

*Please note that the 5th National Action Plan will only include indicators that fall within the 2021-2023 timeframe. Any indicators included beyond that period are included for consultation purposes only.*

## Open Data for Results

### Problem to be addressed

Problem statement: There is a need to apply transparency, accountability and citizen participation principles and tools to open data to drive results for citizens.

Background: Mindsets around open data have matured amongst practitioners and experts. While the end state is still open by default where everything that can be released is released, we need to start by focusing on releasing timely, relevant and high-quality data that has the highest potential for impact. Open Data for Results is key to prioritize publicly demanded, high-value data and information, to raise awareness of the value of the data and to mature the management of open data within the Government of Canada.

For additional information on what we heard from Canadians and Civil Society, as well as on international best practices, please read this thematic backgrounder.

### Commitment Title<sup>iii</sup>

1. Open Data for Results

### Lead Department(s)

TBS  
ESDC  
StatsCan  
NRCan  
ISC

### Milestones and Indicators<sup>iii</sup>

1. **Milestone: Open and strategic management of data and information<sup>iv</sup>**

#### Indicators

- 1.1. Develop a roadmap identifying and prioritizing federal data standards (by end of 2022).
- 1.2. Create a protocol for the development and management of federal data standards (by 2023).

- 1.3. Establish<sup>v</sup> a data and information governance framework to support a holistic approach to governance and inform direction and decision-making on federal data and information initiatives (by end of 2022).
  - 1.4. Define a federal data quality framework to build a common understanding of data quality and harmonize approaches to optimizing the quality of data assets in the Government of Canada (by summer 2023).
  - 1.5. Develop a new standard for systems that manage information and data in the Government of Canada, anchored in principles and business outcomes, to provide an enterprise approach for all federal records management and business systems (by end of 2022).
  - 1.6. Develop an assessment and reporting framework for the standard for systems that manage information and data in the Government of Canada (by end of 2022).
- 2. Milestone: Build an open government and open data ecosystem**
- 2.1. As part of the in development Open Government Strategy, draft a robust open data pillar (by Spring 2022).
  - 2.2.<sup>vi</sup> Within the open data pillar, establish an internal and external stakeholder open data advisory working group to help inform open data priorities, help inform the establishment of public reporting on open data release progress, identify open data users and experts, and report publicly on the work and deliberations of the working group and impact of open data (by 2023)
  - 2.3. Draft a dedicated open data plan to expand on key activities the Government of Canada will take in the Open Government Strategy and open data pillar.
  - 2.4. Consult and develop service standards for prioritizing and releasing<sup>vii</sup> open data, and using the portal as part of the open data plan (by 2023)
  - 2.5. Develop maturity models for Open Data (by end of 2022).
  - 2.6. Equip departments with criteria and a template so they can develop Implementation Plans to align themselves to the Strategy and maturity models to optimize their efforts for<sup>viii</sup> growth, as well as self-assessment and annual reporting tools to monitor progress and outcomes. (by Summer 2023).
  - 2.7.<sup>ix</sup> Expand the federated open data search to include open data from all thirteen jurisdictions therefore providing Canadians with access to open and discoverable data in one place (by March 2023)
  - 2.8.<sup>x</sup> Working with internal and external data tables, create a data sharing policy that would facilitate data sharing with Indigenous governments<sup>xi</sup> and organizations and their partners, while addressing key data governance issues<sup>xii</sup> such as protecting<sup>xiii</sup> the confidentiality of community-level<sup>xiv</sup> information<sup>xvvi</sup>
- 3. <sup>xvii</sup> Milestone: A road map toward a more inclusive barrier free Canada<sup>xviii</sup>**

#### Indicators

- 3.1. Disaggregated Data Action Plan Developmental Phase: collection strategy for major surveys, survey design for new surveys, terms and conditions for collaborations<sup>xix</sup> with partners on the acquisition of new data, establishment and promotion of statistical

- standards for disaggregated data, exploration of existing data sources, start of release of new data and new indicators (by March 2022).
- 3.2. Disaggregated Data<sup>xx</sup> Action Plan Implementation Phase I: Launch of enhanced surveys, a collaborative analysis space<sup>xxi</sup>, and an intersectional, population-level platform; further exploration of existing data sources and release of survey data, new indicators, and new analytical studies (by March 2023).
  - 3.3. Disaggregated Data Action Plan Implementation Phase II<sup>xxii</sup>: Continued release of new indicators<sup>xxiii</sup>, survey data, and analyses; enhancement of the portal of the Centre for Gender, Diversity and Inclusion Statistics, enhanced data integration (start date April 2023; by March 2024).
  - 3.4. Disaggregated Data Action Plan Monitoring Phase: Continued release of new indicators, survey data, and analyses; completion of the evaluation framework; course correction (by March 2025).
  - 3.5. Disaggregated Data Action Plan Evaluation Phase<sup>xxiv</sup>: Continued release of new indicators, survey data, and analyses; evaluation report and recommendations for ongoing data collection and dissemination (by March 2026).
  - 3.6. Disaggregated Data Action Plan Continuous Improvement and Monitoring Phase: Continued release of new indicators, survey data, and analyses; monitoring of data gaps and emerging needs that should be covered, adherence to diversity data standards (in collaboration with TBS where appropriate) at the agency and all levels of government, flow of data to the agency and statistics from the agency, and use of statistics in policymaking (ongoing).
  - 3.7. 2022 Canadian Survey on Disability data collection (by Sept 2022)
  - 3.8. 2022 Canadian Survey on Disability data initial results available<sup>xxv</sup> (by Oct. 2023)<sup>xxvi</sup>
  - 3.9. Disability Screening Questions included in future cycles of the General Social Survey, Canadian Income Survey, and Indigenous Peoples Survey (ongoing)
  - 3.10. 2017 Canadian Survey on Disabilities data integrated with Canada Recovery Benefits data accessible in Federal Research Data Centre (ongoing)
  - 3.11. First set of UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and Sustainable Development Goals indicators available (by Sept. 2023)
  - 3.12. Development of methodology to better understand Chronic Wasting Disease<sup>xxvii</sup> in Canada (CWD) (by summer 2022)
  - 3.13. Development of new children with disability survey (by fall 2023)
  - 3.14. Launch of the Accessibility Statistics Data Hub in June 2021, and ongoing updates (ongoing)
  - 3.15. Analyze and publish the data on the Survey on Accessibility in Federal Sector Organizations (SAFSO) (by March 2022)
  - 3.16. Publish the 2019-20 public opinion research on the Accessibility Statistics Data Hub (by March 2022)
  - 3.17. Carry out additional public opinion research to address further data gaps (by December 2022)
  - 3.18. <sup>xxviii</sup> Publish additional Canada Pension Plan Disability datasets on Open Data <http://open.canada.ca> (by December 2023)

<sup>i</sup> Posted by Xiaoming Guo on 07/30/2021 at 3:03pm

Departments should include Health Canada, such as how many covid cases are imported from which countries. And include Justice Canada, such as people should know why Xiangguo Qiu has been detained for two years without evidence and legal process.

<sup>ii</sup> Posted by Sandrine Edouard on 08/01/2021 at 9:31pm

Departments should also include Environment and Climate Change Canada , especially the Meteorological Service of Canada, international leader in meteorological open data: [https://eccc-msc.github.io/open-data/readme\\_en/](https://eccc-msc.github.io/open-data/readme_en/)

<sup>iii</sup> Posted by Democracy Watch on 08/07/2021 at 1:04am

This list of commitments, and the Government of Canada overall, and every Open Government Partnership plan that the government has developed, has ignored glaring secrecy loopholes that, in addition to large coalitions of citizen groups and tens of thousands of Canadians, even House of Commons committees have unanimously recommended be closed. See a summary of all of these loopholes in the news release at: <https://democracywatch.ca/trudeau-liberal-government-continues-to-ignore-key-open-government-problems-as-it-develops-new-national-action-plan/> with links to details contained in the release. Until the Government of Canada's OGP plan includes closing all of these loopholes the plan will continue to be a sad joke that violates fundamental OGP principles and, therefore, should be rejected by the OGP Steering Committee.

<sup>iv</sup> Posted by Canadian Association of Research Libraries on 08/13/2021

This Standards Council of Canada roadmap looks extremely helpful.

[https://www.scc.ca/en/system/files/publications/SCC\\_Data\\_Gov\\_Roadmap\\_EN.pdf](https://www.scc.ca/en/system/files/publications/SCC_Data_Gov_Roadmap_EN.pdf)

For maximum interoperability and to advance the FAIR principles, we urge adoption of national and international data standards for all open government data - e.g.that all government datasets get a DOI, use of a standard metadata schema such as that of DataCite. See <https://www.crkn-rcdr.ca/en/datacite-canada-consortium> and <https://datacite.org/>

Likewise, government scientists/researchers should have and use an ORCID ID (see <https://www.crkn-rcdr.ca/en/orcid-ca-home> and <https://orcid.org/>). And also, science departments could have ROR (Research Organizations Registry) IDs.

<sup>v</sup> Posted by Oliver Bjornsson on 08/13/2021 at 9:46am

Standards for metadata and data documentation should either be elevated as a separate framework or named as essential components of a data quality framework

<sup>vi</sup> Posted by Canadian Association of Research Libraries on 08/13/2021

There has been a great deal of work done in the academic sector through the Portage Network

<https://portagenetwork.ca/> and other initiatives of NDRIO <https://engagedri.ca/>, including their very extensive needs assessment and strategic planning documentation The government should collaborate with these groups in this work.

Secondly, we suggest appropriate diversity in representatives to this body, to ensure decisions about data priorities acknowledge underserved communities and Indigenous perspectives.

<sup>vii</sup> Posted by Merlin Chatwin on 08/06/2021 at 3:08pm

There has been significant progress made in the development of digital and data maturity models in Canada that will be beneficial to achieving this particular output.

<sup>viii</sup> Posted by Robin Ford on 08/08/2021 at 2:55pm

See -

[https://www.scc.ca/en/flagships/data-governance?utm\\_source=Standards+Council+of+Canada&utm\\_campaign=0b3d7eda27-](https://www.scc.ca/en/flagships/data-governance?utm_source=Standards+Council+of+Canada&utm_campaign=0b3d7eda27-)

EMAIL\_CAMPAIGN\_2020\_10\_05\_01\_56\_COPY\_01&utm\_medium=email&utm\_term=0\_78ab70c6d1-0b3d7eda27-223051889

[https://www.scc.ca/en/system/files/publications/SCC\\_Data\\_Gov\\_Roadmap\\_EN.pdf](https://www.scc.ca/en/system/files/publications/SCC_Data_Gov_Roadmap_EN.pdf)

I was a UK civil servant. The UK is far ahead of Canada on data collection and etc. One initial hiccup that must be avoided is an unnecessarily bureaucratic system (costly for everyone) and failure to ""incentivise"" the correct attitude to disclosure among civil servants. It was an incredibly wasteful part of my job as a lawyer to have to push my clients toward disclosure. Do not under-estimate the task of re-orienting civil servants.

Collaboration with and leadership of other Canadian jurisdictions is really important. They are now a sort of data black hole. To give an example, I work in the fintech sector. CSA collection, analysis, and disclosure of data is terrible, compared to the UK and elsewhere. It is one factor that leads to poor decisions in Canada.

<sup>x</sup> Posted by Canadian Association of Research Libraries on 08/13/2021

To extend the visibility of GC open data sets, the open data portal could be harvested by the NDRIO Portage's Federated Research Data Repository's (FRDR) national discovery layer portal <https://www.frd-ldfr.ca/discover/html/repository-list.html?lang=en>.

<sup>x</sup> Posted by Canadian Association of Research Libraries on 08/13/2021

NDRIO's Portage group has been working with a network of academic data experts to develop best practices on the management of sensitive data. Consider the First Nations Principles of OCAP <https://fnigc.ca/ocap-training/> and the The CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance <https://www.gida-global.org/care>.

<sup>xi</sup> Posted by Merlin Chatwin on 08/06/2021 at 3:10pm

There is an overwhelming amount of complexity inherent in data governance at the Federal level. A suggestion would be for the Open Gov team to lead data governance pilots at specific intersections of federal, provincial, and local jurisdiction in areas such as housing/homelessness.

<sup>xii</sup> Posted by Tracey Lauriault on 08/13/2021 at 12:26pm

Finally, why was the following MSF Civil Society commitment also not addressed?

Data for Results Commitment 2:

Considering the importance of the availability of data designed according to and compatible with the systemic social model of disability to ensure the monitoring of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) ratified by Canada, it is recommended to include the Human Rights Commission of Canada in any discussion related to the government's commitment to open data in the area of disability. In addition, the lead Canadian organization in monitoring the CRPD with civil society partners is the British Columbia Aboriginal Network on Disability Society (BCANDS) [crpd@bcands.bc.ca](mailto:crpd@bcands.bc.ca)

<sup>xiii</sup> Posted by Tracey Lauriault on 08/13/2021 at 10:54am

I provided a detailed response and I will now add specific comments and ask specific questions.

Why are the terms disability and disabled people not included in this commitment?

<sup>xiv</sup> Posted by Tracey P. Lauriault on 08/13/2021 at 10:52am

"Greetings;

Thank you for this submission. The following are questions and comments prepared as a member of the Multi-stakeholder Forum (MSF) to Open Government, with the Government of Canada, and as a co-chair of this commitment with Catherine Roy which we initially called Data For Results: Disability.

To developed the two commitments below, we convened 10 disability experts, organizations and people of lived experience in the formulation of a commitment on the topic of Open Data for Result: Disability.

---

I pasted the submission we made, below. It was presented in a face to face meeting as part of the Open Government civil society process with the MSF. I believe our commitments were also shared with you.

The commitment we prepared was the outcome of several meetings, deliberations, editing and consensus in addition of course to having met with government officials from Statistics Canada, Canada Revenue Agency of Canada, and the Deputy Minister of Public Service Accessibility. Unfortunately, we did not have the opportunity to meet representatives from ESDC who were invited to the face to face meeting but did not attend, nor with officials involved with the Canadian Accessibility Standards Development Organization who we think the commitment we put forward would be of interest and who might have some insight. Also present at the meeting were members of the TBSC Open Government team.

We purposefully did not focus on accessibility, as that is well covered in regulation, in directives and practices when it comes to things digital in Government, as well as by the Employment Equity Act. Our focus was about addressing the dearth of knowledge, information, and data about disabled people in Canada, most notably with regards to data, and when there are data with issues pertaining to how people are classified, and in relation to that, how disabled people, because of their life course are often overly audited by the CRA or overly scrutinized in data flows, as they are outliers to the norm, thus our concern was also with AI/ML and automated decision making processes.

Furthermore, we also heard clearly from the non MSF members we met, that it is key that the Human Rights Commission of Canada be involved in any discussion related to the government's commitment to open data in the area of disability and that the lead Canadian organization in monitoring the CRPD with civil society partners is the British Columbia Aboriginal Network on Disability Society (BCANDS) and that they should have some engagement.

We laud your efforts on disaggregated data, however, we were surprised that the specific focus on disabled people is not obvious, and that there was no reference to the inventory, analysis of the inventory and the creation of an oversight/advisory group of people of lived experience in that process was not part of your commitment.

We were hoping to have heard from you directly, as per the usual OGP engagement processes, and in the spirit of co-creation, so as to better understand your reasoning for not making any reference to what we put forward. But also to have the opportunity, to explain, our reasoning behind our drafted commitment as actors outside of government. In other words to have a mutually beneficial exchange.

Also, having seen the last budget announcements, we find your submission to very closely resemble the Federal Initiative of Equity and Inclusion for Statistics Canada. Which we think is great, and in that light, we had submitted our proposed commitment to aligned with that, but with added specificity. We did so because disabled people have been overlooked historically in Canada when it comes to statistical, state and administrative data, and this was most notably so during the pandemic, and continues to be so.

Finally, as is the case with Indigenous peoples in Canada, there is an element of autonomy and sovereignty over one's life course that is key, and while for Indigenous people the context within a reconciliation framing; for disabled people, the context is a disproportional degree of paternalism by the state over what is considered to be 'in their best interest', sovereignty for disabled people has been articulated as 'nothing about us without us'.

The commitment that has been put forward by the Government of Canada here, although, well meaning, and we believe comes from a place of good intentions, has missed the ideals and intentions, and good will of civil society actors, and is not in the spirit of autonomy and sovereignty, and especially inclusion, which we understand as being engagement and dialogue.

We, as civil society experts, advocates, and people of lived experience, know that disabled people are barely counted, and therefore are not accounted for in the normal apparatuses of the Administration, and we know that when a group of people are nearly invisible in state data systems, there is a lack of evidence to address their issues in an evidence based policy approach. Also, when there are data, they are incomplete, the sample size is small, and in normal state based surveys they are often excluded from the sample, as is the case with the census and the GSS.

We hoped, with our civil society commitment would rectify that invisibility by taking a scientific and open science and evidence based approach to what is being collected about disabled people, to understand why and to identify gaps, and to rectify these identified deficiencies in collaboration with you, and to publish those results as is the goal of open government.

We hope you will reconsider what we have submitted, and that we can work together so that we can better know about how disabled Canadians fare, we can have better systems to assess their socio, economic, material well-being and quality of life of disabled people in Canada, that we can have better foundational data about domiciliary institutions and collective residences, among other data, so that we can see how disabled people are doing in the Canadian workforce, healthcare, education and so on, and also so that we can better understand the built environment, which most often renders this group of Canadians disabled in the first place. We also hoped to revisit models of disability and classification systems, to ensure that all Federal programs in Canada, are up to International Standards, but also to avoid bias in terms of AI/ML and automated decision making systems.

We hope you will reach out to us, in the spirit of collegial collaboration, co-creation, and engagement with stakeholders so that we may work together, - 'about is with us' for the mutually beneficial improvement of the lives of disabled people in Canada, through this incredible process we call Open Data for Results: Disability as part of Canada's commitment to Open Government and the Open Government Partnership, and also to show international leadership in this area.

The following are the commitments we as civil society actors submitted:

Civil Society Commitment Requests on Data For Results: Disability:

Data for Results: Disability Commitment 1:

We would like a commitment to the following 7 step Data For Results process on Disability:

1. Disability Data Inventory → Conduct a cross government of Canada inventory to identify data, surveys, administrative data, program and service data, models, crowdsourcing data collection programs about disabled people, including their social and material lived experience. This would include methodological guides, data dictionaries, classification systems & taxonomies, standards, etc. as well as data owners, and how the data are used in decision making and reporting.
2. Analyze → Analyze the inventory and identify data gaps and issues with disability civil society actors and experts in and outside of government. This includes identifying risks related to automated decision making, validity of the data, assessment of proxies, bias and models of disability. Also, with great attention to the potential ramifications of data to the lives of disabled people i.e. disabled people are often audited more by the CRA as their lives do not follow traditional life courses.
3. Publish → The results of the inventory and later the analysis of the inventory on the Open Government Website and publish any data that can be made open in the open data portal with accompanying documentation. This can be a type of clearinghouse on disability, including laws, regulations, official reporting, etc.
4. Collect → Develop procedures to ameliorate existing datasets, and work with Civil Society actors and experts in and outside of government to produce and collect new data with responsible authorities, keeping in mind the risks discussed earlier.
5. Publish → New, current, and historical existing data on the Government of Canada Open Data portal and also, for those data that cannot be open data, these ought to be listed with details and a contacting authority.
6. Act → Data for Results is about informing public policy, programs and services to address inequities and the social and material conditions of disabled people, to assess impact and outcomes of regulation, to mitigate

ableism and to improve data collection, dissemination and processes including impact and oversight, while also creating affirmative indicators related to participation in Canadian life and the workforce. Impact metrics will be required to monitor progress.

7. Report Results → Report policy, program and service improvements and outcomes.

Data for Results: Disability Commitment 2:

Considering the importance of the availability of data designed according to and compatible with the systemic social model of disability to ensure the monitoring of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) ratified by Canada, it is recommended to include the Human Rights Commission of Canada in any discussion related to the government's commitment to open data in the area of disability. In addition, the lead Canadian organization in monitoring the CRPD with civil society partners is the British Columbia Aboriginal Network on Disability Society (BCANDS) [crpd@bcands.bc.ca](mailto:crpd@bcands.bc.ca)

We look forward to your response, and an explanation as to why our commitment was not accounted for in your submission.

Sincerely

Tracey

Tracey P. Lauriault

Associate Professor, Critical Media and Big Data

School of Journalism and Communication

Carleton University

Also Member of the Multistakeholder Forum on Open Government.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1847-2738>

PS - In working on the OGP commitments with the Government of Ontario, we actually co-edited, wrote the forward, and drafted, and endorsed the commitment that was sent to Cabinet. It would have been great to have done that kind of deep collaborative work with you. Perhaps, there is still an opportunity to do so as we learn to work together.

<sup>xv</sup> Posted by Tracey Lauriault on 08/13/2021 at 10:59am [Comment ID: 232]

Why is there no focus specifically on disability and disabled people as per the request from the MSF Civil Society Submission? The proposal here is interesting, but what you are proposing is what has already been budgeted for here - <https://budget.gc.ca/2021/report-rapport/anx5-en.html>, civil society has requested something very specific on Open Data For Results: Disability. See earlier detailed comments and questions.

<sup>xvi</sup> Posted by Seyed Behrooz Behnejad on 08/04/2021 at 10:25pm [Comment ID: 210]

Explore the use of open data in addressing poverty and crime at local level

<sup>xvii</sup> Posted by Canadian Association of Research Libraries on 08/13/2021 at 3:27pm [Comment ID: 245]

Open data is a positive step forward, however, it does not equate to barrier free. Only a small proportion of the population understand how to use the data and the tools provided. The development of use cases, apps, and training resources would be needed to reduce those barriers.

<sup>xviii</sup> Posted by Tracey Lauriault on 08/13/2021 at 11:02am [Comment ID: 233]

This is great, but first we hoped for an inventory of data about disabled people in Canada, and an analysis of those data before embarking on a plan, and we hoped that disabled peoples civil society actors, experts and people of lived experience would be involved in an advisory capacity to help you do this work. Why was that not considered here? also this proposed plan looks like what was in the 2021 budget, what is new in this commitment and why was the civil society commitment not considered?

<sup>xix</sup> Posted by Tracey Lauriault on 08/13/2021 at 11:03am [Comment ID: 234]

Before the creation and release of new indicators, civil society actors had asked for an inventory, and analysis of that inventory of data about disabled people and the convening of an advisory group to address the gaps as well as



---

the deficit model of disability in addition to classification systems. Is there a reason why that is not a consideration here?

<sup>xx</sup> Posted by Tracey Lauriault on 08/13/2021 at 11:05am [Comment ID: 235]

As per the earlier comments, would it be possible to include an advisory group of disabled people civil society organizations, experts and academics including people of lived experience in this monitoring process but also in priority setting?

<sup>xxi</sup> Posted by Patrick FOUGEYROLLAS RIPPH-INDCP on 08/14/2021 at 3:20pm [Comment ID: 247]

Non seulement, il est essentiel que les organisations par et pour les personnes en situations de handicap soient consultées et parties prenantes des décisions mais il est essentiel de s'assurer de la représentativité des incapacités visibles et invisibles, que tous les milieux de vie soient inclus y compris en institution, et qu'une approche ADS+ ou intersectionnelle de désagrégation des données soit appliquée.

<sup>xxii</sup> Posted by Tracey Lauriault on 08/13/2021 at 11:05am [Comment ID: 236]

See previous comments & questions.

<sup>xxiii</sup> Posted by Robin Ford on 08/08/2021 at 3:00pm [Comment ID: 226]

This document is seriously high level - too short really. Cyber risk? privacy? role of Statistics Canada? etc. More anon hopefully. This project is a big deal. If the federal govt steps up, it could make a huge difference to Canada's competitiveness.

<sup>xxiv</sup> Posted by Tracey Lauriault on 08/13/2021 at 11:08am [Comment ID: 237]

"Once again, this moreso resembles <https://budget.gc.ca/2021/report-rapport/anx5-en.html> and we asked for data about disabled people specifically, see the commitment Civil Society Actors put forward here. Since there is very little about disabled people in Canada, and they have been so negatively affected during the pandemic, is there a reason why the specific request about disabled people was not included here?"

Data for Results: Disability Commitment 1:

- We would like a commitment to the following 7 step Data For Results process on Disability:
  1. Disability Data Inventory → Conduct a cross government of Canada inventory to identify data, surveys, administrative data, program and service data, models, crowdsourcing data collection programs about disabled people, including their social and material lived experience. This would include methodological guides, data dictionaries, classification systems & taxonomies, standards, etc. as well as data owners, and how the data are used in decision making and reporting.
  2. Analyze → Analyze the inventory and identify data gaps and issues with disability civil society actors and experts in and outside of government. This includes identifying risks related to automated decision making, validity of the data, assessment of proxies, bias and models of disability. Also, with great attention to the potential ramifications of data to the lives of disabled people i.e. disabled people are often audited more by the CRA as their lives do not follow traditional life courses.
  3. Publish → The results of the inventory and later the analysis of the inventory on the Open Government Website and publish any data that can be made open in the open data portal with accompanying documentation. This can be a type of clearinghouse on disability, including laws, regulations, official reporting, etc.
  4. Collect → Develop procedures to ameliorate existing datasets, and work with Civil Society actors and experts in and outside of government to produce and collect new data with responsible authorities, keeping in mind the risks discussed earlier.
  5. Publish → New, current, and historical existing data on the Government of Canada Open Data portal and also, for those data that cannot be open data, these ought to be listed with details and a contacting authority.

6. Act → Data for Results is about informing public policy, programs and services to address inequities and the social and material conditions of disabled people, to assess impact and outcomes of regulation, to mitigate ableism and to improve data collection, dissemination and processes including impact and oversight, while also creating affirmative indicators related to participation in Canadian life and the workforce. Impact metrics will be required to monitor progress.

7. Report Results → Report policy, program and service improvements and outcomes.

Data for Results - Disability Commitment 2:

Considering the importance of the availability of data designed according to and compatible with the systemic social model of disability to ensure the monitoring of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) ratified by Canada, it is recommended to include the Human Rights Commission of Canada in any discussion related to the government's commitment to open data in the area of disability. In addition, the lead Canadian organization in monitoring the CRPD with civil society partners is the British Columbia Aboriginal Network on Disability Society (BCANDS) [crpd@bcands.bc.ca](mailto:crpd@bcands.bc.ca)

<sup>xxxv</sup> Posted by Tracey P. Lauriault on 08/13/2021 at 2:34pm [Comment ID: 239]

The addition of 3.7 just now on a Friday afternoon before an election, is great, but these do not constitute Open Government Commitments, as these are the usual business of Government, some of the surveys should not have been cancelled in the first place, and these were things Government had already committed to. We are glad that you are going to do them. Also they have just been added on the last days of the consultation. In addition, some of these surveys do not sample disabled people living in collective dwellings such as domiciliary institutions, the living arrangements for many disabled people, which means it will miss many resulting in a gross under count and under representatio, especially people with developmental disabilities and potentially the elderly with disabilities who live in elder care homes, and any other disabled people relegated to prisons because of inadequate mental institutions, and others with developmental disabilities in mental institutions because of a lack of other forms of care.

We of course, continue to hope that our group of civil society actors will be consulted and an advisory board will be constituted with the people and organizations who helped shape and endorse the civil society submitted commitments.

Part of the issues identified by civil society, are these types of data gaps in existing counting systems, including a clear lack of typologies and classification systems about foundational issues such as living arrangements and dwelling types.

Finally, as is the case with Indigenous people, there ought to be systems developed by and with disabled people as the current deficit indicators are not useful, and what of data that are meaningful to disabled people?

Again, we are most willing to work with you. And we hope that our call for an inventory, the analysis of the data from that inventory, and an advisory group can be set up in an official capacity so that we do this work together. We look forward to your thoughts on this. We have posted our observations and requests here as comments to this document and also here <https://datalibre.ca/2021/08/13/open-data-for-results-disability/>.

Also note, that the groups we worked with as part of this process, expected their contribution in terms of the development of commitments to be enough, they did not expect to have to come back to a website and also have to reiterate what they have already share with you. Thus we did!

Again, we believe the Government has good intentions, but in the absence of dialogue with us, missed what we were proposing and why. The Open Government process involves meaningful engagement, and new commitments

---

beyond usual government business. I am sure we will be able to help you formulate a commitment that is new, and one that is meaningful to disabled people in Canada.

Sincerely  
Tracey

<sup>xxvi</sup> Posted by Tracey P. Lauriault on 08/13/2021 at 2:35pm [Comment ID: 240]  
In the comment, I meant 3.7 onward...

<sup>xxvii</sup> Posted by Patrick FOUGEYROLLAS on 08/14/2021 at 3:04pm [Comment ID: 246]  
UN CRPD and SDG monitoring indicators should be the overarching Canadian goal ensuring collection and harmonization of data in agreement with the systemic social model of disability and a human rights perspective.

<sup>xxviii</sup> Posted by bk on 08/16/2021 at 5:31pm [Comment ID: 254]