

Joint Councils

Public Sector Chief Information Officer Council
 Public Sector Service Delivery Council

Conseils mixtes

Conseil des DPI du secteur public
 Conseil de la prestation des services de secteur public

JOINT COUNCILS MEETING

September 25th, 2019 - Winnipeg, Manitoba

Record of Decision v.3

Attendance

CO-CHAIRS:

Natasha Clarke
 Catherine Bennett

Nova Scotia – PSSDC
 ESDC/Service Canada – PSSDC

Olivia Neal
 Tracy Wood

Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat – PSCIOC
 Prince Edward Island – PSCIOC

PSCIOC MEMBERS:

Benoît Boivin Québec
 Kathryn Bulko MISA (City of Toronto)
 Dafna Carr Ontario
 Rob Entwistle MISA (City of Kelowna)
 Gerry Fairweather New Brunswick
 Dave Heffernan Newfoundland and Labrador
 Hayden Lansdell British Columbia (representing CJ Ritchie)
 Sean McLeish Yukon
 Arlene Williams Nova Scotia
 Rick Wind Northwest Territories
 Munna Zaman Manitoba

PSSDC MEMBERS:

Mark Arsenault
 Deb Bergey
 Mark Burns
 Dawn Curtis
 Shelley Darlington
 Guy Gordon
 Mark Healy
 Gillian Latham
 Christian Laverdure
 Alanna MacDougall
 Raymond Martin
 Adriana Poveda
 Cosanna Preston-Idedia
 Jacqueline Ratté-Kohut
 Sonya Read
 Vidya ShankarNarayan
 Silvano Tocchi
 Danielle White

Prince Edward Island
 MSDO (Region of Waterloo)
 Yukon
 Northwest Territories
 MSDO (Norfolk County)
 Manitoba
 Northwest Territories
 Nova Scotia
 Immigration and Refugees Board of Canada
 Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada
 Public Services and Procurement Canada
 British Columbia (representing Bev Dicks)
 Saskatchewan (representing Lisa Raddysh)
 Manitoba
 Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat
 Innovation, Science and Economic Development
 Canada Revenue Agency
 Indigenous Services Canada

PSCIOC / PSSDC / JOINT COUNCILS OBSERVERS & PRESENTERS:

Jonathan Andrews Service Canada
 Catherine Benning Saskatchewan
 Wendy Birkinshaw Malo Employment and Social Development Canada
 Alexandre Bourque Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat
 Angela Colombage Manitoba
 Krista Dewey Vital Statistics, Nova Scotia
 Anik Dupont Service Canada
 Ray Edwards Corporations Canada
 Robert Frelich Service Canada

Mark Levene
 Alena Lukes
 Margo McCarthy
 Carol Prest
 Cheryl Ringor
 Pirthipal Singh
 Natalie Tarkpea
 David Valentine
 Peter Watkins

Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat
 Vital Statistics, Manitoba
 Employment and Social Development Canada
 British Columbia
 Corporations Canada
 Innovation and Science Development Canada
 Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada
 Manitoba
 British Columbia

Sophia Howse Dan Kerr Kathy Kupfer	British Columbia Manitoba Manitoba	Nick Wise Dan Batista Cathy Kealey	Public Safety Canada ICCS Executive Director Joint Councils Strategic Policy Analyst
ICCS Secretariat: Maria Luisa Willan Stefania Silisteanu			

Item	Topic / Discussion	Decision / Action
	Welcome remarks by Catherine Bennett on behalf of the Co-Chairs followed by introductions.	
1.	<u>ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:</u> A) Approval of Record of Decision from February 27th, 2019 in-person Joint Councils meeting in Ottawa. Record of Decision of Joint Councils' meeting of February 27 th , 2019 approved without changes. B) Acceptance of September 25th, 2019 Joint Councils Agenda Joint Councils' meeting agenda of September 28 th , 2019 approved. No comments or questions raised. C) Joint Councils Action Items Catherine Bennett noted that action items are included for members' review and that several would be completed at this meeting. D) Joint Councils Bring Forward Agenda Catherine Bennett noted that the Bring Forward Agenda is provided for members' information.	<u>Decision #1:</u> Record of Decision of February 27 th , 2019 Joint Councils' meeting in Ottawa approved without changes. <u>Decision #2:</u> Agenda of September 25 th , 2019 meeting approved without changes.
2.	<u>Digital Identity Priority (Refer to TABS 2A & 2B)</u> Sophia Howse and Alex Bourque, Digital Identity Priority Stream Co-Leads, provided an update on the recent work related to Digital Identity. Sophia Howse advised that in February 2019, the Joint Councils approved funds to develop recommendations for the future governance framework for digital identities in Canada. The group was tasked to present the recommendations at the September meeting. Sophia advised that the Digital ID group sent out a governance survey in the spring to both public and private sector organizations. The results of the survey helped to develop and inform the in-person Digital ID workshop held in July. A summary of the survey results and detailed report were shared with workshop participants. Alex Bourque tabled the key recommendations for discussion and approval: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Joint Public & Private Digital ID Forum – a refreshed DIACC 2. Public Sector DI Lead for each jurisdiction – a new jurisdictional focus 3. Public Sector Forum – a reframed IMSC 4. Include Legal Identities such as VSOs, Registrars and Canada Health Infoway 5. Jurisdictional Assessment on readiness to issue digital identities (including legislative review to identify need for changes) 6. ICCS mandated to lead discussion with DIACC and negotiate changes to the DIACC membership fee structure to ensure barrier-free access for all jurisdictions 7. Joint Councils Declaration on Digital Identity – should be reviewed and updated to reflect significant step forward 8. Joint in-person workshops on a quarterly basis 	<u>Action Item #1A:</u> Digital ID Co-Leads to develop a Pan Canadian Digital ID Proposal, with details on resources (skill and analytical capacity) and budget to move this forward. Digital ID Co-Leads to report back to Councils at the next teleconference of November 20 th , 2019. <i>(This proposal will provide details on next steps regarding ICCS engagement and negotiation with DIACC to ensure no financial barriers for jurisdictional participation.)</i> <u>Action Item #1B:</u> Digital ID Co-Leads to send out a call out for jurisdictions to identify their Digital Identity representative. <u>Action Item #1C:</u> Digital ID Co-Leads to work with IMSC Co-Chairs in a review of existing IMSC Terms of Reference and determine future

<p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vidya ShankarNarayan noted that 97% of Canadians business are small business and big contributors to digital identity and that service to business should be considered when it comes to advancing digital identity in Canada. Catherine Bennett noted that if the public sector is joining the private sector in this new ecosystem, it would be helpful to have support from the FPT DMs' Table. What is the view of the Digital ID Co-Leads on that? <p>Alex Bourque responded that they haven't discussed the development of standards, however, next day there will be a joint session with the CIO Strategy Council which is an accredited body to develop national standards. It will be interesting to learn what they could offer and the value to set national standards. The need for standards is captured in the governance report and would need to be addressed. The first step is to get the jurisdictions on board. The Digital ID working group will report back with further recommendations at the next in-person meeting. The group understands the importance of investing in Digital ID and to report to the DMs' Table to build clarity at all levels of government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Silvano Tocchi stated that to be effective, the public sector should work with the private sector on the governance piece and although the public sector representatives could delegate someone as their Digital ID lead, the private sector doesn't have the ability within their constituency to designate someone for that. Things are done differently in the private sector. The conversation about Digital ID has landed within a limited number of private entities which are sophisticated and engaged in these kinds of activities in the technology and financial services space. The other large institutional players are mainly educational, commercial, insurance, health, and are interested in their own purposes. What kind of ecosystem would this be? Is it for the public good? What are the views of the Digital ID co-leads who are the partners and how would they govern this kind of framework? <p>Sophia Howse responded that these questions were raised in the workshop. The workshop included representatives from the public and private sector, including DIACC. If we want to move forward, we need to determine what are the right conversations and who are the leaders from a governance perspective. We are at a crossroads and the main objective is to sort out the governance issue.</p> <p>Alex Bourque added that currently there are barriers that exist that prevent jurisdictions from participating in these discussions. DIACC current high membership fee prevents some jurisdictions from participating. One of the recommendations is to have ICCS (as the legal entity that represents the Joint Councils) negotiate with DIACC to remove these barriers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guy Gordon noted that Canada Health Infoway contributed to the survey results and there is an initiative that by Canada 2022, all Canadians will have 100% access to their health information. He asked on how that fits in terms of a future partnership model? <p>Alex Bourque responded that the Digital ID co-leads plan to engage at the federal level and find synergies and incorporating this into the potential partnership with the Canada Health Infoway.</p> <p>Sophia Howse added that the Digital ID group hasn't invited Canada Health Infoway yet, however, if that is a recommendation from the Joint Councils to engage, the group will work on this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Olivia Neal stated her support for the recommendations to appoint a public sector digital ID lead from each jurisdiction, at all levels of government, and to carry out a jurisdictional assessment on readiness to issue 	<p>alignment of IMSC work (PCTF) to the proposed structure and governance.</p> <p><u>Action Item #1D:</u> Digital ID Co-leads to engage Digital ID Jurisdictional Leads in a coordinated effort to complete an assessment related to the policies and legislative authorities within jurisdictions to determine the ability to issue digital identities.</p> <p><u>Action Item #1E:</u> Digital ID Co-Leads to explore partnerships with VSO, Registrars and Canada Health Infoway and to define roles and responsibilities in advancing the work of the Digital ID.</p>
--	--

	<p>a digital identity. It's important to find out how ready people are across the country. It is important to have tangible elements in moving forward and in keeping the momentum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benoît Boivin stated that in Québec they were influenced greatly by identity theft, the theft allowed them to communicate with financial institutions on what government should do. In terms of recommendations, he suggested having one leader per jurisdiction. This is a complex issue and the role of the private sector is that of partner but not at the forefront of this work. The public sector provides the direction to the private sector, the private sector does not define the work. <p><u>General comments on next steps:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Start with something to test and show value, Digital ID is challenging and difficult to understand, the better we can communicate this to senior leadership, the better this is understood. The governance is not yet determined, however, let's try a sandbox experimentation approach to develop and prove the hypothesis on how the Joint Councils work with different players to advance this work. Recommendation to keep a focus on specific components of the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework (PCTF) such as the verified person. There isn't a digital ID ecosystem without a verified person, this is the foundation, and let's find a way to accelerate the verified person component that would enable Digital ID across the country. Only provinces and territories can issue digital ID and need the legislative foundation to support them being the issuer for verified person. Support for the recommendation to have representation from Vital Statistic Organizations (VSOs) on the Digital ID working group. All VSOs are not equally engaged in this conversation within their own jurisdiction, an entry point will enable the information to flow to their counterparts in support of digital identity. Business and Corporate Registries to be also included in the discussion, they are at different stages in development and have different relationships with Digital ID leads. In Saskatchewan, the Business and Corporate Registry and Digital ID Leads work on projects together, but that is not the same for all jurisdictions. DIACC is a public and private organization with private sector focus, there is a difference and conflict in what they want to accomplish versus what Joint Councils wants to accomplish around Digital ID. A couple of things that raise concern are around DIACC's cost structure which is a barrier for some jurisdictions, the need to have a fundamental discussion on how they're structured to move this forward and highlighting the differences in mandates between public and private sector. <p>Sophia Howse responded that Council members tasked Digital ID co-leads to have people from private sector invited to the Digital ID workshop and there were four people from DIACC where constraints (i.e. cost barrier) were discussed. There was an agreement to bring the recommendations back to Joint Councils members for discussion. Digital ID co-leads are recommending that the ICCS starts the negotiation with DIACC on behalf of the Councils and report back to the table.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was recommended to not use the term "direct" the ICCS as stated in the recommendation but request for the ICCS Board of Directors to review the request to negotiate with DIACC. 	
--	---	--

<p>Dan Batista stated that as a non-for-profit organization incorporated in 2005, the ICCS Board of Directors need to be factored in the relationship of the Joint Councils. The Councils themselves are not a legal entity, the ICCS is the legal manifestation of them. The ICCS Board of Directors is made up of members of the Councils.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natasha Clarke noted that when they start to engage with organizations like DIACC, how can the Councils go ahead as a united voice rather than as separate entities or jurisdictions. The Councils do not have the legal authority but the ICCS, as the organization created by the Councils, does. Need to explore how to leverage the ICCS with direction from the Councils. Are members comfortable to direct the ICCS to negotiate with DIACC to advance this work? <p>Several members commented on the idea of having the ICCS as the neutral platform to negotiate with DIACC on behalf of the Joint Councils, with the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The balance of powers between the public and private sector need to be taken into consideration. It is important that the Councils ask the ICCS how it is positioned; it would be helpful to have a mandate. The ICCS would agree with what members approve but need more clarity on what it is that the ICCS will be negotiating. Need to also be clear that there are things not on the table for negotiation. Notion to propose for the “ICCS to act on behalf of the Councils”, what exactly is this and what is the ICCS going to do, what is the conversation to happen with DIACC? Digital Identity is really good work, going in the right direction, but this also requires the creation of an advisory forum to move this forward as we need a bit more clarity on what this all means. Digital ID co-leads agreed that exploring options is important, need to address the cost barrier with DIACC so that all jurisdictions are represented and fully engaged around this pan-Canadian public-private forum. The Digital ID group commits to do further work based on the feedback at this meeting and report back to the Councils. The cost barrier to participate in DIACC needs to be addressed. Would like for the ICCS to address this so that we, as Councils, are all able to participate and have a collective voice in this new pan-Canadian public-private forum. There are numerous people (groups) mentioned in this new public-private forum, how do we operationalize this? That is something that we need the ecosystem for, but you cannot offer up governance to outside stakeholders. <p>Following the Digital ID discussion, a meeting of the ICCS Board Members present at the meeting was convened to discuss the request for the ICCS to negotiate with DIACC. Natasha Clarke provided the following follow-up as part of this item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natasha Clarke stated that the ICCS Board of Directors proposed that instead of the ICCS directly working with DIACC, the Digital ID co-leads will come back to this group with a Pan Canadian Digital ID Program Proposal, with details on resources (skill and analytical capacity) and budget to move this forward. Collectively we have a strong position to move forward. This work is the cornerstone of collective effort. 	
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint Councils members agreed with the revised approach as presented by Natasha Clarke and the decision was made for the Digital ID co-leads to develop a proposal and report back to the table at the next Joint Councils teleconference of November 20th, 2019. <p><u>Joint Councils members agreed to the following next steps:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Digital ID Co-Leads to develop the first iteration of a Pan Canadian Digital ID Program Proposal, with details on resources (skill and analytical capacity) and budget to move this forward. Digital ID Co-Leads to report back to Councils at the next teleconference of November 20th, 2019. <i>(This proposal will provide details and next steps regarding ICCS engagement and negotiation with DIACC to ensure no financial barriers for jurisdictional participation.)</i> 2) Point of Contact to represent each jurisdiction on Digital ID (public-private forum) – call out to be sent to all members 3) A reframed IMSC (revise the existing ToR and align to new structure and governance) 4) Focus on jurisdictional readiness – Digital ID group to carry out a jurisdictional assessment on readiness 5) Digital ID Co-Leads to seek and formalize partnerships with VSO, Registrars and Canada Health Infoway and to define roles and responsibilities in advancing the work of the Digital ID 	
3.	<p><u>Digital Identity for Business (TAB 3)</u></p> <p>Vidya ShankarNarayan, ISED and Ray Edwards, Corporations Canada, presented on Digital ID and Tell-us-Once. Vidya advised that ISED is focused on advancing work on the Tell-Us-Once approach for service to business, including digital identity.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cosanna Preston-Ideia clarified that Saskatchewan doesn't have a digital wallet yet. Catherine Bennett inquired about a statement in the presentation around "Premiers committing to action under the Canada Free Trade Agreement". <p>Ray Edwards responded that political commitment is key to this work, the group reports back to Premiers and this is what drives it forward. The Multi-jurisdictional Registry Access Service (MRAS) has FPT collaboration aimed at connecting the business registries and it is an agile process leading to a pan-Canadian tell-us-once solution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Olivia Neal noted that the approach is in alignment with Digital Identity, the use of user-centered design, agile development and testing; interested in the data shared and, she asked if they had challenges in that space. <p>Ray Edwards responded that the first step is to decide what data and format to collect, working on protocols, what elements of data are to be shared; it's an ongoing process but it is fundamental and makes the process easier.</p>	No action items.
4.	<p><u>Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators (CCMTA) (TAB 4)</u></p> <p>Marni Kacher Director & Registrar of Motor Vehicles, Driver & Vehicle Policy & Administration, Manitoba Public Insurance and member of the CCMTA Board, gave a presentation on the mandate and work of the Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators.</p>	<p><u>Action Item #2:</u></p> <p>ICCS to connect with Marni Kacher to obtain the CCMTA membership list. ICCS to circulate CCMTA membership list to Joint Councils.</p>

	<p>Marni advised that the CCMTA has a responsibility to provide a P/T/F forum, access to timely data, information and research, responses to requests from the Council of DMs, and oversight, maintenance and custodianship of national reciprocity agreements that have been signed by all P/T/F Ministers of Transportation. There is an MoU between Ministers of Transportation to exchange driver and vehicle data between jurisdictions. CCMTA is the custodian of the Interprovincial Records Exchange (IRE) and is currently in the process of modernizing the IRE.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sophia Howse inquired if the agreements with jurisdictions are with the Ministry of Transportation or with each jurisdiction. Are we able to get a copy of the CCMTA membership? What are the key levels to transform IRE? <p>Marni Kacher responded that agreements with jurisdictions are with the Ministry of Transportation. A membership list of CCMTA can be shared with Council members. Regarding transformation efforts she would consult with appropriate staff and can provide this information later.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Silvano Tocchi inquired as to the use case for the pilot Proof of Concept with a vendor and with Saskatchewan Government Insurance. <p>Marni Kacher responded that the technology is driven to share information between systems in a proper way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alex Bourque inquired around challenges related to governance and how this gets resolved. <p>Marni Kacher responded that issues with governance are challenging when there are numerous jurisdictions involved, however, CCMTA operates on a consensus basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guy Gordon mentioned the reference that CCMTA has about 100 associate stakeholders who tend to be non-voting, how do they play in the CCMTA governance? <p>Marni Kacher responded that what brings people together is a general interest in road safety; many groups involved, broad stakeholder engagement. CCMTA brings policy positions on different policy items in a variety of ways to enable engagement at the table.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guy Gordon inquired about the relationship to Ministers' group, is there a Ministerial table for CCMTA? <p>Marni Kacher responded that there is no official Ministerial group, direction comes from a group of Premiers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digital ID Co-Leads expressed interested in following up with CCMTA around the governance piece. 	
5.	<p>FPT DMs' Table on Service Delivery (TABS 5A & 5B)</p> <p>Catherine Bennett and Mark Burns, FPT DMs' Table Secretariat, provided an update on current priorities of the FPT DMs' Table. Catherine advised that Jaime Pitfield, Deputy Minister, Yukon, is the new P/T Co-Chair.</p> <p>The key takeaways from the FPT DMs' Table teleconference in June:</p>	<p><u>Action Item #3:</u> The FPT DMs' Table Secretariat to provide an update and share the FPT DMs' placemat that has been developed at the next Joint Councils teleconference of November 20th.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FPT DMs are focused on 4 priorities: Digital Identity, Death Notification, Service to Business, and Data Driven Intelligence. The FPT DMs' Table is working on a placemat which will be presented at the DMs' teleconference of October 24th. Once the placemat is completed, it will be shared with Joint Councils. The FPT DMs' Table is aligned and supports the priorities of the Joint Councils. The relationship of the FPT DM's Table and Councils is one of collaboration. The DMs' Table has priority champions that provide direction in advancing work. Natasha Clarke added that MSDO has been invited to participate as an observer, there was no municipal representation at the table in the past. Currently, the FPT DMs' Table is the only DMs table that has direct alignment with the Councils. Council members should contemplate how they leverage the FPT DMs' Table to advance its work. The FPT DMs' Table is a reporting body to the Clerks and Cabinet Secretaries and they are eager to hear from the Councils on opportunities and challenges. Look forward to the conversation on the future strategic direction of the Councils and on how this table can leverage the DMs' Table. Mark Burns noted that Jaime Pitfield, DM, is looking forward to his role as co-chair of the FPT DMs' Table. Jaime retired from the Federal government and now works in Yukon. The FPT DMs' Table Secretariat will provide an update on the Table at upcoming Joint Councils teleconferences. 	
6.	<p>Digital Strategy Working Group (TAB 6A & 6B)</p> <p>A) Presentation on Governance in the Digital Age</p> <p>Kent Aitken, Policy and Partnerships, Government of Canada Digital Academy, gave a presentation on Governance in the Digital Age.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natasha Clarke stated that the presentation was validating. She added that “trojan horses” (<i>open and public success stories, benign and safe initiatives, irreversible pilots and accountability mechanisms</i>) speak volumes, they viewed the trojan horse approach a few times in Nova Scotia and it worked. Their initiative with the rebate program was foundational for the establishment of what is now the Chief Digital Officer role. <p>B) Digital Strategy Working Group</p> <p>Guy Gordon and Mark Burns, Digital Strategy Working Group Co-Chairs, and Cathy Kealey, Strategic Policy Analyst, gave a presentation on the current work of the group and recommendations for next steps. Guy reminded members that at the February 2019 In-Person meeting, the Joint Councils actioned the Digital Strategy Working Group to identify ‘Pain Points’ related to advancing Digital Strategy. A jurisdictional pain points survey was fielded in the summer on two main questions, 1. Challenges advancing digital strategy within the jurisdictions, and 2. Challenges advancing digital strategy within Joint Councils. There were 14 completed surveys from all levels of government. Cathy Kealey presented the results of the survey which were included in the meeting binder.</p> <p>Mark Burns asked for members feedback on the recommendation to task the Digital Strategy Working Group to prioritize and assess Joint Council pain points for potential and bring forward a plan for approval at the next meeting. Do the pain points that came out of the survey resonate with members? How can the table work collaboratively to address the Joint Councils pain points identified in the survey results?</p>	<p><i>No action items.</i></p> <p><u>Action Item #4:</u> Digital Strategy Working Group Co-Chairs to develop a proposal and options related to the Joint Councils Pain Points and to report back at the next meeting.</p>

	<p><i>(Organizational Culture/Change, Governance Issues, Managing Complexity, Skills/Expertise, Funding/Budget, Leadership, Process/Methodology (Agile), and Legacy/Technology (Integration)).</i></p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dafna Carr stated that pain points are high level, as a group we can agree, but need to consider how we are going to package these; what are the use cases, demos, benefit realization? <p>Mark Burns responded that feedback received on moving this forward was around the governance process, especially in digital identity, for example, how do we support each other to be more effective and how can the Councils work in an agile way. The group is proposing to use the grid (slide 14) included in the deck for each pain point and bring back proposals and options for members' consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Bennett thanked the Digital Strategy Co-Chairs for a comprehensive report. She noted that this discussion ties into the next presentation around the future strategic direction of the Councils. 	
7.	<p>Joint Councils Strategic Direction – (TAB 7A to 7C)</p> <p>Natasha Clarke stated that the objective is to have an engaging discussion with members on the Councils' governance and operating model to enable achievement of our priorities and adapting to changing contexts and for members to decide on how we move forward. She referenced the report to the Joint Councils prepared by Cathy Kealey, Strategic Policy Analyst and her consultations with Joint Councils and Working Group Co-Chairs which form the basis for this discussion.</p> <p>The Councils have evolved from an information sharing table to one that is focused on co-creation and co-delivery. The Councils can leverage the ICCS platform cross-jurisdictionally to advance key priorities. Need to find ways to stop working off the corner of the desk. This work would initiate a review of our governance & agenda management and meeting formats to provide recommendations that will position the Joint Councils to address current and emerging priorities. We will also review the connections and reporting relationship to other tables/groups such as the FPT DM Service Table and provide recommendations.</p> <p>Recommended next steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Task the Digital Strategy Working Group with oversight of this work and endorse resource support. 2) Update reporting relationships & meeting structures to support the advancement of key priorities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Move the Data Driven Intelligence and Service to Business Working Groups from the PSSDC to the Joint Councils. o Update the format of the in-person meetings: Joint Councils meetings to become 1 ½ days and ½ day for PSSDC & PSCIOC. <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dan Batista added that the Councils have evolved from information sharing to co-creation and co-delivery. The ICCS is a legal entity and it was created by the Councils, for the Councils. The ICCS is a neutral platform and acts on behalf of the Councils. There is an opportunity for significant work to be done by all three levels of government, like what was done for BizPal. The need is for interjurisdictional work to reside on a neutral platform, which is the ICCS. 	<p>Decision #3: Joint Councils' Members approved tasking the Digital Strategy Working Group with oversight of the work related to the future strategic direction of the Councils.</p> <p>Decision #4: Joint Councils' members approved in principle to be flexible around the proposed new format for the meetings - Joint Councils 1½ day and ½ day for PSSDC and PSCIOC meetings - however only if this is required.</p> <p>Decision #5: Joint Councils members approved Natasha Clarke as the new provincial co-chair of the Digital Strategy Working Group replacing Mark Burns.</p> <p>Action Item #5A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digital Strategy Working Group Co-Chairs to do a call out for participation, refresh membership. As part of the call out, Co-Chairs to seek a federal co-chair. Co-chairs to update membership noting Natasha Clarke as provincial co-chair replacing Mark Burns.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natasha Clarke reiterated that there is great opportunity in leveraging the ICCS platform to enable inter-jurisdictional work. This work is proposing to review all options and opportunities to advance our priorities and to also come back with recommendation around formalizing the relationship to other tables such as the FPT DMs' Table. Members noted the interest in seeing the outcomes of leveraging the ICCS platform in moving Digital ID forward. Regarding the governance and structure of the Councils, it was suggested to start with what we currently have and determine how do we want these groups working together. Many CIOs would like to be part of the discussion, recognizing that there are areas of more interest than others, however, there is great value in coming together and hearing different perspectives around the table to reach common objectives. It was noted that it is challenging to look at the priorities from a bigger group. There is a need though to have more aligned discussions and integration between the Councils. It was noted that MSDO has observer status at the FPT DMs' Table, however, when they talk about governance, something is missing as MSDO does not have the political mandate, as this comes from the province. and federal government. MSDO doesn't have a role in creating Digital ID but they are eager to be part of the solution. Where is the equivalent of the FPT DMs Table related to governance from the municipalities' perspective? It was suggested for the group to look at the process of onboarding for new members. How do we ensure that new members of the Councils are aware of who is around the table, what are the core principles of what it mean to represent our jurisdiction at this table? How can we leverage opportunities for collaboration at the working group level? How do we as member support common goals of the Councils. Better understanding of who is around the table and areas of common interest and how to support moving these forward. Onboarding piece should be a priority, it takes a couple of years for new members to learn the role. Need to outline expectations of what means to be a member and on how to report back on this work in your own jurisdiction, who are you supposed to connect with, what is the commitment, how can you contribute to this work of the Councils. Need resource to develop the onboarding piece with core principles and mentorship. The next generation of the public servant the "so what" and why would they want to come to this body, why they would like to invest time and funding. The information and orientation are helpful, however, how about the co-development from a small jurisdiction's perspective. There are struggles with scale, ability to delegate resources, service transformation, and redefining service models. The notion of co-development and alignment, sharing resources, to achieve common things, looking at and considering how to pull resources to move faster and further, that is very helpful for small jurisdictions. Need to look at the current role of the CDO and how do we engage with them around this work. There is value in using the ICCS platform to co-develop and co-deliver. Opportunity to fully explore ICCS as a lab of interjurisdictional experimentation. Do need a bit more clarity on what this ICCS role is (how/what/when/who). 	<p><u>Action item #5B</u> Digital Strategy Working Group Co-Chairs to review members' feedback and report back on several items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Onboarding process (development of core principles, mentorship, communications) Agenda management to tackle key priorities Review of Councils' governance and structure to enable co-creation and co-delivery Opportunities for leveraging the ICCS Review and recommendations on formalizing relationships with external tables, i.e. FPT DMs' Table. <p><u>Action Item #5C:</u> PSSDC and PSCIOC members to discuss the recommendation to move the DDI and Service to Business Working Groups under Joint Councils at their meeting on September 26th. PSSDC and PSCIOC to report back on their decision at the next Joint Councils teleconference.</p> <p><u>Note 1:</u> <i>Following the meeting, TBS (Olivia Neal) expressed interest in the federal co-chair role of the Digital Strategy Working Group.</i></p> <p><u>Note 2:</u> <i>Following the meeting, MSDO (Shelley Darlington) expressed interest in supporting the work related to onboarding of new members.</i></p>
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support in clarifying relationships with external tables/partners like the FPT DMs' Table. Need to communicate better the value of the Councils to senior executives, i.e. FPT DMs' Table. • It was recommended for this work to have a federal co-chair, currently there are only provincial co-chairs. • It's important for the Councils to have better visibility as a group in other departments. Need to play a greater role with co-creation and will need to engage other groups. Often in departments (jurisdictions), they develop services, but this is mostly done in silos. Opportunity to leverage this FPTM table to have a horizontal approach to the work and in tackling key activities. • It was suggested for the table to focus on results. There are challenges in getting to results. Need to think about building solutions and prototypes that can help us move forward in practical ways. • The group was asked to report back as the work shapes up so that members have opportunity to provide input on the way forward. <p><u>Next steps:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Bennett stated that the discussion on the future direction of the Councils and the recommendation from the Digital Strategy Working Group are in alignment. She suggested to have a federal co-chair for the Digital Strategy Working Group to support the current two provincial co-chairs. • Tracy Wood recommended that as Mark Burns moves to the PSSDC provincial co-chair role, Natasha Clarke to take on the Digital Strategy Working Group Co-Chair role. <p>Members were supportive of this change to the Digital Strategy Working Group membership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natasha Clarke stated that the group will work on the following immediate next steps: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Call out for participation (refresh) on the Digital Strategy Working Group 2) Digital Strategy Working Group to also look for a federal co-chair on the group 3) Group to review members' feedback and report back on several items: onboarding process (development of core principles, mentorship, communications), agenda management to tackle key priorities, review of Councils' governance and structure to enable co-creation and co-delivery, opportunities for leveraging the ICCS, and review and recommendations on formalizing relationships with external tables, i.e. FPT DMs' Table. • Natasha Clarke asked for a decision on the recommendation of moving the Data Driven Intelligence Working Group and the Service to Business Working Group under the Joint Councils. • Catherine Bennett suggested that before deciding on moving the DDI and Service to Business Working Groups under Joint Councils, for each Council to have its own discussion on this matter at their meeting the next day and to report back to this table on their decision. • Natasha Clarke asked members for feedback on updating the format of the Joint Councils meetings to a 1½ day and ½ day for PSSDC and PSCIOC meetings. She noted that it has become challenging to limit discussion at Joint Councils for one day as there is a lot of key priorities to advance. The group is mindful that each Council also has its own priorities and requires its own time for discussion. 	
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members approved in principle to be flexible around the proposed new format for the meetings - Joint Councils 1½ day and ½ day for PSSDC and PSCIOC meetings - however only if this is required. It was noted that there may be meetings where this extra half a day for Joint Councils may be necessary but other times it may not be. This would largely depend on agenda management. 	
8.	<p>Discussion on Legislative, Policy and Data Sharing Barriers (TAB 8)</p> <p>Wendy Birkinshaw Malo, ESDC, reminded members that at the PSSDC February meeting, an action item was assigned to the co-chairs of PSSDC to develop a problem statement for addressing legislative and data sharing barriers impeding the advancement of Joint Councils and PSSDC priorities. She noted that Canadian and many international governments, in addition to several Joint Councils working groups, are exploring the legislative, policy and data sharing landscape affecting service delivery. It is proposed that recommendations be developed to address legislative, policy and data sharing barriers affecting the advancement of the following key Joint Councils and PSSDC priorities: Digital Identity, Death Notification, Service to Business and Data Driven Intelligence.</p> <p>The following is tabled for members' consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assigning the Data Driven Intelligence Working Group to develop the proposed approach/workplan Proceed to undertake the work as outlined in the approach (provided in meeting package) with an estimated \$60K earmarked to support fleshing out the problem definition and use case exploration Seek a federal co-chair for DDI to provide a federal perspective and support the provincial and municipal DDI co-chairs in the work. <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sonya Read was supportive of use cases, the more specific the better to frame and identify the issues. This piece may be a little different than the focus in terms of analytics of the data. A lot of the work in terms of environmental scans has been done by TBS and we can share the information on the jurisdictional scans for the framework. Guy Gordon stated that as current co-chair of DDI he is supportive of this recommendation. This was identified as one of the areas in the Analytics Playbook for Deputies to take the lead on and support. There is benefit in using existing material and bringing the right resources to work on scoping this out properly. This would be a great deliverable for the table. Sonya Read volunteered to take on the Data Driven Intelligence Working Group Federal Co-Chair role. She suggested for the group to develop a work plan to determine project and resource requirements. Natasha Clarke recommended for the DDI request for funding to be discussed at the PSSDC meeting the next day. DDI is a PSSDC working group. <p>Guy Gordon stated that this is an early estimate and the group will report back on a specific proposal at an upcoming meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Olivia Neal asked the DDI Working Group to report back on the approach to be undertaken to advance this work. 	<p><u>Decision #6:</u> Joint Councils members approved Sonya Read as the new Federal Co-Chair of the Data Driven Intelligence Working Group.</p> <p><u>Action Item #6:</u> Data Driven Intelligence Working Group Co-Chairs to develop a proposal and workplan for addressing legislative and data sharing barriers impeding the advancement of Joint Councils and PSSDC priorities. Proposal to include funding requirement for approval.</p>

	<p>The tasks to be included in a work plan (as per recommendation):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Developing an understanding of what are the specific legislative, policy and data sharing barriers affecting each of the four priorities, through identification of specific use cases in order to support analysis, recognizing the legal and policy analysis will be specific to what is being shared, with whom and for what purpose, and that generalization of barriers will be difficult ○ Confirming which barriers are real versus perceived ○ Assessing which barriers should be addressed first, considering factors such as overall impact in advancing one or more of the priorities and possible “quick wins” ○ Completing an environmental scan of other federal-provincial/territorial-municipal committees that may be addressing similar barriers ○ Completing an environmental scan to determine what other jurisdictions or countries have done to address the top barriers ○ Developing recommendations to address the top barriers including the proposed model(s), use case(s) and inter-jurisdictional pilot(s) to test the recommendations 	
9.	<p>Results of Business First 2019 (TAB 9)</p> <p>Michal Dziong, ICCS Research Manager, and Marina Gilson, Ipsos, gave a presentation on the results of Business First 2019. Business First (formerly Taking Care of Business) is a series of studies which have been conducted every 2 to 3 years under the direction of the ICCS. This is the sixth iteration and the fourth study that the ICCS has done with Ipsos. Michal noted that the other key ICCS research study, Citizens First, is in development.</p> <p>Business First surveys explore various dimensions of the evolving service environment, tracking perceptions of service quality and performance for a wide range of services offered by federal, provincial/territorial, regional and municipal governments. Key objectives to measure are related to the service reputation of various levels of government in Canada as perceived by business users of government services; satisfaction with government services provided to businesses; the drivers of satisfaction; usage and preference of delivery channels and motivations for using online services; and attitudes toward regulatory burden and its reduction.</p> <p>Key takeaways from the results of the Business First 2019 study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is significant potential for improvement in service reputation across all levels of government. ➤ Emphasis should be placed on future issues and issue resolution, as these have the lowest scores. ➤ Governments should strive to improve service so that fewer customers experience issues or problems and provide options for resolution when they do occur. ➤ Government service providers should support the customer journey across more than one channel where appropriate. <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Bennett was interested to know if Ipsos considered the priorities of the Councils in the study. <p>Marina Gilson responded that they are looking into a new format for the study and that this would be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Dan Batista added that with Citizens First they are looking at a different approach to the study and involving Joint Councils members and other stakeholders. This would allow the ICCS greater insight into the ability</p>	<p><u>Action Item #7:</u></p> <p>ICCS to consider for the next iteration of Business First to have comparable data with other countries and bring measurable elements to see where Canada stands. ICCS to share with Joint Councils members the quarterly refresh of the Business First when ready.</p>

	<p>to formulate questions. The ICCS is looking into unpacking these studies and with Business First we are looking at quarterly refreshers, continually reporting on basic metrics. Looking at more innovative and agile ways to refresh and update these key research pieces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hayden Lansdell suggested that there is an important piece for this table, the frontline pieces of services and making sure they have the architecture in place with the right components on back end to help services, using data to make the service better. <p>Marina Gilson responded that there is an opportunity for this study to go to a deeper level and to have stakeholder sessions that bring together people to look at what the clients want, what technology is needed and what is the right infrastructure to support it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sean McLeish stated that there is an opportunity to compare the results in Canada with other International jurisdictions that are more digitally advanced, for example the private sector or NGOs to compare and see what is possible to do in that space. <p>Marina Gilson responded that this is a valuable suggestion. Future iterations of the study will consider measurable elements to compare with other countries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> David Valentine inquired if Ipsos had the data to compare between clients having the service face to face or online, to choosing to go in person or online? <p>Marina Gilson responded that they included face to face transactions within what they measured with business clients, however, they didn't include whether it was the only choice they had. We do ask them if they were aware that they could do the service online. Businesses are much less likely to use face to face as opposed to the consumers. People don't feel comfortable to report business information amongst different levels of government. Businesses prefer telephone or online as it is more comfortable and faster than face to face.</p>	
10.	<p><u>Other Business:</u></p> <p>A) Working Group Reports</p> <p>Tracy Wood noted that updates from Working Groups that have not presented today are included in the binder for information only.</p> <p>B) Next in-person meeting of the Joint Councils is taking place on February 26th, 2020 in Toronto, ON. Upcoming Joint Councils teleconference are scheduled for November 20th and January 16th.</p> <p>Tracy Wood thanked all members, observers and presenters at the meeting. She also thanked the ICCS team for the organization of the meetings and events.</p> <p>Tracy Wood thanked Natasha Clarke for her commitment, leadership and support as the provincial PSSDC Co-Chair over the last three years.</p> <p>Natasha Clarke thanked the Joint Councils co-chairs and members for their continued support.</p>	
	<p><i>The meeting adjourned at 4:35 pm CDT.</i></p>	