



Draft – v.1

PUBLIC SECTOR CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER COUNCIL (PSCIOC) MEETING

September 16th, 2015

St. John's, NL

MINUTES OF MEETING

Attendance

PSCIOC CO-CHAIRS

John Messina (PSCIOC)	Treasury Board of Canada
Harry Turnbull (PSCIOC)	MISA East (City of Windsor)

PSCIOC MEMBERS

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

OBSERVERS / SUB-COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRS

Keith Barrett	City of St. John's
Serge Caron	Chair, Cloud Working Group and Co-Chair, Service Mapping Sub-Committee
Annik Casey	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, Canada's Digital Interchange (CDI)
Maurice Gallant	City of Fredericton
Aran Hamilton	President, Digital ID & Authentication Council of Canada (DIACC)
Toni Moffa	Deputy Chief, IT Security, Communications Security Establishment Canada (CSEC)
Clinton Scott	Chair, National CIO Sub-Committee on Information Protection (NCSIP) – <i>via teleconference</i>

INSTITUTE FOR CITIZEN-CENTRED SERVICE

Dan Batista
Maria Luisa Willan
Linda Robins

Item	Topic / Discussion	Decision / Action
1.	<p><u>ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:</u></p> <p>Harry Turnbull welcome all members and introduced John Messina as the new PSCIOC federal Co-Chair.</p> <p><u>A) Approval of Record of Decision from March 4th and 5th, 2015 in-person PSCIOC meeting, Toronto, ON (TAB 1A)</u></p> <p>Moved by: Kathryn Bulko Seconded by: Bette-Jo Hughes Adopted.</p> <p><u>B) Review of Action Items from previous PSCIOC meetings/teleconferences. (TAB 1B)</u></p> <p>Harry Turnbull gave a quick overview of pending PSCIOC action items. He noted that a number of action items have been completed and other items are to be completed at this meeting or follow up required.</p> <p><u>C) Acceptance of September 16th, 2015 PSCIOC Agenda (TAB 1C)</u></p> <p>Moved by: Christian Couturier Seconded by: David Nicholl Adopted.</p> <p><u>D) PSCIOC Fund Activity Status Report (TAB 1D)</u></p> <p>Harry Turnbull, as PSCIOC Treasurer, stated that the PSCIOC has a current surplus of \$380,807.78.</p> <p>Based on a discussion around the fund activity report, CIO members agreed to cover PSCIOC membership dues for Nunavut for the 2015-2016.</p> <p>Moved by: David Nicholl Seconded by: Bette-Jo Hughes Adopted.</p>	<p>Decision # 1: Minutes of March 4th and 5th, 2015 PSCIOC meeting adopted.</p> <p>Decision # 2: Agenda of September 16th, 2015 meeting adopted.</p> <p>Decision # 3: Based on a discussion around the fund activity report, CIO members agreed to cover PSCIOC membership dues for Nunavut for the period of 2015-2016.</p>
2.	<p><u>Workshop: Digital ID and Authentication Council of Canada (DIACC)</u></p> <p><u><i>Via teleconference:</i></u></p>	<p><u>Action Item # 1A:</u> Request by PSCIOC members to</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rita Whittle, TBS and IMSC Co-Chair • Tim Bouma, TBS and IMSC Member <p>Aran Hamilton, President of the Digital ID and Authentication Council of Canada, gave an overview of DIACC and the work that is underway in regards to the future of digital ID and authentication in Canada. He stated that digital identity requires a collaborative (public sector and private sector) pan-Canadian approach that is interoperable. The goal of DIACC is to help Canada transition into a fully digital enabled economy. He also highlighted the seven recommendations that are found in the whitepaper commissioned by DIACC on Building Canada's Digital Identity Future which has been reviewed by PSCIOC members.</p> <p>Aran encouraged members to get involved in this work around the future of digital identity as the work is moving fast and there is a need for the public sector and the private sector to work together on "building a national railway of digital identity". He offered to meet with PSCIOC members around the country to discuss this further or if members had any issues/concerns with what is proposed.</p> <p>Aran advised that DIACC is currently working on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - focusing on standards and protocols and will share this information with members when ready - setting up an expert panel and advisory council to review all this work - getting contractual framework ready and obtaining feedback - drafting rules and methodology for trust mark - bringing public and private sector together to solve the digital identity issue using a user-centric approach <p>Rita Whittle, IMSC Co-Chair, noted that the work on identity management had always planned to include DIACC and that the IMSC continues to work on the Identity Trust Framework from a public sector perspective. Rita stated that IMSC is looking at developing a trust model that brings all these components together.</p> <p>Aran Hamilton noted that the current challenge is around timing and that instead of ensuring that every standard and element is completed and approved that a more effective approach is to get this work underway even if is half way done and getting feedback along the way. He advised that DIACC has started a framework group with input from both the public and private sector. DIACC is planning to draft a trust framework (rules and protocols) within the next 5-6 months and will seek feedback from the group. DIACC is also planning to create a logo and principles around a trust mark and also drafting a certification process. DIACC does require the collaboration of multiple partners in this work.</p> <p><u>Focus of Discussion: What is the role that the PSCIOC wants to play in relations to the work of DIACC?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Nicholl asked Tim Bouma to explain the difference between what the federal government is doing in regards to data interchange and DIACC. <p>Tim Bouma responded that the IMSC over the past year has worked on a pan-Canadian Identity Validation Standard, setting rules which attributes can be validated with respect to identity, which was approved by Deputy Ministers. It is also working on a pan Canadian digital identity trust framework and will be an overarching schema of all the pieces: credential piece is around authentication, identity piece is around validation of identity information, and linking and authorization is the consent piece. He noted that while every jurisdiction would implement these three components differently, all of this work needs to fit into overall scheme and important that what gets implemented is trusted digitally. The CDI work is an implementation of</p>	<p>include DIACC into the Joint Councils discussions on identity management. ICCS Secretariat to ensure that DIACC is included in the Joint Councils agenda for upcoming meetings and teleconferences of the Councils.</p> <p><u>Action Item # 1B:</u> The IMSC Co-Chairs to continue to work on aligning all the work on identity management including the work of CDI and DIACC.</p> <p><u>Action Item # 1C:</u> Request for updates and reports from the various sub-committees around identity management (including Trust Framework and CDI) at every Joint Councils meeting. Identity Management to be a standing item on the Joint Councils agenda.</p> <p><u>Action Item # 1D:</u> DIACC to provide regular reports and updates on its current work and also to include updates on initiatives that it is currently working on with other jurisdictions. Ensure that the reports are aligned in regards to timing and vision.</p> <p><u>Action Item # 1E:</u> Request for Aran Hamilton, DIACC, to provide further details on the project around developing the trust framework and deliverables and this to be circulated to PSCIOC members via the ICCS secretariat in order for members to make a decision in regards to funding.</p> <p><u>Action Item # 1F:</u></p>
---	---

<p>this work. Overall trusted digital identity is the trusted electronic representation of who an individual (as good as being in person). There are four components: 1. User sign-in piece, credential piece (i.e. federal government use of “secure-key concierge”) 2. Verify person, making sure it is a real person, 3. Linking and authorization, consent to use credentials and identity information to obtain services. 4. Enabling infrastructure, trusted processes need to go through an infrastructure that is trusted. Currently the IMSC is focused on the top three components but it also needs to make sure that is used on a trusted infrastructure. The IMSC has set-up various sub-groups to look at each of these components. A lot of work is in place and starting to identify areas of focus to move strategy forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harry Turnbull asked Tim Bouma if the work of the IMSC is complementary to the work of DIACC. <p>Tim Bouma responded that it is absolutely complementary and that this work requires participation and collaboration from all across Canada. This is an opportunity as a country to do this together and right now there are only a few players.</p> <p>Annik Casey advised that she has replaced Christine Desloges on the CDI work who retired in August. She noted that CDI is not competing with this work but it is part of this ecosystem and one of many players. She advised that the work of CDI is part of two specific functions, 1. Verification, being able to validate identity information and attribute within authoritative sources, and 2. Identity Maintenance, being able to make changes to the identity information as required using standards and protocols supporting this process. She advised that she continues to work closely with Rita Whitte and Tim Bouma (IMSC) to understand the longer term vision and working with the provinces and vital statistics offices in getting the right perspective and input in order to develop the business case for these services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Christian Couturier encouraged members to have one on one session with Aran Hamilton to understand that DIACC is trying to connect all these pieces. While the CIO side does the design and architecture work, the service delivery side needs to be engaged as their responsibility is to deliver these services. Need to rely on the network of people that is building this and helping to set the direction particularly around the trust framework. The focus should be on building identity as a service that works with all the protocols and rules that are being established. The value proposition is that DIACC is de-risking the investment and they can do it fast and be of great value to all jurisdictions. Sandra Cascadden inquired in regards to timing if what is being done on the public sector side is aligned with the timing and urgency that DIACC has created. How can we speed up this process? <p>Aran Hamilton responded that the public sector has not been able to see the business case for this until the last two or three years. Something is happening perhaps as a result of data breaches around the country and the need to rethink how things are done and accelerating leverage of data to create better services. Over the last couple of years the public sector speed has been “ok” but now is time to speed up the process otherwise the public sector will be left behind and DIACC will take what has been started and move this along.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Christian Couturier suggested for the IMSC working group to continue to work on aligning all the identity management pieces together. He noted that there is a strong case for the private sector to get there fast and for the public sector to make sure that it communicates the knowledge that is collected internally and to make sure that the information flow is effective and fast as possible. He stated that DIACC does not replace any of the working groups that the Councils have in place that currently provide information and advice. Also 	<p>Request for a further discussion on DIACC related to funding at an upcoming PSCIOC teleconference.</p> <p><u>Action Item # 1G:</u> Request for Aran Hamilton, DIACC, to share presentation deck of September 16th with members via the ICCS Secretariat.</p>
---	---

<p>suggested for this item to be top of mind on the agenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandra <u>Cascadden</u> suggested for 1. Updates and reports from the various sub-committees around identity management at every meeting, 2. Invite DIACC to the meetings to be part of this discussions in order to foster an atmosphere of openness and transparency, 3. Identity management including DIACC to be a standing agenda item 4. DIACC to provide regular reports and updates on current work and also to include updates on initiatives that it is currently working with other jurisdictions. 5. Ensure that the reports are aligned in regard to timing and vision. • Chris Fisher inquired if the identity management discussion should be moved to a Joint Councils discussion and not just for PSCIOC. <p>Annik Casey responded that the identity management discussion and reporting has been done through the Joint councils and that CDI works closely with PSSDC members.</p> <p>Aran Hamilton stated that DIACC has never been involved or has any insight into the work of the PSSDC.</p> <p>There was a recommendation by members to include DIACC into the Joint Councils discussion on identity management and include DIACC in the Joint Councils future meeting agenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Nicholl stated that there is a request for funding from DIACC. He noted that Ontario and British Columbia have been funding this work for over five years but there is an opportunity for PSCIOC to fund part of this work (DIACC) and funds are available. David proposed for PSCIOC to put some money to help fund this work. • Bette-Jo Hughes advised that the Joint Councils are having a conversation around the alignment of its priorities and initiatives at its next day meeting. She was in agreement that DIACC needs to be part of the Joint Councils discussion in moving forward. • Gisela Rempel agreed for PSCIOC to get involved in this work and to have further discussion on funding with PSSDC. She suggested for the PSSDC to identify a representative to participate on DIACC so that both Councils are represented. • David Nicholl made a recommendation for the PSCIOC to fund the project on developing the DIACC trust framework. <p>Aran Hamilton noted that this work would cost about \$750K to \$1M over the next 6-12 months. Aran noted that DIACC membership fees would be doubling in order to fund this work.</p> <p>Harry Turnbull made a recommendation for the PSCIOC to help cover the increase in fees for those members that are on DIACC.</p> <p>Bette-Jo Hughes suggested for Aran Hamilton to provide further details on the project around developing the trust framework and deliverables and to provide this information to PSCIOC members in order to be able to make a funding decision.</p>	
--	--

	<p>Rita Whittle suggested leveraging the work that has already been done to decrease costs and also the need to develop a roadmap with respect to what the “product” is along the way. Rita noted that the various committees on identity management are meeting in November and planning to invite a member from DIACC to make sure there are no gaps and ensure this is done in partnership.</p> <p>Harry Turnbull requested a further discussion on this item at an upcoming PSCIOC teleconference and for the DIACC deck presented by Aran Hamilton to be circulated to all members.</p>	
3.	<p><u>Secure Supply Chain</u></p> <p>Toni Moffa, Deputy Chief, IT Security, Communications Security Establishment Canada (CSEC), provided an update on the topic of Secure Supply Chain as requested at the March 2015 PSCIOC meeting.</p> <p><i>The ICCS Secretariat was requested not to take any notes on the presentation/discussion due to the confidential nature of this agenda item.</i></p> <p>Toni Moffa asked members to contact her directly if they have any questions around this topic.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Cyber Security:</u></p> <p><u>Via teleconference:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cynthia Taylor, Manager, Operational Analysis and Support, Public Safety Canada • Patrick Hoger, NCSIP Chair • Kent Schramm, NCSIP Vice-Chair <p>A) Presentation on the Cyber Incident Management Plan (refer to TAB 4A).</p> <p>Cynthia Taylor, Manager, Operational Analysis and Support, Public Safety Canada, (via teleconference) gave an overview of the Canadian Cyber Incident Response Centre (CCIRC). The presentation included information on Canada's Cyber Security Strategy, roles and responsibilities within Public Safety Canada (National Cyber Security Directorate, Critical Infrastructure and Strategic Coordination Directorate and Communications Directorate), overview of CCIRC mandate (prevention and mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery) as well as an overview of the different types of threats, mitigation strategies, suite of tools/products and recent statistics. Cynthia offered to share more information in the future on the work of CCIRC.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toni Moffa noted that with the exception of Heartbleed every exploit could have been prevented through patching. • Harry Turnbull asked for clarification on what are “watering hole attacks”. Cynthia Taylor responded that it is a way to selectively target victims - in this attack, the attacker observes which websites the victim often uses and infects them with malware. She noted that CCIRC has seen some disruption activity with some international partners. 	<p><u>Action Item #2:</u></p> <p>Request for Public Safety / Canadian Cyber Incident Response Centre (CCIRC) to provide regular updates on Cyber Security, including secure supply chain, at future PSCIOC meetings/teleconferences.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> David Nicholl inquired around sector statistics and whether or not the private sector is sharing information and how to improve this. Cynthia Taylor stated that the partner base is small and relationship is voluntary so CCIRC does not have a clear picture as to the extent that the private sector is sharing this information. She believes that more exposure of what CCIRC does would help to improve reporting. <p>David Nicholl suggested for CCIRC to look at legislation around this as it is important for the government to be more prescriptive when it comes to ensuring that people (retail and financial institutions) are sharing their problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> David Nicholl inquired as to admin rights policies across the organizations and suggested for research on this topic (admin rights policies and exceptions to policies and how to implement admin rights) and for this item to be on the agenda for a future teleconference/meeting. <p>Dave Heffernan responded that NCSIP may have information on admin rights or be able to help in gathering this information.</p> <p>It was requested for Public Safety and CCIRC to provide regular updates at future PSCIOC meetings or teleconferences.</p> <p>B) Update by the National CIO Sub-Committee on Information Protection on their current activities in regards to Cyber Security</p> <p>Clinton Scott, NCSIP Chair and Kent Schramm, Vice-Chair, gave an update on the current work of NCSIP. Clinton stated that NCSIP works closely with CCIRC and continues to play a valuable role in addressing cyber threats facing the Canadian public sector. NCSIP provides an avenue for Chief Information Security Officers (CISOs) or designates to share information, best practices, tools, techniques and threat intelligence to mitigate risk to government. Most importantly NCSIP members openly collaborate and share their experiences and information, in a timely manner, on emerging cyber risks in an atmosphere of confidence. He noted that NCSIP continues to experience ongoing challenges in regards to members' participation in conference calls and in-person meetings. There is consistent participation from certain jurisdictions but others rarely attend meetings making it difficult to further Canada's Cyber Security initiatives. NCSIP requested for PSCIOC members to fully support NCSIP and ensure participation by all jurisdictions.</p> <p>In relation to cyber security, NCSIP has reviewed the action plan that originated with the FPT Table on Cyber Security. The team discussed the objectives and agreed they each had merit. NCSIP participation is key to a successful pan-Canadian vision for Cyber Security. However, concerns were raised and risks identified in delivering where there were dependencies on individual resources. Many of these resources have no backups and there are no resources presently identified outside of NCSIP to participate. Concerns were raised regarding the inability to simultaneously action each of the deliverables on the action plan and a phased approach recommended.</p> <p>Clinton noted that in the update provided to members there were a few requested actions for members' consideration and support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure that there is an NCSIP representative assigned from your jurisdiction and have them participate actively in monthly conference calls. 	<p><u>Action Item #3:</u> Request to invite Mark Matz, acting Director General, National Cyber Security Directorate, and the NCSIP executive team, to the next PSCIOC meeting to review the action plan and provide insight as to where jurisdictions should be committing time and effort as well as discuss priority on action items as a follow up to this discussion.</p> <p><u>Action Item #4:</u> Request for Public Safety Canada to share framework that was circulated in 2013 (<i>includes all groups working on cyber security as well as their roles and responsibilities</i>) to assist the PSCIOC in developing a diagram/roadmap connecting all the various groups working on cyber security using framework provided by Public Safety Canada.</p> <p><u>Action Item #5:</u> Request for the topic of admin rights policies across organizations (admin rights policies and exceptions to policies and how to implement admin rights) to be on the agenda of an upcoming PSCIOC teleconference. (It was suggested at the meeting that NCSIP may be able to provide information on this topic)</p>
--	---

2. Support, within the limitations of existing travel constraints, your assigned member's participation in the semi-annual NCSIP in-person meetings.
3. Support the Canadian Cyber Security Strategy Action Plan by endorsing your jurisdictions participation on NCSIP.

Discussion:

- Christian Couturier (advised that he is the FPT Cyber Security Table Co-Chair) asked Clinton Scott to elaborate on the concerns raised regarding the cyber security action plan (tabled in June in Manitoba) on issues around dependencies on individual resources and what this means.

Clinton Scott responded that NCSIP has reviewed the action plan and is currently working with the team in helping to define the working groups' mandates and expected deliverables and action items. He advised that some of the concerns in the report were raised about two months ago and since then has met with Peter Hammerschmidt, former Director General of National Cyber Security Directorate, to discuss these issues and advised that most of these concerns have been addressed. He noted that Public Safety Canada would be leading more of this work to ensure proper resources are arranged and that all groups within each jurisdiction are aligned.

Christian suggested inviting Mark Matz, acting Director General, National Cyber Security Directorate, and the NCSIP executive team, to the next PSCIOC meeting to go through the action plan and provide insight as to where jurisdictions should be committing time and effort as well as discuss priority on action items as a follow up to this discussion.

- Patrick Hoyer wanted PSCIOC members to be aware that there is a DMs committee on Cyber Security but there have been commitments, discussions and action plans made but that most of this work funnels back to NCSIP and information is coming from two different sources. He also noted that they have outreached to jurisdictions that are not participating and encouraged members to check whether or not their jurisdictional reps are participating on NCSIP.

John Messina offered to broker some conversation with the jurisdictions that are not participating in NCSIP.

- Bette-Jo Hughes added that being involved in the work of NCSIP is the best way for jurisdictions to get more information and support especially if they have limited resources.
- Sandra Cascadden noted that it remains unclear as to how many groups are doing work in this space as well as more clarity as to their role, areas of responsibility and authority and suggested developing a diagram to connect all these groups. She noted that there is a lot of good working coming out of these groups and it is useful to have a diagram to see how it all connects.
- Christian Couturier added that the roles and responsibilities of each of the stakeholders was a piece that the FPT Cyber Security Table circulated back in 2013 and suggested for this framework to be recirculated to members to ensure that it is up to date and requested for Public Safety to share this information.
- Gisela Rempel agreed for the need for a clearer understanding on the activities and governance of these groups as well as their mandate and areas of responsibility and also more clarity on what is expected of the

	<p>PSCIOC vis-à-vis deliverables or is it solely for information sharing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serge Caron noted that there is synergy between NCSIP and Cloud Working Group. The Cloud Working Group has close collaboration with NCSIP and other working groups related to cyber security. Dave Heffernan agreed for the need for a roadmap to make it clearer as to what these groups are working on. Gisela stated that NCSIP is a sub-group of the PSCIOC and members are supposed to be assigning and providing guidance and direction to this group as it is important to ensure that it meets the requirements of the Council. Kathryn Bulko advised that Richard Langley has been replaced by Terry Madsen, CSO of Durham Region and he will be participating in NCSIP. <p>Harry Turnbull recommended for the PSCIOC to stay connected to the work of NCSIP.</p>	
5.	<p><u>PSCIOC Cloud Working Group (refer to TAB 5)</u></p> <p>Serge Caron, Senior Director, IT Architecture and Cloud Working Group Chair, TBS, gave a progress update on the Cloud Industry Consultation, the Cloud RFI response metrics, review process and next steps. Serge thanked all PSCIOC members and jurisdictions who provided input and feedback on this work. Serge introduced two members from the Gartner team who had been contracted to review the RFI. Serge also gave an update on work undertaken to date; review of the outcomes and findings; direction it seeks from PSCIOC on the future of the Cloud Working Group; and discussion on next steps and timelines.</p> <p>Serge advised that the Cloud Working Group hosted a consultation day with industry in November 2014. The RFI was posted on December 3rd, 2014 and closed on January 30th, 2015. Sixty-seven companies from a broad cross section of the cloud industry responded to the RFI including responses from the US. One-on-one meetings were held with 64 companies. Gartner was contracted to do the analysis of the RFI responses and benchmark the submissions. Gartner produced a comprehensive report and the executive summary was shared with the PSCIOC. Serge noted that the full report will be shared with members when ready. He indicated that out of the 67 responses, 1/3 were cloud service providers. There were four pillars to the RFI: 1) business; 2) policy; 3) procurement; and 4) security. Within the pillars 25 topics/trends were identified. The result was 25 recommendations divided into three categories: 1) 3-6 months – key activities including governance/political pathfinders to do proof of concept; 2) 1 year – to 1 ½ years – series of pilots based on pathfinders and seeing results, learning and refining; and 3) expand adoption, expand coverage; monitor and compliance.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bette-Jo Hughes noted that she had read a report from the US which indicated that although the implementation of the cloud is intended to significantly reduce costs but the cost savings were negligible. <p>Serge Caron commented that there is an active growing market in cloud in Canada and we are trailing. There is a need to have a pan-Canadian working group to work on a public sector cloud. He noted that at the last working group meeting, members agreed that there is a need to develop common business enablers to deliver services to citizens. What is needed is to have a secure platform to drive innovation in a secure way. As this</p>	<p><u>Action Item #6:</u> Request for jurisdictional roundtable discussion on public sector cloud and the mandate/objectives of the</p>

<p>moves into more sensitive areas, it will drive security and different requirements will be needed. The Working Group's vision is to have a common cloud contextualized for the public sector and would like a marketplace for Canadian public sector buyers where all services can be offered and that everyone can access. In terms of security, Canada should leverage already established security profiles and have secured and accredited frameworks between jurisdictions.</p> <p>Serge Caron indicated that the Working Group will need to identify the pathfinders to be included. However, should cloud based office productivity suite, collaboration suite; integrated development environment; business intelligence and case management and workflow be included. The model for the public sector workload must include data sensitivity. The proposed six-month work plan includes: validation of the approach – establishing a public sector cloud sub-committee to develop cloud reference architecture and validation of the work plan – a RFP to procure a series of integrated cloud service providers with a secure architecture. The plan would include the transition of the Government of Canada Cloud Working Group whose mandate is currently consultative and move them to a Public Sector Cloud Sub-Committee reporting to the PSCIOC to look at specific opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Messina thanked the presenters and asked if the original consultation with industry included a work plan. Serge Caron advised that the initial work plan focused around the consultation with Gartner. • Christian Couturier asked about documenting at a high level the forecasted cost differential that a Public Sector Cloud Sub-Committee (PSCSC) would drive compared to a public cloud offering. Serge responded that understanding the costs for the Cloud would be included in the sub-committee's work plan. • Bette-Jo Hughes suggested for this item to be included on the next PSCIOC meeting agenda as a roundtable for members to be aware of what is being done in each jurisdiction around cloud computing before making a decision on the Public Sector Cloud Sub-Committee. • Sandra Cascadden suggested for members to also have a discussion around liability. Serge noted that there a number of items of concern regarding a special cloud for government and leveraging what the private sector does in a more secluded space. • David Nicholl agreed that there are benefits and cost savings in moving to a public sector cloud and suggested moving forward on it. He liked the clarity that the deployment model matrix is bringing and agreed that the PSSCC is targeting a strong opportunity space for the public sector. Serge noted that not all workload will have the same benefits and some areas may see initial savings. • Toni Moffa suggested for the Council to rethink data sensitivity and the unclassified category. She also reinforced that data sensitivity is not the only driver in workload deployment. • Recommendation to proceed with both Office Productivity and Integrated Development as a decision for two pathfinders • John Messina noted that there seems to be general agreement to proceed on what is being proposed by the Cloud Sub-Committee on 1) approval of the proposed Public Sector Secure Community Cloud (PSSCC) vision and 2) approval of the six-month work plan, as there seems to be value in a public sector cloud. He requested 	<p>proposed Public Sector Cloud Sub-Committee at the next PSCIOC meeting.</p>
--	---

	that a roundtable discussion on this matter be on the next PSCIOC meeting agenda.	
6.	<p><u>Information Sharing Roundtable</u></p> <p>For the roundtable discussion, each jurisdictions was requested to identify its key priorities and activities. The information sharing from each jurisdiction were included in the meeting e-binder (refer to Tabs 6A to 6M). As per current practice, only action items arising from the discussion are recorded in the minutes.</p> <p>The following jurisdictions provided an update at the meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Yukon</u> – Sean McLeish 2. <u>Nova Scotia</u> – Sandra Cascadden 3. <u>Ontario</u> – David Nicholl 4. <u>British Columbia</u> – Bette-Jo Hughes 5. <u>New Brunswick</u> – Christian Couturier 6. <u>Government of Canada</u> – John Messina 7. <u>MISA</u> – Chris Fisher 8. <u>Newfoundland and Labrador</u> - Ellen MacDonald 9. <u>Manitoba</u> – Gisela Rempel 10. <u>Northwest Territories</u> – Dave Heffernan 11. <u>Prince Edward Island</u> – Ed Malone 12. <u>Alberta</u> – Barry Chatwin 	
7.	<p><u>Other Business:</u></p> <p>A) Sandra Cascadden asked for the following themes to be discussed at future meetings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Many are doing data centre work but are struggling with the bricks and mortar. 2) Capital Expenditures vs Operating Expenditures – conversations with Treasury Boards 3) Education Departments investing in Google Docs and we are investing in Microsoft – are we missing something? 4) DIACC to provide deliverables for funding – need a special PSICOC meeting to discuss 	<p><u>Action Item #7:</u></p> <p>Request for the following topics to be considered for future PSCIOC meetings or teleconferences (as suggested by Nova Scotia):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Data Centre work (many are struggling with the bricks and mortar) 2) Capital Expenditures vs Operating Expenditures – conversations with Treasury

<p>B) PSCIOC Sub-Committees – the following update reports were tabled for information only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Information Management Sub-Committee (TAB 7A) (ii) IT Procurement Working Group (TAB 7B) (iii) ICT Working Group (TAB 7C-1 and 7C-2*) – *request from working group <p>*Decision item: PSCIOC members approved the ICT Working Group Draft Terms of Reference.</p> <p>C) Next in-person meeting of the Councils:</p> <p>Harry Turnbull advised that the next in-person meeting is scheduled for February 24th and 25th at the Old Mill, Toronto, ON.</p> <p>Harry advised that British Columbia had volunteered for the next Fall in-person meeting of the Councils.</p> <p>The Co-Chairs thanked all members for their participation.</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m. NDT.</p>	<p>Boards</p> <p>3) Investing in Google Docs vs Microsoft</p>
---	---