



Draft – v.2

JOINT COUNCILS MEETING – PSSDC-PSCIOC

February 24th, 2016

Toronto, ON

MINUTES OF MEETING

Attendance

PSSDC & PSCIOC CO-CHAIRS

Chris Bookless (PSSDC)	Yukon
Jacques Paquette (PSSDC)	ESDC/Service Canada
John Messina (PSCIOC)	Treasury Board of
Harry Turnbull (PSCIOC)	MISA East (City of Windsor)

PSSDC MEMBERS

Don Bougie	Canada Post
Steve Burnett	Ontario
Natasha Clarke	Nova Scotia
Josée Dussault	Canada Revenue Agency
Guy Gordon	Manitoba
Karla Hale	MSDO Central Region (Region of Peel)
Janine Halliday	MSDO Eastern Region (City of St. John's)
Ron Hinshaw	British Columbia
Caitlin Imrie	Citizenship and Immigration Canada (representing Robert Orr)
Donna Kelland	Newfoundland & Labrador
Réa McKay	Public Works Government Services Canada
Christian Laverdure	Industry Canada
Paul Pierlot	Manitoba
Alan Roy	New Brunswick
Jackie Stankey	Alberta
David Ward	Ontario
Nicholas Wise	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat

PSCIOC MEMBERS

Mark Brisson	Alberta
--------------	---------

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

Kathryn Bulko
Sandra Cascadden
Donna Davis
Marion Guinn
Bette-Jo Hughes
Norman MacDonald
Sean McLeish
Rick Ouellette
Fred Pitt

MISA Canada (City of Toronto)
Nova Scotia
Halifax Regional Municipality (MISA) (representing Chris Fisher)
Manitoba
British Columbia
Prince Edward Island
Yukon
New Brunswick
Ontario (representing David Nicholl)

OBSERVERS / SUB-COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS

Farnaz Behrooz	ESDC/Service Canada
Joni Brennan	Management Consultant, DIACC
Glen Brunetti	Region of Peel (MSDO President)
Mark Burns	Yukon
Serge Caron	Chair, Cloud Working Group and Co-Chair, Service Mapping Sub-Committee
Dennis Carter-Chand	Ontario
Jennifer Cave	Canada Revenue Agency
Richard Dalpé	TBS, Research Committee Co-Chair
Michal Dziong	ICCS, Research Manager
Anik Dupont	ESDC/Service Canada, Death Notification Lead
Rob Frelich	ESDC/Service Canada, CDI Lead
Sophia Howse	British Columbia, Framework Working Group Co-Chair
Cathryn Landreth	Alberta, Information Management Sub-Committee Chair
Nancy MacLellan	Nova Scotia, ICCS Board President
Natalie McGee	ISED
Lee Parker	Canada Post
Rhonda Tsingos	City of Brampton (MSDO)
Annette Vermaeten	ESDC/Service Canada, Costing Working Group Co-Chair
Rita Whittle	TBS, IMSC Co-Chair

INSTITUTE FOR CITIZEN-CENTRED SERVICE

Dan Batista
Maria Luisa Willan
Linda Robins



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

Item	Topic / Discussion	Decision / Action
1.	<p><u>ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:</u></p> <p>Welcome by Co-Chairs and roundtable introduction of Council members and observers.</p> <p><u>A) Approval of Record of Decision from September 17th, 2015 in-person Joint Councils meeting, St. John's, NL (TAB 1A)</u></p> <p>Chris Bookless asked members if there were any questions or comments on the minutes of the September 17th, 2015 meeting. No comments or questions were raised. Minutes adopted.</p> <p><u>B) Review of Action Items from previous meetings (TAB 1B)</u></p> <p>Maria Luisa Willan, ICCS Secretariat, noted that all action items would be completed at this meeting except for one item regarding the Service Mapping Sub-Committee who has requested to report back to the Joint Councils in 12-18 months on a proposal to detail how the SMSC would evolve into a 'standards' body within the Councils (as per request from Sept. 2015 meeting).</p> <p><u>C) Acceptance of February 24th, 2016 Joint Councils Meeting Agenda (TAB 1C)</u></p> <p>No comments or questions were raised by members. All members approved the Joint Councils meeting agenda for Feb 24th, 2016.</p>	<p>Decision # 1: Minutes of Sept. 17th, 2015 Joint Councils meeting adopted.</p> <p>Decision # 2: Agenda of February 24th, 2016 meeting accepted.</p>
2.	<p><u>Update on the FPT Deputies Ministers' Table on Service Delivery Collaboration (verbal update)</u></p> <p>Annette Vermaeten provided an update on the FPT Deputy Ministers' Table meeting of Dec. 3rd, 2015 and on agenda planning for the FPT DMs' Table May 2016 meeting. She noted that Nova Scotia has agreed to co-chair the FPT DMs' Table. Annette advised that at the December meeting there were several updates regarding a number of items including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identity Management - discussion around Canada's digital interchange as well as the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework presented by BC and Alberta. She noted that the Deputies were very interested in moving this forward as a priority item and expressed their support. ○ Service to Business – the DMs' Table continues to place this item as high priority on the agenda. There was also a discussion on the Pan Canadian Business Number adoption and expansion. FTP collaboration is also underway regarding the next generation of BizPal and Canada Business Network related to emerging priorities around Channel Shifting and Service Network Collaboration. ○ Open Data – the DMs' Table was pleased about the level of innovation demonstrated concerning 	<p>Action Item #1: FPT DMs' Table Secretariat to provide update on Deputies' May 2016 meeting at the April PSSDC and PSCIOC teleconferences.</p>



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

approaches to exploring Open Data; Annette referred to the 4th Canadian Open Data Summit scheduled for April 28th in NB. Participation is currently being sought for this event. She noted that several jurisdictions are also interested in the BC Developer Exchange Program Pilot - several Canadian and International forums are advancing this work. The Table is interested in hearing more on this front and the value of Big Data in the work related to service delivery.

- FPT Framework discussions – In Jan 2015, the Clerks and Cabinet Secretaries committed to providing leadership at the FPT DMs' Table in advancing its priorities and requested roadmaps to advance this work. In moving ahead with the Table's priorities, the Joint Councils discussions around framework at this meeting may help to shape the direction of this work which is on their May meeting agenda.

Annette Vermaeten advised that the next FPT DMs' meeting is taking place in Ottawa on May 27-28, 2016. Preparations are well underway for the meetings; DMs Table will be marking its 10th anniversary. Annette noted that for the May meeting DMs are expecting updates and fruitful discussions on the priority areas including Identity Management, Service to Business, and on service design (which includes the three emerging priorities for the PSSDC: Channel Shifting, Service Network Collaboration and Death Notification as well as Open Data and Big Data). She also noted the importance of international speakers/presentations at the DMs Table meetings, in the past UK and Australia have been invited to present on topics of interest. The Table is trying to build on that success again moving forward and are in talks with three jurisdictions: Singapore (One Password); US (Open Data and Big Data as it relates to Service Delivery); NZ (service experience for business). Members were encouraged to make suggestions regarding additional international representation at the DMs Table. Annette noted that consideration may be given to the possibility for cost-sharing to bring international guests to the meetings.

Discussion:

- FPT DMs' Table Secretariat requested to provide update on Deputies' May 2016 meeting agenda at the April PSSDC and PSCIOC teleconferences.

3.

IDENTITY MANAGEMENT

Identity Management Sub-Committee (IMSC) (TAB 2A)

Rita Whittle, TBS, and Fred Pitt, Ontario, Co-Chairs of the Identity Management Sub-Committee (IMSC) gave an update on the current work around identity management. Rita thanked members for their participation on IMSC and collaboration in advancing this work. Rita gave an update on the Pan-Canadian context, progress update on development of the Pan-Canadian Identity Trust Framework and overview of next steps. Fred Pitt gave an overview of identity management in the context of Ontario and the need to take on a digital public service perspective and to look for ways to streamline access. He noted that Ontario is moving forward with the implementation of digital public services. He noted that digital identity is 'key' to advance this work. Fred highlighted the importance of collaborative work and to find ways to streamline access in developing a digital

Action Item #2A

Identity Management: IMSC Co-Chairs to provide update at an upcoming PSSDC and PSCIOC teleconference around next steps on the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework in regards to Trust Framework Charter, development of Trust Framework Conformance Criteria and identifying additional stakeholders.



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

economy in Canada. There is a clear need to have information moved easily and securely across jurisdictions.

Questions were reserved for the roundtable discussion on identity management following updates from CDI and DIACC.

Canada's Digital Interchange (CDI) (TAB 2B)

Robert Frelich, HRSDC, and Annik Casey, TBS (via teleconference), gave an update on the work of the CDI. Robert noted that since the September meeting update on CDI, the group is just beginning the latest phase in the development of the business case. The Federal Deputy Ministers Committee on Service and Federating Identity had provided CDI with a mandate to prepare a business case for Spring 2016. He noted that with the new government, the Prime Minister has requested that the President of the Treasury Board develop, in collaboration with the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Labour, a new service strategy that aims to create a single online window for all government services with new performance standards, as well as rigorous assessments of the performance of key government services. This has reinvigorated federal needs for real-time identity information sharing. The recently-issued ministerial mandate letters clearly outline the government's service improvement priorities including:

- Developing new service strategies
- Improving and expanding existing services
- Implementing new service standards
- Performance measurement and reporting

This would also support the proposed Pan-Canadian Digital Government Vision of the Joint Councils, including:

- "Providing best in class, client-centric public services," and
- "Creating digital government for Canadians"

Robert Frelich noted that the group is on track to complete business case this spring. He noted the key activities, engagement efforts, and next steps moving forward as well as the associated dates (*refer to slide 13 in TAB 2B*).

Discussion:

- Josée Dussault asked to describe the link between individuals and businesses and the role of CDI more thoroughly.
 Robert Frelich responded that some federal departments have indicated that they identify business by identifying an individual who works for that business; and so, ideally they'd like to be able to use a CDI process to identify an individual working for a business as well as another process to identify the business - the link between two forming an identity triangle.
 Josée advised for CDI to pay careful attention as to how this form of sharing is being discussed and presented in the business needs document. There is a complexity to the link which must be kept in mind and is why

Action Item #2B

Identity Management: IMSC Co-Chairs to provide progress report to the Joint Councils at the September 2016 Victoria meeting on the work of the IMSC. (possible items for discussion: Engagement of Intergovernmental Affairs (or equivalent) in respective jurisdictions, Fit within broader Digital Service/Digital government agenda, Political Driver/Leadership, Investment, Readiness/Maturity assessments against Trust Framework across Canada, Sustainability/ongoing maintenance, Compliance, Use Cases).

Action Item #2C

Identity Management: Canada's Digital Interchange (CDI) Co-Chairs to provide a progress report at the next Joint Councils meeting in September.

Action Item 2D

Identity Management: DIACC to provide a progress report on their current activities around the Unified Trust Framework, development of certification process and Trustmark, funding model, member engagement and proof of concept at the September Joint Councils meeting.

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

individual and business CDI solutions are being developed in parallel.

Robert responded that the business needs document is essentially describing what stakeholders would 'like to do' and the 'ideal' for CDI, some of which may or may not be feasible and/or beyond the scope of identity or legal confines. The document attempts to note important aspects that are doable. Robert also mentioned that this type of work is necessary to ascertain what the service is going to be; what program(s) it is going to support and how it will be put into place.

- Natasha Clarke noted her interest in the discussion around the business number and the parallel activities. Is there a stream of activity looking at the Business Number? Clarity is lacking around how CDI supports the Business Number - is this parallel work happening and how/when will the profile be raised?
 Robert responded that from his point of view there is a need to be able to do both. How this is done will be up to other jurisdictions as well. There is a departmental business need to establish a link between the two - to validate business and identify individuals.
- Jennifer Cave mentioned that from a CRA point of view they have been doing a lot of work in identifying the linkages between the individual and the business. The individual first has to be authenticated and from here the authentication occurs with the business and the connection between the two is made. At this time the CDI and BN are there but in two different phases - the BN is an operation and a working prototype. It is also recognition that at the backend when we're doing our authentication for the business, they are already authenticated as an individual. They are keeping a close eye on ensuring alignment and as mentioned this is an iterative and evolving process.
- Natasha Clarke inquired if whether at the provincial level she should be engaging more heavily with her registrar, business registry and legal/privacy legislative team on this work. Is there an opportunity for NS to start planning to ensure that efforts are lining up and completing all that needs to be done?
 Jennifer Cave responded that at the last provincial BN conference, members were engaged and were asked to begin looking at the authoritative sources that reside within them. This work is at an early stage and has made efforts to engage with the provinces to ensure that provincial considerations are taken into account.
- Paul Pierlot noted that in terms of other work being completed, the Service to Business Task Group did some work with CRA in 2014/2015 but was never brought to conclusion: this project track is the Expedited Business Start and certainly the BN has factored into that. If EBS were to work on a multi-jurisdictional basis it would require the authentication piece built in. The S2B CoP will be looking at this in the design sessions that will be held in a few weeks. Paul suggested more work to be done to advance this work.
- John Messina advised for this feedback regarding what needs to be done to be captured in regards to the upcoming Framework discussion. The Councils need to ensure that all streams of work connect to the broader Framework discussion and are not missed or dropped off the agenda.

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

- Rita Whittle stated that in regards to the Business Number discussion from an Identity Management perspective, it is critical to look to businesses and organizations as well. It is about the individual first but then it becomes about what else are we linking the identity information to. She noted that IMSC is considering businesses in the trust model development.
- Bette-Jo Hughes mentioned the work around inter-jurisdictional business registration as one of the Clerks priorities and stressed the need to make sure this is connected as well: this may be the foundational piece needed to make that service work.
- Caitlin Imrie noted that Citizenship and Immigration is working in close collaboration with CDI and they are using the ILP as the pathfinder opportunity to move the markers, making sure it is clear on requirements and moving in an iterative manner. CDI is the ultimate vision and ILP is how they will get there in a tangible manner in the interim period while the ultimate vision is realized.
- Guy Gordon asked what the notion of the business case is and how compelling it is based upon the information the group currently has as well as what might be required to make it more compelling? What are you looking to do?
 Robert Frelich responded that from a federal point of view the data shows a compelling need to share information and complete identity validation between departments. In addition, he maintained that if this is going to be successful, the provinces and territories need to be engaged; without this it becomes a federal service which would limit the value.
 Nick Wise added that strengthening the business case is a question of elaborating the extent of the complexity (jurisdictional wrangling, technological barriers, etc) and clarifying what CDI means. This case is about what Canadians want, need and deserve and not how complex it is for jurisdictions.
- Donna Kelland commented that provinces and territories do want to share information with each other. They do this now in rudimentary form (in terms of vital statistics information) but noted the lack of formal security/protection around these types of initiatives. Donna inquired if an analysis of federal legal authorities is being completed, is anyone doing an analysis/assessment of provincial and territorial legal authorities? What are the next steps to make this happen?
 Robert Frelich responded and reiterated the need for further discussion and collaboration/communication between and within provinces, territories and federal jurisdictions on this.
- John Messina noted that Council members need to have further discussion on federating identity and trust frameworks and how important that is to the digital vision and digital government going forward.

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

Digital Identity and Authentication Council of Canada (DIACC) (TAB 2C)

Joni Brennan, Management Consultant, advised that she had replaced Aran Hamilton, former President of DIACC. She gave an update on the current work of DIACC. In terms of the key highlights that DIACC has accomplished Joni referenced:

- 1) White Paper on Building Canada's Digital Future - outlines the need for government and the private sector to collaborate and establish a set of Digital Identification and Authentication Standards (DIA).
- 2) As a result of the White Paper, DIACC membership grew to 42 members consisting of Canadian thought leaders from across the private and public sectors. Joni has been brought in to leverage the successes to date and to engage the engine of DIACC and ensure members have the opportunity to engage efficiently and effectively in working with the public sector.
- 3) The strategic roadmap for DIACC is being developed over the next quarter to be shared at the next Joint Councils meeting. There are five critical areas of development (refer to *slides 8-12*): 1) Create and publish a unified trust framework (Pan-Canadian Trust Framework) - V1 completion is scheduled for this May. 2) Develop a certification process and Trustmark - Currently building this working group; membership participation in the review process is required. 3) Create a mid-term funding model for 2017 - looking to create an alternative funding model so DIACC won't need to rely as much on membership funding. 4) Proofs of Concept - it allow innovators to move forward at a sustainable pace; allows exploration of the art of the possible in a neutral space within the DIACC so that lessons can be learned through experience. Enables innovators to move forward understanding risks and how to stay on track in terms of aligning principles with trust framework. 5) Member Engagement - a tentative schedule for Canadian and international events of interest for 2016 has been developed. Joni discussed the need for member engagement and ways to mobilize experts and advance development. Noted that a Stakeholder Advisory Council to be formed; it will be an advisory council that sits outside of DIACC with expertise that can inform the DIACC in terms of how it is moving forward; collaborative relationships and partnerships. An opportunity to engage voices outside of the DIACC to provide insights and input.
- 4) DIACC is also interested in bringing in international voices in terms of lessons learned and best practices (i.e. NZ, Sweden, USA, and UK). Networking and sharing opportunities will be critical moving forward.

Discussion:

- Fred Pitt inquired as to where Canada is at in regards to trust framework compared to the international community.
 Joni Brennan responded that Canada is an innovator and has always been 'ahead of the pack'. She stated that each jurisdiction measuring against themselves rather than against each other is more useful. The principles based approach, collaborative spirit and commitment to working together puts Canada in good stand internationally.



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

Roundtable on Identity Management

John Messina charged members to seek out clarification or further discussion on the three presentations on identity management by IMSC, CDI and DIACC in terms of linkages and gaps as this work moves forward.

- Fred Pitt noted that these are 'pieces of something' from the three presentations but what has not been discussed is what is that something? What is the digital strategy and where are we trying to get to with all of this? Identity Management is the foundational piece, the CDI is a piece that would work within the digital context, the work that the DIACC is doing is a part of this too - but where are the Councils going with all of this? Broadly as a federation, what is the vision and what is the common path and what pieces are we not paying attention to/incorporating?
- Rita Whittle agreed that there is a bigger picture; identity and personal information is part of a broader digital service agenda. Rita referenced the Death Bundle as a case example to test in this context. This work could be mapped from beginning to end regarding identity and validation to understand the components, players, public-private relationships, the services, and what is needed from an individual's personal identity perspective, entitlements, etc. Rita stated that unless jurisdictions trust in each other's processes and test/pilot it cannot move forward while respecting privacy and security.
- Joni Brennan referred to an ecosystem – this work is reflective of an ecosystem; different stakeholders all coming to the table with different pieces. Joni endorsed test case Rita had referred to. Noted that there are many opportunities to test and solve real problems. She also noted that what is missing from the work on trust framework is the issue around contracts. Contract negotiations are challenges that create friction and impede development of new and innovative services.
- Robert Frelich noted that CDI is looking to deepen the relationship with DIACC, specifically in terms of the development of the business case, understanding the role of the private sector, when to engage and how. He believes that the vehicle to engage private sector is via DIACC. This is a missing piece of the puzzle; he referenced the need for DIACCs network to support the CDI business case specifically in terms of the private sector context (operation, security, etc.).
- Annik Casey (via teleconference) noted that identity information is at the core of all government services so the work that the IMSC is doing to develop the trust framework and the set of rules and standards to be able to trust digital identities is important. CDI fits into this from a process/mechanism perspective to support some of these functionalities and making use of a test case to be able to see how this work can evolve in an end to end digital delivery world is making it a more practical and achievable reality. Implementation considerations must be acknowledged and private sector considerations as revealed through DIACCs involvement will be critical.

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

- Donna Kelland referenced Rita's case example idea (Death Notification) and stated that the working groups have accumulated valuable information that she believes can be moved towards a test case (via CDI). She believes the Councils can use this idea as next step and talk about what this next piece might look like.
- Bette-Jo Hughes referenced the imperative of having the private sector involved in the public sector trust framework but assumptions are being made about what the value proposition is for each; can DIACC help us understand what is in it for the private sector to be part of this and how can we ensure that we are clearly aware of their interests and vice versa (looking specifically at the business case and funding model here). How can we do a better job of identifying and declaring the value proposition so the private sector is willing to participate in funding what we are building?
 Joni responded with the need for communication and open channels; a continued opportunity to collaborate in solving real problems is key. Joni maintained that the proof of concepts are critical - they show opportunities where there is a real problem to solve and the private sector can put in expertise and create some sort of service and business model off of this. Need to make sure that proposed models meet Canadian principles. An important factor in gaining private sector interest is to ensure, through collaborative efforts, that the Canadian digital ecosystem has the ability to interoperate globally. The pillars for fostering this then include: working together, proofs of concept, use of cases, and recognizing and developing new business opportunities at home and abroad, acting locally and thinking globally.
- Bette-Jo also Hughes referenced the development of the CDI and the need for province to province service and asked CDI to clarify if province to province service is included.
 Robert Frelich responded that the service is intended to be used for both federal to provincial interchanges as well those between provinces. He noted that for example, whenever information passes through the department of Employment and Social Development Canada it is subject to their privacy regulations so if information was to pass from province to province, it would be subject to its privacy regulations. This is the type of considerations that CDI is currently considering. Depending on what provinces would like to use the CDI service for this, then it has impact on how the governance is set up. Ideally, if it is going to truly be a pan-Canadian service then there needs to be a pan-Canadian governance and operating model that goes with it. Bette-Jo Hughes agreed and advised that when CDI is looking at how this is set up that there is an assumption that this would be set up for province to province and so best to deal with the policy and technical issues at the front end. The province to province capability is of interest to this table.
- Don Bougie commented on the private sector value and importance of this. He noted that one of the major banks has just made a decision not to do proof of identity with their own branches because they want to use their people to do more customer facing services so they are paying for Canada Post to validate all customers they can't process through their own systems; their virtual banks are paying for it. So there is a significant requirement, need and value to doing that physically as well as online. From a private sector perspective there

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

is a willingness to pay if we come up with a strong value proposition.

- Guy Gordon advised for the need to think carefully about the governance and the notion of what type of entity this is, who owns and how is it governed and then consider this in terms of various models. Guy went on to reference the Interac model the banking system had put together in terms of jointly owned third party option, likely more in line with where we need to go in time as opposed to a jurisdiction or a department within a jurisdiction taking ownership over a particular area of identity. He also referenced CRA ownership of the Business Number and that this is not the only model. Having something like this linked to a single owner may be short-sighted, it needs to stand over time and be scalable.
- Harry Turnbull noted the Prime Minister's request for a single new window for all government services. Most of the work presented has been about the short-term goals, but should we be looking at a long-term goal like this regardless of what level of government?
- Joni Brennan also noted the interest in land management and conveyance and the need to do identity proofing for those types of systems and those types of organizations do not have a focus in identity proofing or linking and so businesses are indeed looking for experts that they can outsource those services to. In regards to governance she reminded members about why the certification program will be critical. Two pillars within the DIACC are open and transparent governance and that services and systems have the ability to be assessed. Once the framework reaches maturity DIACC will begin seeking alpha adopter communities to walk their system through the framework to get lessons learned. DIACC will start issuing Trustmark so having that third party verification with open trusted governance and a series of marks that can be trusted is going to be critical to help the market accelerate.

The following action items were identified as a result of this discussion on identity management:

IMSC Co-Chairs to provide update at an upcoming PSSDC and PSCIOC teleconference around next steps on the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework in regards to Trust Framework Charter, development of Trust Framework Conformance Criteria and identifying additional stakeholders.

IMSC Co-Chairs to provide progress report to the Joint Councils at the September 2016 Victoria meeting on the work of the IMSC. (possible items for discussion: Engagement of Intergovernmental Affairs (or equivalent) in respective jurisdictions, Fit within broader Digital Service/Digital government agenda, Political Driver/Leadership, Investment, Readiness/Maturity assessments against Trust Framework across Canada, Sustainability/ongoing maintenance, Compliance, Use Cases).

Canada's Digital Interchange (CDI) Co-Chairs to provide a progress report at the next Joint Councils meeting in September.



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

	<p>DIACC to provide a progress report on their current activities around the Unified Trust Framework, development of certification process and Trustmark, funding model, member engagement and proof of concept at the September Joint Councils meeting.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Joint Councils Framework Working Group Session</u></p> <p>Natasha Clarke and Sophia Howse, Co-Chairs of the Framework Working Group (FWG) gave a progress report on the work of the FWG as per action item from the Joint Councils' September meeting:</p> <p><i>"Development of a framework linking all the work of the Joint Councils, PSSDC, and PSCIOC, including its sub-committees and working groups. Framework to identify a "national vision" for the Councils".</i></p> <p>The presentation, facilitated by Natasha Clarke, was divided into 5 areas – 1. update on current work by the FWG, 2) overview of Visual Map and briefing on all Joint Councils, PSSDC and PSCIOC sub-committees and working groups, 3) review and discussion of proposed Vision and Call to Action, 4) review of survey results on 'Level of Readiness in jurisdictions in regards to Digital Government', and 5) roundtable discussion on the work required to advance Vision and Call to Action.</p> <p>1) Update by Framework Working Group Co-Chairs on the work that has been done to date (TAB 3A)</p> <p>Natasha acknowledged contributions by members to the work of the FWG; she noted that there was representation by both Councils and would like to get more PSCIOC members participation in the working group. She noted that there has been a significant commitment, engagement and involvement from members. She also noted and thanked Steve Burnett from Ontario for his help with the development of the Visual Map and also to Maria Luisa Willan from the ICCS for secretariat support to this work.</p> <p>Natasha gave a debrief of the discussion at the September Joint Councils meeting and noted that as a result of that discussion the FWG was tasked to develop a framework linking all the work of the Councils and to identify a common priority that they could work on collaboratively. It was clear from the Sept. meeting that the Joint Councils needed a clearer understanding of the work underway and better alignment of its priorities moving forward. She noted that there are a lot of underlying pieces that the Councils are working on but it has been missing a larger strategic context, a shared vision, to help guide its work. This challenge created the opportunity for the Joint Councils to get really focused and collaborate on something together.</p> <p>Natasha stated that the purpose of the Framework Working Group was to review all the work that is underway, identify linkages/gaps from the work currently going on, develop a visual map to better understand the work of the Council and to propose a shared, Joint Councils' vision/ call to action for members endorsement. Natasha wanted</p>	<p>Action Item #3A - Request to maintain Visual Map of all committees and working groups as presented at the Toronto meetings. Framework Working Group to discuss with ICCS Secretariat regarding ongoing support and maintenance of visual map (discussion on next steps, software and resources/funding required). FWG to report back to the Joint Councils on financial support required for review and approval at an upcoming PSSDC/PSCIOC teleconference.</p> <p>Action Item #3B - Request for Framework Working Group to evaluate all current Joint Councils, PSSDC and PSCIOC Sub-Committees and Working Groups to assess how they support the work/priorities of the Councils in general and vis-à-vis call to action on digital government - linkages/gap analysis. Request to review mandate of each committee/working group to assess support to the Councils, identify opportunities to leverage work, and determine which groups are more action oriented vs. information sharing or communities of practice. FWG to do evaluation of</p>

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

to be clear that the FWG's intention was not to dictate a way forward but to identify a common goal for the Joint Councils to generate discussion. She noted that it was vital to hear from all jurisdictions and both Councils; an opportunity to have a meaningful conversation, to level-set and make sure the Joint Councils are able to move in a collective and collaborative way to drive towards a vision. Natasha gave an overview of the expected outcomes of and the approach taken by the FWG for this session.

2) Overview of Visual Map and briefing on all Joint Councils, PSSDC and PSCIOC Sub-Committees and Working Groups (TAB 3A and TAB 3B)

Natasha Clarke provided a review and high level walk through of the Councils working groups and subcommittees as per Visual Map of the Joint Councils (**refer to TAB 3A**) and overview of Councils' Sub-Committees and Working Groups presentation deck (**refer to TAB 3B**). Natasha noted that the objective of this review was for both Councils to have a general understanding of all the Councils' sub-committees / working groups and the work that is currently underway, "current state", before a discussion on "future state".

Discussion:

- Chris Bookless noted that unless there is ongoing reporting from these committees and working groups, the Councils are not up to date on the work that is underway, which committees/groups are active or inactive and how new members can get involved. He stated the need to open this process up where there is direct reporting by these groups to the Councils and for their work to remain relevant and supporting the Councils' priorities.
- Jacques Paquette referenced the lack of links between the committees. He noted that CDI is connected to IMSC but what is still not clear is how the others are connected. He noticed that some committees seem to be more action oriented and others are more about the sharing of information and collaboration and so this is also raises questions about each group's mandate and what these committees/groups have been tasked to do. He suggested that when establishing committees, they should be set up with some specific mandate that is time limited; committees will then need to come back and reconfirm whether they are needed or not. This provides an opportunity for the Councils to reorient or disband; the Councils tend to create new committees but neglect to retire others that might be outdated.
- Natasha Clarke agreed and noted that many of these points were reviewed in the Framework working group discussions.
- Nick Wise mentioned that the review of the current committees was a useful exercise and the information included in this presentation is very helpful. He noted that while there is a Terms of Reference for the PSSDC and one for PSCIOC, there is no defined mandate for the Joint Councils, he proposed for the FWG to look at

these groups and provide recommendations to the Joint Councils for members to make decision as to which groups need to be repurposed, merged with other groups, or disband. An update report to be included in upcoming PSSDC/PSCIOC teleconferences.

Action Item #3C - Framework Working Group (or other group to be determined) to provide ongoing direction and oversight of the committees and working groups of the Councils moving forward. FWG to provide recommendations to the Joint Councils at an upcoming PSSDC/PSCIOC teleconference or meeting.

Action Item #3D - Request for FWG to set-up an open process for Council members to participate in current/future Committees and Working Groups. FWG to report back on this item at an upcoming PSSDC/PSCIOC teleconference.

Action Item #3E - Request from members to create a working group around 'user experience' and how to assess/measure outcomes. Decision to be made after evaluation of committees/working groups by the FWG.

Action Item #3F - Request for Framework Working Group to draft

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

developing mandate/terms of reference for the Joint Councils to define its work.

- John Messina commented that though the committee structure looks somewhat bureaucratic it is clear that the Councils need the information-sharing, the knowledge and discussion. But it may not necessarily need the bureaucracy around what has been created. This is something the FWG should consider as it continues to work on this item.

Natasha emphasized that the goal of the framework working group is to create a better understanding of the current committee structure and the assets currently available. As a next step, the FWG will be working on a gap analysis based on today's discussion. Is there clearer direction we can provide to the working groups that either narrows or broadens the scope and to ensure that regardless of action oriented or information sharing, the committees are supporting the Councils' priorities/work?

- Paul Pierlot commented that some time ago the Councils undertook an initiative to look at what the working groups were and how they were set up and functioned; ServiceOntario led the development of a paper looking at a way to assemble these pieces to bring sense to how and why they were set up. It might help in moving forward. Wondered about the end status and where it currently is at.
- Bette-Jo Hughes commented that as the Councils are looking at this, to keep in mind that not all committees are there to do work of the Councils; in a number of cases the committees were set up because being vested under the Councils gave them some legitimacy from a working group collaboration perspective and also to get administrative support through the ICCS. It will be good at the end of the day to decide what our priority is and what sub-committees are in place to help move this forward. But some committees may just continue moving on with good work, just because there isn't a connection doesn't mean the people on these groups aren't getting great value from them.
- Jacques Paquette commented that some working groups are project oriented tasked to specific outcomes and some are more information-sharing oriented; we might need to characterize these committees in a different way (ex. CoP vs task oriented committees). We must ensure that the committees we have are in line with the priorities that the Councils are trying to achieve. He noted that the FWG can help in doing an assessment of all groups and identifying gaps. How do we avoid duplication? How can the committees support one another?
- Harry Turnbull stated that sometimes there exists some confusion in regards to FPT Deputy Ministers' Table and specifically the relationship between them and the Councils. From a CIO's perspective, it is clear that direction doesn't come from the FPT DMs' Table however this relationship is different from a service delivery perspective.
Natasha responded that there is an opportunity to leverage the work of the FPT DMs Table to help advance the work of the Councils. Whether we're linked or not there's an opportunity here.

mandate for "Joint Councils", currently there is only a mandate for PSSDC and PSCIOC. FWG to report back on this item for Joint Councils members' review at an upcoming PSSDC/PSCIOC teleconference.

Action Item #3G - Request for Framework Working Group to develop a project plan (roadmap) around short-term and long-term next steps to advance this work and report back to the Joint Councils at an upcoming PSSDC/PSCIOC teleconference or September meeting.

Action Item #3H - Request for Framework Working Group to ensure Joint Councils' collaboration on foundational pieces for Digital Government, i.e. identity management and to use 'Death Notification' as pathfinder. Framework Working Group to include this item in roadmap and report back to Joint Councils at the September meeting.

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

- Jacques Paquette added that for many members they are reporting to DMs. But what is really useful is that where we face horizontal issues it is helpful to ensure jurisdictional support beyond the department. The DMs are counting on their Council's representatives to advance the agenda; members are in turn counting on DMs to help support these efforts.
- Bette-Jo Hughes expressed agreement around the importance of support from the FPT DMs Table. She stated that the Deputies' Table was put in place because it was felt that it would be helpful to have a more senior level of executives where we had initiatives that required more senior direction. The Councils have taken advantage of this with things like identity management, service to business, etc. because we need the support at a more senior level for the policy direction across the country. Need to remind people that if the DMs' Table comes up with an initiative that they want some work done on, they aren't in a position to task it to the Councils but we can bring it back to the Councils for consideration, there is an entrusting dynamic between the two.
- Paul Pierlot commented that alignment needs to occur at the Councils level not directly with the working groups and committees. It is vital that all work tasked comes back to the Council(s) and the Council(s) does the alignment and if there's tasking for the working groups, the Council(s) is responsible for this.
- Natasha inquired as to what is the status of DIACC vis-à-vis the Councils. There seems to be good work happening here in parallel with ours but there seems to be a lack of cohesion. Harry Turnbull responded that DIACC is not a committee or working group of the Councils. There is work by DIACC that is moving in parallel with the work of the Councils. However there needs to be solid linkages between DIACC and the Councils going forward. He noted that the PSCIOC has managed DIACC conversations up to this point but it makes more sense to bring the conversation to the Joint Councils; doing identity work for technology's sake is not the reason we do it, we do it for the sake of delivering services.
- Bette-Jo Hughes agreed that things would improve and there has been a lot of work being done in parallel but not well connected. She noted that BC, ON and NB are represented on DIACC so this will help to remind them to stay connected. Also, the Trust Framework Working Group is connected with DIACC. She expressed confidence that with Joni Brennan at the helm and the expanded membership, that is going to be much more structured in terms of their approach, plan and engagement than in the past.
- Fred Pitt noted that IMSC is working with DIACC on trust framework and various jurisdictions have supplied resources to support the work. However there is a need to formalize the working relationship (referenced an MOU - letter of intent) to make it easier to work together. But there are many implications (policy, security, etc.) that go beyond those working on the trust framework. To grow the relationship we need to focus on how we communicate with each other and how we communicate progress and forge cohesion moving ahead.

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

- Guy Gordon agreed that this is an absolutely critical element to the future stability/sustainability of the Canadian economy, in particular the pillars of the banking industry (re: payments). He also referenced the notion of an ecosystem and the notion that we are here with a loose mandate as we try to play an influencing and transformational role in our own jurisdictions. The notion of an ecosystem and how it evolves is perhaps a new model the Councils need to consider. It is understood that the private sector and DIACC must be part of the ecosystem.
- Jacques Paquette inquired about CDI and the need to look at legislation, authorities, privacy and security, etc.; how do we address this? Do we ask the CDI group or the Privacy Sub-Committee to look into this? Natasha responded that the committee is still unclear about focus and direction. While the work has been good, useful, and serving a purpose, how do we get very clear with what need to do over the next 3-5 year so we can move forward with things and get away from providing the same update each time. The next conversation is critical; it is about level setting and the road ahead.

C) Review and discussion of proposed Vision and Call to Action for the Joint Councils (TAB 3A)

Natasha Clarke reminded members that at the January teleconference with both PSSDC and PSCIOC, there was a review of the Vision and Call to Action for the Joint Councils. She noted that the FWG is seeking endorsement of this vision and a call to action in order to develop a roadmap for the next 3-5 years in order to move this work forward.

Proposed Vision: “Providing Best in Class Public Services”

Natasha noted that this is not an exercise on exploring vision without limitations; more about what resonates for members and providing best in class public services and what best in class in service means.

Proposed Call to Action: “Creating Best in Class Digital Government* for Canadians”

**Definition of Digital Government:*

Digital Government refers to the use of digital technologies, as an integrated part of governments’ modernisation strategies, to create public value. It relies on a digital government ecosystem comprised of government actors, non-governmental organisations, businesses, citizens’ associations and individuals which supports the production of and access to data, services and content through interactions with the government. – (Recommendation of the Council on Digital Government Strategies - Adopted by the OECD Council on 15 July 2014)

Natasha noted that this is the: 'Where do we want to focus our energy over the next 3-5 years?' Need to think about in terms of the work that we do as a Joint Councils and how we will set our priorities, direction and roadmap for the next number of years.

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

Harry Turnbull asked the group if there were any immediate reactions to the vision and call to action.

Discussion:

- Chris Bookless commented that while supportive of the digital government vision, the in-person contact remains also an important component and should not be eliminated. Harry added that many might confuse digital government with online. It is important to know that digital applies to all the channels.

Natasha spoke to what Digital Government means/what it can mean to set the context; she noted that what is critical is that Digital Government is not all about the technology. It is about coming together in terms of how we use digital technologies and digital approaches and the operating models used. It is about how we can use these pieces when we are designing and delivering public services to create that value. How do we better deliver our public programs in this new digital era? She referenced 'A day in the life example' (Slide 17); this was a picture that came from the Deloitte report that really shows all of the interactions an individual can have digitally today. When someone is interacting digitally today, it's not just about the technology but the applications and use of it. The FWG tried to overlay and connect a couple of the working group activities/initiatives to this slide. Digital government doesn't mean that we're leaving people behind. Digital assisted is a huge component of any digital strategy that we build. We need to make sure that our strategies are incorporating what digitally assisted means, what are the legislative and privacy implications of assisting someone or completing that transaction on their behalf using the digital service?

- Jacques Paquette referenced slide 15 (Call to Action), he noted that Digital Government is for a purpose and more like the 'how' and the 'why' is maybe missing. Believes that it should be 'creating best in class digital government for better services to Canadians', without this it seems more inside-in (later slides did however support a more outside-in approach).
- Sandra Cascadden commented that even though it was said that digital government is not about the technology, the first line in the definition is digital government refers to the use of digital technologies. So perhaps we can wordsmith this. Digital government pertains to both, what is going on internally in government but also externally between the public; so there are digital government services to citizens as well as internal digital government services both of which provide value to the public. As a CIO, she expressed concern about the internal and external; how do we reflect both sides in definition? Is this the place to do it? Are we talking about digital government services as opposed to Digital Government?
- Bette-Jo Hughes asked for clarification on what members are trying to achieve? Believes that what the Joint Councils is looking for is a Call to Action for both Councils and determine what they want to focus on in the near future. The Call to Action was about getting collective agreement that this is what we want to focus on.

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

Natasha responded that it is exactly what the FWG is seeking from the Joint Councils, endorsement of the Call to Action.

- Harry Turnbull responded that there is a lot of internal services that digital government applies to and those services all have a purpose. The purpose is always to improve service to the citizen.
- Nick Wise agreed and commented that the idea behind picking digital government for this exercise is that it does bridge the work of the Joint Councils and binds the work together.
- Natasha Clarke suggested a new approach with user focus be adopted whether external facing service or internal process; the more productive we are as internal staff there will be more time to consider external service improvement. Many digital approaches and thinking exists here for application to both internal and external objectives and service design.
- Rick Ouellette commented that it could be 'dangerous' to use the word 'digital' because sometimes we may lose sight of true objectives which is to well manage the services we are delivering. Recommended the removal of 'digital' as the Councils are trying to deliver best in class government which is not about technology but service delivery.
- Donna Kelland expressed her agreement with the proposed solid vision and call to action for the Joint Councils. She noted that we have all of these great ideas but we can't seem to make it happen where it matters to the citizen. All IT money in government has been going to fixing internal legacy systems and not to direct services to citizens. What is possible here? Is it really possible to move things forward? How advanced is the vision? Is it appropriate for today's reality in government?
- Natasha Clarke responded that this is the mire that we're in and living in. Donna speaks to the challenges we face that need to be overlaid with this reality which is this tidal wave of digital that is upon us. So how do we move this forward in a meaningful way? Today is about the question of can we agree as a Joint Councils to start to focus our attention on a shared vision so that we can start to pick away and figure out how we help each other solve those challenges? If we can get agreement on the vision and call to action, we can then move on to setting priorities and the roadmap to advance our efforts.
- Paul Pierlot stated that he is in favour of the vision and call the action; the holistic view of digital government makes sense, but we can't do it all, we do need to focus on external service delivery; internal focus ultimately needs to support external delivery initiatives. The definition of digital government may need some tweaks but it is fine for now. He suggested leaving digital technology in the definition for without it is not really describing digital government, although the ecosystem is a lot more than the technology. Believes that we need to do better as a country when it comes to digital service delivery. Also asked about what 'class' are we talking

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

about; Global, North America, or breaking it down to social services vs business services? Presumably we're going to want to look at whether we're making progress and to do some sort of measurement, we need to know what class we're positioning ourselves in.

- Natasha Clarke responded that the global class is what we're referring to. These Councils can push the bar for our country. Need to decide how we can best leverage this Table to support the Canadian agenda across the board.
- Nick Wise suggested that digital government is where the two councils can intersect; it is a useful common denominator that joins front and back office service delivery mandates. Perhaps the mandates and activities of all the working groups and committees can connect to these broad principles under digital government. Perhaps this should be the three year plan.
- Bette-Jo Hughes noted that there is nothing in service delivery that isn't underpinned by technology. Digital Government is not a future thing in BC where everything is aligned with the service delivery framework. We need to say that this is where we are going so every decision we make takes us closer.
- Sophia Howse spoke about the launch of BC services card and identity management service. She noted that BC is getting ready to launch its first online service with the BC services card. The journey has been 7 years in terms of issuing cards and getting the funding and putting things in place. About 18 months ago, BC realized that the ministries didn't understand the identity management piece, the ministries didn't understand this (too technical and undefined). Didn't allow them to understand how it helps them be successful, to bundle their services, to identify the user path, incorporate citizen voices, end to end service delivery that meets the citizens need, and drives out inefficiencies. Found that they had to bring the service delivery experiences and identity management language to their tables. Service delivery and identity go hand in hand. BC has also completed a proof of a concept to use the service card technology and connect it technically to BC health systems to demonstrate that it works. Coming to the ministry tables showing that they can do their business better and improved service delivery is the goal. The pieces of information needed to understand cannot reside in one jurisdiction and must be shared across the country. If we can actually come together and work through use cases, we can identify our values. If we can understand our business model we can work together on what that looks like in terms of a consent model for individual saying 'yes to sharing information' across jurisdictions. There are of course privacy policy and legislative changes that will need to be faced as a country. Here is the opportunity in the Joint Councils to work together and to share mistakes and learnings.
- Christian Laverdure noted that it is a very laudable goal to have digital government; sees it as an outcome, an environment that we need to go towards if we are really serious about putting users at the centre of our services not the technology or the reference to digital. 'Best in class government for Canadians' is suggested. The aim should be great service, great government over any reference to 'digital'.

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

- Josée Dussault asked if the vision is about digital government or digital government transformation. We are transforming the government into a digital world, we may never be a 'digital government'; it gives the impression that that is the focus.
Natasha Clarke responded that the call to action is about how we focus on setting priorities at this table to deliver something. What is the work we need to do over the next 3-5 years, how does it hang together and how do we give direction to the working groups so we can get moving, what structures do we need in place, what are the outcomes we are seeking to measure?
- Harry Turnbull asked if members endorsed vision, all members noted agreement. He noted that digital means more than online services and applications on a mobile device, it is about using data to drive better service and make better decisions.
- Robert Frelich noted that if the Councils are talking about providing public services he worries that this is an insular conversation. He noted the challenges in the past in getting approval for public opinion research. Is there any way to find out what inventory of public opinion research on service exists throughout our jurisdictions? This type of information will be very useful in driving our priorities.
- Mark Burns asked is the question really about whether we are going to contemplate digital government and all of the processes that go with it or what are the top five priorities from jurisdictions? Suggested aligning with BC in terms of digital transformation and expressed interested in learning more from others to provide insight into current challenges. Can we collaborate and leverage best practices?
- Natasha Clarke commented that overthinking is not the objective; it is about being intentional about packaging up our work. Digital government is massive in terms of scope but, fundamentally can we notionally buy into this as a driving concept? Next, and more critically, what are the priority things that we can focus on as Joint Councils that we can then pull together in a cohesive way and map out and advance?
- Harry Turnbull reiterated the lack of alignment between subcommittees and the need to have something to align to; the call to action is on the table as a driving force.
- Serge Caron noted that the Councils need to establish the vision, move onto capacity planning, and identifying synergies between the various working groups. A three year plan can be developed but also important to plan short term goals. Identify a pathfinder that will have both Councils working together with a clear mandate from the working groups to contribute to this. Keeping this time bound will be key to introducing agility.
- Jacques Paquette asked members where the Joint Councils focus their attention on. He noted his agreement with the vision. Regarding the call to action, he noted a need to add better service for Canadians. This will



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

help frame the actions that the Councils need to take.

- John Messina and Harry Turnbull agreed that there seems to be consensus from the table regarding the proposed vision and call to action but that the table needed to move the discussion to next steps to move this forward.

D) SURVEY RESULTS ON DIGITAL READINESS (FPTM) (TAB 3A)

Review and discussion on the survey results on the Level of Readiness in jurisdictions in regards to “Digital Government” (results from survey sent to members in January 2016). Natasha provided an overview of the survey results. She noted the risks in pursuing digital transformation and feedback from members on future considerations related to digital transformation (slides 36 and 37).

E) DESIGNING DIGITAL GOVERNMENT:

Roundtable Discussion on the work required to advance “Vision” and “Call to Action”

Natasha Clarke provided an overview of the proposed next steps to advance the vision and call to action (slides 40-42, TAB 3A).

The Co-Chairs facilitated a roundtable discussion on the work required to advance the vision and call to action.

Discussion:

- Marion Guinn noted that she is looking to see what others have done in the digital space to map out a plan for Manitoba.
- Ron Hinshaw inquired about capacity; if we map out everything we are doing as it relates to the call to action, what capacity do we have to do more? How do we make decisions on where we are going from here? There is a lot to be done on identifying what we need to do to get us there if this is our call to action.
- Bette-Jo Hughes added that the work the Councils is doing on the Trust Framework is vital and that all pieces are in place within the ecosystem; and figuring out how as a foundational piece we will be able to authenticate information across Canada via the CDI, this is the foundational piece that allows us to do anything else. We need to get this right.
- Harry Turnbull commented that it is really important to learn about the various levels of maturity models as to

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

where jurisdictions are at in regards to digital government; mature jurisdictions in this space can help build toolboxes for others to learn from.

- E) Jackie Stankey noted that Identity Management has been a key piece in Alberta and remains a main priority, as it is critical if we want a truly federating identity across Canada. Also focusing on e-commerce and payment platform as ways to get away from time-consuming cash-based transactions.
- F) Mark Burns noted that his jurisdiction will pick one or two initiatives, CDI as a priority; need to see the plan and where things are going and how to get there.
- Kathryn Bulko commented that there are foundational elements that need to be established first, i.e. identity management. What is essential for things that cross our borders; what is foundational to digital service delivery and what is foundational to be able to collaborate amongst one another should drive our efforts. Harry Turnbull reiterated that linkages do need to be established, i.e. privacy and identity management. Kathryn pointed out that the two committees are separate. She noted the need to identify duplication and redundancy in terms of efforts and the impact of this on resources.
- Steve Burnett commented that this work resonates with work in Ontario and associated priorities; i.e. single digital identity and trust framework are a priority in terms of effort and resources. The CDI piece should really lend a strong use case that the Councils can push forward; the death notification is a primary candidate for moving this forward. He noted the service reboot piece whereby some of the poorly performing services are identified and a new set of design principles applied. Steve noted the need for a digital government policy framework and information sharing inter-jurisdictionally in connection with Kathryn's note on foundational pieces. He also noted capacity concerns. Lastly, he noted a lot of work and money in Ontario are focused on internal legacy systems updates and that he sees this as an opportunity to drive the partnership agenda rather than a constraint.
- Fred Pitt noted the push in Ontario towards digital and this connects much of the work in the working groups (from a security, privacy, policy perspective, etc.). In every area, collaboration towards digital outcomes across the country is welcome.
- Sean McLeish noted interest in CDI; there is opportunity in the policy area around resources and wonders if money should come forward collectively to place some dedicated resources to tackling 2-3 key priority areas. Suggested checking in every three months not six.
- Rick Ouellette stated that it is more about both Councils working well together as a whole towards the outcomes; determining roles and goals and processes and moving ahead with set priorities. Need to run this like a decentralized organization - strategic initiatives, with scorecard measurement, portfolio managements,

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 du secteur public



smart goals, etc.

- Alan Roy referenced the New Brunswick Smart Province Initiative; he noted that NB is looking at Open Data and working with jurisdictions; digital ID; the creation of a digital lab. He found the conversations pertinent and looking forward to moving ahead.
- Sandra Cascadden framed her response around the opportunities for the Joint Councils to drive this from a Pan-Canadian perspective. She noted that in order to continue on the identity management path, there are some opportunities from the committee structure and how the Councils should repurpose some of these committees to actually deliver on things very specific to the digital services agenda. She proposed that a new short-term committee be struck to help develop a tools set/kit to create the business case for digital services. Suggested repurposing the security group and that their primary focus is going to be on the digital service agenda - what does this mean for their work and output. Repurpose the privacy group - the focus is on digital services agenda and what does this mean from a privacy perspective. Repurpose the Information Management group - how are we going to measure successes and outcomes and actually get them delivering on this digital agenda. Create another Joint Councils committee around assessing and measuring what the user experience should be. Cloud Working Group to be repurposed in relation to new priority of digital government.
 Natasha Clarke agreed with Sandra's suggestions on repurposing the committees and working groups
- Fred Pitt added that the Councils need to focus on the level we want to get into from the Joint Councils vs the level of work taking place in jurisdictions. So to set targets of actually developing pieces, the starting point for collaboration should be an understanding of where everyone is at.
- Norm MacDonald mentioned that these talks are somewhat of a challenge as he does not have a PSSDC counterpart. That said, he wants to become more engaged and would like to see something of value happen, a real deliverable he can take back and demonstrate the Councils' value. Harry suggested for Norm to use this as an opportunity to host a future PEI meeting.
- Donna Kelland noted the value of repurposing some of the subcommittees. Concerned about the idea of more working groups and highlighted the issue of capacity. She noted that the Councils set out to develop a framework and components to hang within in and believes it is pretty close but then the question becomes how quickly can we wrap up some of these things? When do we sign off on some of our groups? The issue right now is time and resources. How do we get to the actual delivery of things with these kinds of constraints?
- Bette-Jo Hughes noted that things are definitely moving along in BC but to realize the vision unless all members collectively figure out how we work together; the CDI and trust framework (death notification as pathfinder use case to proof out the value of the trust framework and CDI) as foundational pieces really need

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

to be in place.

- Chris Bookless agreed that there is some heavy lifting necessary to move this forward. He noted that both Councils have funds available and can help to get the resources required to move this along.
- Harry Turnbull noted that agility is a challenge at these meetings. Things move along much slower at the provincial and federal level compared to the municipalities.
- Glen Brunetti stated that the digital focus is a priority in the municipal sector. What municipalities can offer is the closeness to the citizen; flexibility and access to the public; can help Joint Councils test concepts and work things through given public closeness; efforts would be in reference to the citizen relationship more so than business; citizen-centred digital service design is of great interest to the municipal sector. The challenge is to institutionalize/standardize the 'how to': the design standard/methodology that we all adhere to. This would help to close the maturity gap between jurisdictions. The municipalities present unique opportunities for the provinces and federal government to test inter-jurisdictional services and service design. Glen noted that municipalities do work at an agile pace in terms of technology development and implementation of solutions but that sometimes agility ends up dropping the citizen.
- Natalie McGee mentioned that Corrine Charette wanted to share with the Joint Councils the following news on the new government's priority on service. In December the Deputies named Corinne the first Chief Digital Officer for the department and the portfolio. She delivers this role in partnership with the CIOs. She has 3 specific tasks associated with this role: improving the government's ability to interact digitally with business; initiate and lead digital transformation; drive the adoption of the business number as the federating identity. There is a new digital transformation hub, a small group of people designed to help bolster and fulfill this role; going to be establishing a digital roadmap and to start aligning and ensuring digital initiatives within ISED.
- John Messina referenced Rita Whittle's work on identity management and the example of taking the Death Notification case and using it as a proof of concept. He added that the Councils need to clarify the critical path and items for resolution around this work especially if a funding proposal is to be put forward.
- Jacques Paquette inquired about Councils' strategy to organize its work around this vision and call to action. He asked to what extent can the existing groups be qualified differently (exchange of information based committees vs. action oriented/delivering committees). He noted that there is also another point of comparison: committees where we are all facing similar issues and we work together to find solutions to implement in our own jurisdictions vs where we are working together for the same project (CDI for example). He agreed to repurpose some of the current committees to better serve the needs of the Councils. He stated that the Councils are faced with a lot of pressure in terms of the work that needs to be done with a lot of interest. Given the collective limited capacity, the working groups should support the major projects. To what

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

extent do these working groups support answering questions and gathering information for the major foundational projects? This will help us when we go about repurposing the committees.

- Nick Wise referenced the need for a Joint Councils' vision as the means to bind the work of the Joint Councils together in a strategic way to give guidance and purpose to the work taking place. He agreed that it might be helpful to take the vision/call to action further and outline 4-5 broad principles that would help the FWG go deeper in terms of what is meant by digital government and that the work of the committees can tie in and reference these elements. He also agreed that what is lacking is a common lexicon in terms of what the Councils are doing. This exercise will help to provide some alignment and a deeper understanding of shared expectations and implications.
- Rita Whittle commented that being on these councils means we all share the same value set of serving Canadians better. One of the challenges that we have is that development is still happening individually and that the Joint Councils are not leveraging the work of others to provide stronger alignment. She suggested listing all of the themes and activities that fall under the Pan-Canadian Trust framework that support a federating identity and where everyone is at. Noted that she endorses the death notification case but there are challenges in terms of implementation, privacy, security, legislative, etc. From an intergovernmental affairs perspective, if we are going to sign off on a solution, we are also going to need to look at what this means.
- Annette Vermaeten stated the need to map out what the foundational pieces are for digital government (i.e. identity management, single online access, digital, design, etc.). Need to be clear about what these pieces are and need to have an action plan to adhere to.
- Paul Pierlot referenced the program evaluation and that in addition to the gap analysis there is an opportunity analysis of what exists amongst the working groups. Noted the Expedited Business Start (from the service to business side) and that perhaps the focus of the EBS project can be sharpen and bring a part of in into the Joint Councils to advance the call to action.
- Christian Laverdure noted the opportunity on the business front via Corrine Charette for some resourcing to move the EBS forward.
- Harry Turnbull referenced tools and who can maintain them. He believed we will need to hear back from the ICCS in terms of what can be done in this realm. Some of the tasks that Sandra brought up are useful in terms of repointing committees. We need to sort out how we task existing committee structure appropriately.
- Bette-Jo Hughes thanked members for a useful day but noted the need to be clear regarding who is going to pick up next steps and create that project plan of activities that need to be done.

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

- Natasha Clarke noted that the FWG will put together a proposal; costs/resourcing roles of members and ICCS, and assorted responsibilities. She suggested coming back to the Councils at next teleconference for discussion/endorsement.

Natasha stated that progress has been made and reminded members about next steps and the work that still needs to be done:

- Death Notification as a practical way to test things
- Current state map and its value/sustainability
- Need for program evaluation/review - gap analysis of working groups and subcommittees
- Outcomes/measuring - how can we begin to measure outcomes and what does this look like from a practical point of view?
- Development of the roadmap

As a result of this discussion, the following action items were identified:

A) Request to maintain Visual Map of all committees and working groups as presented at the Toronto meetings. Framework Working Group to discuss with ICCS Secretariat regarding ongoing support and maintenance of visual map (discussion on next steps, software and resources/funding required). FWG to report back to the Joint Councils on financial support required for review and approval at an upcoming PSSDC/PSCIOC teleconference.

B) Request for Framework Working Group to evaluate all current Joint Councils, PSSDC and PSCIOC Sub-Committees and Working Groups to assess how they support the work/priorities of the Councils in general and vis-à-vis call to action on digital government - linkages/gap analysis. Request to review mandate of each committee/working group to assess support to the Councils, identify opportunities to leverage work, and determine which groups are more action oriented vs. information sharing or communities of practice. FWG to do evaluation of these groups and provide recommendations to the Joint Councils for members to make decision as to which groups need to be repurposed, merged with other groups, or disband. An update report to be included in upcoming PSSDC/PSCIOC teleconferences.

C) Framework Working Group (or other group to be determined) to provide ongoing direction and oversight of the committees and working groups of the Councils moving forward. FWG to provide recommendations to the Joint Councils at an upcoming PSSDC/PSCIOC teleconference or meeting.

D) Request for FWG to set-up an open process for Council members to participate in current/future Committees and Working Groups. FWG to report back on this item at an upcoming PSSDC/PSCIOC teleconference.

E) Request from members to create a working group around 'user experience' and how to assess/measure outcomes. Decision to be made after evaluation of committees/working groups by the FWG.



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

	<p>F) Request for Framework Working Group to draft mandate for “Joint Councils”, currently there is only a mandate for PSSDC and PSCIOC. FWG to report back on this item for Joint Councils members’ review at an upcoming PSSDC/PSCIOC teleconference.</p> <p>G) Request for Framework Working Group to develop a project plan (roadmap) around short-term and long-term next steps to advance this work and report back to the Joint Councils at an upcoming PSSDC/PSCIOC teleconference or September meeting.</p> <p>H) Request for Framework Working Group to ensure Joint Councils' collaboration on foundational pieces for Digital Government, i.e. identity management and to use 'Death Notification' as pathfinder. Framework Working Group to include this item in roadmap and report back to Joint Councils at the September meeting.</p>	
5.	<p>Research Committee (refer to TABS 4A & 4B)</p> <p>Richard Dalpé, Federal Co-Chair of the Research Committee (via teleconference) and Dan Batista, ICCS Executive Director, gave a status update on the Research Committee.</p> <p>A) Background on Research Committee (review of Research Committee Terms of Reference including its sub-committees) – (TAB 4A)</p> <p>Dan Batista gave a general overview of the Research Committee’s Terms of Reference, particularly around its mandate. Dan introduced Richard Dalpé, TBS, as the new federal co-chair of the Research Committee. He noted that the committee is seeking a P/T member from the Councils to volunteer for the position of P/T Co-Chair of the Research Committee.</p> <p>B) Discussion on the proposed priorities for the Research Committee going forward - (TAB 4B)</p> <p>Richard Dalpé advised that he had taken notes from the previous discussion regarding the work of the FWG and that it was clear that the Councils need to establish linkages between its work/priorities of the Councils and those of its sub-committees and working groups including the Research Committee. Richard noted that he has recently taken over the role of federal co-chair and that the committee is looking for a P/T Co-Chair to work with him on the future priorities of the Research Committee.</p> <p>Richard advised that included in the meeting binder where the following interim priorities for the Research Committee for members’ review and approval at this meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify Provincial Government Research Committee Co-Chair 2. Review Research sub-committees and recommend changes to reflect the priorities of the Joint Councils 	<p>Decision # 3:</p> <p>Joint Councils members unanimously endorsed Guy Gordon as P/T Co-Chair of the Research Committee.</p> <p>Action Item #4A</p> <p>Research Committee Co-Chairs to send out via the ICCS Secretariat a Call for Participation in the Research Committee to all PSSDC and PSCIOC members.</p> <p>Action Item #4B</p> <p>Research Committee Co-Chairs to provide a progress report to the Joint Councils at an upcoming PSSDC and PSCIOC teleconference OR at the September Joint Councils meeting around the following next steps (as discussed at the Toronto meeting):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review Research sub-committees and recommend changes to reflect the priorities of the Joint Councils 2. Identify members of Committees and Sub-committees 3. Confirm research needs of the

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

3. Identify members of Committees and Sub-committees
4. Confirm research needs of the Joint Councils and member jurisdictions
5. Identify priority research projects, including identification of recent research related to current Joint Councils priorities
6. Develop detailed work plan for the way forward, for approval at next meeting of the Joint Council

Richard advised that in regards to identifying provincial Co-Chair, Guy Gordon from Manitoba, had expressed interest.

- Guy Gordon confirmed his interest in taking over the role of Provincial/Territorial Co-Chair of the Research Committee.

Joint Councils members unanimously endorsed Guy Gordon as P/T Co-Chair of the Research Committee.

Richard stated that in regards to membership there are no active members on the research committee and that he will be sending out, via the ICCS Secretariat, a Call for Participation in the Research Committee to all PSSDC and PSCIOC members. He encouraged members from both Councils to participate in the Research Committee. He also noted that he will also be looking for membership outside of the Councils, i.e. academia and other groups of interest.

- Jacques Paquette proposed membership from ESDC Director of Research on Service on the Research Committee.

Richard advised that one of the action items for the Research Committee would be making sure key priorities for research can be identified - gaps and opportunities and establishing foundational issues (digital government, CDI, identity management, privacy etc.).

Discussion:

- Jacques Paquette noted the importance to differentiate between research and analysis.
- Chris Bookless noted that it was important to clarify that the Research Committee takes direction from the Councils and formulates strategy to complete research to satisfy the Councils' needs/priorities. Richard responded that this was his understanding and that the Research Committee would be focusing its work on the following three items: 1) Confirm research needs of the Joint Councils and member jurisdictions, 2) Identify priority research projects, including identification of recent research related to current Joint Councils priorities, and 3) Develop detailed work plan for the way forward, for approval at next meeting of the Joint Councils.

Joint Councils and member jurisdictions
 4. Identify priority research projects, including identification of recent research related to current JC priorities
 5. Develop detailed work plan for the way forward, for approval at next meeting of the Joint Council.

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

- Harry Turnbull noted that in the past the Research Committee often couldn't get ideas from Councils and would put forth recommendations; most research has been service based and less ask from CIOs and that this may need to change.
- Bette-Jo Hughes welcomed the opportunity to bring findings to CIOs and what can be brought to the CIOs; playing field has changed today so this may differ.
- John Messina stated that there needs to be some combination of committee coming forward with ideas and Councils delegating ideas to complete work.
- Nick Wise thanked both Richard Dalpé and Guy Gordon leading the Research Committee and suggested the importance to take stock of what is already out there in the jurisdictions and create a repository of information.
- Donna Kelland advised the Councils to take a clear direction to research committee on future work.
- Anik Dupont suggested for the need to focus on people who are using services and what they want and can do; should leverage municipal offer to work together.
- Natasha Clarke noted that there are many things currently happening that the Research Committee can help with; how can we leverage this group quickly and begin to action based upon discussion today? How can the Research Committee help to identify common digital government challenges across jurisdictions?
- Richard Dalpé suggested ongoing communication regarding committee work and its connection to the Joint Councils framework. He noted that the Research Committee will report back to the Councils with a detailed work plan.

As a result of this discussion, the following action items were identified:

- A)** Research Committee Co-Chairs to send out via the ICCS Secretariat a Call for Participation in the Research Committee to all PSSDC and PSCIOC members.
- B)** Research Committee Co-Chairs to provide a progress report to the Joint Councils at an upcoming PSSDC and PSCIOC teleconference OR at the September Joint Councils meeting around the following next steps (as discussed at the Toronto meeting):
 1. Review Research sub-committees and recommend changes to reflect the priorities of the Joint Councils
 2. Identify members of Committees and Sub-committees
 3. Confirm research needs of the Joint Councils and member jurisdictions



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

	<p>4. Identify priority research projects, including identification of recent research related to current JC priorities</p> <p>5. Develop detailed work plan for the way forward, for approval at next meeting of the Joint Council.</p>	
6.	<p>Institute for Citizen-Centred Service – Research (refer to TAB 5)</p> <p>Michael Howell, Associate Vice President, Ipsos Public Affairs and Marina Gilson, Director, Ipsos Public Affairs (via teleconference) gave a preview presentation on the findings of Taking Care of Business 5. (TCOB5).</p> <p>Michael noted that for TCOB5, there was a strong emphasis on responding to stakeholder input on the approach for Taking Care of Business. Stakeholders were consulted about the approach using Ideation, enabling participants to discuss their needs and preferences over a conference line and type responses on the online forum. The approach was reviewed by the Research Methodology Standards board for their input and approval.</p> <p>Key changes to Taking Care of Business 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streamline the main customer experience measure to a three-item index. • Maximize the number of businesses providing detailed evaluations of services provided by the subscribing jurisdictions. • Drill-down on what it is going to take to get more businesses to use government services online. • Up-date understanding of attitudes toward red tape and regulatory issues. <p>Michael noted that data for TCOB5 was collected using a multi-staged approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-notification letter which included an invitation to complete the survey online • A follow-up call to request a telephone interview • Those who preferred to take the survey online rather than over the telephone were sent an invitation by e-mail <p>He noted that for TCOB5 there are around 2,500 participants, interviews conducted by telephone and online (expected ratio is 75/25) between January to March 2016, there are 7 participating jurisdictions and that interviewing in Manitoba will be delayed due to the election. Expecting final product by May/June 2016.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Pierlot inquired around changes in methodology, what about year to year comparability; will this still be possible? Marina Gilson responded that they had maintained similar approach even though questions are different and for the streamlined index the key satisfaction questions have been sustained. • Jacques Paquette referenced the seven jurisdictions participating (subscribing jurisdictions); was there a question about non-routine government services? 	



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

Marina Gilson responded that information on slide 15 includes an average of broad services by channel; but will separate service types in final version.

- Sandra Cascadden asked whether the public does have really low expectations of service delivery, are expectations different amongst same group when it comes to private service providers?
 Marina Gilson responded that satisfaction trends have been improving consistently over the last 8-10 years; noted channel change in results. She noted that she can do comparisons looking at private sector and quasi-private sector analysis in the reporting phase.
- Natasha Clarke stated that numbers can tell us a lot and indicators show that there is a lot of room for growth.
- Guy Gordon noted that in the last iteration of CF5 if you look at citizen expectations vs. business expectations there is a gap; we did do citizens expectations/experiences vs other sectors in the past but this work has not been maintained and this has not been measured on the business side.
- Bette-Jo Hughes referenced reducing barriers to using the online channel in reference to identity management work and how identity management work can help.
- Nick Wise referred to client satisfaction index; asked about types of respondents.
 Michael Howell responded that it varies from small to big; general managers and owners; whoever is interacting with government.
- Chris Bookless thanked Michael Howell and Marina Gilson for the presentation and noted that members are looking forward to the final results.

7.

Other Business:

Joint Councils Sub-Committee Update Reports: *(submitted for information only)*

Privacy Sub-Committee Update Report (refer to TAB 6A)

Chris Bookless advised that an update report on the work of the Privacy Sub-Committee was included in the meeting binder however the Chair of the Privacy Sub-Committee was not able to attend the meeting. He noted that in the update report under Work plan, the Privacy Subcommittee is looking to develop a document library and has indicated that the committee has identified an option to use BC's SharePoint document library for this purpose.

Chris Bookless asked as to why this document repository cannot be hosted on the ICCS website He asked why

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 du secteur public



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

groups are not using the ICCS for this purpose.

Maria Luisa Willan, ICCS, agreed that the ICCS should be the repository of all the work of the Councils and its sub-committees and working groups however at the present time there are very limited resources available at the ICCS to manage this work.

Natasha Clarke added that this is an item that will be considered when doing the review and analysis of committees and working groups.

Open Data and Information Working Group

Maria Luisa Willan, ICCS, confirmed that the working group was requested to submit an update report but no report was received by the ICCS Secretariat from the working group Chair.

Next in-person meeting of the Joint Councils: Victoria, British Columbia, September 13th to 15th, 2016

Bette-Jo Hughes and Ron Hinshaw invited members to the next Councils meetings in Victoria in September 2016 (short video).

No further items or questions were raised.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m. EST