

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
October 4th, 2017
CHARLOTTETOWN, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Record of Decision

Attendance

CO-CHAIRS:

Natasha Clarke
Heather Sheehy

Nova Scotia – PSSDC
ESDC/Service Canada – PSSDC

Sandra Cascadden
Denise Gomes

Nova Scotia - PSCIOC
Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat – PSCIOC
(for Alex Benay)

PSCIOC MEMBERS:

Ian Bailey
Kathryn Bulko
Chris Fisher
Cheryl Hansen
Dave Heffernan
Ron Huxter
Ellen MacDonald
Sean McLeish
Bonnie Schmidt
Harry Turnbull
Tracy Wood

British Columbia
MISA Central (City of Toronto)
MISA West (City of Regina)
New Brunswick
Northwest Territories
Ontario
Newfoundland and Labrador
Yukon
Saskatchewan
MISA East (City of Windsor)
Prince Edward Island

PSSDC MEMBERS:

Glenn Brunetti
Mark Burns
Beverly Dicks
Alan Doody
Elizabeth Douglas
Claudia Ferland
Karla Hale
Michelle Herder
Ron Hinshaw
Rob Horwood
Michelle Lattimore
Christian Laverdure
Howah Lee
Linda Maljan
Anne Matthews
Jacqueline Ratté Kohut
Mélanie Robert
Jackie Stankey
Silvano Tocchi
David Ward

MSDO (Region of Peel)
Yukon
British Columbia
Newfoundland and Labrador (for Roxie Wheaton)
Veterans Affairs Canada
Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada
MSDO (Region of Peel)
MSDO (York Region) (for Karla Hale)
British Columbia
New Brunswick
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada
Innovation, Science & Economic Development
PSPC (for Réa Mckay)
Northwest Territories
Ontario
Manitoba
Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat
Alberta
Canada Revenue Agency
Ontario

PSCIOC / PSSDC / JOINT COUNCILS OBSERVERS & PRESENTERS:

Aneeta Bains	Innovation, Science and Economic Development	Margo McCarthy	ESDC/Service Canada
Alexandre Bourque	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	Natalie McGee	Innovation, Science and Economic Development
Deb Bergey	Region of Waterloo	Patricia Nadarajah	Shared Services Canada
Bernadette De Souza	Ontario Shared Services	Chantal Ritchey	Alberta
Dan Campbell	Prince Edward Island	Annette Vermaeten	ESDC/Service Canada
Robert Frelich	ESDC/Service Canada	Susan Wilkins	Newfoundland and Labrador
Tim Garrity	Prince Edward Island	Arlene Williams	Nova Scotia
Sophia Howse	British Columbia	Nick Wise	Public Safety Canada
		Rochelle York	Service Canada

ICCS Secretariat:

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

Item	Topic / Discussion	Decision / Action
1.	<p><u>ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:</u></p> <p>Natasha Clarke, on behalf of the PSSDC and PSCIOC Co-Chairs, welcomed all members and observers to the meeting followed by roundtable introductions. She extended her appreciation to Tracy Wood for the hosting of the meetings in PEI.</p> <p><u>A) Approval of Record of Decision from February 22nd, 2017 in-person Joint Councils meeting, Ottawa, ON (Refer to TAB 1A)</u></p> <p>Record of Decision of Joint Councils' meeting of February 22nd, 2017 adopted without changes.</p> <p><u>B) Acceptance of October 4th, 2017 Joint Councils Agenda (Refer to TAB 1B)</u></p> <p>Joint Councils' meeting agenda of October 4th, 2017 adopted. No comments or questions were raised.</p>	<p><u>Decision # 1:</u> Record of Decision of February 22nd, 2017 Joint Councils' meeting in Ottawa adopted without changes.</p> <p><u>Decision # 2:</u> Agenda of October 4th, 2017 meeting adopted.</p>
2.	<p><u>Framework Working Group (Refer to TABS 2A to 2D)</u></p> <p><u>Vision:</u> Enabling World Class Public Service Through Co-creation and Collaboration. <u>Call to Action:</u> Focus and Acceleration to Enable Digital Government for Canadians.</p> <p><u>A) Framework Working Group – Context Setting</u></p> <p>Natasha Clarke thanked Sophia Howse, FWG Co-Chair for her contribution and strategic thinking on the working group. She also extended her appreciation to her team, Elky Hanlon and Keleigh Annau, and the priority leads that worked diligently on this over the last few months. She reminded members that at the Ottawa meetings in February the Joint Councils' priorities were confirmed; Digital Identity, Digital Strategy and Client-Centric Services. At this meeting, priority leads will report back on each of the three Joint Councils' priorities. She noted that the Framework Working Group has started the work on the gap analysis of all Councils' sub-committees and working groups</p>	<p><u>Action item #1:</u> Framework Working Group to report back at the February meeting on the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gap analysis to understanding how each of the Councils' working groups can help to achieve priorities and the Logic Model's short term goals. Work with Priority Leads for a report out on each of the priorities (scope/roadmap).

<p>however an update on this will be presented at the Toronto meeting in early 2018.</p> <p>B) <u>Framework Working Group – Client- Centric Services (Refer to TAB 2B(i))</u></p> <p>Natasha Clarke introduced Bev Dicks and Annette Vermaeten who are the leads for the Client-Centric Services (CCS) priority. Bev Dicks and Annette Vermaeten presented an update report on the work related to the Client-Centric Services priority. It was noted that the objective of this work is to begin developing a common understanding of the Client-Centric Services priority, present a proposed Client-Centric Services Maturity Model and to confirm next steps in preparation for the February 2018 meeting.</p> <p>Annette Vermaeten advised that a Maturity Model has been developed to provide a client perspective on the type of integrated service experience clients would expect governments would be working towards. It aims to enhance our understanding of client experience and facilitate Joints Councils' collaboration on initiatives. It is aspirational, consensus-based, and a guiding document. It can be used to establish a baseline of where a Joint Councils/PSSDC initiative is on the continuum of client satisfaction and what to strive for. She noted that the Maturity Model articulates the vision – “the citizen is at the centre of everything”. The priority leads are seeking Joint Councils members' feedback/validation - whether the scoping of the Client-Centric Services priority through the Maturity Model and proposed activities are in line with the Joint Councils intent for this priority. It is proposed the Maturity Model be tested with the Death Notification initiative. In regards to next steps, the CCS priority leads would report back to the Joint Councils in February 2018 with a validated Maturity Model, proposed Statement of Work and articulation of Playbook components.</p> <p><u>Members' Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claudia Ferland (INAC) commented that in regards to mobile/digital there is a different reality when it comes to indigenous communities, i.e. Death registration and notification. Before we do the design, how do we engage the client for feedback and consultations (co-development)? She also inquired as to how to ensure that information (from the Councils and its working groups) can be easily accessed or shared, particularly when work has been sunset. • David Ward (ON) noted that there is a lot of work happening around service delivery in Ontario; in regards to digital, we realize that is not only one channel, but multi-channels, there are many things to be done before talking about design in the life cycle and engaging people who are using the services. Are there other jurisdictions thinking about this, have we donemething that is already in place in their jurisdiction? Have we done enough to canvass jurisdictions to inform model enough across Canada? Are there any jurisdictions that have something to contribute to this model - so? <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Bev Dicks noted that between now and February meetings the work will include consultations with jurisdictions around this work (maturity model).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ian Bailey (BC) stated that many jurisdictions are looking at improving services; we need continuous improvement and suggested adding this to the maturity model. Annette Vermaeten responded that they will continue improving and refining the model. 	<p>Action Item #2: Client Centric Services Priority Leads will refine the Maturity Model based on members' feedback from this meeting and also the feedback from the jurisdictional consultations that will be carried out in the fall/winter. The CCS Priority Leads will report back to the Joint Councils on this work at the next in person meeting in February.</p> <p>Action Item #3: Digital Strategy Priority Leads to report back at the next Joint Councils teleconference the results from the breakout session on Digital Strategy and future direction for this work based on members' feedback.</p> <p>Action Item #4: Digital Identity Priority Leads to report back on the five components of the roadmap needed to accelerate identity management in Canada: 1. Communication/Collaboration, 2. Pan-Canadian Trust Framework, 3. Pilots, 4. Approach to technology, and 5. Public Policy and Governance. This priority includes update on the work from IMSC and CDI.</p> <p>Action Item #5: CDI to invite Vital Stats to participate as an observer at the February in-person meeting discussion on CDI.</p>
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natasha Clarke (NS) inquired as to how do we apply this in our home jurisdictions, what are we trying to address as a collective Joint Councils, and what are the challenges? • Mélanie Robert (TBS) was in agreement with Ian Bailey and noted that at the federal level, they work on Open Government and Government Digital Service (GDS) to engage the citizens in the process, building that into the model, and communicating progress in terms of results. • Heather Sheehy (Service Canada) stated that we have to understand that the citizen is at the end of the line, we need a roadmap on how can we use this work in terms of showing progress and also addressing what Claudia Ferland mentioned about vulnerable populations. We have this somewhere in the model but it is hidden, we need easy access and being accessible, how to ensure that vulnerable populations are able to access the services. Some of the vulnerable populations have the most difficult time accessing the service. <p>Bev Dicks responded that the leads will focus on that in the next steps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jackie Stankey (AB) commented on how to create synergies with the Channel Shifting priority. She noted that in Alberta there have been some difficult decisions around shifting services to one channel - moving the traditional mailing to digital emails, that was a real difficult decision but resulted in significant savings. Alberta is moving to digital (shifting from traditional to modern technology) however there is pressure to deliver in every format, for example, for persons with disabilities, they continue to send out letters. • Sandra Cascadden (NS) noted that the term “client” and “citizen” is being used interchangeably and suggested that the term “client” is more encompassing. She noted that majority of people around this table don’t have the internal and external clients. <p>Bev Dicks asked Joint Councils members what term to use going forward - client or citizen. Members agreed that the term “client” should be used in this context.</p> <p>Joint Councils members were asked to approve on moving forward with the work for the Client Centric Services priority. All members in agreement.</p> <p><u>C) Framework Working Group – Digital Strategy (Refer to TAB 2C)</u></p> <p>Guy Gordon (via teleconference), Sean McLeish and Mark Burns presented an update on the work related to the Joint Councils’ priority on Digital Strategy. Guy stated that digital strategy is a new term and it needs to be defined. The Digital Strategy priority leads are beginning the process of developing a Digital Strategy for the Joint Councils. The Joint Councils Logic Model supports this Digital Strategy but it needs further scoping and seeking Joint Councils members input and feedback. What is the role of the Joint Councils on a pan-Canadian Digital Strategy?</p> <p>Mark Burns asked how we evolve to the next step for digital strategy in Canada. Digital Strategy is big and disruptive and jurisdictions are in different places so how can we create a strategy that can work for each jurisdiction? There is currently no Pan-Canadian strategy; the Joint Councils logic model is a prototype, but not complete. Need story on how do all components of digital strategy fit together. We don’t have a clear business</p>	<p>Action Item #6: Members to notify CDI Co-Chairs of their interest to participate in the Benefits Realization Study. CDI to provide an update on this item at the next meeting or teleconference. MB may participate in the study.</p>
--	---

case; need one to bring all jurisdictions on board.

Breakout session

Members were divided into four groups. Each group was asked to report back on the following questions:

1. What is the role of the Joint Councils in respect of a national digital strategy? What pieces/components do the Joint Councils own or are they responsible for? Are we currently organized and/or capable for delivering on these?
2. What “crunchy” things need to be done next?

The Digital Strategy Priority Leads to report back at the next Joint Councils teleconference the results from the breakout session on Digital Strategy and future direction for this work based on members’ feedback.

D) Framework Working Group – Digital Identity (Refer to TAB 2D)

Ian Bailey and Jackie Stankey provided an update report on the work related to the Joint Councils’ Digital Identity priority. Jackie Stankey reminded members that the leads were tasked to develop a roadmap for the Joint Councils to make digital identity real across jurisdictions and service channels. She noted that their key findings identified the five components of the roadmap needed to accelerate identity management in Canada: 1. Communication/Collaboration, 2. Pan-Canadian Trust Framework , 3. Pilots (there are 4 pilot types: A. Testing out trust framework/standards – concepts; B. Supporting client centric service delivery; C. Testing inter-jurisdictional governance/policy processes; D. Testing existing and emerging technologies), 4. Approach to technology, and 5. Public Policy and Governance.

The Digital Identity priority leads led a discussion around the key questions and recommendations to move this forward. Overall, members were in agreement to move forward on the five key components to accelerate identity management.

This presentation included an update report on the current work of the Joint Councils Identity Management Sub-Committee (IMSC) by Rita Whittle (via teleconference) and the Canada’s Digital Interchange by Robert Frelich and Arlene Williams, CDI Co-Chairs.

Members’ Discussion:

- Natalie McGee (ISED) inquired about the role of the Identity Management Sub-Committee (IMSC). Back in June 2008 the IMSC was created and wondered if this work was overtaking the work of the IMSC or how can we better combine forces. Natasha Clarke stated that the Joint Councils have set their priorities, we need to look at all the Councils’ sub-committees and working groups and ensure that they are in alignment with the priorities of the Councils in order to help us advance the vision and call to action.
- Heather Sheehy (ESDC/Service Canada) suggested that more work is required around the actual questions being asked of members e.g. policy and governance.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ian Bailey stated the need to confirm that these five components are the right things to work on before looking for possible solutions. Do you think that we can take these steps? • Sandra Cascadden (NS) noted that if this is not the work of the Joint Councils then who is working on this? We need to go to the Deputies' Table and bring these things forward. The question of who else could do that? If it's not public sector is it the private sector? • Guy Gordon (MB) noted that it would be important to involve the Deputies and Clerks on this work. Manitoba endorses these five components and supports the sense of urgency in moving this forward. Also, it is the public sector and not the private sector to drive it. • Melanie Robert (TBS) added that these five components are all very important; we just need to figure out how to work together. • Robert Frelich (CDI Co-Chair) suggested putting some resources in policy otherwise this would become an obstacle for advancement. Need to look for somebody to provide the concrete analysis to move the agenda forward. • Natasha Clarke (NS) noted that the Deputies and Clerks are waiting for the Joint Councils members to come up with a plan; they've articulated that this is a priority, so it's our role to identify the issues, etc. • Sophia Howse stated that from BC's perspective the policy and communication components are important ones. • David Ward (ON) agreed that these five components are the right pillars. The Ontario government has done work in each of these areas, the question is what is this Table expected to answer around policy? To what level are we trying to answer the public policy framework question? He suggested that public policies be rolled up to the next level of this work. • Rita Whittle (IMSC Co-Chair) noted that federal identity management created a policy (back in 2009) that needs to comply with Trust Model. There has been recent updates to this policy and can share this information with the Joint Councils. • Ian Bailey (BC) stated that we are not focusing on the policy internally through our public service, but to the external, from citizen's perspective. • Linda Maljan (NT) suggested getting the communication tool. We are in different places and communication is important. • Harry Turnbull (MISA East) suggested giving the digital identity priority leads the authority that they need to move this forward. • Cheryl Hanssen (NB) inquired about the relationship of DIACC vis-à-vis the Joint Councils. 	
--	--

- Guy Gordon (MB) noted that he would reserve judgement on DIACC; it is a broader question that needs to be revisited.
- Heather Sheehy (ESDC/Service Canada) suggested having a conversation with DIACC to find out more about this relationship and possibilities around the types of engagement.
- Jackie Stankey suggested sorting out the question on policy and governance before having further discussions with DIACC.
- Sophia Howse (BC) noted that standards are already underway; the question is how should we continue?
- Natasha Clarke asked if it is the Joint Councils to decide on standards - are there 2 sets of standards or one set of standards, the mechanics of what that is to have a relationship with DIACC.

Ian Bailey responded that there is one set of standards to connect the public and private sector. In regards to Public Policy and Governance, the question is who does what?

- Sandra Cascadden (NS) noted that some members have reservations about DIACC and its role with the Councils. She suggested for this group to provide further updates at upcoming teleconferences and not to wait until the next face to face meeting.

The Co-Chairs asked members for agreement to advance the work on the five components to accelerate identity management:

1. **Communication and Collaboration – overall members were in agreement to proceed.**
2. **Trust Framework – overall members were in agreement to proceed with Trust Framework. It was suggested for a strategy to be formulated around DIACC and further discussion around the relationship with DIACC with members.**
3. **Pilots (in collaboration with CDI) – overall members were in agreement to continue work on pilots and may wish to add others in the future.**
4. **Technology – overall members were in agreement to advance the work on approach to technology**
5. **Public Policy and Governance – overall members were in agreement that more scoping is required around policy and for the group to report back on this.**

E) CDI Proof-of-Concept of FPT Pilots:

Robert Frelich and Arlene Williams, CDI Co-Chairs, provided a status report on the work around the CDI Proof of Concept of FPT Pilots. Robert advised that CDI is working on testing inter-jurisdictional governance and policy processes through the Nova Scotia and Alberta pilots. The CDI pilots will demonstrate the business value of CDI between interjurisdictional levels of government, advance key CDI design elements, test elements of the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework, and improve client service delivery.

Arlene Williams stated that the jurisdictions see a lot of value in the proof of concept pilots. She inquired as to how

<p>to engage the Vital Stats office in this discussion, perhaps they can participate as observers. More collaboration and participation of all stakeholders (related to CDI) is important. Arlene also reminded members that CDI was working on a benefits realization study but it has been on hold due to lack of participation (interest) from jurisdictions.</p> <p>The CDI Co-Chairs will provide an update on this work including sharing of lessons learned at the February in person meeting.</p> <p><u>Members' Discussion on CDI Proof of Concept of FPT Pilots:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alan Doody (NL) inquired about the driver's license database. Robert Frelich responded that a driver's license should not be used for identity. The policy and authority around this depends on the jurisdiction - it would be great to have access to data based on driver's license, but it's a matter of policy. Those required if the jurisdictions can access the information on the social insurance number. In February we will come with improvements to the data. <p>Alan Doody added that some technology is not up to date in all jurisdictions; they are working in silos. Robert Frelich responded that if we were able to leverage that data, the ability is to validate; they are using it to access data, receive a receipt as an app, eliminating the bureaucracy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natasha Clarke (NS) agreed with Alan Doody's comment around using the database – what are the tangible parts that we can use the database for? The driver's license is more valid than the birth certificate. These rules were in place before we were using the tools. How can we action this. • Ian Bailey (BC) mentioned that in BC they cannot use the driver's licence data. They are working on facial recognition as an app. • Jackie Stankey (AB) added that in Alberta they do leverage the driver's license data and they have partnered with CDI. Alberta is also working with other federal departments such as IRCC and CRA for more high value services to citizens through My Alberta Digital ID. Current approach is sharing of information and lessons learned and the standards needed to be in place. Jackie also inquired as to the participation of Privacy Commissioners to the discussion on CDI. How to invite and engage all important parties (stakeholders) in this discussion for better collaboration. • Heather Sheehy (ESDC/Service Canada) noted that it would be beneficial to have Vital Statistics as an observer at this table. In regards to Benefits Realization Study, she noted that FPT Deputies are interested in this. <p>Sandra Cascadden asked members for agreement to invite Vital Stats to the discussion on CDI at this table. Members were in agreement for CDI to invite Vital Stats to participate in this discussion at the next Joint Councils meeting as an observer.</p> <p>Sandra Cascadden asked members for agreement for CDI to continue its work related to the FPT pilots. Members in agreement for CDI to continue its work and provide an update at the next in person meeting.</p>	
--	--

	<p>Sandra Cascadden asked members to notify CDI Co-Chairs of their interest to participate in the Benefits Realization Study. CDI to provide an update on this item at the next meeting or teleconference. MB may participate in the study.</p> <p><u>F) Framework Working Group: Discussion/approval of FWG recommendations and next steps</u></p> <p>Natasha Clarke stated the Framework Working Group will report back at the February meeting on the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In partnership with working groups and committees of the Councils, complete the gap analysis to understanding how each of these groups can help to achieve priorities and the Logic Model short term goals • Priority leads will report back on each of the Councils' priorities based on members' feedback at this meeting (Client Centric Services, Digital Strategy and Digital Identity). <p>Natasha advised that there would be a discussion at the February meeting around the future role of the Framework Working Group.</p>	
3.	<p>Case Study – Blockchain Proof of Concept (Refer to TAB 3A and 3B)</p> <p>Kevin Armstrong, Partner at Deloitte Digital presented on Blockchain 101.</p> <p>Bev Hawton, A/Deputy Minister, Ontario, and Natalie McGee, ISED, gave a presentation on Blockchain Proof of Concept. The Government of Ontario, Federal Government, and City of Toronto have been collaborating to identify opportunities to reduce administrative burden on restaurant businesses in the City using digital services. The presentation included a video that was embedded in one of the slides: https://vimeo.com/232853080/96ecd2ea4f</p> <p><u>Members' Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mélanie Robert (TBS) inquired as to how the team managed to remove the risk aversion to this work. Bev Hawton responded that this was tabled as a "proof of concept pilot"; identified the opportunity and all partners agreed and this is how it came together. This is a public – private partnership. • Sophia Howse (BC) inquired as to how far did they go in terms of governance. Who were the players in terms of decision making? Bev Hawton responded that Ontario led this work in terms of decision making and if there was a disagreement this was escalated to a Steering Committee (composed of directors at the ADM level from each of the participating jurisdictions). Sophia Howse inquired as it was a private or public partnership, was it a member from Deloitte that was empowered to make decisions on behalf of members? Bev Hawton confirmed that this is a public-private partnership. There is a real case and need for multi-stakeholders' governance because it's a truly co-delivered program, there is no one owner and in that regard the governance becomes much more important. • Harry Turnbull (MISA East) noted that BizPal was developed a while ago and how to move to the BizPal 2.0. Natalie McGee responded that BizPal was established when technology wasn't advanced, the idea of Blockchain and of secure and private digital relationship is a game changer, if we look as to how to 	<p><i>No action item identified from this presentation/ discussion.</i></p>

	<p>operationalize it, this opens the door for BizPal 2.0. Aneeta Bains (ISED) stated that there are numerous opportunities here for all of us and ISED is hoping to lead this and look for the support from this table. Dan Batista added that if Blockchain was around 10 years ago, the BizPal would have been completely different, this goes beyond BizPal 2.0; this revolutionizes the possibilities on how to do business.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mélanie Robert (TBS) noted the need of pilots to help us get a grip on “governance and shared governance” and by doing these pilots we discover a lot more and it helps to clarify the governance issue. 	
4.	<p>Death Notification Working Group – Progress Report (<i>verbal update</i>)</p> <p>Anik Dupont and Ron Hinshaw, Death Notification Working Group Co-Chairs, provided an update on the current work related to the Death Registration and Notification. Anik advised that death notification across jurisdictions is not timely and this has an impact on survivors; delayed access to benefits. The objective is to enable and develop shared information electronically with those who need it, improve the client experience, particularly around a difficult time such as this. The DNWG completed Phase I of this work which was to develop a Death Registration and Notification Blueprint. In May the FPT Deputies confirmed death registration and notification as a priority. The DNWG is looking for jurisdictions who would be willing to look at the Death Registration and Notification Blueprint and implement it in their jurisdiction. The DNWG is currently working on Phase II – client journey mapping. For phase II, the DNWG developed an RFP. The targeted process identified 11 consultants who were invited to respond. Three proposals were received and the selection panel (Anik Dupont, Ron Hinshaw, Steve Burnett and Dan Batista) reviewed and scored these proposals. The contract was awarded to Davis Pier.</p> <p>Ron Hinshaw added that for the client journey mapping exercise, British Columbia, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and federal government will be participating in moving forward with this in the fall. The main objective of Phase II is to “listen, learn, and act”. Davis Pier will map the journey citizens take in regards to death registration and to identify gaps and challenges. Need to develop better solutions for citizens. Davis Pier will undertake jurisdictional consultations with all necessary stakeholders (government, funeral home directors, doctors, etc). The expected outcome of these consultations is to take stock of what is there and what we need to do next to solve the problem. The DNWG will report back on progress at the next in person meeting in February.</p> <p><u>Members’ Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heather Sheehy (ESDC/Service Canada) noted that there’s a challenge to use the blueprint in jurisdictions, are there any other barriers that have been identified by jurisdictions? Ron Hinshaw responded that jurisdictions are in different places when it comes to death registration, they will use the blueprint in different ways. The blueprint is about how you fix the back end process. Claudia Ferland (INAC) suggested having special considerations from the perspective of indigenous communities (cultural differences) around death notification. INAC would be very happy to help on this in regards to indigenous communities. Ron Hinshaw noted that the DNWG has looked at the cultural perspective and have included this in this work. David Ward (ON) inquired as to what is the actual ask of the DNWG around this work. Ontario needs to 	<p>Action Item #7: Death Notification Working Group Co-Chairs to report back on client journey mapping (Death Notification and Registration – Phase II) at the February 2018 Joint Councils in person meeting.</p>

	<p>modernize the death notification process but unclear about the implementation of the blueprint across jurisdictions. Would Ontario be a proper jurisdiction to start to implement the blueprint? How is the blueprint different from journey mapping?</p> <p>Anik Dupont responded that the blueprint is intended for internal use as to how this information travels, who received the information, and how long it takes. The client journey mapping is for external use; how does a Canadian dealing with a jurisdiction in a death notification, what is the interaction like and what information is required. The DNWG would be pleased to work with Ontario on this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michelle Lattimore (IRCC) stated that for client journey mapping this work also needs to take into account those Canadians that are not interacting with jurisdictions. • Alan Doody (NL) expressed interest in collaborating with the DNWG on this work. • Kathryn Bulko (MISA Canada) asked if the DNWG needs municipal volunteers. Anik Dupont responded that the municipalities are a great partner to have and that the DNWG welcomes this support. • Heather Sheehy (ESDC/Service Canada) inquired if there are any linkages between journey mapping and using the Client-Centric Services maturity model. Bev Dicks responded that the Client-centric Services priority will be using the maturity model with death notification and the journey mapping process to validate it this is client centric and to validate the maturity model. Ron Hinshaw added that for the design process the working group is listening and learning and will look at using the maturity model for this work. • Sophia Howse (BC) suggested taking this initiative (DNWG) and putting it as an objective for the Joint Councils under Client-Centric Services priority. • Natasha Clarke (NS) stated that any opportunities to tie things together are a good. As members we can do more to improve, simplify and to focus this work around the priorities of the Joint Councils. • Anik Dupont thanked members for their support and noted that she would connect with Ontario, Newfoundland and City of Toronto for further collaboration. 	
5.	<p>Joint Councils Research Committee – (Refer to TAB 4)</p> <p>Richard Dalpé and Guy Gordon (via teleconference) presented a progress report on the work of the Research Committee related to key initiatives. Co-Chairs provided an overview of the work underway related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ On-line research repository ➢ Daily newsletter and monthly reports ➢ Media monitoring pilot project <p>In regards to next steps, the Research Committee Co-Chairs advised that the committee will continue work with consultants to further develop various research projects, it will engage Research Committee members and special advisory committee on further development of projects, it will test early prototypes and refine as required, and it will report back to the Joint Councils at the February meeting on final drafts for approval.</p>	<p>Action Item #8: Research Committee Co-Chairs to provide a progress report on the online research repository, daily newsletter (media monitoring) and monthly reports at an upcoming teleconference/meeting.</p>

	<p><u>Members' Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Libby Douglas (VAC) noted that the online research repository and the monthly research reports are valuable. In regards to media monitoring she expressed concerned about the effort required to get this done. • Linda Maljan (NT) agreed that media monitoring and daily newsletter is valuable. • Sophia Howse (BC) suggested that the FWG Co-Chairs and each of the Joint Councils Priority Leads can provide further details (key topics) for the monthly research reports. It is important to tie research projects to the priority of the Joint Councils; need discipline around this. • Guy Gordon and Richard Dalpé agreed that the Research Committee is trying to keep the focus of this work on the priorities of the Councils. Also looking for members' collaboration/sharing of material for the online research repository. • Michelle Lattimore (IRCC) stated that the online research repository gives the Councils the opportunity to tell a positive story of all the work we do. She suggested using AI to scan and gather information. • Natasha Clarke (NS) proposed for the Joint Councils to provide strategic direction to the Research Committee to avoid ambiguity. Members to give the research committee co-chairs more clarity on the priorities of the Councils. • Mélanie Robert (TBS) stated that in regards to the question by the Research Committee to establish an Advisory Committee, no need for formality of advisory group but rather a mechanism (informal) to provide input to research committee by the Councils. <p>Members were in general agreement for the Research Committee to continue its work and report back at an upcoming teleconference or meeting.</p>	
6.	<p><u>Other Business:</u></p> <p>A) Joint Councils Action items from previous meetings (TAB 5A)</p> <p>Heather Sheehy advised that most action items would be completed at this meeting and that the ICCS Secretariat would follow up on pending action items. She suggested reviewing action items at the next meeting to ensure that all items remain relevant.</p> <p>ICCS Secretariat to allocate time on the February meeting agenda for a review of action items.</p> <p>B) Discussion on location of future winter meetings of the Councils -Toronto (fixed location) or alternate between Toronto and Ottawa – Decision item</p> <p>Heather Sheehy advised members that a decision is required around the location of future winter meetings. Currently, due to a decision made by members in 2012, the winter meeting of the Councils takes place in Toronto however members have expressed interest in alternating the meetings between Toronto and Ottawa.</p>	<p>Action Item #9:</p> <p>ICCS Secretariat to allocate time on the February meeting agenda for a review of action items.</p> <p>Decision #3:</p> <p>Joint Councils members were in agreement to alternate the winter in-person meetings between Toronto and Ottawa.</p>

	<p>Heather asked members if they were in agreement to alternate the winter meeting location between Toronto and Ottawa or for Toronto to continue to be the fixed location.</p> <p>Joint Councils members were in agreement to alternate the winter in-person meeting between Toronto and Ottawa.</p> <p>Heather Sheehy advised that the next in person meeting of the Joint Councils is taking place in Toronto on February 20-22, 2018.</p> <p>C) Update Reports from Joint Councils' Sub-Committees and Working Groups</p> <p>Heather Sheehy advised that the update reports from the Joint Councils sub-committees and working groups were included in the meeting binder for information only.</p> <p>Heather Sheehy thanked Tracy Wood for hosting the meetings in PEI and for the warm hospitality.</p> <p>The Co-Chairs thanked members and observers for their participation in the meeting.</p>	
	The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm AST.	