

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 September 14, 2016 VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Record of Decision

Attendance

CO-CHAIRS:

Chris Bookless
Jacques Paquette

Yukon – PSSDC
ESDC/Service Canada – PSSDC

Bette-Jo Hughes
John Messina

British Columbia - PSCIOC
Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat - PSCIOC

PSCIOC MEMBERS:

Mark Brisson
Kathryn Bulko
Sandra Cascadden
Robert Devries
Chris Fisher
Cheryl Hansen
Ellen MacDonald
Sean McLeish
Harry Turnbull
Tracy Wood
Munna Zaman

Alberta
MISA Central (City of Toronto)
Nova Scotia
Ontario
MISA West (City of Regina)
New Brunswick
Newfoundland and Labrador
Yukon
MISA East (City of Windsor)
Prince Edward Island
Manitoba

PSSDC MEMBERS:

Glenn Brunetti
Steve Burnett
Natasha Clarke
Beverly Dicks
Libby Douglas
Josée Dussault
Guy Gordon
Karla Hale
Janine Halliday
Ron Hinshaw
Rob Horwood
Michelle Lattimore
Christian Laverdure
Réa McKay
Lee Parker
Cosanna Preston-Idedia
Alan Roy
Jackie Stankey
David Ward

MSDO (Region of Peel)
Ontario
Nova Scotia
British Columbia
Veterans Affairs Canada
Canada Revenue Agency
Manitoba
MSDO Central Region (Region of Peel)
MSDO Eastern Region (City of St. John's, NL)
British Columbia
New Brunswick
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada
Innovation, Science & Economic Development
Public Services and Procurement Canada
Canada Post Corporation
Saskatchewan
New Brunswick
Alberta
Ontario

PSCIOC / PSSDC / JOINT COUNCILS OBSERVERS & PRESENTERS:

Ian Bailey	British Columbia	Robert Frelich	ESDC/Service Canada
Jennifer Dawson	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	Marina Gilson	Ipsos Public Affairs
Denise Gomes	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	Hayden Lansdell	BC Centre for Data Innovation
Stephen Gordon	British Columbia	Allison Little Fortin	Immigration, Refugees and Immigration Canada
Sophia Howse	British Columbia	Nancy MacLellan	Institute for Citizen-Centred Service (Nova Scotia)
Gary Perkins	British Columbia	Margo McCarthy	Employment and Social Development Canada
Niki Sedmak	British Columbia	Silvano Tocchi	Canada Revenue Agency
Mark Burns	Yukon	Rhonda Tsingos	MSDO
Corinne Charette	Innovation, Science and Economic Development	Annette Vermaeten	Employment and Social Development Canada
Richard Dalpé	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	Joni Brennan	DIACC
Anik Dupont	ESDC/Service Canada	Maurice Gallant	City of Fredericton
Pascale Elvas	ESDC/Service Canada	Steve Karam	Systemscope
		Greg Lypowy	Davis Pier

ICCS:

Dan Batista	Michal Dziong	Linda Robins	Maria Luisa Willan
-------------	---------------	--------------	--------------------

Item	Topic / Discussion	Decision / Action
1.	<p><u>ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:</u></p> <p>Chris Bookless, on behalf of the PSSDC and PSCIOC Co-Chairs, welcomed all members and guest observers to the meeting followed by roundtable introductions.</p> <p><u>A) Approval of Record of Decision from February 24th, 2016 in-person Joint Councils meeting, Toronto, ON (Refer to TAB 1A)</u></p> <p>Record of Decision of Joint Councils' meeting of February 24th, 2016 adopted without changes.</p> <p><u>B) Review of Action Items from previous meetings/teleconferences (Refer to TAB 1B)</u></p> <p>Maria Luisa Willan, ICCS Secretariat, advised that all action items would be completed at this meeting with the exception of the Service Mapping Sub-Committee who will report back in February 2017. The Research Committee will provide a short update with a full update to be provided at the next meeting of the Joint Councils. No comments or questions were raised by members.</p> <p><u>C) Acceptance of September 14th, 2016 Joint Councils Agenda (Refer to TAB 1C)</u></p> <p>Joint Councils' meeting agenda of September 14th, 2016 adopted. No comments or questions were raised.</p>	<p><u>Decision # 1:</u></p> <p>Record of Decision of Feb. 24th, 2016 Joint Councils' meeting adopted without changes.</p> <p><u>Decision # 2:</u></p> <p>Agenda of Sept. 14th, 2016 meeting adopted.</p>
2.	<p><u>Showcase Presentation: British Columbia Services Canada (Refer to TAB 2)</u></p> <p>Bette-Jo Hughes introduced Sophia Howse, Executive Director, Provincial Identity Management Program, Government of British Columbia.</p> <p>Sophia Howse presented an overview of BC's journey related to its Service Card including legislation and</p>	

regulation, governance and oversight, technology and infrastructure, public consultation and engagement as well as a live demonstration on the use of the BC card followed by Q&A.

Discussion:

- Josée Dussault asked if any measures had been built in to protect against fraud or any mechanism from a security perspective. Sophia Howse explained that citizens are required to go in-person to apply for the card (card requires photo). The services provided with the BC card have limited monetary impact. Ian Bailey noted that the process ensures that you have a pass card with authorization but it is too early in the process to determine fraudulent use of the card. The BC Services Card will be fully deployed in 2018. Ian Bailey offered to share further information on the card and connect members to the right staff to answer questions.
- Harry Turnbull asked if BC has had a change in legislation to include municipal services using the card. Ian Bailey explained that the identity management will be scalable to all levels of government and will be similar to the use of a driver's license for authentication purposes. Bette-Jo Hughes noted that currently the BC Services Card is not set up to be used for municipal services. Ian Bailey explained that the card is just an authentication and works similar to a debit card. Sophia Howse noted that the City of Surrey have shown interest in the card.
- Cosanna Preston-Ideia asked if there were any lessons learned for those just embarking on this journey. Ian Bailey advised to spend more time on change management with employees.
- David Ward asked about the governance structure. Bette-Jo Hughes explained that there were two bodies that were providing the governance: one for card usage and one for card issuance. She explained that Health leads the card issuance through the DM Project Board whereas card usage consists of representatives from all partners.
- Bette-Jo Hughes noted that one of the challenges BC had was that money was available for issuance but it was not funded for onboarding. Treasury Board only provided the money for the first part and they were asked to come back for funding requests when the challenges and costs of development were known.
- A question was asked about the customer support for 3.6 million users. Sophia Howse explained that a call centre has been set up to support the cards however the number of calls are small and usually are around onboarding and finances. They do not have any social media support.
- Robert Devries asked if anyone had looked at duplicating this model in Canada. The investment would be in the billions but the access may not be apparent; this would be a tough case to sell. He asked if anyone at the table had taken advantage of the work that has been done in British Columbia. Bette-Jo Hughes explained what made it real in British Columbia was that Health needed to replace their care card. You need to have a major service willing to use and prove the business case for the card. The service needs to be extensive and it needs to touch everyone. Then you can make the case with the partner and can prove the value of the card. In the early stages, a lot of the money that was used to develop the card was repurposed from existing budgets.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guy Gordon asked if British Columbia is looking at the 'art of the possible' with the BC Services Card. Sophia Howse explained that education is interested as well as other groups and currently exploring ways to take advantage of the card. Ian Bailey explained that the identity infrastructure has been built to enable linkages. <p>No decision/action item was identified as a result of this agenda item.</p>	
3.	<p><u>IDENTITY MANAGEMENT</u></p> <p>A. Identity Management Sub-Committee (IMSC) (<i>Refer to TAB 3A</i>)</p> <p>Rita Whittle, IMSC Co-Chair (via teleconference), provided an update on the current work of the Identity Management Sub-Committee related to the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework.</p> <p>Robert Devries, IMSC Co-Chair, commended the great work going on in British Columbia and in others jurisdictions around identity management and noted that the approach to identity management is different in each province.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nancy MacLellan noted that Rita Whittle had been a champion for a long time and thanked her for her perseverance on this project. She asked if there was an interim step on the Verified Person Component (slide 11) where a jurisdiction is able to say how they are doing within a certain criteria or is there an interim step to move along. Rita Whittle explained that an example of the adoption of the solution is the driver's license model study. This is a Pan Canadian model with a level of assurance that has a set of common requirements and the common model which is where it needs to get to. Harry Turnbull asked Sophia Howse about their assurance solution and if British Columbia has to overlay their solution over the identity management framework. Sophia noted that British Columbia tackled their card with a high assurance of identity in order to get acceptance from other ministries. Robert Devries noted that they are looking at the trust framework to standardize identity assurance. John Messina noted that good progress has been made and thanked Rita Whittle, Robert Devries and the rest of the IMSC team for their contributions in advancing the work on identity management. Bette-Jo Hughes commented that in reference to identity assurance it is about identity and not the program solution. Ian Bailey noted that in using the driver's license program, they used biometrics to stop fraud. For those that don't drive, need to set a minimum bar. <p><u>The following action item was identified as a result of this agenda item:</u></p> <p>IMSC to continue the work on the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework and collaboration with DIACC and provide update at the February meeting and/or upcoming Joint Councils teleconference.</p>	<p><u>Action Item # 1:</u></p> <p>a) IMSC to continue the work on the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework and collaboration with DIACC and provide update at the February meeting and/or upcoming Joint Councils' teleconference.</p> <p>b) DIACC to continue the work on the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework and collaboration with IMSC and provide update at the February meeting and/or upcoming Joint Councils' teleconference.</p>

	<p>B. Digital Identity and Authentication Council of Canada (DIACC) <u>(Refer to TAB 3B)</u></p> <p>Joni Brennan, DIACC President, provided a progress report on the current work of DIACC related to the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework, development of certification process and Trustmark, funding model, member engagement and proof of concept as a follow up to the discussion from the February meeting in Toronto.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robert Devries commented that he valued the contributions of DIACC particularly in solving practical problems. DIACC provides a great opportunity for the private sector to explore new solutions. He noted the importance for members to continue to support the work of DIACC. <p><u>The following action item was identified as a result of this agenda item:</u></p> <p>DIACC to continue the work on the Pan-Canadian Trust Framework and collaborate with IMSC, and provide update at the February meeting or upcoming Joint Councils teleconference.</p> <p>C. Canada's Digital Interchange – Progress Report <u>(Refer to TAB 3C & 3C(ii))</u></p> <p>Robert Frelich, CDI Co-Chair, provided an update report on the current work of Canada's Digital Interchange.</p> <p>No comments or questions were raised.</p> <p><i>Please note that a further discussion on CDI's business case was scheduled for later in the agenda.</i></p>	
4.	<p><u>Death Notification Working Group – Results of Development of a Blueprint for Death Registration and Notification Processes (Refer to TAB 4)</u></p> <p>Anik Dupont, Co-Chair of the Death Notification Working Group, noted that the objective of the working group is timeliness of death notification and noted that the work of Canada's Digital Interchange will rely on the work of the Death Notification Working Group. Anik reminded members that the Joint Councils had approved funding to hire a consultant to develop a blueprint for death registration and notification and that Greg Lypowy from Davis Pier would be presenting the results of this work.</p> <p>Greg Lypowy, Associate at Davis Pier, gave a presentation on the results of work done related to the development of a blueprint for death registration and notification. The presentation included discussion on next steps and recommendations proposed by the working group.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lee Parker noted that Canada Post has several businesses such as municipalities and the RCMP where there is sensitivity in the delivery of documents and that Canada Post's EPost Connect (e-portal) has been implemented in several jurisdictions. 	<p><u>Action Item # 2:</u></p> <p>a) Death Notification Working Group requested to work with consultant in finalizing report based on members' feedback at this meeting. This feedback included proposing a more aggressive transition to digital, providing information on the state of readiness of each jurisdiction and considering a "buddy system". DNWG to present/share with members final report when ready.</p> <p>b) There was general consensus</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cosanna Preston-Iledia mentioned that in the stages for processing they would only use the last one around digital and would not be supportive of fax as an option. From a Saskatchewan perspective, she would like to see this more aggressively focused. Greg Lypowy explained that there is a great disparity among the provinces in the stages that they are in this process. • Corinne Charette stated that what is needed is a blueprint moving from paper/electronic to digital. Need to align with others such as the UK. She challenged that the legislation informing the sharing agreements would not impact death notification. She asked why there would be a requirement for an information sharing agreement when only there is sharing of information related to name, date of death, etc. which is all public information. She asked the group to go back and study this aggressively. Greg Lypowy noted that some of these agreements contain information on payment which would require an agreement. Anik Dupont responded that the working group would look into whether or not the death notification requires legislation and will report back. • Bette-Jo Hughes noted that jurisdictions are all at different stages and there are a lot of jurisdictions struggling in this area. Each jurisdiction has different processes, some manual, some partly electronic and some are just entering into pilots. How close are we to getting to the future state? She proposed a buddy system to help jurisdictions get up to the same speed. She commented that it would be interesting to know how many jurisdictions are struggling towards moving to the future state. • Ron Hinshaw commented that BC shares death information through NRS and through their partners; however there are some concerns around privacy in sending data out widely for small applicability. How do we determine the eligibility of the partner and what format are we sharing that information with those partners? The other question is around the level of assurance, is it level three or four? How many jurisdictions at the VSO are collecting level assurance 3 information? Greg Lypowy advised that the conformance criteria for identity management have not been developed yet and the conformance level needs to be considered. • Annette Vermaeten noted that this work is a pathfinder for CDI and suggested anchoring it in the blueprint as the way to go forward and see how it fits in. • Anik Dupont commented that there is a need to collect and share information quickly and be client focused but not all jurisdictions are at the same stage. She advised that the Death Notification Working Group would like to reengage Davis Pier to continue on this work and to drill down and develop a pilot project. • Jacques Paquette summarized the discussion and noted that the report will be finalized with a clear message about accelerating this priority and moving forward on next steps around how this can be implemented with specific steps and a pilot project. • Steve Burnett advised that the Death Notification Working Group is proposing that Davis Pier continue their work until December 2016. He noted that the Joint Councils had approved a maximum of \$75K for this project. Anik Dupont added that the working group would like to take the blueprint to the next stage and towards implementation and working with all jurisdictions. She also noted that the working group would like to engage with the territories as well because while all 10 provinces are connected to the NRS, the territories are not. 	<p>that the work around the Death Notification and Registration should continue to develop and for this project to be accelerated where possible. Death Notification Working Group to provide a progress report at an upcoming meeting/teleconference.</p> <p>c) Death Notification Working Group and Canada's Digital Interchange to collaborate to accelerate this work and develop a pilot for the Death Registration and Notification that will serve as an important "use case" for CDI once it is up and running; a digital-first approach to receiving death information to improve timeliness of death notifications.</p> <p>d) Death Notification Working Group to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a fuller understanding of privacy issues related to sharing death notification data. • Work to scope out bereavement bundles as part of next F-P/T discussions to be explored, with a particular focus on communications.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bette-Jo Hughes suggested making a decision on this item after the CDI discussion because this work aligns with their work and also aligns with the work at the F-P/T DMs' table and its priorities. Natasha Clarke asked as to when the bereavement bundle will be back on the Joint Councils' agenda and what progress had been made on the bereavement bundle. Steve Burnett advised the death notification piece happens across the jurisdictions and the bereavement bundle is more jurisdictionally specific. He noted that a framework could be created but there will be things that are more specific to each jurisdiction. Natasha Clarke noted that there may be things in the bereavement bundle that involve other levels of government and so it should not be only the provinces sorting out the bundle. <p><u>The following action items were identified as a result of this agenda item:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Death Notification Working Group requested to work with consultant in finalizing the report based on members' feedback at this meeting. This feedback included proposing a more aggressive transition to digital, providing information on the state of readiness of each jurisdiction and considering a "buddy system". The DNWG to present/share with members the final report when ready. The DNWG to present/share with members the final report when ready. ❖ There was general consensus that the work around the Death Notification and Registration should continue to develop and for this project to be accelerated where possible. Death Notification Working Group to provide a progress report at an upcoming meeting/teleconference. ❖ Death Notification Working Group and Canada's Digital Interchange to collaborate to accelerate this work and develop a pilot. ❖ Death Notification Working Group to develop a fuller understanding of privacy issues related to sharing death notification data. ❖ Work to scope out bereavement bundles as part of next F-P/T discussions to be explored, with a particular focus on communications. 	
5.	<p><u>F-P/T Deputy Minister's Table on Service Delivery (refer to TABS 5A & 5B)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annette Vermaeten and Natasha Clarke, F-P/T DMs' Table Co-Secretariat, provided an update on the work of the F-P/T DM's Table on Service Delivery. Natasha Clarke stated that the DMs' Table is supportive of a number of areas that the Joint Councils are working on. <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> David Ward noted that the F-P/T DMs' Table has asked to accelerate some of the more programmatic, foundational pieces and the visual placemat is a great representation of what the Deputies want and expect from the Table. 	<p><u>Action Item # 3:</u></p> <p>FPT DMs Table: All Priorities - Build upon the Acceleration Placemat with clear "asks" for acceleration for the December 1 F-P/T DMs' Table's call. Recommend how DMs can contribute more concretely to acceleration e.g. DM champions</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maurice Gallant asked about the areas for acceleration and noted that municipalities are not represented at the F-P/T DMs' Table and this is a missed opportunity. Municipalities need to have direct links and ongoing involvement and can help to accelerate the work. • Natasha Clarke commented that there is a whole eco-system of bodies touching a lot of these issues and the need to link with them to help us advance priorities. • Bette-Jo Hughes reminded members about the framework working group discussion. She noted that once the Joint Councils decide on their priorities we can then decide to move ahead on some of the priorities of the F-P/T DM's Table; need to design a crisp proposal for the Deputies' influence and direction. • Harry Turnbull volunteered to participate on the Service Network Collaboration accelerator project. • Annette Vermaeten noted that there are examples of collaboration with the municipalities which they can showcase. • Jacques Paquette asked about the vision and asked if there was support for collaborative leadership to deliver best in class public services. • Annette Vermaeten commented they are looking to go back to the Deputies' Table to say that the vision statement resonates with the Joint Councils in helping to advance service collaboration inter-jurisdictionally. <p><u>The following action items were identified as a result of this agenda item:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ All Priorities: Build upon the Acceleration Placemat with clear "asks" for acceleration for the December 1 F-P/T DMs' Table's call. Recommend how DMs can contribute more concretely to acceleration e.g. DM champions. 	
6.	<p><u>Framework Working Group (Refer to TABS 6A & 6B)</u></p> <p>Natasha Clarke introduced the session. She thanked all working group members and co-chairs of the Councils' working groups and sub-committees who participated in the consultations. Natasha also thanked Steve Karam and team from Systemscope and Maria Luisa Willan, ICCS Secretariat, for all the support provided to the working group.</p> <p>Natasha reminded members that at the meetings in St. John's, Newfoundland, last September, the Joint Councils began work on how to have better alignment of priorities and synergies between the PSSDC and PSCIOC. There has been a lot of great work done by everyone and this was an opportunity for the Joint Councils to focus their attention on common priorities in order to action and deliver. At the February 2016 Joint Councils' meeting, the Framework Working Group received endorsement of a shared vision and call to action. The vision agreed upon was "providing best in class public services" and the call to action was "creating best in class digital government for Canadians". She noted that digital is not just online service delivery. Digital Government touches all service delivery channels, and all aspects of public service.</p> <p>It's about how we operate and changing the fundamental way we operate; it's about being less risk adverse, being</p>	<p><u>Action Item # 4:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Framework Working Group requested to review and edit logic model and roadmap based on feedback provided at this meeting. b) Joint Councils members to provide feedback to the FWG on what they would suggest as a logic model that represents their own thoughts/priorities and what's important to them as a jurisdiction. Framework

<p>entrepreneurial focused and focusing on the users' needs. The working group was asked to evaluate all of the committees and working groups, to assess how they support the call to action and work of the Councils, and also to assess which groups would need to be repurposed, disbanded, etc. This included looking at the mandate of the Joint Councils and developing a roadmap around short term and long term next steps. Change is needed as the status quo is not working. Natasha stated that all that is expected at this meeting was for members to hear back from consultant on the results of the review and analysis work and for members not to dig too deep into the "how" but to consider this work as an "approach" the Councils could use to help deliver results. Success today means getting endorsement as a means to move forward and to get the Joint Councils on the right track to making the call to action a reality.</p> <p>Steve Karam gave a presentation on the key findings of the review and analysis work done by Systemscope including review of current state Council priorities and structure, gap analysis of all the Councils' working groups and sub-committees, proposed framework in support of the call to action, recommended future state for the councils in order to best support the call to action and review of the high level roadmap in support of call to action.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Christian Laverdure thanked Natasha Clarke and working group for all the work done and stated that this work resonated with him and that he was fully supportive. David Ward echoed Christian Laverdure's comments and also agreed that this work was a step forward compared to where the Councils were a year ago with no clear vision of the collective priorities. David was supportive of the presentation material and logic models and commented that the project has been taken quite far in a short period of time. He suggested that the term government was used quite often and there is a need to think more in a citizen-centred context. • Jacques Paquette commented that he found the presentation challenging. It does raise several issues and questions. When discussing the vision and call to action, the vision was the key element. The vision is "providing best in class public services" and that the Deputies' Table does support this vision and working "collaboratively" to accelerate best in class services. Jacques Paquette asked if the call to action was too separated from the vision. He noted that the main driver was to deliver better services and that was a conversation they had in their department about how digital fits into the picture. Is digital the driver or is service the driver? In looking at the logic model, it felt as though we are moving away from the service agenda and moving to a digital government agenda. He stated that he was hesitant to support it because it is very ambitious, the proposed path forward seems to be moving quickly away from the work of the group, and the longer term deliverables and the scope is beyond the mandate of these Councils' agenda. The F-P/T DMs' placemat outlines key priorities with concrete deliverables. • Harry Turnbull advised that he sees the vision as best in class digital government as our call to action. Our government today is built on an old foundation and we need a new foundation to get to best in class public service. The call to action is recognition that all aspects of government are touched by digital. In the F-P/T update, there was discussion about accelerating collaboration. We need to have good, easy to use, digital online services that are intuitive to support the collaboration. The call to action supports the vision. • Robert Devries agreed that the Councils need to reset to a new goal and is supportive of a call to action around best in class public services building on digital technologies to achieve this. 	<p>Working Group to follow up with Joint Councils members to obtain feedback. (Feedback to focus on - what are the things that are aspirational and how do we make sure that it reflects what we think the Joint Councils should be doing. Where can the Councils add value and do things bigger and better than what can be done on our own.)</p> <p>c) Framework Working Group to undertake a second round of consultations around logic model and roadmap with all members of PSSDC and PSCIOC.</p> <p>d) Framework Working Group to report back to the Joint Councils at an upcoming teleconference/meeting on revised logic model and roadmap based on second round of consultation with members. Important to flush out the activities that the Councils are currently working on and those that the Councils will continue to advance. There was General agreement that the Councils will continue to advance the priorities related to Canada's Digital Interchange, Death Notification and Registration, Identity Management and Service to Business.</p> <p>e) Framework Working Group to provide advice to the Joint</p>
--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maurice Gallant asked if this work was around what government needs to work towards or is this something that the Joint Councils need to work toward. He stated that if the Councils are making aspirations about the future of government it needs to clear about roles and responsibilities. • Mark Brisson stated that he was supportive of the vision, call to action and material presented as it provides a good frame but now needs to refine the key pieces the Joint Councils need to focus on and deliver over the next few years. • Sandra Cascadden stated that the Councils have been working a lot on the vertical and now need to begin working more on the horizontal so it can deliver on something. She was in agreement with some of the new streams of thought and liked the measurements and reporting. She stated that the Councils can move the yardstick forward by putting people together outside the vertical to talk about the various components. The challenge will be the size of the groups and the need to trust that, for example if there is one privacy representative, they can represent privacy and then go back to the vertical conversation. We need to trust each other to send a representative to these groups so we can move things forward. • Cheryl Hansen commented that the framework is easy to understand and allows a good understanding of the synergies of the work and what we are trying to achieve. She commented that this framework includes many actors to achieve the end. • Beverly Dicks noted that she had reviewed the gap analysis of the working groups and sub-committees of the Councils and she was concerned that it showed gaps in client engagement but then she looked at the other maps and it showed the strength in other areas and the gaps seemed to be addressed. • Guy Gordon advised that he appreciates the logic model however his concern is the abstraction. The Councils need to identify concrete, deliverable projects that include a focus on critical activities of making things real and delivering on projects. • Karla Hale noted that she liked the presentation and roadmap but a further conversation is needed considering mixed feedback/comments and need to address all concerns raised. • Cosanna Preston-Idedia stated that she was glad to see digital as the focus, whether it's assisted digital service or self-serve digital. It's easy for new members to see how they can fit in. • Bette-Jo Hughes noted that the following assumptions required clarification, 1) Vision and Call to Action – Joint Councils' members agreed to the vision and call to action at the February meeting but when we look at how the call to action is being translated, the question is do we understand the call to action given the results of it? More discussion will be needed when we get into the detail of it. 2) Although the logic model does include the vision and call to action, does it reflect digital government at large versus the logic model for the Councils as it relates to specific principles and areas of focus? • Natasha Clarke stated that there is more work that is needed to get that right for the Joint Councils. Today's 	<p>Councils at an upcoming teleconference/meeting on the proposed expert-team (made up of PSSDC and PSCIOC members) that will engage and advance this work.</p>
--	---

	<p>presentation was about coming back to members with a package including questions such as are these the types of tools we can use to further the dialogue? The logic model does give us a logic model for digital government and now we can ask what kind of role can the Councils play in fulfilling the logic model of digital government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bette-Jo Hughes asked around the transition point from high aspirational goals to the role of the Councils and what are the specific things the Councils should be focusing on. Natasha Clarke asked members as to what they see as the role of the Councils; is this forum where jurisdictions have a voice across the country to set a tone and direction around changing how it operates? What will our role be in the future? Will we remain passive, information sharing group or an active group in the changes that need to take place to move forward? How can we use the logic model to shape the work to be done? • John Messina inquired as to what the Councils can add to the “best in class digital services to Canadians” from a service perspective to fill the gap. What would the logic model for service be? There is a clear disconnect if some people think this is going off one way and others another way and we need to address this. • Chris Bookless commented that a lot of it is around what we are calling “best in class digital government” and what happens when you head down that digital path. The vision of providing best in class public services resonates with everyone. The reason for using technology is to advance the drivers of business requirements; we’re talking about the technological supports. The technology has advanced to allow more self-serve but it also assists the back office as well. Technology will change and capabilities enhanced so we are trying to frame the appropriate use of technology to advance the drivers of business and to be more citizen-centric. • Cosanna Preston-Iledia suggested including the wording “citizen-centric” in the principles and defining the standard of citizen-centred service. • Annette Vermaeten noted that she found the presentation challenging particularly the element around service. Need to think about client centric but also service excellence. Digital is a way of doing something but the ultimate goal is to provide the best services to clients. One piece is service excellence but there are others such as bundled services to make services better for clients. Clients want digital but they also want simple services that they can easily understand. Client-centric is about how as a Council we can provide better services for Canadians. Digital is one way and we need to weave in the other concepts and embed that into the discussion. • Jacques Paquette commented that whatever the framework, the Councils need to deliver faster and better concrete results. He also suggested that success factors should be built into the framework. • Bette-Jo Hughes summarized the discussion and next steps. She noted that members were in agreement with the logic model from a process approach but needs some wordsmithing. She suggested for members to also think about and provide feedback on what they would suggest as a logic model that represents their own thoughts/priorities and what’s important to them as a jurisdiction. Also, for members to provide insight around what the Joint Councils should be focusing on. What are the things that are aspirational and how do we make sure that it reflects what we think the Joint Councils should be doing. Where can the Councils add value and do things bigger and better than what can be done on our own. She suggested doing another round of 	
--	---	--

	<p>consultations and asked the working group to come back with another review at the logic model based on feedback at this meeting. It is important to flush out the activities that we know and that we will continue to advance. What is the work that we want done in particular areas and what is the cross-expert team that we can put together to work on these things.</p> <p><u>The following action items were identified as a result of this agenda item:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ While there was general consensus from members on logic model presented, working group requested to review and edit logic model and roadmap based on feedback provided at this meeting. (As noted, at the February 2016 Joint Councils meeting members approved the Vision and Call to Action.) ❖ Joint Councils members to provide feedback to the FWG on what they would suggest as a logic model that represents their own thoughts/priorities and what's important to them as a jurisdiction. Framework Working Group to follow up with Joint Councils members to obtain feedback. (Feedback to focus on - what are the things that are aspirational and how do we make sure that it reflects what we think the Joint Councils should be doing. Where can the Councils add value and do things bigger and better than what can be done on our own). ❖ Framework Working Group to undertake a second round of consultations around logic model and roadmap with all members of PSSDC and PSCIOC. ❖ Framework Working Group to report back to the Joint Councils at an upcoming teleconference/meeting on revised logic model and roadmap based on second round of consultation with members. Important to flush out the activities that the Councils are currently working on and those that the Councils will continue to advance. There was general agreement that the Councils will continue to advance the priorities related to Canada's Digital Interchange, Death Notification and Registration, Identity Management and Service to Business. ❖ Framework Working Group to provide advice to the Joint Councils at an upcoming teleconference/meeting on the proposed expert-team (made up of PSSDC and PSCIOC members) that will engage and advance this work. 	
7.	<p><u>Canada's Digital Interchange (CDI) (Refer to TAB 7)</u></p> <p>Robert Frelich, CDI Co-Chair, gave an additional presentation on the CDI Business Case.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nancy MacLellan commented that death registration is a provincial responsibility now and asked if they see the provinces stepping away from that and would the federal government pay provinces for this data. Anik Dupont commented that phase 1 is the work that the DNWG needs to do to continue to do CDI and it's about how we organize ourselves related to death notification. Nancy MacLellan commented that this is about the federal government organizing so when the data comes in from the province they are able to share it in a way that is efficient. • Chris Bookless stated that death notification focused on cutting off benefits such as OAS and CPP but there 	<p><u>Action Item # 5:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Canada's Digital Interchange to continue to develop the CDI business case including all "phases and layers" and to present back to the Joint Councils a summary report with highlights. b) Canada's Digital Interchange to proceed with "CDI proof of concept FPT pilots" that will

<p>are some entitlements that result from death. He asked if the working group has a full scope of all the pieces. Robert Frelich responded that the presentation deck did not include the full list but he can provide this information. Anik Dupont noted that this is a benefit to the provinces as there would be an impact if the notification is not received on time. Robert Frelich commented that the business case has a benefits realization which is broken down into: direct cost savings - if things can be moved online it would save people from going in person and indirect cost savings which include improvements to service and service improvements for survivor benefits. They continue the process to refine information to move forward with CDI and have engaged Pricewaterhouse to do analysis on their benefits realization work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bette-Jo Hughes asked if there is a jurisdiction that is ready to do a proof of concept with the federal government. Mark Brisson commented that in Alberta they are almost ready to move. They are working with their vital statistics team to get it aligned and trying to decide whether to go to CDI or ILP. Jackie Stankey added that their work would include sharing agreements with other provinces where there is mobility into their province. It was noted that British Columbia, Nova Scotia, Alberta and the federal government are potential participants on this. • Corinne Charette commented that there is a lot of work to be done at the federal level. Need to find a small number of focused use cases of validation. She suggested identifying an identity value use-case such as one in immigration because of the focus of the government and the challenges of all new immigrants in getting such things as a driver's license or a bank account. The focus on a use-case on one or two services with Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Alberta will inform other jurisdictions. We need to show value to citizens as soon as possible. She suggested creating a sub-group and their challenge in the next three months (agile development) would be to develop a use-case, the framework and a limited pilot. • Steve Burnett commented that Ontario is also interested but asked a question regarding the identity linkages project. Robert Frelich noted that they are working on the identity linkages project with IRCC whose main goal is to increase the integrity of the passport program. Robert Frelich commented that they had met with 10 provinces and the feedback they received was that there was interest in a project focused on the death notification and birth registration. With respect to the accelerating IRCC data, there was no current interest. <p><u>The following action items were identified as a result of this agenda item:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Canada's Digital Interchange to continue to develop the CDI business case including all "phases and layers" and to present back to the Joint Councils a summary report with highlights. b) Canada's Digital Interchange to proceed with "CDI proof of concept FPT pilots" that will focus on testing CDI design elements with respect to exchange of information protocols. CDI to engage those jurisdictions that are willing to collaborate in the discovery and piloting phase. (NOTE: This pilot is in addition to the CDI and Death Notification Working Group pilot as noted in action item #2C.) c) Canada's Digital Interchange to develop a one pager (executive summary) to clearly identify the value proposition, intended outcomes, challenges etc. for sharing with jurisdictions. d) Canada's Digital Interchange to provide a progress report on these items to the Joint Councils at an upcoming 	<p>focus on testing CDI design elements with respect to exchange of information protocols. CDI to engage those jurisdictions that are willing to collaborate in the discovery and piloting phase. (NOTE: This pilot is in addition to the CDI and Death Notification Working Group pilot as noted in action item #2C)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) Canada's Digital Interchange to develop a one pager (executive summary) to clearly identify the value proposition, intended outcomes, challenges etc. for sharing with jurisdictions. d) Canada's Digital Interchange to provide a progress report on these items to the Joint Councils at an upcoming meeting/teleconference.
--	--

	meeting/teleconference.	
8.	<p><u>Other Business:</u></p> <p>A) <u>Update Reports from Joint Councils sub-committees and working groups</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Privacy Sub-Committee (Refer to TAB 8A) ○ Research Committee (Refer to TAB 8B) <p>Richard Dalpé, Federal Research Committee Co-Chair, provided an update on the work of the Research Committee. He noted that the Research Committee has good and broad representation from FPTM members. The Committee has eliminated the sub-committees of the Research Committee and reviewed and updated their terms of reference. Members of the Research Committee and other WG members completed a survey on their jurisdictional priorities and the co-chairs are currently reviewing the responses. The Research Committee will be presenting a more detailed report to the Joint Councils at the February meeting. Guy Gordon, Provincial Research Committee Co-Chair, noted that the committee would be looking at specific areas where they can add value to the work of the Councils. Guy thanked Richard Dalpé for taking the lead on this work. Chris Bookless reminded the members that the Research Committee is not the driver of the research but the Committee's responsibility is to carry out the research required by the Councils and its working groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Open Data and Information Working Group – (Refer to TAB 8C) <p>David Hume, Open Data and Information Working Group Co-Chair, provided an update on the current work of the Open Data and Information Working Group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Service Mapping Sub-Committee (no update available, will report back in Feb. 2017) <p>No update was provided. The SMSC will report back in February 2017.</p> <p>B) Other Business</p> <p>There was no other business from this meeting.</p> <p>C) ESDC Service Research Conference (refer to TAB 8D)</p> <p>Annette Vermaeten advised that ESDC will be holding a Service Research Conference in November and the call for papers deadline was September 16th but it can be extended to accommodate those wishes to participate in the conference.</p> <p>D) Next in-person meeting scheduled for February 22-23, 2017, Ottawa, Ontario</p> <p>The Co-Chairs thanked all members and observers for their participation in the meeting and asked them to complete their evaluation forms.</p>	

	The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm PDT.	
--	---------------------------------------	--