

**MEMORANDUM**

**OPSEU** TO:



**SEFPO**

Syndicat des Employé-e-s  
de la Fonction Publique  
de l'Ontario

All Presidents with members in the Ministry of Consumer and Business Services

All Stewards in the Ministry of Consumer and Business Services

**FROM:** Terry Baxter, OPS Supervisor/Negotiator

**DATE:** June 7, 2004

**SUBJECT:** **The Ministry of Consumer and Business Services ERC Minutes – November 14, 2003**

---

Attached, for your information, are the minutes of the above captioned meeting.

Please post or otherwise make them available to the members in your workplaces.

Also attached is a MERC referral form, which should be used when referring unresolved local issues to the ministry level. The referral should be sent care of the our Job Security Unit with all the supporting documentation, (e.g. minutes, correspondence, etc.), with any referrals.

**PLEASE NOTE: THESE MINISTRY MINUTES WERE PREPARED BY THE EMPLOYER.**

AUTHORIZED FOR DISTRIBUTION:

IN SOLIDARITY,

100 Lesmill Road,  
Toronto, Ontario  
M3B 3P8

e-mail: [opseu@opseu.org](mailto:opseu@opseu.org)  
[www.opseu.org](http://www.opseu.org)

100 chemin Lesmill,  
Toronto, Ontario  
M3B 3P8

courrier électronique  
[opseu@opseu.org](mailto:opseu@opseu.org)  
[www.opseu.org](http://www.opseu.org)

Tel: (416) 443-8888

Fax: (416) 443-9670

Ontario:

free: 1-800-268-7376

TDD:

(416) 443-9898

or

1-800-663-1070

Leah Casselman  
President

/cf  
att.

cc: MERC Chairs  
Ministry ERC

Terry Baxter  
OPS Sector Supervisor/Negotiator

## **MINUTES**

Ministry of Consumer and Business Services

### MINISTRY EMPLOYEE RELATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING (MERC) – OPSEU

Date: November 14, 2003  
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
Location: OPSEU – Toronto Regional Office  
31 Wellesley St. East

#### **UNION**

L. Ferguson (Co-chair)  
A. Gildea  
J. Catroppa  
P. Schillemore  
B. Scanlon

#### **MANAGEMENT**

J. Lee (Co-Chair)  
P. Moore  
B. Kaya

#### **HR/LR REPRESENTATIVES**

J. Price (Labour Relations Consultant)  
E. Denike (Labour Relations Analyst)

#### **GUESTS**

Nita Azuaga - ISB  
Gary Williams – WIN  
John Dalgliesh – RPR  
Richard Steele – ONVIP

FEB 11 2004

**ISSUE****DISCUSSION DETAILS****TABLED DATE ACTION**

<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>DISCUSSION DETAILS</b>	<b>TABLED DATE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	<p>The meeting was chaired by the Union</p> <p>The agenda was adopted with four new items. Three items were tabled by the Union, with one item tabled by Management. The Union tabled the following item in advance of the meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ministry Assessment (Learning) Programs</li> </ol> <p>The Union tabled the following (additional) items, at the commencement of the meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strategic Plan 2003</li> <li>2. LERC Referral (Local 736 ORG)</li> </ol> <p>Management tabled the following (additional) item:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. WDHP &amp; IT Abuse</li> </ol> <p>The May 9/03 minutes were signed by the Union. In addition, the Union and Management signed the Sept. 12/03 minutes.</p>		
<b>FOLLOW-UP ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES:</b>			
<b>Ministry Alignment</b>	<p>Since the Sept.12/03 MERC, Companies and Personal Property Security Branch (PPSRB) hired a Consultant to look into the feasibility of merging the two technical units. A letter went out to staff, dated Sept. 25/03, regarding the plans for the Consultant to meet with staff and Management. Following the letter, the Consultant met with Management and staff from the technical areas to collect data on the current structure,</p>	Feb. 20, 2001	<p>Management to provide updates as received.</p> <p>Management to confirm the</p>

	<p>etc. The questions posed to staff were sent to the Union on Oct. 16/03, as interviews commenced on Oct. 23/03. The Consultant is also speaking with staff to get feedback on the first phases of the reorganization. Those questions were sent to the Union on Nov. 5/03.</p> <p>The Consultant is scheduled to bring recommendations (if any) back to Management at the end of November, and interviews were scheduled to complete by this time.</p> <p>The Union questioned the need for those already restructured to be interviewed. Management responded that the purpose of such questioning was to provide feedback on the merger, and that there were no plans for any further questioning.</p> <p>The Union requested disclosure of the number of people affected by the IT merger, as well as confirmation on whether the letter dated Sept. 25/03 was disseminated to all staff members (and if so, how?). Lastly, the Union requested confirmation that all staff members are receiving the Nov. 5/03 questionnaire, and that the Consultant's recommendations will be shared with staff, once they have been forwarded to Management.</p>		<p>number of people affected by the IT merger, if/how the letter of Sept.25/03 was disseminated to (all) staff; if all staff members received the Nov. 5/03 questionnaire, and whether the Consultant's recommendations will be shared with staff members.</p>
<p><b>Unclassified Listing and Position Inventory</b></p>	<p>Previously, the Union requested an updated list of unclassified positions. Management has provided the Union with a response on this issue, along with a copy of the Unclassified Listing Report. Management noted that this should be a local issue; not a MERC issue. Names of (those) employees the Union feels are eligible for conversion should be brought forward locally to the appropriate HR Consultant.</p> <p>The Union voiced its concern over those persons on the Unclassified List who appear to have met the 18-month eligibility requirement for</p>	<p>May, 2002</p>	<p>Management to follow-up on individual cases prior to the next MERC meeting; will provide updates as received.</p>

	<p>conversion, and noted that the affected positions should be posted. The Union also proposed joint review (Management and Union Stewards) for instance, of such lists/reports, in the interest of efficiency.</p> <p>Management responded that a lack of time and resources prohibited them from conducting a manual review of all Unclassified positions in a month's time, and asked the Union to notify them of any 'red-flags'. Management also responded that Continuous Service Dates are often inaccurately reflected in WIN, due to system limitations.</p> <p>The Union inquired about specific positions; Management responded that it would follow-up on these individual cases prior to the next MERC meeting.</p> <p>The Union also requested clarification on how it is decided that an employee will work up to 34 hrs/week, or up to 36.25 hrs/week, and cited Management's obligation to abide by the Collective Agreement (Article 31A.15.1.1) and to post positions where work is ongoing.</p> <p>Management responded that the decision to require an employee to work up to either 34 hrs/week or 36.25 hrs/week is determined by operational needs.</p>		
<p><b>Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal</b></p>	<p>Nita Azuaga, Business Coordinator, Information Services Branch (ISB), Integrated Service Delivery Division (ISDD), spoke to this issue at the meeting. Co-location of functions (Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MAH) employees in selected GICs) is complete. Staff members from ORHT locations have all moved to GICs. Those (GIC) offices that have co-located services are: Kingston, Peterborough, Whitby, Thunder Bay, and Kitchener, Whitby, St. Catharines, Owen Sound and Barrie.</p>	<p>Sept., 2001</p>	<p>Management to provide updates as received.</p>

	<p>The Windsor co-location will occur next fiscal year.</p> <p>At the Sept. 12/03 MERC meeting, the Union inquired whether GIC employees are covering for MAH employees' lunch periods.</p> <p>Management responded that in the co-located offices, GIC staff would conduct intake functions only for MAH staff during breaks and/or lunches. GIC staff would not be required however, to provide advice on MAH issues to clients during these periods.</p>		
<p><b>Compressed Work Week Agreements</b></p>	<p>The CWW Policy Grievance was mediated at the GSB on August 1, 2003 and no resolution was reached. The parties agreed to adjourn the mediation, pending the outcome of Management's review of the feasibility of reinstatement of CWWs for those offices where they were cancelled. Management committed to providing a rationale for each Land Registry Office (as to whether or not the CWW would be reinstated) to MERC and the Union by the end of September 2003. This information was forwarded to the Union on September 30, 2003. John Dalgliesh (Director, RPR) joined the meeting to speak to this issue.</p> <p>For those offices where the CWWs are to be reinstated, Management provided the Union with the first draft/template of the CWW Agreement, and asked the Union to provide feedback. Management noted that this document is intended as a template for CWWs in Land Registry Offices; not as a template for the entire Ministry.</p> <p>The Union voiced its concern over those offices whose CWW agreements had not been reinstated and noted the reasons provided by Management for not doing so were not acceptable.</p>	<p>September, 2003</p>	<p>Management and the Union agree to disagree on the rationale for determining (the) reinstatement of CWWs, and note that this issue is currently the subject of an adjourned grievance. All further discussion on this matter will proceed under the grievance procedure.</p> <p>The Union agrees</p>

	<p>Management responded that in some cases, staff members are required on a full-time basis, which is not conducive to a CWW agreement at these locations.</p> <p>The Union requested disclosure on why E-reg training was limited to five (5) days.</p> <p>In response to the issue of days allotted to E-reg training, Management noted that some training sessions span nine (9) days. The five-day training sessions likely refer to remote offices, with limited E-reg functionality.</p>		<p>to provide Management with feedback on the first draft/template of the CWW Agreement for LROs.</p>
<b>Hiring Freeze</b>	<p>There are no updates at this time; the hiring freeze remains in place. It is not yet clear what direction the new government intends to take on this issue. At this time, MCBS assignments under 6 mos. hires, etc. must be approved by Directors, while assignments greater than 6 mos. must have the approval of the Deputy Minister.</p> <p>The Union inquired if this was fundamentally a matter of criticality. Management responded that program areas have been required to submit staffing plans, which reflect such needs until the end of the fiscal year. Management declined to disclose these plans to the Union. Program areas are not being asked to restructure.</p>	September 2003	<p>Management to provide updates as they become available.</p>
<b>GIC/Libraries Pilot Project</b>	<p>The Union disclosed reports from Strategic Directions Committee (SDC) dated Jan/03, Feb/03 and May 30/03 respectively, discussing the development of a strategic partnership between GICs and Ontario Libraries.</p> <p>Nita Azuaga (Business Coordinator, ISB, ISDD) spoke to this issue at the</p>	September 2003	<p>Management to provide updates as received.</p>

	<p>meeting. Management provided project-briefing notes to the Union in advance of the meeting, and noted that the intention of the project was to increase public accessibility to government online services.</p> <p>Consequently, the aim of the pilot project is to equip library staff with a knowledge index of what government services are available to the public online. Library staff would not be required to assist people with actual online registrations, but would direct people to the appropriate website/phone number.</p> <p>There are no provincial funds currently being transferred to the GIC/Libraries Pilot. Funding is provided by the Ministry of Culture and (applicable) municipalities.</p> <p>There are two pilot projects scheduled to commence over the next few months:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. North – Nipissing West</li> <li>2. South – Alexandria</li> </ol> <p>These projects will be reviewed after a six- month period to determine their success.</p>		
<p><b>Attendance Support Program – Thunder Bay (ORG)</b></p>	<p>At the Sept. 12/03 MERC meeting, the Union noted its dissatisfaction with the administration of the Attendance Support Program (ASP), in particular at the Thunder Bay location. Management has requested further information/particulars from the Union (i.e. names of affected employees, etc) however, the Union has not responded to this request.</p>	<p>September 2003</p>	<p>The Union to respond to Management's request for particulars.</p>
<p><b>STANDING ITEMS:</b></p>			
<p><b>Injury and Illness Management (IIMS)</b></p>	<p>Management reported that there are no employees currently in Level 3 of the Attendance Support Program.</p>		<p>Management to provide updates as received.</p>

<p><b>Corporate Projects</b></p>	<p><b>Integrated Financial Information System (IFIS)</b></p> <p>Management reported that IFIS has been operational for approximately six weeks, since October 1, 2003. All scheduled IFIS training is now complete, and Divisions have the facility to run their own reports (both monthly and ad hoc). IFIS Management reports will be available for October month-end; approximately 80 non-management (MCBS) staff members have access to IFIS. In November 2003, a new reporting database will be implemented (“Discoverer”), which will have better access and security functions. The project is expected to wrap up in December 2003 or January 2004.</p> <p>Whitby Integrated Service Centre:</p> <p>Nita Azuaga (Business Coordinator, ISB, ISDD) spoke to this issue at the meeting. Management reported that the long-term objective is to improve access to and integration of government services across the province and that the Ministries of Finance and Municipal Affairs are joining MCBS to co-locate at 590 Rossland Road in Whitby, to create an integrated service centre as a pilot project. The Project Team is being established, and the preliminary drawings have been completed. There will not be any impact on jobs as a result of this project; rather the project is intended to produce efficiencies and streamlined processes for the customer. Presently, a business and management model has yet to be developed, and the targeted project planning completion date is March 31, 2004 with implementation occurring in April with a review in 6 months.</p> <p>The Union inquired as to the number of functions that would be co-</p>		<p>Management to provide updates as received.</p> <p>Management to follow-up, to provide updates as received, and to provide any disclosure as it becomes available.</p>
----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>located, and whether LRO staff would be trained to deliver services in other program areas. Management reported that the following functions would be co-located at the Whitby site:</p> <p>Municipal Affairs and Housing/Ontario Rental Housing Tribunal (MAH/OHRT), Land Registry Offices (LRO – MCBS), Retail Sales Tax/Min of Finance, Personal Property Security Branch (PPSRB - MCBS), Ontario Business Connects and Government Information Centre</p> <p>Management reported that LRO and GIC staff will continue to perform the duties outlined in their job descriptions.</p> <p>The Union requested disclosure on the number of persons affected, and an indication of who is performing what function. In addition, the Union requested disclosure of new staffing plans and job descriptions (eg. GIC staff), and whether existing staff will be impacted.</p> <p>Management responded that new job descriptions have not yet been determined, and that the project is still in the planning phase, Implementation is scheduled for March 31, 2004, with a review scheduled six months following the implementation date.</p> <p>Land Registry Office Computers</p> <p>John Dalgliesh (Director, RPR) spoke to this issue at the meeting. The Union raised the issue of those PCs ordered to replace dumb terminals at selected LROs. Currently, a lack of ports/routing capability precludes Management from setting up all three of the PCs (Milton LRO), as Teranet owns the router/network.</p>		
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

	<p>Management reported that they are looking into obtaining larger routing capacity with Teranet, and will provide follow-up in the New Year.</p>		
<b>Redeployment</b>	<p>Management reported that there is no one on the redeployment list except one employee who is still on LTIP.</p> <p>Management also reported that all Publications Ontario employees who were on the redeployment list have now been placed, including the additional employee noted in the Sept. 12/03 minutes.</p>		<p>Management to provide updates as received.</p>
<b>Ontario Vital Information Project (ONVIP)</b>	<p>Richard Steele, Project Director, provided a status update on ONVIP. ONVIP is scheduled to go live in Thunder Bay (ORG) on Nov 24/03, with everything reported as being on-track. The Steering Committee is scheduled to meet Nov. 12/03 for the final confirmation, with the first data conversion (Vision) scheduled for the evening of Nov. 12/03. Major objectives at this phase of the project include ensuring the continuity of service and effective contingency planning.</p> <p>Training in Toronto and Thunder Bay will continue for approximately 2-3 weeks following implementation. Each ORG team has established a Team Leader to provide continuous support following the implementation.</p> <p>The Union inquired as to whether contingency planning for those unable to attend training sessions existed, and cited its concern with staff training other staff (i.e. how does one ensure that the knowledge is imparted thoroughly?)</p> <p>Management responded that those employees affected would receive</p>		<p>Management to provide updates as received, and will communicate these updates to those LROs performing ORG intake functions.</p>

