



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CANADA

**DEPARTMENTAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS  
ABOUT GOVERNMENT RESPONSES  
(39<sup>TH</sup> PARLIAMENT)**

**Report of the Standing Committee on  
Public Accounts**

**Hon. Shawn Murphy, MP  
Chair**

**FEBRUARY 2008**

**39th PARLIAMENT, 2<sup>nd</sup> SESSION**

---

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

If this document contains excerpts or the full text of briefs presented to the Committee, permission to reproduce these briefs, in whole or in part, must be obtained from their authors.

Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Available from Communication Canada — Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

**DEPARTMENTAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS  
ABOUT GOVERNMENT RESPONSES  
(39<sup>TH</sup> PARLIAMENT)**

**Report of the Standing Committee on  
Public Accounts**

**Hon. Shawn Murphy, MP  
Chair**

**FEBRUARY 2008  
39th PARLIAMENT, 2<sup>ND</sup> SESSION**



# **STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**

## **CHAIR**

Hon. Shawn Murphy

## **VICE-CHAIRS**

Jean-Yves Laforest

David Sweet

## **MEMBERS**

David Christopherson

Brian Fitzpatrick

Mark Holland

Hon. Charles Hubbard

Mike Lake

Marcel Lussier

Pierre Poilievre

John Williams

Borys Wrzesnewskij

## **CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE**

Justin Vaive

## **LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT**

**Parliamentary Information and Research Service**

Jack Stilborn

Jean Dupuis



# **THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**

has the honour to present its

## **SIXTH REPORT**

Pursuant to its mandate under Standing Order 108(2), the Committee has studied the Departmental answers to questions about government responses (39<sup>th</sup> Parliament), and has agreed to report the following:



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

OVERVIEW .....	1
BACKGROUND .....	1
FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS .....	2
NEXT STEPS: ESTABLISHING SYSTEMATIC FOLLOW-UP.....	4
CONCLUDING REMARKS .....	8
APPENDIX I: STUDY METHODOLOGY .....	9
TABLE 1: HOW WE CLASSIFIED GOVERNMENT RESPONSES .....	10
TABLE 2: HOW WE CLASSIFIED GOVERNMENT REPORTING .....	11
APPENDIX II: SURVEY AND REVIEW OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS RECOMMENDATIONS AND GOVERNMENT RESPONSES.....	13
Tables of Findings.....	13
Table 1: Government Responses to 112 Selected Committee Recommendations .....	13
Table 2: Number of Performance Reports** Confirming Government Actions in Response to 112 Selected Recommendations.....	14
Compilation of Individual Recommendations, Responses and Reporting Assessments.....	15
REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT RESPONSE.....	139



# **STRENGTHENING ACCOUNTABILITY: A NEW APPROACH TO FOLLOWING UP ON COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

## **OVERVIEW**

This report presents the results of a review of government responses to a selected group of recommendations of the PAC, made during the 37<sup>th</sup> and 38<sup>th</sup> Parliaments, and announces new procedures the Committee has begun using to follow up on recommendations.

The purpose of the review was to develop a credible estimate of how frequently governments accept recommendations of the committee, and whether Committee recommendations make a demonstrable difference to what government departments actually do.

The central finding, discussed under the heading “Findings and Observations,” is that there is a great deal of room for improvement. While there are numerous examples of recommendations that have resulted in action by the government, there are many more where ambiguous responses and inadequate reporting of actions leave the real impact of recommendations open to doubt.

Our major conclusion is that communication between the Committee and the government needs to become a great deal clearer and more complete. This will strengthen the accountability of the government to this Committee and Parliament. It can also help to ensure that the contributions of this Committee to public policy and administration are as well-informed, constructive and effective as possible.

The concluding section of this report, entitled “Next Steps: Establishing Systematic Follow-Up,” sets out our plan to address these issues. The Committee is already implementing this plan; systematically reviewing government responses to its recommendations, monitoring results, and dialoguing with the government about implementation issues as required.

## **BACKGROUND**

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts was described, in the February 2006 Phase 2 Report of the Gomery Commission, as Parliament’s administrative accountability committee. This description accurately captures the central focus of this Committee, which

is to make sure that government is held accountable on behalf of citizens for its performance and for delivering results efficiently and effectively.

A key requirement for this work is the availability of clear and reliable information about departmental performance, its deficiencies and prospective improvements. This is why the reports of the Auditor General comprise an essential information base for the Committee. The formal responses of the government to committee recommendations are also essential. They can provide key information about how deficiencies will be remedied, and state action commitments for which the government can subsequently be held accountable.

This report originates from longstanding concerns of members about the degree of real accountability that is achieved in many government responses to our recommendations. Too often, responses leave considerable uncertainty about the level of agreement with the substance of recommendations, and the precise nature of action commitments. However, the work pace undertaken by the Committee makes it difficult to devote committee time to achieving greater clarity. Reflecting these concerns, the Committee launched the background research that is presented in this report as a basis for defining problems and developing solutions.

## **FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS**

The study assessed government responses to a sample of Committee recommendations made between 2001 and 2005. The sample was composed of 110 recommendations that called for the reporting of results in departmental performance reports or related publications. Since public reporting is required, this type of recommendation provides a readily accessible means of determining governmental compliance.

The purpose of the assessment was, first, to provide an estimate of the proportion of Committee recommendations that are being accepted. Second, it was to determine whether the government is actually doing what its says it is going to do in these responses. For details concerning the study methodology employed, see Appendix 1 of this report.

The detailed results of the review, on a recommendation-by-recommendation basis, are contained in Appendix II of this report. Table 1, immediately below, summarizes the results by providing the number of government responses in the sample that: (a) accepted a recommendation, (b) relied on status quo statements focussing on what the government was already doing, or (c) rejected a recommendation.

**Table 1: Government Responses to Selected Committee Recommendations**

	<b>Accepted</b>	<b>Status-Quo</b>	<b>Rejected</b>	<b>Total</b>
37th Parliament, 1st Session	35	16	0	51
37th Parliament, 2nd Session	26	8	0	34
38 Parliament, 1st Session	10	9	6	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>71 (64,5 %)</b>	<b>33 (30 %)</b>	<b>6 (5,5 %)</b>	<b>110*</b>

\* Plus two non-responses.

Table 2 indicates, for the same group of recommendations, the number where subsequent government reports: (a) provided confirmation that recommended actions had been taken, (b) did not provide clear confirmation, or (c) could not be expected to provide confirmation, because the government had rejected the substantive recommendation that was to be reported on.

**Table 2: Number of Performance Reports Confirming Government Actions in Response to Selected Recommendations**

	<b>Confirmation</b>	<b>No Confirmation</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>	<b>Total</b>
37 <sup>th</sup> Parliament, 1st Session	32	19	0	51
37 <sup>th</sup> Parliament, 2nd session	26	8	0	34
38 <sup>th</sup> Parliament, 1st Session	10	9	6	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>68 (61.8%)</b>	<b>36 (32.7%)</b>	<b>6 (5.5%)</b>	<b>110*</b>

\*Plus two non-responses.

While Table 1 indicates that most of the recommendations surveyed were accepted, a significant proportion resulted in essentially status quo responses from the government. In these responses, the government provides vaguely affirmative comments on the recommendations, and focuses on descriptions of what is already being done.

Where a Committee recommendation reflects the substance of an earlier Auditor General recommendation, it is reasonable and even desirable that departments would already be acting in response to the Auditor General by the time that the Committee recommendation is made. However, it is important that responses make it clear where action has been initiated in response to recommendations. Otherwise, they leave the impression that nothing new is being done.

If anything, Table 1 understates the problem of status quo responses. Vaguely worded statements of acceptance in government responses posed a significant challenge in the classification of these responses. The group of responses that have been classified as “status quo” responses represents merely the most obvious cases where commitments to recommended actions were not clearly made.

The second pattern indicated by the survey results, in Table 2, is that government departments are failing to live up to approximately one third of commitments to use the DPR's to report publicly on actions taken and results achieved (including status quo statements implying that the required reporting is already being done). Departments may be doing what the Committee (and frequently also the Auditor General) has recommended, or they may not. Short of a follow-up investigation, however, or access by the Committee to follow-up work of the Auditor General, there is simply no way for Committee members to determine the answer.

Most obviously, these results reinforce the concerns about Committee effectiveness discussed above. If Committee recommendations do not at least provoke clear responses, with explanations and timely reporting of results, then Committee members and the public have reason to wonder what is being accomplished.

Where a government is not prepared to accept a Committee recommendation, we urge that the recommendation be clearly rejected. There may be valid reasons for a government to reject a Committee's recommendation, including the element we frequently include that calls for the public reporting of results. Our central requirement, in such cases, is that the rejection be clearly stated and accompanied by valid reasons, including the presentation of better approaches where these are available. Such responses can provide useful information to Parliament and the public, and contribute to the broad process of accountability that is our ultimate reference point.

The results of the review presented above need to be treated as estimates rather than definitive facts. The substantial size of the sample and the nature of the evidence detailed in Appendix II strongly suggests, however, that the overall direction of the findings is reliable. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that there is widespread room for improvement in the clarity and completeness of government responses to recommendations of this Committee.

## **NEXT STEPS: ESTABLISHING SYSTEMATIC FOLLOW-UP**

The findings outlined above should not detract from the fact, apparent in the content of many government responses, that the federal government does take very seriously its responsibility to parliamentary committees by preparing detailed responses to report recommendations. However, the consistency, quality and degree of comprehensiveness in the responses vary considerably. There is clearly a need for the Committee to strengthen its capacity to ensure that all government responses fully address the substance of its recommendations and result in action. Without improvement, the full potential value to citizens of the work that is done on their behalf by this Committee and Parliament is not being obtained.

Strengthening the relationship between government and this Committee can provide an essential basis for stronger accountability, and a remedy for many of the specific problems documented in this report. This concluding section of our report outlines the steps that the Committee is taking to initiate this kind of change.

In particular, the episodic character of communication between this Committee and government, consisting of individual reports and recommendations from the Committee, followed by one-time responses from the government, needs to be addressed. While there is room for improvements to the key events — individual recommendations, individual responses, and changes to individual performance reports — Committee members believe that a far more powerful basis for progress can come from better communications about these events, and a more systematic approach to holding the government accountable for its actions.

This approach could provide a means of addressing questions that government officials may have about the central intent of recommendations, and questions that Committee members frequently have about the precise meaning of government responses and the nature of the actions, if any, that are being initiated specifically in response to Committee recommendations. It could also foster discussions about practical issues involved in the implementation of recommendations and, where necessary, alternative approaches that would satisfy the Committee's intent.

As well, strengthened communication between the Committee and government could provide the Committee with a means to obtain information about the results that are being achieved by departmental actions, where information supplementing departmental performance reports is needed. Finally, more extensive communication could provide an information base to support formal follow-up meetings between government officials and the Committee, where these are needed to address issues that remain unresolved through more informal means.

Traditionally, the volume of issues generated by the reports of the Auditor General has led to chronic congestion of the Committee schedule, and severely limited time for follow-up activities related to earlier recommendations. However, the work process outlined below relies upon the use of Committee staff working under the direction of the Committee Chairperson and Steering Committee to expedite the more routine phases, as well as to identify critical issues that may require attention by the Committee as a whole. Among its other advantages, this approach should contribute to efficiency.

The relationship that the PAC is seeking to establish with the government starts with improvements to existing actions: Committee reports and recommendations and formal government responses. Building on this, a newly established phase of staff level work is focussing on the systematic review of government responses, the provision of assessments to the Committee and Committee follow-up communications to the government. Depending on the results achieved at this stage, further steps involving

committee follow-up meetings and/or coordination with the Auditor General may also be taken. In sequence, the key events of the process are as follows:

- A. Reports and Recommendations: As now, the Committee will issue these periodically, normally in response to reports of the Auditor General. Responses treating each Committee recommendation separately, and clearly addressing each element of composite recommendations, will be sought as a matter of routine practice.
  
- B. Government Responses: As now, Committee reports will normally request a written government response to recommendations within the 120 days specified in s. 109 the Standing Orders of the House of Commons.
  
- C. Letters of Acknowledgement/Clarification: When a government response is received, it will reviewed by staff (who may consult departmental officials and officials of the Office of the Auditor General concerning its contents), and circulated to Committee members with staff comments. A letter of acknowledgement will be sent to the originator of the response. As required, the letter will include requests for a government letter clarifying the response, or providing information required so that all elements of all Committee recommendations will have been addressed. This step was initiated during the summer of 2007, with a review of Government Responses to recent PAC recommendations, and follow-up letters to eight government departments.
  
- D. Government Letters of Response: Where the Committee has requested clarification of a government response or supplementary information, the government letter of response will be reviewed by Committee staff, who will provide periodic status reports to the Steering Committee of the PAC. The Steering Committee may direct further correspondence concerning issues that have not been addressed, or schedule follow-up meetings of the Committee, requesting the appearance of the minister responsible and/or departmental officials. This step has recently been implemented, with respect to government letters responding to the PAC letters sent during the summer.
  
- E. Communication With Other Committees: Letters with follow-up questions sent to the government, along with government answers, will be shared with appropriate House of Commons committees. In addition to assisting these committees, we believe that this practice will foster reciprocal sharing that could enhance the work of this Committee.

- F. Follow-Up Meetings: Depending on the nature of the issues requiring follow-up attention, the Committee may devote a short period at the beginning of any meeting to discussions with any relevant person.
- G. Annual Follow-Up: The PAC will now be reviewing systematically and on an annual basis actions taken in response to recommendations and results obtained. Where meetings with departmental officials or the minister responsible are required for this purpose, the Committee schedule will provide for them in the early fall of each year. This review will be informed by two status reports prepared by Committee staff during the summer of each year, and presented to the Committee at the beginning of the fall session:
- i. A status report on recommendations made in the current Parliament. This will consist of a compilation of recommendations made in the current Parliament, and government responses with staff comments, along with a status report on any ensuing exchanges of letters or consultations; and
  - ii. A status report on government action in response to earlier recommendations. This report will assess government action in response to recommendations made during the previous Parliament, and selected recommendations made during earlier Parliaments. This report will be based on departmental performance reports and also rely centrally on information released by the Auditor General in Status Reports (follow-up audits that assess progress in response to earlier Auditor General recommendations).
- H. Involvement of the Auditor General: The Office of the Auditor General of Canada conducts follow-up reviews of its own audits every two to three years to evaluate the government's progress in addressing recommendations.<sup>1</sup> In addition to using these Status Reports in conducting its own follow-up reviews, the Committee may from time to time seek the assistance of the Auditor General in determining and assessing what government departments are doing in response to Committee recommendations, where the steps outlined above have not produced satisfactory results.

---

1 Introduced in 2002, the *Status Report of the Office of the Auditor General of Canada* improved upon the way follow-up reviews of value-for-money are carried out. The Status Report is a more extensive in its way of selecting issues, in determining the scope and depth of the reviews and in the assurance of the audit findings. Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 2002 Status Report, Ottawa, September 2002.

As indicated above, initial steps to implement this process have already been taken. Beginning in August 2007, letters acknowledging Government Responses to Committee reports, and seeking clarification or supplementary information where required, have been forwarded to the government. Answers to many of these letters have already been received. The additional information provided enhances the usefulness of the initial Government Responses, and will contribute to the future effectiveness of the Committee in holding the government accountable.

## **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

The ultimate measure of success for the process outlined in this report would be that it becomes largely unnecessary. Clear and complete government responses do not require follow-up questions, prolonged communication or follow-up meetings. Equally, departmental performance reports that provide clear and complete information about governmental actions and results responding to committee recommendations could preclude the need for follow-up work to find out what governments are doing. Current Treasury Board Secretariat guidance, requiring that committee reports be referenced where information in a Departmental Performance Report relates to recommendations, is a useful beginning here.<sup>2</sup> But there continues to be room for improvement in the usefulness of these reports. We believe that the follow-up process outlined in this report will encourage progress in the clarity and completeness of both government responses and the information subsequently reported about actions. More immediately, it is already providing improved information to support the accountability work of this Committee.

---

2 See Treasury Board DPR guidance:  
[http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rma/dpr3/06-07/guide/guide11\\_e.asp#Toc165955537](http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/rma/dpr3/06-07/guide/guide11_e.asp#Toc165955537)

## **APPENDIX I: STUDY METHODOLOGY**

---

The central objective of the study was to determine the extent to which government responses accept the recommendations of the PAC and provide commitments to the actions recommended. A secondary objective was to estimate the degree to which departments actually carry out the actions to which they are committed, using publicly available information so as to avoid the expense and complexity of detailed follow-up audits of the kind conducted by the Auditor General.

In order to permit the completion of the review on a timely basis, a sample of Committee recommendations was selected. The sample consisted of recommendations requiring that results of recommended departmental actions be reported publicly in the Departmental Performance Report (DPR) of the appropriate government department, and made during the Thirty-seventh and Thirty-Eighth Parliaments. The survey covered two full sessions of the 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament and one full session of the 38<sup>th</sup> Parliament, a period extending from January 31, 2001 to November 29, 2005, just less than four years and ten months.

The scope of the study was limited to recommendations that required the federal government to report its corrective actions in accountability documents such as Reports on Plans and Priorities (RPPs), Departmental Performance Reports (DPRs), and Annual Reports. This restricted the group of government responses to a sample consisting of responses to 110 recommendations found in 34 committee reports. This sample includes a significant number of recommendations, made during a substantial time period which includes several different governments. It thus avoids possible distortions that could occur in a shorter time-period during which a single government held power.

The restriction of the sample to recommendations calling for the public reporting of results in DPR's (or, in some cases, Reports on Plans and Priorities, RPP's) provided a readily accessible basis on which to confirm that action had been taken, or not. It also reflects a consistent theme of Committee recommendations over the years, concerning the need for greater transparency in the workings of government, and more effective use of the DPR's, which are the key public reporting document of government departments. As a result of the special emphasis the Committee has placed on the reporting aspect, a review of compliance with reporting recommendations may shed light specifically on departmental responsiveness to Committee recommendations, as distinct from the Auditor General recommendations which may be similar in other respects.

The selection of a sample of recommendations to survey was also advantageous because the volume of issues considered by the Committee normally results in the development of large numbers of recommendations each year. During the period surveyed, the Standing Committee on Public Accounts tabled a total of 77 committee reports, which incorporated an overall total of 535 written recommendations. Any attempt to

explore the implementation of all recommendations over the multi-year time-period needed to ensure that short-term patterns would not distort results would have resulted in excessive delay in completing this review.

Government responses to each recommendation in the sample were classified on the basis set out on Table 1, immediately below:

**TABLE 1: HOW WE CLASSIFIED GOVERNMENT RESPONSES**

ITEM	CLASSIFICATION	CRITERIA
<b>RESPONSES</b>	<b>Rejected</b>	<u>Key test:</u> Expresses disagreement with major elements of the recommendation. - may explicitly state disagreement, - may provide grounds (e.g. we do not think recommendation is practical), -may state a preferred alternative course of action.
	<b>Status Quo</b>	<u>Key test:</u> Does not commit government to new actions called for in the recommendation. - may rely on vaguely affirmative language instead of clear commitments, - may provide details re what a department is already doing, in lieu of action commitments.
	<b>Accepted</b>	<u>Key test:</u> Makes the major action commitments called for in the recommendation. - may alter recommended action time-frames or other non-central elements.

In order to determine whether reporting requirements set out in each recommendation had been met, the report referenced in the recommendation was reviewed against the criteria set out below (in cases where government responses specified that reporting would be available elsewhere, these alternate sources were also examined).

**TABLE 2: HOW WE CLASSIFIED GOVERNMENT REPORTING**

<b>REPORTING</b>	<b>Confirmation</b>	<p><u>Key test:</u> Does the DPR (or other report) provide all or most of the information requested in the recommendation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-the information may be presented as a response to the recommendation,</li> <li>-the presentation needs to be sufficiently clear to be identifiable as a response,</li> <li>-is the level of detail sufficient to respond to the recommendation?</li> </ul>
	<b>No Confirmation</b>	<p><u>Key test:</u> Report contains little or none of the information requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- report may rely on highly general statements that do not provide enough detail to confirm that a recommendation is being implemented.</li> </ul>
	<b>Not Applicable</b>	<p><u>Key test:</u> Was the recommendation rejected (precluding reporting of results)?</p>

While most of the government responses and relevant sections of performance reports proved easy to classify within the above frameworks, it should be noted that imprecision in the language of many of the responses, including affirmative comments on recommendations that fell short of explicit agreement with their detailed content, posed a continuing challenge. As well, several of the classification boundaries require the exercise of judgement even where the response being classified is reasonably precise, and leave room for discussion about individual classifications. In particular, the boundary between the partial acceptance of a recommendation sufficient to warrant classification as “accepted,” and the less complete, or merely less clear, level of acceptance that would suggest classification as “status quo,” is judgemental. Also, the level and detail of reporting that distinguishes a “confirmation” classification from a “no confirmation” classification is similarly judgemental (although the tests outlined above limit arbitrariness).

The study addressed the “grey area” issue by means of a process of independent classification by two analysts, followed by cross-checking for consistency in the application of the criteria and reconciliation of differences on the basis of joint discussion of the evidence. It is noteworthy that the number of “grey area” classification issues identified was less than 15% of the total. This indicates that the general findings of the study may be accepted with a high level of confidence, even though certain individual classifications may remain problematical.



## APPENDIX II: SURVEY AND REVIEW OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS RECOMMENDATIONS AND GOVERNMENT RESPONSES

---

### TABLES OF FINDINGS

**Table 1: Government Responses to 112 Selected Committee Recommendations**

	<b>Accepted</b>	<b>Status-Quo</b>	<b>Rejected</b>	<b>Total</b>
37th Parliament, 1st Session	35	16	0	51
37th Parliament, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Session	26	8	0	34
38 Parliament, 1st Session	10	9	6	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>71 (64.5%)</b>	<b>33 (30%)</b>	<b>6 (5.5%)</b>	<b>110*</b>

**Table 2: Number of Performance Reports\*\* Confirming  
Government Actions in Response to 112 Selected Recommendations**

	<b>Confirmation</b>	<b>No Confirmation</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>	<b>Total</b>
37th Parliament, 1st Session	32	19	0	51
37th Parliament, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Session	26	8	0	34
38 Parliament, 1st Session	10	9	6	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>68 (61.8%)</b>	<b>36 (32.7%)</b>	<b>6 (5.5%)</b>	<b>110**</b>

\* Plus two non-responses: Report #13, 37-2 (Canadian Space Agency, response due August 8, 2004), and Report #22, 38-1 (Foreign Affairs and International Trade / Passport Canada, response due March 22, 2006). \*\*Or comparable reports such as Plans and Priorities.

## Compilation of Individual Recommendations, Responses and Reporting Assessments.

<b>Standing Committee on Public Accounts, 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 1<sup>st</sup> Session.</b>			
<b>Report #, Department or Agency concerned and date tabled in House of Commons</b>	<b>Recommendation number, action required by Standing Committee on Public Accounts (SCOPA) and Implementation target date</b>	<b>Governmental response corresponding to recommendation</b>	<b>Confirmation of Actions</b>

For the copies of the selected committee reports and their corresponding government responses for the 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament (1<sup>st</sup> Session) please visit the following website: <http://cmte.parl.gc.ca/cmte/CommitteeList.aspx?Lang=1&PARLSES=371&JNT=0&SELID=e24 &COM=228>

<b>Report # 5</b>  <b>Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC)</b>  <b>20/03/2001</b>	<b>Recommendation #1</b> That Human Resources Development Canada disclose, in its annual Performance Report to Parliament, the amount of resources allocated to its internal audit function.	The Government of Canada agrees with this recommendation. HRDC will disclose, as part of its Performance Report to Parliament, the resources utilised by the Internal Audit and Risk Management Service directorate. HRDC will report this information as part of its Performance Report for the period ending March 2002.	<b>Confirmation:</b> Disclosure of resources used (dollar amount expended) in internal audit function found in <a href="#">Departmental performance report 2001-2002</a> and <a href="#">Departmental performance report 2002-2003</a> but not in subsequent Departmental performance reports. Major audit and evaluation activities are currently reported through the annual Departmental Report on Plans and Priorities, and all approved internal audit reports are proactively posted to the departmental website. But no audit and evaluation budgets found.
	<b>Recommendation # 2</b> That Human Resources Development Canada disclose, in its annual Performance Report to Parliament, the number of programs audited and examined by its Internal Audit and Evaluation Committee for that year. It should also provide a summary of the observations and recommendations contained in	The Government of Canada agrees with this recommendation. HRDC did disclose a listing of the HRDC audits of the last two years as part of its Departmental Performance Report (DPR) for the period ending March 2002; this practice will continue. As indicated in the Departmental performance reports, HRDC's	<b>Confirmation:</b> All Departmental performance reports and Reports on Plans and Priorities reviewed contain section listing internal audits and evaluations carried out during the year. Moreover, recent <a href="#">audit reports</a> and <a href="#">evaluation reports</a> posted on departmental websites available for consultation.

	<p>the internal audits together with a summary of the Department's action plans and implementation timetables.</p>	<p>public site lists complete audits, which include an executive summary, as well as departmental action plans. In publishing this information on its Web site, HRDC is able to provide more timely reporting of audit results. This is in keeping with the new Treasury Board Policy on Internal Audit.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 3</b> That Human Resources Development Canada ensure that the advance payments made for its grant and contribution programs are executed in accordance with all the requirements of the <i>Financial Administration Act</i> so that the timing of such payments be in the beneficial interest of its funded programs and thus ensure their success. The Department should report the progress of this initiative in its Performance Report to Parliament, for the period beginning March 31, 2002.</p>	<p>The Government of Canada agrees with this recommendation. To ensure that prudent cash management principles are being addressed, the Treasury Board transfer policy requires sponsors to provide a written request providing a rationale for advance payments along with a cash flow forecast.</p> <p>HRDC has implemented a Quality Assurance (QA) framework comprising of a National Performance Tracking Directorate at National Headquarters, and financial Post Audit officers in the regional offices. All three levels are responsible for conducting reviews that include the treatment of advance payments. HRDC will continue to provide information on the implementation of the QA framework, including compliance with the Treasury</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> "In 2001, the Office of the Auditor General conducted a follow-up audit of the Department's administration of grant and contribution programs. Later that year, the Auditor General reported to Parliament that HRDC has made "good progress towards meeting the major commitments of the action plan" such as "quality assurance measures that provide for ongoing monitoring and ensuring that staff understand the basics of financial control." The report also noted HRDC's compliance with previous recommendations of the Auditor General." Page 48, HRDC Departmental performance report. 2001-2002.</p>

		<p>Board's Advance Payments policy for Grants and Contributions in the Departmental performance reports.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 5</b> That Treasury Board Secretariat consider the option of defining a specific set of circumstances that would allow the conversion of grants into contributions. Treasury Board Secretariat should present the results of its findings in its Performance Report to Parliament, for the period ending March 31, 2002.</p>	<p>The Government of Canada agrees that there should be effective accountability for grants and contributions. The Government of Canada believes that Ministers must continue to be responsible for the selection of the appropriate transfer payment vehicle: grants, contributions or other transfer payments, when a program is designed or amended. There are a number of considerations that go into reaching a decision: the right to audit is one of these. The use of grant funds is not subject to audit. However, all grant payments are subject to verification of the continuing eligibility, entitlement and qualification of a recipient of a grant before payments are made. These elements of eligibility for a grant may be subject to audit.</p> <p>With respect to very large grants, Treasury Board Ministers currently review the funding agreements with recipients of very large grants. Such agreements are required</p>	<p><b>No confirmation:</b> Found no reference in either Treasury Board Secretariat's Departmental performance reports or Reports on plans and priorities regarding the definition of the conversion threshold of grants into contributions. Just a brief paragraph on improvements to the management of transfer payments (page 11 of TBS Departmental performance report 2001-2002)</p>

		<p>to contain accountability provisions, and include the need for audited financial statements to be made available to the Department and ministers. Parliament has approved similar accountability provisions in specific pieces of legislation, such as the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation, which requires the tabling of its annual report in the House of Commons by the Minister of Human Resources Development. That being said, the Government of Canada recognises that there may be a need to review the accountability requirements for very large grants. Therefore, the president of the Treasury Board has asked officials at the Treasury Board Secretariat to address the need for a policy that enshrines principles of appropriate accountability for such grants.</p>	
<p><b>Report # 7</b></p> <p><b>Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS)</b></p> <p><b>29/05/2001</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation 8</b> -That Treasury Board Secretariat regularly review the level of funding allocated to the internal audit function in departments and agencies to ensure that the function maintains its capacity to fulfill requirements set forth in the Policy on Internal Audit. Any identified deficiencies in levels of funding must be reported in</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> The Treasury Board has approved an additional \$7.2 million for 2001-2002 and \$15 million for 2002-2003 to support the internal audit function in departments, and an additional \$6 million for the Centre of Excellence for Internal Audit in the Treasury Board Secretariat over this fiscal year and the next. The departmental allocation was</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> could not identify any explicit reference to any funding review exercise of audit function in departments and agencies. No reporting of funding discrepancies of departmental audit functions.</p>

	<p>Treasury Board Secretariat's annual Performance Report.</p>	<p>based upon an assessment of the business cases submitted by each organization, whereby each was judged on the merits of their plans to implement the Policy on Internal Audit and to demonstrate results.</p> <p>Deputy heads are accountable for establishing an appropriately resourced internal audit function in order to provide sufficient and timely assurance services on all important aspects of their risk management strategies and practices, management control frameworks and practices and information used for decision-making and reporting. Deputy heads are also responsible for monitoring the performance of their departments in respect of the Policy on Internal Audit.</p> <p>The Treasury Board Secretariat is working with the internal audit community to develop a human resource strategy to support departments in their implementation of the Policy on Internal Audit. The evaluation of the policy will be carried out in two phases, the first within two years and the second, within five years of the effective date of the policy. The results of these evaluations will be made available by the Treasury Board Secretariat.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p><b>Recommendation 11</b> - That, following consultation with Treasury Board Secretariat, departments and agencies begin to include relevant evaluation plans in their reports on plans and priorities starting in fiscal year 2002–2003 and begin to include any relevant findings from those evaluations in their performance reports beginning with the reports for the period ending 31 March 2003.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Treasury Board Secretariat is encouraging departments and agencies to post and update their evaluation plans on their web sites. The Centre of Excellence for Evaluation will be requesting these plans and monitoring them on an ongoing basis. Departmental plans for evaluation will also be accessible to Program and Policy Analysts from all branches and sectors in the Treasury Board Secretariat as part of the broader Treasury Board Secretariat approach to active monitoring.</p> <p>The <i>Guidelines for the Preparation of Departmental Performance Reports</i> developed in 2001 by the Treasury Board Secretariat also encourage departments and agencies to integrate relevant evaluation findings in their annual Departmental Performance Reports with suitable references to the accessible evaluation summaries and reports. The review of the Departmental Performance Reports will help determine if there is a need for further guidance with regard to the reporting of evaluation results</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> Subsequent to fiscal 2002-2003, several departments now publish list of program evaluations to be performed or already executed. See <a href="#">Human Resources Skills Development RPP 2004-2005</a>.</p> <p>Also confirmed, relevant findings of audits and program evaluations reported in Departmental performance reports. See <a href="#">Industry Canada Departmental performance report 2002-2003</a>.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p><b>Recommendation 12</b> - That Treasury Board Secretariat instruct all departments and agencies to include a list and synopsis of all internal audits and evaluations completed during the just ended fiscal year in their performance reports, beginning with the reports for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The new policies and standards for internal audit and evaluation are encouraging greater transparency and accessibility to internal audit and evaluation reports. The Treasury Board Secretariat has signalled the importance of this matter through an Information Bulletin from the Deputy Comptroller General to all departments and agencies.</p> <p>Departments and agencies are required to send copies of completed internal audits, evaluations and other reviews to the Treasury Board Secretariat whereby a synopsis is posted on the Treasury Board Secretariat web site. Departments are also being encouraged to post summaries of completed studies on their own web sites. A link to these is created and provided on the TBS web site.</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> audit and evaluation results are reported in Departmental performance reports and in some cases are available on departmental websites. See <a href="#">HRDC Departmental performance report 2002-2003</a> and <a href="#">HRDSC website</a> .</p>
<p><b>Report # 8</b></p> <p><b>Office of the Auditor General of Canada (OAG)</b></p> <p><b>29/05/2001</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 1</b> - That the Office of the Auditor General conduct a thorough review of its methods of assessing its recommendations and observations, including their impact, and rates and timeliness of adoption, and report the results and conclusions in its <i>Performance Report</i> for the</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Office is currently <u>developing a new follow-up audit approach</u> that will provide Parliament with better information on progress made by departments in resolving issues raised in our reports. New follow-up chapters will focus on matters that need additional parliamentary attention. We will</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">Departmental Performance Report 2001-2002</a> discusses new approach at following-up departmental responses to audit recommendations. (See pages 7, 33 and 37 of the report.)</p>

	<p>period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p>continue to monitor the implementation of our recommendations and update our database of recommendations. Work has been done on clarifying the criteria used to assess the progress in implementing our recommendations. The Office will report the results of this work in its 2002 <i>Performance Report</i>.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 2</b> - That the Office of the Auditor General pursue efforts to estimate the money that government operations may have saved, directly or indirectly, as a result of the work and recommendations of the Office, and that it report these instances as examples in its annual <i>Performance Report</i>.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> We fully agree that it is important to estimate savings that may have resulted from the work of the Office. Savings are not a perfect measure of the outcome of the work of the Office because they cannot be directly attributed to us, but they do serve to illustrate one of many effects the legislative auditor's work may have on government operations. Our 2001 <i>Performance Report</i> includes some examples of savings.</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">Departmental Performance Report 2000-2001</a> See Exhibit 8 (page 20), the document contains a discussion on estimated cost saving resulting from the implementation of the recommendations.</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 3</b> - That the Office of the Auditor General of Canada further clarify and strengthen the links between its objectives and planned activities, as stated in its annual <i>Report on Plans and Priorities</i>, and the activities it has completed and the outcomes it has achieved, as reported in its annual</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Office will continue to make every effort to provide clearer links between objectives, activities, and results. Our 2001-02 <i>Report on Plans and Priorities</i> includes a results chain that links our outputs to our outcomes. It also includes targets for selected outcome measures. Future</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">Departmental Performance Report 2000-2001</a> See Exhibit 4 – Results Chain (page 12.) This exhibit explains the links between the OAG's outputs (audits, opinions, information and advice) and the strategic outcomes (It is hoped that such analytical tools will provide program managers and policy-makers with better capacity to evaluate programs performance and improve accountability to</p>

	<p><i>Performance Report.</i></p>	<p>reports on plans and priorities will include additional performance measures. As we continue to implement the new performance framework, and integrate it with our planning and management information systems, information on the outcomes achieved will be easier to document and report in the annual <i>Performance Report</i>. For example, in our 2001 <i>Performance Report</i>, we report our performance against the results chain adopted last year.</p>	<p>Parliament.)</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 4</b> - That, in its annual <i>Performance Report</i>, the Office of the Auditor General begins to show actual hours spent on individual audits compared against budgeted hours.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Office has begun reporting this information. The 2001 <i>Performance Report</i> includes two tables (tables 7 and 8) that compare budgets and actual costs of audits. Table 7 shows budgeted and actual costs of audits completed in 2000–01. Table 8 shows budgeted and actual audit hours spent in each entity audited in 2000–01. It also shows the cost of our work.</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">Departmental Performance Report 2000-2001</a> See Table 8 – Audit Effort by Entity in 2000-01, page 38. (Shows actual hours versus budgeted hours and the cost of the audit).</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 8</b> That senior management of departments and agencies be required to include, in their annual performance reports, signed statements attesting to the comprehensiveness and accuracy of the information provided</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> <i>The government will respond separately to this recommendation in its comprehensive response.</i></p> <p>The Office believes this would be an excellent incentive to increase the reliability, credibility, and quality of the</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">Departmental Performance Report 2000-2001</a> See Financial Statements on page 46, describes the OAG’s management’s responsibility in the preparation of the financial statements and related information in the performance report.</p>

	therein. This requirement should take effect beginning with the annual performance reports for the period ending 31 March 2002.	information in the departmental performance reports. The Office has included such a statement in its 2001 <i>Performance Report</i> .	
<p><b>Report # 9</b></p> <p><b>Canada Customs and Revenue Agency (CCRA) &amp; Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC)</b></p> <p><b>23/10/2001</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 1</b> - That Human Resources Development Canada and the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency explore ways to improve information sharing during insurability rulings and appeals processes, and discuss the results in their performance reports for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government agrees with this recommendation. A joint action plan was developed by Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) and the Canada Custom and Revenue Agency (CCRA) to deal with cases where Employment Insurance (EI) fraud or abuse is suspected and the status of the parties is in doubt. A service agreement was drafted between HRDC and the CCRA, which outlines their respective roles and responsibilities on the handling of such cases.</p> <p>CCRA Rulings has implemented <u>new procedures</u> for dealing with HRDC referrals of suspected EI fraud or abuse. The procedures enhance cooperation between the CCRA and HRDC, and strengthen their coordination and planning activities when dealing with these cases.</p> <p>Additionally, HRDC and the CCRA have retained the services of Consulting and</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CCRA Departmental performance report 2001-2002. p.1- 64-67</a>, and page 129. Attributes its current success in the performance in the Benefits Programs and Other Services business line to strengthened partnerships with provinces, territories and other government departments which results in CCRA administration of additional programs and services using its delivery infrastructure.</p> <p>However, Performance Report does not provide any information on data sharing of insurability rulings.</p> <p><a href="#">HRDC Departmental Performance Report 2001-2002</a> (See pages 43 and 44-45) contains a short section on the department's efforts to protect the integrity of the EI Account by implementing a strategy involving three basic elements: prevention, detection, and deterrence of fraud. The number of investigations and savings to the EI Account are provided.</p> <p>There is a section that contains some mention of HRDC's internal audit and evaluation work on the department's Income Security Programs. (See pages 112-117).</p>

		<p>Audit Canada (CAC) to conduct a review and evaluation of the existing processes between HRDC and the CCRA. CAC will be assisting the CCRA and HRDC in determining whether the rulings and appeals processes carried out within the CCRA on behalf of HRDC are efficient, and where necessary, define perceived problems and the drivers behind the problems by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- reviewing the process involved;</li><li>- identifying central problems;</li><li>- suggesting any procedural changes that could improve the program; and</li><li>- examining other potential solutions to problems and impacts on HRDC and the CCRA.</li></ul> <p>A report is expected shortly and both the CCRA and HRDC will give full consideration to the conclusions drawn from this exercise.</p> <p>The CCRA and HRDC have agreed to discuss the results of these initiatives in their</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p><b>Recommendation # 4</b> - That the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency include a discussion of the human, technological, and financial resources it intends to devote to dealing with employment insurance claims where abuse or fraud is suspected in its <i>Report on Plans and Priorities</i> for fiscal year 2002-2003.</p>	<p>performance reports for the period ending March 31, 2002.</p> <p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government agrees with this recommendation.</p> <p>The CCRA created and classified positions with respect to Complex Case Officers for both Rulings and Appeals. These officers will be strategically placed in all areas across the country.</p> <p>A comprehensive training package on investigative skills has been developed and has been given to most of the Case Officers. Additionally, a training package in evidence gathering developed for Appeals by the Department of Justice has been given to most of the Canada Pension Plan (CPP)/EI appeals officers.</p> <p>HRDC is invited to attend these training sessions in an effort to sensitize its staff to the process. This in turn gives them insight as to the commitment level that the CCRA has towards these types of referrals and potential appeals, as well as providing them with knowledge on how to maximize the effectiveness of</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CCRA Report on Plans and Priorities 2002-2003, page 34.</a> Report only provided a short discussion of efforts to enhance systems and procedures in dealing with EI claims in the department: "We (CCRA) have enhanced existing systems to enable tracking and reporting of EI cases dealing with fraud, and improve information sharing with HRDC." See page 34 of 2002-2003 RPP.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>their referrals.</p> <p>Both HRDC and the CCRA have committed to holding joint meetings and to attend each other's workshops. As previously mentioned, there have already been two national meetings to date, and the collaborative efforts during these meetings have already yielded a number of processes and mechanisms for dealing with cases where fraud and abuse is suspected.</p> <p>During the last few years, CCRA Rulings invested in the development of a system (Case Management System) to manage and track its national rulings inventories. This technology will also be used to track fraud cases. The system will eventually be linked to HRDC in order to facilitate referrals and communication.</p> <p>The Decision Support System is also the result of technological investment made by CCRA Rulings. The system provides statistical information which is used to measure and monitor performance by CCRA's field operations as it relates to rulings, including</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>fraud cases.</p> <p>The CCRA will include a discussion of the human, technological, and financial resources it intends to devote to dealing with EI claims where abuse or fraud is suspected in its <i>Report on Plans and Priorities</i> for the fiscal year 2002-2003.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 5</b> -That the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency consider strengthening the capacity of its CPP/EI rulings and appeals units by making the expertise of its special investigations units available to them in cases involving suspected fraud, and report its progress in its performance reports beginning with the report for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government agrees with this recommendation.</p> <p>Training packages have been developed and delivered in an effort to strengthen the capacity of the CPP/EI rulings and appeals units.</p> <p>The CCRA will report its progress in its performance report beginning with the report for the period ending March 31, 2002.</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CCRA Departmental performance report pp. 62-67</a>. Short discussion on client service performance related to CPP/EI benefits. (See pages 64, 66-69, and 129). "We also processed 73,000 requests for CPP/EI rulings, 81% within agreed-upon timeframes, somewhat below our target of 85% (Fig. 2-2). We are working with Human Resources Development Canada to better link our operations to close this performance gap."</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 6</b> - That Human Resources Development Canada and the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency monitor the performance of all measures, including those outlined in their action plans, to prevent, deter and detect fraud and abuse with regard to Record of</p>	<p><b>Accepted: The Government agrees with this recommendation.</b></p> <p><b>Case officers will be placed strategically across the country by CCRA Rulings and Appeals to deal with cases</b></p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">HRDC Departmental Performance Report 2002-2003</a>. HRDC Report provides no specific reference to Payroll Data Collection.</p> <p><u>No specific mention of record of employment fraud in the <a href="#">CCRA Departmental performance report</a>.</u></p>

	<p><b>Employment forms</b>, and report the results to Parliament in their performance reports beginning with the reports for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p><b>for which HRDC suspects fraud or abuse.</b></p> <p><b>CCRA Rulings will monitor the performance of these officers on a regular basis via their Case Management and Decision Support Systems, as well as receive regular updates on files that they are currently working. Furthermore, HRDC and the CCRA have undertaken to do joint monitoring of selected files involving fraud or abuse.</b></p> <p>HRDC will provide figures in the departmental performance report on the number of major investigations it undertakes in the 2001-2002 reporting period, as these investigations typically involve abuse of the record of employment. In addition to this indicator that identifies their detection efforts, HRDC will report on the number of employer-information sessions conducted in 2001-2002, as these are interventions that promote awareness of information on their detection programs and provide an indication of their prevention and deterrence efforts.</p> <p>The CCRA and HRDC will report the results to Parliament</p>	
--	---	--	--

		<p>in their respective performance reports beginning with the reports for the period ending March 31, 2002.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 7</b> - That Human Resources Development Canada make specific reference to the impact of its new payroll information system in reducing fraud and abuse under the EI Program commencing with its <i>Performance Report</i> for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government agrees with this recommendation. In order to maximize the use of our current system, HRDC is exploring the possibility of automating the required payroll data collection for all its EI Programs.</p> <p>The automation will provide a timely update of earnings information and would ultimately reduce fraud and abuse.</p> <p>In the interim, the current Automated Earnings Reporting System (AERS) will continue to exchange selected payroll data with HRDC on a regular basis with a limited number of employers. The data obtained from AERS is compared to EI files, which give rise to early detection of unreported earnings. Such early detection prevents large overpayment and penalty situations.</p>	<p><b>No confirmation:</b> <a href="#">HRDC does mention once a pilot project on electronic filing of records of employment (ROE) in 2002-03 DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT.</a> See Section III: HRDC Environment and Performance – Departmental Context and Operating Environment: “We successfully piloted “Appli-Web”, the on-line EI application process, paving the way for national implementation. We also piloted “ROE-Web”, which enabled six major employers to submit 23,000 Records of Employment (ROE) over the Internet for employees who were leaving their jobs. All this was complemented by an improved “Teledec” service that enables EI clients to report on their weekly employment status using an automated telephone process, instead of completing and mailing the traditional “report cards.”” (See page 47 of HRDC 2001-2002 Departmental performance report).</p>

<p><b>Report # 10</b></p> <p><b>Health Canada (HC)</b></p> <p><b>27/11/2001</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 1</b> - That Health Canada inform Parliament of the progress it is making in implementing the recommendations contained in chapter 13 of the 1997 Report and chapter 15 of the 2000 Report of the Auditor General of Canada and in the Committee's 5th Report (36th Parliament, 1st Session) and also this report. This information must make specific reference to progress in implementing each recommendation and be provided annually in Health Canada's performance reports beginning with the report for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p><b>Combined Response: #1: Accepted, #5: Accepted, #9: Status Quo, #11: Status Quo, #12: Status Quo, #15: Status Quo, #16: Status Quo, #19: Status Quo, #23: Status Quo, #24: Status Quo</b></p> <p>The Government of Canada extends its appreciation to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts for its Tenth Report on the October 2000 Report of the Auditor General of Canada (<i>Chapter 15: Health Canada B First Nations Health Follow-up</i>). The Government shares the Standing Committee and the Auditor General's belief that health programs for First Nations and Inuit must be well managed and accountable.</p>	<p><a href="#">Health Canada Departmental performance report 2001-2002 - Section VIII: Executive Summary: Response to the Public Accounts Committee Tenth Report on the Auditor General's Report, October 2000 (First Nation Health: Follow-Up)</a></p> <p><b>No confirmation to Recommendation # 1</b> is found in the Executive Summary, above. Response to the Public Accounts Committee – First Nation's Health Follow-up. (See Appendix B, page 137)</p> <p>"To respond to this Recommendation as well as Recommendations 5, 9, 11, 16, 19, 23 and 24, we will be reporting with a web-based link to Departmental Performance Reports.</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 5</b> - That Health Canada include, in its annual performance report to Parliament, a discussion of the status of the accountability framework for community health programs including the status of reporting requirements that addresses timeliness, completeness, and accuracy. This discussion should also describe actions taken by the Department to correct deficiencies in reporting and in service delivery and should start with the performance report for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p>In its Report, the Committee recognized that Health Canada - First Nations and Inuit Health Branch (FNIH Branch) had made a commitment to phase in the development and implementation of new accountability frameworks for Community Health Programs (CHP)[1] and the Non-Insured Health Benefits Program (NIHB)[2]. The Committee also indicated it would continue to monitor the Department's progress in these areas. To assist Parliament in its</p>	<p>The ongoing need for this special reporting requirement will be reassessed with the Auditor General in three years, after her next audit on First Nations and Inuit health programs. An initial PAC reporting Annex was prepared for the Departmental Performance Report 2001-2002 and full reporting will begin in 2002-2003."</p> <p><b>Confirmation for recommendations 5, 9, 11, 15, 16, and 19</b>, see also Health Canada Departmental performance reports 2002-2003 and subsequent reports until 2005.</p> <p><u>Re recommendation #5:</u> Health Canada 2001-2002 Departmental performance report contains a short discussion of measures taken to improve management accountability for community health programs (see pages 65-66 of Health Canada Departmental performance report).</p> <p><u>Re recommendations # 9 and # 11:</u></p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 9</b> - That Health Canada start specifying the human, financial, and technological resources that it devotes to building the capacity of First Nations and</p>		<p>"Health Canada developed pilot Health Plan demonstration sites that will improve capacity to manage health programs and services; improve capacity to identify community health needs and resources; improve management coordination,</p>

	<p>Inuit communities, both at the departmental and community levels, commencing with its report on plans and priorities for fiscal year 2002-2003.</p>	<p>oversight, Health Canada will supplement its annual Departmental Performance Report with an electronic annex on progress made towards fulfilling the Auditor General's and the Committee's recommendations, beginning with the report for 2001-2002.</p>	<p>integrated health programs and services; improve financial and human resources allocation processes; and improve/enhance programs and services management information and reporting.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation # 11</b> - That Health Canada report the results of its capacity-building efforts in its annual performance report, beginning with the report for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p>Several important milestones were reached in 2001-2002 as Health Canada - FNIH Branch worked to implement its new measures. The Department began to phase in new accountability frameworks for its First Nations and Inuit Health (FNIH) programs. As well, departmental capacity was increased through the creation of the Business Planning and Management Directorate, which serves to implement and support accountability and management measures.</p>	<p>There are eight demonstration projects under way. Among them, three communities have completed the first nine month phase which lays the foundation for the First Nations management structure and assessment of health needs. These communities moved into the second six month phase which focused on the establishment of objectives to meet the identified community health needs and the selection of programs to best support them. Two other communities will soon be ready to move into phase two.</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation # 12</b> - That Health Canada use data collected by the First Nations Health Information System to demonstrate the health outcomes achieved by Community Health Programs and the Non-Insured Health Benefits program. This analysis must appear in Health Canada's performance reports beginning with the report for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p>Milestones for CHP in 2001-2002 included the introduction of new standard agreements and other types of contribution agreements which clarified roles and responsibilities. An electronic system to manage contracts and contributions was implemented nationally. This single management system for contribution agreements will enhance the ability to report, monitor and audit. In March</p>	<p>In addition, a capacity strategy and action plan was developed, which describes ongoing activities to ensure <b>capacity building</b> in First Nations and Inuit (FNI) communities. As part of the capacity action plan, existing strengths and capacity needs with respect to management and administration of funding agreements between Health Canada and FNI communities were identified. Also included in the assessment, is an analysis of capacity with respect to reporting, data collection, interpretation and analysis related to agreement management. A draft Capacity Review was completed and is being analyzed."</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation # 15</b> - That Health Canada include the evaluation plans for community health programs and the Non-Insured Health Benefits program in its report on plans and priorities, beginning with the report for fiscal year 2002-2003.</p>	<p><b><u>Re recommendations # 15, # 16, &amp; # 19:</u></b>          "To respond to the accountability recommendations Health Canada implemented several actions. To address the need for risk based monitoring on accountability documents, the Management Contract and Contribution System (MCCS) was developed and implemented.</p>		
<p><b>Recommendation # 16</b> - That Health Canada list all completed evaluation reports for community health programs and the Non-Insured Health Benefits program in its annual performance reports commencing with the Report for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p>A draft comprehensive Reporting Handbook with financial and audit reporting guidelines was</p>		

	<p><b>Recommendation # 19</b> - That Health Canada include a discussion of its analysis of pharmacists' overrides along with subsequent action taken in response to that analysis in its performance reports beginning with the report for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p>2002, an Intervention Policy was introduced to guide Health Canada-FNIH Branch's actions in communities which have been unable or unwilling to address exceptional or problem situations.</p>	<p>developed for programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The draft is being reviewed by regional staff and will be produced incorporating their feedback.</li> <li>▪ A review of reporting requirements for funding agreements was initiated to rationalize and streamline the reporting demands on FNI communities. Once complete, the program reporting guidelines will be amended.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 23</b> - That Health Canada include, in its report on plans and priorities for 2002-2003, a detailed description of the project it is testing with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan to facilitate the sharing of information between pharmacists and the College under the Non-Insured Health Benefits Program. This description should include: a discussion of the nature of the information being shared; time lines for project implementation; and the human, financial, and technological resources devoted by the Department to this project.</p>	<p>In 2001-2002, the NIHB program also improved its overall accountability and management. In 2001, the NIHB program, with the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) and the Inuit Tapiriiksat Kanatami (ITK), established a framework to gather client consent for the use of personal medical information in claims processing and reimbursement. In 2002-2003, consent will be gathered nationally to permit retrospective and online drug utilization monitoring to be reintroduced in 2003-2004.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A Quality Assurance Review of reporting practices was conducted.</li> </ul> <p>An Intervention Policy was developed to address problem situations under health funding arrangements. A handbook to assist in implementing the policy was approved and distributed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Communications and training on the Intervention Policy is expected to be completed by the fall of 2003.</li> <li>▪ A review of the Intervention Policy will be conducted by April 2005." </li></ul>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 24</b> - That Health Canada discusses the progress of the project being tested with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan, including the outcomes achieved, in its performance report for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p>In 2001, the NIHB program established a results-based management and accountability framework. As benefits are primarily delivered to individuals through a third-party claims administrator and health practitioners, the NIHB program requires an accountability framework which includes auditing of providers. The framework features a risk management initiative, introduced in 2000, to address financial and management</p>	<p>"The PAC recommended that Health Canada immediately upgrade the Point-of-Sale system for pharmacies under the NIHB Program so that the system provides the dates, quantities, and drugs prescribed for a client's last three prescriptions and information on doctors visited. Health Canada, working with partners, enhanced the Point-of-Sale system or Pharmacy Electronic Communication Standard (PECS) and providers have utilized the most current version of the system. The enhanced system standard streamlines claims administration, facilitates efficient coordination of benefits, improves access to patient medication history (including Drug Utilization Review data) and provides interactive communication with other health professionals.</p> <p>Health Canada will continue to conduct regular analysis of pharmacists' overrides of warnings,</p>

		<p>risks, using a more transparent process. The initiative allows the program to better target and manages benefits. The comprehensive audit program is a key component of the risk management activities.</p> <p>The NIHB program management and accountability framework will improve the reporting of outcomes and results achieved by the program. As the framework is further developed and phased in, assessment and evaluation elements will be introduced. The program has undertaken evaluations of specific program components, including the drug benefit management process and the dental benefit review process.</p> <p>Although considerable progress has been made in developing and phasing in new measures to improve its performance, the Government also recognizes that more remains to be done and is committed to undertaking this work.</p> <p>The Government has chosen to respond to the 26 recommendations by grouping information fewer than five topics: Community Health Programs accountability; supporting capacity</p>	<p>conduct audits on providers and continue generating quarterly reports on the number of Drug Utilization Review (DUR) claims submitted, accepted and rejected. From 1999 to the end of 2002-2003, 600 pharmacy/dental/medical supplies and equipment audits were completed. A report will be generated on the pharmacist overrides once the data is finalized.</p> <p>The PAC/OAG recommended that Health Canada seek consent to share information on client use of pharmaceuticals with health care professionals. In September 2002, the NIHB Program implemented the national rollout of the consent initiative and was engaged in communication and community outreach activities at the national, regional and community levels. An extensive communications strategy and materials were prepared to outline the purpose of consent, the options for giving consent and how the information will be used, collected and disclosed. The consent requirement is anticipated to be in place by the fall of 2003. If recipients do not sign the consent form, they will have to pay for the benefit and may complete a reimbursement form which includes consent for the processing of that specific benefit. DUR activities will resume in September 2003. A report on DUR activities will be provided beginning with the 2003-2004 DPR electronic Annex C.</p> <p>The Department is committed to implementing greater measures to improve our management of First Nations and Inuit programs and services. We will continue to report on actions taken on the Public Accounts Committee and Auditor General recommendations in the annual Departmental Performance Report. Our detailed follow-up actions in response to PAC can be found in the electronic Annex C of the DPR: <a href="http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/english/care/estimates/index.htm">http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/english/care/estimates/index.htm</a>."</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>development; measuring performances, outcomes achievement, and managing information; NIHB control and prevention measures; and reporting to Parliament on progress. A general statement for each of the subject areas precedes the detailed responses to each recommendation. This thematic format is consistent with the Committee Report which clusters its observations and recommendations.</p> <p><b><i>Community Health Programs (CHP) Accountability</i></b></p> <p>Health Canada - FNIH Branch's introduction of new standard funding agreements for the delivery of health programs and services coincided with the release of the revised Treasury Board <i>Policy on Transfer Payments</i>, which obliged all federal government departments, including Health Canada, to ensure that agreements comply with the new financial policy. The new standard agreements were one of the first accountability measures to be implemented with First Nations and Inuit communities, as part of a comprehensive Accountability Framework.</p> <p>The new standard agreements</p>	<p><b>Confirmation for recommendation # 12:</b>          "Health Canada worked with Statistics Canada and the National Aboriginal Health Organization (NAHO) to support the First Nations Regional Longitudinal Survey. Health Canada participated in the development of the data sharing agreement to provide health information about on-reserve populations. By the end of 2002-2003, 50 percent of the health data was collected.</p> <p>To support evidence-based decision-making, Health Canada completed program evaluations for the Canada Prenatal Nutrition Program and Aboriginal Head Start for First Nations On-Reserve. The final reports are expected by March 2004. The evaluation function was strengthened by the development of an Evaluation Policy and a Multi-Year Evaluation Plan to improve program planning and decision-making. The Canadian Strategy on HIV/AIDS for First Nations On-Reserve will be completed by August 2003."</p> <p>No confirmation of action for recommendations # 23 &amp; # 24 in 2002-2003 Report on Plans and Priorities.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>streamline 16 agreements into seven. They help clarify the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved, improve risk management, and allow the Department and First Nations and Inuit communities to better reflect accountability for the prudent use of public funds.</p> <p>=</p> <p>The review of all funding agreements and the subsequent adoption of new standardized agreements is just one part of the comprehensive Accountability Framework. Health Canada has already begun the implementation of a departmental Management Control Framework (MCF) for Grants and Contributions which will also serve to strengthen internal and external governance and accountability mechanisms, through improved information systems and risk management. The MCF emphasizes government-wide control objectives that relate to Modern Comptrollership and the Results for Canadian Management Framework. It addresses control practices to provide assurance that grants and contributions are well managed, and aims at streamlining processes across the Department's Branches and Regions. Health Canada - FNIH Branch continues to work</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>closely with First Nations and Inuit communities on all aspects of the Accountability Framework, including the development of its major elements.</p> <p>To support implementation of the MCF relating to reporting, auditing and monitoring aspects of the FNIH accountability framework, Health Canada - FNIH Branch introduced the Management of Contracts and Contributions System (MCCS). MCCS was introduced in all regions of the Health Canada - FNIH Branch in December 2001, with full implementation in April 2002. MCCS will facilitate active monitoring of compliance and performance, results-based management, continuous learning and progress at both community and departmental levels. The system will increase transparency, leading to more effective action should problems with reports and audits arise.</p> <p>Health Canada - FNIH Branch recognizes that exceptional or problem situations under health funding arrangements may arise, and in response to this an Intervention Policy Framework has been developed. When there is an inability due to lack of capacity or an</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>unwillingness/lack of commitment to address a problem situation, Health Canada - FNIH Branch will act to correct the situation, with the appropriate level of intervention required. Intervention may range from assisting the recipients to develop and implement a plan of action to requiring a co-management arrangement to a third party management. Health Canada - FNIH Branch is committed to working closely with communities, and recognizes that this is one of the most important aspects in determining the nature of the problem and in obtaining the communities' perspective and input. The intervention policy helps ensure the protection of health programs and service delivery, and the adherence by communities to the accountability principles of transparency, disclosure and redress. The policy parallels that of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.</p> <p>Health Canada - FNIH Branch pays particular attention to developing its internal administrative capacity, and on supporting First Nation and Inuit authorities in strengthening their capacity to create a basis for accountability, risk-</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>management, and continuous learning. The new Business Planning and Management Directorate oversees ongoing management of funding agreements, staff development, and business planning and reporting.</p> <p>While it is important to ensure that reports are provided by First Nations and Inuit recipients and are consistent with the terms and conditions of funding agreements, Health Canada - FNIH Branch also uses on-site visits along with regular contacts and discussions to ensure permanent efficient and active accountability.</p> <hr/> <p><b>[1]Community Health Programs</b> deliver services in three key areas: primary care, public health and health promotion, and children's programs. Programs are delivered at the community level by Health Canada's First Nations and Inuit Health Branch or by First Nations and Inuit communities through agreement.</p> <p><b>[2]The Non-Insured Health Benefits Program</b> provides to registered Indian and recognized Inuit and Innu a range of medically required</p>	
--	--	--	--

		goods and services that supplement benefits provided through other private or provincial or territorial programs. Benefits include drugs, dental care, vision care, medical supplies and equipment, short term mental health services, and transportation to access medical services.	
<b>Report # 11</b>  <b>Public Service Commission (PSC)</b>  <b>06/12/2001</b>	<b>Recommendation # 1</b> - That the Public Service Commission immediately amend the practices and procedures of the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program to ensure that all regions across Canada have an equal opportunity for recruitment in the federal public service. That the Commission describes these corrective measures and report their progress against expected performance targets in its departmental progress report to Parliament for the year ending 31 March 2002.	<b>Accepted:</b> An increased regional participation in the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program is a key objective. The Government has discussed the issue with the Public Service Commission and agrees with this objective. The Post-Secondary Recruitment Program is a national program that advertises entry-level jobs with a national area of selection. The Public Service Commission has indicated to the Government that it has amended practices and procedures to increase the use of the program. It has redesigned the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program to take full advantage of technology and to increase its visibility. The main elements of the redesign are: continuous year-round campaign (as of January 2002); efforts to increase departmental participation in the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program; efforts to increase the	<b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">PSC Departmental performance report 2001-2002, p.29</a> . Short discussion on the areas of selection and increased access to public service jobs, where PSC ensures that candidates participating in the Post Secondary Recruitment (PSR) in all regions of Canada have equal opportunity in recruitment in the federal public service (p. 29). Discussion on performance of PSR mostly limited to some descriptive statistics on the number of applications received per year, on number of days for processing applications, etc.

		<p>number of jobs made available in the regions; and, better co-ordination of federal presence on campuses across the country. According to the Public Service Commission, the number of Post-Secondary Recruitment Program appointments has almost doubled over the past five years (from 339 in 1995-96 to 656 in 2001). The Commission expects this trend to continue in the future years as retirement-ready public servants leave their organizations.</p> <p>Through its regional offices, the Public Service Commission is engaging the Federal Regional Councils and regionally-based departments and agencies such as, Western Economic Diversification and the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and others, in order to raise awareness of the program and increase its use. An inventory of pre-qualified candidates was established in November 2001, and was made available to departments and agencies across the country.</p> <p>Other enhancements that the Public Service Commission reports as contributing to the use of the program include: links to web sites of 28 universities across the country, an electronic referral system, on-line application and</p>	
--	--	---	--

		electronic test corrections, information kits for managers, and a 24-hour web access to applicants and managers.	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 2</b> - That the Public Service Commission, the Secretariat of the Treasury Board of Canada and departments engage in a dialogue to determine their respective roles and responsibilities regarding human resource planning and management in the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program. Once the roles and responsibilities are clearly established and the respective priorities are developed regarding the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program, that the Commission provide a statement describing specific responsibilities and priorities in its performance report to Parliament beginning with the report for the year ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> Through the Task Force on Modernizing Human Resources Management in the Public Service, the Government is currently re-examining how human resources management is governed. The President of the Treasury Board is the Minister responsible for this initiative, and is expected to table a proposal for legislative changes later this year. Once the proposal is approved, the roles and responsibilities for human resources planning of the Public Service Commission, the Treasury Board Secretariat, and departments and agencies will be determined. Roles and responsibilities in the management of the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program flow from the roles and responsibilities of the key players in the overall management of human resources.</p> <p>The Public Service Commission contributes to better human resources planning of departments and agencies by providing demographic and forecast data about their major occupational groups, including employment equity representation data. The Public</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">PSC Departmental performance report 2001-2002, p. 32.</a> Recognition of the importance and role of Human Resource Planning and how PSC assists departments in that area but nothing specific to Post Secondary Recruitment Program. See pages 8, 9, 17, 28, 32 and 44.</p>

		<p>Service Commission also made available to departments and agencies findings from its recent studies (e.g. survey of new hires to the Public Service and a student opinion survey). Those are helpful in planning of entry-level recruitment needs.</p> <p>Through the joint Centre for Demographic Analysis, the Public Service Commission and the Treasury Board Secretariat are providing departments and agencies with workforce statistics, labour market data and other human resources planning information.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 3</b> - That the Public Service Commission, once having established its roles and responsibilities regarding the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program, build up its human resource capacity. That the Commission describe these measures and report their progress against expected performance targets in its departmental progress report to Parliament beginning with the report for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government <u>agrees</u> with this recommendation, and notes the measures the Public Service Commission has already taken in order to strengthen its human resources capacity. Over the last year, the Commission has upgraded the knowledge and competency base in its own ranks by developing new competency profiles for its staff and by increasing participation in corporate development programs. It also trained personnel and developed tools to help the Public Service Commission's officers become more adept at providing strategic advice and information on recruitment programs. The Government notes that the Public Service Commission has</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">PSC Departmental performance report 2001-2002, p. 8, 19, 21, 33 &amp; 39.</a></p> <p>Some descriptive statistics on Post Secondary Recruitment (PSR) Program performance but no performance targets specified. No mention of capacity building efforts to PSR Program. Pp. 21-22.</p>

		<p>reviewed and updated existing tools and produced new ones such as, the Manager's Handbook on Staffing and Recruitment, Staffing Manual, and Staffing Modules. These manuals provide essential information to human resources professionals and managers on the staffing process, options and recruitment programs, including the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program. Under the Public Service Commission's leadership, some 30 departments and agencies have identified Recruitment Champions. They advocate effective renewal of the Public Service workforce and, in that context, promote the use of the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program. Likewise, there are 35 student ambassadors on campuses promoting the Program.</p> <p>According to the Public Service Commission, program redesign measures are already starting to show good results – the number of participating departments in the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program has increased from 16 to 22, and the number of applications has increased by 33%. With continued efforts in this direction, the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program will contribute more substantively to</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>general recruitment and to the renewal of the Public Service. We recognize that continued and better use of this program is critical for successful renewal of the Public Service workforce in a highly competitive labour market. In line with the guiding principles for modernizing the human resources management in the Public Service, the Government remains committed to the merit principle as a cornerstone of a competent, non-partisan Public Service.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 4</b> - That the Public Service Commission strengthen the content of its accountability documents, notably the Commission's annual report, the report on plans and priorities and the performance reports to Parliament, with respect to human resource management matters, and that these reports contain information about results expected and achieved.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government supports this recommendation. In 2001, the Treasury Board Secretariat developed the Guide to Preparing the 2001 Departmental Performance Report. This should assist departments and agencies in developing improved reports to Parliament. The Public Service Commission reports on having taken several concrete measures to strengthen the content of its accountability documents. For example, its Annual Report to Parliament now provides more information on how well the staffing system is functioning, and how staffing values are adhered to across the Public Service. In its Departmental Performance Report later this fall, the Commission will identify the results and impacts of its</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">PSC Departmental performance report 2001-2002, p. 6.</a></p> <p>Performance report does acknowledge importance of human resource management and provides strategic outcomes but does not outline how Commission intends to achieve these strategic outcomes. Performance information limited to descriptive statistics. Little or no performance targets defined or specified.</p>

		<p>activities in 2001-2002. The information and the analysis in the key accountability documents of the Public Service Commission supported by system-wide surveys on the quality of the appointment process, pre-audit investigations, evaluation of programs and thematic reviews.</p> <p>Since the spring of 2001, the Public Service Commission is asking participating departments and agencies to report electronically on the number of appointed Post-Secondary Recruitment Program candidates. This will make it possible to provide an up-to-date picture of post-secondary recruitment outcomes, including the total number of Post-Secondary Recruitment Program appointments, appointments from designated employment equity groups, and number of recruits per official language group.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 5</b> - That the Public Service Commission applies the results from the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program to develop a database of pre-screened candidates to be made available for referrals in other general recruitment processes. That the database maintains a list of pre-screened candidates for at</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government fully concurs with this recommendation, as does the Public Service Commission. In October 2001, using the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program data, the Commission established an inventory of university graduates and made it available to departments and</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">PSC Departmental performance reports 2001-2002, p.29.</a></p> <p>DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT briefly mentions the development of a general inventory of university candidates and an inventory of pre-assessed candidates to maximize the applications received through PSR. (See page 29).</p>

	<p>least six months before requiring re-registration. That the Public Service Commission describe and report the progress against the expected timetable of implementation in its departmental progress report to Parliament beginning with the report for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p>agencies that may now request referrals via e-mail and select pre-assessed candidates at any time of the year. Departments and agencies may also customize questions for specialized positions, which further enhance the quality of referrals.</p> <p>Consistent with the Committee's recommendation, departments and agencies can use the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program inventory whenever they are ready to staff a position with a recent university graduate. Likewise, candidates interested in Public Service jobs can apply to the inventory at any time. To keep the inventory up-to-date and accurate, the Commission is reminding candidates through e-mail every sixty days, to confirm their continued interest. These new Post-Secondary Recruitment Program features seem to be working well. On February 26, 2002, the inventory contained 4,372 available graduates pre-qualified and interested in Public Service jobs. Speed of processing, ease of access, and more visible information about the Post-Secondary Recruitment Program, makes the program more attractive to departments and agencies and potential recruits. Efforts to support the Post-Secondary</p>	<p>Also mentioned <a href="#">in PSC 2001-2002 Annual Report</a>, page 26.</p>
--	---	---	--

		Recruitment Program through better use of technology and the creation of user-friendly, on-line features will continue to be pursued.	
<b>Report # 14</b>  <b>Canada Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)</b>  <b>19/02/2002</b>	<b>Recommendation # 1</b> - That the Canadian Food Inspection Agency strengthens its program audit function to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of compliance actions. That the Agency prepare an action plan on this initiative together with an implementation timetable and present the results achieved against performance targets in its performance report to Parliament for the period ending 31 March 2003.	<b>Accepted:</b> The audit report noted that a program audit is the chief mechanism that the Agency uses to determine whether inspectors are delivering food inspection programs according to the Agency's standards and that the Agency has had some difficulty integrating the program audit functions; it harmonized them in early 1990. Program audit represents only one of many activities that are in place to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of compliance actions.  To put program audit into perspective, it is important to understand where this activity fits in the overall control framework in place to promote accountability, effectiveness and continuous management and program improvement in the Agency's operations. Key activities in this overall control framework include both internal and external review activities. Internal review activities include those of management oversight of inspectors (Operations Branch), program audit, corporate audit, compliance and enforcement, legal services,	<b>Confirmation:</b> CFIA provides results of compliance actions by type of agricultural commodity or sector in its annual reports and Departmental performance reports. In terms of strengthening the effectiveness of compliance action, the Agency claims to have hired additional veterinarians to support inspection activities. See <a href="#">CFIA Annual Report 2001-02</a> .  See also <a href="#">CFIA Departmental Performance Report 2002-2003 under section 3.1.2 Promoting Compliance</a> .

		<p>etc. External review activities are carried out by such organizations as Health Canada, the Office of the Auditor General, Treasury Board, foreign trading partners, etc.</p> <p>Ultimately this framework contributes to: safe food and labelling practices; protection of the health of animals and control of animal diseases that are transmissible to humans and protection of the plant resource base from regulated pests and diseases.</p> <p>The Agency has recently taken measures to hire new veterinary supervisors in the animal health and meat hygiene areas. These supervisors will undertake program audit functions on a regional basis, providing greater assurance of consistent delivery of inspection programs.</p> <p>The Agency will present the results of compliance actions in its performance report to Parliament for the period ending 31 March 2003.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 2.</b> That the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, in consultation with the Office of the Auditor General of Canada, engage in discussions with its provincial and territorial counterparts to identify and develop a satisfactory method to carry out a proper overall risk assessment of the non-federally</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> In 2000, the Agency modified its enforcement and compliance approach for this sector. The new approach to inspection is based on the overall health and safety provisions regulated under the FDA. The approach is managed by Science Committees of CFIA on which Health Canada</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> DPR 2002-03 contains no references of any initiatives designed to enhance risk assessment in the non-federally registered sector.</p> <p>Same observation in <a href="#">CFIA's 2002-2003 Annual Report</a>; we did not identify any mention of federal-provincial-territorial consultations on executing the proper overall risk assessment of food products in non-federally registered sector.</p>

	<p>registered sector. That the Agency presents the result of these consultations in its performance report to Parliament for the period ending 31 March 2003.</p>	<p>officials participate, which annually examine overall risk in the sector and set out multi-year investigation plans to address these risks.</p> <p>The Agency believes it is making sound progress in improving its capacity to assess and manage overall risk in the non-federally registered sector. It will continue to work with other government departments, provinces and territories to enhance the methodology to carry out overall risk assessment of the non-federally registered sector. Progress will be reported in the performance report to Parliament for the period ended 31 March 2003. The Office of the Auditor General will be kept apprised of progress.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 3.</b> That the Canadian Food Inspection Agency engages in discussions with its provincial and territorial counterparts about their respective roles and responsibilities in managing the non-federally registered sector. That the Agency reports the results of these discussions in its performance report to Parliament for the period ending 31 March 2003.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> Recognizing the shared responsibilities of the federal government and provincial, territorial and municipal governments for food safety and inspection, the Agency works in close cooperation with several federal-provincial-territorial committees and has established a large number of bilateral work sharing agreements with the provincial and territorial governments. Bilateral agreements are in place or are being negotiated with all provinces and the Northwest Territories; five have</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CFIA Annual Report 2002-03</a>. "The Agency also identified intergovernmental cooperation as a priority in its 1997 <i>Corporate Business Plan</i>. On a multilateral basis, federal, provincial, territorial and municipal governments continue to work toward an integrated Canadian food inspection system that is responsive to both consumers and industry. Since 1997, significant progress has been made with respect to federal, provincial and territorial agreements, standards and codes of practice related to food safety. The Agency continues to support these important initiatives." (Page 58 of 2002-03 Annual Report) But could not find any specific reference about F/P/T consultations on the non-federally registered sector.</p>

		<p>been recently updated. These arrangements include a number of bilateral umbrella agreements aimed at coordinating federal, provincial and territorial inspection services and a number of subsidiary agreements covering such areas as food safety, management of shellfish harvesting, dairy inspection, egg and egg product inspection, non-registered food establishment, food recalls, investigation of food-borne illness etc.</p> <p>The CFIA continues to cooperate and consult with the provinces and territories, industry and other stakeholders on issues related to the non-federally registered sector and will continue to participate in national coordinating bodies and in bilateral agreements to ensure that roles and responsibilities continue to be clear and well understood. Progress will be reported in the performance report for the year ended 31 March 2003.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 4.</b> That the Minister of Health table, in Parliament, the Agency's status report from various initiatives related to the implementation of an overall strategic approach pertaining to the management of imported commodities, including the requirements of Bill C-80</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> This recommendation should be addressed to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, rather than the Minister of Health. Furthermore, it should be noted that the <i>Canada Food Safety and Inspection Act</i> (formerly Bill C-80) died on the</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> CFIA's response indicated that the recommendation ought to have been addressed to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Foods, rather than the Minister of Health. There is a short section on "import controls" in section <a href="#">3.3.1 "Control the entry and domestic spread of regulated animal diseases" of Departmental performance report 2002-2003.</a></p>

	<p>should it become law. That this progress report be tabled no later than 31 March 2003.</p>	<p>Order Paper when the election was called in the Fall of 2000. It has not yet been re-introduced. The Agency prepared a discussion paper and draft import policy (October 2000) to provide a strategic direction to enhance and guide the integration of the various import control systems within the CFIA. As progress is being made in all areas of import controls, an Agency-wide import policy and strategy guide programs, such as developing comprehensive import control programming. Areas of particular attention include managing the border; managing the tools CFIA uses to mitigate the risks presented by import trade flows; managing information and technology; managing the introduction of importer quality management systems; taking full advantage of Canada's international rights while respecting its obligations; and managing the continuum of CFIA inspection control activities. The CFIA works closely with the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency on import issues. In the post-September 11 environment, attention has focused on border and inspection issues. The 2001 Budget provided the CFIA with additional resources to respond</p>	
--	---	---	--

		<p>to public security issues, such as enhanced border controls, increased surveillance and detection activities and upgraded science and laboratory capacity.</p> <p>The development of an integrated CFIA response on these issues will contribute to positioning the Agency for the future and enhance our ability to anticipate and respond to the changes underway in Canada and internationally.</p> <p>Progress on this front will be reported in the performance report for the year ended 31 March 2003.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 5.</b> That the Canadian Food Inspection Agency provide in its annual report, its report on plans and priorities as well as its performance reports to Parliament, information on human resource management matters and challenges facing the Agency, particularly on current and future human resource requirements by occupational groups, the progress of various recruitment and training initiatives together with information on results expected and achieved. That the Agency commences reporting this information in its performance report for the period ending 31 March 2003.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Agency will continue to report on Human Resource Management initiatives, outputs and results in the CFIA using a balanced approach that reflects both our human resource achievements as well as those areas requiring development. The Agency has developed the capacity to forecast and assess its recruitment and retention needs. In January 2001, CFIA completed a statistical study of all occupational groups which resulted in the identification of occupational groups facing the greatest recruitment and retention challenges. Targeted recruitment and retention strategies are being developed to address the specific issues of</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CFIA Departmental performance report 2002-03</a> See under “<a href="#">Section 3.6 Human Resources Management.</a>” This section contains detailed discussion of human resources inputs, activities, and outputs required to realize CFIA’s human resources challenges: the maintenance of a qualified workforce, the hiring and retention of skilled employees, and the building of a supportive work environment.</p>

		<p>these critical groups.</p> <p>The CFIA is in the second year of its Officer Training Program, (OTP), an innovative, 12-month training program targeted at new and recent graduates who are interested in exploring challenging and rewarding positions with the CFIA. The program consists of up to three work placements within the various business lines and geographic locations of the Agency. Recruits also participate in formal learning assignments and are assigned a mentor. This program has been very successful in contributing to recruitment objectives.</p> <p>The Agency continues to make improvements towards the establishment of an Agency-wide approach to the collection of recruitment and training information so that complete training information required for business analysis and reporting purposes is captured.</p> <p>As well, our Human Resource Performance Measurement Framework is helping the Agency in identifying what needs to be measured as well as a consistent approach to collect/ analyze data and to produce reports.</p> <p>Progress will be reported in performance reports for the year ended 31 March 2003.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p><b>Recommendation # 6.</b> That the Canadian Food Inspection Agency develops a more formal strategy for managing the implementation of the Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point approach. That the Agency presents a progress report on its implementation in its performance report to Parliament for the period ending 31 March 2003.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> The Agency considers that it has an effective strategy for managing the implementation of the Hazard Analysis Critical Control Approach. The Agency's HACCP strategy involves a mix of mandatory and voluntary initiatives to the application of HACCP based control systems by the industry.</p> <p>The CFIA presently has two programs that incorporate HACCP systems into their program requirements. These are the Quality Management Program (QMP) for the fish and seafood sector and the Food Safety Enhancement Program (FSEP) which applies registered meat, poultry, processed products, dairy, honey, maple and egg establishments. In addition, the CFIA has also been actively involved with industry-led HACCP-based initiatives including the Canadian Food Safety Adaptation Program and the On-Farm Food Safety Program.</p> <p>In support of the Agriculture Policy Framework (APF), the Agency is working with Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, provincial governments, and industry associations to develop and implement a recognition process for industry-developed On-Farm</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> See Section 3.2.2. ("<i>Industry adoption of science-based risk management practices</i>") of <a href="#">CFIA Departmental performance report for 2002-2003</a>: "The Agency is actively promoting the use of Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) principles in the meat, fish, processed products, egg, dairy and honey industries and on farms. These science-based principles are internationally recognized as the best means to prevent food safety problems, be they biological, physical or chemical. In HACCP-based systems, the CFIA and industry's primary goal is to identify and control hazards in the food production process and to prevent problems by monitoring these "critical points." Currently, HACCP-based programs are voluntary except for fish-HACCP is mandatory for federally registered fish processing establishments. In addition, the Meat Hygiene program is currently in transition to a mandatory HACCP-based audit approach."</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Food Safety Programs (OFFSPs).  Approximately ten national associations have expressed their intention to forward their applications for OFFSP's for technical review by CFIA by the end of 2002.  Progress will be reported in the performance report for the year ended 31March 2003.</p>	
<p><b>Report # 17</b>   <b>Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) &amp; Health Canada (HC)</b>   <b>12/03/2002</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 2</b> - That the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission includes in its annual performance report the number of technical and scientific vacancies at each year end and the length of time each position has been vacant.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> The Government supports this recommendation. The Government acknowledges the Committee's concerns with respect to the number of vacant technical and scientific positions at the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) and the length of time some of these positions have been vacant, and agrees that in order for the CNSC to carry out its mandate as expeditiously as possible, the CNSC needs to maintain appropriate staffing levels.  The Government's intention with respect to reporting to Parliament is to provide parliamentarians and the public with relevant, accurate, consolidated and timely information. Departments and agencies, including those with significant regulatory responsibilities, are required to provide departmental Reports on Plans and Priorities (RPP), tabled in Parliament each spring, and Departmental</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CNSC Departmental performance report, 2001-2002, p. 9.</a> No reference to number or duration of vacancies in scientific and technical staff. The 2002-2003 Departmental performance report provided a general overview of the CNSC's Workforce Sustainability Strategy (WSS).  From CNSC <a href="#">2002-2003 Departmental Performance Report,</a></p>

		<p>Performance Reports (DPR), tabled each fall. Any significant issues or pressures relative to health and safety and other regulatory programs are contained in these departmental reports.</p> <p>The CNSC will, in response to the Committee's recommendation, include information on the staffing environment in the DPR, beginning with the report for the period ending March 31, 2003.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 11</b> - That Health Canada undertakes all the necessary measures to fill outstanding vacancies in its regulatory and surveillance programs for related biologics and report the progress of these initiatives in its annual Performance Report to Parliament for the period ending 31 March 2003.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> The Government supports this recommendation. Health Canada staffing levels and recruitment needs for regulatory and surveillance programs, including those for biologics, are constantly re-evaluated so that new initiatives may be strategically targeted. Human resource strategies have been or are being developed by Branches and Directorates and designed to respond to their particular needs. In recent years, special teams have been established and charged with addressing human resource issues and conducting recruitment and staffing activities.</p> <p>Two major staffing initiatives within Health Products and Food Branch (HPFB) have been conducted to find highly specialized scientists and physicians to assess and</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">Health Canada Departmental performance report 2001-2002 - Section VIII: Executive Summary: Response to the Public Accounts Committee Tenth Report on the Auditor General's Report, October 2000 (First Nation Health: Follow-Up)</a></p> <p>Several organizational changes have taken place over the past three years in an effort to strengthen both the regulation and surveillance of biological products within the Health Products and Food Branch (HPFB).</p> <p>Throughout the past year, the recently created Directorates stemming from these organizational changes (Biologics and Genetic Therapies Directorate (BGTD), Marketed Health Products Directorate (MHPD), and Inspectorate) have concentrated their efforts on their reorganization, growth and staffing of vacancies in their respective regulatory and surveillance programs for related biologics.</p> <p>HPFB has successfully undertaken several measures to fill these vacancies.</p> <p>The Human Resources Initiative, jointly led by the BGTD, MHPD and HPFB Inspectorate, was concluded during this reporting period. Its objective was to accelerate internal staffing of</p>

		<p>regulate therapeutic products. This initiative resulted in the identification of dozens of qualified candidates, some of which have already been hired. Health Canada publishes a Report on Plans and Priorities with the Government Expenditure Plan and Main Estimates presented to Parliament each year. This Report outlines the priorities of the health and safety regulatory programs within Health Canada. The annual Performance Report provides the Department's accomplishments.</p>	<p>positions and recruitment of highly qualified staff needed to fill numerous vacancies in a timely fashion, to be able to effectively deliver programs. Much effort was invested in several important generic competitions which were held jointly amongst the Directorates in question. These large internal and external competitions served to qualify approximately 30 Biomedical Evaluators and 40 Medical Officers. During this period, 11 Biomedical Evaluators and 12 Medical Officers were recruited and appointed. Most of the remaining qualified candidates are available to staff future vacancies. Other internal and external competitions were launched to address the vacancies, which resulted in the appointment of over 25 qualified staff. Where it was considered to be in the best interests of the Public Service, some internal and external appointments were made without competition. For positions deemed as shortage areas, some 15 qualified candidates were recruited from job fairs, Health Canada's Science and Technology inventory and other sources. Approximately 10 students, having worked within the Department through a student program, were recruited upon completion of their studies through the student bridging mechanisms. In addition, other competitions to address the vacancies were initiated during this period. Completion is anticipated shortly. During fiscal year 2002-2003, BGTD has grown from 180 to 217 filled positions. BGTD has launched several of their own competitive processes and staffed some of their vacancies from them. Specific focus continues to be paid to staffing to address attrition and internal movement, as well as gaps in expertise.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>MHPD's staffing priorities, in the short-term, will continue to concentrate on the recruitment and appointment of Medical Officers and of other specialized staff for shortage areas. The Directorate has made the greatest use of the generic joint competitions for Medical Officers and Biomedical Evaluators. Staff within the Marketed Biologicals and Biotechnology Products Division of MHPD has increased from approximately 23 to 25.</p> <p>The HPFB Inspectorate has 14 positions assigned to biologics, across its National Coordination Centre and Regional Operational Centres. All but two of these positions are filled in a permanent capacity. Competitions or other projects are under way, or are soon to be initiated, to permanently address these vacancies.</p>
<b>Report # 20</b>  <b>Department of National Defence (DND)</b>  <b>07/05/2002</b>	<b>Recommendation # 5</b> - That the Department of National Defence include a summary of the results of all internal audits of its management information systems in its annual performance reports, beginning with its Performance Report for the period ending 31 March 2003.	<b>Accepted:</b> Commencing the year ending March 31, 2003, key internal audits will be identified in National Defence's Departmental Performance Report. Summaries as well as full reports will be available on the Internet at <a href="http://www.forces.ca/crs/home/reports">www.forces.ca/crs/home/reports</a> .	<b>Confirmation:</b> Summary of the results of the internal audits on management information systems available on the internet at <a href="http://www.forces.ca/crs/home/reports">www.forces.ca/crs/home/reports</a>
	<b>Recommendation # 6</b> - That the Department of National Defence set readiness and maintenance standards for its most important equipment and report performance against those standards in its annual performance report to the House of Commons. This reporting must begin with the Performance Report for the period ending 31 March 2003 and must include a	<b>Accepted:</b> The Department of National Defence is in the process of integrating a number of separate readiness evaluation and reporting systems for the Canadian Forces. A framework has been established based on the annual Report on Plans and Priorities and the Defence Plan. Work is now focused on establishing the procedures and reporting mechanisms to bring a	<b>No Confirmation:</b> Some information on ongoing initiatives related to material management ( <a href="http://www.vcds.forces.gc.ca/dgsp/00native/rep-pub/ddm/dpr/dpr2004/j-matMang_e.asp">http://www.vcds.forces.gc.ca/dgsp/00native/rep-pub/ddm/dpr/dpr2004/j-matMang_e.asp</a> And : <a href="http://www.vcds.forces.gc.ca/dgsp/pubs/rep-pub/ddm/dpr2004/matMang_e.asp">http://www.vcds.forces.gc.ca/dgsp/pubs/rep-pub/ddm/dpr2004/matMang_e.asp</a> ) but found no specific information on readiness and maintenance standards:

	<p>discussion of steps taken in response to performance that has failed to meet expectations.</p>	<p>Canadian Forces-wide readiness and reporting system into effect. This system will set clear and standardized measures of operational readiness and maintenance for major in-service equipment. The Department's ability to track in a holistic fashion equipment performance against readiness and maintenance standards will be facilitated by the implementation of the Materiel Acquisition and Support Information System (MASIS). Full implementation of MASIS is expected by 2006.</p> <p>Much of the developmental work that is underway in relation to Readiness Reporting can be linked to the Department's Performance Measurement Framework that is also under development. This system is not yet fully operational but is evolving, and its progress will be reflected in future annual performance reports.</p> <p>The Canadian Forces complete annual readiness evaluations on those units that need to be evaluated based on operational requirements. Some information on readiness reporting is already incorporated in the annual Departmental Performance Report and the Chief of the Defence Staff Annual Report on the Canadian Forces. The Department of National Defence</p>	
--	---	---	--

		<p>is examining how to enhance readiness reporting in these reports and will aim to implement changes beginning with the period ending March 31, 2003, with the intent of enabling progressively more detailed reporting thereafter.</p>	
<p><b>Report # 21</b> <b>Transport Canada</b> <b>(TC)</b> <b>07/05/2002</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 7</b> - That following resumption of lease renegotiations and signing of renegotiated leases, Transport Canada provide, in its annual performance report, details of the new leases, indicating where they differ from the previous lease, explaining the reasons for any rental increase or decrease with reference to fair market value, showing how changes affect the government's and the Department's cumulative cash flow, and demonstrating how each renegotiated lease is</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The recommendation of the Committee is consistent with the view of Transport Canada. The National Airports Rent Policy Review is examining whether rent policies achieve an appropriate level of fairness, equity and consistency for all affected parties (i.e., airport authorities, carriers, and taxpayers) as well as the financial impact of any proposed change in rent policy on rent revenues accruing to the government. In this context,</p>	<p><b>No confirmation:</b> <a href="#">Transport Canada Departmental performance report 2002-2003, Table K.</a></p> <p>Very little performance information or analysis about leases found in performance report documentation.</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 8</b> - That the Department of National Defence measure, assesses, and report the outcomes of its efforts to improve the management of its in-service equipment to the House of Commons in its annual performance reports. This reporting must make specific reference to each of the actions undertaken for this purpose and must commence with its Performance Report for the Period ending 31 March 2003.</p>	<p><b>Accepted: The Government is committed to providing Parliament and all Canadians with clear, meaningful and timely information on the effectiveness of its programs and policies. In keeping with this commitment, the Department of National Defence will develop a summary assessment of the results of efforts to improve the management of in-service equipment and will include these assessment in future annual reports.</b></p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> the <a href="#">DND Department Performance Report 2002-2003. See Part V, Consolidated Reporting</a> does contain some information on Alternative Service Delivery Initiatives, Procurement and Contracting, Material Management, Sustainable Development Strategy and Status of Fuel Storage Tanks on DND Lands. <b>But found no summary assessment on efforts to improve the management of in-service equipment.</b></p>

	equitable, uniform, consistent, and fair with regard to the other leases.	<p>Cabinet will have approved the parameters of all key adjustments to airport leases prior to such activities taking place.</p> <p>The Department will report on the nature and reasoning behind major differences resulting from any existing or modified airport authority rent formulae. In addition to reporting to Cabinet, Transport Canada will provide relevant information in the Departmental Performance Report (DPR), the Report on Plans and Priorities, and/or the Annual Report, as appropriate.</p>	
	<b>Recommendation # 10</b> - That Transport Canada informs Parliament of its plans to implement recommendations contained in the Auditor General's Report in its annual report on plans and priorities, and of the outcomes that have been achieved in relation to these plans in its annual performance report. This process should begin with the Departments' performance report for 2003-04.	<b>Status-Quo:</b> Transport Canada currently reports progress against the OAG Report recommendations directly to the OAG on an annual basis. The OAG then reports this progress to Parliament. Consistent with our response to Recommendations 5, 6, 7 and 8 above, the Department proposes to include relevant information on current and planned initiatives related to airport transfers and any lease renegotiations in the appropriate reporting document.	<b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">Transport Canada Departmental performance report 2003-2004, 2.0 Summary of Departmental Performance.</a> No reference found about Auditor General's recommendations. But there are certain sections in the performance report that discuss the linking of Transport Canada's strategic outcomes to Government priorities. Also in Annex 5.5 there is a table describing the crosswalk between strategic outcomes and business lines. No discussions on performance targets.
<b>Report # 22</b>  <b>Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO)</b>	<b>Recommendation # 2</b> - That the Department of Fisheries and Oceans begin to provide Parliament with accurate, reliable information on the plans and priorities of its fleet, and on its	<b>Accepted:</b> Again the Government agrees with the recommendation but providing this information for years prior to 2002 is problematic as information is limited and	<b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">DFO Departmental performance report 2002-2003, Section 3.</a> Some discussion on the management of DFO's fleet assets. But further information only available on request. Performance information includes chain results which link inputs to

<p><b>22/05/2002</b></p>	<p>performance, in all of its accountability documents beginning with its performance report for the period ending 31 March 2002. In particular, performance reports must include a frank discussion of gaps in service that have occurred, why they have occurred, and the actions planned or underway to close them.</p>	<p>incomplete. The Department will however, provide information highlighting fleet performance starting with the Departmental Performance Report (DPR) for the period ending March 31, 2003. The DPR for the period ending March 31, 2002 has set the stage for this by including a specific section devoted to the Fleet and noting the Department's concurrence with the recommendations of the committee. Subsequent accountability documents (Reports on Plans and Priorities (RPPs) and DPRs) will also provide information on fleet plans and priorities and performance. Fleet plans and priorities will be highlighted in the Report on Plans and Priorities for 2003-2004. The Departmental Performance Report for the period ending March 31, 2003, will begin to discuss service gaps in two components: first, the gap in program service requiring fleet participation and secondly the gap in service due to fleet capacity.</p>	<p>activities to output and outcomes (but without an explanation to justify the linkage, nor are performance targets specified). Most performance information is in the form of descriptive statistics.</p> <p>In her December 2002 report, the Auditor General of Canada made recommendations about how the Department could improve performance in these areas. The Standing Committee on Public Accounts considered these and issued its own recommendations. The Department is currently working on a response to the Committee's recommendations, which will be tabled in Parliament in the fall of 2003.</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 3</b> - That the Department of Fisheries and Oceans provide, in its performance reports, information on the results achieved by actions taken in response to the observations and</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The government agrees with the recommendation and work has progressed in addressing all the issues raised. With regards to the results achieved to date DFO has, in the areas of:</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">DFO Departmental performance report 2001-2002, pp. 18-19</a>. Makes specific reference to response to Auditor General's report and Public Accounts Committee's report. Whole section of the Departmental performance report is devoted to management discussion on departmental performance by major themes or</p>

	<p>recommendations contained in Chapter 31 of the December 2000 Report of the Auditor General of Canada. Provision of this information should be specifically linked to the action plan prepared by the Department and should commence with the performance report for the period ending 31 March 2002.</p>	<p>Life Cycle Material Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developed and implemented a technical business management system that includes, national business rules, costing models, technical support planning processes, cost accounting tool and performance management systems</li> <li>• Deployed the Maintenance Management Information System (MIMS) to land-based sites and selected ships</li> <li>• Developed an asset-class management framework and life-cycle material management guidance manual</li> <li>• Developed a service delivery options analysis tool</li> </ul> <p>Multi year Planning Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduced, through Service Accords, 3-5 year Program commitments to Fleet</li> </ul> <p>Long Term Capital Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Department has introduced a more rigorous Capital Planning process of which a "Centre of Expertise" for Fleet capital is now a part</li> <li>• Established a network of clients and Regions in a process that applies a ranking criteria to project priorities</li> <li>• Updated the financial analysis of projects</li> </ul>	<p>business lines: management and protection of fisheries resources, maritime safety, maritime and ocean commerce development, etc. Some of the performance information in the form of descriptive statistics.</p> <p>Performance Reporting in <a href="#">DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORTS 2002-2003</a>. Provides summary information on performance, departmental logic models describing priorities and goals, interrelations between departmental inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes. Some of the performance information in the form of descriptive statistics.</p>
--	---	---	---

		<p>Integrated Management Information Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarified information to be collected and standardized the criteria for its use</li> <li>• With respect to Fleet salary management, introduced consistent and complementary use of related information systems such as the Salary Management Information System (SMIS)/Mari-Time.</li> </ul> <p>Financial Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determined Total Fleet Costs to establish funding requirements, based on validation of 2000/2001 figures</li> <li>• Standardized accounting and reporting practices in HQ and Regions</li> <li>• Established a new funding approach (fixed/variable) for the Fleet where the fixed costs of having a vessel available are A-base funded and the DFO programs have the funds to use the vessel.</li> </ul> <p>Service Accords</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developed a standard Service Agreement framework to be put into place with all clients.</li> </ul> <p>Concept of Operations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated to reflect recent Departmental Management Committee decisions on Operational Control and Fleet</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>finances as well as ongoing Fleet responsibilities and priorities.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Base Fleet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued to rationalize the size of Fleet based on Program demand</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">HR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed a comparative survey of other Canadian commercial/crown corporation fleet collective agreements.</li> <li>• Initiated discussions with Unions to simplify the collective agreements</li> <li>• Recruitment and retention activities (demographic survey completed)</li> <li>• Increased CCG College intake to the present maximum of 42 Cadets</li> <li>• Increased staffing of permanent positions from terms</li> <li>• Introduced Ships Crew Officer Training Program and successfully completed a pilot of same</li> <li>• Developed National Statement of Qualifications for all Officers positions</li> <li>• Begun introducing National Training Standards</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">Fleet Management Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In light of recent</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>departmental decisions, DFO has begun to formally document these and other management improvements for national application</p> <p>Operations Control/Accountability Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Formalized the approach to planning and accountability</li><li>• Provision of stronger HQ functional direction</li><li>• Standardized shore operational organizations and activities; and</li><li>• Begun introducing a zonal approach to program delivery</li></ul> <p><b>The Departmental Performance Report for the period ending March 31, 2002, contains highlights of the Action Plan and future reports will highlight performance improvements and results achieved in the context of the plan.</b></p> <p><b>With regards to implementation of the full Action Plan, contained in the DFO Report, the Audit &amp; Evaluation Group of DFO has been charged with monitoring adherence to that Plan with respect to both doing what was planned as well as efficiencies gained.</b></p>	
--	--	--	--

<p><b>Report # 23</b></p> <p><b>Canada Customs and Revenue Agency (CCRA)</b></p> <p><b>04/06/2002</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 1</b> - That the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency include in its report on plans and priorities a section on relevant international tax treaty issues, incorporating the number of treaties currently under negotiation, detailing the relevant issues and challenges, and, if possible, provide an estimation on the amount of un-assessed non-resident income and that the Agency begin to report for the fiscal year ending 31 March 2003.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Canada Customs and Revenue Agency (CCRA) agreed to begin to report, in part, for the fiscal year 2003-2004, in the manner recommended. The CCRA will undertake reporting on methodologies, tools and strategies used to identify and challenge offshore tax planning arrangements. The CCRA will also undertake to report on the number of treaties that it administers and those under negotiation. For the purpose of this report, the CCRA understands non-resident income to be income earned offshore by residents of Canada, and as such, the CCRA will also report on the tax-at-risk in identified cases involving the use of offshore tax planning arrangements. The CCRA will begin to report in the Corporate Business Plan for the fiscal year 2003-2004.</p> <p>The CCRA's primary role with respect to tax treaties is administrative. The CCRA provides advice to the Department of Finance when problems arise in administering provisions of a treaty or when a proposed tax treaty is under negotiation. Once negotiations are underway, the CCRA works closely with the Department of Finance to ensure that its</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CCRA Departmental performance report 2003-2004, p. 1-31.</a> Requested information on international tax treaties can be found on page 31 of the performance report.</p>
---	---	---	---

		<p>concerns are addressed. It is the responsibility of the Department of Finance to consider entering into negotiations to amend a treaty.</p> <p>The negotiation of tax treaties, as with any negotiation, is a delicate balance of give and take. Reporting on unresolved issues in the context of treaty negotiations is inappropriate and could cause harm to Canada's position at the negotiating table.</p> <p>Finally, identifying and reporting on perceived shortfalls in treaties would inhibit the Government's ability to enforce compliance, protect the integrity of the Canadian tax base and respect confidentiality.</p> <p>Accordingly, we will begin to report, in part, in the Corporate Business Plan for the fiscal period 2003-2004.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 2</b> - That the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency include in its Departmental performance report to Parliament a section on relevant international tax treaty issues, incorporating the number of completed treaty negotiations with a discussion on resolved and outstanding treaty issues that will require further negotiation, and provide the total amount of non-resident income tax collected together with the total un-assessed non-resident income. That the Agency begins to report</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The CCRA agreed to begin to report, in part, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2003, in the manner recommended.</p> <p>The CCRA will undertake reporting on methodologies, tools and strategies used to identify and challenge offshore tax planning arrangements. The CCRA will also undertake to report on the number of treaties that it administers and those under negotiation. As with recommendation No. 1, for the purpose of this report, the CCRA</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CCRA Department Performance Report 2002-2003, P. 1-46.</a> Requested information can be found under "international tax and e-commerce compliance initiatives."</p>

	for the fiscal year ending 31 March 2003.	<p>understands non-resident income to be income earned offshore by residents of Canada, and as such, will also report on the tax-at-risk and amounts reassessed in identified cases involving the use of offshore tax planning arrangements. The CCRA will also report the amount of tax collected from non-residents who earned income in Canada.</p> <p>Finally, as with recommendation No. 1, reporting on unresolved issues in the context of treaty negotiations is inappropriate. For this reason, the Government cannot report on them.</p> <p>Accordingly, the CCRA will begin to report, in part, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2003.</p>	
<p><b>Report # 24</b></p> <p><b>Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) and Public Service Commission (PSC)</b></p> <p><b>04/03/2002</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 9</b> - That the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Public Service Commission strengthen the content of their accountability documents with respect to human resources management matters, particularly in emphasizing more on outputs and outcomes of their human resource management activities, and that these reports contain information about results expected and achieved. That they begin to present the new information content and format beginning with the fiscal year ending 31 March 2003.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government agrees with the Standing Committee on Public Accounts that improved human resources reporting to Parliament is a desired objective. To that end, the Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) and the Public Service Commission (PSC) have strengthened the content of their key accountability documents.</p> <p>The TBS 2002-2003 Report on Plans and Priorities builds on the reporting principles established in the previous year and introduces the notion of strategic outcome as the primary means to present plans and priorities</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">PSC Report on Plans and Priorities 2002-2003, Section III. PSC Departmental performance report 2002-2003, Appendix 1.</a></p> <p>PSC defines broad strategic goals with amounts of funding allocated and outlines actions to be achieved within planning timeframe of 2002-03. PSC performance report compares strategic goals with overall results. Departmental performance reports contain discussions pertaining to the context within which results were achieved and includes section on challenges and planned improvements. Some statistical performance data is included. <a href="#">TBS Report on Plans and Priorities 2002-2003, Section III, p. 11.</a> <a href="#">TBS Departmental performance report 2002-2003, Section II, p. 22.</a></p>

		<p>over the next three years. It also introduces a new, standardized terminology for results-based management and reporting. As well, the Report features links to permanent websites to provide additional and more detailed program information.</p> <p>Future TBS Departmental Performance Reports will focus on outcomes and associated performance on previous commitments. It will set performance in context and link resources with outcomes. Together with improvements in modern comptrollership, the net effect will be to strengthen and clarify accountabilities.</p> <p>Similar to the work undertaken by TBS, the PSC began a reorientation of both the Annual Report and Departmental Performance Report for the period 2000-2001 so as to strengthen these accountability documents to Parliament. The PSC Annual Report focuses on the health of the staffing system. The PSC's Departmental Performance Report focuses on the results the PSC has achieved as an organization in a concerted effort to better serve clients, stakeholders and, ultimately, all Canadians. In addition, the PSC continues to inform Parliament on issues</p>	<p>TBS Departmental performance report contains performance by strategic outcome including discussion on context, partners involved. Very little quantitative performance information. But policy making output and outcome are difficult to measure.</p>
--	--	--	---

		identified as requiring its attention. The latest report of this nature is: 'The Road Ahead: Recruitment and Retention Challenges for the Public Service'.	
--	--	--	--

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts, 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session.**

Report #, Department or Agency concerned and date tabled in House of Commons	Recommendation number, action required by Standing Committee on Public Accounts and implementation target date	Departmental response to recommendations	Confirmation of Actions
--	--	--	-------------------------

For copies of the Committee reports and their corresponding government responses for the 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament (2<sup>nd</sup> Session), please visit the following website: [http://cmte.parl.gc.ca/cmte/CommitteeList.aspx?Lang=1&PARLSES=372&JNT=0&SELID=e24\\_&COM=3275](http://cmte.parl.gc.ca/cmte/CommitteeList.aspx?Lang=1&PARLSES=372&JNT=0&SELID=e24_&COM=3275)

<b>Report # 4</b>  <b>Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS)</b>  <b>01/05/2003</b>	<b>Recommendation # 1</b> - That Treasury Board Secretariat include in its Departmental performance report, a section containing information on the government-wide progress of both the <b>Financial Information Strategy</b> and the <b>Modern Comptrollership Initiative</b> , emphasizing results achieved, identifying significant outstanding challenges and describing corrective measures together with their implementation timetables. That Treasury Board Secretariat begins reporting the government-wide progress report for both initiatives in its Departmental performance reports for the fiscal year ending 31 March 2003.	<b>Accepted:</b> The successful implementation of the Financial Information Strategy was reported in the Treasury Board Secretariat Departmental Performance Report in 2000-2001. As part of its core responsibilities, Treasury Board Secretariat continues to support the Financial Information Strategy implementation through its ongoing review and introduction of accounting policies, training and review of the quality of financial data. The change in management practices required to realize the full benefits of the Financial Information Strategy is now part of the longer-term process of Modern Comptrollership implementation.	<b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">TBS Departmental performance report 2002-2003</a> . No reference found about Financial Information Strategy. Modern Comptrollership Initiative mentioned a few times but little or no information relating to results achieved, challenges or timeframes of implementation.
---	--	---	---

		<p>The Government agrees that the Treasury Board Secretariat should report on government-wide progress of the Modern Comptrollership Initiative. Treasury Board Secretariat did report in its last Departmental Performance Report (2001-2002) the early results of the government-wide implementation of Modern Comptrollership Initiative, and will continue to do so throughout the life of the project.</p> <p>The Treasury Board Secretariat guidance for the preparation of Departmental Performance Reports also includes a section dealing with Government-wide Initiatives and Management Issues. This section stresses the importance for departments and agencies to provide Parliamentarians and Canadians with information on cross-cutting themes and key management initiatives that underpin achieving <i>Results for Canadians</i>. In particular, the guidance suggests departments and agencies highlight the measures they have taken to create a culture and environment conducive to instituting Modern Comptrollership.</p>	
<p><b>Report # 6</b></p> <p><b>Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendations # 1</b> - That the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency establish performance targets for its repayable contributions portfolio that include</p>	<p><b>Combined Response: #1: Accepted, #2: Status Quo:</b> In 1995, the Agency introduced its Business Development Program (BDP) to directly assist</p>	<p><b>#1: Confirmation; #2 Confirmation:</b> See <a href="#">ACOA Report on Plans and Priorities 2003-2004, pages 31, 32 and 43.</a> <a href="#">ACOA Departmental performance reports 2003-2004.</a> Performance information on Repayable</p>

12/12/2002

targets for collections, accounts defaulted, write-offs, and the mix of risk in the balance of the portfolio, and provide those targets in its Report on Plans and Priorities, beginning with the Report for 2004 .

**Recommendation #2** - That the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency report performance against the targets set for its repayable contributions portfolio in its annual Departmental performance reports, beginning with the Report for the period ending 31 March 2004.

small and medium-sized enterprises wishing to establish themselves, or expand and modernize their operations, along with the requirement that loans be repayable. ACOA's repayable contribution policy is consistent with the Treasury Board Repayability Policy of 1990 and additional Ministerial restrictions put in place in 1995 and 1996.

The Agency enters into each repayable contract with the expectation that it will be repaid in full, and no new financial assistance is approved to existing clients unless they are up-to-date in their reporting and repayment obligations. However, economic reality and uncertainty always result in a percentage of clients who are unable to fully repay their loans. In instances such as these, ACOA institutes commercial debt collection practices, which may include involvement of the Recovery Unit at Head Office, to try to recover the remaining portion of funds owed to the Agency.

ACOA has collected approximately 80% of its forecasted scheduled repayments on an annual basis for the past two years. Approximately 15% of those forecasted revenues are rescheduled to future years, and

Contributions such as size of loan portfolio, collections and write-offs is available on [ACOA's website that is updated on a monthly basis.](#)

		<p>approximately 5% represent defaulted contracts and write-offs. The collection of repayable contributions under BDP is expected to exceed early estimates by almost 10% and should total approximately \$44.8 million in FY 2003-2004.</p> <p>ACOA has also explored the risk mix of its repayable contributions portfolio over the past several years and noted that it has become more risk averse. A recent evaluation of the Business Development Program will provide a good starting point for discussions on risk mix and establishing performance targets over the coming months.</p> <p>The Agency has calculated that the cumulative rate of defaulted contracts and write-offs since 1995 is 12% (\$71.2 million of a total \$571.5 million in expenditures to date) and the average annual combined default and write-off rate over the past four years was 4.3% (4.8% in FY 2001-2002). ACOA anticipates that it will write off approximately \$18 million in FY 2003-2004.</p> <p>Concerning the Agency's risk mix, ACOA's planned risk mix for FY 2003-2004 is as follows:</p>																					
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Risk Rating</i></th> <th><i>Current</i></th> <th></th> <th><i>Anticipated Mix</i></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Low</td> <td>14%</td> <td></td> <td>10%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Low-Medium</td> <td>29%</td> <td></td> <td>25%</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medium</td> <td>35%</td> <td></td> <td>35%</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Risk Rating</i>	<i>Current</i>		<i>Anticipated Mix</i>		Low	14%		10%		Low-Medium	29%		25%		Medium	35%		35%		
<i>Risk Rating</i>	<i>Current</i>		<i>Anticipated Mix</i>																				
Low	14%		10%																				
Low-Medium	29%		25%																				
Medium	35%		35%																				

		Medium-High High	16% 6%		25% 5%	
		As requested by the Standing Committee in its Sixth Report, the foregoing information has been included in the Agency's Report on Plans and Priorities for FY 2003-2004.				
	<p><b>Recommendations # 6</b> - That the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency submit copies of the evaluations of the Business Development Program and the Community Business Development Corporations to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Accounts following their completion..</p> <p><b>Recommendation #7</b> - That the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency provides details of the actions it intends to take in response to the evaluations of the Business Development Program and the Community Business Development Corporations in its Report on Plans and Priorities for 2004.</p> <p><b>Recommendation #8</b> - That the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency includes a discussion of the outcomes produced as a result of changes it has made to the design and delivery of the Business Development Program and its agreements and relations with Community Business</p>	<p><b>Combined Response: #6: Accepted, #7: Accepted, #8: Accepted:</b> The Agency will provide copies of the two evaluations – Business Development Program (BDP) and Community Business Development Corporations (CBDCs) – when completed, to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Accounts as requested. Further, the Standing Committee will be provided with an Agency action plan that addresses the recommendations arising from the two evaluations. The evolution of the Business Development Program, as a result of changes made in response to the evaluation and any other changes to the Program, as well as the Agency's relationship with the Community Business Development Corporations, will continue to form part of the Agency's Reports on Plans and Priorities (RPP) and Departmental Performance Reports (DPR). Targeted results for the BDP and CBDCs will</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:#6: Confirmation, #7: Confirmation, #8:</b> The website provides electronic copies of reports evaluating the relevance, success and cost effectiveness of ACOA programs from 2000 to 2006. Many reports provide a list of observations and recommendations, but only a few reports are accompanied with a Management Response and Action Plan.  For evaluation report results see following ACOA websites for <a href="#">Business Development Program</a> and <a href="#">Community Business Development Corporations</a>.</p>			

	<p>Development Corporations in its performance reports, beginning with the Report for the period ending 31 March 2004.</p> <p><b>Recommendation # 9</b> - That the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency develop clear guidance on reporting, accountability, transparency, and protecting the public interest with regard to all of its programs, include these guidelines in its Report on Plans and Priorities for 2004, and begin discussing adherence to this guidance in its performance reports, beginning with its Performance Report for the period ending 31 March 2004.</p>	<p>continue to be included in the Agency's RPPs, and success in meeting those results will be included in subsequent DPRs.</p> <p><b>Status-Quo:</b> The Agency has made reporting, accountability, transparency and protecting the public interest the cornerstones of its results-based management approach to program planning, monitoring, audit and evaluation. It should be noted that ACOA was awarded the inaugural Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation-Treasury Board of Canada Award in 2001 for the pursuit of excellence in public performance reporting. That said, the Agency will continue to strive for excellence in its approach to results-based business reporting. The Agency's Review Policy is being updated to reflect changes in Treasury Board guidance. A specific section on Review Services has been added to the FY 2003-2004 RPP, as well as a table outlining the specifics of the Agency's FY 2003-2004 Review Plan.</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> There is a short discussion in <a href="#">ACOA's 2003-2004 RPP (see under pages 43-44)</a> on how the agency uses audits and evaluations to improve the management and delivery of its programs. It also indicates that executive summaries of these reports are to be posted on the ACOA website.</p>
<p><b>Report # 7</b> <b>Canada Customs and</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 2</b> - That the Canadian Customs and Revenue Agency include a discussion of</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government agreed with this recommendation. As per the</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> Compliance performance information is found in the <a href="#">CCRA Annual Report to Parliament 2002-2003, under pages 17, 63,</a></p>

<b>Revenue (CCRA)</b>  <b>09/05/2003</b>	<b>Agency</b>  progress achieved and the results obtained as a result of its efforts to improve its management of the risks surrounding non-compliance of commercial shipments entering Canada in its Performance Report for the period ending 31 March 2003.	Committee's request, a revised action plan, responding to the individual recommendations of the AG and including completion dates, critical milestones and target dates, was sent to the Committee.	<a href="#">67, 70 and 71.</a> (Please see under "Customs Services – Expected Outcomes." Please note section entitled "Progress against areas targeted for improvement in the 2001-2002 Road Ahead."
--	---	---	--

	<p><b>Recommendation # 3</b> - That the Canadian Customs and Revenue Agency conduct a thorough assessment of its data and information systems requirements related to all phases of its management of commercial shipments entering Canada and include its planned response to this review in its <i>Report on Plans and Priorities for 2004</i>.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government agrees with this recommendation. The CCRA is reviewing and improving all of its existing systems but does not have a mature, post-release verification system that would allow it to collect and analyze verification results, and, ultimately to identify and correct non-compliance trends. To address the lack of a system, the CCRA has developed an interim solution to capture and analyze the results of post-release verifications undertaken as part of its Post Release Verification Plan, through the use of an Excel spreadsheet. A business case has been developed to move to a long-term solution: a fully automated, nationally accessible computer system. The CCRA is considering technology being employed in the development of other Customs initiatives and is improving the accessibility of its targeting information and processes by enhancing its computer systems. An example would be the interface created in December 2001 between the Accelerated Commercial Release Operation Support System (a system that allows importers to transmit customs release and invoice information to any customs automated</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CCRA Report on Plans and Priorities 2003-2004, page 27, 29, 36, 53, C-9.</a> REPORT ON PLANS AND PRIORITIES contains discussion on Smart Border Management which details the plans to improve the management of cross border traffic of goods and peoples (See pages 27-30). Table 11 provides a description of CCRA major initiatives and investments in customs in order to improve integrity and security on Canada –U.S. border. Also Annex D provides anticipated results with success criteria.</p>
--	---	---	---

		office) and its Commercial Driver Registration Program (a program for drivers who have demonstrated a high level of compliance with the laws administered by the CCRA). This interface provides information on drivers at the same time that a customs inspector is looking at information on the shipment, giving the CCRA the ability to target drivers and goods that are deemed high-risk.	
<b>Report # 9</b>  <b>Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC)</b>  <b>20/08/2003</b>	<b>Recommendation # 4</b> -That the Canadian Human Rights Commission provide the criteria used to measure the performance of its executive (EX) group, an aggregate level assessment of that performance, the number and percentage of executives receiving performance pay, and the total amount paid in performance bonuses, in its annual performance reports beginning with the Report for the period ended 31 March 2003.	<b>Accepted:</b> Performance measurements for the CHRC's EX group is governed by a Treasury Board government-wide policy. Furthermore, the criteria and format for Departmental Performance Reports are under the aegis of the Treasury Board Secretariat and the CHRC will continue to conform to these standards in its Departmental Performance Report to Parliament. The CHRC will provide the Committee with the information requested in Recommendation 4.	<b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2002-2003, 2003-2004, 2004-2005 and 2005-2006.</a> No reference to any performance criteria for executive compensation was found. This applies for Departmental performance reports for 2003-2004, 2004-2005 and 2005-2006.

<p><b>Report # 13</b></p> <p><b>Canadian Space Agency (CSA)</b></p> <p><b>10/04/2003</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 3</b> - That the Canadian Space Agency include in its Departmental performance reports a summary discussion of the strategic advice and input provided by the Advisory Council and by the service line advisory groups to the Canadian Space Agency. That the Agency begins reporting their contribution in the Departmental performance report for the fiscal year ending 31 March 2004.</p>	<p>No Government response provided (was requested under Standing Order 109, which made it due August 8, 2004)</p>	
<p><b>Report # 15</b></p> <p><b>Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO)</b></p> <p><b>14/05/2003</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 2</b> - That the Department of Fisheries and Oceans include the Auditor General's recommendations and its action plan in response in its Departmental performance report for the period ending 31 March 2003.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The <i>Departmental Performance Report for the period ending 31 March 2003</i> focuses on performance up to the end of March 2003 and it is being produced concurrently with this response. As the focus of Departmental Performance Reports is on results achieved with respect to plans outlined in the <i>2002-03 Report on Plans and Priorities</i>, it is not appropriate to include the action plan in this document. However, the <i>Departmental Performance Report for the period ending 31 March 2003</i> will provide mention of both the AG recommendations and the action plan and will note that more information will be provided in subsequent reports.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the action plan will be completed by 31 December 2003 and summary information on results to be</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">DFO DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2002-2003</a>.</p> <p>"In her December 2002 report, the Auditor General of Canada made recommendations about how the Department could improve performance in these areas. The Standing Committee on Public Accounts considered these and issued its own recommendations. The Department is currently working on a response to the Committee's recommendations, which will be tabled in Parliament in the fall of 2003." However, we could not locate in the DFO's 2004-2005 Report on Plans and Priorities or its 2004-2005 Departmental Performance Reports any detailed information referring to responses to recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee or related action plan.</p>

		<p>achieved through this plan will be included in the <i>Report on Plans and Priorities for 2004-2005</i> along with sources of more detailed information. Summary information on progress with respect to the action plan and the results achieved will be included in subsequent Departmental Performance Reports.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 3</b> - That the Department of Fisheries and Oceans develop a series of indicators to measure performance regarding implementation of its action plan for inclusion in its Departmental performance report for the periods ending after 31 March 2003.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> Consistent with government-wide efforts and central agency guidance in furthering results-based management and modern comptrollership initiatives, the Department continues to refine its performance measurement frameworks. The goal is to better measure the performance of departmental initiatives to deliver results to Canadians and to better link financial and non-financial performance information. Indicators in support of the action plan will be developed concurrently with the plan and integrated into the overall departmental performance measurement framework as it is developed to support a renewed Planning, Reporting, and Accountability Structure. Use of this structure for parliamentary planning and reporting documents is anticipated to commence for the 2005-06 fiscal cycle given the one-year lead time associated</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">DFO DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2002-2003</a>. Report indicated that the Department was working on a response to the Committee's recommendations, which was supposed to be tabled in Parliament by the fall of 2003. The response was included in section 3 of the <a href="#">2003-2004 Departmental Performance report</a>.</p>

		with the government planning cycle.	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 4</b> - That the Department of Fisheries and Oceans begin to report the outcomes achieved through implementation of its action plan beginning with its Departmental performance report for the period ending 31 March 2004, and in each performance report thereafter until the identified shortcomings have been resolved.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> Summary information on progress with respect to the action plan and the results achieved will be included in the <i>Departmental Performance Report for the period ending 31 March 2004</i> and in subsequent reports as appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">See DFO Departmental performance report 2003-2004, Section 3 – Summary of Departmental Performance: Parliamentary Committee recommendations.</a> DFO tabled a response to <i>Contributing to Safe and Efficient Marine Navigation</i> that accepted the committee's findings and recommendations. DFO had recognized many of the same issues and has a number of initiatives well under way to address the recommendations. These include the Departmental Assessment and Alignment Project, the Expenditure Management Review exercise and the implementation of a revised management model for the CCG sector.</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 5</b> - That, for its activities in the area of marine navigation and boating safety, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans select a permanent set of performance indicators, provide a complete range of data and improve the quality of analysis, for its Departmental performance reports, beginning with the report for the period ending 31 March 2003.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> <b>As noted in the response to Recommendation 3 above, the Department continues to develop and refine its performance measurement frameworks. This is consistent with government-wide efforts and central agency guidance in furthering results-based management and modern comptrollership initiatives. The goal is to better measure the performance of departmental initiatives to deliver results to Canadians and to better link financial and non-financial performance information. Performance indicators for Marine Navigation and Boating Safety are integral to the overall departmental performance measurement framework and</b></p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">See DFO Departmental performance report 2003-2004, Section 5: Departmental Performance – Maritime Safety.</a> See under "Strategic Outcome: Maritime Safety." The department confirms the development of a number of national performance indicators, especially in the areas Search and Rescue, Environmental Response, Marine Communications and Traffic Services, Aids to Navigation, Waterways Development, Icebreaking, the Office of Boating Safety, and Navigation Protection. These have proven to be valuable management tools and have been used to make business decisions and to report performance information in DFO's Departmental Performance Report and the Annual Performance Report prepared by Marine Programs.</p>

		<p><b>will be developed concurrently.</b></p> <p>The departmental performance measurement framework will support a renewed Planning, Reporting, and Accountability Structure. Use of this structure for parliamentary planning and reporting documents is anticipated to commence with the 2005-06 cycle. Improved performance information will be included in Departmental Performance Reports, beginning with the report for the period ending 31 March 2004. The anticipated one-year delay in reporting is due to the need to ensure consistency with the action plan.</p>	
<p><b>Report # 16</b></p> <p><b>Human Resources and Development Canada (HRDC)</b></p> <p><b>06/06/2003</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 8</b> - That Human Resources Development Canada review its reporting systems, practices and policies to ensure that its reports on plans and priorities contain clear objectives (planned results) for the Social Insurance Number Program, with activities related to those objectives, and establish performance targets. That the Department begins reporting such information under the new format for the fiscal year commencing 1 April 2004.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> HRDC is reviewing its reporting and monitoring systems, practices and policies to ensure that objectives and activities related to the SIN are made clear in the report on plans and priorities and that information on the SIN including program results are reflected in the departmental performance report. The Government assures the Committee that it is fully committed to the continuing improvement of the management of the SIR and the SIN and will report regularly on progress.</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> See <a href="#">HRDC Report on Plans and Priorities 2004-2005, see pages 25, 26, 51 and 104.</a> Apart from a few general statements, we could not identify planned results, activities or performance targets.</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 9</b> - That Human Resources Development Canada reviews its monitoring</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> HRDC is reviewing its reporting and monitoring systems, practices and policies</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> See <a href="#">HRDC Departmental performance report 2005-2006, pages 12, 28, 33-34, 46, 49, 83, 95, 105, 107, 112, 157-59,</a></p>

	<p>systems, practices and policies to ensure that its Departmental performance reports contain information on the Social Insurance Number Program, including program results achieved compared with performance expectations. That the Department begins reporting performance information under the new format for the current fiscal year ending 31 March 2004.</p>	<p>to ensure that objectives and activities related to the SIN are made clear in the report on plans and priorities and that information on the SIN including program results are reflected in the departmental performance report. The Government assures the Committee that it is fully committed to the continuing improvement of the management of the SIR and the SIN and will report regularly on progress.</p>	<p><a href="#">and 187.</a> Some discussions about initiatives undertaken and results achieved but little in the way of quantitative performance data.</p>
<p><b>Report # 19</b>  <b>Public Works and Government Services Canada</b>  <b>06/06/2003</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 5</b> - That Public Works and Government Services Canada ensure that its Departmental performance report contains information on the progress (achievements versus planned targets) of the Action Plan initiatives designed to improve the Department's planning, acquisition and management of office space. That the Department begins reporting this information in its Departmental performance report for the fiscal year ending 31 March 2004.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> PWGSC agrees to start reporting on the progress of the response initiatives in the Action Plan that address the recommendations of the Auditor General's 2002 Report.</p> <p>The Auditor General made recommendations to improve several aspects of the planning, acquisition and management of office space. They cover matters such as the need to have better planning and information systems to properly manage both the supply and demand of office space. The Auditor General also noted that PWGSC has to find a way to be able to consistently consider long-term options for office space acquisition. There was concern about the lack of good financial information about how much it costs to provide office</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> See <a href="#">PWGSC Departmental performance report in Annex B: "response to Parliament, 2. Real Property."</a> Basically restates departmental response to recommendations. Some results are discussed but little information in the way of performance targets and implementation timetables.</p>

		<p>accommodation.</p> <p>PWGSC agreed with all the recommendations to prepare a comprehensive Action Plan to respond to the recommendations and to remedy the shortcomings. This annual progress reporting to Parliament on the Action Plan will begin with the Departmental Performance Report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2004.</p>	
<p><b>Report # 20</b></p> <p><b>Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) &amp; Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC)</b></p> <p><b>01/10/2003</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 9</b> - That Indian and Northern Affairs Canada and Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation develop Action Plans and initiatives aimed at improving the information content of their accountability documents. That these Action Plans be tabled, with their implementation timetables, to the Public Accounts Committee no later than 31 March 2004.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> The Government agrees with this recommendation. The Indian and Inuit Affairs program within INAC strives to foster a more promising future for all First Nation people by supporting good governance and accountability from First Nation governments to their citizens as the basis for social and economic development.</p> <p>INAC and CMHC are committed to reviewing collective reporting requirements and to agreeing on processes to better meet those requirements.</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">INAC Departmental performance report 2003-2004</a> does contain a short section about the government response and provides some information on strategic outcomes (see section IV). But found no evidence of action plans or timetables of implementation.</p>
<p><b>Report # 21</b></p> <p><b>Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) and Public Service</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 2</b> - That the Treasury Board Secretariat trace the progress achieved in setting up cost monitoring and tracking systems and procedures related</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government agrees to report on its progress toward establishing cost-monitoring systems and procedures in the Public Service</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">TBS and PSHRMA Departmental performance report 2003-2004</a>. See under <i>Annex 2 - Response to reports from the Office of the Auditor General and from</i></p>

<p><b>Human Resources Management Agency (PSHRMA)</b></p> <p><b>01/10/2003</b></p>	<p>to the classification reform and ensure that the information is contained in the Secretariat's annual Departmental performance report for the fiscal year ending 31 March 2004, and also in the next annual update report of the classification reform.</p>	<p>Human Resources Management Agency's annual DPR for the fiscal year ending 31 March 2004, and also in the 2004 Annual Report on Classification Reform.</p>	<p><i>parliamentary committees</i></p> <p>Cost tracking system is being developed with departments.</p> <p>Also new classification monitoring framework initiated during fiscal year 2002-03.</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 4</b> - That the Treasury Board Secretariat complete the testing of its methodology for the government-wide monitoring of the integrity of departmental classification practices and reports the results in its annual Departmental performance report for the fiscal year ending 31 March 2004.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government agrees to test and refine its monitoring approach and methodology until the end of the fiscal year 2003 and to regularly inform employees of the Public Service of progress on classification reform. The Government will publish the results in its Reports on Plans and Priorities as well as DPRs that are tabled annually in Parliament. The PSHRMA will also give an account of progress made in its Annual Reports on Classification Reform and in the Agency's annual report to Parliament on the Health of the Public Service.</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> see <a href="#">Modernizing the Classification System – Annual Report 2005-2006</a> includes specific section on active monitoring programs to evaluate progress of classification reform.</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 8</b> - That the Treasury Board Secretariat prepare an action plan together with an implementation timetable for the complete introduction of the corporate compensation policy for the federal public service. That the Treasury Board report on these initiatives to Parliament with ongoing updates</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The TBS is in the final stages of consultations on the Compensation Policy Framework, the last consultation scheduled to take place in January 2004. The paper will then be revised and updated to reflect the comments received during the six-month consultation phase. The TBS will</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> found only one single reference in <a href="#">TBS 2004-2005 Departmental performance report</a> about compensation policy framework.</p> <p>One reference of Compensation policy framework found in <a href="#">PSHRMA 2003-2005 Departmental performance report</a>. Under the heading of <i>Main Challenges and Lessons</i></p>

	in its annual performance reports and also table a specific annual report to the Public Accounts Committee and begin reporting for the period ending 31 March 2004.	report with ongoing updates on the Compensation Policy Framework in the DPR.	<i>Learned:</i> "Classification reform is a large undertaking that <i>must be aligned with compensation policies</i> and must operate as a coordinated element of the employer's collective bargaining objectives and schedule.
<b>Report # 23</b>  <b>Department of National Defence (DND)</b>  <b>22/10/2003</b>	<b>Recommendation # 7</b> - That the Department of National Defence include in its annual Report on Plans and Priorities a section that lists all DND training and testing sites potentially contaminated by unexploded ordnance, together with a summary of the remediation and restoration measures and planned implementation timetables. That the Department begins reporting this information to Parliament for the fiscal year commencing 1 April 2004.	<b>Accepted:</b> The Defence 2003 Sustainable Development Strategy tabled in Parliament on February 16 <sup>th</sup> , 2004, spells out the environmental targets and the concrete, measurable activities DND will carry out to meet those targets. The 2003 Sustainable Development Strategy includes a target specifically aimed at measuring the sustainability of military activities at training and testing areas. By monitoring this target, the Department will be able to determine what changes are required to military activities to ensure sustainability at each site. Additionally, the target related to reducing Departmental Liabilities associated with contaminated sites will ensure the identification and the remediation of sites contaminated by energetic materials.  The Department of National Defence's action plan to address the environmental impacts resulting from energetic materials is outlined in the	<b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">DND Report on Plans and Priorities 2004-2005, p. 37</a> . DND REPORT ON PLANS AND PRIORITIES contains a brief discussion and lists of known or suspected contaminated sites, including the management initiatives involved in their clean-up, and current activities to address the issue of unexploded ordnance. Also see following website: <a href="http://www.forces.gc.ca/admmat/site/index_e.asp">http://www.forces.gc.ca/admmat/site/index_e.asp</a>

		<p>response to <a href="#">Recommendation 6</a>. As previously mentioned, funding for this action plan will be considered as part of the Department's annual business planning process. Restoration and remediation measures will again have to take into consideration current and future use of the training areas as well as availability of resources. Given that departments already provide contaminated sites management plans to Treasury Board on an annual basis (by 1 July), the Government intends to use this existing reporting structure to communicate the details of its action plan on contaminated sites. Progress that relates to the Department's targets for training areas and contaminated sites outlined in its Sustainable Development Strategy will be reported annually in the Department's Performance Report.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 8</b> - That the Department of National Defence incorporate in its Departmental performance report a section containing information about results achieved against planned targets in the identification, remediation and restoration of DND training and testing sites potentially contaminated by unexploded ordnance. That the Department begins reporting this</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> The Departmental Performance Report currently includes a section dedicated to the Department's Sustainable Development Strategy. As stated in the response to <a href="#">Recommendation 7</a>, this strategy, prepared every three years, spells out the environmental targets and the activities DND will carry out to</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">In DND Departmental performance report 2003-2004</a>,: According to the departmental database, 106 contaminated sites have been re mediated, 63 have been assessed with no action required, 69 are under remediation, 493 are being risk-managed and 178 sites are being assessed for a total of 909 sites.</p>

	information to Parliament for the fiscal year ending 31 March 2004.	meet those targets. The 2003 Sustainable Development Strategy includes a target specifically aimed at measuring the sustainability of military training and testing sites. The Departmental Performance Report tabled in Parliament each year will comment on progress made against all targets listed in the Department of National Defence's Sustainable Development Strategy.	
<p><b>Report # 24</b></p> <p><b>Justice Canada (JC)</b></p> <p><b>30/10/2003</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 11</b> - That Treasury Board Secretariat begin immediately to monitor Departmental performance reports actively and work with departments and agencies to ensure adherence to its guidance, paying particular attention to the need to present balanced, complete, accurate reports, and to integrate financial with non-financial performance information.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> The Treasury Board Secretariat agrees that Departmental Performance Reports (DPRs) to Parliament should be actively monitored. Over the last several years, TBS has undertaken a number of initiatives aimed at monitoring and supporting overall improvements to DPRs. These efforts included the introduction of reporting principles in its guidance in 2001, which are available on the TBS website, followed by reviews of DPRs to assess adherence to principles and feedback to departments and agencies on how to strengthen their DPRs.</p> <p>As part of its continued efforts to improve the quality of reports to Parliament, this year, the Treasury Board Secretariat is taking an integrated approach to</p>	<p><b>Confirmation :</b> <a href="#">Estimates for the Government of Canada and Other Supporting Documents</a></p> <p><a href="#">Treasury Board Secretariat Departmental Performance Report 2003-2004</a></p> <p>See under Section IV: Performance Discussion</p> <p>“Accountable to Treasury Board ministers for the success of the Modern Comptrollership Initiative, the Secretariat ensured that a solid accountability framework was established to effectively manage the funding (19) transferred to federal organizations to support modernizing their management practices. This included approving departmental and agency milestones and deliverables at the outset, and tracking and monitoring progress in achieving these commitments. Many organizations submitted quarterly progress reports to the Secretariat on their management improvement action plans.</p>

		<p>reviewing both Departmental Performance Reports (DPRs) and Reports on Plans and Priorities (RPPs) to ensure greater consistency between planning and performance reporting. These reviews will also assess adherence to TBS guidelines and help provide advice and support to departments and agencies to improve linkages between planning and performance, resources invested and results achieved, as well as help strengthen the relevance and accuracy of information provided to Parliamentarians.</p> <p>There are some 87 departments and agencies currently producing RPPs and DPRs; however, a majority of these are characterized by steady state, on-going operations with little fundamental change in their primary plans, priorities and program performance on a yearly basis. A comprehensive yearly review of all these documents would be very resource intensive and would not be cost-effective in terms of identifying significant opportunities for change or improvement. Instead, TBS will target approximately 15 to 20 departments per year and review both their DPRs and RPPs, thus</p>	<p>Periodic surveys, analysis of annual results statements and an in-house database were also used to track and assess progress.”</p> <p>“Conducting an independent evaluation of <b>monitoring related to the Treasury Board policy suite</b>, identifying requirements to promote effectiveness and capacity across government, as well as evaluations of specific individual policies. The resulting recommendations will be addressed in the continuing policy review. “</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>allowing for an integrated review throughout the reporting cycle. All DPRs would be reviewed over a 3 to 5 year cycle. TBS will also work closely with these selected departments throughout the fiscal year to ensure improvements to their reports are made; more informed feedback to departments and agencies is provided, and better performance reports that influence planning are produced and tabled in Parliament. TBS has begun to implement such an integrated approach, which can be managed within existing TBS resource and capacity levels.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 12</b> - That in its monitoring activity, Treasury Board Secretariat devotes particular attention to performance reporting on horizontal issues, areas of high risk and programs and activities involving significant levels of expenditure.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> The Treasury Board Secretariat agrees with this recommendation. Horizontal initiatives and programs of high risk and significant levels of expenditure are an important component of the government's agenda and should be monitored.</p> <p>Through the targeted reviews of DPRs and RPPs described in the response to Recommendation 11, TBS will be monitoring closely performance reporting on horizontal issues and programs that are of high risk and high materiality.</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">Treasury Board Secretariat Departmental Performance Report 2003-2004</a> See under Section II: Summary of Departmental Performance A. Performance against Commitments in the 2003-04 Report on Plans and Priorities: "The Secretariat had committed to launching a review of government expenditures by departments and horizontal activities over a five-year cycle. That review process was launched in 2003-04, focussing on four departments (Statistics Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Public Works and Government Services Canada, and the Department of Justice Canada) and four areas of cross-departmental activity (biotechnology, public security and anti-terrorism, fixed capital assets of cultural institutions, and common infrastructure and service delivery). Those reviews were completed. Plans to continue with these reviews were modified subsequently to</p>

		<p>In addition to monitoring these key initiatives at the reporting stage, TBS is also ensuring that the structures necessary to facilitate this reporting are in place at the front end. For instance, as part of its continued efforts to improve monitoring of horizontal initiatives, TBS will work with PCO to strengthen governance and accountability frameworks for horizontal initiatives at an early stage in their development. For example, TBS is currently supporting the Climate Change Secretariat in the development of a Results-Based Management and Accountability Framework.</p> <p>TBS provides guidelines, advice and tools to assist departments and agencies in reporting on major horizontal initiatives, including plans and priorities, expenditures, activities and results achieved. This year departments and agencies reported on over 30 horizontal initiatives in their Departmental Performance Reports. Information on these initiatives is available on the TBS Horizontal Results Database, which can be accessed via the TBS website.</p> <p>TBS is also improving reporting on horizontal issues through the</p>	<p>focus instead on new priority areas identified by the newly established Expenditure Review Committee.”</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>President's annual report to Parliament, <i>Canada's Performance</i>, which clusters departments and agencies into 26 horizontal areas. For example, thirteen federal organizations contribute to the horizontal area entitled "An innovative, knowledge-based economy".</p>	
<p><b>Report # 25</b></p> <p><b>Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC)</b></p> <p><b>06/11/2003</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 1</b> - That the Department of Citizenship and Immigration Canada continue to pursue initiatives that will prevent the entry of inadmissible individuals from entering Canada and report the outcomes and costs of these preventative measures in its annual performance reports.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government agrees with the recommendation and refers the Committee to the newly formed Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA), within the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness of Canada (PSEPC). The mandate of the CBSA, along with CIC, includes preventing inadmissible foreign nationals from entering Canada. The uniting of border inspection services into one agency will create opportunities for greater synergy in implementing border security initiatives.</p> <p>CIC and the CBSA oversee a multiple borders strategy that uses a risk management approach to intercept security threats and inadmissible persons as far in advance of entering Canada as possible. Interception points in the multiple borders concept include visa offices, carrier check-in, point of</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> Check Canada Border Services Agency <a href="#">2003-2004 DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT, chapter 2</a>. Under the Immigration and Enforcement Programs section of CIC, there is a fairly lengthy discussion on the department's performance against anticipated results with regards to preventing entry to high risk individuals.</p>

		<p>embarkation, and transit points along the route, the point of last embarkation and Canadian ports of entry. Each of these points is a “border transition” where a traveller’s identity, documents and admissibility can be verified. The strategy includes initiatives that build on international co-operation, domestic partnerships and sharing of information in order to control movement and entry to Canada as well as to establish controls once inside Canada.</p> <p>The CBSA will report the outcomes and costs of border security initiatives in annual performance reports.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 3</b> - That the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, and the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency draw up an evaluation schedule for the primary and secondary inspection lines at ports of entry, and correct shortcomings that are detected in a timely manner. Both the Department and the Agency should make references to these activities in their annual performance reports.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government agrees with the recommendation and has implemented an action plan to complete both an evaluation of the primary inspection line (PIL), with respect to immigration-related duties, and the immigration secondary examination process. Consulting and Audit Canada has been contracted to prepare an Evaluation Framework that will provide CIC and the CBSA with options for the actual evaluations. The evaluations of both the PIL and the immigration secondary examination lines are expected to take place by the</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> See <a href="#">Canada Border Services Agency DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2004-2005</a>. Please note that the Integrated Primary Inspection Line (IPL) system became operational at March 31, 2005 at 47 locations including major airports, select cruise ship, ferry, and bus and rail locations. While no specific mention is made about the recommendation, the CBSA performance report does mention that the agency had set a risk-management approach, an audit and evaluation strategy and performance-measurement framework. Moreover, a risk based multi- Year Audit Plan was developed and approved by the CSBA’s Internal Audit and Evaluation Committee (IAEC). Page 34.</p>

		end of 2005.	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 4</b> - That the Department of Citizenship and Immigration ensure that all files on temporary resident permits contain correct information on the reason for inadmissibility and the reasons for issuing the permit. The Department must describe the steps it has taken and the results achieved in this regard in its Performance Report for the period ending 31 March 2004.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Government accepts this recommendation. CIC began an analysis of quality assurance (QA) requirements in the summer of 2003 of permits issued in 2002 to persons who were inadmissible on grounds of security, human rights violations, organized crime and serious criminality. In these instances, CIC sought confirmation of inadmissibility reasons and justifications for entry. For serious criminality, a random verification of inadmissibility reasons entered in the electronic file was performed. A survey of offices across Canada was also undertaken to ensure that a proper analysis of factors was considered before issuing a permit and that the justification for granting permits was documented. Random QA checks of temporary resident permit data is continuing in 2004. Updates to training modules relating to the issuance of temporary resident permits have also been made.</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">Check CIC DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2003-2004</a>. Provided some descriptive statistics on temporary resident permits but no discussions of departmental efforts to ensure that temporary resident files contain correct information on reason of inadmissibility.</p>
<p><b>Report # 26</b></p> <p><b>Correctional Services Canada</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendations # 2</b> - That Correctional Service Canada implement its action plan that addresses the recommendations contained in Chapter 4 of the April 2003 Report of the Auditor</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Auditor General's report addressed these general areas: assessment or "classification" instruments; case management issues; program delivery and</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">See Correctional Services Canada DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2003-2004, under Response to the 26th Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts</a>: "In the summer of 2003, CSC developed and provided its Action Plan to the</p>

<p>(CSC)  06/11/2003</p>	<p>General according to the timetable set forth in the plan, and report the results to Parliament in its annual performance reports.</p>	<p>programs designed specifically for women; work and other forms of release; employment issues for women offenders; and accommodation, programs and services in the community.</p> <p>Progress will also be reported in the Service's annual performance reports.</p>	<p>Auditor General to address the 11 recommendations put forth in the Report. CSC is currently implementing the Action Plan."</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 4</b> - That upon completion of the tests, Correctional Service Canada reports the results and any actions taken in response to the outcomes in its annual performance report for the year in which testing occurred.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> When an inmate is first admitted to an institution, a complete assessment is conducted. The Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process helps to determine the individual programming needs of the offender. The OIA process also includes the application of the Custody Rating Scale (CRS) which aids in the determination of the initial security classification of each offender. At regular intervals later in the sentence, each offender's security classification is reassessed through an examination of three risk domains: escape risk, risk to public safety and institutional adjustment.</p> <p><b>Current Status:</b> CSC will provide a schedule for testing to the Committee by March 31, 2004.</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CSC 2003-2004 Departmental performance report</a>: "CSC contracted with an external firm to conduct Inter-Reliability Tests on the Custody Rating Scale (CRS) and the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA). Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada (PSEPC) is reviewing all research conducted to date for both men and women offenders."</p>

		<p>CSC tested the applicability of the Custody Rating Scale and the Offender Intake Assessment process for women offenders in the early 1990s. The Custody Rating Scale has since been revalidated for women offenders. While the reliability and validity of both the CRS and the OIA process were confirmed at that time, the Auditor General recommended that external experts retest their reliability and validity. Reliability testing will be completed by March 31, 2004. This testing includes <i>inter rater</i> reliability, which assesses whether different people using the scale will come to the same conclusion regarding institutional placement. Validity testing by external experts will begin in the spring of 2004. Testing should be complete by the fall of 2004 and CSC will submit results to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts at that time.</p> <p>CSC has designed a gender specific Security <b>Re</b>classification Scale for Women (SRSW) to be used at regular intervals later in the sentence. The scale is based on the specific characteristics of this population. Field test validation of the scale is now complete and data are currently being analysed (for both non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>women). It is anticipated the SRSW, including the integrated Offender Management System component, will be implemented in the fall of 2004.</p> <p>However, given the concerns expressed by the Public Accounts Committee and community-based organisations for a gender specific classification scale, CSC will work with experts to develop a new gender specific approach to classification of women offenders. It is likely that development could take three years. This is due to the small number of women; the incarcerated population has been fairly stable between 350 and 390 over the past few years and an appropriate sample size is needed to ensure the instrument is valid. In the meantime, the Custody Rating Scale and Offender Intake Assessment process will continue to be used as a guide for decision-making.</p> <p>Progress on this project will be reported in CSC's annual performance reports.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p><b>Recommendation # 6</b> - That Correctional Service Canada place an emphasis on the timely provision of, and full access to, adequately resourced programs that will assist women offenders obtain skills relevant to the current job market and secure meaningful, rewarding employment following completion of their sentences. This emphasis must result in an employment strategy for inclusion in the Service's Report on Plans and Priorities for 2004. and</p> <p><b>Recommendation # 7</b> - That following implementation of programs geared towards the provision of marketable skills for women offenders, Correctional Service Canada regularly evaluate the success of its efforts and report the results to Parliament in its annual performance reports.</p>	<p><b>Combined Response: #6: Accepted, #7 Accepted</b></p> <p>CSC consolidated all of its employment programs (for men and women offenders) under the umbrella of the Employment and Employability Program (EEP). This program is designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhance the employability of offenders;</li> <li>Develop the employability skills of offenders (skills that are relevant to the current job market) through institutional work experience and basic employability skill courses;</li> <li>Provide a sense of purpose to inmates and contribute to a safe institutional environment;</li> <li>Link employment-related activities or interventions that span from intake to community release so that offenders remain employable during incarceration and within the community; and</li> <li>Assist institutional self-sufficiency, thereby lowering the cost of incarceration.</li> </ul> <p>The Service has also restructured its vocational training programs to enhance</p>	<p><b>#6: Confirmation; #7: Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CSC 2003-2004 Departmental performance report:</a> "The Service's Research Branch is conducting a survey with both incarcerated women and women on conditional release to obtain an enhanced understanding of their work experience and current needs. Survey dissemination to offenders and staff began in February 2004 and is now complete. Data collection and analysis will conclude in the Fall 2004.</p> <p>The information derived from the above survey will serve as the basis for developing a national employment strategy framework for women offenders. Details will be provided in the next DPR."</p> <p>"CSC was successful in allocating 10% of its total vocational training program restructuring monies (\$1.1 M) to women offender initiatives in 2002-2003. The monies were designated into the following: Career and Occupational Preference System (COPS) and Career Ability Placement Surveys (CAPS); Vocational Assessments; Basics in Food Safety; WHMIS; Industrial Cleaning Program; First Aid and CPR; Portfolio and Essential Skills; Socio-Occupational Integration Services; Industrial Sewing Machine Mechanic's Helper and Industrial Design.</p> <p>Progress related to the national employment strategy framework for women offenders and newly implemented programs will be documented in the next DPR."</p>
--	--	--	--

the job readiness of offenders. Vocational training program components now include:

Employability skills acquisitions, as set by the Conference Board of Canada (i.e., Fundamental Skills, Teamwork Skills, and Personal Management Skills);

Acquisition of short term (normally up to 3 months) Third Party Certification; and

Employment, which includes Skills for Employment and other authorised activities, through revised work descriptions.

An Evaluation Framework for the Employment and Employability Program has been completed and implementation progress is being monitored.

**Current Status:** While women make up four percent of the federal offender population, CSC has invested in the women's institutions almost 10% (\$140,000) of the total resources (\$1.5M) allotted to vocational training and/or Employment and Employability programs. Results will be reported in CSC's annual departmental performance

		<p>reports.</p> <p>The Service's Research Branch is conducting a survey with both incarcerated women and women on conditional release to obtain an enhanced understanding of their work experience, training and skills before and during incarceration, their perceived employment competencies and suggested strategies for overcoming impediments to obtaining and maintaining meaningful work in the community on release and an assessment of their interests in pursuing particular vocational training and employment experiences. Survey dissemination to offenders and staff began in February 2004. Data collection and analysis will be completed by the fall of 2004.</p> <p>The information derived from the above survey will serve as the basis for developing a national employment strategy framework for women offenders. Progress related to this strategy will be reported in CSC's annual performance reports.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 8</b> - That Correctional Service Canada work with its counterparts in the provinces and territories and with</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Committee was concerned about the limited access to programs providing psychiatric and other forms of</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CSC 2003-2004 Departmental performance report</a>: "Discussions have begun with the Heads of Corrections Sub-Committee on Women Offenders. It is anticipated that CSC</p>

	<p>non-governmental women's advocacy organizations to develop a shared approach to addressing the needs of female offenders under community supervision and discuss the results in its annual performance reports to Parliament.</p>	<p>support and was encouraged by the Commissioner's ideas involving possible cooperation with provincial counterparts.</p> <p><b>Current Status:</b> CSC will meet with its federal, provincial and territorial counterparts and with non-governmental women's groups in the coming fiscal year. The goal will be to further develop a shared approach to addressing the unique needs of women offenders in the community and how to overcome some of the obstacles faced by this small and dispersed population (for example limited access to specialists in both urban and rural areas).</p> <p>CSC held a National Community Initiatives Meeting with stakeholders in June 2003 and will hold a National Aboriginal Community Initiatives Meeting with stakeholders in the spring of 2004. Similar to the National Community Initiatives Meeting, the purpose will be to examine current Aboriginal-specific program and service delivery in the community, and to further enhance community initiatives for Aboriginal women offenders.</p> <p>Partnership initiative results will</p>	<p>and its provincial and territorial counterparts will meet in 2005.</p> <p>Non-Governmental Stakeholders: CSC held a National Community Initiatives Meeting with stakeholders in June 2003 and a National Aboriginal Community Initiatives Meeting in May 2004. The purpose of both meetings was to examine current program and service delivery and to further enhance community initiatives for women offenders. Results of these meetings are being analyzed and next steps will be determined."</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p><b>Recommendation # 10</b> - That Correctional Service Canada work closely with interested Aboriginal communities to help them develop the capacity to participate in reintegration efforts for Aboriginal women offenders, and report progress in its annual performance reports to Parliament. In so doing, that Correctional Service Canada, together with other federal government departments, its provincial and territorial counterparts and Aboriginal organizations, explore new means of providing the necessary financial resources to those communities wishing to undertake the responsibility of assisting in the reintegration of women offenders.</p>	<p>be included in CSC's annual performance reports.</p> <p><b>Status-Quo:</b> The <i>Corrections and Conditional Release Act</i> is the legislation that governs the Correctional Service of Canada (and the National Parole Board). Section 81 of the Act allows the Minister to enter into agreements with Aboriginal communities for the provision of services and the care and custody of offenders. Section 84 makes it possible for CSC to provide an Aboriginal community with the opportunity to propose a plan covering an Aboriginal offender's release and integration into that community.</p> <p><b>Current Status:</b> CSC is already involved in a number of initiatives to help develop the capacity of Aboriginal communities to participate in the reintegration efforts of Aboriginal women offenders. Examples include:</p> <p>Regions have been engaged in discussions with four Aboriginal communities regarding potential Section 84 arrangements.</p> <p>Section 84 beds are currently available as follows:</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">CSC 2003-2004 Departmental performance report</a>: "CSC is already involved in a number of initiatives to help develop the capacity of Aboriginal communities to participate in the reintegration efforts of Aboriginal women offenders. For example:</p> <p>Regions have been engaged in discussions with a number of Aboriginal communities regarding potential Section 84 arrangements.</p> <p>A total of 10 Section 84 arrangements with Aboriginal women offenders are currently in effect.</p> <p>Institutional awareness sessions have been held to increase staff and inmate knowledge about Section 81 and 84 provisions.</p> <p>10 Aboriginal Community Development Officer Positions have been staffed across the country to create links for both men and women offenders with Aboriginal communities, to raise Aboriginal community interest in participating in the correctional process, and to initiate Section 84 arrangements.</p> <p>An Aboriginal Advisory Committee has been established in the Pacific Region to explore Section 81 and 84 arrangements for women offenders.</p> <p>Two institutional, culturally-specific programs are currently offered to Aboriginal women offenders to help prepare them for release: Spirit of a Warrior and Circles of</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Native Centre for Women (Hamilton, Ontario)</p> <p>At'lohas Native Family Healing Services CRF (London, Ontario)</p> <p>Institutional awareness sessions have been held to increase staff and inmate knowledge about Section 81 and 84 provisions.</p> <p>Aboriginal Community Development Officers are currently in place to help initiate Section 84 arrangements with Aboriginal communities.</p> <p>Two institutional, culturally-specific programs are currently offered to Aboriginal women offenders to help prepare them for release: <i>Spirit of a Warrior and Circles of Change</i>.</p> <p>CSC will report progress on these initiatives in its annual performance reports.</p> <p>Safe reintegration requires strong community supervision and support by both CSC and community members. One of CSC's priorities for 2004 2005 is to strengthen citizen and community engagement and criminal justice partnerships in correctional endeavours.</p>	<p>Change.</p> <p>A National Aboriginal Community Initiatives meeting was held in May 2004. Participants examined current program and service delivery in Aboriginal communities and discussed ways to further develop and enhance community initiatives for Aboriginal women offenders. Results of this meeting are being analyzed and next steps will be determined.</p> <p>One of CSC's priorities for 2004/05 is to strengthen citizen and community engagement and criminal justice partnerships in correctional endeavors.</p> <p>Some of the resources allocated for this priority will be dedicated to enhancing the role of Aboriginal communities in the correctional process. The Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness will explore new means of providing assistance to communities wishing to undertake the responsibility of assisting in the reintegration of Aboriginal women offenders."</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Some of the resources allocated for this priority will be dedicated to enhancing the role of Aboriginal communities in the correctional process. The Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness will explore new means of providing assistance to communities wishing to undertake the responsibility of assisting in the reintegration of Aboriginal women offenders.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Five reports were tabled during the third session of the 37<sup>th</sup> Parliament by the standing committee on the Public Accounts. Parliament was dissolved before it could provide any response to the reports. The Fourth report was re-tabled during the 38<sup>th</sup> Parliament as the First report. For copies of the committee reports and their corresponding government responses, please visit the following website: <http://cmte.parl.gc.ca/cmte/CommitteeList.aspx?Lang=1&PARLSES=373&JNT=0&SELID=e24 &COM=8800>

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts, 38<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 1<sup>st</sup> Session.**

Report #, Department or Agency concerned and date tabled in House of Commons	Recommendation number, action required by Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Implementation target date	Departmental response to recommendations	Confirmation of Actions
--	--	--	-------------------------

For copies of the committee reports and their corresponding government responses for the 38<sup>th</sup> Parliament (1<sup>st</sup> Session), please visit the following website: <http://cmte.parl.gc.ca/cmte/CommitteeList.aspx?Lang=1&PARLSES=381&JNT=0&SELID=e24 &COM=8989>

<p><b>Report # 1</b></p> <p><b>Public Service Commission (PSC), Office of the Privacy Commissioner (OPC), Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) and Privy Council Office (PCO)</b></p> <p><b>28/10/2004</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 3</b> - That the Public Service Commission monitor progress made in the implementation of all measures in its action plan, assess the outcomes achieved, record any adjustments, and include all findings in its annual performance report beginning with the report for the period ending 31 March 2004.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The PSC is monitoring progress made in the implementation of its action plan. It will report, through its Annual Report to Parliament, on the major results and their implications for Public Service wide staffing. The PSC will also use its Report on Plans and Priorities and the associated Departmental Performance Report to report on its activities in this regard.</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">PSC DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2003-2004, Strategic Goal # 3</a> and <a href="#">PSC DRP 2004-2005, p.48</a> : "The First Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts on the Audit of the Financial Management and Administration of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada outlined six recommendations (out of 20) aimed at the Public Service Commission. Recommendations 1, 2 and 3 dealt with the PSC Action Plan for the Office of the Privacy Commissioner. The updated action plan was included as Appendix A in the response to the Standing Committee at the following address: <a href="http://www.parl.gc.ca/InfocomDoc/Documents/38/1/parlbus/commbus/house/GovResponse/PACP_Rpt01_GvtRsp-e.htm">http://www.parl.gc.ca/InfocomDoc/Documents/38/1/parlbus/commbus/house/GovResponse/PACP_Rpt01_GvtRsp-e.htm</a>."</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 10</b> - That Treasury Board Secretariat report all instances in which it has had to intervene to ensure compliance with Treasury Board policies, naming the entity involved, the nature of the non-compliance, and the corrective measures taken, in its Departmental performance report, beginning</p>	<p><b>Rejected:</b> Treasury Board Secretariat monitors departments and agencies and intervenes as appropriate. It is departments and agencies that are accountable for reporting on the performance of their organizations including the results they achieve, as well as the actions they take to address</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable:</b> <a href="#">TBS DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2004-2005, p.92:</a> The Secretariat is said to be: "implementing broad measures to strengthen accountability and compliance." But does not report on the number time the agency had to intervene in cases of non-compliance to TBS policies.</p>

	with the report for the period ending 31 March 2004.	identified deficiencies. These are to be reported in their Departmental Performance Reports, as required by Guidance for Departmental Performance Reports published by Treasury Board Secretariat. In addition, other means such as the public posting of internal audit reports, associated action plans, evaluations and other management reviews may also provide information regarding compliance with policy.	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 13</b> - That all departments and agencies be required to include in their Departmental performance reports the criteria used to determine the eligibility of executive-level employees for receipt of performance pay, the total number of executives employed, the total number and percentage of those in receipt of performance pay, and the total amount of the bonuses awarded, beginning with the reports for the period ending 31 March 2004.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> PSHRMAC recognizes the need to increase the transparency of salary payments made within the framework of the Performance Management Program.</p> <p>In March 2005, PSHRMAC will publish on its Web site detailed results of the Performance Management Program for all departments and agencies. Subject to certain restrictions in the <i>Privacy Act</i>, the following information will be made public, by department and agency: the total number of senior executives employed the value of bonuses awarded, as well as the number and proportion of those who received a performance bonus. The admissibility criteria common to departments will be published in</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> Public Service Human Resource Management Agency <a href="#">DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2004-2005, p.52.</a></p> <p>“To support the accessibility of information to Committee members, government employees and members of the public, the Agency committed to the publication of the new directives for the Performance Management Program for the year 2004-05 on its Web site. This has been completed. The directives are based on the principle of sound management of public funds and include the criteria used to determine eligibility for performance pay.”</p> <p>“In order to enhance the transparency of salary payments made within the framework of the Performance Management Program, the Agency committed to the publication, on its Web site, of the results of the <a href="#">Performance Management Program</a> for all departments and agencies. This has been done.”</p> <p>“The Agency is in full compliance with the commitments made in each of its 2004-05</p>

		the Performance Management Program Guidelines in March 2005.	responses to parliamentary committees.”
<p><b>Report # 9</b></p> <p><b>The government, Treasury Board Secretariat</b></p> <p><b>07/04/2005</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 25</b> - That departments and agencies be required to include sections in their performance reports that specifically address contracting activities, grants and contributions, and transfers to other departments or agencies. The goals and objectives of these activities, performance indicators, and results must be clearly stated.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> The Treasury Board Secretariat provides reporting guidance to departments and agencies on <i>Reports on Plans and Priorities</i> and <i>Departmental Performance Reports</i>, so that Parliament receives a coherent, balanced and effective picture of departmental priorities, expected results and performance. The Secretariat's guidelines require departments and agencies to explain how their expected results will be achieved, as well as the means used to achieve them. These organizations are also to provide enough information to demonstrate how resources and activities, as well as programs and services, logically support the achievements of their results. In particular, specific templates are already provided in the guidelines to ensure that departments and agencies meet policy and statutory reporting requirements applying to them, including for procurement and contracting, transfer payments, grants and contributions. The templates require clear statement of objectives, expected results, results</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> Re requirements for the provision of information on procurement and contracting etc., see requirements included in the guidance for departments provided on the Treasury Board Secretariat website. For an example of departmental response to this guidance, <a href="#">See PWGRC DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2005-2006, p.134, Table 20: Procurement and Contracting.</a></p> <p>Also see tables 13 and 14, details on transfer payment programs and foundations (conditional grants).</p>

		achieved, as well as of efficiency and effectiveness for procurement practices.	
<p><b>Report # 11</b></p> <p><b>Health Canada (HC) Department of National Defence (DND), Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) and Correctional Services Canada (CSC)</b></p> <p><b>13/05/2005</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 3</b> -That beginning in 2006 Health Canada, the Department of National Defence, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Correctional Service Canada, and Veterans Affairs Canada include distinct sections in their annual reports on plans and priorities, and performance reports that address their drug benefits programs and begin with a clear statement of program objectives followed by the indicators used to assess performance.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> All federal organizations responsible for federal drug benefits programs agree with this recommendation. Through the FHP, federal organizations are working collaboratively to establish or strengthen drug benefit program objectives and performance measures, appropriate to their client populations and mandates, against which progress will be regularly reported.</p> <p>This work includes developing common drug benefit program objective statements that will serve as the foundation for the development of common performance measures. These measures will permit inter-department comparison and public reporting of results being achieved by the partner organizations in the delivery of their drug benefit programs.</p> <p>The individual federal organizations will report as follows:</p> <p>HC proposes to include reporting on its NIHB program in its Departmental Performance Report (DPR) and the Report on</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">See Health Canada DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2005-2006, p 133.</a> <a href="#">See Veterans Affairs Canada DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT, pp 72-75.</a></p> <p>See Government response to STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, recommendation 3: "All federal organizations are committed to continuously improving their ability to report in meaningful ways on their program performance to Parliament and Canadians. Establishing and/ or strengthening drug benefit program objectives and performance measures are also a priority across all the federal organizations. However, given the relative size of their drug benefit programs, other departmental priorities, and constraints on available resources for evaluations and reporting activities, not all federal organizations are able to produce discrete reports on their drug benefit programs."</p>

		<p>Plans and Priorities (RPP) by referring to an electronic web link to the NIHB annual report in the First Nations and Inuit Health section of those reports.</p> <p>DND will ensure that future versions of its annual reports incorporate information on its drug benefit program. Exact information elements to be included are still to be determined, and will be influenced by the work on the FHP to establish and strengthen common performance measures. However, given that proposed modifications to the DPR /RPP reporting structure will likely limit the elements which may be reported in this venue, alternate reporting mechanisms will also be identified.</p> <p>The RCMP will have a hyperlink in its annual reports to a web-page that will contain reporting information.</p> <p>CSC plans to include information within their RPP and DPR.</p> <p>CIC will include distinct sections in its RPP and DPR that address its drug benefit programs and include a clear statement of program objectives and indicators to assess performance. CIC will include a</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>hyperlink to its Interim Federal Health Program web-page that will contain reporting information.</p> <p>VAC will provide an overview of its prescription drug program and key information on the performance and management of the Program through its RPP and DPR.</p> <p>However, reporting limitations will be imposed by the various information systems that some federal organizations use, and wide variances in the priority afforded drug benefit programs given other more pressing departmental priorities.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 4</b> - That Health Canada provide information on the full cost of its consent gathering initiative under the Non-Insured Health Benefits Program, a full explanation of how the privacy environment has evolved in ways affecting the issue of consent and list the insights it has gained regarding the issue of consent in its performance report for the period ending 31 March 2005.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> the department provided a cost estimate and a lengthy discussion on how the evolution of the privacy environment has affected the issue of consent.</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> Health Canada's provides a very comprehensive response to recommendation # 4 in <a href="#">Government Response of the 11th Report of the STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS</a>.</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 5</b> - That beginning with its Departmental performance report for the period ending 31 March 2005, Health Canada provide data on the</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> "The NIHB Program has received approximately 165,000 signed consent forms since 2001. This represents less than a quarter of the NIHB</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> <a href="#">See NIHB program annual report 2004-2005</a>, section 8: program activities, sub-sections 8.10 and 8.11, Report repeats response to recommendations.</p>

	<p>number of times it has sought verbal and written consent from Non-Insured Health Benefits Program clients to share personal health information with health care providers, the number of consents given, the number of consents withdrawn, and the number of instances in which it has refused payments arising from lack of consent. Data on written and verbal consent must be presented separately.</p>	<p>eligible client population. In February 2004, Health Canada announced a revision to its approach to the Non-Insured Health Benefits Program's consent initiative. The NIHB program no longer requires a signed consent form for day-to-day processing activities and program administration. In a few instances where client safety or inappropriate use of the system is a concern, the NIHB program will seek the express consent of clients to share their personal information with health care providers. This consent may be provided verbally or in writing.</p> <p>In 2004-2005, the NIHB Program received approximately 2,350 consent forms from its clients. During the year, there were 14 requests to withdraw consent. In addition to the forms received, consent was proactively sought from several individuals considered to be at risk; verbal/one-time consent was received from a small minority of these clients. The NIHB Program will continue to monitor the number of written consents given and withdrawn. A process is also being put in place to capture information related to verbal consent, which is provided for specific one-time transactions only.”</p>	
--	---	---	--

	<p><b>Recommendation # 9</b> - That Veterans Affairs Canada begins immediately to collect data on claims processing alerts and overrides, and perform regular analysis of the results that includes an assessment of the volume of alerts and the reasons for overrides. This data, along with the analysis, should be provided to Parliament annually in the Department's performance reports beginning with the report for the period ending 31 March 2006.</p>	<p><b>Rejected:</b> VAC currently collects and analyzes data pertaining to duplicate drug therapy, drug-to-drug interactions, and the potential overuse/abuse of narcotics as part of its current Drug Utilization Evaluation (DUE) process. Work is underway to make this activity more robust to enhance the safety of clients, such as by finding ways to include over the counter drugs which can cause negative drug interactions with prescription medication, in monitoring activity. However, <b>it should be noted that VAC does not use the codes in the CPhA's point-of-service system that produce the types of alerts that can be "overridden" by pharmacists. Consequently, it can neither collect nor analyze data on overrides or reasons for overrides.</b></p> <p>DND has institutionalized a systemic approach to risk management by providing the training, tools, guidance, templates, expert support and regular reviews by senior management.</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable:</b> <a href="#">Health Canada DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2004-2005, p. 133.</a> <a href="#">Veterans Affairs Canada DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2004-2005, p. 73.</a> Both Reports basically repeat the responses to recommendations.</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 11</b> - That each federal department provide information on efforts to meet the goal of a centrally managed</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> As per their response to the Auditor General's recommendation, the six partner organizations in the</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> See <a href="#">First Nations &amp; Inuit Health Website</a> . All participating organizations are working on processes that promote cost-effective drug-use and system efficiency. All are</p>

	<p>system as well as overall program objectives, costs, and performance in their annual reports to Parliament on plans and priorities, and performance; and</p>	<p>FHP are working collaboratively to explore cost-effective drug use and system efficiency while maintaining departmental mandates and ministerial authorities. In the longer term, as part of the federal involvement in the development and implementation of the National Pharmaceutical Strategy, the federal government will ensure that the specific needs of federal client populations are reflected.</p> <p>To this end, the six federal organizations have begun to work on a number of initiatives, including defining a common core formulary and using this common core formulary to assist with cost management of the programs.</p> <p>For information on individual and collective efforts of the federal organizations to enhance reporting to Parliament on drug benefits programs objectives, costs and performance please see the response to <a href="#">Recommendation 3</a>.</p>	<p>involved in initiatives to assist cost management of the programs.</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation # 12</b> - That, beginning in fiscal year 2006-07, Veterans Affairs Canada, National Defence, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Correctional Service Canada, and Citizenship and Immigration Canada provide a comprehensive</p>	<p><b>Rejected:</b> five federal organizations are committed to continuously improving their ability to report in meaningful ways on their program performance to Parliament and to Canadians. As explained in the response to</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable:</b> federal organizations do not have the same capacity to produce full and complete reports on their drug benefit programs. Targeted information could be made available upon request.</p>

	<p>annual report (similar to that provided by Health Canada in its overall NIHB program) containing information on their drug benefits programs.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 3</b>, establishing and/or strengthening drug benefit program objectives and performance measures is also a priority across all the federal organizations. However, given the relative size of their drug benefit programs, other departmental priorities, and constraints on available resources for evaluation and reporting activities, not all federal organizations are able to produce discrete reports on their drug benefit programs.</p> <p>VAC will provide, through its RPP and DPR, an overview of the Prescription Drug Program and key information on the performance and management of the Program. In addition, VAC has detailed information similar to that included in Health Canada's NIHB Annual Report. However, given limited resources and competing priorities, a comprehensive annual report is not contemplated at the present time. Targeted information could, however, be made available in an appropriate format upon specific request.</p> <p>DND plans to provide all information of interest, including reporting on the common cost-based performance indicators identified through the FHP Task</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Groups, in its departmental Drug Benefit Plan report.</p> <p>Beginning in fiscal year 2006-07, the RCMP will prepare a comprehensive annual report containing information on its drug benefit program. CSC is working on developing the tools and capacity it needs to be able to report comprehensively on its offender program results, and expects to be in a position to do so by 2009-2010 when its health information management module is fully operational.</p> <p>CIC has produced reports on its drug benefit program, although not at regular intervals. It will begin to produce a more comprehensive annual report by the requested target date, though the department cautions that, given the smaller size of its program and constraints on its reporting resources, its annual report will not be as comprehensive as the Health Canada document.</p>	
<p><b>Report # 12</b></p> <p><b>Treasury Board Secretariat and (TBS) Office of the Auditor General of Canada (OAG)</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 8</b> - That the government take the necessary steps to require all foundations to table in Parliament separate annual reports, reports on plans on priorities and performance reports and that these documents be referred to the appropriate</p>	<p><b>Rejected:</b> government departments are required to prepare Departmental Reports on Plans and Priorities and Departmental Performance Reports. Foundations are not federal departments and are not subject to this reporting regime. There are, however, a number of</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable:</b> Departmental performance reports contain only summary information about foundations: funding, objectives, expected results and highlights of achievements. Government agrees to evaluate foundations but will start reporting by 31 March 2007.</p> <p><a href="#">Check Industry Canada DRP 2004-05, under</a></p>

02/05/2005	parliamentary committee.	<p>other reports that help to ensure transparency to Parliament and the ability of committees to review foundation activities.</p> <p>In the 2003 Budget, the Government committed that summaries of foundations' corporate plans submitted to ministers will be made public by ministers and submitted to Parliament. In addition, departments responsible for administering funding agreements are to incorporate significant expected results to be achieved by foundations in their Departmental Reports on Plans and Priorities, which are tabled in Parliament, and situate these within overall departmental plans and priorities. For the duration of funding agreements, these departments are also to report on significant results achieved by foundations in their Departmental Performance Reports and situate these within overall results achieved.</p> <p>The annual reports of foundations are presented to ministers responsible for funding agreements. All reports are made public and ministers are encouraged to table them in Parliament. The annual reports of those foundations established by legislation, which represent about 80% of all transfers to</p>	<p><a href="#">Section 3.7: supplementary information (Conditional Grants).</a></p> <p><a href="#">Check Environment Canada DRP 2004-2005, Table 11 and 12: Details on Transfer Payment Programs and Conditional Grants (Foundations).</a></p> <p><a href="#">Check Heath Canada DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2004-2005, Financial Table 12: Conditional Grants.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Check Human Resources and Skills Development Canada DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2004-2005, Table 11: Foundations (Conditional Grants).</a></p> <p>For additional information, please check individual foundations websites for annual reports.</p>
------------	--------------------------	--	---

		foundations, are tabled.	
--	--	--------------------------	--

<p><b>Report # 14</b></p> <p><b>Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS)</b></p> <p><b>30/07/2005</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 5</b> - That the Treasury Board Secretariat provide in its annual Departmental performance reports information on its monitoring activities with respect to its obligations as set forth in Appendix A of the Government Security Policy. Reference must be made to the frequency and scope of monitoring, the results, and corrective measures taken. This reporting should begin with the report for the period ended 31 March 2005.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> The Secretariat will include monitoring activities in its annual departmental performance reports beginning with the period ending 31 March 2006. This report will reflect the results of monitoring of MITS implementation in the summer and fall of 2005, and progress towards implementation of a comprehensive IT Security performance measurement, monitoring and oversight program.</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> departmental performance report did not provide any reference about frequency or scope of monitoring of MITS implementation. <a href="#">DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2005-2006, p.17. :</a></p>
<p><b>Report # 15</b></p> <p><b>Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) and Office of the Auditor General of Canada (OAG)</b></p> <p><b>09/06/2005</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 2</b> - That Treasury Board Secretariat set benchmarks for the implementation of the revised Policy on Internal Audit, monitor departmental progress against these benchmarks, take corrective action in the event of slippage, and report the results to Parliament in its annual Departmental performance report beginning with the report for the period ending 31 March of the year following the coming into force of the revised Policy on Internal Audit.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> Timelines for the production and implementation of a revised Policy on Internal Audit are presently under consideration by the Government. The Government undertakes to implement the recommendations set out above; however, since the internal audit policy review is still in its consultative stage, the details have not been finalized.</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> Departmental performance report contains discussions on the revision of Internal Audit Policy but provides no references about benchmarks or implementation timeframes. <a href="#">TBS Departmental performance report 2004-2005, pages 58-60, and 92-93.</a></p>

<p><b>Report # 17</b></p> <p><b>Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC)</b></p> <p><b>16/06/2005</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 2</b> -That INAC report on its progress in drafting its roles and responsibilities in its REPORT ON PLANS AND PRIORITIES in the spring of 2006 and on its progress in developing a final version of its roles and responsibilities in its DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT in the fall of 2006. Once the roles and responsibilities are defined and in the public domain, they must be published regularly in both the Department's REPORT ON PLANS AND PRIORITIES and its DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> "... the Department is finalizing a draft statement of INAC's current roles and responsibilities and will hold information sessions with First Nations over the fall in order to arrive at a mutually agreed upon statement of roles and responsibilities. Once this statement is finalized, it will be made publicly available and published regularly in the Department's RPP and DPR to the extent possible within Treasury Board reporting frameworks. In the interim, INAC will report on its progress in drafting its roles and responsibilities in its 2006 RPP and DPR."</p> <p>"In order to keep the Committee abreast of progress, INAC will present a draft statement of roles and responsibilities to the Committee in September 2005 with the understanding that the document: is a work in progress that will need to be revised based on First Nations' comments; will be subject to further discussion and consideration leading up to the June 2006 Policy Framework; and will be subject to government decision-making."</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> Report on Plan and Priorities provides a short discussion on efforts to clarify roles and responsibilities among respective stakeholders involved in First Nations education. See <a href="#">INAC REPORT ON PLANS AND PRIORITIES 2005-2006, pages 16 and 44.</a></p> <p>Departmental performance report contains several brief references about INAC's efforts with its partners to clarify respective roles and responsibilities regarding education. See <a href="#">INAC DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2005-2006, p. 9, 28-29.</a></p>
--	---	--	--

	<p><b>Recommendation # 6</b> - That INAC immediately take steps to ensure that school evaluations are completed and that recommendations flowing from these evaluations are addressed. The Department must report on its progress in its DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> In June 2005, the Department completed compliance directives for its education programs that will be implemented this October, and for which guidance and training will be provided to regional staff. The purpose of these directives is to provide guidance to INAC regions to establish consistency in the application of existing terms and conditions for the Department's education programs. The objective is to provide clarity to regional staff, rather than to introduce new requirements or measures for First Nations. The elementary and secondary education directives include a requirement for First Nations to arrange for an independent evaluation of each First Nation school at least every five years and instruct INAC regions to ensure that the Council (or recipient) has a plan in place for the implementation of the recommendations made in the school evaluation report. Moreover, the directives provide instruction on the implementation and management of tuition agreements between provinces and First Nations as well as between provinces and INAC, on behalf of First Nations.</p> <p>The compliance directives will be revisited by the Department,</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> Departmental performance report provides only one single reference (on page 66) to “audit of post-secondary student support program.” Not even sure this related to “school evaluations.” No further discussions on school evaluations.</p> <p>Report on audit of post secondary student support program available at following website:  <a href="http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/pr/pub/ae/au/01-15/01-15_e.html">http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/pr/pub/ae/au/01-15/01-15_e.html</a></p>
--	---	---	--

		<p>through its regional offices with First Nations as part of the process to develop a renewed management framework for all INAC's education programs that will strengthen the accountability regime in all areas of education, including the mutual accountability between INAC and First Nations.</p> <p>A main objective of this process will be to allow more flexibility at the community level to respond to local needs and circumstances while, at the same time, ensuring consistency with government management standards. In doing so, it will be necessary to ensure compliance measures can be implemented within existing resources.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 7-</b>That INAC, in consultation with First Nations, immediately takes steps to ensure that all tuition agreements between it, First Nations and provincial school boards are in place. The Department must also provide its regional offices with sufficient guidance and training to ensure that its responsibilities are understood and applied consistently. The Department should report annually on its progress in its DEPARTMENTAL</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> Same response as above.</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> Departmental performance report did not provide any specific reference to "tuition agreements" in <a href="#">INAC DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2005-2006</a>.</p>

	PERFORMANCE REPORT.		
	<p><b>Recommendation # 8</b> - That INAC, in consultation with First Nation communities, set a timeline for closing the education gap between FN students and the broader Canadian population. The Department must report on its progress, or lack thereof, in closing the educational gap in its Departmental performance reports.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> By the end of 2005, the Department will be in a position to report on progress made with First Nations to develop a revised set of performance indicators. A further update will be provided in the Department's 2006 Report on Plans and Priorities to outline how the set of indicators will be completed and implemented. The finalized indicators will then be utilized to measure progress in future Departmental Performance Reports. In the interim, the Department will keep the Committee updated on this work as requested.</p> <p>Given that roughly 40 percent of on-reserve students attend provincial schools, it will be important for the Department</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> Departmental performance report did not provide any specific reference regarding the setting of timelines "for closing education gap between First Nations students and broader Canadian population."</p>

		and First Nations to engage provinces on this topic to ensure comparable indicators are being utilized and to establish acceptable targets for narrowing the education gap in the short, medium and long term that can be realistically achieved through the collaborative efforts of all stakeholders.	
--	--	---	--

	<p><b>Recommendation # 10</b> - That INAC updates Parliament annually on the detailed cost of FN education in its Departmental performance reports.</p>	<p><b>Rejected:</b> INAC recognizes that its public reports are important vehicles to keep First Nations, Parliament and Canadians abreast of progress on First Nations education. The Department currently reports on its education programs and services in the following documents: Report on Plans and Priorities, Departmental Performance Report, Basic Departmental Data, and Canada's Performance Report (Aboriginal Chapter). In addition, INAC will publish the second edition of the Education Programs Report in December 2005 that will provide Canadians with an update on the education programs it provides and the activities it is undertaking in partnership with First Nations to provide access to a high quality education for First Nation learners.</p> <p>In all of these publications, INAC endeavours to: provide accurate and clearly worded information that is appropriate for a wide audience; define the objectives and expected results of its educational programs; and demonstrate the progress being made to improve outcomes for First Nation learners and narrow the education gap between First</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable:</b> Departmental performance report provides some funding information but no detailed itemized breakdown of education costs. See in <a href="#">Departmental performance report 2005-2006 "Financial Tables – Table 1: comparison of planned to actual spending."</a></p>
--	---	--	---

		<p>Nations and the broader Canadian population. As part of its program authority renewal exercise that went to Treasury Board, the Department provided accurate and detailed information on the way all of its education programs operate, including in-depth information on funding mechanisms.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 14</b> - That INAC immediately review the strengths and weaknesses of the Mi'kmaq Education Agreement and the BC FNESC and develop strategies to expand the best features of both initiatives to other First Nations communities. The Department must report on its progress in this work in its DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT beginning with the report for the period ending March 31, 2006.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> Another issue related to elementary/secondary comparability is the current lack of school board-type services for on-reserve First Nation schools to provide effective and efficient planning, instructional support, and management and accountability of programs and services to individual schools. The support offered by provincial school boards to public schools is critical to the successful outcomes of students across the country. First Nation schools cannot be expected to achieve comparable educational outcomes from their students without this essential level of support.</p> <p>Through a joint process with the Assembly of First Nations, INAC is currently gathering information from provincial, and the few existing First Nations school boards about the range of school board services offered and their associated costs. Concurrent</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> Departmental performance report provides only one single reference to Mi'kmaq Education Agreement on page 28.</p>

		<p>with this study is a detailed mapping of the existing capacity, needs and long-term objectives of identified First Nations regional education authorities. The First Nations Education Steering Committee and the Mi'kmaq Education Agreement, as well as other existing regional education initiatives, are providing valuable information with respect to organizational models, process, service delivery, lessons learned and accountability. The Department, working with First Nations, will provide an update on its progress in this exploratory work in its Departmental Performance Report beginning with the report for the period ending March 31, 2006.</p>	
<p><b>Report # 18</b></p> <p><b>Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada (PSEPC), Department of National Defence (DND), Health Canada (HC), and Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC)</b></p> <p><b>23/06/2005</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 7</b> - That Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada work with the relevant departments, agencies and other levels of government to coordinate emergency response plans and report their progress in the annual Departmental performance report.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> As set out in the response to Committee <b>Recommendation 1</b>, under Auditor General <b>Recommendation 2.105</b>, the Government of Canada is working closely with the relevant federal departments, agencies and other levels of government to coordinate emergency response plans. PSEPC will report on the continuing progress of the National Emergency Response System and the coordination of emergency response plans in its</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> Departmental performance report provides discussion under the rubric: "Seamless Emergency Management and National Security Measures." See <a href="#">PSEPC Departmental performance report 2005-2006, page 21</a>.</p> <p>"Expected Results and Timelines: Coordinated and complementary F/P/T response to all types of emergencies – summer 2006."</p>

	<p><b>Recommendation # 9</b> - That Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada provide the Standing Committee on Public Accounts with an action plan detailing what it will do to increase the number of first responders trained to respond to chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear emergencies and that it report on its progress in its annual Departmental performance reports.</p>	<p>departmental performance report.</p> <p><b>Accepted:</b> As set out in the response to Committee <b>Recommendation 1</b>, under Auditor General <b>Recommendation 2.173</b>, the Government of Canada is taking the necessary steps to increase the number of first responders trained to respond to chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear emergencies, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a strategic review of the First Responder Training Program (summer 2005);</li> <li>launch of the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Advisory Committee on CBRN Training (began in summer 2005);</li> <li>piloting and launch of introductory and basic CBRN courses through e-learning (three pilots were held in summer 2005; final pilot in October 2005; launch of e-learning courses in October 2005);</li> <li>development of a revised short-term operational plan (September 2005);</li> <li>renewed regional delivery of basic CBRN train-the-</li> </ul>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> Departmental performance report provides several references about activities related to the training and equipping of first responders.</p> <p>See <a href="#">PSEPC Departmental performance report 2005-2006, p. 11, 30-32, 36.</a></p> <p>Also see <a href="#">CBRN Strategy of Canada</a></p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>trainer courses (delivery in three regions in fiscal year 2005-06);</p> <p>delivery of intermediate CBRN course increased to seven in fiscal year 2005-06 (May, June, September, October and November 2005 and January and March 2006); and</p> <p>development of a long-term operational plan (December 2005).</p> <p>The CBRN First Responder Training Program is projected to train some 1,000 first responders during fiscal year 2005-06.</p> <p>PSEPC will report on its progress in its annual departmental performance reports.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 10</b> - That the Department of National Defence immediately resolve the serious command and control issues in the Joint Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defence Company and report on its progress in its annual Departmental performance report.</p>	<p><b>Rejected:</b> The National Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Response Team is a multi-departmental unit, composed of the Canadian Forces' Joint Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defence Company, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Public Health Agency of Canada, specifically trained to handle CBRN materials, weapons or agents. The team was created to rapidly respond to and investigate criminal or terrorist incidents</p>	<p><b>Not Applicable:</b> Departmental performance report provides at page 55 a detailed discussion on the efforts and initiatives undertaken to address the command and control issues regarding the Joint Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defence Company. See <a href="#">DND Departmental performance report 2005-2006, p. 55.</a></p>

where CBRN materials may have been used.

The team draws on a broad range of skills and expertise from both its civilian and military members. A member of the RCMP leads the team and is the primary link to the first responders involved in an incident. The RCMP also provides expertise in dealing with CBRN improvised explosive devices as well as supplying forensic experts to collect and handle evidence. The Canadian Forces provides expertise on CBRN defensive measures and detection, identification and decontamination capabilities through its Joint Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defence Company. The Public Health Agency of Canada provides expertise in dealing with biological substances, including a portable laboratory capable of dealing with highly contagious and highly lethal pathogens for which there are no vaccines (bio-safety level 4) (e.g. Ebola, pneumonic plague, etc.).

The Government has defined procedures to allow Canadian Forces personnel to cooperate with federal and provincial law enforcement agencies and other government departments while responding to CBRN incidents.

		<p>In December 2004, the Government evaluated the unit's ability to respond to domestic and expeditionary operations. Following this review, distinct and clearly defined roles for both the team's civilian and military members were devised to avoid any command and control issues, given that under the <i>National Defence Act</i>, Canadian Forces personnel are precluded from receiving orders from non-military members.</p> <p>This resolved the command and control issues that were identified. The Department of National Defence will continue to report on the work of the Joint Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defence Company in its annual departmental performance reports.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 11-</b> That Health Canada should immediately resolve the legal issues that are blocking the creation of emergency response medical and smallpox teams and report on its progress in its annual Departmental performance report.</p>	<p><b>Accepted:</b> This matter is now within the mandate of the Public Health Agency of Canada. It has pursued implementation measures to render Health Emergency Response and Smallpox Emergency Response Teams operational.</p> <p>Creating an effective and efficient structure to respond to public health emergencies requires cooperation between the federal, provincial and territorial governments. Through</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> Departmental performance report provides brief response to the recommendations. Basically these relate to discussions with various stakeholders, no formal or concrete results reached, no timeline of implementation or benchmark developed.</p> <p>: See <a href="#">PHAC DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2005-2006, p. 72.</a></p>

		<p>the Canadian Public Health Network and other forums (e.g. the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Expert Group on Emergency Preparedness and Response) and instruments such as the National Health Emergency Management Framework endorsed by all provincial and territorial jurisdictions, the Agency has addressed with the provinces and the territories the issue of cooperation in emergency preparedness and response. Agency officials working with the Canadian Public Health Network have drafted a federal/provincial/territorial mutual aid agreement that would facilitate inter-jurisdictional cooperation across Canada in health emergency preparedness and response.</p> <p>Within this general context, extensive discussions have taken place relating to Health Emergency Response and Smallpox Emergency Response Teams. To make the concept of a surge capacity through Health Emergency Response Teams a reality, the Agency has addressed a number of critical issues. Since provinces and territories have the authority for licensure within their jurisdictions, the Public Health Agency of Canada has</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>developed a process for emergency licensing through the Federation of Medical Regulatory Authorities of Canada. This body will validate the credentials of Health Emergency Response Team members so that when they are deployed for an emergency, a provincial or territorial license can be secured immediately.</p> <p>The issue of liability has been addressed through consultation with the Canadian Medical Protection Association so that individual medical malpractice insurance will apply for medical practice during an emergency situation. The issue of indemnification has been addressed through the use of federal emergency employment provisions with the liability protections incorporated in federal employment.</p> <p>Recently, it has been recognized that the smallpox vaccine clinical trials that must be conducted to meet regulatory requirements for the recently acquired vaccine will generate several hundred recently immunized persons. Among these will be public health workers at federal, provincial, territorial and local levels who will be organized to form the core of instructors to rapidly train smallpox</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>vaccinators at the site of a smallpox outbreak. This will overcome previous obstacles to the establishment of a rapid response capability in the highly unlikely event of a smallpox outbreak.</p> <p>It is anticipated that this work will resolve the issues identified and that the first team will be established by the summer of 2006.</p> <p>The Public Health Agency of Canada will report on progress in its annual departmental performance report.</p>	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 12</b> - That the Public Health Agency of Canada purchase items for the national emergency stockpile based on risk assessments and casualty scenarios and report on its progress in its annual Departmental performance report. It should also improve its ability to transport and distribute supplies during emergencies and report on its progress in its annual Departmental performance report.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> The Public Health Agency of Canada constantly maintains the National Emergency Stockpile System in a state of readiness for deployment anywhere in Canada within 24 hours of receipt of a request from provinces or territories. The National Emergency Stockpile System constantly undergoes updating, refurbishing and replacement of used or outdated supplies and materials.</p> <p>In the long term, the National Emergency Stockpile System routinely commissions strategic reviews to ensure that it is positioned to meet and respond to all hazards and emergencies.</p>	<p><b>Confirmation:</b> See <a href="#">PHAC DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2005-2006, p.73.</a></p> <p>“The Agency’s National Emergency Stockpile System working group, in collaboration with the Integrated Threat Assessment Committee, Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada and the provinces and territories, developed a risk and threat analysis document in the fall of 2005. This document is being used as a framework to design and plan a modern day stockpile based on threat and casualty scenarios for natural and human caused disasters, and as a guide for procurement.”</p>

		<p>Such a review is currently underway and includes a review of the contents of the stockpile. The Public Health Agency of Canada expects the Strategic Review Committee to produce a series of interim reports that will be acted upon by the National Emergency Stockpile System as they are received. As an example, the National Emergency Stockpile System is now commissioning an immediate review of the strategic scope of its 165 transportable hospitals to ascertain how well these existing hospitals could meet a situation similar to the collapse of the hospital capacities that occurred in New Orleans due to Hurricane Katrina and the resulting flooding.</p> <p>Emergency transportation of National Emergency Stockpile System supplies has been addressed through the National Emergency Transportation System established by Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada. The Public Health Agency of Canada's Regional Emergency Response Coordinators have been developing National Emergency Stockpile System provincial and territorial emergency transportation plans in collaboration with each provincial/territorial jurisdiction.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		The Public Health Agency of Canada will report on progress in its annual departmental performance report.	
	<p><b>Recommendation # 13</b> - That Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada report on its progress in developing a long-term plan and budget for the conduct of national exercises in its report on plans and priorities and in its Departmental performance reports. PSEPC must also indicate how people are trained and how many training exercises it has conducted in its Departmental performance report and reference key lessons drawn from these exercises.</p>	<p><b>Status-Quo:</b> As set out in the response to Committee <b>Recommendation 1</b>, under Auditor General <b>Recommendation 2.179</b>, the Government of Canada has made progress in developing a long term plan and budget for the conduct of national exercises. PSEPC will continue to report on its activities in this area in its report on plans and priorities and in its annual departmental performance report.</p>	<p><b>No Confirmation:</b> Departmental performance report provides only very brief statement on domestic and international emergency exercises to build up preparedness and response capacity but no specific reference to the number of people trained or number of exercises carried out. See PSEPC <a href="#">Departmental Performance Report 2005-2006</a>, page 31.</p>
<p><b>Report # 22</b></p> <p><b>Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) and Passport Canada (PC)</b></p> <p><b>22/11/2005</b></p>	<p><b>Recommendation # 2</b> – That Passport Canada include, in its performance report for the period ending 31 March 2006, a detailed discussion of the problems raised by the Auditor General of Canada in her April 2005 report and the status of actions being taken in response. Where appropriate, a discussion of outcomes must also be provided, and this reporting must continue until all corrective measures have been implemented fully.</p>	<p>No Government response provided (was requested under Standing Order 109, which made it due by March 22, 2006).</p>	



# REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the Committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this Report.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings ([Meetings Nos. 14, 15 and 16](#)) is tabled.

Respectfully submitted,

Hon. Shawn Murphy, MP  
Chair

