



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

Draft – v.1

PUBLIC SECTOR CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER COUNCIL (PSCIOC) MEETING
February 25, 2016
TORONTO, ONTARIO

Minutes of Meeting
Attendance

CO-CHAIRS:

John Messina (PSCIOC)
Harry Turnbull (PSCIOC)

Treasury Board of
MISA East (City of Windsor)

MEMBERS:

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

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

OBSERVERS:

Serge Caron
Cathryn Landreth
Mark Matz
Kent Schramm
Rita Whittle

Chair, Cloud Working Group and Co-Chair, Service Mapping Sub-Committee
Alberta, Information Management Sub-Committee Chair
Public Safety Canada
Ontario, NCSIP Chair
TBS, IMSC Co-Chair

ICCS SECRETARIAT:

Dan Batista, Linda Robins



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

Item	Topic / Discussion	Decision / Action
1.	<p>ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:</p> <p>A) <u>Approval of Record of Decision from September 16th, 2015 in-person meeting, Yellowknife, NT</u> (TAB 1A)</p> <p>The record of decision from the September 16th, 2015 in-person meeting was adopted.</p> <p>B) <u>Review of Action Items from previous meetings/teleconferences.</u> (TAB 1B)</p> <p>Harry Turnbull advised that all action items are underway and will be completed on time.</p> <p>C) <u>Acceptance of February 25th, 2016 Agenda</u> (TAB 1C)</p> <p>The PSCIOC agenda of the February 25th, 2016 meeting was adopted.</p> <p>D) <u>PSCIOC Financial Status Report</u> (TAB 1D)</p> <p>The PSCIOC Fund Activity Status Report was received for information. Harry Turnbull, PSCIOC Treasurer, noted that further to the discussion at the Joint Councils meeting from the Framework Working Group, funding is available for projects. There were no comments/questions.</p> <p>E) <u>PSCIOC Membership Dues for 2016/2017</u> (TAB 1D)</p> <p>Harry Turnbull commented that the invoices for the 2016 membership fees have been sent out and received by members.</p> <p>F) <u>Provincial/Territorial/Municipal Co-Chair Position</u> (TAB 1F)</p> <p>Harry Turnbull advised members his term as provincial/territorial/municipal co-chair would be ending and asked members if anyone was interested in taking over the role of P/T/M Co-Chair of the PSCIOC. Bette-Jo Hughes expressed interest in taking on the Co-Chair position for the PSCIOC.</p> <p>There was general consensus at the meeting to appoint Bette-Jo Hughes as PSCIOC Provincial/Territorial/Municipal Co-Chair for a two-year term beginning September 14th, 2016 to September 10th, 2018. Harry Turnbull will complete his term as PSCIOC Co-Chair on September 13th, 2016 (modified from end of</p>	<p>Decision # 1: Minutes of Sept. 16th, 2015 PSCIOC meeting adopted.</p> <p>Decision # 2: Agenda of February 25th, 2016 meeting adopted.</p> <p>Decision # 3: Bette-Jo Hughes is appointed as P/T/M PSCIOC Co-Chair, for a two-year term beginning on September 14th, 2016 and ending on September 10th, 2018. Bette-Jo Hughes will Co-Chair the next PSCIOC meeting in Victoria, BC.</p>



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

	term of Dec. 31 st 2016 as previously approved by members).	
2.	<p><u>PSCIOC Cloud Working Group (TABS 2A and 2B)</u></p> <p>Serge Caron provided an update on the work of the PSCIOC Cloud Working Group. Since the last meeting of the PSCIOC, the Group has a new co-chair, Stephen Gordon (British Columbia). Serge provided a quick review of the group's mandate. Serge outlined the three main objectives: take stock of what has been done since St. John's; 2) have a discussion on public sector community cloud and key aspects related to it; and 3) discuss the next mandate. Serge advised that the consultation work done last year is available on BuyandSell.gc.ca. The Committee has been meeting monthly with sub-work streams who are meeting on a bi-weekly basis. The sub-working groups were feeding information to the main group. The group has a collaboration portal where all artifacts are stored and available to the working group. The Cloud Working Group is working on common PSCIOC and GC deliverables through multiple work streams. They focused on cloud strategy, procurement, business models and skill sets and set up some pathfinders. Each work stream is meeting on a bi-weekly basis with a goal of completing their deliverable for March 31st. Activities included setting up a common reference architecture which will be leveraged for the next phase including taxonomy attached to the reference architecture. Shared Services Canada is looking at a business model to provide cloud computing services not only to the GoC but also to go about the procurement of cloud computing capability in a new and innovative way. PWGSC is leading the developing of Common Terms and conditions that would be leveraged as part of an upcoming procurement. TBS has been working on a set of common security profiles. There are linkages to NCSIP and the policy working group. Through learnings from early pathfinders, group has been able to include them in upcoming strategy for GoC, procurement and architecture. The Cloud WG is also looking at the skills set required to leverage cloud computing services.</p> <p>All key findings have been organized into a Six Month Work Plan with key accountabilities for each component and these were sub-deliverables. Serge noted that a number of groups are contributing to advancing the cloud strategy including the PSCIOC policy group and there are a lot of interdependencies. Serge highlighted two pathfinders and provided an update on office productivity suites and integrated environments. They began learning more about leveraging infrastructure as a service and platform as a service. The e-procurement work led by PWGSC was to leverage software as a service in an integrated procurement solution. The discussion included the types of boundaries we can put on cloud service providers. On the Shared Services side, they have been looking at brokering cloud services and looking at different jurisdictions to see what can be done with minimal involvement. There is a window of opportunity as many jurisdictions have similar needs.</p> <p>Serge presented the Community Cloud Vision, the future state of how the cloud could be consumed across jurisdictions. In September, the Group proposed that a view where we would create a set of consumers and set up a set of cloud services providers in a way that is appropriate for the type of business for public sector</p>	<p><u>Action Item # 1:</u></p> <p>The ICCS Secretariat will request all sub-committee and working groups to submit latest membership lists (bi-annually) and provide this to members.</p>



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

organization. These types of services would be available to public sector organizations in a catalogue, in a secure way, in the marketplace. Serge highlighted the findings of how this would be set up. This is relevant as it provides the foundation for the upcoming procurement to be discussed later on in the presentation. The benefits of a community cloud would be easy access to cloud services; would have a common application, a significant business enabler; would have a set of services at various levels of information; would have a common set of terms and conditions; and an appropriate security posture and cloud security monitoring. From a policy organization, we would have a strategy that allows us to adopt cloud with confidence.

Serge outlined the cloud security approach. In September, there was a discussion about different security models and the general approach has been to put the information at the center of decision-making. This is done by understanding the sensitivity of the information. We need to make sure the language and application are reflective of business decisions. Serge also outlined the proposed security planning for the Cloud. The Group looked at the existing security profiles and suggested that we leverage existing security profiles established by NISP in the US and contextualized for the Canadian context and to leverage it as a baseline. The services would be monitored for any changes.

Serge reviewed the requests from the Cloud Working Group.

1. That the Cloud Working Group be authorized to complete a demand survey which would be distributed to each jurisdiction that will influence the next steps.
2. The Cloud Working Group has been working work on a proposal of procurement of cloud services in a pan Canadian way; this includes cloud based services that are unclassified, protected and case management.
3. The Group proposed that Shared Services Canada led the procurement with a focus on the catalogue and preparation of a Case Management Solution.
4. The Working Group also requested an endorsement to move from a planning phase to an execution phase.

Discussion:

- Fred Pitt asked who is representing Ontario on the Cloud Working Group. Fred noted that the proposal is to operationalize the procurement piece. Serge advised it is to go and launch a formal procurement according to the 3 streams and also validating that we could do it in a pan-Canadian way. They would be launching the procurement and the other ask is to complete a survey to see how this can be used. Serge commented that this would focus the procurement and have a broader understanding of what type of cloud consumption service would be envisioned in the next 18 months. Fred stated that this is a Federal government procurement which is accessible to other jurisdictions. Serge confirmed that this would be accessible to other jurisdictions and would be set up like a brokering service. Jurisdictions will be able to go to the catalogue and

Decision # 4:

The PSCIOC members approved the transition of the PSCIOC Cloud Working Group from a planning phase to an execution phase.

Decision #5:

The PSCIOC authorized the Cloud Working Group to go ahead with the execution of the demand survey.



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

	<p>procure services and the terms and conditions will be established for all jurisdictions. The jurisdiction will be paying for the procuring but this is establishing a vehicle. The first vehicle will be a cap of \$20 million dollars per cloud service provider.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandra Cascadden commented that NS is doing it now and will be releasing an RFP on IAS for their data centre on Friday and inquired as to how this will impact the negotiation and their position collectively. There are other things already in motion that could impact the negotiations. • Bette-Jo Hughes noted that BC is in a similar situation to NS. They are just finalizing an RFX (an invitation to submit offers) and are expecting it to go out in March. She expects that there would be no confusion with the individual jurisdictions and Shared Service Canada and cloud services. She hopes that it will be transparent enough to see how the vendors are responding to all of the different procurements. Bette-Jo noted that Shared Services Canada is going to go ahead and do this but asked what is needed from this table in order to move ahead. Bette-Jo agreed to do the demand survey but there will be several vehicles in which the demand will be filled. Bette-Jo wanted to clarify that the demand may not be filled by the GoC marketplace. <p>Harry reviewed the requests from the Cloud Working Group for endorsement.</p> <p>The members approved the transition of the PSCIOC Cloud Working Group from a planning phase to an execution phase and the execution of the demand survey. The third recommendation is to initiate a phased procurement for the public sector community cloud based on the results of the survey and this would influence the volume numbers. Serge wanted to ensure that there will be one or two jurisdictions that will follow the procurement very closely. The members approved the third recommendation.</p> <p>Sandra Cascadden noted that Nova Scotia is interested in participating and would appreciate anything that could be done to speed up this work. Serge advised that they would look at ways of streamlining the work. This is also a priority with Shared Services Canada.</p>	<p><u>Action Item # 2:</u> Members approved the Working Group's recommendation to initiate a phased procurement for the public sector community cloud based on the results of the survey and requested for Serge Caron to look at options on how this work can be streamlined and completed sooner.</p>
3a.	<p><u>Cyber Security (TABS 3A and 3B)</u></p> <p>Mark Matz, Director, Policy and Issues Management, National Cyber Security Directorate provided an update to the members on Cyber Security.</p> <p>Canada's Cyber Security Strategy was first launched in 2010, had an action plan that ran 5 years which is still in place. There are 3 pillars to the strategy; secure GoC systems; partner to secure vital cyber systems outside the federal government and assist Canadians be secure online.</p>	<p><u>Action Item #3:</u> Request for regular reporting on the work of the FPT DM's Table on Cyber Security at upcoming PSCIOC meetings.</p>



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

There have been significant initiatives at the Federal level under Canada's Cyber Security Strategy. With the new government there is a platform commitment which became a mandate letter commitment from the Prime Minister to a series of Ministers with the Minister of Public Safety to lead. It talks about a review of existing measures to protect Canadians and critical infrastructure from cyber security threats. This review will result in a renewed strategy or cyber security framework specific to the new government and how they would like to approach things.

The review will include a consultation process with stakeholders engaging the private sector (particularly small and medium enterprises), critical infrastructure owners and operators and provinces and territories for their ideas on how to evolve the cyber security strategy in Canada. The public consultations will be structured around the themes stating the core reasons why government would be interested in cyber security and why it might want to take action, what are the principles on which a government might act and look at action areas rather than targets that we would want to protect.

The public consultation paper will be issued in April and will need endorsement by Ministers. The consultation will take place over four months reaching out to key stakeholders' tables and an online component. They will be talking to provinces and territories and tables such as the PSCIOC. A white paper (framework) is expected in the Fall of 2016 with further consultations.

At the same time, the Federal government is developing legislation to protect vital cyber systems as outlined in the budget in 2015. The legislation is targeted at things under Federal jurisdiction but there is a link to other jurisdictions as well. There is a gap in that there is no baseline requirement for critical infrastructure owners and operators to have a minimum standard of cyber security. The regulatory levels are minimal and usually entail revoking someone's license rather than requiring them to meet some sort of standard. They are looking for platforms for collaboration with particular CIO operators.

Mark noted the involvement of the DM's FPT Table on Cyber Security. The DM's table on Cyber Security identified areas of concern and actions it could undertake. The DM's table have agreed upon four areas to collaborate and develop actions on: 1) information sharing and incident response; 2) public awareness; 3) cyber security standards and bests practices; and 4) education and talent management. The action plan is ambitious but the issue is that cyber security cuts across mandates of departments/ jurisdictions.

NCSIP has been assigned two activities to action and consider better alignment of Table with PSCIOC. The other area focused on common standards/guidelines for critical infrastructure promotion, public awareness and how jurisdictions might want to integrate cyber security into the education system.

Mark advised that they would like to bring the revised Action Plan back to the DM's Table. He asked PSCIOC



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

members to consider who in their organization would be best positioned to sit on the DM's FPT Table on Cyber Security. He also asked members how they see themselves participating in the review process.

Discussion:

- Bette-Jo Hughes mentioned that she had attended the DM's Table on Cyber Security and there were a number of CIO's and a number of people from the safety side. She commented that what the DM's Table focuses on will determine what departments/representatives are at the table. For example, if it is about operations/standards, it will be the work of this table and NCSIP.
- Sandra Cascadden agreed that there are two streams here and noted there is a role for the PSCIOC and its sub-committees that we could support.
- Harry Turnbull asked if an official delegation from this group should attend the next DM's FPT Table meeting. Rick Ouellette noted that he is co-chair of the FPT DM's Table on Cyber Security. He noted the need to start with the business requirements with a layered and integrated approach from a government perspective and certainly CIOs need to be involved. Rick has sent the co-chair of the DM's Table a few links/slides to leverage what is out there.
- Mark Matz agreed there is a lot of overlap with the CIO's and the DM's Table. He commented that he is fine with different streams of work being discussed by different tables and trying to mix it up in one table doesn't work well.
- Bette-Jo commented that it was not clear when the request came from the Clerk's and may have been interpreted differently by jurisdictions. The DM's table needs to be elevated to a national cyber security level but need some clarity of objectives for the DM's table to determine how the PSCIOC can support this work. She recommended regular reporting from the DM's Table to PSCIOC.
- Mark Brisson commented that he also participated in the DM's Table and there seems to be some confusion whether it is about public safety or the IM/IT side. Need further clarification and then we will be able to support it.
- Harry noted than when we talk about the country's critical infrastructure a lot of it is managed at the municipal level and right now you are talking at the F/P/T level and so you will have a level of government that is the weakest link because they weren't part of the conversation.



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

3b. **Update by the National CIO Sub-Committee on Information Protection (NCSIP)**

Kent Schramm, NCSIP Chair, and Gary Perkins, NCSIP Vice-Chair (via teleconference) provided an update on the work of the group. Kent advised that the sub-committee holds monthly teleconferences however participation varies. Participation at the in-person meetings of NCSIP is even lower. Kent asked members to encourage participation on the Committee.

In November 2015, they held an in-person meeting in Ottawa and discussed security education. They are looking at new and innovative ways to educate users. The information shared between jurisdictions results in the jurisdiction not having to reinvent the wheel. Some jurisdictions have the responsibility for educating the citizens in their province and they are exploring that. Incident response is important in sharing between jurisdictions. NCSIP has been working on risk assessment, sharing threat intelligence, participation in cloud discussions and also areas that concern individual jurisdictions and mitigating risks with foreign travel and the security of IT devices. They also talked about cyber security talent; competing for talent in a highly competitive industry. NCSIP has had discussions on recruitment, looking at data classification and phishing campaigns. At the CIO meeting on January 7th, 2016, they presented a report on administrative privileges. NCSIP has held several teleconferences on security awareness education however Gary noted that participation has been sporadic. There is a lot of sharing of information and materials at these teleconferences and it is an opportunity to trade once and use many times.

Kent outlined the requests to support participation/travel for the NCSIP members. The Committee noted that some of the DM's at the table are not responsible for cyber security. There is a concern that the DM's may be committing resources that don't belong to them. The Committee asked the PSCIOC to support the Public Safety's Cyber Security Action Plan yet noted that it is sometimes difficult to meet the deadlines set out for these projects. They suggested that the PSCIOC consider quarterly briefings by cyber security staff for DM so they have a sense that everything is well in hand.

Discussion:

- Bette-Jo Hughes encouraged those not participating to do so as it is an inexpensive way to share information and has the greatest value. Bette-Jo asked how the municipalities are engaged in this Committee. Harry Turnbull advised that there is a municipal representative on NCSIP. Bette-Jo advised that at the June 2015 FPT meeting there was a discussion regarding Public Safety and providing resources to support the work of NCSIP and they agreed that there could be resources made available. It may not be full time people but maybe this is something that PSCIOC could look at to augment the work of the Committee.



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

- Norman McDonald suggested that NCSIP use the model used by the Joint Councils for their meetings, holding the winter meeting in Toronto and the other meeting in another location in Canada.
- Fred Pitt asked if there examples of where information from one jurisdiction has benefitted other jurisdictions that they would be good to track to help support travel requests and to talk to Deputies about.
- John Messina advised they have been doing a lot of work on the response and the event management plan and wanted to make sure that there is a connection in from a federal level to the provinces/municipalities. Rita Whittle advised that there is a critical infrastructure link through Public Safety through the Federal Emergency Response Governance. Rita agreed to share the cyber security event management plan with members.
- Mark Brisson commented that it is important to get participation in NCSIP. The way to stay ahead of phishing campaigns is to share information with the alerts.

4.

Information Sharing Roundtable (TABS 4A to 4N)

Jurisdictions were requested to identify their key priorities and activities (refer to TABS 4A to 4N for information). Please note that only the discussion/questions arising from each update are captured in the minutes.

1. British Columbia – Bette-Jo Hughes

Discussion:

- Mark Brisson noted his interest in the Cloud RFP. Are there a maximum number of providers or is it a brokerage model of all? Bette-Jo commented that it is a brokerage model. When get to software side, what they want to use Cloud BC for is to promote the technology sector in BC so we want to use this vehicle to get some visibility and make it easier to consume their services. Mark commented he is interested in seeing who shows up and the ability to manage that many would be interested to see. Mark asked about the BC Service Card and the percentage of the population that you have right now that have an identify card or moved over their license card. Bette-Jo advised that about 3 million of 4.6 million cards have their services card. People have the ability to have a services card and a driver's license or they can combine them. We are finding that people prefer the two cards as they can produce two pieces of government identification.
- John Messina asked about data sovereignty concern on the Cloud and the thinking around that and any concerns about putting that in. Bette-Jo advised that BC and NS have most stringent data sovereignty



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

language in the information and protection privacy legislation. They had to determine the appropriate qualifications needed. BC worked with the Policy and Legislation folks as well as the Office of the Privacy Commissioner and demonstrated to them what is available now. BC has been focused on the Office 365 piece and Microsoft has been briefing Deputies on their security. The vendors are saying tell us what we need to do so that we can comply. The other challenge is existing agreements and obligations with them before going to the market. John asked if it is up to them which vendor they want to use. Bette-Jo responded that it depends on contractual obligations.

- Sean asked about Office 365 and what is the value proposition. Bette-Jo commented that they are working on determining the value proposition. Their current licensing agreement expires at the end of March 2016 so they have to do something. Each entity will have to do a business case. One other issue with Microsoft is the challenge with do you buy the bundle or the parts.

2. Yukon – Sean McLeish

Discussion:

- Sean McLeish asked about the Federal procurement on products and services and is curious about Microsoft and Oracle. Sean suggested that following yesterday's discussion that we consider dedicated resources that are running with identity hub but a few other initiatives, something where we can find common group for common value. All starting to engage on Privacy Impact Assessments, is there best practice approach to modulate how to look at personal information. Another one is security threat assessments and also consideration of a national approach alternative to Microsoft. Fred Pitt suggested for the Joint Councils Research Sub-Committee to identify what has been done in organizations and this would be available to everyone.
- Bette-Jo Hughes noted that the Privacy Sub-Committee have looked at PIA's and best practices. NCSIP has done this on STRA's as well. It is about where is the repository that you can refer to. Sean noted that he is going to market for a land titles solution and Bette-Jo advised that BC has just built one and can offer more information.

3. Alberta – Mark Brisson and Cathryn Landreth

No further comments or questions

4. Manitoba – Marion Guinn



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

Discussion:

- Kathryn Bulko asked if MB had chosen Quorum for their case management solution. Marion advised that they had chosen Quorum as they wanted a whole solution and not just to replace pieces.
- Bette-Jo advised that they went with Deloitte for their integrated case management software and there have been issues with implementation but it was more about the change management.

5. Ontario – Fred Pitt

Discussion:

- John Messina asked Fred to clarify their organizational structure. Fred responded that there are nine CIO's reporting to different Deputies but they all report into the Corporate CIO. There are two others: the Corporate Chief Strategist with Policy and Enterprise Architecture and the Corporate Chief Infrastructure Strategist.
- Mark Brisson asked about the application portfolio management process. Fred responded that Ontario has done an inventory of applications. In the past they had MAPS that was a remediation of some legacy solutions that they had but don't have an enterprise wide portfolio management system. In some cases, the clusters do that in their purview. Ontario is starting to do that now at an enterprise level to look for efficiencies/duplication of spending. Mark noted that the classification for cloud because they went through the same process in their disaster recovery piece where a lot of the applications are identified as critical and vital when they are not critical/vital but actually are an administrative classification.
- Serge Caron advised that he could share information on APM from the Government of Canada (approach, methodology).
- John Messina noted that TBS has catalogued every application that they have and it would be useful to look at the things that are captured in the catalogue; essential and critical applications.
- Fred Pitt asked if the GoC had done patching. John responded the GoC is now looking to get an idea of application patching. Fred noted that Ontario is working on it now and may be some interesting collaboration on that.
- Bette-Jo Hughes noted that BC is working on an inventory on all of their applications and infrastructure identifying stage of life and using that information to do their investment planning. Bette-Jo can profile this in



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

September.

- Fred commented that as Ontario modernize their governance around enterprise architecture, it is bringing business to the governance tables. Ontario is broadening governance and making it a partnership.

6. New Brunswick – Rick Ouellette

Discussion:

- Rick Ouellette offered to share the following two studies to the Secretariat for distribution: Ernst & Young, New Case for Shared Services (2014) and Leveraging COSO Across the Three Lines of Defense from the Institute of Internal Auditors.
 Note: PSCIOC members received a link to the report on Feb. 25th, 2016 via the ICCS Secretariat.

7. Nova Scotia – Sandra Cascadden

Discussion:

- Fred Pitt asked Sandra about her reference to lining with companies that come to town. Sandra provided the example: A Business Group bringing in company from the US that wants to play in the healthcare field and they are offering a service we are looking for, the government is willing to give them a payroll rebate and we're looking for this service, why can't we negotiate for them to provide the government with that service. We are not fully taking advantage of the opportunities. Some companies come for payroll rebate and move on to another province for another rebate. We need to have these conversations in government about the appetite for doing this.
- Mark Brisson asked about NS's governance structure. Sandra responded that she is in a shared services organization (Department of Internal Services) and separate from Treasury Board.
- John Messina commented that he is interested in hearing about different models of shared services.
- Serge Caron asked about SAP S4 and whether Sandra was going to leverage that in the short future. Sandra advised that NS negotiated this inside their contract but is cautious about it. Serge will follow up with Sandra on this matter.



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

8. Prince Edward Island – Norman MacDonald

No further comments or questions were raised.

9. MISA Canada – Kathryn Bulko

No further comments or questions were raised.

10. Government of Canada - Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat

Discussion:

- Harry Turnbull asked about the Open Data site. John Messina responded that the government is asking departments to put data sets on opencanada.gc.ca and is trying to move to open formats. John noted that they are working with their Library and Archives regarding Open Information and Open Data and how to go from published data to archived data. Stephen Walker from John's team is working on this.
- Fred Pitt asked about the federal government service delivery direction and the look across jurisdictions. Are you getting any indication of how discussions will start? John Messina responded that there is no direction yet and does not how the consultation will go but do have the existing committees and it may go through that.
- Bette-Jo Hughes asked if members were in agreement with information sharing being shared more broadly. The consensus is that the documents can be shared among colleagues within the public sector but not publicly.

5a.

PSCIOC Sub-Committee/Working Groups Update Reports (TABS 5A, 5B, 5C)

IT Procurement Working Group (TAB 5A)

Kathryn Bulko, IT Procurement Working Group Chair, provided an update on the current work of the group. She stated that the group was created in 2010. Last year, the group was not as effective as they could have been. She reviewed the mandate with the group and agreed to no changes. Following the discussion at the Joint Councils meeting around the review of all sub-committees and working groups, there may be an opportunity to come back to members regarding changes to mandate. There are currently 21 representatives on the group with the exception of Saskatchewan and PEI.

Action Item #4:

ICCS Secretariat to provide sub-committee and working group updates submitted for the in-person meetings with co-chairs of the other committees and groups.



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

Kathryn noted that there is broad interest in leveraging the federal contracts or share in some joint procurement. PWGSC received approval last February to allow access to Federal contracts. PWGSC transferred the procurement to IT contracts to Shared Services Canada and they did not have the authority to share. Shared Services Canada has now been awarded the same authority to share. The IT Procurement Working Group have invited Shared Services, Mary McKay, Director of Procurement Policy to the next meeting to talk about what contracts are going to be prioritized, recycled or refreshed. Serge Caron has also been invited to the next meeting of the group to speak about the Cloud procurement exercise that municipalities might be able to help with.

Kathryn asked about taking advantage of the contracts mentioned in today's discussion which have been negotiated between jurisdictions. Bette-Jo Hughes advised that when they go to market they will ensure that the services are extensible to municipalities.

Information Management (IM) Sub-Committee (TAB 5B)

Cathryn Landreth, IM Sub-Committee Chair, provided an update on current work of the group. She noted that the committee sent out a call for membership following the meeting last September and have updated its membership list. The committee is focused on 3 themes: IM Governance & Policy, Competency and Capacity Building and Emerging Trends. In January they reviewed the list with PSCIOC. With respect to IM Governance & Policy, there is interest in IM maturity models – who has them, who is in a fairly developed IM implementation especially focused on measures and criteria. They are also looking to refresh their repository of IM frameworks and policies in anticipation of whatever comes out of the joint councils conversation re digital government – what does that look like and what is required as a modern response in information management. One significant focus is email management and had been tasked to bring forward email management principles. The committee received general support in Yellowknife from the Council. The majority of problems in this area are disposition and similar issues. One of the questions that surfaces in the conversation is who has an ERDS solution that is actually using the disposability capability. If anyone has anything on disposition and document management systems, they would appreciate receiving it. With respect to Emerging Trends, the committee had a good discussion and three municipalities are participating in this focus on IM considerations in Cloud strategy. This makes reference to life cycle management in a cloud strategy. There are several control points in information management and one of them is security, one is classification and the last is disposition. They will be working with the Cloud Working Group to ensure that the IM requirements are included in the Cloud strategy.

Cathryn expressed concerns about membership commitment and participation. Over the last couple of years, the majority of the work has been done by Canada and Alberta. This is a challenge and something for the Council to contemplate. She also noted an overlap in Committees – the Privacy, Cloud and Open Data committees. In the past 4 years, the Committee has only been assigned to do the email protocol however they will continue to work on the three areas noted earlier. There are other areas discussed today such as the work being done by Library

Action Item #5:

Request for the work from all committees and working groups to go into 'toolkits' (repository) so this information can be readily available by current and new members.



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

and Archives with an IM component that this committee could help with.

Discussion

- Sandra Cascadden commented that she struggles with this in her own shop; trying to come up with something really tangible for that team to deliver other than policy and standards. It is important for us to come up with something that the Committee can deliver that is above the policy and standards. One of the areas is information management in cloud and how we are going to do that. IT goes into data sovereignty; what do we have to write in terms and conditions in contracts with regard to the data and access to the data. This would be useful when having conversations with cloud vendors and it is a good solid deliverable.
- Bette-Jo Hughes asked what happens to your data when you stop using that service. Some people get back their data but not their metadata and so the data is useless. For information, in BC, the whole IM file has been moved to the Ministry of Finance. Once we see work plan re digital governance, we can determine what needs to be done and we can focus our attention and resources on that.
- Serge Caron commented that when it comes to exit clauses/data sovereignty there has been a lot of dialogue. One of the things that came out is retention rules that you apply within cloud based services and this is one area where there has been very little discussion.
- Harry Turnbull requested for the work from all committees and working groups to go into 'toolkits' (repository) so this information can be readily available by current and new members.

ICT Policy Working Group (TAB 5C)

Charlotte Ward, ICT Policy Working Group Chair (via teleconference) provided an update on the current work of the group. The ICT Policy Working Group was established in 2014. Charlotte joined as Chair in January 2016. She noted that in regards to membership, Alberta and PEI are not represented on this Committee but do have good participation from all of the other jurisdictions. The group's Terms of Reference was approved last Fall. The group is working on developing a work plan on areas of collective interests (IM, Service Management as a discipline, Open Data, Open Government, Digital, and Security and Privacy dimensions of ICT). The group has been sharing existing documents on the Public Service Without Borders website on many topics including their policy portfolios. Group has also been invited to discussions with the Cloud Working Group.

Discussion:

- Harry Turnbull asked if PSCIOC should be doing more of assigning policy work that may be within the other



Photo courtesy of City of Toronto

	<p>sub-committees to the ICT Policy Working Group or should the policy work be tackled by the sub-committee that has been assigned the task. Charlotte advised that they were invited to listen in on the Cloud Working Group efforts but they are not doing policy work for them. To date, the group has not undertaken any pan-Canadian policy work on Cloud.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sandra Cascadden suggested for the committees and working groups to interact with each more and to encourage groups to continue to invite each other and hand off pieces of deliverables to appropriate groups. 	
6.	<p><u>Other Business:</u></p> <p>John Messina thanked Harry Turnbull for co-chairing the PSCIOC meetings over the past few years.</p> <p>John advised that the next in-person meeting of the Councils is scheduled for September 13th to 15th, 2016 in Victoria, British Columbia.</p> <p>The Co-Chairs thanked all members/observers for their participation.</p>	
	<p>The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. EST</p>	