

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



Draft – v.3

JOINT COUNCILS MEETING – PSSDC-PSCIOC

February 22nd, 2017

OTTAWA, ONTARIO

Record of Decision

Attendance

CO-CHAIRS:

Natasha Clarke
Jacques Paquette

Nova Scotia – PSSDC
ESDC/Service Canada – PSSDC

Bette-Jo Hughes
John Messina

British Columbia - PSCIOC
Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat - PSCIOC

PSCIOC MEMBERS:

Benoît Boivin
Mark Brisson
Kathryn Bulko
Robert Devries
Chris Fisher
Dave Heffernan
Sean McLeish
Rick Ouellette
Harry Turnbull
Tracy Wood
Munna Zaman

Quebec
Alberta
MISA Central (City of Toronto)
Ontario
MISA West (City of Regina)
Northwest Territories
Yukon
New Brunswick
MISA East (City of Windsor)
Prince Edward Island
Manitoba

PSSDC MEMBERS:

Kim Andrews
Chris Bookless
Glenn Brunetti
Steve Burnett
Mark Burns
Jennifer Dawson
Beverly Dicks
Guy Gordon
Michelle Herder
Ron Hinshaw
Rob Horwood
Christian Laverdure
Linda Maljan
Réa McKay
Jacqueline Ratté Kohut
Jackie Stankey
Silvano Tocchi
Rhonda Tsingos
David Ward

Veterans Affairs Canada (for Elizabeth Douglas)
Yukon
MSDO (Region of Peel)
Ontario
Yukon
TBS (for Nick Wise)
British Columbia
Manitoba
MSDO (York Region) (for Karla Hale)
British Columbia
New Brunswick
Innovation, Science & Economic Development
Northwest Territories
Public Services and Procurement Canada
Manitoba (representing Paul Pierlot)
Alberta
Canada Revenue Agency
MSDO (City of Brampton)
Ontario

PSCIOC / PSSDC / JOINT COUNCILS OBSERVERS & PRESENTERS:

Ian Bailey	British Columbia	Robert Frelich	ESDC/Service Canada
Deb Bergey	Region of Waterloo	Kevin French	Ontario Shared Services
Corinne Charette	Innovation, Science and Economic Development	Sophia Howse	British Columbia
Patrick Charette	ESDC/Service Canada	Allison Little Fortin	Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada
Richard Dalpé	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	Nancy MacLellan	Institute for Citizen-Centred Service (Nova Scotia)
Bernadette De Souza	Ontario Shared Services	Margo McCarthy	ESDC/Service Canada
Anik Dupont	ESDC/Service Canada	Philip Pietersma	Innovation, Science and Economic Development
Claudia Ferland	Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada	Annette Vermaeten	ESDC/Service Canada
Nick Wise	TBS	Rita Whittle	TBS

ICCS Secretariat:

Dan Batista	Maria Luisa Willan	Linda Robins	Stefania Silisteanu
-------------	--------------------	--------------	---------------------

Item	Topic / Discussion	Decision / Action
1.	<p><u>ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:</u></p> <p>Jacques Paquette, on behalf of the PSSDC and PSCIOC Co-Chairs, welcomed all members and observers to the meeting followed by roundtable introductions.</p> <p><u>A) Approval of Record of Decision from September 14th, 2016 in-person Joint Councils meeting, Victoria, BC (Refer to TAB 1A)</u></p> <p>Record of Decision of Joint Councils' meeting of September 14th, 2016 adopted without changes.</p> <p><u>B) Acceptance of February 22nd, 2017 Joint Councils Agenda (Refer to TAB 1B)</u></p> <p>Joint Councils' meeting agenda of February 22nd, 2017 adopted. No comments or questions were raised.</p>	<p><u>Decision # 1:</u> Record of Decision of September 14th, 2016 Joint Councils' meeting in Victoria adopted without changes.</p> <p><u>Decision # 2:</u> Agenda of February 22nd, 2017 meeting adopted.</p>
2.	<p><u>Showcase Presentation: Shared Services (Refer to TAB 2)</u></p> <p>John Messina introduced Kevin French, Associate Deputy Minister, Ontario Shared Services, Ministry of Government and Consumer Services. Kevin led a presentation on Shared Services with collaboration from Ontario (Robert Devries), Quebec (Farah Ouamara), New Brunswick (Judy Ross), Manitoba (Scott Sinclair), British Columbia (Bette-Jo Hughes), and Shared Services Canada (Graham Barr).</p> <p>Kevin French presented an overview of Shared Services across the country, with excellent work in the municipal jurisdictions. Kevin noted that the presentation would focus on common themes across the Pan-Canadian community such as; governance as a shared services delivery organization; evolving maturity in shared service delivery models; funding mechanisms - some commonalities but lag in terms of an enterprise system; and Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) platforms/systems. Kevin stated that there are numerous commonalities and common interests between jurisdictions in terms of Shared Services; there is a real value in a group like the Joint Councils coming together having a clear shared service and value proposition. Kevin is establishing/coordinating a Shared Services Network. Kevin asked members to contact him if they wish to join, had any questions or wish to</p>	

	<p>discuss this topic further. He also noted that the group may wish to have a further discussion with the Joint Councils on possible opportunities for collaboration in the future.</p> <p>There was no further discussion to the Shared Services presentation.</p>	
3.	<p><u>FRAMEWORK WORKING GROUP (Refer to TAB 3A and 3B)</u></p> <p>Bette-Jo Hughes thanked Natasha Clarke and Sophia Howse for their leadership on the work of the Framework Working Group and their collaboration with all jurisdictions on the revisions to the Logic Model in making it relevant to the work and priorities of the Joint Councils.</p> <p>Natasha Clarke stated that a lot of work has been done since the September meeting. The focus of the work of the Framework Working Group was for the Joint Councils to have an opportunity to work together and create meaningful change to advance and improve service delivery in Canada. She thanked all members of the working group and Council members for their time and effort in providing important feedback to the group and support as part of the jurisdictional consultations. Natasha advised that the working group was seeking members' approval of the revised logic model and consensus on the Joint Councils' priorities. She noted that members of the Councils will have an opportunity to vote on their top three priorities at this meeting. Upon confirmation of the Joint Councils' priorities the Framework Working Group would then develop a roadmap (work plan) over the spring/summer and would be presented at the fall meeting.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bette-Jo Hughes asked to define "Digital Governance". Natasha Clarke responded that digital governance is the creation of digital organizations, on how digital is used in jurisdictions, how we build the business case for it on a pan-Canadian level. Sophia Howse added that digital governance is how we understand all the components of strategies embedded in the "digital government ecosystem" and how to apply these tools within our own jurisdictions. • Jacques Paquette noted that it seems that digital governance and digital strategy is the same topic. Natasha Clarke clarified that there is an opportunity to look at how these pieces are linked together under the same umbrella, including the roles and responsibilities; for example, if you don't have the governance piece, how can you deliver the strategies? • Silvano Tocchi suggested focusing on some of the practical things; for example, what the governance looks like. It is important not to lose the small practical things to show progress. Natasha Clarke responded that the group will also do a swot analysis of the working groups/committees of the Councils to determine what we should keep, what should be repurposed and have more opportunities for pilots such as the Death Notification and Canada's Digital Interchange pilots. She agreed that it is important not to lose sight of this and also an opportunity to bundle those things to stay focused. • Harry Turnbull expressed that it is important to keep this work tactical and strategic. • Natasha Clarke reminded members that the work of the Framework Working Group was to focus in on the 	<p><u>Decision # 3:</u> Joint Councils members approved the Logic Model that was presented by the Framework Working Group.</p> <p><u>Decision # 4:</u> Joint Councils approved the following top three priorities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Digital Identity 2. Digital Strategy 3. Client-Centric Services <p><u>Action Item #1A:</u> Framework Working Group to work on further refinements of the Logic Model based on approved Joint Councils' priorities. FWG to provide an update at an upcoming teleconference/meeting.</p> <p><u>Action Item #1B:</u> Framework Working Group to develop Joint Councils' roadmap (work plan) based on approved priorities. Framework Working Group to present roadmap to the Joint Councils at the next in person meeting or teleconference.</p> <p><u>Action Item #1C:</u> Framework Working Group to work with Joint Councils' top three priorities leads in the development of the work (scope and workplan) around each</p>

<p>common priorities of both Councils, work that can be done together, while some priorities are common priorities, there are others that would remain solely as PSSDC or PSCIOC priorities. That work should continue but the work of the Framework Working Group is about confirming and advancing Joint Councils' priorities and finding more opportunities for Joint Councils' collaboration. Natasha recommended for PSSDC and PSCIOC members to have a further discussion about how the work of their individual council can support the priorities and help to advance the agreed upon goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nick Wise stated that he is pleased with the outcome and admitted that things are never completely done; this is a work in progress. We need to recognize that we have to continuously evolve and shift our priorities as needed; the work of the Framework Working Group (logic model) it's a really good start. This is an exercise on the Councils' priorities and looking at how the Joint Councils can function as a group; how and why Joint Councils are doing things. The logic model speaks to our purpose as a pan-Canadian Table. Jacques Paquette congratulated the Framework Working Group on a work well done; he recognized the amount of work that has been done and how much Natasha Clarke and her colleagues have reached out for feedback. He was very pleased with the outcome however he noted that this is a conversation will continue to evolve over the next couple of year or so. He asked members if there were any other comments/issues with any of this work that needs to be addressed at this meeting. Chris Bookless stated that the Framework Working Group had done a great job. He expressed caution around the area of "trust and secure"; privacy and security is a paradigm and we cannot separate it; the revised Logic Model provides direction. <p><u>Confirmation of Joint Councils' Logic Model and Priorities</u></p> <p>Bette-Jo Hughes asked for the approval of the Logic Model. All members voted in favour.</p> <p>Each member of PSSDC and PSCIOC were given three votes (sticky dots) to identify their top three priorities. Members voted on their top three priorities. The results on the top three priorities and identified leads are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Digital Identity – Identity Management (32 votes) – Leads: Ian Bailey, BC and Jackie Stankey, AB Digital Strategy (14 votes) – Leads: Guy Gordon, MB, and Sean McLeish, YT Client Centric Services (14 votes) – Leads: Annette Vermaeten, ESDC/Service Canada and Réa McKay, PSPC <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jacques Paquette suggested using time at a future in person meetings to workshop some of the pieces around priorities, including for the other priority items that are not in the top three e.g. legislation/policy modernization Natasha Clarke stressed the importance in focusing on the priorities that are relevant to the Joint Councils. Bette Jo Hughes stated that Identity Management and Digital Identity themes are not mutually exclusive, and they are related to individual Councils also; how do the priorities of the Joint Councils relate to each Council; 	<p>priority item. FWG to report back on this work at an upcoming teleconference/meeting.</p> <p><u>Action Item #1D:</u> Framework Working Group to undertake a gap analysis of all the Councils' working groups and committees. This work would identify gaps and opportunities for better collaboration and a better understanding of how each working group can help to achieve Councils' priorities and Logic Model short term goals. FWG to provide an update at an upcoming teleconference/meeting.</p> <p><u>Action Item #1E:</u> Each Council to have a further discussion about how the work of the PSSDC and PSCIOC can support the priorities and help to advance the agreed upon goals.</p> <p><u>Action Item #1F:</u> Framework Working Group to work on pending action items from previous meetings that include development of a Joint Councils' Terms of Reference and recommendations on the future of the FWG and accountability of the Councils to the logic model. FWG to provide an update at an upcoming teleconference and/or meeting.</p>
---	---

	are they overlapping? She noted that this table has a relationship with the FPT DMs' Table and it would be a great opportunity for the Councils to get support from the DMs' Table around this work. Natasha Clarke stated that the Councils need to be intentional and clear in conversations with Deputy Ministers.	
4.	<p><u>FPT Deputy Minister's Table on Service Delivery</u></p> <p>Natasha Clarke introduced Leslie MacLean, Senior Associate Deputy Minister of Employment and Social Development Canada and Chief Operating Officer for Service Canada, Federal Co-Chair of the F-P/T DMs Table and Joanne Monroe, Nova Scotia Deputy Minister and Chief Executive Officer and Co-Chair of the F-P/T DMs' Table (<i>joining by teleconference</i>).</p> <p>Leslie MacLean thanked the Joint Councils Co-Chairs and members for the work they do; ensuring that Canadians are provided with better services. She also thanked them for the excellent debriefs that the DMs' Table receives from the Councils at each of their meetings. She stated that there are numerous expectations to manage, with little amount of money, the whole question is how to best consolidate our efforts and how can we best collaborate our efforts, how can we really drive for synergy in the work that we are doing. In terms of the work that the Councils have under way, she noted that she was impressed with the Joint Councils' meeting agenda items and delighted to see some of the topics align with the DMs' Table agenda. She also expressed her support for the Joint Councils' Call to Action, the pilots related to the work of Canada's Digital Interchange and Death Notification; pilots are an important opportunity, in a manageable way, to scope out and learn what works and what doesn't. We have solid networks and need to ensure that wherever possible we have better synergy (for example, co-location or geo-mapping). She noted that the FPT DMs' Table is interested in opportunities for better collaboration and partnership to respond to the FPT Clerks and Cabinet Secretaries call for service to be accelerated. She indicated that she and her Co-Chair will be presenting to Clerks and Cabinet Secretaries in April on tangible results.</p> <p>Joanne Monroe emphasized the importance of collaboration, noting on what DMs have been asked to deliver on. The work between CIO and service delivery community is very important in advancing common priorities and agendas. She stated that the work of the Joint Councils helps the DMs with their acceleration plan. The DMs' endorsed their acceleration plan at the December meeting and would like to develop better collaboration with the Joint Councils. Three highlights from the December Deputies' meeting: 1. Adopting a vision which is aligned with the Joint Councils: "Collaborative leadership to accelerate the delivery of best in class public services in Canada", 2. Deputies all agreed on targeting specific initiatives: Expedited Business Start, Death Notification for acceleration, and 3. To continually identify quick wins; examples: the Behavioural Insights Playbook, Death Notification and Registration Blueprint. She also noted that Deputies agreed to champion various priorities and initiatives that align with those of the Joint Councils. They are also using a "buddy" system so that advanced jurisdictions could help the less advanced ones. They have also agreed for MSDO President, Glenn Brunetti, to participate in DMs' Table meetings as an observer.</p> <p>Leslie MacLean and Joanne Monroe suggested better collaboration and partnership between the DMs' Table and the Joint Councils on a regular basis. Joanne Monroe thanked the Joint Councils members for their work. Leslie MacLean noted that the next Deputies' teleconference is scheduled for March. Leslie thanked Joanne and Natasha Clarke for hosting the in-person meeting in May in Nova Scotia. In-person informal bilateral/multilateral conversations between DMs' are planned. She encouraged members of Joint Councils to provide their DMs' with suggested topics for these conversations.</p>	

	Bette-Jo Hughes thanked Leslie MacLean and Joanne Monroe for taking the time to provide the update to the Councils on the work of the FPT DMs' Table. She noted that Joint Councils members will continue to work and make progress on its priorities; an update can be provided at the DMs' May meeting.	
5.	<p><u>Identity Management</u></p> <p>A) Progress Report on the current work of the Identity Management Sub-Committee (IMSC) (Refer to Tab 4A)</p> <p>Rita Whittle and Robert Devries, IMSC Co-Chairs, provided a progress report on the work of the Identity Management Sub-Committee. Rita noted that she was pleased to see identity management identified as a top priority for the Joint Councils during the Framework Working Group session.</p> <p>Rita Whittle advised that she had a discussion with Ian Bailey (BC) and Jackie Stankey (AB) on identity management going back to the basics of what that comprises from an identity management perspective. For a service entitlement eligibility, it would be interesting to know how many s, (maybe this is the research component), would be able to cross the jurisdictional boundaries to have seamless service, to enable whatever that is, to continue the work to make sure that the deliverables of IMSC are in line with what is required. Rita Whittle and Robert Devries will work in collaboration with Ian Bailey and Jackie Stankey on the Digital Identity priority (related to the action item from the Framework Working Group discussion).</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robert Devries stated that the PC Trust Framework is very important but also very technical. Through the Councils, creating a user journey on how somebody is using their digital identity would be a valuable outcome. Robert stated that some of the risk with this work is that the private sector and public sector are moving in different speeds, the private sector will overtake public sector in developing identity solutions. We want to make sure that what we are creating a viable trust framework for government to share its assets with private sector in a way that they can take advantage and build on what we have. Developing a trust framework is a way to get ahead of the industry to say here are standards that you need to implement in order to make sure that what the private sector is producing is not the "wild west of identity". There are innovative companies developing e-wallet solutions and each is trying to get ahead and be the one that creates the secure identity in e-wallet. Need to learn from other jurisdictions such as BC that are more advanced in this work. Leaning on private sector and take advantage so they create identity products so that government is not the sole creator and distributor of identity but creating an ecosystem where we all participate. This work is foundational to this goal. Corinne Charette agreed in bringing the client experience to this work and focusing on the notion of value. The issue of trust is key to identity management; technology solution or use cases are important; in the case of interactions with citizens/businesses, trust that we provide to the right people who are who they say they are. Does every jurisdiction understand how they can apply the trust framework? Each one runs on Identity Management through these standards, do they work with or against them? We should be able to say that in British Columbia or Quebec, for example, we issue an identity because we followed the standards or identity steps; are they trustworthy? Having different use cases across the country related to compliance with this Trust Framework would be very important. 	<p><u>Action Item # 2A:</u> Rita Whittle and Robert Devries to provide a progress report on the work of IMSC at an upcoming teleconference/meeting. IMSC Co-Chairs will work with Digital Identity leads related to the work of the FWG.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ian Bailey noted that use case testing is currently happening in British Columbia. • Sophia Howse and Bette-Jo Hughes talked about integrating a solution that takes into account the person's identity, for example the current work on Death Notification; if this is unsuccessful than we cannot manage the identity in the life cycle. The good news is that jurisdictions have the foundation of the identity that Corinne referred to, but how do we leverage it to our services and make it usable for our clients in a streamlined way? • Harry Turnbull stated that numerous jurisdictions are waiting for the work around the toolkit and through the Framework Working Group feedback, there was a desire to bring it to a national identity service as opposed to everyone working separately; smaller jurisdictions may not even know where to start from. • Robert Devries noted that the IMSC would have a discussion with DIACC around enabling identity in an ecosystem; citizens accessing government services using digital. How to leverage digital in big governments or at the municipal level is the linkage that comes from the work of CDI and DIACC. <p>B) Progress report on the current work of DIACC related to the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework (Refer to TAB 4B)</p> <p>Joni Brennan, DIACC President, gave a progress report on their current work related to the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework and its continued collaboration with IMSC. She noted that since the last meeting in Victoria, membership is growing which demonstrates the connection of the public and private sectors on Identity Management. DIACC is focused on delivering components of the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework through a strong collaborative effort; bringing together the public and private sectors to support a digital economy. DIACC has received interest from corporations outside of Canada.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corinne Charette asked for more clarification around the proof of concept on Block Chain technology (distributed ledger technology) with the parts that DIACC can help with and what are the next steps in regards to British Columbia. Ian Bailey replied that so far this is giving great insight to where the technology could help; it's different when you run a business workshop and you turn the business into a solution, and we are getting to see the value of this kind of technology and it's complex, its architecture is to provide real time visibility to transactions on the surface, it's a useful technology that enable things to solve business problems. British Columbia has been very successful. In regards to next steps, BC is still working on this, in a matter of weeks, BC has created a Blockchain infrastructure, applications that talk to the Blockchain infrastructure and from the viewer application: we have complete visibility across Canada; it's a straightforward architecture and it would provide great value to an individual business owner and also to government' operations. • Corinne Charette added that the challenge with Blockchain is not in learning how to apply the technology, but that there are no centralized registries - we have a need for centralized registries, but that does not exist. Ian Bailey responded that BC has learned that this could be used as a complementary solution; BC got into solving the business transactions with modest investment. 	<p><u>Action Item #2B:</u> Joni Brennan to provide details on the DIACC workshop in Toronto when available.</p> <p><u>Action Item #2C:</u> Joni Brennan to provide a progress report on DIACC at an upcoming meeting/teleconference.</p>
---	--

- Robert Devries: CDI is an example of how we share the data; we diverge from the architecture paradigm into something new, we can try these things and see how they fit.
- Joni Brennan stated that there are always more opportunities for this work; DIACC will reach out and plan a workshop in Toronto to share more findings. Joint Councils members will be invited to participate in the workshop. This is a journey of connecting the verified organizations with verified people in a digital landscape; caution in using Blockchain as there are different standards around to use them. Joni will provide information on the DIACC workshop when available.

C) Jurisdictional showcase on Alberta's Identity Management Program (Refer to TAB 4C)

Jackie Stankey, Alberta, gave a presentation on Alberta's Identity Management Program.

Discussion:

- Bette-Jo Hughes inquired around the verification piece, in the case of a driver's license, how do you know that the person online is the same person they claim to be? How do you get a high level of verification? Jackie Stankey responded that when this is done online there are identifiers (security codes) similar to credit cards, to provide verification. There is physical mail that it's sent to the address of this individual to confirm residence.
- Robert Devries noted the evolution of the CRA solution (as per the presentation at the Learning Event), where in the past, individuals had to wait for this piece of mail to arrive; we don't want to do that. Are there any other ways to verify identity by a phone call or other way to fulfill that more immediately? Waiting for mail is not an incentive for people to use the online system. Jackie Stankey responded that the verification process is a one-time process.
- Natasha Clarke commented on federated identity across the country, how can we govern that; in Nova Scotia we trust our data; how can we make sure that we are ok with that?
- Rita Whittle added that Alberta has furthered its identity management approach and tested the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework. At some point we have to address the governance piece. The federal government has its own standards.
- Corinne Charette stated that in regards to the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework and validation of identity, we have to have a trusted ID ecosystem in Canada; there are 14 jurisdictions that need to sort out the identity issue, jurisdictions would need external auditors that periodically will show up and check. The notion of the trust framework governance is too big and overused; need to think about external auditors.
- Jacques Paquette thanked Jackie Stankey for the presentation and expressed appreciation for Alberta's Deputy Minister Tim Grant championing identity management He looks forward to continued FPT engagement on the file.

6.	<p><u>Canada's Digital Interchange – (Refer to TAB 5)</u></p> <p>A) Progress report related to CDI business case including “CDI proof of concept FPT pilots”</p> <p>Robert Frelich and Arlene Williams (<i>by teleconference</i>), CDI Co-Chairs, gave a progress report on the work of the group. He noted that since the September meeting, CDI has continued to maintain momentum with all partners to refine key design elements of CDI, including advancing on possible pilot projects with interested jurisdictions. Productive discussions on possible pilots have already taken place with Nova Scotia and Alberta in November and December, 2016. Both provinces have shown an interest in pursuing the discussions and to start defining the requirements to move forward with pilot projects. Two Proposals have been put forward as potential pilot projects with Nova Scotia. One other pilot is being discussed between Alberta and Treasury Board Secretariat. A legal opinion was requested to look at whether the proposals fall within the existing legal authorities. Further engagement is planned for February/March to continue discussions and collectively define a critical path. Robert noted that CDI will continue its work around next steps as noted in the presentation deck. CDI is planning to report back at the Joint Councils' meeting in October.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corinne Charette congratulated ESDC, NS and AB for advancing the work on the pilots; it shows incredible leadership. She suggested looking at the passports database; it could be a second way of validation. She suggested looking at the passports database as a second source of validation for immigrants. • Robert Frelich responded that there are options to move forward because this is a pilot not a program. This definitely needs mitigation and risk assessment and nothing is without risks. • Bette-Jo Hughes inquired that in regards to database, who is checking the database? Does it make a difference who is doing the cross checking? If you don't give access to another jurisdiction to access the database; would that resolve some of the issues in terms of the use of the database? • Natasha Clarke stated that the Councils need to address these issues if we want to move forward. Arlene Williams added that the pilots will help to identify gaps/challenges. • Corinne Charette stated that assuming that we have the authority, what is the risk if you have an individual who gives you the consent to use his/her SIN, you give him a better service and you get the confirmation back to your province. You are taking risks in all processes. Jacques Paquette responded that it is the minister that assumes the risk, if the minister is willing to take the risk, it is their role to change the legislation; the pilot is useful to identify issues and give us a better understanding of the issues. <p>B) Presentation on federal study of CDI benefits realization done by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC)</p>	<p><u>Action Item #3A:</u> CDI to provide a progress report on the CDI proof of concept FPT pilots at the Joint Councils' meeting in October.</p> <p><u>Action Item #3B:</u> Framework Working Group and CDI leads will work on further scoping of work related to the federal study of CDI benefits realization.</p>
----	---	---

	<p>Robert Frelich gave an overview of the federal study of CDI benefits realization done by PwC. The core objective of the report was to provide ESDC with Benefits Realization research and analysis in support of the Canada's Digital Interchange (CDI) Business Case. Specifically, the completed CDI Business Case was reviewed through the lens of the three pillars of the CDI Benefits Realization framework: 1. Direct cost avoidance (e.g. those costs that can be eliminated or avoided by the business transformation processes as the result of using CDI); 2. Indirect cost avoidance (e.g. those costs that can be avoided or recovered by improved sharing of identity information attributes); and, 3. Overall service improvements (e.g. non-quantifiable benefits).</p> <p>Robert noted that CDI and digital ID were identified as top Joint Councils' priorities; similar with what is being done around Death Notification. It would be valuable to understand what is the value proposition for the jurisdictions; need to confirm if that is in your interest or fits within the priorities of your jurisdiction. If anyone is interested in the presentation on federal study of CDI benefits realization done by PwC, connect with ESDC or TBS for further discussion.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natasha Clarke commented that there is an opportunity to work together with CDI Co-Chairs in the identity journey and on an approach to scoping this work further through the work of the Framework Working Group. The Framework Working Group will work with CDI on this. Jacques Paquette confirmed this would be a good approach given that CDI is a top priority. Corinne Charette suggested making it easy for jurisdictions to apply this framework. 	
7.	<p><u>Death Notification Working Group – (Refer to TAB 6)</u></p> <p>Anik Dupont, Steve Burnett and Ron Hinshaw gave a progress report on the work of the Death Notification Working Group. The DNWG was tasked with addressing how to improve the timeliness of registering and reporting deaths between jurisdictions; and, how to improve the service experience for citizens. The DNWG is seeking approval to move forward with Phase II of the project: development of detailed visual map of a client's death reporting journey by jurisdiction (including federal government); compile a list of all programs/services that require a death certificate as proof-of-death and for what purpose; and, begin to "scope out" a bereavement bundle.</p> <p>In regards to next steps, the DNWG will be completing Phase I of project with approval of blueprint; will be seeking additional funding to move forward with Phase II; will be initiating work on mapping of a client's death reporting journey to identify issues and challenges faced by citizens which would inform and contribute to continuing work on a "Tell us Once" approach and development of a bereavement bundle.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claudia Ferland (guest observer from Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada) stated that this is a fascinating journey; this work impacts all jurisdictions. She suggested for the DNWG to include indigenous people and to consider the cultural component as well. Stephanie Jay-Tosh noted that human centric service is very important – in mapping the journey take into 	<p><u>Action Item # 4:</u></p> <p>Death Notification Working Group will work on defining the scope of work for Phase II including funding request. The DNWG to submit scope of work and funding request for approval at an upcoming Joint Councils' teleconference/meeting.</p>

	<p>consideration the client's experience and what are the real key points. She suggested for the group to take some jurisdictions and use as a proof of concept.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jacques Paquette inquired as to amount needed by working group to continue with Phase II. Steve Burnett replied that the working group will be submitted a funding proposal in the spring/summer and that the group is looking at around \$75,000 for Phase II. • Bette-Jo Hughes noted that it would be a great idea to do journey mapping; designing work to document client experience - if we had that information it would make a great story to present and articulate the problem. Bette-Jo shared that in British Columbia, a four page document was created to provide citizens with information when dealing with the death of a family member. Although the appropriate authorities are notified when someone dies, people are still required to provide further information. A suggestion was made that something needs to be done to better understand the business problem. She agreed that this work is a place to start, how can we do a better job of standardizing our services and sharing information to make it a better service experience? This work can be a proof of concept to test all those things. Phase 1 - the blue print is a good tool for citizens, it gives us a place to start and how do we do a better job internally; two strings of work linking with CDI and IMSC could be a proof of concept to work on. • It was agreed that the Death Notification Working Group will work on defining the scope of work for Phase II including funding request to the Councils. The DNWG to submit funding request for members' approval at an upcoming Joint Councils' teleconference/meeting. 	
8.	<p><u>Joint Councils' Research Committee (Refer to TAB 7)</u></p> <p>Guy Gordon and Richard Dalpé, Research Committee Co-Chairs, provided a progress report on their current work related to confirmation of research priority themes (<i>Access to digital services, Client-centric services, Client feedback, Digital government, Identity management, Legislative barriers, and Privacy and security</i>). Richard stated that the Research Committee was seeking approval from the Joint Councils on the following items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of a proposal for research management support - secure the services of an independent contractor for a period of up to 12 months (April 2017-March 2018), with expenditure of up to \$70,000 to: establish and manage an on-line research repository, develop a series of monthly reports (e.g., synthesis, summaries or recent research on priority themes, targeted at Executive Management), and develop a review of the project at the completion of the contract. The contract is to be administered and managed by the ICCS. 2. Explore options for a research / information sharing and collaboration platform: need for a repository to store and share research papers and information. 3. Media Monitoring Proposal: daily updates on IM/IT/service-related news, sourced from local and national newspapers, newswires, TV/radio, trade journals and corporate databases - (\$6,600/year) <p><u>Discussion:</u></p>	<p><u>Decision Item #5:</u> Joint Councils members approved funding request from the Research Committee related to the hiring of research management support. All members were in favour of the funding request of up to \$70,000. This amount will be paid by both PSSDC and PSCIOC in equal amounts.</p> <p><u>Decision Item #6:</u> Research Committee to leverage the ICCS website to set-up a research / information sharing and collaboration platform.</p> <p><u>Decision Item #7:</u> Members approved additional expenditure of \$6,000 for media</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chris Bookless inquired if the intent is to have it open to the public or to just limited number of people. Guy Gordon responded that the intent is for this site to be public however it may take time to establish the right platform to share this information publicly as some people/jurisdictions would not be comfortable with sharing information broadly. Richard Dalpé stated that 90% of data/information is public information; the intent is to centralize the information in one repository for easy access. Jacques Paquette stated that in terms of sharing of information to the public, in the case of Service Canada, this has to go through different processes/approvals. The main goal is for this information to be accessible to Joint Councils members and then look at sharing this information more broadly once this has been set-up. In regards to media monitoring, are the Joint Councils in agreement to spend an additional \$6,000 on top of the \$70,000 that is being requested? Linda Maljan stated that in regards to media monitoring, there would be a lot of effort/time committed for this task and inquired if this will be done by ICCS or does someone else needs to be hired to do this work. Natasha Clarke has asked if social media (Twitter) are included in the InfoMart offering. Richard Dalpé responded that for social media there is an additional fee. Linda Maljan inquired if we could have it tested for one month and how much would that cost? Guy Gordon responded that the vendor (InfoMart) did offer a trial period. Jacques Paquette asked if there is a limit of people who would receive the daily feed of information. Richard Dalpé responded that there is a limit as to the number of people who will receive the emails daily. In regards to this particular offering, we are looking at Joint Councils members, we are expecting between 60 to 100 people as part of this offering. Richard offered to connect back with InfoMart and get more information. Natasha Clarke asked members to confirm their agreement to the funding request from the Research Committee related to the \$70K ask and the additional cost for media monitoring. <p><u>Support for Statement of Work</u> Joint Councils members approved funding request from the Research Committee related to the hiring of research management support. All members were in favour of the funding request of up to \$70,000. This amount will be paid by both PSSDC and PSCIOC in equal amounts.</p> <p><u>Support for Research Sharing Platform</u> Members agreed with the recommendation to leverage the ICCS website to set-up a research / information sharing and collaboration platform.</p> <p><u>Support for Media Monitoring Tool – InfoMart</u> Members approved additional expenditure of \$6,600 for media monitoring provided by InfoMart for a one year period. This amount to be paid by both Councils in equal amounts.</p> <p>Members approved, in principal, to include social media monitoring pending confirmation of additional costs by the Research Committee. (NOTE: at the PSSDC and PSCIOC meeting of Feb 23rd, an additional expenditure of \$6K</p>	<p>monitoring provided by InfoMart for a one year period. This amount to be paid by both Councils in equal amounts.</p> <p>Members approved, in principal, to include social media monitoring pending confirmation of additional costs by the Research Committee.</p> <p><u>Action Item # 5:</u> Research Committee Co-Chairs to provide a progress report to the Joint Councils at an upcoming teleconference on the following items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hiring of Research Management Support 2. Research Sharing Platform 3. Media Monitoring
--	---

	<p>was approved to include social media monitoring for a total of \$12.5K paid 50/50 by both Councils.)</p> <p>It was noted that funding approval for media monitoring was approved on the basis that this would be an appropriate product for research and that members were encouraged to provide feedback on usability of product.</p>	
9.	<p><u>Other Business</u></p> <p>A) Ralph Heintzman Leadership Award Winner 2016</p> <p>Nancy MacLellan, President of the ICCS Board of Directors announced the winner of the Ralph Heintzman Leadership Award 2016. She stated that there will be an official presentation at the next February meeting as the winner was not able to receive the award at this meeting. The award is annually given to someone who has demonstrated outstanding, superior and sustained leadership in the public sector; nominations were received from across Canada, from all levels of government. This year winner is Frank D'Onofrio from Ontario. Frank was a member of PSSDC and had a successful career with the Government of Ontario.</p> <p>B) Joint Councils Action Items from previous meetings (TAB 8A)</p> <p>Natasha Clarke advised that most of the Joint Councils action items will be completed at this meeting except for a few items related to the work of the Framework Working Group.</p> <p>C) Next in-person meeting of the Joint Councils is scheduled for October 4th, 2017, Charlottetown, PEI</p> <p>Jacques Paquette advised that the next in person meeting of the Joint Councils is taking place in Charlottetown, PEI, on October 4th, 2017.</p> <p>Bette-Jo Hughes and John Messina announced they will be retiring in the spring. Jacques and Natasha thanked them both for all their work and support as co-chairs and members of PSCIOC. The PSSDC Co-Chairs on behalf of all members expressed their best wishes to Bette-Jo and John on their upcoming retirement.</p> <p>The Co-Chairs thanked members and observers for their participation in the meeting.</p>	
	The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm EST.	