



CARM Trade Chain Partner Working Group – Record of Discussion

Wednesday, July 4, 2018 4:00-5:00 pm EST

Trade Chain Member Participants

Melanie Bédard

Milgram Customs Brokerage
mbedard@milgram.com

Janice McBride

Canadian Society of Customs Brokers
jmcbride@cscb.ca

Candace Sider

Canadian Society of Customs Brokers
csider@livingstonintl.com

Karin Muller

Magna International
karin.muller@magna.com

Debbie Price

Walmart
debbie.price@walmart.com

Ruth Snowden

Canadian International Freight Forwarders Association (CIFFA)
ruths@ciffa.com

Lak Shoan

Canadian Trucking Alliance (CTA)
lak.shoan@ontruck.org

Jim Sutton

IE Canada
jsutton@iecanada.com

Ashley Ziai

Canadian Federation of Independent Business (CFIB)
ashleyzai@cfib.ca

Winnie Lau

Global eTrade Services (GeTS)
winnielau@globaltrade.services

Ray Fischer

Ernst & Young (EY)
ray.fischer@ca.ey.com

Oryst Dydynsky

Descartes / AICBA
odydynsky@descartes.com

Emil Fiorantis

Dominion Group
efiorantis@dominiongroup.com

Renate Jalbert

FedEx / Canadian Express Association
rjalbert@fedex.com

Vikram Patil

Global eTrade Services (GeTS)
vikram@globetrade.services

Thomas Wong

Global eTrade Services (GeTS)
vikram@globetrade.services

Michael Tamilia

CN / Rail Association of Canada
michael.tamilia@cn.ca

Tara Forristal

London Sufferance Warehouse / Canadian Sufferance Warehouse Association (CSWA)
tara@londonsufferance.ca tara@londonsufferance.ca

CBSA Member Participants

Lisa Anawati

Vice-President, CARM Project
Lisa.Anawati@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Omar Subhani

Director General, CARM Project
Omar.Subhani@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Irene Serry

Director, CARM Portfolio Control and Stakeholder Relations, CARM Project
Irene.Serry@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Benjamin Walker

Director, Programs Branch, CARM Project
Benjamin.Walker@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Jim Clark

Director, Operations Branch, CARM Project
Jim.Clark@cbsa-safc.gc.ca

Richard Lavoie

Director, CARM Project Delivery, CARM Project
Richard.Lavoie@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

CBSA Guests

Glenn O'Flaherty

CARM Project
goflaherty@deloitte.ca

Daniel Melkin

CARM Project
Daniel.Melkin@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Kevin Horseman

CARM Project
Kevin.Horseman@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Jonathan Hopkins

CARM Project
Jonathan.Hopkins@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Jane Howe

CARM Project
Jane.Howe@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Benoit Riel

CARM Project
Benoit.Riel2@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Carole Daffner

Solution Design
Carole.Daffner@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Kristin Lavoie

CARM Project
Kristin.Lavoie@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Rohan Patra

CARM Project
Rohan.Patra@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

<p>Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introduction</p> <p>Summary: Lisa Anawati discussed the purpose of the CARM transformation and noted the following regarding the CARM Trade Chain Partner Working Group (TCP WG):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key to success is how we talk to each other. • CARM will focus on being customer-centric. • The CBSA is seeking to receive broad based input from the TCP community. • The CBSA hopes the TCPs come to the table with an open and collaborative approach and a willingness to work together. • The TCP WG should be a platform for a general understanding and alignment between industry and the CBSA. • The TCP WG should remain open-minded towards new solutions. • The CBSA will respect the various points of view, follow up on questions and try to do so in a timely manner, as well as serve as open and honest collaborative partner throughout this journey. <p>Record of Decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCP WG meetings will be conducted in English, but questions are welcome in either English or French and will be responded to accordingly. <p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCPs members to notify CARM Project team of their language preference.
--

<p>Agenda Item #2: Working Group Approach</p> <p>Summary: Kevin Horseman provided an overview of the TCP WG approach, as well as the sub-working groups that will tackle relevant issues with a broader reach. The TCP WG will lead the sub-working groups to seek and obtain their perspectives and feedback from the broader TCP community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oryst Dydynsky - there should only be three sub-working groups. Service providers are not a separate entity, but support the other groups' lines of business. Oryst, Ray Fischer and Vikram Patil agreed. • Richard Lavoie – the current focus is on the business requirements and the business transformation piece. In the future, there may be a requirement to have a sub-working group addressing technical questions. • Kevin overviewed the TCP WG roles and responsibilities. The CARM Project is seeking feedback and input as early as possible and throughout the design stage. The TCP WG is a feedback mechanism that will coordinate and drive sub-working group deeper dives on hot topics and ensure appropriate consultation. There may be instances where the sub-working groups may get together to discuss key topics and challenge each other for a more fulsome discussion. <p>Record of Decisions: N/A</p> <p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Service Provider sub-working group will be reviewed and amalgamated into the other sub-working groups.

<p>Agenda Item #3: Consultation Session Approach</p> <p>Summary: Jonathan Hopkins provided an overview of the design workshops. The purpose is to develop the to-be processes related to each of the capabilities, and we will be seeking the TCP involvement on key elements of the CARM design during the TCP WG Consultation Sessions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CARM Project wants consolidated feedback on the considerations from a TCP perspective (concerns, things the CBSA may have overlooked). • The TCP WG Consultations will likely be a full day of sessions where more specific elements of the scope of CARM will be discussed and initial reactions on the topics and considerations at play will be gathered. • The sub-working groups will then conduct a deeper dive on relevant topics. This output will be brought back to the overarching TCP WG for discussion by the sub-working group leads. • Janice McBride – will the CBSA come to the WG with a variety of options or a recommended concept for the future state? Jonathan replied that we are trying to narrow down the scope of potential options, to a more targeted recommended solution. • Richard - some of what the CARM Project proposes originally came from TCPs through previous consultations and engagements. Janice asked that when there are things that are simply unfeasible from the CBSA side, the TCPs would appreciate it if they were told that from the get-go. Project leadership agreed with this request. Lisa pointed out that regulatory and legislative issues may affect the implementation of some things that are proposed. <p>Record of Decisions: N/A</p> <p>Action Items: N/A</p>
--

<p>Agenda Item #4: Calendar of Activities</p> <p>Summary: Kevin reviewed the proposed timeline of TCP WG Activities. July 18th is proposed for first TCP WG consultation. In person is highly recommended. Webex will be provided as an alternative. We will send out an email to confirm availabilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oryst - many participants have to report to a board of directors. There will be positions or issues that may need approval to move forward with, to ensure recommendations are on the correct path. As a result of this, these timelines seem tight. Some TCP reps will need to consider additional feedback from boards of directors on an ongoing-basis. Jonathan replied that we would appreciate receiving caveated input from TCP WG members that is subject to further ratification where required. We expect to have most of our solution elements confirmed with the TCP WG, with a few outstanding issues that would need to be addressed at a later date, as things go through the various TCP association boards for review/approval. • Debbie asked if the meetings be in Ottawa or Toronto. Lisa responded that we recognize that many TCP partners are in Toronto, so we will explore the option of Consultation Sessions alternating between Toronto and Ottawa. • Mike asked if the sub-working group meetings will be full day meetings as well? Kevin responded that it depends on key topics/material of relevance for those deep dive sessions. • Janice asked that we clearly indicate what materials are for limited distribution. The project will create a folder in GCcollab marked accordingly. <p>Record of Decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All documents will be available for mass distribution, unless specifically marked. If there are things to be specifically contained to this group, it will be marked and put in a separate folder in GCcollab. <p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An email will be sent to TCP WG members to confirm the July 18th consultation date, within the next few days. • We need to determine if we need to combine the August and September consultations sessions due to summer availability.
--

<p>Agenda Item #5: Roundtable and Q&A</p> <p>Summary: The WG discussed the value in having one discussion on topics that are of interest to all sub-working groups. We will work together to determine integration of deep-dive sessions where possible. Mike highlighted the importance of having the dates for TCP WG activities finalized as early as possible. The project team will seek to provide these dates as early as we can.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jane Howe introduced CARM’s Innovation Program, highlighting that they are doing sensing and scanning activities to uncover what other border services agencies are doing so that they can bring that knowledge to our CARM thinking. The other key focus is to run small-scale experiments to test and try things. As part of these experiments, we will look to engage the TCP WG on ad-hoc basis, but not one that will be mandatory. • GCcollab will be the place where we will provide documents, calendar of events, and facilitate group discussions. <p>Record of Decisions: N/A</p> <p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kevin will connect Vikram with Jane.
--

<p>Agenda Item #6: Conclusion and Next Steps</p> <p>Summary: Lisa mentioned that if there are questions after the call, feel free to reach out to her, Kevin, or Irene and we will get back to you promptly. Lisa thanked everyone for their participation.</p> <p>Record of Decisions: N/A</p> <p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCP WG reps to select representatives for their respective sub-working group, and send their contact info to the CARM Project team. • TCP WG members to register for GCcollab if they haven’t done so already.
--