



*Draft – v.1*

**JOINT COUNCILS MEETING – PSSDC-PSCIOC**  
**September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2015**  
**St. John's, NL**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**Attendance**

**PSSDC & PSCIOC CO-CHAIRS**

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

**PSSDC MEMBERS**

Steve Burnett	Ontario
Natasha Clarke	Nova Scotia
Laurie Duncan	British Columbia
Karla Hale	MSDO Central Region (Region of Peel)
Janine Halliday	MSDO Eastern Region (City of St. John's)
Ron Hinshaw	British Columbia
Glen Hynes	Public Works Government Services Canada (representing Dan Loewen)
Donna Kelland	Newfoundland & Labrador
Stephanie Kirkland	Citizenship and Immigration Canada (representing Robert Orr)
Christian Laverdure	Industry Canada
Linda Maljan	Northwest Territories
Paul Pierlot	Manitoba
Jackie Stankey	Alberta
David Ward	Ontario
Nicholas Wise	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat

## PSCIOC MEMBERS

Kathryn Bulko	MISA Canada (City of Toronto)
Sandra Cascadden	Nova Scotia
Barry Chatwin	Alberta (representing Mark Brisson)
Christian Couturier	New Brunswick
Chris Fisher	MISA West (City of Regina)
Dave Heffernan	Northwest Territories
Bette-Jo Hughes	British Columbia
Ellen MacDonald	Newfoundland and Labrador
Ed Malone	Prince Edward Island (representing Norman MacDonald)
Sean McLeish	Yukon
David Nicholl	Ontario
Gisela Rempel	Manitoba

## OBSERVERS / SUB-COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS

Keith Barrett	City of St. John's
Shereen Benzvy Miller	Industry Canada
Deb Bergey	Region of Waterloo (MSDO)
Sandra Bonneau	ESDC/Service Canada
Carolyn Burggraaf	Newfoundland and Labrador
Mark Burns	Yukon
Serge Caron	Chair, Cloud Working Group and Co-Chair, Service Mapping Sub-Committee
Annik Casey	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, Canada's Digital Interchange (CDI)
Mary Crescenzi	ESDC/Service Canada
Elizabeth Douglas	Veterans Affairs Canada
Anik Dupont	ESDC/Service Canada
Michael Fowler	Canada Revenue Agency
Rob Frelich	ESDC/Service Canada
Janet Hughes	Government of the United Kingdom
Sharon Squire	Veterans Affairs Canada
Annette Vermaeten	ESDC/Service Canada

## INSTITUTE FOR CITIZEN-CENTRED SERVICE

Dan Batista  
Maria Luisa Willan  
Linda Robins

Item	Topic / Discussion	Decision / Action
1.	<b><u>ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:</u></b>  Chris Bookless welcomed all members and guest observers to the meeting.	

	<p><b>A) <u>Approval of Record of Decision from March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2015 in-person Joint Councils meeting, Toronto, ON (TAB 1A)</u></b></p> <p>Chris asked if there were any questions or comments on the minutes of the March 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. No comments or questions were raised. Minutes adopted.</p> <p><b>B) <u>Review of Action Items from previous meetings (TAB 1B)</u></b></p> <p>Harry Turnbull introduced John Messina as the new PSCIOC Co-Chair.</p> <p>Harry reviewed two pending action items from the March meeting in Toronto. Items were noted as completed. No comments or questions were raised by members.</p> <p><b>C) <u>Acceptance of September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Joint Councils Agenda (TAB 1C)</u></b></p> <p>Harry Turnbull advised that there were a couple of changes to the meeting agenda. The Deputy Ministers update was moved to afternoon, the update on the FPT DMs' Table would follow after administrative matters and Janet Hughes' presentation on Digital Transformation in the UK was moved to the morning session. No comments or questions were raised by members.</p>	<p><b>Decision # 1:</b> Minutes of March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Joint Councils meeting adopted.</p> <p><b>Decision # 2:</b> Agenda of September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2015 meeting adopted with noted changes.</p>
2.	<p><b><u>Update on the FPT Deputies Ministers' Table on Service Delivery Collaboration (refer to TAB 3)</u></b></p> <p>Annette Vermaeten, ESDC/Service Canada gave an update on the FPT Deputy Ministers' Table May meeting as it relates to both current and emerging priorities of the Councils. She noted that the meeting included international speakers from the Australia Digital Transformation Office, as well as from Janet Hughes, from the Government of the United Kingdom, who is also presenting at this Joint Councils meeting on digital transformation. Annette stated that at the DMs meeting, last May, there were discussions around Identity Management, including federal identity and Canada's Digital Interchange. Both British Columbia and Alberta presented on their framework and vision. Deputies strongly endorsed the need to continue the work on identity management. There were also discussions around Open Data; Deputies asked to explore the idea of business/data analytics and whether this can be incorporated into the Open Data discussions.</p> <p>Annette stated that the Deputies had requested a service innovation showcase and that Service Canada presented a case study on Canada's Retirement Income System and service improvements. She noted that the Deputies also endorsed the work on Service to Business and asked that more consideration be given beyond the Business Number and Expedited Business Start Project. The Deputies also requested for the Joint Councils to consider taking on this work and reporting back at their next meeting on how service to business can be elaborated. DMs suggested PSSDC consider additional citizen-centred activities and Annette noted that this suggestion by the DMs could be considered in the context of the new emerging priorities around Channel Shifting, Service Network Collaboration and Death Notification Bundle that the PSSDC is currently working on. Annette noted that the next Deputies' Table teleconference is scheduled for December and that their next in-person meeting will take place in May 2016, at which time the Table will be celebrating its 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Annette thanked Alberta for being a great host and for helping to shape the agenda and events for the May 2015 meeting.</p> <p>No comments or questions were raised.</p>	

3.	<p><b><u>DIGITAL SERVICES : Presentation on Digital Transformation in the UK (refer to TAB 7)</u></b></p> <p>Janet Hughes, Program Director, Government Digital Services, gave a presentation on Digital Transformation in the UK. The presentation focused on lessons learned and best practices around digital transformation and how digital services creates a transformed experience for users using government as a platform and platform as a service. Janet also presented on the benefits to government as a result of digital transformation.</p> <p><b><u>Discussion:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p>Nicholas Wise inquired if this digital transformation had been initiated politically or by/within bureaucrats. Janet Hughes responded that it was a combined effort, there is a community of people in the UK (both inside and outside government), particularly from an organization called 'My Society', and these people had met at informal meetings. There was a groundswell of opinion that things needed to change and this coincided with massive financial strife and the need to save money. A report was commissioned and the outcome of this report was to establish digital services. People from the community outside of government, who were helping to steer this work, were brought in to work for the government.</p> </li> <li> <p>Mary Crescenzi inquired around the unanticipated but welcomed outcome around cost savings and asked Janet to elaborate on where the savings are coming from and where are the savings opportunities. Janet Hughes responded that the savings were not unanticipated but were not totally the focus of people designing services. She noted that by focusing on the users, the savings will follow. It is an approach to transformation and savings and highlighted the need to control expenditures, to fully understand contracts and the procurement process, the need to help people to buy more effectively and to be certain on what you really need. In the UK they have not seen all the savings yet that can come from digital transformation.</p> </li> <li> <p>Mary Crescenzi asked about cost savings for other channels and whether there has been some rationalization on other channels as things continue to shift. Janet Hughes responded that it depends on the service, the users and the quality of the online experience. She noted that 80% of call centre volume was "failure demand" because users' needs were not met on the first contact, 30% of calls were completely avoidable if the service delivery was designed more effectively. She suggested governments look at where the failure demand is, based on data and research. You need a tracking system for online and to look at the whole system when building. She also recommended looking at the case of Peel Region in regards to garbage collection (led by Glenn Brunetti) as a great example to follow.</p> </li> <li> <p>Christian Couturier inquired about who is responsible for communications and how are communications handled by this department. Janet Hughes stated that by making things open, it makes things better. She noted that not much had been done around communications when starting this work, but as she started blogging, the benefit of receiving positive feedback and engagement from the public far outweighed the fear of getting negative feedback. By being open in communicating the information it increased credibility with the users. Janet stated the importance to build a legacy of openness and urged governments to do so, but also to get good advice and support before starting out.</p> </li> <li> <p>Jacques Paquette stated that Service Canada is looking at doing this work and trying to move away from the old approach, and inquired as to how to maintain the dialogue between the "implementers" and those</p> </li> </ul>	
----	--	--

<p>responsible for service design and those responsible for “policy” and making sure there is the right alignment. Janet Hughes responded that the best approach is to have one team working on this together and that is how her system is designed to work. By having one team it avoids the back and forth that happens between departments and the risk of losing focus on what you are tasked to achieve. One team allows for more meaningful and open dialogue to make good decisions and to gain confidence in moving this agenda forward. She also highlighted the importance to make people responsible for the service they are tasked to build, all co-located working in the same place, taking advice, where needed, and being prepared to make decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linda Maljan inquired as to the funds that were put into this effort. Janet Hughes responded that the savings she noted in her presentation are net savings. Those savings are net of the investment made to build those services. You need to make an investment to build a good service. Start small to de-risk the investment. Governments can make a business case based on evidence and balance out the cost and benefits.</li> <li>• David Nicholl inquired as to how this team has influenced departments to be on board and work together around digital transformation of government in general. Is this team’s role to be the “doer” or is it more of an advisory role. Janet Hughes responded that the strategy is to make people think it is their own idea. First, creating a team to build something small and then building on that success. Make people feel it is coming from within their department and people like success and this strategy has worked successfully a few times. She noted that GDS does engage with leaders in various departments at a strategic level that results in a lot of open discussion. There is a lot of talent and energy in departments and all that is needed is to give people confidence in their work. Just get people to do “stuff” and have the right support and demonstrate value.</li> <li>• David Nicholl inquired if ultimate success is when GDS would become part of the fabric of government. Janet Hughes responded that the government wants to be in a position for departments to take more ownership and responsibility and not relying on GDS. GDS would provide more of a supporting role. Government would still need a central capability around standards/policy and providing help to those departments that are not there yet.</li> </ul> <p>Harry Turnbull thanked Janet Hughes for a great presentation.</p>	
--	--

<p>4. <b><u>Joint Councils' Collaboration Workshop on the Alignment of PSSDC and PSCIOC Current and Emerging Priorities (refer to TAB 4)</u></b></p> <p>Chris Bookless gave an overview of the presentation deck around alignment of PSSDC and PSCIOC current and emerging priorities that was included in the meeting e-binder. Chris noted that the PSSDC and PSCIOC have been working on initiatives and priorities over the years. He noted that the PSSDC had engaged in a strategic session during their meeting (Sept. 16<sup>th</sup>) to talk about emerging priorities and new areas of interest to members. The objective of this session was to have a plenary discussion around alignment of PSSDC and PSCIOC priorities and identify areas where the Councils can better support each other. It was suggested for the Councils to focus on a couple of projects. There are a lot of initiatives but leads need to be identified to move these priorities forward as well as identify appropriate structures to support the work, i.e., sub-committees, working groups, external; support. Some of the current priorities are shared or owned by the individual Council. Chris noted that there are inter-relationships such as the work of the IMSC that requires the support of both councils. There are also a number of priorities of interest to the FPT Deputy Ministers' Table and to both Councils. Emerging priorities from the PSSDC are around Channel Shifting, Service Network Collaboration and Death Notification Bundle. The focus of the discussion is to identify ways for better alignment between the Councils, identify areas where a Council can add value to the other Council's work, identify the IT/IM enablers required to support the identified business transformations, and to identify the appropriate structures, work plan and timeframes for key projects.</p> <p>Harry Turnbull added that there needs to be better alignment between the Councils; the service delivery side is the "what" and the IT/IM side is the "how", and the Councils need to work together. He noted that the work of the Identity Trust Framework crosses all boundaries and that the work of DIACC currently rests under PSCIOC. He advised that based on the outcome of the discussion on DIACC at the PSCIOC meeting (Sept. 16<sup>th</sup>), PSCIOC members recommended that the work of DIACC be incorporated into the Identity Trust Framework conversation, which is a Joint Councils' priority under IMSC. He also noted the importance for the Councils to act quickly around the work around identity management as it is one area that is making a lot of progress and that the Councils need to be engaged.</p> <p>Mary Crescenzi stated that based on the discussion at the PSSDC meeting (Sept. 16<sup>th</sup>) it became clear that there is a need to develop a framework document to describe all these initiatives and new priorities in a way that brings forward recognition of the changing landscape. How will the focus on these priorities make a difference in service delivery and how do we, as a Council, advance these priorities. She suggested looking at all the work that is being done as a whole piece, rather than independent priorities or project-based initiatives. How is PSSDC contributing to service delivery in Canada and to show how things are being done from an FPTM perspective. She noted that a framework will help to engage in a dialogue with PSCIOC and to identify a way forward.</p> <p>Michelle Snow, Director, Office of Public Engagement, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and facilitator of the discussion, noted that the goal was to stimulate a meaningful dialogue with members of both Councils on the alignment of priorities. Michelle gave a summary report of the discussion at the PSSDC meeting (Sept. 16<sup>th</sup>) around the three current emerging priorities on Channel Shifting, Service Network Collaboration and Death Notification Bundle. (see Attachment)</p> <p><b><u>Discussion:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bette-Jo Hughes commented that it was interesting to see where the PSSDC had landed around the discussion on their emerging priorities however the focus of this discussion was to also talk about the current</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Action Item #1A:</u></b> <b><u>Framework</u></b> – Request to develop an overall framework linking all PSSDC, PSCIOC and Joint Councils priorities as well as the work of all Councils sub-committees and working groups. Framework to identify the linkages and gaps of all the work that is underway. Framework to be developed over the next couple of months for an in-depth discussion at the February in-person meeting.</p> <p>Natasha Clarke volunteered to be the lead in developing framework in collaboration with those members that volunteered to support this work, and the ICCS.</p> <p><b><u>Action Item #1B:</u></b> <b><u>Framework</u></b> - An update on the development of the framework to be on the agenda of an upcoming PSSDC and PSCIOC teleconference to obtain feedback from members.</p> <p><b><u>Action Item #2A:</u></b> <b><u>Emerging Priorities</u></b> –The PSSDC working groups on emerging priorities to continue the work around the development of each of these priorities (Channel Management, Service Network Collaboration and Death Notification Bundle) and for the working group to provide an update at an upcoming meeting.</p> <p><b><u>Action Item #2B:</u></b></p>
--	---

<p>priorities of the Councils and to discuss ways for better alignment. She suggested for the Councils to review a couple of Joint Councils' priorities to focus on and for members to have a conversation around how to best align this work; need to discuss existing priorities before talking about new priorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gisela Rempel stated that at the PSCIOC meeting (Sept. 16<sup>th</sup>), it was noted that there are sub-committees and working groups of the Councils but there is a lack of information and/or discussion about what these groups are doing and how their work fits into or support the work of the Councils. She suggested having a review of current priorities and working groups / sub-committees before creating new groups and discussing emerging priorities.</li> <li>• Donna Kelland stated that from the point of view of service delivery members it was assumed that existing priorities were continuing. She did not want to focus the discussion on current priorities, as these existing priorities were outcomes from previous Joint Councils' discussions; but instead, she hoped to focus on the new work without interfering with work already going on. Donna noted that assumptions were made to leave the existing work as is. Donna stated that the facilitator is trying to focus the discussion on these emerging priorities, on how to move this work forward, on how the PSCIOC can help to identify the "how" and also how the Councils can better align its work to move these priorities forward.</li> <li>• Christian Couturier expressed concern about a discussion on new priorities without first discussing existing priorities. He stated that current priorities are not being worked on as efficiently and effectively as they should be. He suggested for the Councils to have more clarity on how to better deliver on its work, particularly around the Identity Management Trust Framework and DIACC, which need immediate attention. He asked how the Councils would address the gaps around existing priorities before the next meeting. He suggested for the discussion to focus on existing priorities in regards to how members are going to work together on ensuring better alignment between the Councils and on identifying what needs to be improved in order to advance these priorities over the next twelve months.</li> <li>• Natasha Clarke agreed that there is a need to develop a framework for this work. She noted that there are a lot of pieces of work that are being done by the Councils, but it is difficult to see how all these priorities are interconnected and to identify gaps. She noted that there is a need to focus attention on what are the big pieces of work, which are game changers for the economy and the jurisdictions. She agreed that the service delivery side needs to better understand the work of DIACC and of IMSC before talking about new work and that there is a need to develop a clear picture of how all this work fits together. Are these priorities part of the vision?</li> <li>• Jacques Paquette agreed that there was no question that the work around identity management, Canada's Digital Interchange and Identity Trust Framework continues to be a Joint Councils' priority and that the Councils need to ensure that progress is made on these priorities. He noted that PSSDC and PSCIOC have also their own set of priorities. He added that the discussion should focus on identifying better alignment between the Councils and on ways for the Councils to support each other. He noted that the development of a framework can help not only in making sense of all this, but also in terms of sequencing these priorities; this framework can help to identify which priority should be developed first and to set timelines.</li> <li>• John Messina stated that there is value in having a discussion around each of the existing priorities for members to better understand what each Council is doing, to discuss the work that still needs to be done for each priority and how each Council can support each other to advance this work. He stated that it is not clear</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Emerging Priorities - PSSDC</u></b> to identify what directions it needs from PSCIOC on each of the emerging priorities, particularly around IT/IM issues that the PSSDC and PSCIOC need to address together to move this work forward.</p> <p><b><u>Action Item #2C:</u></b> <b><u>Emerging Priorities -</u></b> The Joint Councils to have a further discussion on emerging priorities at the next meeting in February and for background material (updated concept papers and framework) to be circulated in advanced of the meeting.</p> <p><b><u>Action item #3A:</u></b> <b><u>Identity Management</u></b> – Request for the IMSC Co-Chairs to incorporate the work of DIACC into the Joint Councils' priority on identity management that also includes the work of the CDI and the Identity Trust Framework.</p> <p><b><u>Action item #3B:</u></b> <b><u>Identity Management</u></b> Request for the IMSC Co-Chairs to look at the interlinks of the work of the CDI, Identity Trust Framework and DIACC and to report back at the next in-person meeting of the Joint Councils' with a well prepared discussion on all the identity management pieces and how they complement each other and also to identify what should be brought forward to the Joint Councils for future discussion.</p>
--	---

<p>to everyone all the work that is being done and to tie this work within a framework would be helpful.</p> <p>Michelle Snow, facilitator, provided a couple of suggestions for members consideration to move the discussion forward; a) continue the discussion on each of the PSSDC emerging priorities, b) have a broader level discussion on a couple of questions included in the presentation deck, c) do a poll on which of these priorities members would like to engage in a more in-depth discussion or d) have an open discussion amongst members without a facilitator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bette-Jo Hughes suggested to review the questions that were provided in the deck and to have a discussion specifically around the first question - what work are the Councils already doing where they could do a better job of alignment with each other – within the context of identity management and how it supports service delivery.</li> <li>• Donna Kelland stated that she had made an assumption that the identity management work was working fine. Christian Couturier responded that the priority on identity management needs to be improved. There is currently a gap showing in the diagram (TAB 4, slide 5): the DIACC priority is not being addressed by both Councils. He added that the Identity Trust Framework should be completed within the next 6-8 months, and there is a sense that if the PSSDC is not engaged in this work, the PSCIOC feels that this project won't succeed. He noted that there are other timely items that are not being addressed by both Councils.</li> <li>• Annette Vermaeten proposed to have a systematic review of each of the priority items and to identify where are the gaps, in order for each Council to support these priorities, particularly around identity management, information management, and Open Data, and then to shift to the new priorities and determine how the PSCIOC can support this new work.</li> <li>• Harry Turnbull noted that DIACC has been a PSCIOC priority but this work is complementary to identity management. He noted that all the identity management work crosses boundaries, except for DIACC. The service delivery Council left the DIACC piece for the PSCIOC to figure out.</li> <li>• Chris Bookless summarized that identity management, in the context of service delivery, means that in order to properly provide service to citizens, governments must first identify the individual and have trust and confidence that we know who we are dealing with. Then, there is another piece that once the individual has been identified in jurisdiction X, the Canada's Digital Interchange work is about how governments then exchange that information or have the ability to recognize an individual that has been set up in Yukon, for example, who is looking for services in Ontario as the same individual. So, there is an interface piece required and it is standards-based. The identity trust framework is about governments needing to collect the same information about the people, with the same level of diligence, in order to say, with 99% assurance, that this individual is who he/she claims to be. In regards to DIACC, the involvement of the private sector, particularly the banks/financial institutions, already do that work through bank accounts and PINs; the question is why would government recreate the wheel and issue PINs to people when people could log on using a credential that they already use every day.</li> <li>• Christian Couturier added that DIACC would not just bring the industry perspective, but they would bring both the industry and government perspectives together: government working with industry and taking each other's concerns in consideration instead of just government reacting to what industry is doing. He noted that industry is moving forward and will continue to do so and it is in the best interest of the government to find better ways to work more efficiently together. He noted that it would be helpful for the Councils to identify a framework that</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Action item #3C:</u></b>  <b><u>Identity Management</u></b>  PSSDC to have a discussion on identity management at an upcoming teleconference. A focused discussion on the interdependencies and gaps of the work of the IMSC, CDI and DIACC.</p> <p><b><u>Action item #3D:</u></b>  <b><u>Identity Management</u></b>  Joint Councils to have a discussion on identity management at the next meeting. A focused discussion on Joint Councils collaboration on identity management based on the feedback/material provided by the IMSC (refer to action item #3)</p>
---	---



members can all work within.

- Jackie Stankey noted that Alberta participates in working groups around identity management and there has been much discussion about government owning identity. She added that it is a space in which government should be as governments are identity service providers and there is great trust and confidence in that. However, broader questions for discussion have been around: how can governments partner with the private sector; are there revenue generating opportunities that government can benefit from; and how can governments work with banks and other organizations to look at a whole ecosystem.
- Annik Casey advised that she has taken the lead on the work of Canada's Digital Interchange since Christine Desloges retired in August. She noted that the Identity Management Sub-Committee (IMSC) of the Joint Councils is doing a lot of good work on developing the identity trust framework. The discussion between the PSCIOC and DIACC (Sept. 16<sup>th</sup>) reinforced the need to ensure that the private sector perspective is incorporated into this work, and to leverage each other's work to get to that future vision of enabling service delivery and digital identity. Annik stated that the work of CDI is a component of this work and it allows governments to validate identity information and also enables governments to update or make changes to identity information. So it is a two-function or two services in a broader ecosystem. She indicated that more work needs to be done; the public sector has a big role to play in setting the standards and being the authoritative source of identity information, but it also needs to ensure that it applies private sector perspective so that they are developing this strategically and in partnership towards the future vision.
- Natasha Clarke stated that this is a combined service delivery technology "issue" that members need to figure out and that the PSSDC can look at ways to be more engaged. In regards to the CDI business case, there were some challenges, at the provincial level, to understand what the implications are to the funding model and how this impacts the vital statistics organization. So the issue is how do the Councils work together to build the right business case for this work, particularly around CDI and DIACC. Governments need to design services in a way that the client actually understands. There is a need to engage with all partners involved in this work to ensure that it is a strategic coordinated effort within a pan-Canadian approach. She noted that the sub-committees and working groups are doing a lot of work, but members need to better understand the implications from a broader perspective.

Jacques Paquette offered three suggestions in moving this dialogue forward:

1. Identity Management – the work of DIACC be incorporated into the current priority on identity management by the IMSC, which also includes the work of the CDI and the Identity Trust Framework. A request be made to the IMSC Co-Chairs to look at the interlinks of these three elements (CDI, Identity Trust Framework and DIACC) and report back at the next in-person Joint Councils' meeting in February with a well prepared discussion on all the identity management pieces and how they complement each other and also to identify what should be brought forward to the Joint Councils for future discussion.
2. Emerging Priorities – in regards to the three concept papers on emerging priorities around Channel Management, Service Network Collaboration and Death Notification Bundle, he noted that in each of these emerging priorities there are IT/IM issues that the PSSDC needs to address and discuss with PSCIOC. He advised that working groups are being set-up to discuss these emerging priorities further. However, the question is how the PSSDC will get input from PSCIOC members to enrich this work. He noted that the emerging priorities are in early stage for these working groups, but a Joint Councils' discussion is needed on what can be done together. Jacques suggested for each Council to identify what

	<p>directions it needs from the Joint Councils on these emerging priorities and to have a further discussion at the next meeting in February, with proper documentation and background material in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>3. <u>Framework</u> – For the next in-person meeting, a framework be developed to link all these priorities together to see the interconnection from both councils' perspective. This framework would be useful in identifying the linkages, the gaps, and the sequencing between the priorities. It would allow members to make some decisions on what priorities should come first or on which ones must be delivered first. He noted that both councils have identified the need for an overall strategic framework and that the agenda for the winter meeting needs to be developed with a focus on key elements for discussion.</p> <p>Jacques inquired if members were in agreement with the suggested approach and if so, how should the PSSDC organize its emerging priorities so that it can have input from PSCIOC members on each of these priorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natasha Clarke stated that the Councils are at a critical point and that the presentation on Digital transformation shows that the UK service delivery agenda is far advanced and other countries, such as Australia, are following suit. She noted that the Councils have pieces of work that are important and hang together to deliver on a vision. She agreed with developing an overall framework that ties all this work and these priorities together, and that both Councils could use as a reference. She asked members as to what are the priority pieces that can help the Councils advance this service delivery agenda as a pan-Canadian group. Where are the opportunities? She proposed to leverage the ICCS to help in developing this framework that would show all the work that is being done and how it all interconnects and how each Council can benefit from it. She noted that while resources are limited, it is also a critical time and the Councils need clear understanding on where it is going, and also on what pieces the Councils should focus on before the next meeting, so that they use a strategic approach to determine what is moved forward.</li> <li>• Donna Kelland added that there are pieces from the identity management work that the PSCIOC does not feel that the service delivery Council is fully engaged in and that do require critical involvement from both sides. She noted that the PSSDC emerging priorities cannot happen without the involvement of the PSCIOC. However, moving to a discussion on the three new priorities, without fully understanding the current priorities and the gaps, may not be the best approach. Donna suggested for the IMSC to recruit more PSSDC members to be involved on this work moving forward.</li> <li>• Harry Turnbull noted that there was consensus from members that identity management continues to be a top priority for the Joint Councils and recognized that there is a piece at the PSCIOC level, around DIACC, that needs to be incorporated into the work of the IMSC so that it is a Joint Councils' discussion going forward. He agreed to task the IMSC to integrate the DIACC piece to this discussion and also noted that the CIOs need better understanding on these three new emerging priorities for the PSSDC.</li> <li>• Annette Vermaeten proposed for Service Canada, in collaboration with Annik Casey leading CDI, to work on a plan around this work to provide analysis on the inter-relationships and gaps, harnessing the PSSDC strategic directions working group to better understand the links and gaps, to come up with the service story that needs to be told and report back at the next meeting.</li> <li>• Laurie Duncan expressed her concern about the federal government working on a plan without provincial/territorial input. She added that the PSSDC has never talked about identity management without the PSCIOC, but haven't had a joined conversation as equal partners. She noted that Channel Shifting builds on</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>the work of the CDI and the IMSC work. They are not separate and it is part of the discussion on what this means. She agreed that waiting until the next meeting is a long time, but members can find a way to have a conversation about this work and it can be done via teleconference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natasha Clarke stated that there is a “line” that is missing on the identity management box, which is the actual delivery of digital services. She noted that governments have a big role to play, but feels that we are currently sitting back as bystanders and that there is a critical need to be better involved. This work is at a critical point in the digital service delivery space, but the question remains: what is the right mix or way to bring this dialogue together?</li> <li>• Annik Casey stated that CDI continues to develop its business case and will be coming back to provinces/territories after the federal election to continue to engage people in the discussion and to look at technical requirements. She noted that the IMSC is looking to refresh its Terms of Reference and expect to hold a workshop in November as an opportunity to continue this discussion. She noted that at a recent meeting, with Deputies in August, they confirmed support of this work and options for moving forward.</li> <li>• Bette-Jo Hughes agreed with the need to figure out the identity management piece. At the PSCIOC meeting (Sept. 16<sup>th</sup>) there was a discussion on DIACC and there is a need to pay attention to this work as it involves both the private and public sector. The discussion should not be solely on how to integrate DIACC into the identity management priority, but also on what is the business outcome that the Councils are trying to achieve with IT/IM enablers. We need to ensure that service delivery counterparts are at the table. She reminded members that up to now it has been mostly the CIO side that has been involved in identity management. She suggested for the Councils to have a broader discussion on what it is trying to achieve.</li> <li>• Jacques Paquette suggested for the PSSDC to have a focused discussion on identity management at a future teleconference. He noted that the framework that is being proposed would be useful when looking at this work from a strategic perspective noting the gaps and the interdependencies. He also noted that it was clear that the councils don't have to work on all things at the same time, but they need to be clear on the forward agenda.</li> </ul>	
5.	<p><b><u>Status Update on Canada's Digital Interchange (CDI) (verbal update)</u></b></p> <p>Annik Casey and Robert Frelich, TBS, provided a status update on the work of Canada's Digital Interchange.</p> <p>Annik Casey advised that Christine Desloges had retired in August and that she is now managing the work of CDI. She noted that CDI continues to work with Citizenship and Immigration (CIC) and Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) in developing technical requirements. In May 2015, CDI Working Group sent out a Request for Information to solicit industry feedback to refine requirements and to determine interest from the marketplace. CDI received 13 responses to the RFI and Gartner was hired to review them. She advised that the CDI Working Group also held a two-hour session with Deputy Ministers in August with the intent to review initial proposals for the business case and options for moving forward.</p> <p>Annik stated that CDI is also working in partnership with Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC) to develop the business case and will be gathering information and doing an in-depth analysis. The working group is also looking at privacy and security requirements, information sharing agreements, funding and costing options, as well as seeking to further engage the Councils on this work. The group is also looking to ensure that the business</p>	

	<p>and technical requirements meet the needs. The working group is planning to hold a workshop in late November, with the IMSC, to look at the work around the identity trust framework and the linkages with the work of the CDI. A save-the-date for this meeting will be sent to members shortly.</p> <p>Robert Frelich noted that TBS was tasked to work with CDI because it aligns with its mandate. He advised that the CDI working group is working over the next couple of months in developing a business plan. The working group is having internal discussions with federal departments and will also reach out to the provinces/territories for bilateral talks. CDI is also working with CIC on an Identity Linkages Project and this work, around password modernization, will be a pathfinder for CDI. This project requires three steps: 1) Validate electronically - reuse current vital events linkages system - the goal here is to use, reuse and leverage as much of the current structure as possible; 2) enable two-way communication with provinces/territories; and 3) provide CIC with death notification (this could be a federal hub).</p> <p>Annik Casey advised that she and the CDI team will be working with the IMSC to incorporate the DIACC piece into the identity management priority.</p> <p><b><u>Discussion:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stephanie Kirkland, CIC, added that efforts to align the password modernization project with CDI are coming together. This project shows the importance of collaboration and leveraging existing work and exploring opportunities for other needs. She reinstated the importance for the provinces/territories to engage in this work early and often to understand what is happening and what it is that we are building.</li> <li>Bette-Jo Hughes stated that the collaborative work of the CDI and CIC on the password modernization project is the story that the councils need to be telling about the business opportunity here, and how identity management is supporting this work. She suggested using this as an example to explain why this work is important for the citizens of Canada.</li> </ul>	
6.	<p><b><u>DIGITAL SERVICES: Presentation by Gartner on Digital Services (refer to TAB 6)</u></b></p> <p>Paul Haskins, Senior Director, Digital Business, Gartner, gave a presentation on advancing digital government with a focus on the pre-requisites for digital government service delivery, the power of digital technology and the opportunities it offers across all levels of governments, the digital moments (creating value for citizens, business and government) and case studies.</p> <p><b><u>Discussion:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Laurie Duncan asked for further insight into what governments should be focused on in the midst of constant changes/shifts. Paul Haskins stressed the importance of 1) bringing business and IT together. IT sees this opportunity, business sees this opportunity, but the alignment between the two is missing. There is a need to form this internal partnership. 2) Data Readiness – readiness to expose and share information, build trust, and engage with multiple partners to achieve vision/goals. This will drive significant changes.</li> <li>Gisela Rempel inquired as to current trends within government vis-à-vis government digital strategy that would lead to the monetization of some of the data that government holds; government has data that would be</li> </ul>	

	<p>useful. Paul Haskins responded that government is sitting on authoritative source (data), but the challenge for governments is to identify the value in data and the role it wants to play around data aggregations and mergers, as well as acquisitions of data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linda Maljan inquired as to the key changes required with regards to government digital transformation. Paul Haskins responded that key factors to digital transformation are digital literacy and readiness.</li> </ul>	
7.	<p><b><u>Striking a Balance: Cultural Change and the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015</u></b></p> <p>Judith Hearn, Deputy Minister, Office of Public Engagement, gave a presentation on the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador's Open Government initiative related to the Access of Information and Protection of Privacy Act 2015.</p> <p><b><u>Discussion:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nicholas Wise inquired if Newfoundland has codified or defined public interest in the legislation in this reform. Judith Hearn responded that it has not been codified and that Privacy Commissioners have provided guidance on public interest, but the guidance is very broad. She noted that if the government ends up in court around this, it will get some idea on interpretation, but currently the responsibility rest with heads of public bodies.</li> <li>Jacques Paquette inquired about duty to document. Judith Hearn responded that the committee saw duty to document as a way to hold government responsible. There are important things that people require information on and if there is a legislative duty to document then this document can be produced.</li> <li>Linda Maljan inquired as to the difference between open information and open data. Judith Hearn responded that open information is the proactive disclosure of information, and access to information is about promoting and encouraging government departments to make proactively available the information, without going to access to information request.</li> <li>Chris Bookless inquired as to the ability for public bodies to share information amongst themselves (i.e., between provinces and municipalities) for the purposes of delivering services to common citizens; is this also incorporated into this legislation? Judith Hearn responded that Newfoundland and Labrador is beginning to look at this and that there is still a lot of fear around releasing data. She agreed that a project that allows the sharing of information, between provinces and municipalities, to create something in a collaborative effort would serve as a testament of the value of open government.</li> </ul>	
8.	<p><b><u>Other Business:</u></b></p> <p><b>A) Joint Councils Sub-Committees – Update Reports <i>(for information only):</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Service Mapping Sub-Committee <b>(TAB 8A-1 and 8A-2)</b></li> <li>(ii) Privacy Sub-Committee <b>(TAB 8B)</b></li> <li>(iii) Open Data and Information Working Group <b>(TAB 8C)</b></li> <li>(iv) Research Committee – <b>(no update available)</b></li> </ul>	

<p><b>Harry advised that in the Service Mapping Sub-Committee update report, included in the meeting binder (refer to TABS 8A-1 and 8A-2), there is a request by the SMSC Co-Chairs for Joint Councils' approval on the following:</b></p> <p><b><u>Decision Item requested by SMSC Co-Chairs:</u></b>  Joint councils approve the plan for SMSC to promote informal collaboration and sharing (public and private sector) of public sector reference models and transformation methodologies. For the SMSC to return with a proposal in 12-18 months to detail how (among other things) SMSC evolves in to a "standards" body within Joint Councils. Support to SMSC will be limited to inclusion in Joint Councils proceedings during this time.</p> <p>Serge Caron, SMSC Co-Chair, added that the SMSC would plan to be involved in the discussions around the development of an overall framework around the Councils priorities as a result of the discussion on the alignment of priorities and the support from sub-committees.</p> <p>Recommendation to approve request from SMSC  Moved by: John Messina  Seconded by: Chris Bookless  Adopted.</p> <p>Harry requested the ICCS Secretariat to highlight any request from the sub-committees and working groups on the agenda for future meetings so that these request are not missed.</p> <p><b>B) Meeting Hosts for the St. John's meetings</b></p> <p>The PSSDC and PSCIOC Co-Chairs, on behalf of the Councils, expressed thanks to the NL meeting hosts, Donna Kelland, Ellen MacDonald and Janine Halliday for being such great hosts.</p> <p><b>C) Next in-person meeting of the Joint Councils</b></p> <p>The Co-Chairs confirmed that the next in-person meeting of the Councils is scheduled for February 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016 at the Old Mill, Toronto, ON and that British Columbia has agreed to host the September 2016 meeting in Victoria.</p> <p>The Co-Chairs thank all members and observers for their participation in the meeting.</p>	<p><b>Decision # 3:</b>  Joint Councils members approved proposal from SMSC to promote informal collaboration and sharing (public and private sector) of public sector reference models and transformation methodologies.</p> <p><b><u>Action Item #4:</u></b>  SMSC to report back to the Joint Councils in 12-18 months on a proposal detailing how the SMSC would evolve in to a "standards" body within Joint Councils (as per SMSC's request approved at the Sept. 2015 meeting).</p>
<p><b>The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m. NDT.</b></p>	