

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL CANADA (NRC)

MINUTES OF THE 105th MEETING

OF THE

NRC – JOINT CONSULTATION COMMITTEE (JCC)

DATE: December 10th, 2020
TIME: 9:30 AM
LOCATION: ZOOM Videoconference

IN ATTENDANCE

Chairperson:

Cathie Fraser, President RCEA

Representing NRC:

Michel Dumoulin, Vice-President, Engineering
Emily Harrison, Vice-President, HRB
Amy Campbell, Acting Director Labour Relations and Compensation, HRB
Leah Kennedy, Labour Relations Officer, HRB

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

Patricia Loder, President, NRC-PIPSC Consultation Team
Cathy Cheung, President RO/RCO Group
Stephan Grosse, RO/RCO Group Executive
Louis Poirier, RO/RCO Group Steward
Dejan Toncic, Employment Relations Officer, PIPSC (absent)

Representing Research Council Employees' Association (RCEA):

Cathie Fraser, President
Joan Van Den Bergh, Negotiator
Marvin Zaluski, 1st Vice-President
Michelle Lévesque, 2nd Vice-President

ITEM	105th JCC - MINUTES – DISCUSSION	ACTION
105.1	Approval of Agenda The agenda was approved with some additional items included pertaining to Carry-Over at M-54 of Vacation Leave, Incorrect Pension Numbers on Pension Calculator Site and E-Post not working for NRC Employees.	
105.2	Minutes of the 104th Meeting of the JCC Edits were submitted by the RCEA, Management and PIPSC in advance of the JCC Meeting. There were no issues with the proposed changes and the Minutes were approved.	

ITEM	105 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
105.3	Follow-up Action Items of the 104th Meeting	
91.6	<p>Terms – Reporting on Long Terms</p> <p>The RCEA requested that information on the status of long-term terms be shared with the Bargaining Agents as this would help them to understand the full picture of how many terms there are at NRC and what the duration of their employment has been with the organization.</p> <p>PIPSC shared that their understanding was that the percentage of term hires at NRC who would fall into the category of being considered a long-term, term employee was about 15%.</p> <p>Management shared that their belief was that the trends were changing and that the number of long-term term hires should be less than 15%.</p> <p>Management commits to providing the Bargaining Agents with a report on the workforce composition depicting term hires and identifying those terms which would be considered longer terms in the New Year.</p>	E. Harrison
96.10	<p>Outsourcing CSs</p> <p>A meeting was held in December 2020 to discuss the topic of Outsourcing with the CS Classification. Francois Cordeau, Emily Harrison, Joan Van Den Bergh, Marvin Zaluski and Amy Campbell were in attendance.</p> <p>Further discussions on this topic will continue between the RCEA and NRC Management in offline meetings and the RCEA extended their gratitude to NRC Management for making the time to have this discussion which has been of great concern to them and their members.</p>	
101.RT1	<p>MOU on Implementation of the Collective Agreement</p> <p>A meeting was held with Amy Campbell, Monique Melbourne, Joan Van Den Bergh and Leah Kennedy in October 2020. The concerns raised at the JCC pertaining to the MOU on Implementation of the Collective Agreement were addressed with Compensation’s Manager explaining how payments are being processed and the timelines.</p>	
101.RT3	<p>Phoenix Damages - \$100</p> <p>At the September 2020 JCC, the RCEA requested clarity around how the Treasury Board Secretariat was addressing the “Me too” clause that the NRC has in their collective agreement. As a follow up, the RCEA shared that they have learned that there has been a decision made on how this will be handled and have had a preliminary glance into the agreed upon terms that were negotiated. They stated that they “want what the other unions are getting” and would like to know how this will happen at NRC.</p> <p>Management shared that there is a Heads of LR meeting taking place on 11 December 2020 and it is likely that NRC’s HR team will learn the breakdown of the terms and conditions of the pay out and from there NRC can determine the next steps in accordance with direction from TBS.</p>	

ITEM	105 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>The RCEA shared that they already know what has been proposed and can share that with the NRC as they understand that there is an MOU on Catch-Up in addition to an MOU on Implementation.</p> <p>Both NRC and the Bargaining Agents agree to share what they learn about these terms that were negotiated with each other to better understand what is on the table currently for other government departments.</p>	
102.6	<p>Parental Leave – Article for MyZone</p> <p>PIPSC and the RCEA had previously requested that an article or cheat sheet be created such that it could be posted on MyZone so that it could explain the impacts and considerations an employee must review prior to requesting maternity and parental leave. A draft article was shared with both of the Bargaining Agents and comments back have been received.</p> <p>PIPSC shared that they felt the proposed article was very detailed and perhaps too technical but was also challenged to find a way to make it easier to understand given the information that was negotiated was so complicated in the first place. PIPSC expressed that there are people who are told they can't get their info on leave until they choose their date for leaving on parental/maternity leave.</p> <p>The RCEA says the information is complex and even HRGs are not understanding the full information, which is challenging for their members. The RCEA acknowledged that the Compensation team understands the impacts but they want their members to know ahead of time so that they can plan accordingly in an informed way. The RCEA also shared that face to face discussions which took place in the past would be good to happen now as it helps their members feel heard and that they can talk through their questions without them getting lost in email correspondence. Even virtual face to face meetings over MS Teams or Zoom would be helpful. The RCEA shared that this is a major decision for their members and they need to understand what they are signing up for ahead of time, not after.</p> <p>The RCEA says that having an overly complicated article going out to employees while having a good intention may serve to confuse their members and if we try and summarize too much we risk putting something out which is contrary or could be mis-interpreted from the Collective Agreement. The RCEA shared that if their members can be given a shorter article summarizing options with high level links to the appropriate resources (collective agreements and other government websites), along with an FAQ and direction to speak with their compensation advisor this would be helpful as a starting point.</p> <p>PIPSC is in agreement with the approach proposed by the RCEA but added that concerns from their members extend beyond their lack of understanding the impacts of going on maternity and parental leave and includes knowing how payments are processed and key dates. PIPSC expressed concerns around the fact that employees do not know what they have to do in terms of their promotion cases when going on this leave in concert with their CTEs.</p>	

ITEM	105 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Both unions shared their challenges as it relates to understanding how Quebec handles this leave as there are differences and it is critical that any communication or tool to help educate employees must also detail or reference where employees can get clarity around understanding their entitlements while living in Quebec and being on leave.</p> <p>Management stated that for anyone who is going on leave and has completed a large portion of the year, they will need to close out their CTE. They understand the concerns employees may have with this step now that the CTE is linked with D1 cases for individuals in RO and RCO positions, but the intent and plan should be that the CTE should be finalized prior to the employee's departure.</p> <p>Management commits to continuing this discussion in offline meetings with the Bargaining Agents to better understand what they feel their members may need by way of tools and collectively they can look at creating something that employees would find useful and informative.</p> <p>Management also commits to speaking with Monique Melbourne to discuss the possibility that Compensation Advisors hold face to face meetings via Zoom or MS Teams (or by phone) to assist in answering questions. In the interim Management asks the Bargaining Agents to continue to direct their employees to their Compensation Advisors for when they are seeking answers to questions pertaining to going on maternity and parental leave.</p> <p>Note: An email was forwarded to the Bargaining Agents by Leah Kennedy on 14 January 2021 seeking additional feedback on the proposed Maternity and Parental Leave communication tool and outlined that a project is scheduled to be undertaken in the new FY with the Compensation Team that may address this action item going forward.</p>	<p>A.Campbell</p> <p>A.Campbell</p>
<p>102.11</p>	<p>IP Awards Policy</p> <p>Chris Johnstone joined the JCC to continue discussions on the topic of the IP Awards Policy to address some outstanding concerns raised by PIPSC.</p> <p>Chris Johnstone outlined his understanding that there was a previous matter raised about files that were submitted before the new IP Policy Awards was launched. He outlined that retro-active payments have been issued back to April 2019 with the intent of capturing and recognizing inventors from across the Council and milestone payments have been issued. He stated that he was asked to speak to a small number of cases that were submitted before the new IP Policy was launched but signed after the effective date and seemed to not have been addressed, however he shared that his belief was that these have now been addressed as they were investigated, accepted and processed. That being said, if people have not received their payments from Finance they should be able to follow up. He reiterated the intent to recognize and encourage new inventions.</p>	

	<p>Chris Johnstone shared that with the IP Achievement awards, \$120K was issued to staff inventors who were involved in the advancement and the marketing of technology. This is intended to recognize the efforts of those who would have been a compliment to the lifecycle of IP.</p> <p>He further stated that there is a onetime effort to collect all outstanding inventor distribution forms from the research centres, where these are being processed. These distribution forms allow inventors to decide amongst themselves how the awards can be split differently (not necessarily an equal share). He outlined that there have been some complications with a few of the inventor rewards given they had not specified how the royalty payments were to be handled in accordance with the licenses, but these are being addressed. He expressed that it is not a straight forward process yet in the future in the Form 1s being submitted the weightings will be required to be outlined up front so they can indicate their relative weight in their roles on this invention.</p> <p>On the topic of the Inventor Revenue Share Awards, PIPSC had the following questions: What information will be shared with employees? Will they get an explanation on how the share will be calculated?</p> <p>Chris Johnstone explained that under the previous program people would get something on their pay cheque with a non-descript text line. Now the IP team is working hard to make this clearer through the milestone payments and it will outline how many disclosures, filings have occurred to then outline what to expect and how that matches to the payment. Employees will get an email that outlines the revenue share payment amounts and then they will see the payment show up on their pay cheque.</p> <p>PIPSC outlined their concern with using non-invention-specific IP protection costs to calculate Inventor Revenue Share Awards as currently done, rather than a pro-rated share of annual costs. PIPSC shared that they felt it is very encouraging that NRC decided to share IP revenue with its inventors however, they do feel that the current distribution formula greatly favors inventors in certain research fields whose patents naturally have a better potential for higher revenues without considering protection costs. They believe that this distribution formula socializes losses and privatizes profits.</p> <p>Chris Johnstone responded by saying that he understood what was being shared by PIPSC but that this was taken into careful consideration in the Awards Policy design. In their evaluation they had to address major administrative burden considerations, and also very complicated issues of practicality. Chris stated that one major consideration is that most NRC patents have negative margin (protection costs but no IP revenues). Further he stated that there is also a temporal complexity where, IP protection costs occur over a long period of time, with the highest costs typically being incurred many years before any revenues.</p> <p>PIPSC stated that they understand that NRC's position is that it may be too complex to calculate the net gain for every IP revenue which would be a fairer distribution of the funds amongst the inventors. However, PIPSC provided an alternative to split the "inventor revenue share awards funds."</p>	
--	---	--

ITEM	105 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>They suggested to distribute a percentage equally amongst all inventors that contributed to the NRC IP revenue and only use the current formula that favors patents with higher revenue on the remainder. PIPSC feels that this would be a better compromise regarding IP losses and profits and would not incur additional expenses to NRC.</p> <p>Management shared that in building the new Awards Policy several cases and scenarios were investigated and while the construct may seem fundamentally artificial, there is no absolute “correct” way to calculate and this was the best system that actually achieved the intended outcomes. The goal is to support and value commercialization such that inventions come out. Management stated that this was the best compromise as it is hard to get a perfect system and researchers seem overwhelmingly happy with the changes, even though there are some things which can be improved.</p> <p>Chris Johnstone stated that the systems are getting better and the tracking of revenue by license that was previously done very manually has now moved over to SAP and is more robust which was the needed change in implementing the new awards program. Chris Johnstone shared that they are open to discussing this further, particularly in seeking to find a broad consensus and he committed to preparing a response for PIPSC on this topic which can be further discussed offline if required or at the JCC.</p> <p>PIPSC had previously raised concerns about IP Cases that should have been filed five years ago but were not. The fear was that cases were missed. Further they had questions about payments for inventions disclosed before the new IP Policy came into effect but that were signed after this effective date.</p> <p>Chris Johnstone stated that his understanding was these may have been hypothetical situations rather than actual cases but notwithstanding this, he explained that disclosures now will be eligible for the Inventor Fixed Milestone Award disclosure payment. He shared concern with the suggestions made by PIPSC that researchers may not have disclosed previously due to a lack of [monetary] “incentive.” The concern stems from the fact that not only are NRC employees required to disclose inventions as per the Public Servants Inventions Act, technology transfer is fundamental to the NRC’s mandate and benefiting Canadians. He explained that in his branch it is flagged if a researcher fails to disclose IP cases from years ago, and has since published /presented the invention, or the state of the art has changed since. If this occurs, NRC then has lost the ability to pursue IP protection.</p>	
102.RT1	<p>NCOSH & JCC Articles for ECHO</p> <p>The article on NCOSH was posted earlier in the Fall of 2020 and a draft on the JCC is underway with Communications and the LR team.</p> <p>The article will be shared with the Bargaining Agents for their comments with the hope that the article will be released in the New Year.</p>	<p>A.Campbell</p>

ITEM	105 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
104.5	<p>RO/RCO Promotions Training</p> <p>At the JCC Meeting held in September 2020 a question was posed by PIPSC regarding training on the Promotions Process, and Management committed to looking into whether this was a possibility. Since then, the RO/RCO MOU Compensation Committee has been assembled and meetings have started.</p> <p>Management requests that this action item be moved to be handled as part of that Committee given there are discussions underway concerning the creation of tools and supports for managers and employees in understanding the promotions process.</p> <p>Agreement was received by all parties to move this item to that committee and PIPSC will raise their questions there.</p>	
104.6	<p>December Shutdown</p> <p>At the last JCC meeting in September 2020 a request was made by the RCEA for a message to be sent out on the topic of December shutdown.</p> <p>Management responded that they have been dealing with these communications at the local level and no large communication has been sent out specific to December Shutdown only. Messaging has been sent out with regards to the use of Other Paid Leave, Vacation Leave and December Shutdown has formed part of these communications.</p> <p>The RCEA stated that they were under the assumption that there would be an email solely dealing with the topic of December Shutdown and wish to state that if a commitment had changed and that no official communication was going to be sent out, they believe they should have been informed. The RCEA shared that RPPM has sent a communication out on December Shutdown recently and it was to be clear that authorized overtime could be used to substituted for December Shutdown hours but at the premium rate as it was earned. PIPSC further added that ACRD has also done this within their Research Centre.</p> <p>Management commits to sharing with the Bargaining Agents the communication that was in an Intercom article that spoke to 0699 and December Shutdown.</p>	E. Harrison
104.7	<p>Management Presence at M-4</p> <p>A meeting was held in September 2020 and this concern was raised with Senior Management and the matter was addressed.</p>	

	Recurrent Business	
88.9	<p>CTE Calibration Process – Automation of Ratings and Flexibility</p> <p>The RCEA shared that they recently learned that there is a system generated rating which occurs through the SuccessFactors (SF) CTE process. The RCEA was very surprised to hear about this and shared that it is especially important for those people who are having performance issues and whose self-rating differs from the system generated or that of their supervisor’s. Further, the RCEA explained that if things are automated in SF and there is little to no interaction between the employee and supervisor, there is a real lack of transparency. As a reference, the RCEA shared that given there were delays with dates for CTE completion due to the pandemic, there have been many cases where there has been no discussion between employees and their supervisors meaning the entire performance evaluation process has been an electronic transaction. The RCEA feels this is further evidence that performance management as a process has gone from a people exercise to a “digital” one.</p> <p>Management explained that this automated feature in SF actually can provide for more fairness because the ratings are populated without subjectivity. With each commitment that people set, they add weightings. If someone has a big commitment - weighted at say 40% - then this will factor more into the system’s calculation. If the first commitment that was most heavily weighted was met or more it will attribute more of the weighting and will then show up as part of the final suggested rating. Management outlined that with supervisors the vast majority of changes above the system generated rating has resulted in higher ratings because the supervisor chose to amend it. The CTE is an evergreen document and can be modified because of changes in priorities throughout the year and this should be done regularly where there are changes in the commitments. Management acknowledges that the communication piece is a very key issue and this also came up in a recent town hall where it was raised that some people have not been hearing from their supervisor at all. They stated that Supervisors should be reaching out and checking in with their staff as the interpersonal exchange is critical.</p> <p>PIPSC asked if there is a mathematical equation that can be shared on how the system generated rating is calculated. Additionally they asked what the timeframe is for responding to disputes and disagreements.</p> <p>PIPSC stated that there is a need for having proper team meetings. They explained that virtual water cooler gatherings are needed and given the pandemic they are just not happening. PIPSC feels that supervisors needed to be equipped with the tools and reminders to continue to meet with their teams to check in to see where people are at with some of their commitments.</p> <p>Management responded that the VP of HRB reports to the Senior Executive Committee on the completion rates of CTEs, and as part of this discussion, the VP of HRB is also trying to find more ways that will effectively work to help people stay connected while working remotely.</p>	

	<p>Management also outlined that at the end of the fiscal year, there are two months to wrap up the previous year and in this time there can be some back and forth between supervisors and their employees. In addition, it is always possible to re-activate and revisit CTE agreements. This can be done by reaching out to Denise Le Voguer to open up the document to look into this further. Management shared that they agree that people should have the chance to revisit and discuss their cases.</p> <p>The RCEA stated that employees must know what their supervisors rating is before it goes to their recommending officer/ calibration. They see no value in an employee attaching comments to a digital document in SF after the fact once it is finalized. The RCEA stated that if there is a dispute over a rating or the contents of a CTE, there needs to be genuine effort put in to trying to resolve prior to final rating being entered in the system. They shared that they do not feel that their employees will be supported by going to Human Resources/ Labour Relations.</p> <p>Management would like to understand further why the Bargaining Agents feels that cases going to HR/LR are not supported. They explained that SF or a paper based form is the same process and if things are not working the fault is not because of the medium used for people management but may be a result of challenges in communication. Management shared that they are communicating with supervisors that they need to be speaking with their employees on an ongoing basis. They commented that performance ratings should not be a surprise and they are encouraging managers to have early discussions with employees.</p> <p>PIPSC shared that they encourage their members to check in on their CTE on a monthly basis to see if something has changed and by doing so it forces the discussion to occur but this is being initiated by the employee rather than the supervisor which seems odd, but it is helping to mitigate any issues from arising at the back-end. They are encouraging this behaviour as they share that there are CTEs out there that are locked and this could have an impact on people's D1 promotion cases.</p> <p>PIPSC shared that they see a difference between the statements from Management on the CTE process today and those outlined in the 100th JCC Minutes regarding sharing the ratings from supervisors to employees before calibration.</p> <p>Management responded that they are ensuring all employees are being assessed on the same basis and in calibration exercises - if the rating changes it will be because the case warrants a higher level.</p> <p>The RCEA shared that from the earliest days there has to be discussions about a rating prior to going to the next level of review so that people have an idea of where they are at in their ongoing performance assessment. Further, the RCEA shared their confusion that if calibration has been used for as long as it has (and only in some locations) why is it necessary to still train on the process of calibration?</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Management responded that the supervisor/ director cadre is constantly changing so training is still required to ensure there is a common lens on how we view and measure commitments in the CTE. Performance Management is not everyone’s favourite topic however it is almost impossible to create a process that everyone all agrees on. The system works for the vast majority of the NRC population and the ratings indicate that it is still only 1.7% of the population that are falling below expectations. Management stated that there is a common desire to have ongoing conversations occur and a common idea of what that could and should look like. Therefore, there is agreement that we need training to help our supervisors. In this same vein, there are actions currently underway on leading remote teams, providing feedback and how to touch base with team members. These are all training tools that will be launched and there is a commitment to share timelines for this training and background. That being said, NRC is not ready to revisit the CTE process at this time. In the next 3-6 months the focus will be about supporting health and wellness.</p> <p>PIPSC has inquired if there can be a special COVID communication created to direct supervisors to have a conversation with all of their staff by the end of January so that CTEs can be revisited and adapted relative to what has been possible during the pandemic. PIPSC feels that flexibility is required for those who are unable to complete these commitments as there is fear that there will be severe impacts to their member’s careers. Further, there needs to be some identification that these talks have been held.</p> <p>Management shared that given this is an evergreen process, reminding staff to revisit is something that should be occurring but it may also require an additional reminder given the unusual year we are living through and hence we may need to encourage more checking in. This revisit of the CTE should not be overwhelming and should be a quick overview of the commitments to see where people are at and to adjust accordingly.</p> <p>Management commits to looking into what options are out there that could be used to communicate this with employees and they will look into ways that could enhance the performance management process. Management also asks that this topic be raised at the COVID meetings held between Management and the unions so that continuing dialogue is possible on the topic of navigating through the CTE process during the Pandemic where people are working from home.</p> <p>Management commits to sharing the math weighting on how the system generated rating is calculated.</p> <p>NOTE: this Success Factors Calculation was shared with Members of the JCC by Denise Le Voguer on the 16th of December 2020.</p>	<p>E. Harrison</p> <p>E. Harrison</p>
<p>97.9</p>	<p>Encryption Issues / Access by the Bargaining Agents to Protected B Documents by Email</p> <p>The RCEA shared that they are hearing from their members that they need to forward documents to their union reps but express fear of reprisals for sharing Protected B documents that are supposed to be encrypted.</p>	

	<p>The issue is that the RCEA is challenged in that they only have one computer that has Entrust on it and that is maintained within their office and not accessible when RCEA representatives are working from home. The RCEA expressed that many times these Protected B documents are coming from the NRC Security Branch and they are relevant to their member's individual situations but their members are not permitted to send the documents.</p> <p>The RCEA stated that they all have valid security clearances working as members of the RCEA union and they have a duty to represent their members. Further, the RCEA feels that if their members are in agreement with sharing the documentation with their union, they should be able to forward it for their review without being disciplined for breaking any IT policies.</p> <p>Management responded that if members are sending protected B information pertaining to their cases to the BAs there will not be any reprisals.</p> <p>The RCEA inquired with other unions as to whether they are receiving Protected B information that is unencrypted and they confirmed that they are indeed receiving these documents freely. Further the RCEA stated that the implication that the unions will not store the information safely and securely is insulting.</p> <p>The RCEA stated that if the NRC is in agreement with employees forwarding relevant personal documents pertaining to their individual cases to the unions, they feel that this message should be communicated to employees so that they know there will be no reprisals.</p> <p>The RCEA suggested that they may seek a legal opinion on the topic of sharing information between employees and the union and whether the classification of these documents is prohibiting the fair transmission of information which in turn could be argued to be an interference with their duty to fair representation.</p> <p>PIPSC said that they would like to understand from Tim Grubb why there are seemingly more issues at the NRC and why the rules are enforced more strongly at NRC.</p> <p>PIPSC outlined that within their projects and in dealing with clients they are sending them encrypted documents so it is possible that there are existing solutions out there which allow employees to forward and share encrypted files while giving them permission to open and review documents.</p> <p>Management responded that they are seeking to adhere to the Government of Canada policies on IT use and in line with relevant security direction so their intent is not to withhold employees from interacting with their unions.</p>	
--	--	--

New Business		
105.4	<p>Fillable Grievance Forms in PDF</p> <p>Prior to the 10th of December 2020, JCC meeting, three versions of the fillable grievance forms were shared with the members of the JCC. There is the individual grievance form, the group grievance form and the policy grievance form. The RCEA mentioned that they are already using these forms and have had no issues. The only item still to be resolved is setting up electronic signatures.</p> <p>The RCEA sought confirmation from Management as to whether an email with the attached grievance form could be deemed acceptable as proof of signature and date.</p> <p>Management agreed that this was an acceptable interim practice.</p>	
105.5	<p>Swipe In and Swipe Out – Pilot Project from the Security Branch</p> <p>Tim Grubb joined the JCC to present and discuss a pilot project (currently still under construction) from the Security Branch which will give the opportunity to monitor employees who are coming into and who are exiting NRC premises on a daily basis. The program is called CHEXIT. The hope is to have preliminary installations of new card readers in Buildings M-9, M-10, M-19, M-36, M-50, M-54 and M-58 by the middle of January 2021 with the hope that if all is working and all bugs are attended to, this can be further distributed and implemented. Building Authorities will be informed such that this can also be communicated to contractors and tenants in buildings and supervisors will also be notified of this new pilot project.</p> <p>Tim Grubb explained that this is an initial prototype that offers an advantage around employee safety. The system is monitored by the NRC Security Branch, as the current badge access system has been for years.</p> <p>The RCEA inquired if this system is going to be removed after the Pandemic has ended and people return to the workplace. The RCEA asked if this system will be used to monitor employee attendance.</p> <p>Tim Grubb responded that given this is a prototype and proof of concept they do not know if this will be maintained or used after the Pandemic is over, but it is being implemented with the express desire to monitor who is in the building from a safety side. The information that is captured on cameras will be kept for two weeks. Tim Grubb further explained that the information is to be used by the Security office only, however if there is an investigation into a disciplinary matter that may relate to verifying when a person entered a building, this information can and will be shared as it would form part of the fact finding that is being conducted.</p> <p>Tim Grubb explained that in the event of an evacuation of a building in an emergency situation, all doors will automatically unlock and swiping out is not required. He further outlined that Building M-1 will be able to identify who was in the building at the time of evacuation and they can assist the Chief Building Emergency Officer with cross-referencing the Access logs to the evacuees at the various Muster points.</p>	

	<p>Tim Grubb explained that employees using this new system will need to come in and exit using the same door. If not, the system will lock employees out so that they cannot get back in – this is done to ensure there is a clear and obvious indicator of who is in the building. Tim outlined that the current Standard COVID Operating Procedures documents developed to identify who can be/should be coming in to the NRC premises have a single point of entry and a single point of exit already built into the plan. This lends itself well to the use of the Chexit program.</p> <p>The RCEA raised a concern that for locations such as Building M-19, there are a lot of entrance/exit points from various areas that have employees coming in to the workplace and this may present challenges for some employees having to only use one entrance/exit. The RCEA stated that based on the nature of the work the employees are performing and where their work trucks are located they may need to leave from a different door and it may also pose an inconvenience to have to go out one main entrance door to get to the area closest to their work vehicles.</p> <p>The RCEA also shared a worry that having employees wait 15 seconds to authenticate their badge when trying to leave the building may raise anxiety levels in people wanting to leave. They also inquired if this type of system is commonly being used outside of the NRC.</p> <p>Management shared their understanding that in the Core Public Service this type of swipe in and swipe out system is actively being used so NRC is not mis-aligned. Additionally, in locations such as Boucherville this system is actively already in place.</p> <p>Tim Grubb also responded that the 15 seconds waiting period for the door to unlock to let people leave the building is possibly something to investigate further but employees should not be concerned as in an emergency situation the doors would automatically open. The intent is to get people out as quickly as possible in those scenarios but for every other occasion it is to get people to badge out to be able to account for their continued (or not) presence in the building.</p> <p>PIPSC stated that they feel education is required to ensure that people going into buildings using this system understand the requirements and also what to expect in case of an emergency. PIPSC also inquired what people should do if they forget to bring their badge when coming to work as this does and has happened. PIPSC suggested that perhaps a call box may be required that would direct people who are in this situation to Building M-1 to determine a solution for getting into the building.</p> <p>Tim Grubb stated that in cases where people have previously forgotten their NRC badge they have been given a Visitor badge and this may also need to be a solution going forward.</p> <p>The RCEA raised that NCOSH has not been consulted on this project and highlight that this must happen before the system goes live. The RCEA shared that the next NCOSH meeting is scheduled to be held on the 25th of February 2021 and they request that Tim Grubb attend.</p>	
--	---	--

ITEM	105 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Management commits to raising this for the next NCOSH meeting.</p> <p>NOTE: Management raised the need to include the topic of Swipe In and Swipe Out from the Security Branch's Pilot Project with the NRC's NCOSH and asked that it be added to the agenda for the next NCOSH meeting taking place in February 2021. Tim Grubb has been invited to attend.</p>	<p>A.Campbell</p>
<p>105.6</p>	<p>Revised Interim Process for PANDU Cases</p> <p>Tim Grubb outlined for the members of the JCC an interim process that has been put in place for managing cases where there has been a violation of the Policy on Acceptable Network and Device Use (PANDU).</p> <p>Given the current COVID-19 situation this new process was implemented to protect the employee who committed the violation and the investigators and analyst from possible exposure to the virus while undertaking the formal investigation. The new process follows when Bluecoat (the Government of Canada security program examining traffic over the internet from NRC issued devices) is triggered and identifies that an individual has accessed a prohibited website. From there, Shayne Dark, NRC's Security Analyst performs a deeper examination and produces a report. The report is then shared with Management and the individual in question.</p> <p>In the former process, once the computer was seized, additional information could be captured providing more details about the timelines for the infraction and possible other violations. This does not occur in this new interim process. Once the report is shared with Management and the employee a disciplinary investigation may be initiated as a next step.</p> <p>Management explained that from the labour relations side, the report is a finding of fact and the employee is invited to a disciplinary hearing where they can speak to the findings of the security report. If there is a dispute as to what activity occurred the NRC Security Office or the employee themselves can request a forensic copy be made of the computer after it has been seized under very safe protocols.</p> <p>The RCEA feels that NRC is putting the onus on the employee to defend that he/she did not access prohibited sites. They also feel that the report is used to prove that the employee did offend with no interview.</p> <p>Management stated that the standard is always based on the balance of probabilities and pattern of usage for a disciplinary action and what is important to note is that if this was raised by Bluecoat it was because it was detected as a PANDU violation, otherwise it would not have been picked up in the first place.</p> <p>PIPSC added that there is a real lack of clarity for employees around what is truly a violation under the PANDU as many people may not realize that they are violating the PANDU every day when they are having phone calls with clients over landlines while working from home during the Pandemic. Many phone conversations which are Protected B in nature may be taking</p>	

	<p>place but landlines may be the only tool that is available to some employees as not everyone has a work cellphone.</p> <p>Tim Grubb explained that the Security Branch has provided advice on protected B conversations using BBME software that allows for conversations at this level so there are ways to hold these client calls. .</p> <p>RCEA asked for clarification on ad spaces and click bait appearing on websites. Tim Grubb clarified that they would not show up on a report unless the ad was clicked. Also with https encryption, the content of a webpage is not visible but the page title is visible.</p> <p>The RCEA inquired what information is shared with Labour Relations (LR) when a violation report occurs?</p> <p>Management confirmed that the respective LR Officer for the client group of the employee found to have the infraction will see the same security report as the employee and Management. In the previous process, employees were interviewed by the Security Branch as part of the investigation and employees could offer comments on the report. Under the new process the individual can offer their comments at the disciplinary hearing should they not agree with any of the contents of the report.</p> <p>The RCEA stated that the old process for handling PANDU violations allowed for very respectful conversations to occur between the investigator and the employee. The RCEA feel that the current disciplinary hearings referring only to the security reports is bringing about harsher meetings that feel less respectful to their members. Further the RCEA takes issue with the disciplinary hearing process such that the Bargaining Agent is told that it is only the employee who can speak. They feel that they could help the employee to navigate this conversation in a respectful way and in the past when they have attended security meetings, they have been permitted to help in clarifying. The RCEA feels that it is an intimidating process and so they are wanting to help sort out what is actually being raised as facts that demonstrate how the employee has committed a violation of the PANDU. The RCEA outlined that they want a fair investigation done with sufficient evidence to prove a violation.</p> <p>PIPSC expressed their confusion around why MS Teams is not able to be used as a mechanism to hold a security investigation as was done previously. They inquired if there was any leniency to expand on this interim process for these cases?</p> <p>Management requests to take this discussion offline to further the conversation around possible adaptations for the process.</p> <p>NOTE: A meeting was held offline between Management and the Bargaining Agents to discuss this process in December 2020.</p>	<p>A.Campbell</p>
--	---	--------------------------

105.7 Employee Files/ Security Records at NRC

Tim Grubb outlined for the JCC the process and responsibilities that NRC has with regards to performing security investigations in addition to retention policies for security files of the NRC employee workforce.

He explained that the President has a responsibility under direction from the Treasury Board Secretariat to ensure that security incidents and other security events are assessed, investigated, documented, acted on and reported to the appropriate authority and to affected stakeholders.

Further the President will be required to investigate and act when significant issues regarding policy compliance arise, and must ensure that appropriate remedial action is taken to address these issues. He will delegate this to the Security Branch to perform these functions.

Tim Grubb outlined that the collection, use, disclosure, retention and disposal of personal information for the purpose of security screening is carried out in accordance with the Privacy Act and associated policies, directives, standards and guidelines. He elaborated that the decision about an individual's eligibility for a security status or clearance that follows the initial security screening process, reflects the person's eligibility at a specific point in time. That eligibility can change over time.

Tim Grubb explained that when an individual changes department or agency, permanently or temporarily, the individual's security file will be made available or transferred, in the case of a permanent move, to the receiving Chief Security Officer (CSO) or delegated official, upon request. This then means that any adverse information must be revalidated with the appropriate security screening service provider before a decision is rendered to ensure that the information is still relevant. As appropriate, updated information required for the security status or clearance should be obtained and evaluated by the receiving department or agency before a decision is made to accept the transfer.

Tim Grubb shared that security screening files are retained for at least two years following an individual's departure from the federal public service. Additionally, security screening files of individuals who have been denied or revoked a security status or clearance will be retained for at least 10 years following their departure from the federal public service before being destroyed, to help ensure that these individuals are not engaged by a department or agency without regard to the denial or revocation.

Tim Grubb outlined that investigations are flagged in the NRC Security Screening Database and the retention policy timelines for NRC security files differ based on the depth to which the security incident was investigated. This means that the retention timeline for a security file could be retained between 5 and 15 years after a case is closed. Given this, since the retention periods differ, a security screening file may be destroyed, however the investigation file may still be linked if a Government of Canada department were to inquire.

Lastly, Tim Grubb explained that the need to maintain a culture of security must be balanced with the need for people to trust that they are in a safe environment to do their work, and with individuals' legitimate expectation of privacy.

	<p>Given this, departments and agencies while respecting individuals' right to privacy, must continue to assess reported changes in behaviour and identify suspicious patterns that could give rise to security concerns.</p> <p>The RCEA shared that they recently learned that in settlements which were negotiated between them (the union) and the NRC which resulted in an employee choosing to resign because of their PANDU violation, the security investigation report was not removed from their security file. The RCEA is very concerned by this given the note on file would only indicate that there was a security investigation done yet it may have been for a minor PANDU violation (such as they streamed music over the internet using their NRC issued computer). The RCEA is worried that this may give the wrong idea about an employee to the new organization/ department and they may not be able to obtain the job offer.</p> <p>Management outlined that on the Labour Relations side, when matters of this type are negotiated, the HR file will be forwarded to the new organization but documents which have been negotiated to be removed will be taken off the file. This would possibly include the removal of a disciplinary record. The security file only goes on request by the other department. NRC cannot destroy the security file as there are imposed retention timelines which must be adhered to.</p> <p>The RCEA inquired about what NRC says to the inquiring department when they are contacted about a prior employee's security status.</p> <p>Tim Grubb explained that there is a note on the file when the employee leaves the NRC so that the Records Office know to remove the file after 2 years or 5 to 15 years depending on the nature of the file. He further shared that the NRC rarely gets calls of this nature and most employees hold a reliability status so their security is re-done at the new department. There they will take fingerprints, perform a credit check and do the reliability status review.</p> <p>PIPSC inquired with Tim Grubb about how to handle situations when unusual changes in behaviour are noted in an employee should someone witness this.</p> <p>Tim Grubb explained that in circumstances such as this when someone who is normally calm becomes aggressive and starts displaying unusual behaviours, it is important to follow the chain of command and first go to the supervisor to raise awareness. This could also relate to sharing knowledge that there might be a financial issue that has arisen which has become known publicly and is bothering the employee.</p> <p>Tim Grubb further outlined that the information that we hold at NRC is very valuable so if there are concerns about an individual's access to this information and they are also going through financial distress it is important to raise this and it can be done very quietly and in a respectful way.</p> <p>In response to PIPSC, Tim Grubb outlined that if another employee is worried about a colleague and their personal situation which might be strained or potentially compromised, Security should be made aware so that the matter can be investigated initially. In this early assessment stage no official record or security file may be created.</p>	
--	---	--

ITEM	105 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	Management and the union commit to meeting offline to further this conversation.	A.Campbell
105.8	<p>Proactive Pay Equity in the Federal Public Service</p> <p>The RCEA and Management were in attendance at a meeting in December 2020 to provide an update on Pay Equity in the Federal Public Service. The following information was shared with attendees as further context:</p> <p>In December 2018, Parliament passed proactive legislation on pay equity to address systemic undervaluing of work performed by women. The Pay Equity Act and the Regulation are targeted to come into force in 2021. The Act requires that employers with unionized employees establish a joint pay equity committee to develop a pay equity plan. Once the Act comes into force, the Pay Equity Commissioner, with the support of the Pay Equity Unit at the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC), will provide education, oversight and enforcement functions.</p> <p>The Treasury Board Secretariat will be responsible for establishing and maintaining pay equity plans for the RCMP and the rest of the Core Public Service, via joint pay equity committees. Separate agencies and other federally regulated employers will each be responsible for developing pay equity plans within their organizations. As participants on pay equity committees, bargaining agents will be involved in decision-making throughout the pay equity process. Non-unionized employees will be responsible for selecting individual(s) to represent them on joint pay equity committees with employers and bargaining agents.</p> <p>The regulations are currently with TBS who are working on mapping this process out and the NRC has already submitted some questions for clarification namely around how a person based system works into the pay equity review. There is still more information and direction to come. This discussion will continue and information will be shared when available with the members of the JCC.</p> <p>Management commits to sharing with the Bargaining Agents links on Pay Equity to provide the most current information available.</p> <p>NOTE: An email was sent to the JCC sharing links on Pay Equity on 25 January 2021 by Leah Kennedy.</p>	A.Campbell
105.9	<p>Work Life Balance / Delayed emails by default/ Presence on MS Teams</p> <p>PIPSC shared that they are getting calls from their members who are feeling obligated to be “visible” online and they are noticing how often people are connected. They are feeling that there is an expectation that employees should be accessible all hours of the day.</p> <p>In one example shared by PIPSC, an employee conveyed that they were contacted by their VP at 6am.</p> <p>PIPSC shared that in France there is a law that enforces the responsibility of individuals to disconnect from work. PIPSC inquired if there is something that can be done to automate a shutdown and protect people from over exertion and burnout by having to be online all of the time.</p>	

	<p>Management shared that this topic is a common one that has been raised with Senior Management and has shown up at EXCO in addition to being raised at a Town hall in the late Fall. The intention is truly to support employees to find means to work in a flexible way. And as such, because someone is messaging or logging in later or earlier, false assumptions may be made. People are working in a flexible environment and so while it may seem that someone is logged in early in the morning and all through the day into the evening, this may in fact not be the case. They may have logged in early and logged out only to come back later so that they could attend to family needs while teleworking at home.</p> <p>Management agrees that there may be merit in exploring ways that may support establishing and continuing to work in healthy ways; however, employees do need to establish their own healthy work schedules and communicate with their supervisor on their needs and what is possible. Flexibility is the key point here with a lot of other factors coming in to play.</p> <p>PIPSC also suggests that while a law like the one that exists in France may solve some problems, many employees would not appreciate having an automated system that would limit them from logging in or sending emails outside of the core working hours. Given this, people should choose for themselves what works. So there needs to be an option about how you are managing your presence online and finding a good balance.</p> <p>Management shared that there is material available in Lifespeak about being glued to your devices and how to manage the separation in a healthy way. Management commits to looking into Lifespeak to share any links with the Bargaining agents on this topic that might be available.</p> <p>The RCEA suggested that this may need to form part of continuing education and awareness by way of communications to employees on establishing work life balance and scheduling time for oneself.</p> <p>As a final note on this topic, PIPSC also identified that long before the Pandemic, maintaining extremely long work days and needing to be available and present well outside the bounds of core working hours has been a problem. This is a long-standing issue and there is a need to find ways to manage expectations.</p>	<p>E. Harrison</p>
<p>105.10</p>	<p>Multi-Factor Authorization w/ MS Teams</p> <p>PIPSC shared that in early December 2020 an email was sent to all NRC employees explaining that multi-factor authorization would be required when using systems such as MS Teams. They explained that this has since given rise to a number of complaints coming in where employees are now having to verify to authenticate themselves and has meant that emails or phone verifications are being initiated so that they can access their account. PIPSC also explained that there are a few default settings as part of the multi-factor process that do not seem to be working and this is further adding to their member’s frustrations.</p> <p>PIPSC shared that their members are having to give a secondary device that can be used to authenticate who they are such as their personal cell phone and do not wish to be using this for work-related purposes. Further, many employees do not have work cell phones so they do not have any other means other than using their cell phones.</p>	

ITEM	105 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>This is making many feel uncomfortable and they would like to see if they can be issued a work cellphone.</p> <p>The RCEA also inquired what the process is for approving work cellphones as for many jobs this was previously not required but perhaps this needs to change to ensure that all employees are able to access NRC communication platforms without having to use personal devices.</p> <p>Management suggested that employees experiencing challenges with the authentication process should reach out to the IT Client Service team, particularly if the issue is with regards to incorrect default settings as this could potentially be resolved in short order. Additionally, the NRC is obliged to now use multifactor authentication by the Government of Canada given that username and password are the only things in single use authentication and these can be easily hacked as many people use the same password for so many things, so it opens themselves and then the NRC, to being compromised.</p> <p>The fact that the NRC is moving towards multi-factor authentication is not an anomaly and is becoming common place in the banking and IT industries.</p> <p>Management also conveyed that the intention is not to issue everyone at the NRC cellphones, so we as an organization need to find means and options to ensure people can and are able to stay connected.</p> <p>Management suggests that a communication may be required on this topic of multi-factor authentication and will commit to reaching out to KITS to determine if this is on the radar or could be a new future communiqué.</p>	<p>A.Campbell</p>
<p>105.11</p>	<p>Language Training at NRC</p> <p>PIPSC raised that some junior researchers have approached them seeking guidance on how language training is intended to be structured at NRC as they are seeing many of their more senior peers leaving mid to later in their careers to attend language training either on a part-time or full-time basis. These researchers are wondering if they should be pursuing language training now so that they can support their career path.</p> <p>PIPSC conveyed that this may support their member's aspirations to attain these leadership positions and recognize that it can take many years to reach the required linguistic levels many of these positions require. PIPSC would like to know how their members should pursue language training and what steps they should take to engage in this developmental activity.</p> <p>Management acknowledged that the observation shared from PIPSC is very valid given that supervisory positions are requiring them to be bilingual more and more and there are many factors that go into determining the linguistic profile of positions. Management further shared that for employees wishing to pursue development opportunities with regards to language training, they should be encouraged to talk about this with their supervisor during their CTE development conversations. This is the opportune time to engage in these discussions as it also lays the groundwork for understanding individual career aspirations and what may be required to achieve these goals. Management added that unfortunately during the pandemic, a lot of training has slowed down or stopped but now things are up and running with virtual offerings.</p>	

	<p>There are however some challenges relating to the ability or inability to be tested; however, measures are being reviewed. Management advised that there is a large list of vendors available that people might be able to tap into and the training itself is not overly expensive, however location of training may be a bit of a challenge. In the past many people have also pursued language training on their own time outside of the working hours, and this can certainly be entertained.</p> <p>Management expressed that the HR Branch has tried to integrate language training requirements into the workforce planning tools so that it supports their succession planning. With the arrival of Alana Duncan to the HR Branch as a new Senior OL Advisor, this conversation will continue and HRB will undertake additional consultations that will serve to feed into the refresh of the OL Strategy.</p> <p>PIPSC stated that this sounds promising however they have heard from their members that discussions between employees and their supervisors on the topic of language training differs across the Council. PIPSC shared that there are employees who are seeking various types of training but their supervisor is telling them that they don't need this training for their job and this includes language training. The concern from PIPSC is that individuals are seeking to find training suitable to their career development as they do not want to feel stuck to the position for which they were hired.</p> <p>Additionally, PIPSC shared that some of their members are worried that they may not be successful in passing their language assessment when and if they need to be tested as they will have lost their language proficiency that they may have had in their youth but it has not been maintained or required in their unilingual positions. It is possible that they may already meet a BBB linguistic level and with maintenance training or additional developmental training they may meet higher levels sooner. There is a real concern that their bilingual skillset may be lost.</p> <p>Management stated that there needs to be administrative measures in place to support a bilingual working environment and they acknowledge that it may feel unfair to those who are already bilingual either because of birth or early education getting and having to do the lion's share of bilingual work to fill the gap - this is not the intention.</p> <p>Management shared that there is no magical solution for this and they agree that this is a key piece and so there is a need to keep reminding supervisors that it is their job to help people develop in their jobs and for future roles. Given this, management also suggests that pooling resources for language training and testing might be the ideal goal, and so organizing some group lessons in a virtual setting might be the next step.</p> <p>Management (HRB) commits to speaking with Alana Duncan so that it can be incorporated in to the refresh of the OL Strategy form part of the workforce plan.</p>	<p>E. Harrison</p>
<p>105.12</p>	<p>Finitiative – Negative Time Entry</p> <p>PIPSC raised the topic of Negative Time Entry as it relates to the Finitiative Project. They shared that it was their understanding that changes were supposed to be implemented but there has been no new update on this.</p>	

ITEM	105 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>PIPSC shared that at ACRD there are many time codes out there and they are all still expected to be used and yet they have heard that the pilot project implementation of the Negative Time Entry process at ACRD seems limited to specific projects. They are hoping for less complicated processes but this has not changed yet.</p> <p>Management shared that their understanding is that the pilot project will commence for projects that have been identified as no longer needing time-entry requirements and this will kick off in the new year, so there will be a bit of a lag as this will need to also be reviewed alongside the changes to the time management system (SAP). The intent is that the new process will be applied to new projects as it was not the intent to force existing projects to switch to a new process midway through. The plan is to implement this more broadly in the coming months with a goal to have all the Research Centres transitioned for the new fiscal year.</p> <p>Management encourages PIPSC to further this discussion offline with Rebecca Mann, who is a Project Manager for this Finitiative topic.</p> <p>NOTE: Additional information shared offline specific to ACRD was shared with PIPSC from Rebecca Mann via Leah Kennedy on 18 December 2020.</p>	
105.13	<p>Issuing T2200 Forms to NRC Employees</p> <p>The RCEA raised the topic of T2200 forms from CRA and has asked if NRC is aware of how this will be handled. The RCEA shared that they have had a preliminary glance at what may be on the table and mentioned that there seems to be a credit of \$400 that can be a flat rate payable to all employees (and all Canadians) required to be working from home. This is a measure that will be put in place but it is unclear whether it will require a T2200 form to be filled out to cover modest expenses.</p> <p>RCEA shared that the Treasury Board Secretariat via the Office of the Chief Human Resources Officer already shared some guidance on this topic with the Bargaining Agents but it seems that it has not yet been shared with Management. The RCEA says that this initial messaging speaks to the economic statement but it is not specific to the T2200, so there will be more to follow in the coming days. The RCEA commits that if they hear anything they will share with Management and asks that if NRC hears anything that they communicate with the Bargaining Agents as well.</p> <p>PIPSC shared their concern that \$400 is not a lot of compensation when the costs for their members can and has been quite a bit higher for people who are having to work from home. They said that there are people who have had to buy printers as they don't have green printers. PIPSC stated that their members want to attain the T2200 from the employer if they opt for the longer version of the tax credit. PIPSC shared that they are aware that some of their members do have green printers at home and have had some expenses for printer cartridges and paper reimbursed. They are concerned though about those who do not have the green printers and have incurred expenses for work-related reasons.</p> <p>Management says that there is a lot of interest in this topic but the NRC is still waiting for clear guidance from TBS. Management will be re-issuing clear messaging about what is going to be able to be reimbursed.</p>	

ITEM	105 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>In addition, the topic of printing and printing costs will be raised at the next meeting between the VP HRB and the CFO, Dale Macmillan. Management also will share information in the near future on the topic of the T2200 and what will be available to employees who are teleworking.</p> <p>NOTE: A Communication on the T2200 and expenses that can be claimed was sent out to all employees by Dale MacMillan on 6 January 2021.</p>	E.Harrison
105.14	<p>Carryover Of Vacation Leave for HHT</p> <p>The RCEA raised the topic for management to consider carry-over of vacation leave for HHT staff who have been working through the pandemic. Management agrees to look into this request and will respond offline.</p> <p>NOTE: This was addressed in December 2020 the BA's and Management.</p>	A.Campbell
105.15	<p>Pension Calculation</p> <p>The RCEA shared that they have learned that the numbers and rates of pay reflected online within the Pension Calculator on the Compensation Web Application are inaccurate. It appears that the information displayed shows only the last round of negotiated salaries and is not reflective of the current (most recent) salaries negotiated and signed in 2019.</p> <p>The RCEA is concerned that their members are making life decisions based on information that is not showing them the full financial picture. As a tool that was made to be accessible to employees in the Federal Public Service, the RCEA feels that the employer should do their best to support employees in understanding their salary forecasts. Additionally the RCEA expressed that while they understand that the Pension Calculator site is not maintained by the NRC, they feel that the NRC should do their best to advocate on behalf of their members to get this problem resolved. The RCEA requests that their members be informed that the information they are seeing online through the pension calculator is not current.</p> <p>Management responded that the proper calculations for pension cannot occur until the salary information is transferred from the Pay system to the Pension system electronically. It seems the two systems currently are not able to share the new salary information due to the new way salary revisions are processed. Management stated that while they do not have a target date for when the sharing of information will occur, they know it is a priority as NRC employees are not the only GOC employees impacted.</p> <p>Management shared that they did send out information pertaining to various planning for retirement courses and they would be open to putting a message out on these resource pages to advise people that they should contact the Pension Centre for their most up to date pension numbers. This message could also include a note that indicates that the pension calculator is also not using revised salaries.</p> <p>Management commits to looking into getting clarity on when the new rates will be integrated into the CWA and connecting with the RCEA and PIPSC to share any updates prior to the next JCC.</p> <p>NOTE: An email was sent to the Bargaining Agents by Leah Kennedy on 14 January to provide an update on where this item is at.</p>	A.Campbell

ITEM	105 th JCC - MINUTES - DISCUSSION	ACTION
105.16	<p>EPOST</p> <p>The RCEA raised the fact that E-POST for obtaining copies of Pay stubs online is not working for NRC employees. They shared that they are hearing from their members that there are problems.</p> <p>Management heard that there may have been issues because employees may have been signing up too soon and that there may be issues with recognizing the PRI number.</p> <p>The RCEA expressed that the issues were unrelated to the PRI number and their concern was that their members would be cut off from the CWA upon retiring or leaving the NRC and that E-POST is the only way they can get the last pay stub and additional pay stubs at later dates when there have been salary revisions.</p> <p>The RCEA requests that someone from the compensation office perform a test case in setting up an E-POST account to see if this is working and to investigate options for resolving this for employees.</p> <p>NOTE: An email was sent to the Bargaining Agents by Leah Kennedy on 14 January to provide an update that new language will be emailed to employees leaving the NRC and how to navigate EPOST to ensure they can access Pay stubs after their departure.</p>	A.Campbell
105.17	<p>Round Table</p> <p>PIPSC asked that the two items pertaining to EME and OCRE which were raised to form part of the agenda for the JCC which did not make the meeting be discussed offline. These items will be addressed with the appropriate HRG and LR Officer in concert with PIPSC.</p> <p>Happy Holidays and thanks for all of the hard work and collaboration!!</p>	
	<p>The next meeting of the JCC will take place on 10 March 2021. Dates are currently being finalized and invitations will be sent out prior to the end of December 2020 for these meetings. Michel Dumoulin will be the Chair of the next meeting in March 2021.</p>	
	<p>Meeting adjourned at: 3:30 pm</p>	