done well in advance and everyone could address their schedules and comments.
- 2) Deliver promotion evaluation and promotion by a committee not by an individual. Having diversity referee ensuring that the committee are representatives of the overall workforce. And then rigorously tracking the data behind that: what the recruitment looks like, what their promotion looks like, are they losing grounds, how are results coming out and committing to make big changes and fixing it. That is seen in the public and private sectors with good benefits.

Rob Palter added that one of the risks of flexible work is being progressive in diversity and inclusion. Many organizations are having this issue, there are certain jobs where employees must be physically in the building to fulfill that job, cannot be done remotely. In the public sector there could be some elements that require employees to physically be at work to fulfill their responsibilities. People who would be required to go into the building are not the management class and so many would feel put out that the management class has the pay and the flexible work and these people who are required to go to the office and taking the COVID risk in the process. That could be seen neither diverse nor inclusive.

Phil Kirshner (McKinsey) commented that not everyone wants 5 days a week of remote work, some people want a little and they are starting to see things that changed and would never think in retail sector. For example, Apple hasn’t thought on how to do that, but they would like to give flexibility to their workforce and work with them to figure out on how to change the employees’ week. Employers recognize that they don’t know how to do it, but they are willing and trying to work with the employees so they could start piloting and look for those cases. Flexible work practices, better agendas in meetings, giving people time to think of what they are going to do and inject information and questions before being in person meeting all of that is fantastic for the population that you want to attract, but often employers don’t operate that from the top down, and employees feel left out.

- Tracy Wood mentioned that intentionality goes to diversity of people who are working from home and in office or in a hybrid model, looking at what the leadership is doing. They have the diversity across level and the outcome-based should be the focus.
- Bev Dicks (BC) inquired if there was a different expectation from the public on how public servants implement the hybrid model versus different for-profit businesses. There is an expectation that the taxpayers have from public servants. Was there any research completed on the public expectations from the public servants on the hybrid model in their communities?

Phil Kirshner responded that there is an expectation from individual workers to be flexible, but many people in government mentioned that they cannot have nice offices as the others that they are competing with, it would be inefficient use of public funds to have that. It would be beneficial for public servants to lean on the flexible programs, using the public funds efficiently.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bev Dicks commented on the public service value chain, trust, and confidence in government. At the beginning of the pandemic citizens were concerned that the government offices have closed, and it escalated their anxiety as the government people weren't working in their community. In British Columbia government offices remained open with personnel in place who experienced various levels of wellbeing and concern during the pandemic to lower the anxiety of those communities concerned that they cannot access government services. <p>Phil Kirshner responded that telehealth is very popular now, however, some people would prefer to interact with the doctor in person, the same with government services. They may allow for better investments into more engaging and technical enabled spaces because they are not carrying the same level of administrative burden.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Michelle MacFarlane (NS) stated that in Nova Scotia they are in the process of proceeding with a hybrid model, the findings are that employees who have been working remotely for 18 months, for 5 days a week, are asking why they cannot continue to do so. And on the other hand, some employees are inquiring about perks to compensate for them working on the front line. They are struggling with the mindset change from COVID emergency to the new way of working and communicating. She inquired to what would be the mental shift. <p>Rob Palter responded that for the broader public sector to work, it needs to have physical connectivity, build personal relationships, trust, culture, collaboration, and cohesion in a team. Individuals can perform their job 5 days a week indefinitely, but the employer is trying to build an organization and the collective is as important as the individual. They must balance those things.</p> <p>Tracy Wood thanked the McKinsey team for an excellent and insightful presentation. She noted that it would be valuable to see analytics on the hybrid work model; people working remotely and from home. Also, information (statistics) around the health status of individuals who are working in various locations. If members had more questions, they were encouraged to send to the ICCS.</p>	
4	<p>RESULTS OF THE PSSDC and PSCIOC INFORMATION SHARING ANALYSIS</p> <p>Maria Luisa Willan (ICCS) advised that the ICCS is starting a recruitment process to fill the position of Research Analyst. Sophia Jesow, who was previously in this position, recently started a new employment opportunity but has been retained under short contract to deliver the daily newsletter and monthly research executive reports for the next few months until we have a suitable replacement. The secretariat will be sharing a copy of the job description and we invite members to share this opportunity with your network and those that you think may be interested in working within a pan-Canadian context, providing support to the federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal levels of government to advance the strategic research priorities of the Councils. We also encourage members to consider offering a secondment opportunity for at least a one-year period. This is a valuable opportunity in FPTM relations where someone can bring their research, data analytics and communications experience to carry out these specific and important deliverables.</p> <p>Maria Luisa also advised that Richard Dalpé, Research Committee federal co-chair, is retiring in December and a call out will be sent to federal members to consider this exciting leadership opportunity. The secretariat thanks Richard for his extraordinary leadership, commitment and guidance supporting the Councils' research priority over the last few years.</p> <p>Maria Luisa reminded members that the PSSDC and PSCIOC Information Sharing analyses are found in the meeting binder. PSSDC and PSCIOC members submitted jurisdictional reports for the September meeting, this enables enables FPTM jurisdictions to exchange key information regarding organizational accomplishments, priorities, issues/needs, and topics of interest.</p>	<p><u>Action Item #2A:</u> The ICCS Secretariat to send out a message asking members to identify candidates for the Research Analyst position or to consider offering a secondment opportunity.</p> <p><i>(Action Item completed. Secretariat sent message to members on November 3, 2021)</i></p> <p><u>Action Item #2B:</u> The ICCS Secretariat to send out a call out for a federal co-chair for the Joint Councils Research Committee.</p>

PSSDC analysis:

- Most service delivery priorities noted in the PSSDC information sharing documents align with the priorities of the Joint Councils related to Digital ID, Client Centric Services, and Research and Strategic Intelligence.
- Citizen-Centric services was the most reported service delivery priority across all governments. The COVID-19 pandemic continues to place greater emphasis on the need to better understand and improve the experiences of citizens. Jurisdictions aim to make public sector services more accessible, easier to deal with, and more responsive to individuals and communities.
- FPTM organizations are no longer struggling to absorb the shock generated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Based on ongoing progress of vaccination rates and improvements of key public health and health care indicators, governments are turning their focus towards recovery and re-opening measures. FPTM organizations are focusing on the following service delivery areas in the current recovery phase.

FPTM Service Delivery organizations identified specific areas where interjurisdictional collaboration would be beneficial. The predominant areas mentioned by jurisdictions have been grouped into the following six themes: 1. digital transformation, 2. digital enablement, 3. digital identity, 4. enterprise strategic planning, 5. COVID-19 response and recovery, and 6. privacy.

PSCIOC analysis:

Most of the priorities noted in the PSCIOC information sharing documents align with IT/IM priorities of the PSCIOC related to Cloud, Cybersecurity, and Digital Connectivity and to those of the Joint Councils related to Digital ID, Client Centric Services, and Research and Strategic Intelligence. FPTM IT/IM organizations are no longer struggling to absorb the shock generated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Based on ongoing progress of vaccination rates and improvements of key public health and health care indicators, governments are turning their focus towards strengthening IT/IM goals to aid pandemic recovery measures.

FPTM CIO (IT/IM) organizations identified specific areas where interjurisdictional collaboration would be beneficial. The predominant areas mentioned by jurisdictions have been grouped into the following six themes: 1. digital identity, 2. digital experience, 3. Cloud security, 4. Talent management and development, 5. Chatbot technology enablement, and 6. cybersecurity.

Regarding jurisdictional showcase opportunities, there were not as many offers this time around however there are some topics that are aligned to Councils' interests and priorities. The secretariat will plan the next set of learning events around these topics.

Interest in Showcases:

- Robotic process automation
- Yukon's use of Geospatial capabilities in service delivery
- Ontario's Digital identity and digital adoption journey
- Chatbot use cases

There is ongoing work on Digital Identity. The PSSDC will have a discussion this week on their path forward and how best to support Joint Councils' priorities. The Secretariat is working closely with the JC co-chairs; however, members are welcome to send topics of interest or recommendations on items they would like to discuss or present on. The

	<p>secretariat would like to ensure that agendas have relevant topics that are engaging and lead to actionable outcomes. The working groups of the Councils (16) continue to do tremendous work and there is opportunity to leverage those networks and expertise around priority topics.</p> <p>The next JC Learning Event is on November 18th. Thanks to Denis Skinner who has arranged for the presentation by Matthew Skelton and Manuel Pais, authors of the book <u>Team Topologies: Organizing Business and Technology Teams for Fast Flow</u>. They will present on concepts of organizational architecture, guiding leaders on how to structure effective value delivery teams, stream-aligned teams that own an entire slice of the business domain (or other flow) end-to-end, the platform as a product approach.</p>	
9	<p><u>Other Business:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tracy Wood (PSCIOC Co-Chair, PEI) noted that the Action Items list, Bring Forward Agenda, and update reports from several working groups (Privacy Sub-Committee, GDPR and Death Notification CoP) were included in the meeting binder for information. She thanked the ICCS Secretariat for organizing and managing the meeting. 	
	<p><i>Tracy Wood thanked members, presenters, and observers for their participation in the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. EDT.</i></p>	

Attendance

CO-CHAIRS:

Tracy Wood
Denis Skinner

Prince Edward Island – PSCIOC
Treasury Board of Canada – PSCIOC

Catherine Bennett
Mark Burns

ESDC/Service Canada- PSSDC
Yukon - PSSDC

PSCIOC MEMBERS:

Jan Bradley
Liz Byrne-Zwicker
Hong Chung
Dave Heffernan
Sophia Howse for CJ Ritchie
Jonathan Kelly
Sean McLeish
Rick Wind

MISA W, City of Calgary
New Brunswick
Manitoba
Newfoundland and Labrador
British Columbia
Québec
Yukon
Northwest Territories

PSSDC MEMBERS:

Sylvain Beauchamp
Bev Dicks
Lori Doran
Shelley Darlington
Kathryn Durkin-Chudd
Jean-Paul Fradette
Mitch Freeman
Roxanne Hersack
Gillian Latham
Linda Maljan
Michelle MacFarlane
Necie Moulard
Rene Nand
Michelle Orth
Denis Poirier
Sonya Read
Judy Ross
Cameron Sinclair
Jackie Stankey
Silvano Tocchi

Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada
British Columbia
Indigenous Services Canada
MSDO, Norfolk County
Manitoba
Manitoba
Veterans Affairs Canada
New Brunswick
Nova Scotia
Northwest Territories
Nova Scotia
Newfoundland and Labrador
MSDO, Region of Peel
MSDO, Region of Peel
Indigenous Services Canada
Treasury Board of Canada
New Brunswick
Ontario
Alberta
Canada Revenue Agency

PSCIOC / PSSDC / JOINT COUNCILS OBSERVERS & PRESENTERS:

Tareq Al-Shumari	Ontario	Margo McCarthy	ESDC/Service Canada
Rhianna Begley	British Columbia	Colin McDonald	Manitoba
Jean-François Biron	Québec	Trevor Milne	ESDC/Service Canada
Mariana Brandao	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	Jennifer Mulligan	Innovation, Science and Economic Development
Guillaume Charest	ESDC/Service Canada	Kitiya Myles	Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada
Alex Coleman	Ontario	Vincent Painchaud	Québec
Angela Colombage	Manitoba	Carol Prest	British Columbia
Richard Dalpé	Treasury Board of Canada	Kristy Ready	Canada Revenue Agency
Robert Devries	Ontario	Mélanie Robert	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat
Harpreet Dhillon	MISA, City of Calgary	Charles Ruby	Québec
Isha Dhingra	Ontario	Nataliya Rylska	Innovation, Science and Economic Development
Edward Dodd	Ontario	Andrew Satterthwaite	MSDO, Region of York
Jason Doiron	Northwest Territories	Louise Simos	Ontario
Cathy Evans	Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada	Perry Slump	British Columbia
Robin Flaherty	ESDC/Service Canada	Dean Sutton	British Columbia
Kelly Fuessel	Saskatchewan	Natalie Tarkpea	Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada
Elky Hanlon	Nova Scotia	Michael Taylor	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat
Zelko Holjevac	Ontario	Peter Watkins	Digital ID Program Executive
Marc-Étienne Joseph	ESDC/Service Canada	Dan Batista	ICCS Executive Director
Mark Levene	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	Linda Robins	ICCS Manager Business Operations
Betty MacLean	Prince Edward Island		

ICCS Secretariat:

Maria Luisa Willan

Stefania Silisteanu