

***OPS Excellence and Innovation Office***

**Contact:** Art Daniels  
Assistant Deputy Minister  
OPS Excellence and Innovation Office  
Centre for Leadership, Cabinet Office  
Government of Ontario

**Tel:** (416) 325-7612

**Email:** [art.daniels@mbs.gov.on.ca](mailto:art.daniels@mbs.gov.on.ca)

**Vision for Integrated Service Delivery**

The vision for ISD in Ontario is clear: a single transactional organisation with one multi-channel access point. Effort has been made to move toward this goal with a focus on the life cycle of an individual and the life cycle of a business. Ultimately, the goal is to link in with other levels of government – first by building within Ontario, then by working together through PSSDC.

**How Do We Get There?**

To achieve this vision, agency models such as Service New Brunswick and Centrelink Australia should be pursued. This model involves being accountable to a government and a board of directors, and allows some control over reinvesting and developing infrastructure. As it stands now, roles and responsibilities between ministries are not delineated clearly enough and partners can lose out because there is not a contract in place – an agency model would add rigour through contracts. There is also a benefit to agency status because it is more straightforward for other jurisdictions to work with an agency than with a ministry e.g. SNB can make deals – the language of agencies working together allows, and agencies can be much more collaborative. Current systems, on the other hand, are too cumbersome and can lack the business dynamic of an agency. Other examples include Canada Customs and Revenue Agency, Technical Standards and Safety Authority (Ontario) and Canada Post.

## **Drivers**

In Ontario, the transformation toward an integrated service delivery agenda has been in incremental steps rather than a bold leap forward. This allows ministries and the culture of silos to dictate the pace of change; transformation encounters resistance for reasons of turf, culture, roles, and capacity. In Ontario, the Ministry of Transportation has proven it can operate comfortably outside the boundaries of its silo, but there are few examples of a single ministry transforming itself from the inside in this way. It is much harder to instil cultural change in each organisation individually than it is to have a strong central drive to integrate.

Citizen expectations and demands are the biggest driver to breaking down silos. This is where to get our leverage to break down the barriers between jurisdictions and implement integrated service delivery models.

## **Potential Cross-Jurisdictional Initiatives**

Ontario Life Event Bundles could easily be national/cross-jurisdictional. Significant changes come into everyone's life - such as birth, marriage, retirement, or having a child. Similarly, businesses go through a series of predictable events in their life cycle - such as initial registration of the new business, relocation, filing of forms and reports to government. These are referred to as life events.

The Government of Ontario is using Life Events as a new way to organise information and services - in groupings that cross government jurisdictions and ministerial lines in order to bring everything on a subject together in one place. Life Event bundles provide access to all relevant government information and services through a single Web site for individuals and another single access point for businesses, regardless of which level of government is responsible for that subject.

The aim is not to duplicate what is already available online. Instead, value is added by bringing information together in a single place.

It would be possible to implement these nationally/cross-jurisdictionally quite easily.

*Start at the channel level first*

It makes sense to start merging at the channel level first – e.g. COBSC is a good collaborative model for counters, 1-800 Canada could be cross-connected with a 1-800 Ontario for call centre integration, Life Event Bundles could be a pilot for integration of electronic service delivery

*Engage Municipalities*

More work needs to be done through PSSDC to engage the municipalities in integrated service delivery initiatives.

*Call for Leaders*

Volunteers are required to step forward and lead some initiatives with tangible deliverables to move toward cross-jurisdictional implementation.

## ***Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal***

**Contact:** Diana Macri  
Director of Operations  
or  
Brian Opitz  
Manager, Corporate Services Section  
Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal  
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing  
Government of Ontario

**Tel:** (416) 585-6948 or  
(416) 585-7604

**Email:** [diana.macri@mah.gov.on.ca](mailto:diana.macri@mah.gov.on.ca) or [briano.opitz@mah.gov.on.ca](mailto:briano.opitz@mah.gov.on.ca)

### **Overview**

The Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal (ORHT) is one of Ontario's administrative Tribunals. Administrative Tribunals are designed to make decisions of a "quasi-judicial" nature, which require specialised abilities. In the case of ORHT, this requires the Tribunal's adjudicators to have an in-depth knowledge of the *Tenant Protection Act*, which was proclaimed in June 1998.

The *Tenant Protection Act (TPA)* defines the rights and obligations of residential tenants and landlords in Ontario. The Act allows for both landlords and tenants to file applications to determine whether their rights have been compromised. The TPA also sets rules governing when rent increases can be taken, how notice of rent increases must be served and, in some cases, the amount of the rent increase.

The TPA covers all areas of residential tenancies including maintenance, termination of tenancies because of rent arrears or behavioural issues, sublets, etc.

In general, the mandate of the Tribunal is to:

- Resolve disputes between landlords and tenants through mediation or adjudication, or in some cases, a combination of both, and
- To educate the public about their rights and obligations under the TPA.

If a landlord or a tenant has a dispute, they may file an application with ORHT to have their dispute resolved. There are

fees for all applications, except for applications where a tenant believes that their rights have been denied or violated.

The Tribunal's website includes up-to-date information and announcements. The website offers applications, forms and notices that must be served within the rules of the Act. The website also offers applicants the opportunity to find information about the status of their application online.

Clients who are looking for information on the Act and how the Tribunal works will find easily downloaded pamphlets and brochures.

The website is divided into four parts which mirror the life cycle of an application. They are:

- Your Rights
- How to Apply
- Progress of the Application
- The Order

This provides a simple citizen-centric service to the residents of Ontario. By the summer of 2003, filing an application on-line will be possible.

#### *Vital Statistics*

- One head office, eight regional offices and a virtual call centre
- Eight offices co-located with Ontario Government Information Centres
- Planning is underway to co-locate the last remaining ORHT field office
- Volumes per year: 75,000 to 80,000 applications files, 800,000 telephone calls
- 90% of applications are from landlords whose tenants are in arrears of rent
- 10% of the cases are the most complex ones that deal with tenant's rights
- The work of the Tribunal represents nearly 50% of the government's total adjudication caseload and operates with 15% of the adjudicative resources

#### **Partners**

The partnership between the OHRT, the Ministry of Consumer and Business Services (MCBS), and the Ministry of Northern

Development and Mines (MNDM) demonstrates a clear improvement in customer service while at the same time realising cost efficiencies. The ministries worked together to provide ORHT services at the MCBS Government Information Centres (GICs); MNDM operates the GICs in the North through a Memorandum of Understanding with MCBS.

### **Project Catalysts/Drivers**

Counter services across the province are critical to the ORHT's success. While clients can choose to file applications through other channels, most prefer to make their application in person. Initially, the ORHT used the Ministry of Transportation's (MTO) Private Issuers' Network (PIN) as the point of access for counter clients, but began to look for another network as it became clear that the cost was not only prohibitive to the ORHT, but that their clients were not comfortable sharing their information with a private sector intermediary. In October 2001, the ORHT, MCBS and MNDM began to explore the idea of partnering to deliver ORHT services.

An agreement was reached in which ORHT application services would be transferred from low-volume private Document Filing Centres to the GICs, and higher volume ORHT Customer Service Offices would be co-located with the GICs.

The opportunity was clearly beneficial to both parties: the ORHT has realised a onetime savings of approximately \$500,000 with another million dollars in savings expected over the next three years, while MCBS benefited from the addition of a new stream of revenue at the GICs. The mutual advantage was derived from the fact that the volume at some ORHT offices was not enough to support more than one full-time staff member. Logistically, however, at least two people are required in an office to allow for lunch breaks, vacations and sickness. The issue of physical security can also not be underestimated. ORHT staff had typically been housed in a relatively isolated location yet were facing angry tenants and landlords. Co-location has diffused this issue and allowed the sharing of security costs. Furthermore, Tribunal staff at the co-located offices feel more part of a team than they did prior to this initiative. MCBS has benefited from the support for its corporate Over-the-Counter Strategy as will the showcasing of the GIC network as a viable alternative for other ministries delivering counter programs.

## **Critical Success Factors and Challenges**

### *Committed Leadership*

Critical to the success of this partnership has been the clear leadership from all levels of the partner organisations. At the political level, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing provided clear direction and support for the integration. One clear indication of this support was ensuring the integration project was put into the Deputy Minister's performance contract. In MCBS, the ADM and the Director responsible for the GICs provided similar direction and support and ensured that MCBS paved the way for a smooth integration of ORHT services. All leaders provided clear direction throughout the project and infected champions at all levels in the organisation with their enthusiasm.

### *Shared Purpose and Culture*

An important factor in any relationship is developing a shared purpose or objective, and to the extent possible, this should be developed by the partners rather than imposed by one on the other(s). Managers at the working level from the partner organisations held a series of clear and open discussions on the outcomes and givens that were required to make the project a success. The financial framework was also clearly established at the beginning of the project. A business case was developed to assess the impact of the transition. This supported a shared understanding of the roles and responsibilities of each group and paved the way for a strong relationship based on a shared understanding of the broad objective: providing the public with convenient access to government services and information.

The ORHT did not, at the time of negotiation, have a backlog of cases, and it was vital to them that this level of service continue. Clear direction on requirements versus negotiables meant a common understanding of the importance of the customer and has led to a positive impact on customer service. At co-located counters, Tribunal clients like the idea that while multiple services are available at the same physical location, a separate person addresses their ORHT needs. In a survey conducted by MCBS at counters where services were transferred from Document Filing Centres, clients responded positively about the change and, in fact, commented that GICs were preferable to the private Document Filing Centres.

### *Integrated Planning*

Regular meetings were held to define, together, all aspects of the transition to integrated service delivery of ORHT services through the GICs. This includes operational environments, process concerns and customer service standards. More specifically, cancellation of the existing contract with the MTO PIN was co-ordinated with MTO well in advance of the formal notice to ensure a smooth service transition.

### *Lessons Learned*

In hindsight, the areas that did not go as smoothly as they could involved the logistics of the project itself. More clarity was needed up front in terms of communication processes and meetings. An agreed upon framework to allow “synchronised yet speedy” results would have helped to streamline some of the interactions. There also needed to be more effort in ensuring there was a consistent vision from all people in the vertical organisations. Some inconsistencies were identified between the different locations – both in philosophy and energy level. Finally, there was room for improvement in ensuring effective interaction at the local level and enable decision-making at the lower levels.

### *On-going Relationship Management*

There is a sense by both partners that the overall process has been a resounding success. As a result of the overall success of this initial phase of the partnership, MCBS and ORHT have expanded the partnership to provide service at more than 60 GICs. Work is currently taking place to streamline areas where the pilots showed some inefficiencies. These include:

- clear accountability within the project team and within each partners’ organisation;
- co-ordination for such operational issues as counter requirements for taking on new business, acceptable methods of payment etc.;n and
- earlier consideration of such issues as physical security and the impact of the new services

There is a shared culture of co-operation and commitment to continuous improvement by each of the stakeholders. And, as in any good partnership, the details of the agreement are evolving based on the changing context and needs of those involved.

**What will it take to achieve truly integrated service delivery?**

- Framework where partners move forward in step with each other
- Iron clad workplan that was developed and approved together
- Consistency with funding
- An accountability framework
- A workplan framework that could be re-used
- Time to do some foundation work on all the pieces that need to be co-ordinated and brought together

## **Possible Pilots**

### *Building Regulations*

Area of building regulations – federal government, municipalities, Ministries of Labour, Consumer and Business Services, Municipal Affairs and Housing, Environment, Finance all involved

### *Enforcement Activities*

### *Call Centres*

The challenge with call centres will be figuring out how to integrate program information provision without saddling all staff with knowing everything. There needs to be a decision made on how people access information about their government in a consistent way. Will take integration behind front end, but need one telephone number, one website, and one counter network.

## ***Integrated Service Delivery Division***

**Contact:** Mary Tate  
Assistant Deputy Minister  
Integrated Service Delivery Division  
Ministry of Consumer and Business Services  
Government of Ontario  
**Tel:** (416) 326-7102  
**Email:** [mary.tate@cbs.gov.on.ca](mailto:mary.tate@cbs.gov.on.ca)

### **Overview**

The Integrated Service Delivery Division is developing and implementing an adaptive, cost effective, customer-centered, multi-channel service delivery system to provide individuals, businesses and other organizations with seamless, speedy access to government information, services and products and offer choice in how, when and where they access these services.

This means to strive:

- For superior customer service ratings compared to leading organizations (public or private sector)
  - High usage rates through our integrated channels
  - Customer-driven/centric, save customers time and money
  - Increased number of services and transactions available through the integrated channels
- To be “the” service delivery partner sought out by other ministries and jurisdictions to help them provide cost-effective quality service to customers and make it easier for them to deliver their services
- To be the world leader in providing electronic access to government informational and transactional services
- To be the government champions and active supporters of integrated service delivery

The division’s strategic goals include:

- To identify, develop, implement and grow a unique value-added integrated service delivery business offering on behalf of the Ontario Government that meets customer needs and partner business requirements
- To develop agile, sustainable, scaleable partner relationships that support effective integrated service delivery

- To develop and promote a program and customer-centric division culture, structure and protocols regarding the way that works internally and with our partners that enables achievement of ISD business goals and plans
- To attract customers to integrated channels and encourage customer trust
- To influence government policies and processes to enable fundamental change that promotes accountability but enables the way to do business

## **Challenges**

### *Resources Required*

Partners tend to underestimate the time and resource commitments it will take to create and maintain a partnership, and instead assume that a partnered process will take the same amount of time as a process over which they have complete control. Experience has shown, however, that there is additional work required to develop and maintain a partnership.

There is a need to identify and articulate what is different about a project/initiative when a partner is involved, and then improve our capacity to do partnering work. This needs to include accounting for the less tangible work required on building relationships. While nurturing the relationship is often the first activity to get dropped off the agenda when schedules are tight, it is a fundamental element in the success of a partnership. Examples of activities that cannot be side-stepped in the interest of time or capacity include setting common goals, establishing common assumptions, and building trust between the partners.

### *Developing a Common Culture and Shared Benefits*

In order for a partnership to work, there has to be a sense of shared culture amongst the partners. This does not mean that one partner imposes its culture on the other(s), but rather that the partners work together to have a common understanding, vision and goals about why and how they will come together and work toward something. Clearly, a common culture is even more difficult to establish the more different the partners are (e.g. private/public, large ministry/small ministry, province/municipality). Just how difficult depends on the strength of the common interest. While both partners need to be able to articulate what they have to offer (i.e. a clear understanding of their own strengths and constraints AND the

needs of their partner), there also has to be a compelling reason for the partners to engage in a joint venture. A partnership only works in the long term if both partners will benefit from the success of the partnership and both parties will feel negative consequences if the partnership fails. Unevenness of benefits or consequences makes it too easy for one partner to abandon the relationship when something in the partnership is not working well.

### *Current Funding Mechanisms*

Research shows that the public does not distinguish between branches, divisions, departments, ministries or levels of government. Yet, our silo approach to conducting business, strongly reinforced by policy and legislative requirements, continues to impede the flexibility and innovation required to finance integrated service delivery initiatives:

- Traditional funding approaches are based on annual business cycles (BPA process) and do not allow for straightforward multi-year operational / financial planning.
- Complex cross-organisation projects are more likely to carry a multi-year deficit prior to realising a return on investment (be it financial, political, operational or other). This makes it more difficult to secure funding in an environment of fiscal restraint.
- Inter-ministry funding requests are more complicated than those originating in a single ministry. Inter-jurisdictional projects add a further level of complexity that has not been fully addressed.

## **Critical Success Factors**

### *Committed and Active Champions*

Any partnership requires champions at the senior level that are willing to step in and make the partnership a priority at the working level.

### *Proactive Relationship Management*

In addition to establishing clearly defined goals and objectives at the outset of the relationship, it is imperative that the partners check back with each other at regular intervals on these goals and objectives. While it can be easy to become focused on developing policy and implementation plans, partners should also ensure continued alignment of original assumptions. There must always be a clear benefit to each partner of staying in the relationship, and it is much easier to address diverging

expectations before the gap becomes too wide. The dynamics of the partnership will evolve, and the partners must devote time and energy to the relationship to keep it healthy.

### *Project Management Capacity*

Managing a partnership is inherently different and often more complex than managing an initiative contained within a single organisation. There is a certain skill set, mindset *and* knowledge base required. This must be defined and recognised in individuals so that an appropriate project team can be built.

### *Understanding Change Management and Integration*

The literature of change management is often focused on resistance to change within an organisation and how to overcome this. This notion does not allow the legitimate reasons for resistance to surface because it allows the changer to label any dissent as “resistance-based.” It is not always true, however, that people who resist change “just don’t get it.” Resistance at all levels of the organisation can stem from inadequately addressed risks to customers or stakeholders as well as from comfort with existing policies and processes. It is important to take the time to figure out which kind of resistance is being met. Part of this process is researching and listening to partners to understand their business, their customers and their operational reality.

## **Enablers for Integrated Service Delivery**

- Change management guidelines: there are many methodologies; the key is to choose one and stick to it.
- Policy Analysis framework: there is also considerable research into the area of policy analysis. These frameworks can also serve as a useful tool for partnering for service delivery because they help to work through an issue systematically.

## **Integrated Service Delivery Wish List**

- That the client be at the centre of the picture.
- That there be more latitude to work out issues with the client as the common goal.
- Partnerships live or die by relationships: technology could be used better for video conferencing and net meetings – ways of working together to overcome the realities of geography

and the expense and difficulty of attending inter-jurisdictional meetings.