

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL CANADA (NRC)

MINUTES OF THE 97th MEETING

OF THE

NRC – JOINT CONSULTATION COMMITTEE (JCC)

DATE: September 26, 2018
TIME: 9:00 AM
LOCATION: Room S-303, Building M-58

IN ATTENDANCE

Chairperson:

Emily Harrison, Vice-President, HRB

Representing NRC:

Emily Harrison, Vice-President, HRB
Amy Campbell, Manager Special Initiatives, HRB
Meredith Marchand, Senior Labour Relations Officer, HRB
Anthony Galipeau, Student, Labour Relations, HRB

Representing Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada (PIPSC):

Christine Poirier, Labour Relations Team Lead
Patricia Loder, President, NRC-PIPSC Consultation Team
Cathy Cheung, President RO/RCO Group
Dominique Charbonneau, President LS Group
Stephan Grosse, RO/RCO Group Executive

Representing Research Council Employees' Association (RCEA):

Cathie Fraser, President
Marvin Zaluski, 1st Vice-President

Guests:

Tim Grubb, Executive Director, Security Branch

ITEM	97 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	RCEA inquired whether there was a quorum . Management responded that this is believed to be the case, but would verify the requirements under the NRC Terms of Reference for Labour Management Consultation Committees and report back off-line.	M.Marchand
97.1	Approval of Agenda RCEA requested the addition of union dues reports, Administrative Services and Support (AS/AD) job postings, telework, attrition and	

ITEM	97 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
97.1 (cont.)	training, generic pay and benefits mailbox, and amount of overtime at one Research Center. The agenda was then approved by the members.	
97.2	<p>Minutes of the 96th Meeting of the JCC</p> <p>Members approved the 96th minutes without any changes. The bargaining agents (BA) inquired regarding delay in posting the 95th minutes. Management noted a translation delay and additional verification required for external website posting but would follow-up.</p>	M.Marchand
97.3	Follow-up Action Items of the 96th Meeting	
87.5	<p>Probation</p> <p>Management reported that the requested probation data on long-standing terms was recently e-mailed to the BAs and that an annual review of workforce composition was being implemented as part of the greater human resources planning exercise.</p>	
88.9	<p>Performance Improvement Plans (PIP)</p> <p>Management committed to send proposed process document and would confirm ownership for the PIP process.</p> <p>RCEA noted they are awaiting another meeting on the matter.</p> <p>PIPSC indicated they are concerned about several PIP cases. Management requested that they raise these cases directly with Labour Relations so that issues can be addressed.</p>	M.Marchand P.Loder S.Grosse
93.5	<p>RO/RCO Promotion Cases including D1</p> <p>Management confirmed that discussions had taken place regarding leveraging Echo, MyZone and DocZone to improve communications regarding promotion case requirements as well as celebrating the successful promotions of NRC's researchers and scientists. The results of the appeal process for the January 2018 round were also issued to the BAs in July.</p> <p>PIPSC inquired about the appeal process for the July 2018 round. They also felt there was a level of secrecy surrounding the Human Resources Promotions Committee (HRPC) especially around meeting dates which was perceived to be creating angst regarding decisions that unknowingly had not yet been made due to delays. This could be reduced with updates on the process for each round. Promotions are very important to the individual and reflects well on NRC; therefore, they should be celebrated even it is only the number of scientists and researchers promoted.</p> <p>Management reported that while the <u>pilot appeal process</u> was continued for the July 2018 round, it was not found to be as effective as desired so considerations are underway to determine a more appropriate and sustainable method going forward. Dr. Dan Wayner who was recently appointed as Departmental Science Advisor on a part-time basis to support the President and Dr. Mona Nemer, Canada's Chief Science</p>	

ITEM	97 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>93.5 (cont.)</p>	<p>Advisor will also be Chair of the HRPC. As such he would have insights into the appeal process specifically as a former Chair of the HRPC, as would the new President's Research Excellence Advisory Committee (PREAC). Management committed to providing an update on the appeal process off-line and reaching out to PREAC regarding a briefing on their role and insights.</p> <p>It was further noted by Management that the <u>Industrial Technology Advisor (ITA) promotion criteria</u> review was in the early planning stages. PIPSC expressed disappointment that this was six or more months behind schedule and inquired about possibility of accelerating the process in light that they had already collected data on the research RCOs which was then broken down for ITAs. They also highlighted that in their view there are challenges for ITA's to move across the //. Management to connect with IRAP and Classification regarding these concerns and a timeline for this review moving forward.</p> <p>Management advised that in response to PIPSC's concerns regarding the effectiveness of the <u>D1</u>, HR is looking into employee and management feedback on the value of the D1s and investigating possible connections between the D1 and the Commitment to Excellence (CTE) processes to reduce redundancy. They also confirmed that two of the D1 cases that PIPSC had raised were denied for valid performance reasons. Management to send details on those but awaiting additional information on the third and will send once received.</p> <p>In response to the request from PIPSC, Management supplied statistics from the <u>July round</u> of Degree 3 and 4 promotion submissions under the revised Research Officer (RO) promotion criteria. This data was limited to protect the individuals involved. However, for research ROs and Research Council Officers (RCOs) 60% of the submissions were approved, with 6 into PRO/RCO-5, 17 across //, and 25 into SRO/RCO-4. For the non-research RCOs submissions 50% were promoted. The number into RCO-5 was not disclosed but 5 crossed the // and 11 entered RCO-4. Management committed to providing the details in writing subsequent to the meeting. For each submission, written general feedback was provided to the employee with an appropriate contact, such as the Director General, should they require additional clarification.</p>	<p>M.Marchand E.Harrison</p> <p>E.Harrison M.Marchand</p> <p>M.Marchand</p> <p>M.Marchand</p>
<p>95.5</p>	<p>NRC Diversity Committee</p> <p>It was confirmed by Management that the NRC Women in Research report without the annexes had been sent the RCEA in July. The annexes had been removed to preserve the anonymity of the participants although a future meeting was scheduled to see if the annexes could be further edited in a manner that would still retain the essence of those recounts</p>	
<p>95.6</p>	<p>TBS People Management Policy Suite Reset</p> <p>Management reported that RCEA had been issued the list requested of the TBS policies that are applicable to NRC, such as the Policy on Acceptable Network and Device Usage (PANDU), and which were</p>	

ITEM	97 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
95.6 (cont.)	adopted with revisions for NRC's environment. Although most of NRC's policies are unique to the Council.	
96.9	<p>E-Mail Changes – Leave Without Pay (LWOP)</p> <p>It was confirmed by Management that employees on LWOP who want to continue accessing their e-mail can do so by bringing their green laptops home with them as these devices are not reassigned during this period. Should an employee already on LWOP wish to do so, they can make arrangements to pick it up.</p>	
96.10	<p>Outsourcing Work</p> <p>RCEA reiterated their concern that there were funds for outsourcing work but not for paying overtime to their members or for hiring short-term or term members for longer-term needs. This is especially disconcerting if this is an on-going practice.</p> <p>In response to the concerns raised regarding outsourcing in certain areas of NRC, Management responded that in one area they believed the issue was related to the requirement for funds to be in the overtime budget before the work can be authorized. It may take time to transfer the funds from one Research Centre to another whereas if there is an existing standing offer in place and the need is an urgent client one it, can be outsourced quickly to meet the deliverable. However, local management is aware the employees wish to work overtime and are communicating with stakeholder the need for quick funds. As well, there may be times when only operational funds are available from which outsourcing can be paid whereas the valuable alternative of converting operational funds to salary dollars with the additional benefits costs may not be a viable option in all circumstances. Management will follow-up regarding whether this is an on-going issue.</p> <p>In the other NRC location of concern, outsourcing was limited urgent needs in the context of a much larger staffing exercise applicable to existing employees in addition to external candidates. Management to send more details off-line.</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p> <p>M.Marchand</p>
96.12	<p>Parking</p> <p>RCEA was informed off-line of the special process for their member to pay for parking on a monthly basis via cheque through NRC-Finance as an exception to the default for monthly parking payments through Phoenix.</p>	
96.13	<p>Montreal Road Campus Shuttle</p> <p>RCEA was notified by Management in July that given the limited demand this was not a viable option.</p>	

Recurrent Business		
89.4	<p>1950 vs. 37.5 (Core Hours)</p> <p>Management confirmed that 5.17.4.4 of Hours of Work policy states that “Common Core Hours” means the period during which all non-shift employees must be on the job. These hours are 0900 to 1130 and 1330 to 1530.” Although for those under the 1950 Hours of Work provisions of the RO/RCO collective agreement, there needs to be flexibility to allow for days when the employee will not be at work to recalibrate for the extra hours they worked.</p> <p>PIPSC noted from their perspective the application of core hours within 1950 is vague and complicated by the differing ways it is implemented across NRC. Some supervisors are requiring adherence to common core hours and rules for leave notices within a 1950 work schedule whereas others do not as long as the work is getting done and in adherence to their 1950 obligations. For example some individuals are working extra-long days for a period and then are being told they have to maintain the core hours while rebalancing these extra hours so it could take weeks if not months to do so. This lack of consistency is causing confusion even though the 1950 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) is explicit in direction but appears to not be applied appropriately at the local supervisor level. Additional training along the lines of 1950 FAQ is recommended so that a better work-life balance can be maintained.</p> <p>Management confirmed that under 1950 there needs to be flexibility on a daily basis while at the same time maintain the general expectation that an employee would normally be present at work. For example, taking every Friday off was not the intention of 1950 but acceptable for a time to rebalance extra hours worked. However, if general attendance and/or performance are an issue then that needs to be managed in a different manner. Management will review the 1950 FAQs and NRC’s Hours of Work policy. If conflicting language is found then clarification will be provided. Followed by discussions with Director Generals and possibly the R&D Communities of Practices to ensure a common understanding regarding the application of the 1950 work schedule.</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p> <p>E.Harrison</p>
90.4	<p>Mental Health at NRC</p> <p>PIPSC noted that NRC does not subscribe to the Joint Learning Program (JLP) workshops which include some on mental health. They expressed concern regarding NRC’s training in mental health given NRC’s results in the Public Service Employee Survey (PSES) around mental health issues and awareness. NRC’s Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) did not seem to have charge of mental health but rather part of Human Resources. However, Bill C-65, is an Act to amend the Canada Labour Code to include harassment and violence and widens the scope of OSH to include psychological injuries and illnesses. The concern is that if ownership of mental health is not clear then it may not be given adequate attention. Clarification was sought regarding who is responsible for harassment complaints and the subsequent restoration in the workplace. If it is local management who are is responsible for restoration then what</p>	

ITEM	97 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>90.4 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>level of oversight does the Secretary General's Office play and who does the union contact if they have concerns or questions?</p> <p>Management responded that overall wellness including mental health are the responsibility of the Human Resources Branch (HRB) and an additional resource will be hired to support this. Harassment is managed by the Secretary General's Office while restoration after a complaint resides with local management with the help of HR. Management will follow-up regarding to whom the bargaining agents should direct their question or concerns regarding harassment cases. Further clarity is required on the impact of Bill C-65 on NRC as it may be two years prior to its implementation as well as the role of OSH in wellness and mental health and Security regarding violence in the workplace. Mental health initiatives currently underway include Echo promoting tools already available such as Employee Assistance Program (EAP) and LifeSpeak. Discussion are underway with Communication regarding updating MyZone to direct employees to the tools currently available. It was noted that the employee workplace survey had low participation at NRC, likely due to survey burnout.</p> <p>Both RCEA and PIPSC expressed their desire to be involved in mental health at NRC and encourage the development of grass roots initiatives under a large umbrella program. PIPSC then inquired as to whether a time code for would be created for mental health activities or would they fall under the existing OSH code.</p> <p>Management confirmed that they would involve the bargaining agents in the mental health strategy and that the question of a time code for employees for these activities needs to be explored further.</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p>
<p>91.8</p>	<p>Electric Car Charging Stations (Tesla)</p> <p>Management reported a recent change in direction regarding electric car charging stations within the public service. Natural Resources Canada (NRCan) had initially been tasked with developing an electric car charging station policy for Treasury Board (TB) and now all departments and agencies have been mandated to develop their own policies. Administrative Services and Property Management (ASPM) is currently investigating what this means for NRC and then developing an electric car charging policy which reflects that NRC cannot subsidize the electricity employees require to charge their vehicles.</p> <p>RCEA requested that considerations be made for the installation of a Tesla plug on the Montreal Road campus. PIPSC noted that while not ideal, even access to a standard outside outlet plug to supply the extra charge required to make it home in the cold winter months would be appreciated.</p>	
<p>96.11</p>	<p>Re-hiring of Terms</p> <p>RCEA raised concern that some of their members were having short breaks in service instead of having their term extended when this need was known in advance. The former is causing delays in receiving their</p>	

ITEM	97 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>96.11 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>last and first pays. PIPSC indicated that this is an area of concern for them as well.</p> <p>Management responded that breaks longer than a weekend or a weekend with a statutory holiday require a struck off strength pay action and while the Human Resources Generalist have been encouraged to use extensions there are times when that is not possible such as short-terms of greater a year less a day and post-retirees working full-time hours for six months.</p>	
New Business		
<p>97.4</p>	<p>Overtime Payments</p> <p>Concerns were expressed by RCEA regarding the delays in overtime payments to their members. Some were only recently receiving payments for the current fiscal year but missing overtime payments between January and March 2018. Some members rely on these payments to cover their living expenses and others are concerned about the accuracy of their retroactive overtime payments.</p> <p>Management responded that the Pay and Benefits office is in a crisis situation due to having less than half the required Pay and Benefits Advisors. They acknowledged the delay is too long and they have now dedicated three individuals to processing the overtime payment and anticipate the overtime for FY18/19 to be entered within several weeks, although verification would still be required after that.</p>	
<p>97.5</p>	<p>Pay & Benefits Department</p> <p>RCEA inquired about the long-term plans to address the staff shortage in Pay and Benefits and remove the out-of-office automatic e-mails.</p> <p>As indicated on the last agenda item, management referenced having less than half the required Pay and Benefits Advisors (PBAs) and the absence of a Pay and Benefits Manager. An on-going competitive process has led to the hiring of three more PBAs, although one resigned after only a few days on the job. Some retired PBAs are have also returned on post-retirement to address the shortage. A review processes and organization structure with consideration for underfills are underway. The creation of a generic mailbox to triage incoming requests has also been implemented, although a formal communication to all e-employees via Echo and more direct ones to managers and Human Resources Generalists (HRGs) is still required. Once this has been implemented the intention is to stop the out-of-office automatic e-mails as HRGs would be able to contact the appropriate PBA directly on urgent matters as would the employee responding to the PBA assigned to manage their specific case. Management reported that NRC has only 5% problem cases where other comparator organization have 19% problem files.</p> <p>Appreciation for the step taken was expressed by the RCEA with a request that their AD members be taken into consideration for underfill</p>	

ITEM	97 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>97.5 (cont.)</p>	<p>AS positions. They also questioned whether employee who had already sent e-mails to their PBA contact should re-submit these questions generic e-mails box.</p> <p>PIPSC requested the reinstatement of the bi-weekly reports regarding the number of employees not receiving payment or a quarterly report regarding common pay issues. As well, given it will be many years before Phoenix is replaced, certain parts of the government are looking to move away from Phoenix sooner via a pilot, and could not NRC do the same given its smaller size.</p> <p>Management responded they would look into the process for unaddressed e-mails sent to the PBA. As an alternate to the no payment report one regarding the number of emergency pays may be more appropriate as there are times when an employee is legitimately not receiving any pay that period.</p>	
<p>97.6</p>	<p>Maternity and Parental Information</p> <p>Concern was expressed by PIPSC that the level of information currently provided to employees leaving on maternity and parental leave was lacking information or was not clearly communicated. More specifically they would like to see information on benefits, sick leave, access to NRC facilities and equipment, changes to pay, vacation leave, carry over, promotions, daycare, impact on probation and term employees, pension, and union membership. A draft document has been prepared by one of their members.</p> <p>Management responded that existing letters detailing some of this information including the new extended parental leave provisions are currently issued from local Management regarding the Leave Without Pay approval followed by a separate more detailed letter issued from Pay and Benefits. Within the context of existing workload issues currently in Pay and Benefits, they could review the draft document against the existing letters. As well, they could post this information on MyZone for those proactively seeking an increased understanding to make an informed family decision.</p> <p>PIPSC to send Amy Campbell a copy of the draft document.</p>	<p>C.Cheung</p>
<p>97.7</p>	<p>Posting of RO/RCO Collective Agreement</p> <p>PIPSC enquired as to when the new RO/RCO Collective Agreement would be posted on MyZone.</p> <p>In reply, Management indicated that the agreement had been signed on August 9th and they had 120 days to implement the changes although discussions were underway with Communications to make the necessary arrangements for the agreement to be posted on MyZone.</p> <p>RCEA noted that their revised agreements had not yet been posted either.</p>	

ITEM	97 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>97.7 (cont.)</p>	<p>Management noted that part of the issue is that the collective agreement documents are unstable as it is believed they are based upon an old WordPerfect platform and really need to be retyped. Currently only the LS and IS revised collective agreements have been posted but Labour Relations is working with Communications to ensure all are updated correctly on MyZone and if there ways to quicken the process in the future. Management committed to updating PIPSC and RCEA on the status of posting each of their respective collective agreements.</p> <p>RCEA offered the suggestion that if the documents are in a PDF form then it may not be necessary to retype them.</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p>
<p>97.8</p>	<p>CTEs in SuccessFactors</p> <p>In response to a request from PIPSC, Management provided data on the distribution of overall performance ratings from the 2017-18 fiscal year. More specifically of those CTEs completed 0.1% were rated as Did Not Meet Expectations, 1.6% as Met Some, 76.7% as Met, 20.5% as Exceeded, and 1.2% as Significantly Exceeds, which represented a nice bell distribution. Management to forward the Bargaining Agents the details and supporting graph. There were 138 incomplete CTEs which include those on sick leave. Completion rates are monitored in the Vice President weekly scans</p> <p>PIPSC also requested an overview on the first year of CTEs in SuccessFactors and whether there were any lessons learned. They have received positive and negative feedback from their members. Some recommendations are that the October mid-year review be expanded to a window of time from October through to November to accommodate for heavier workloads that may arise. That commitments and indicators from previous years retained in the system for comparison. Meaningful metrics to determine when Significantly Exceeds expectations verses Exceeds verses Met are warranted. Many were questioning the motivation for putting in the effort as a non-management employees there is no distinguishing impact on the salary levels between a Met and Exceeds or even Significantly Exceeds rating aside from pride. There is often additional supporting documentation required to justify the higher rating in addition to the work itself. That is if the supervisor believes in giving a rating above Met. Furthermore there is concern that the bar to achieve the same level would then increase in subsequent years impacting even the level to achieve Met or there would be higher expectations placed upon others in the group all which would have a demotivating impact. Then there is concern that a change in supervisor may lead to a lower rating or that a negative area such as poor communications would greatly impact the overall rating. PIPSC also sought clarification regarding if a Met Some and Does Not Meet rating would automatically trigger a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).</p> <p>RCEA also noted that they too have observed that the assignment of Met verses Exceeds is not consistently applied and also have the same</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p>

<p>97.8 (cont.)</p>	<p>concern that to achieve an Exceeds rating will led to increased expectations the following year.</p> <p>Management acknowledged that there was a learning curve for employees to get used to the CTE in SuccessFactors, especially regarding the check points. They are increasing manager/supervisor training to help address some of these issues in addition to improving timeliness by shortening the back and forth regarding commitments and performance evaluations as well education on how to facilitate these conversations with employees. The reorganization around the end of the fiscal year and changes in supervisors also impeded some CTEs from moving forward which was further compounded by delays in completions this year so that the development of the new commitments could not be launched as planned. Suggestions from the Bargaining Agents were sought regarding how to streamline and tighten the timelines.</p> <p>Management confirmed that the commitments and performance history is stored in the system and would provide instructions off-line on how to access. While there is subjectivity in the CTEs, some metrics for Met would be achieved as planned, whereas Exceeds would be achieved more or faster than planned. For those areas using calibration, a greater consistency as those metrics would develop over time and extend that level of consistency even when calibration is not done. There is also no ratings bell curve that NRC Managements is working towards.</p> <p>On a positive level, Management reported there is an appreciation for the increased transparency and overall timeliness with only a very limited number of employees not willing to sign. The weights built into the commitments are also mathematically designed to impact the overall rating removing some of this subjectivity as well the evergreen nature of the commitments if used properly. The overall system generated ratings can be overridden by the supervisor when there is a real justification to do so and Management can track when this is done. Management recognizes that employees place different value on different forms of recognition. For some it is client recognition, others promotions or rating on the CTE or recognition among the team and managers should be conscious of what motivates their employees individually. While there may be issues with how the system is or is not motivating an employee, many are opting to stay on at NRC beyond the age of retirement as they derive intrinsic value from the work they preform so Management needs to look for creative ways to incentify this behaviour. There are organizations that have determined that there is no longer sufficient value in performance reviews; however, they often have additional financial incentives at their disposal, something not available to NRC.</p> <p>Management confirmed there is no automatic generation of a PIP in response to a Does Not Meet or Met Some ratings, unlike the core Public Service. The PIP is intended to help the employee close the deficiencies in their performance and as such can be commenced at any point in the</p>	<p>M.Marchand</p>
--------------------------------	--	-------------------

ITEM	97 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
<p>97.8 <i>(cont.)</i></p>	<p>year to improve performance in an effort to prevent a poor performance rating on the CTE.</p> <p>PIPSC praised the amazing accomplishments of the employees at NRC. Given it is a smaller organization there is so much to be proud of.</p> <p>Management agreed with PIPSC on the accomplishments of NRC's employees, especially given it has been a demanding year.</p>	
<p>97.9</p>	<p>Security Investigations</p> <p>Mr. Tim Grubb, Executive Director of the Security Branch spoke to the members to address the concerns from the BAs that their role as the official representative for their members was not, in their view, being respected in security investigations. More specifically that during meetings, they felt ignored and not able to speak for their members, nor were meeting invitations or reports issued directly to them even though they were involved. Instead everything had to come via their member. They also expressed concern over their length of time that investigations were taking, some four to six months, as well as the redaction of portions of the final security report issued to their members.</p> <p>Mr. Grubb informed the committee that employees involved in a security investigation are informed from the start they can actively involve their BA and have their representative attend meetings with them. The investigator also accommodates the availability of the BA representative. If an employee, who initially chose not to involve their BA, then has a change of mind in the meeting, the investigator will adjourn the meeting until their representative can attend. However, many employees do not want their BA to be aware and there are times when they have initially involved their BA only to later decide otherwise. To respect employee privacy, the involvement of the BA is left to the employee to inform them at each step. Nevertheless, Security recently implemented a change in the process regarding the distribution of the final investigation report wherein the employee can sign a form to authorize a copy of the report to be issued directly from Security to their BA representative.</p> <p>Security investigations are done in adherence with the policy on Administrative Investigations which supports natural justice, reported Mr. Grubb. Although in doing so, this takes time to gather evidence, witness statements, looking at all angles to find the truth before interviewing the subject employee. The employee needs to be informed in writing about the substance of the investigation and the allegations against them. Be afforded adequate time to prepare for the subsequent security investigation interview, which can also occur over several meetings, especially if the employee requires more time. While the involvement of the BA representative is welcome, in the search for the truth it is the employee, and not the BA representative, who needs to speak to their actions or inactions. These investigation meetings are taped to ensure accuracy of account. The employee can also choose not to speak in their defense. The investigator reviews the entire report line by line with the</p>	

<p>97.9 (cont.)</p>	<p>employee and any additional comments they make will be included at the end.</p> <p>To address concerns regarding the redaction of the final report, Mr. Grubb noted that all redactions are done by the Access to Information and Privacy (ATIP) coordinator and each justified to specific provisions of the Act. Investigators endeavor to prepare investigation reports in such a manner that very little, if anything, is redacted, although some of those redactions are to protect the private information of the employee. The report is also a Protected B Government of Canada (GOC) document for which NRC-Security is responsible for its proper protection under GOC policies. Although if the information contained within the report is only about the employee themselves then they can choose to share this information.</p> <p>The Bargaining Agents commented that if they are involved and fully aware then they can see the big picture and encourage their member to be transparent, which in their best interest while ensuring their member's rights are respected. They also understand it is the employee's choice if they want to avail themselves of representation by their BA, but to not do so early on makes it harder later. As for the Protected B nature of the investigation report, they often receive protected B documents from their members directly in support of the many avenues by which they represent them.</p> <p>Mr. Grubb noted that recently there have been a number of security investigations related to infractions of the GOC <u>Policy on Acceptable Network and Device Usage (PANDU)</u>, which is also applicable to NRC. A local NRC policy, under the greater PANDU, is also in development to provide greater certainty regarding what is and is not permitted for employees in the NRC environment. Once approved employees will be informed of the NRC policy but current NRC security training courses reference the requirement of adherence to PANDU.</p> <p>The members were further informed by Mr. Grubb that <u>Bluecoat</u>, a software program used to enforce PANDU, was implemented last fall by Shared Service Canada (SSC) in a staggered roll-out throughout the government which included NRC. More specifically Bluecoat categorizes internet websites, tracks internet usage, blocking some inappropriate ones and issuing a pop-up message indicating access to a web page is not permitted. If the employee tries to go around, the page location and IP address will be noted on a report automatically generated for NRC's Security Branch. If the content of the page is in contravention to PANDU and there were numerous attempts or access from the same IP address, then an investigation is made by Security into the owner of that IP address at that time. If warranted, management and the employee are notified and their computer is seized to take a mirror copy as evidence in a security investigation. He further noted that it is recognized that employees may inadvertently end up on an inappropriate website but</p>	
---------------------------------------	---	--

<p>97.9 (cont.)</p>	<p>their subsequent actions support this and therefore, these cases are not investigated.</p> <p>The BAs stressed the necessity to actively educate employees on their requirements under PANDU and NRC's future local policy. Management agreed with the need for appropriate training and communication.</p> <p>PIPSC inquired about whether Bluecoat also protects against targeted ads? Mr. Grubb responded that NRC's web filtering will stop a lot of spam getting through but it will not show up as bluecoat report.</p> <p>Both BAs inquired about the impact under PANDU of employees connecting their own IT devices, such as a printer, to an NRC device. Under PANDU no government owned data can be placed on non-GOC devices, clarified Mr. Grubb. Should an employee's work task place them in this potential situation, they should speak to their supervisor about providing them with the appropriate GOC IT devices or alternatives to using their own IT devices.</p> <p>There was further enquiry by the BAs regarding the implication under PANDU of downloading software or using open source software to conduct research or even how to work collaboratively with non-GOC clients or partners wherein data needs to be shared across IT devices. Mr. Grubb answered that there are over 4000 applications at NRC accredited to ensure that our data is being protected during their use. As well, he further noted that freeware is only free for personal use and not for commercial use and so to use it would be a violation of copyright under PANDU. Collaborative applications like TeamViewer should not be used to connect externally whereas the Citrix Landing Pad application, which enables the user to collaborate in a secure partitioned environment with assigned privileges has been approved by SSC and is being investigated for its effectiveness in outside collaborations or when employees are travelling. There are also network security profiles that can be used to enable outside research while protecting NRC's networks.</p> <p>PIPSC raised concern regarding the added administrative burden to complete the <u>Security Requirement Check List (SRCL)</u> each time a trusted existing contractor enter the NRC facility.</p> <p>Mr. Grubb, stated that the SRCL is five questions that must be answered before issuing a contact to an outside organization that will involve access to protected information. However, he clarified that this form is only required as part of each new contract and not for each entry into the facility. If additional examination of particular cases is required, the details can be sent directly to him off-line.</p>	
---------------------------------------	--	--

ITEM	97 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	Roundtable	
RT	<p>Membership Dues Report for RCEA</p> <p>RCEA was informed that Treasury Board was offering bargaining agents a recoverable advance on missed dues; however, bargaining agents for separate employers are ineligible and the RCEA will be grieving this decision. It has been two years that they have not seen dues from some of their members nor are these individuals included on the deletions list.</p> <p>Management suspected this situation was related to the crisis in Pay and Benefits. However, a copy of the data was request to address the matter now.</p> <p>RCEA to send the data to Labour Relations</p>	C.Fraser
RT	<p>Staffing</p> <p>RCEA raised an issue that some of their members had applied to AD and AS job postings open to all NRC employees across locations who later received messages that the positions were in Ottawa and closed to regions as the intent was to solicit a pool of interest. The messaging should have explicitly stated the regions for the current openings and other applicants who are screened in should be clearly been informed that they were now part of a pool for future positions. They have seen the same situation occur for CS positions.</p> <p>PIPSC shared a situation of a solicitation of interest e-mail sent to externals before internals for positions not being posted on NRC's website. They also sought clarification if an internal candidate can reapply to a position that has yet to be filled.</p> <p>Management commented that these could be collective staffing actions where a number of similar positions in potentially difference locations are being posted as one. As well, while it is a common practice to solicit interest for acting assignments from internals first, there is no requirement to do so. For candidates who have already applied to a position there is no need to reapply as their candidacy is still connected to that job posting until it is filled. Management requested that the bargaining agents forward applicable details regarding the situations mentioned in support of additional enquiry of the appropriate knowledge holders and off-line follow-up.</p>	C.Fraser D.Charbonneau M.Marchand
RT	<p>Telework</p> <p>RCEA reported that some of their TO members were being told that all their work needed to be done in the lab and as such they could not telework occasionally. In their view there should be some paperwork that could be completed outside of the lab. They enquired whether data was available on teleworking in the regions.</p> <p>In response management stated that these arrangements are managed on a case by case basis provided that there are no attendance or performance issues and if the employee will actually be working that day</p>	

ITEM	97 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	and not focused on looking after family members. However, some positions have less capacity for work to be conducted outside of an NRC campus. NRC does not track data on ad-hoc telework arrangements.	
RT	<p>Attrition</p> <p>A situation was raised by RCEA wherein members, mostly TOs, from one Research Centre are feeling overworked and the situation is worsening as replacements are not being hired.</p> <p>This was not known to Management and they can make an enquiry into the matter.</p>	M.Marchand
RT	<p>Overtime</p> <p>RCEA had received reports from a couple of their members in one Research Centre that they have had to work large amounts of extended overtime for which they cannot refuse and this is impacting their personal lives. In their view this level of overtime, if sustained, should warrant the addition of a new position.</p> <p>Management would look into the matter and follow-up off-line</p>	M.Marchand
RT	<p>BA Representative on Pay issues</p> <p>It was reported by RCEA that an individual in HR had questioned their role in assisting a member with pay issues.</p> <p>Management indicated that individual may have been anxious in speaking with the President of the RCEA and that the Bargaining Agents should direct issues related to an employee's pay to the generic Pay e-mail box or Amy Campbell.</p>	
RT	<p>No Local Steward</p> <p>PIPSC sought clarification as to whether an outside PIPSC steward can be brought in when there is no local steward as local Management had declined the request.</p> <p>In response, Management noted the definition of a steward is normally tied to a geographic region but it would depend on the language in the collective agreement. Management would look into the matter and confirm off-line.</p>	A.Campbell (M.Marchand)
RT	<p>HR Policies</p> <p>RCEA enquired where the HR policies are found on MyZone.</p> <p>Management replied that the HR Manual is on MyZone as one document and Communications is working on breaking it out into sections that are then searchable under the MyZone search function.</p>	
RT	<p>Safety Concerns</p> <p>A PIPSC representative inquired as to where they should be directing continuing safety concerns at the Montreal Road location.</p>	

ITEM	97 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	Management confirmed that the National Committee on Occupational Safety and Health (NCOSH) would be the appropriate committee. If the safety concerns are not resolved at the local OSH level or through Administrative Services and Property Management (ASPM), then it can be escalated to NCOSH to be addressed without having to wait for their quarterly meeting.	
	Next meeting is scheduled for December 12th, 2018	
	Meeting adjourned at: 2:21 pm	