

IATF Governance Workshop

On May 2, the Task Force held a one-day workshop in Niagara-on-the-Lake to explore possible governance models for a pan-Canadian IdM&A framework. In the morning, four speakers presented their thoughts and experiences about inter-jurisdictional/inter-organizational governance to the Task Force members. In the afternoon, Task Force members, members of the Steering Committee, the speakers and invited guests explored some of the challenges and critical success factors related to a governance model for IdM&A.

ISD Governance Considerations

Presented by: *Kenneth Kernaghan*, Brock University

Prof. Kernaghan began by describing an *ideal service delivery model*. He noted that integrated *service* delivery (ISD) requires a fitting together of related government services so that citizens can access them in a single seamless experience, based on their wants and needs. It is not enough, he stressed to simply group these services together in related “chunks”. They must actually be dove-tailed and rationalized. Similarly, integrated *channel* delivery not only involves providing services through multiple channels, it also means the rationalization and convergence of these channels.

Ideally, there should be a single entry portal for each delivery channel which would provide access to the entire network of services for all orders of government. This portal should be clearly and consistently organized from the citizen’s perspective and services should appear seamless, regardless of which government has responsibility for the service and of how many services, providers and channels are involved. This involves fitting together services not only at the front end, but also at the back end. The ideal service delivery model assures users of privacy and security and tailors services to the needs of the individual citizen, regardless of the channel and their social, demographic, geographic or technological circumstances.

However, there are four types of challenges to achieving this ideal model:

1. **Political and Legal Challenges.** Political opposition to ISD can be a “show-stopper” and there is a need to work across ministerial boundaries and responsibilities. ISD is especially problematic across jurisdictions. Furthermore, ministers and governments usually want credit for their contributions, and collaborative arrangements tend to blur these distinctions. Finally, legislative and regulatory barriers may inhibit what information can be shared.
2. **Structural Challenges.** The departmental structure of government emphasizes vertical organizational silos and increases resistance to inter-departmental and inter-jurisdictional ISD. As a result, there is a need to minimize inter-departmental and inter-jurisdictional tensions through a greater reliance on influence, negotiation and consensus building. Finally, finding an effective formula for funding ISD projects can be difficult.

3. **Operational and Managerial Challenges.** Not only does technology need to be inter-operable, governments and departments also need to find ways to inter-operate. This means agreeing on standards, policies, and how to handle multiple accountabilities. While it is important to ensure that all stakeholders are represented in governance arrangements, it can be difficult to get the right people with the right decision-making authority together to ensure decisions can be taken.
4. **Cultural Challenges.** Traditional governance arrangements have led to the development of tunnel vision within vertical silos. This impedes the broader vision needed for horizontal relationships. Similarly, this often leads to a reluctance to share information across departmental and jurisdictional boundaries.

Kernaghan then identified six factors that can help overcome these challenges. He recommended:

- **Perfecting partnerships** by learning about the factors which are important for effective partnering.
- **Establishing the governance framework.** Agreements should be clear, transparent, comprehensive and flexible. Time should be taken to spell out accountabilities and standards.
- **Obtaining dedicated funding.** Agreements should be specific as to who, how much and for how long.
- **Leadership.** ISD initiatives need champions, from both the senior public service and politicians. This is the number one critical success factor according to PSSDC research.
- **Marketing.** This is needed to address concerns and to demonstrate improvements as they are made.

To date, we have learned a number of lessons from several ISD initiatives. Looking to existing models of inter-jurisdictional governance, such as Service Canada, is a good starting point for **ISD**. A key benefit of the Service Canada model is that it provides an over-arching legislative framework within the federal department of Human Resources and Social Development but works with federal departments, most provinces and community partners to provide a single service delivery network. Getting ISD right at this level would be a first step and then efforts could be put towards ‘boutique’ entities that specialize in sectoral services.

Finally, he noted that because the Internet is a less expensive channel, there is considerable pressure to move services and funding to this channel. To address this, all channels should be managed together in an integrated fashion. This will minimize channel competition and foster channel rationalization. Citizens can then be encouraged to migrate toward self-service channels in a way that respects equity.

Overall, ISD has matured in government in the past twenty years. It is moving from intra-departmental ISD to inter-governmental ISD and from silo-owned applications to integrated, managed models. In the future, these trends will continue and we can expect to see many services managed jointly across multiple channels and jurisdictions.

Three Inter-jurisdictional / Inter-organizational Governance Models

Prior to this workshop, representatives of three inter-jurisdictional /inter-organizational entities: Canada Health Infoway; Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators, and Interac Association, were invited to describe their governance structures. The following three caselets describe the following elements:

- The purpose of the organization
- Its membership
- Its governance structure
- Its funding
- Critical success factors and challenges
- How the organization has changed over time.

At this workshop, representatives from these organizations elaborated on these elements and answered Task Force members' questions about their governance issues.

Canada Health Infoway

Presented by: Stan Ratajczak, Canada Health Infoway

Canada Health Infoway (Infoway) is an independent not-for-profit corporation whose goal is to deliver electronic health record (EHR) solutions to Canadians. Its mission is:

- to foster and accelerate the development and adoption of electronic health information systems with compatible standards and communications technologies on a pan-Canadian basis.
- To build on existing initiatives and pursue collaborative relationships in pursuit of its mission.

Infoway is a *strategic investor* that works in partnership with health ministries, regional authorities, other healthcare organizations and vendors to align its investments with jurisdictional plans and to leverage existing solutions. Privacy and security are key aspects of all projects it funds. Other priorities are the potential for reuse in other jurisdictions and an interoperable approach.

The organization is “owned” by the 14 Deputy Ministers of Health of the federal, provincial and territorial governments who are its members. They meet once a year in an Annual General Meeting to review all business plans as well as the financial and compliance audits. Infoway is therefore equally accountable to all jurisdictions. The organization also has a 13 member board of directors, composed of: two members appointed by the federal Deputy Minister of Health; five members, each representing a

region of the country (Atlantic provinces; Quebec, Ontario, Prairie provinces, BC), appointed by the provincial and territorial Deputy Ministers of Health; and six independent directors appointed by the Members of the Corporation. The Board meets four or five times a year and approves all projects over \$10 million. Three committees report to the Board: finance, investment and audit, which approves smaller projects; HR and compensation; and governance, which is responsible for memberships and mandates.

On a day-to-day basis, Infoway is run by a management team of eight, including a CEO, a CFO, a COO, a director of Human Resources, a Chief Technology Officer, an SVP of Investment Programs Management, an SVP of Investment Strategy and Alliances, and a VP of Innovation and Adoption. Mike Sheridan, Infoway's Chief Operating Officer, identified seven factors responsible for the organization's accomplishments to date.

Three factors are foundational elements on which Infoway's programs are based:

1. **A Strategic Plan.** This outlines nine key priorities and strategies for achieving the organization's mission, e.g., diagnostic imaging, laboratory information systems, EHR systems.
2. **A Blueprint Architecture.** This lays out how information will be accessed, as well as how the different EHR components will communicate with each other. It defines a set of common services and functional requirements for each. This architecture has also shaped a culture of what is acceptable amongst jurisdictions.
3. **Standards.** These establish ways to exchange components in a standardized fashion. They are based on 11 principles of operation, e.g., "We will commit to using international standards." While part of the architecture, there are several standards in health care and so these are managed somewhat separately (see below). In the past, it has been challenging to establish standards in health care because there is no one coordinating body in Canada and often no dedicated staff or resources in the jurisdictions. Infoway has thus been able to add value to the provinces in this area. Standards are typically developed as part of an Infoway project, rather than in a vacuum.

Sheridan estimates that it took Infoway about 18 months to put these elements in place, but he noted that they have been critical to the organization's ability to move forward with ever-increasing rapidity on various projects.

Two further success factors are related to collaboration:

4. **Flexibility and integration with jurisdictional plans.** Not all jurisdictions have the same priorities for EHR. Infoway's approach to achieving collaboration and cooperation across jurisdictions is to enable each jurisdiction to set its own pace and priorities for achieving EHR. "This was a big 'A-HA' for us", said Sheridan. "It means that each jurisdiction can be moving down different roads at a different pace but working towards the same goal."

5. **Investment in EHR strategic projects.** Infoway will fund up to 75% of the costs of implementing (not operating) approved elements of its strategy. This gives all the jurisdictions a significant motivation to work with Infoway in this area.

Finally, two principles of operation have been established as guidelines:

6. **Replication.** Infoway wants to leverage its investments in more than one jurisdiction. Therefore, it tries to make strategic investments with one or more jurisdictions, which incorporate the needs of others. All software is open source but provinces can customize aspects of it as they wish.
7. **Staggered funding.** Infoway releases funding for its projects in two stages. Fifty percent is released when a project is ready for implementation; the other 50% is released when the project reaches certain adoption levels (e.g., utilization of the system, number of users). Adoption criteria are worked out with each jurisdiction and project.

Each Infoway program is headed by a Program Manager, who is responsible for establishing and managing a particular strategic area and who is accountable financially. Each Program Manager works with a set of project directors, drawn from the jurisdictions, who help set the goals and objectives in the area. “At this level, it’s all about relationship management,” said Sheridan. This group also works to identify and set standards for its area, which must then be approved by Infoway’s Pan-Canadian Standards Committee, composed of clinicians, vendors and jurisdictional representatives. This Committee helps ensure that standards are coordinated between each strategic area and are also consistent with international standards. Once a program is ready for delivery, Executive Regional Managers work with the relevant jurisdictions on a day-to-day basis to ensure programs are implemented on time and on budget.

Sheridan noted that ideas for programs can come either from the Program group *or* from the individual jurisdictions. “We’ve learned there is no ‘one size fits all’ for EHR,” he said. “Flexibility is key. As a result, we’ve had very positive reviews of our governance model.” Ratajczek also stressed the importance of broad consultation in Infoway’s work, including the participation of the Privacy Commissioners, multiple review cycles, and workshops.

Canadian Council of Motor Transport Administrators **(CCMTA)**

Presented by: *Michel Gravel*, Executive Director

CCMTA is a not-for-profit organization which acts as a neutral and independent coordination and support body for making decisions on administrative and operational matters dealing with the licensing, registration and control of motor vehicles and highway safety. As well, it manages a communications network, called the Interprovincial Record Exchange (IRE) system, which is used by governments to achieve business efficiencies in

the areas of driver licensing and vehicle registration and by third parties who wish to access this type of data.

It works closely with the:

- **Transportation Association of Canada (TAC).** This is a larger, national association whose mission is to promote safe, secure, efficient, effective and environmentally and financially sustainable transportation services in support of Canada's social and economic goals. Its 500 members include federal, provincial and territorial transportation departments, municipalities, and private-sector firms with an interest in transportation issues. Seniors and students may also join as individuals. TAC standing committees explore guidelines and best practices in various areas relating to transportation infrastructure and urban issues and make recommendations to its Board of Directors.

CCMTA reports to two Councils:

- **Council of Ministers of Transport and Council of Deputy Ministers of Transport (COM-T).** These two councils set the policies and make the decisions in all matters concerning collaborative transport matters in Canada. Programs, policy matters and planning report through the DM Council, which in turn reports to the Ministers' Council. These are not a formal organizations so TAC provides all of the needed support for these Councils and also acts as the means whereby funding can be pooled for common projects.

Coordination between these three entities is maintained in several ways. First, CCMTA and TAC, share a common Executive Director, Michel Gravel, who is also Secretary to COM-T. Second, all three organizations are co-located in the same building in Ottawa. Third, they share a common secretariat function and common services, such as IT, Finance, and Accounts Receivable. However, each also has its own dedicated staff, its own mandate and its own sources of funding.

The CCMTA is run by a 14 member board of directors representing each province and territory, as well as the federal government. Directors tend to be Assistant Deputy Ministers or their counterparts from vehicle registry agencies, e.g., government insurance companies. The board runs the organization and makes recommendations to COM-T, which has the final approval on all CCMTA issues. Committees of the board work on achieving consensus on various issues and then draft memoranda of understanding (MOUs) for COM-T's approval.

COM-T costs are paid for by assessments based on pre-established formulae – some equally and others by percentage of population. CCMTA has a number of sources of funding, the largest being the IRE, which charges both by utilization and assessments based on population. Some funding comes from government member assessments and other funds come from the sale of associate memberships (non-voting), its annual conference, and public sales of information. TAC's funding comes from the sale of

memberships and the sale of a wide range of products and services, such as technical courses, a newsletter, and technical guides. Much of its work is also done by volunteer councils and committees.

This current structure works extremely well, according to Gravel, although this wasn't always the case. One key success factor has been the creation of "firewalls" between these three entities. "A number of years ago the organizations were always straying into each other's business," he said. "And this caused a great deal of frustration." Today, it is clear what each organization is and is not responsible for: COM-T – policy; CCMTA – vehicle, driver and regulatory matters; and TAC – technical standards and best practices. "This separation works very well. Now everyone is satisfied with how things are working. We have the right people working on the right issues at the right level," Gravel noted.

The success of COM-T is built on mutual respect and trust at the ministerial and deputy ministerial levels and support from good senior staff. A key factor is that this is *not* a forum for advocacy. Advocates and stakeholders are heard and consulted in the standing committees, not at the Councils. In addition, the Councils have begun to meet informally in meetings which are not recorded and these have proven to be "very productive". Another success factor is a stable secretariat that can help orient new Council members, since turnover is fairly consistent.

Within CCMTA, Gravel identified consultation with stakeholders and open discussion as being critical to success. "Not only is it important for everyone to have a say, it is also fundamental to the credibility of the organization," he said. Today, even board meetings are open. The same is true for TAC's councils and committees.

A significant challenge for the groups is getting the right people at the table. In some jurisdictions, for example, two Deputy Ministers have responsibility for transport matters or a Deputy and a provincial agency will share responsibilities. "When this happens, there is sometimes a disconnect between the two organizations involved and it can be difficult to get decisions made," Gravel explained. Furthermore, none of these three organizations has any ability to motivate compliance on the part of their members. Sometimes, even with a signed MOU, members do not always implement what has been agreed. "There are almost always political or financial reasons for this," said Gravel. "And there is only peer pressure between the jurisdictions to ensure that the work gets done."

Gravel identified five key governance lessons learned:

1. Structure needs to be tailored to the organization's mandate and strategic objectives.
2. The governing council/board needs to be designed for effectiveness, e.g., the number and type of members, committees, roles and responsibilities, the basis of representation and the role of stakeholders.
3. The organization needs to be properly supported.
4. The organization needs to be properly funded.

5. Membership needs to be determined and their roles and benefits defined. Overall, it is extremely important for any inter-jurisdictional organization to understand what it is trying to achieve up front and to design its governance appropriately. “You must take the time to do it right,” he said. “Otherwise, it’s a recipe for disaster.”

Interac Association

Presented by: *Kirkland Morris*, Interac Association

Interac Association is the organization responsible for the development and operation of a national network of two shared electronic services: shared cash dispensing (ABMs) and direct payment (debit cards at the point of sale). Founded in 1984 as a cooperative venture by five of Canada’s financial institutions, today it has 85 members. Any company incorporated in Canada can be a member of Interac Association, said Kirkland Morris, Assistant Vice President, Strategic Policy and Programs. “One of our strengths is our flexible structure that allows individual companies to choose how they want to participate with Interac.” Thus, not all companies which use Interac services choose to be members.

Contrary to the popular belief in the civil service, which holds that private sector organizations have simpler and more straightforward governance mechanisms, Interac Association¹ has just as many Byzantine complexities as most public sector collaborations. It is controlled by a host of regulations, such as the Competition Act and acts governing financial institutions, which restrict what types of collaboration are possible and what types of services can be offered by its members. “These restrictions are things we must deal with every single day,” said Morris.

Interac Association is an unincorporated not-for-profit association of members. It is headed by a Board of Directors of 14, appointed from the largest members, but whose structure ensures that both non-financial institutions and other types of members are represented. Interac Association’s members include: all major Canadian financial institutions; many foreign bank subsidiaries; trust companies; credit unions; caisses populaires; payment processing companies; “white label” bank machine operators; and some very large merchants. The board typically meets three times a year, one meeting incorporating a larger Annual General Meeting.

Members sign a Memorandum of Association (MOA), which is Interac Association’s governing document and outlines its mandate, scope and requirements of operation. Members include both Direct and Indirect Connectors, which refers to the manner in which they connect to the INTERAC network.

¹ While Interac Association is unincorporated, Interac Inc. is a formal legal entity, which handles Interac’s legal affairs and intellectual property matters. It is “subservient” to Interac Association. As well, Access Corporation owns the intellectual property underpinning the network, because of legal restrictions.

- **Direct Connectors**, connect directly to one another through the network. Direct Connectors operate processing systems and run special communications software to connect to the Interac network.
- **Indirect Connectors** connect to the network through a Direct Connector. A number of Direct Connectors offer these network connection services in a competitive marketplace. Interac Association is not involved in the negotiation of these network access arrangements.

Members are also free to outsource various functions and enter into business arrangements with non-members. In these instances, the member retains full responsibility for compliance with all rules and for all transactions entered into the network.

Interac Association's network is completely decentralized with no central hub. Each Direct Connector maintains physical links with every other Direct Connector. Interac Association manages the network itself (through outsourcers) but not the clearing and settlement of payments between members (which is done via the Canadian Payments Association). It maintains management oversight and provides common services, such as fraud detection and management and establishing standards.

Policies and standards in specific areas are developed through twelve Advisory Groups (e.g., security, fraud, network operations) comprised of a number of member representatives. It is the job of these Advisory Groups to serve as a channel for consultation on issues, providing both subject matter expertise and a vehicle through which support and consensus is sought. "Originally, most of these groups had the same organizational representation as the board," noted Morris. "However, over the years we have found that broader membership on these groups is desirable and helps us achieve more buy-in to our plans." Advisory Group members come from a variety of organizations and work on a part-time basis (e.g., most advisory groups meet monthly), in addition to their day-to-day work. As a result, it can sometimes be challenging to get their full attention.

Interac Association's governance critical success factors are also its most important challenges, explained Morris. Chief among these are:

- **Acknowledging the Need for Collaboration.** There are many areas where members benefit more from the critical mass and standards offered by collaborating, but there are others where individual members want to maintain a competitive edge. Interac Association tries to walk the thin line between operating as a trade association and functioning as a business. As a trade association, it has a role to play in regulating the network and representing the group's collective interests; however, it also understands that its members are in business to sell products and services. Interac Association's success is therefore predicated on the members' acknowledgement that the benefits of collaboration outweigh those of "going it alone".
- **Broad Consultation.** As the organization has evolved from one whose members had very similar interests to one with many more divergent interests, governance and

decision-making practices have also had to evolve. “We are hugely dependent on consultation,” said Morris. “It’s not a trivial exercise to generate agreement.” However, while decision-making in a multi-stakeholder environment can be “arduous”, inclusivity is critical to maintaining the effectiveness of the organization. Where non-members are major players in an area, they are typically invited to participate in the work of the Advisory Groups. “Finding ways to do consultation is therefore critical to making progress in our organization,” said Morris.

- **Flexibility.** As noted above, membership in Interac Association is open to all Canadian companies. There are no fees to become a member. Interac Association’s costs are recovered on a fee-for-transaction basis. Its MOA is neither exclusive nor binding for any period of time. Members only agree to follow the parameters of the network’s operations and abide by legal and regulatory conditions. They can also choose which services to participate in.
- **Relationship Management.** Behind all the formal relationships are “myriad others”, noted Morris. “As we have evolved, we have found that informal committees and one-to-one working relationships are often where the work really gets done.” Maintaining and supporting these relationships requires more legwork than supporting more structured groups, but the results are worth it.

Interac Association is supported by a staff of about 65, who direct all aspects of the organization’s work, manage the relationships, and oversee the operation of the network.

Discussion

You have each indicated the importance of broad consultation from amongst your stakeholders. How do you select them? At Interac, consultation begins with representation that is a mirror image of the board of directors. Then, large participants in the association or constituent groups who have an interest in the subject at hand are added on a case-by-case basis. If the situation will require investment, then all possible investors are included. At Infoway, efforts are made to include thought leaders and all stakeholders with representation in the pan-Canadian space, e.g., Ministries of Health, National Health Care Providers. While these don’t always truly represent the full pan-Canadian view, they are the best groups available. As well, national representatives of public groups, e.g., the Citizens Privacy Coalition, are consulted. At CCMTA, who is consulted depends very much on the issue. If there is a permanent standing committee to deal with the topic, it is usually quite easy to identify the relevant stakeholders.

It’s sometimes difficult to determine which minister is responsible for IdM&A. What is your advice in this situation? At Infoway, in these situations, each jurisdiction is asked to nominate someone to represent it to the organization. This nominee is then responsible for managing communication and decision-making internally. With COM-T there is some overlap between ministers, and they tend to decide amongst themselves what they want to do. If both come to meetings, they get one vote and therefore must agree on what to do in advance. All participants agreed that since responsibilities in the

different organizations/jurisdictions change continuously, it is important for a governance structure to be able to adapt to changes and restructure accordingly.

How involved is Interac with arrangements between its direct and indirect connectors? These arrangements are negotiated between the two organizations involved. Interac is responsible for doing due diligence, but it is not a broker.

What principles and standards do you have around IdM&A? Infoway would be happy to share these with the Task Force. These were established in consultation with the key stakeholders and based on common principles, e.g., “we will adopt international standards”, “we will connect using international standards”. If there are no standards in place at the time a project is being developed, Infoway will fund retrofitting it to standards when these are established. All jurisdictions have committed to using the standards developed by others during Infoway projects. Since standards go through several reviews, they are likely to be well-designed when finally accepted.

What models do you use for independent audits? Michel Gravel noted that the new audit requirements are onerous for not-for-profit organizations. Directors must fully understand their responsibilities and more documentation is required. In addition, the auditor has the option of appearing before the board and identifying any issues that he/she feels have not been satisfactorily addressed. At Interac, there is an annual financial audit. In addition, members are audited for adherence to the organization’s standards, including technical standards for inter-operability and security and risk management standards for confidence in the network. The organization uses a blend of centrally-managed audits and self-managed audits. Increasingly however, this function is becoming more centralized. Infoway has an annual audit regarding its spending of public funds but the systems it funds are not audited because they are a provincial responsibility. Infoway also certifies adherence to standards for vendor products and this has been very positively received by vendors because it speeds up the acceptance process in the different jurisdictions.

What are the critical success factors for your funding models? Infoway is funded by Health Canada but the organization must demonstrate the value it has delivered. At CCMTA, value for money is also critical since it is a user pay model. Interac has similar criteria. Morris noted that value must be perceived by the *individual* members as well as the collective membership.

What challenges do you face around having common terminology? All three organizations face difficulties in this area. Infoway believes that it is “immensely critical” to agree on common terms, even if a different term is used by a jurisdiction internally. Glossaries can be important documents in these cases. “We put a stake in the ground with terminology and leave the jurisdictions to map their own terms to this,” stated Ratajczak. At Interac, establishing common terminology is a prolonged process that is “painful but necessary”. Morris has found that it is easier to wait to draft documents until these common terms can be established. Gravel agreed, noting that even when English terminology has been agreed on, “everything can start all over again when French terminology is being worked on.”

What advice do you have for establishing a governance structure for IdM&A?

Before a governance structure can be established, it is essential to get agreement on *what* is going to be governed, said Gravel. Only after the key strategic objectives have been established can governance be introduced. Morris agreed. He also pointed out that it is easier to expand one's governance structure to include "those who yell and scream to be included" than to take away a voice. At Infoway, the governance framework is evolving. Ratajczak stated that whatever gets built will likely be "50% wrong" and that establishing an effective governance framework is going to be a constant and evolutionary process.

Preliminary Elements of an IdM&A Governance Framework

In the afternoon, the Task Force was joined by members of the IdM&A Steering Committee or their representatives. With the assistance of a facilitator, the group participated in a multi-step process to identify the important elements of a future governance framework for IdM&A. In the first step, each member of the group was asked to interview others and be interviewed by them concerning four governance questions. Answers to each question were then summarized and edited by the group at large.

1. What key elements of the models described would apply to a Pan Canadian IdM&A governance model? The most important elements include:

- Business driven strategic objectives
- Value for money in three areas: return on investment; for each partner; for citizens
- A flexible and evolutionary governance framework
- Leadership from both politicians and senior public servants; and especially, champions
- Political buy-in and early wins (the need for easily understandable, highly desirable outcomes, i.e., "warm puppies")
- Arms-length relationship with governments.

2. What are the top three challenges in identifying a Pan Canadian IdM&A governance model?

- Understanding who the stakeholders are and what is the value for each stakeholder.
- Clarifying the different elements of governance.
- Getting politicians to think nationally but act locally
- Marketing the need for IdM&A governance
- Finding sustainable funding and resources
 - Developing a funding model
 - Ensuring sustained interest
- Finding champions; Generating interest and understanding at both the political and the executive levels of the public service
- Establishing a clear mandate/target

- Agreeing on the goals or strategic pillars
- Identifying the criteria for success
- Establishing trust between jurisdictions; making decisions clear and transparent
- Identifying the scope of IdM&A
- Maintaining focus on the business needs; technological neutrality; ensuring IdM&A is not seen as just an online issue
- Dealing with the incompatibility of policies, practices and rules
- Balancing the tendency to go to the lowest common denominator with not setting the bar too high.
- Understanding what is permissible by legislation
- Determining commonalities and understanding the 80/20 rule for IdM&A.

3. What advice would you provide on how to overcome the challenges of a Pan Canadian IdM&A governance model?

- Get political buy-in and get the DMs engaged. Find leaders and champions for this issue.
- Build consensus and engage stakeholders
- Establish a clear simple mandate and value proposition
- Separate decision making from decision taking and establish tiers of accountability
- Develop a stable funding model
- Undertake a cost/benefit analysis for proceeding or not
- Understand and articulate the business drivers of IdM&A
- Start somewhere and take calculated risks
- Keep the structure small and nimble
- Think nationally, act locally
- Develop gradually
- Include marketing and communication initiatives as part of this work
- Include municipalities
- Set clear priorities with timeframes of what is to be achieved
- Leverage tools and best practices in existence – don't reinvent e.g., IAAWG; Infoway
- Focus on risk, integrity and service delivery

4. What are the critical success factors for the implementation of a Pan Canadian IdM&A governance model?

- A positive value proposition (both financial and political) that is continually reinforced
- A model that is: flexible; adaptable; able to be implemented in a graduated, incremental way; and easily understood
- A clear, common vision
- A strong champion with both influence and authority
- A fair funding model tied to objectives
- Engagement of stakeholders to obtain/sustain trust and confidence, including:

- Other governments
- Others e.g., Privacy Commissioners, academics, industry experts
- Citizens
- Business
- Clients
- Identification of oversight roles and processes
- Leveraging existing solutions, methods, practices, lessons learned
- Recognition of different levels of decision making
- Appropriate initial membership.

Critical Success Factors for an IdM&A Governance Model. Following this discussion, the group used the common elements found in each of the answers above to identify six critical success factors on which an IdM&A governance model should be built. These are:

1. **Leadership** throughout each of the partnering organizations and political buy-in.
2. **Flexibility and evolution.** A structure that will allow its members to influence its direction.
3. **Clear vision** that is inspirational and which markets the need for IdM&A.
4. **Core principles** for the governance framework.
5. **Stakeholder engagement** to develop trust.
6. **Sustainable funding.**