

Government and Voluntary Sector Collaboration for the Benefit of Communities

**Summary Report of the
1st Joint Champions Meeting**

- November 22, 2004 -

Table of Contents

Message from the Joint Steering Committee.....	1
A. Introduction	2
B. The Joint Champions Meeting	2
1. Opening Remarks.....	2
2. Keynote Address: “The Challenge of Integrative Citizenship” by Hugh Segal.....	3
3. NSNVO and Satellite Account Findings	7
4. Success Stories.....	10
5. Beyond the VSI – Future Directions.....	13
6. In Closing.....	14
C. Next Steps.....	14

Appendices:

Appendix A: Participants List.....	15
Appendix B: Agenda.....	18
Appendix C: Keynote Address: Hugh Segal	20
Appendix D: Written Questions.....	24
Appendix E: Evaluation Results.....	27

Message from the Joint Steering Committee

Colleagues:

We are pleased to provide you with a copy of the Champions Meeting Report which summarizes the dialogue generated through your participation at this important Joint Champions Meeting. We encourage you to read and share this report within your organization. Additional copies can be downloaded on the VSI website at www.vsi-isbc.ca

Monica Patten
Co-Chair

Susan Scotti
Co-Chair

A. Introduction

The 1st Joint Champions Meeting was held on Monday, November 22, 2004 at the Chateau Cartier in Gatineau, Quebec. Entitled "Government and Voluntary Sector Collaboration for the Benefit of Communities", the daylong session had three primary objectives:

- acknowledge and celebrate the accomplishments made over the past year on projects related to the Voluntary Sector Initiative (VSI);
- share the experiences and lessons learned working with *An Accord Between the Government of Canada and the Voluntary Sector*, the *Code of Good Practice on Funding* and the *Code of Good Practice on Policy Dialogue*; and
- discuss future priorities and challenges in strengthening collaboration and innovation in the federal government/voluntary sector relationship.

Attended by 37 representatives (champions) from departments and agencies in the federal government and 35 champions from voluntary sector organizations across the country, the meeting included presentations by key speakers, plenary discussions and small group sessions.

About this report

The purpose of this report is to: summarize the presentations and discussions held throughout the day; describe the key outputs of the meeting; and identify next steps for the two sectors. Designed to serve as a resource for participants and others with an interest in the ongoing work of the VSI, the report is aimed at raising awareness, transferring knowledge and promoting positive change across the sectors.

B. The Joint Champions Meeting

1. Opening Remarks

Monica Patten, Chair of the Voluntary Sector Forum and CEO Community Foundations of Canada, Co-chair of the Joint Steering Committee

In opening the session, Ms. Patten set out the goal for the day – i.e., to achieve a common understanding of what the sectors have achieved together and a clearer understanding of where they're going. Highlighting achievements to date, she cited: increased knowledge of the "other" sector, including research that highlighted the nature and scope of the voluntary sector's contributions to society; the development and ongoing implementation of the Accord and Codes of Good Practice on Funding and Policy Dialogue; regulatory changes; the Canada Volunteerism Initiative and progress in human resources. Among the challenges Ms. Patten identified were: continuing doubt about the VSI's impact and direction; a perceived lag in applying the Accord and Codes within the federal government; and limited capacity in the voluntary sector as organizations struggle with

funding issues, paperwork burden and changes in government personnel. She called on participants to ensure that both sectors continue communicating, underscoring that the federal government is listening – as indicated through the recently announced Task Force on Funding – as is the voluntary sector – as is evidenced in the IM/IT Portal initiative.

***Susan Scotti, Assistant Deputy Minister, Social Development Canada
Co-Chair of the Joint Steering Committee***

Ms. Scotti stressed the important role the voluntary sector plays in meeting the federal government's goals and described the achievements of the VSI to date (e.g., the Accord and Codes, a modernized regulatory framework for charities, the Satellite Account and the NSNVO, and the establishment of 13 Canada Volunteerism Initiative Centres). While these achievements provide a solid foundation, Ms. Scotti indicated that there remain some significant challenges to moving forward – for example: the changes in the government-voluntary sector relationship are not happening as quickly as some may have hoped; there have been shortcomings in reaching and/or working at the community level; and there remain day-to-day challenges with respect to diverse funding practices. As the VSI draws to an end in March 2006, she called on both sectors to meet these outstanding challenges by re-establishing their commitment and building on the substantial progress made thus far.

2. Keynote Address: “The Challenge of Integrative Citizenship” by Hugh Segal

Mr. Segal opened his remarks by applauding the tremendous progress made by the two sectors over the past decade, citing such achievements as the VSI, improvements in tax policy and the voluntary sector's broad-based engagement with the public. Looking ahead, he predicted that the government-voluntary sector relationship would necessarily change as each sector moves forward to shape its own priorities and perspectives.

Mr. Segal suggested that one of the most compelling public policy areas in the coming years will be the challenge of integrative citizenship – specifically, how to sustain a common set of Canadian values while working to integrate people from diverse ethnic and multicultural backgrounds. Citing experiences in other countries, he posed some thought-provoking questions – for example: What is the role of government and the likely tolerance among Canadians for government action in this area? How do poverty and economic exclusion contribute to cultural/racial tensions? What are the benefits of achieving true integrative citizenship? Mr. Segal underscored the need for – and appropriateness of – a strong, dynamic voluntary sector role in achieving this important goal.

About Hugh Segal

President of the Institute for Research on Public Policy, Mr. Segal also teaches at the Queens University's School of Policy Studies and School of Business. In the not-for-profit sector, he is Chair of the Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation, a governor of the Kingston General Hospital and sits on the board of the (NATO) Atlantic Council of Canada.

(A complete text of Mr. Segal’s address is provided in Appendix C.)

■ **From the Tables: *How do these messages relate to your work?***

Participants agreed that integrative citizenship is an important concern that has particular relevance for the voluntary sector, given its focus on civil society issues such as immigration and diversity. In their small group discussions, participants identified the following themes:

■ ***Collaboration is key.***

While it is essential for the sectors to work together on this issue, a number of challenges must be addressed – for example: the “nuts and bolts” of the sectors’ day-to-day collaboration needs to be improved.

■ ***Awareness of the sector’s value/potential role is limited.***

Promoting awareness of the voluntary sector’s principles/value/achievements and current and potential contribution should be a priority. Creating awareness and a sense of cohesion is particularly important among the sector’s grassroots/local organizations.

■ ***The voluntary sector has substantial credibility at the local level.***

The voluntary sector has more “local” credibility than the federal government and is better placed to implement policy in communities. This is particularly true in the case of new Canadians, who may have trust issues with government.

■ ***It’s important to define roles for the two sectors.***

Specific roles should be set out for the two sectors regarding integrative citizenship. The challenge will be to match a national vision with local delivery and explore the issues from a “bottom-up” perspective. Possible roles for the government include providing instruction on democratic traditions and acting as champions for diversity and integrative citizenship. The voluntary sector could contribute by inputting into policy development and providing services.

Table Talk

“The VSI is a start, but there is a feeling that government has ‘done its thing’ and will move on.”

“We still feel the government is only in partnership with the private sector, not with the voluntary sector.”

“The key issue is always funding and the Accord doesn’t address it.”

“Voluntary sector concerns need to be connected to government priorities before they will get any attention.”

“The success of the VSI so far has been to forge the sector’s identity and profile, and to establish networks.”

“The voluntary sector needs a long-term agenda and then be willing to accept incremental progress – it takes government a long time to change.”

- ***Capacity is a major issue for the voluntary sector.***

The voluntary sector has an important role to play but little capacity to deliver (for example, in the areas of leadership, technology, funding and understanding “the rules of the game”). This is particularly true for the vast number of small organizations that make a significant contribution, but are not adequately funded or recognized. Capacity issues make it difficult for many voluntary sector organizations to engage in a meaningful way with their communities or with government.

- ***Ongoing dialogue is essential if the sectors are to move forward.***

The sectors need to explore models that are designed to achieve cohesion/collaboration at various levels. Consideration should be given to:

- establishing regional “hubs” that bring together the various levels in the two sectors (this is currently underway in the voluntary sector);
- establishing a “fourth (neutral) sector” to connect business, government and the voluntary sector in dialogue;
- creating a roundtable of government and voluntary sector representatives in which leadership is shared;
- providing voluntary sector groups – at the municipal/community level – with access points to government; and
- designing a 10-year agenda re: integrative citizenship.

- **Plenary Discussion:** (Mr. Segal responded to the following questions.)

Q: What’s the best way to approach “integrative citizenship” challenges when values are not shared?

A: People approach things in different ways according to their cultural norms – that doesn’t mean that values/goals aren’t shared, just interpreted differently. That’s the essence of a federation. It’s not about setting up new structures; we need to look at what we have now, identify where the weaknesses are and reinforce them.

Q: While the VSI generated a lot of goodwill, there are structural barriers created by a risk-averse government. How can these be addressed?

A: The current climate in the federal government should be viewed as part of a cycle that will change over time. Certainly, it is adding immense burdens to the relationship, but it’s currently beyond our control – the cycle must run its course. Right now, we need to focus and build on what’s been achieved – for example, the research that’s just come out will help to increase our understanding about the role of the voluntary sector in key issues such as immigration and children’s well-being.

Q: What advice can you offer on tackling the issues of poverty and social exclusion in a minority government – specifically, how can we get them on the agenda when health issues seem to be crowding everything else out?

A: A minority government is a very good opportunity for public debate and movement on social justice issues as it forces both the government and the opposition to be responsible. Now is a good time for structural change.

Q: There is a (mistaken) perception that the VSI is solely a federal initiative. How do we do a better job of engaging the provinces?

A: There are opportunities – such as the Council of the Federation and the First Ministers Meeting – for raising the profile of the voluntary sector. As well, many jurisdictions are looking at tax expenditures and leveraging tax dollars not spent, which is something the sector can do well.

Q: Although Canadians are typically “joiners,” there has been a lot of conversation about “individual citizenship.” What role can associations play in promoting/portraying the notion of “integrative citizenship?”

A: The evidence for integrative citizenship is there. For example, look at some of the integrative Canadian symbols – Tim Horton’s, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Terry Fox, our human rights commitment and the commitment to reduce the gaps between the rich and the poor. We need to keep discussing the issues, or else we are going to make mistakes.

Q: Recent fundamentalist/extremist actions (e.g., the murder of Van Gogh) illustrate what can happen when there is no agreement about the importance of values like tolerance and freedom of expression. How would you comment?

A: We can’t take the attitude that we need to keep out the intolerant because it will fundamentally change the nature of our country. We need views that are outside the normative. The issue shouldn’t be how to get others to change, but how we can adapt our approach in order that they will feel included and see the benefits of it.

Q: Poverty among new Canadians is a huge problem – especially in larger urban centers like Toronto – and a major barrier to active citizenship. However, the current support trends for social service organizations don’t recognize the importance of a diversity of services. How does this affect integrative citizenship efforts?

A. Governments have generally been slow to act on information about poverty. We need to increase the urgency about this issue – using foreign examples where we can. We also need to ask some tough questions. For example:

- How honest are we being about the prospects for immigrants?
- To what extent are agencies reflective of the communities they represent?
- How do funding practices discourage cohesive activity?
- Are we excluding people from the economic mainstream?

3. NSNVO and Satellite Account Findings

■ Survey of National Non-Profit and Voluntary Organizations (NSNVO)

Presenter: Penelope Rowe, CEO, Community Services Council Newfoundland and Labrador

Ms. Rowe began her presentation with a brief overview of the NSNVO methodology (telephone interviews with 13,000 nonprofit and voluntary organizations). She then addressed the survey findings, which support conclusions that nonprofit and voluntary organizations: touch every aspect of our lives; serve as important vehicles for citizen engagement; are a major economic presence; generally operate locally; and are experiencing a growing resource divide. Among the key challenges organizations face are: planning for the future; recruiting volunteers; and recruiting board members.

Some notable findings ...

- there are 161,000 nonprofit/voluntary organizations in Canada
- 19 million volunteers contribute more than two million hours
- organizations reported \$112 billion in revenues in 2003
- the sector employs two million people (13% of the labour force)
- the highest proportion of organizations engage in activities related to sports and recreation (21%) and religion (19%)

Looking ahead, Ms. Rowe identified a number of next steps for the research team, including disseminating the results, conducting regional roundtables and preparing regional and other in-depth analyses. Research considerations for the future include repeating the survey every three years, broadening the sample to allow further analysis of key variables and ensuring access to data so that it can be used by a broad range of researchers. (Note: the NSNVO can be accessed through the VSI web site www.vsi-isbc.ca)

■ Satellite Account Of Non Profit Institutions And Volunteering (Satellite Account)

Presenter: Sylvie Joyal, Senior Economist, Non-Profit Sector and Unpaid Work Analysis, Statistics Canada

In her overview of the Satellite Account, Ms. Joyal underscored the importance of the research initiative, which expands the traditional framework to place the nonprofit sector and volunteer contributions on an equal footing with other sectors of the economy. Drawing on a broad range of administrative and other data sources, the Satellite Account demonstrates the sector's substantial contribution to the Canadian economy (8.6 % of GDP), the value of volunteer labour (more than double that of individual donations) and the extent of the sector's reach into a variety of fields.

Ms. Joyal also previewed next steps for the Satellite Account initiative, which include: maintaining it as an ongoing annual program in the Canadian System of National Accounts; extending the scope of next year's release; and planning future development with input from an advisory committee. (Note: the Satellite Account is available through the VSI web site www.vsi-isbc.org)

■ In Response

Margaret Biggs, Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet, Priorities and Planning, Privy Council Office

Ms. Biggs suggested that the research allows us to explore previous assumptions about the voluntary sector (e.g., concerning its capacity, funding and governance) and adds to the knowledge base about such important issues as diversity and the contribution of service delivery to the public good. Looking to the future, she highlighted some of the challenges facing Canada – including aging, diversity, exclusion/marginalization, spatial shifts (e.g., rural/urban), global drivers and security – and urged participants to consider the role of civil society and government in addressing them.

Al Hatton, CEO, United Way/Centraide Canada

Commenting on the general skepticism and cynicism about the VSI and its impact on the government/voluntary sector relationship, Mr. Hatton called on participants to view the initiative as an interim step on a longer journey. He urged a renewal of passion and commitment to building the relationship, and leadership on key issues, such as enhancing the well-being of children, cities/communities and Aboriginal peoples. Although progress has been slow on issues such as advocacy and funding, Mr. Hatton underscored the importance of the research results as validation of the sector's role as a major force in the economy and in connecting people.

■ From the Tables: *What are the most significant findings and why? How will the findings influence your organization?*

Overall, participants agreed that the survey findings provided essential information about the sector – in particular, information about its defining features, its contribution to Canadian society, and areas of ongoing challenge. Participants also suggested several focus areas for future research.

The surveys illustrate some of the sector's defining characteristics.

- it is large and diverse – the survey research provides strong support to anecdotal information
- volunteers are the lifeblood of the sector; however, paid staff make a substantial contribution to the sector's work
- there are poor, middle and rich organizations in the voluntary sector
- corporate funding is not as significant as expected

Table Talk:

“The high level of volunteering may be a sign of a dysfunctional society – closer-knit communities do these things in less structured ways.”

“It helps to see the disparities in the sector – there are a few organizations getting most of the funding.”

“This information helps us to move from a begging charity to a place of power.”

“It enhances sector credibility immensely.”

“The data will help us to identify levers for change within the sector.”

The voluntary sector makes a substantial contribution.

- the sector is an economic force in Canada – the research will help the sector to develop a strong business case and help to build the sector’s collective self-confidence

The research points to some ongoing challenges.

- although the sector has a strong presence at the local level (i.e., two thirds of organizations are community based), these organizations have not been adequately represented in the VSI to date
- there are apparent disparities between some sub-sectors’ significant representation and their limited profile/participation in ongoing work (e.g., environmental, faith-based and sports organizations)
- larger organizations manage to grow while smaller organizations do not
- volunteer retention issues may be related to volunteer burnout
- some organizations may have stable funding, but their costs are increasing by 3% per year, without any increase in Government support
- most private donations are coming from a shrinking pool

There are indications for future research directions.

- identify the impacts of the voluntary sector and its contributions (i.e., What would society look like without the voluntary sector? What has sector activity meant in terms of the amount of care provided to older adults, programs for children, etc.?)
- conduct the surveys on an annual basis; however, don’t fund surveys *in place of* programs
- conduct trends analyses down the road
- emphasize gender analyses
- disaggregate the data to show results by region and sub-sector and, where necessary, increase sample size
- promote/communicate the findings widely; get the data to provincial governments and regional bodies

■ In Plenary:

Suggested research directions:

- apply a gender analysis to the research to determine, for example, the role and impact of women in the sector
- make the research more inclusive of all parts on the sector
- measure the *impact* of the voluntary sector’s work – e.g., how many people benefit from programs such as meals on wheels, children’s food programs
- come together as a sector at all levels (national, provincial, local) with clear priorities and advocate for them with a joint lobbying strategy
- take the research to the next level by generating data that is relevant to provinces and local areas (rather than just “median” data); develop evaluation capacity at regional/local levels
- support research on the Aboriginal sector

Qs and As:

Q: How will the findings of the Satellite Account be reported and how frequently?

A: The Account is currently funded on an annual basis. The potential is there for greater frequency but it would be challenging. Discussions are underway about the possibility of incorporating the Satellite Account into the core Accounts and input is invited on what specific directions should be taken.

Q: Can you respond to concerns that the NSNVO won't be funded again and that additional resources are needed for a more in-depth analysis of the findings?

A: The survey provides good baseline data but now we need to develop a new research agenda. We will also need to be more creative in how we engage universities, research organizations such as the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and provincial agencies in developing the research questions and in contributing resources.

4. Success Stories

■ Charities Regulatory Reform Framework

Presenter: John Walker, Director, Legislative and Regulatory Reform Secretariat, Charities Directorate, Canada Revenue Agency

Mr. Walker described the progress made to date on regulatory reform for charities, citing five examples of the Codes' influence on reform:

- the Accord implementation plan is linked to the department's corporate mandate and values and uses regulatory reform to model change for the Agency
- the Joint Regulatory Table process provides a roadmap and vision for the Charities Directorate
- the charities regulatory reform framework is designed to foster trust through, for example, service improvements, enhanced public awareness and sector outreach, and jurisdictional collaboration
- the grants and contribution program was adapted to include new funding programs, encourage innovative projects and provide multi-year funding, as well as other enhancements
- the Charities Advisory Committee was created to provide on-going advice to CRA on issues and initiatives of importance to the sector

Some lessons learned:

- importance of early and on-going dialogue
- need to quickly transform the theoretical to the practical
- need to support change by tying to corporate values and Government priorities
- importance of building broad support for funding decisions

■ A Relationship Built on Mutual Trust and Respect: Environment Canada and the Canadian Environmental Network (CEN)

Presenter: Brian Hobbs, Environment Canada

Mr. Hobbs described the positive relationship that has been built over the years between Environment Canada and the CEN. Acting on the principles set out in the Accord, the two groups have improved the process and content of their contribution agreement and worked together to sponsor a national conference on the environment. Built on mutual trust and respect, the relationship has embodied the values of democracy, active citizenship, equality, diversity, inclusion and social justice, and enabled both organizations to achieve their goals.

Presenter: Brigitte Gagné, Canadian Environmental Network

In addition to providing participants with an overview of the CEN, Ms. Gagné reviewed its contribution agreement with Environment Canada, citing the many advantages of the agreement and the benefits to her organization (e.g., joint development of content, continuous monitoring of deliverables) and to Environment Canada (e.g., improved access to services, enhanced credibility). Ms. Gagné also spoke about current challenges for the CEN, which include funding, access to political representation and senior managers, and staff turnover in Government.

■ Living the Codes – the Evolving Relationship: Justice Canada and Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD)

Presenters: Karen Bron, A/Director, Innovations, Analysis and Integration Directorate, Justice Canada and Ekuwa Smith, Senior Research Associate, Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD).

Describing the department's challenges in "living the Codes," Ms. Bron commented on the need for a more widely shared view of the role of its grants and contributions programs in serving departmental/Government priorities, the need for greater flexibility within the department and the preponderance of short-term discreet funding arrangements. However, the department's collaboration with CCSD on a SIDPD project on partner violence against immigrant and visible minority women demonstrates the potential for successful partnerships involving front-line voluntary sector organizations across the country. Ms. Smith emphasized the influence of the Codes of Good Practice in ensuring this project's successful outcomes and cited several key policy and program actions that resulted (e.g., follow-up funding to develop a national network and publish newsletters to support service providers, and the development of partnerships between smaller NGOs and the department).

Plenary Discussion:

Q: Do you have any suggestions on how to get issues of core funding addressed across government departments?

- A:** Share information and talk to departments. Know the contribution agreement timetable. (Brian Hobbs)
- Q:** There is not much resonance with the Accord and Codes in the Winnipeg community. Will this be addressed?
- A:** We are aware that knowledge/awareness of the Accord and Codes is not great in the regions and it's very important. However, we are consulting with CRA regional offices and will be sharing information about the early successes in order to demonstrate the effectiveness of these approaches. (John Walker)
- Q:** We need changes regarding charities and advocacy. Do you have any comments?
- A:** CRA saw that the 10% rule was overly restrictive – especially for small organizations – so it was raised to 20% (over five years). Now charities with annual budgets between 100K and 200K can do up to 12%, those between 50K and 100k can do up to 15% and those under 50K can do 20%. There is a new provision for averaging – a charity may overspend in one year by using the unclaimed portion of resources it was allowed to spend, but did not, over the two preceding years. As well, there is no restriction on policy input to government – for example, through Standing Committees. We encourage debate and discussion on how to best address the issue. (John Walker)
- Q:** The majority of grassroots organizations say that bureaucracy and reporting requirements have skyrocketed and that changes to improve the situation as outlined in the Accord and Codes are not being implemented. What guarantees can the government make in this regard?
- A:** Each department has a Champion, a senior official, who can then report to central agencies. It is important to focus on demonstrating how they work and what benefits new approaches can have – both at HQ and in the regions. (Brian Hobbs)
- Q:** Is there a mechanism to review how voluntary sector organizations – especially those doing a lot business with the government – are feeling (i.e., a “reality check”) about issues such as contribution agreements, policy dialogue, employment services, procurement policies, etc.?
- A:** We need a strategy across all departments and we need to share practices and discuss progress with seven or eight key departments. (John Walker)
- Q:** I'm very impressed with the regulatory changes so far. Looking three years out, how do we engage in a dialogue about the role of the voluntary sector in citizen engagement and policy development – without getting into government silos? How do we take input from the sector and use it?

A: It is a huge challenge to establish horizontality across the voluntary sector, but it needs to be done. The sector needs to think about getting itself together and we need to identify someone responsible for engaging civil society inside each department.
(John Walker)

5. Beyond the VSI – Future Directions

Presenter: Marie Gauthier, Director, Social Development Directorate, SDC

Ms. Gauthier commented on the successes of the VSI to date and outlined some of the directions for moving ahead as the Initiative winds down to a close in March 2006. Among the activities/focus areas identified as opportunities/challenges for both the government and the voluntary sector were:

- continue to incorporate the principles, values and commitments to action outlined in the Accord and Codes into government-voluntary sector relationships
- make SDC a model department for government-voluntary sector collaboration
- advise the Minister of Social Development on potential ways to build a horizontal approach post-VSI
- work together on key issues, such as aging, early childhood, and long-term poverty and social exclusion, and mobilize communities in these areas
- promote innovative partnerships, connectedness to the community and progress towards limited and realistic goals

Presenter: Jean Christie, Executive Director, Voluntary Sector Forum

Speaking about the future of the Government-voluntary sector relationship, Ms. Christie divided her comments into two time periods – shorter term and longer term. She stressed that the relationship will continue long after the funding for specific pieces of work is concluded.

Short-term obligations/directions (i.e., to the end of the VSI in March 2006):

- complete VSI commitments (e.g., awareness campaign, voluntary sector Portal, summative evaluation)
- ensure the NSNVO occurs regularly
- provide for the voluntary sector Portal post VSI
- identify responsibility centres for monitoring the Accord and Codes
- promote/share the findings from the SIDPD projects
- communicate and celebrate the VSI achievements

To move forward, the sectors need to:

- build mechanisms for future dialogue and collaboration to address longer-term concerns
- begin identifying *new* sector-wide concerns that can be worked on jointly (e.g., the voluntary sector’s role in the “communities agenda”)

Longer-term directions (i.e., beyond March 2006):

On the “vertical track” between individual departments and their partners in the voluntary sector, Ms. Christie urged that organizations – through sector and departmental champions – build on the VSI experience and use the framework provided by the Accord and Codes.

On the “horizontal track,” Ms. Christie highlighted the need to anticipate and plan how the voluntary sector will work with SDC on issues that cut across the sectors (e.g., regulatory/legislative/policy issues, building capacity in the voluntary sector and enhancing the government-voluntary sector relationship).

6. In Closing

Presenter: Susan Scotti, Assistant Deputy Minister, Social Development Canada

Ms. Scotti thanked participants for their input, highlighting some of the achievements of the VSI, including the Accord and Codes, the NSNVO and the Satellite Account, and the Charities Regulatory Framework. As well, Ms. Scotti recapped some of the challenges and directions identified during the day, including: maintaining/enhancing both sectors’ sense of commitment and resolve; determining the voluntary sector and the government’s evolving role in addressing priorities such as aging and children’s well-being; maintaining the dialogue on funding and advocacy; and mining and disseminating the results of the research.

Presenter: Monica Patten, Chair of the Voluntary Sector Forum and CEO Community Foundations of Canada

In her closing remarks, Ms. Patten commented that the tone in the room was one of respect and familiarity. She urged participants to connect with the past while continuing to address the goals of the VSI within a new framework by strengthening their relationships and modeling good practices, and building on processes that are already in place. Ms. Patten pledged – on behalf of herself and Ms. Scotti – to continue work on the NSNVO and to “find a home” for all components of the VSI.

C. Next Steps

The Joint Champions meeting provided federal government and voluntary sector representatives with essential input and “on-the-ground” perspectives regarding the achievements and outstanding challenges of the VSI. These inputs – as expressed in the day’s dialogue and summarized in this report – will contribute to ongoing discussion, analysis and development of the collaborative relationship between the two sectors for the duration of the VSI and beyond.

For example, the report will be posted on the VSI Web site, shared with the Joint Steering Committee and the Voluntary Sector Forum and disseminated via other channels to inform discussion and priority setting. As well, the workshop evaluation report (see Appendix E) will be carefully reviewed.

Appendix A: Participants List

Yvonne Atwell Atlantic Centre of Excellence for Women's Health	Deborah Davis Industry Canada
Dianne Bascombe National Children's Alliance	Sange de Silva Statistics Canada
Darlene Bessey YWCA Canada	Beth DeLong Pillar – Voluntary Sector Network
Margaret Biggs Privy Council Office	Gérard Finn Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages
Karen Bron Justice Canada	Elaine Finn Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
Alison Burgoyne Centre for Community Leadership, Niagara College	Brigitte Gagné Canadian Environmental Network
Mary Campbell Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada	Ted Gallivan Treasury Board Secretariat
Tamara Candido RCMP	Marie Gauthier Social Development Canada
Susan Carter Third Sector Advisor & Researcher	Ed Gauthier Canada Revenue Agency
Joan Christensen Coalition of Ontario Voluntary Organizations	Alex Gill Canadian Centre for Philanthropy
Jean Christie Voluntary Sector Forum	Brian Graham Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Jackie Claxton Status of Women Canada	Bonnie Greene Voluntary Sector Forum
Suzanne Clément Canadian Heritage	Al Hatton United Way Canada/Centraide Canada
	Wayne Helgason National Aboriginal Voluntary Organization

Brenda Herchmer
Pan Canadian VS Portal

Brian Hobbs
Environment Canada

Monique Horth
Canadian Museums Association

Kathy Hunter
Health Canada, Alberta/NWT Region

Rick Hutchins
Policylink NB

Aaron Hywarren
National Defence

Darlene Jamieson
Merrick Jamieson Sterns

Bill Jarvis
Environment Canada

Michael Jay
Canadian International Development
Agency

Damon Johnston
Voluntary Sector Forum

Sophie Joyal
Statistics Canada

Sol Kasimer
Altruvest Charitable Services

Colleen Kelly
Volunteer Vancouver

Joanne Kidd
CMHA – Edmonton

Frances Lankin
United Way of Greater Toronto

Miriam Lapp
Elections Canada

Gary Lindfield
Parks Canada Agency

Doug MacQuarrie
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada

Gerry Maffre
Infrastructure Canada

Ralph Manning
Library and Archives Canada

John G. McAvity
Canadian Museums Association

Don McCreesh
The Garnet Group

Kathryn McDade
Human Resources and Skills Development

Gregory Meredith
Correctional Service Canada

Anne Milne
Social Development Canada,
Alberta/NWT/Nunavut Region

Donna Mitchell
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Ed Nera
Canada Mortgage and Housing
Corporation

Marjorie Northrup
Volunteer Bureau of Montreal

Monica Patten
Community Foundations of Canada

Gilles Pelletier
Canada Economic Development for
Quebec Regions

Lorraine Pelot
Law Commission of Canada

Aaron Pereira
The Community Bank Initiative

Sarah Phillips
International Trade Canada

Hélène Quesnel
Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Lucie Rémillard
Fondation de l'Hôpital Sainte-Justine

Penelope M. Rowe
Community Services Council NL

Claudine Sauvé
Transport Canada

Susan Scotti
Social Development Canada

Hugh Segal
Institute for Research on Public Policy

Tim Simboli
Family Services Ottawa

K. Ekuwa Smith
Canadian Council on Social Development

Paula Speevak Sladowski
Centre for Voluntary Sector Research and
Development

Shauna Sylvester
IMPACS

Charlotte Thibault
Canadian Women's Foundation, Montréal

Elizabeth Tromp
Canada Revenue Agency

Katherine Van Kooy
Calgary Chamber of Vol. Orgs.

John Walker
Canada Revenue Agency

Megan Williams
Ottawa Art Gallery

Sylvan D. Williams
Canadian Ethnocultural Council

Appendix B: Agenda

Government and Voluntary Sector Collaboration for the Benefit of Communities”

Meeting of the Government of Canada / Voluntary Sector Joint Champions November 22, 2004, Chateau Cartier, Gatineau, QC

The objective of the Joint Champions meeting is to acknowledge and celebrate the accomplishments made over the past year on Voluntary Sector Initiative-related projects, share the experiences and lessons learned on working with the Accord and Codes in our day-to-day business, and engage in dialogue on future priorities and challenges in continuing to strengthen collaboration and innovation in the government-non-profit sector relationship.

07:30 ***Registration and Continental Breakfast***

08:30 **Welcome and Opening Remarks**

Co-Chairs of the Joint Steering Committee

Susan Scotti, Assistant Deputy Minister, Social Development Canada

Monica Patten, Chair of the Voluntary Sector Forum and CEO Community Foundations of Canada

Opening Remarks

Nicole Jauvin, Deputy Minister, Social Development Canada

09:10 **Keynote Address “Diversity, Community and Citizenship: The Next Voluntary Sector Challenge”**

Hugh Segal, President, Institute for Research on Public Policy and Richard B. Ivey, Fellow, School of Policy Studies, Queen’s University

Table Discussion

10:15 ***Health Break***

10:30 **NSNVO and Satellite Account Findings**

Summary Presentation and Application to Policy Development

Presenters:

Penelope Rowe, CEO, Community Services Council Newfoundland and Labrador

Sophie Joyal, Senior Economist, Non-Profit Sector and Unpaid Work Analysis, Statistics Canada

Respondents:

Margaret Biggs, Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet, Priorities and Planning, Privy Council Office

Al Hatton, CEO, United Way/Centraide Canada

Table Discussions

12:15 ***Lunch***

1:15

Panel Presentations

Accord and Codes Implementation Success Stories

Charities Regulatory Reform Framework: Implementation Plan for the Accord and Codes

John Walker, Director, Legislative and Regulatory Reform Secretariat,
Charities Directorate, Canada Revenue Agency

A Relationship Built on Mutual Trust and Respect

Brian Hobbs, Environment Canada

Brigitte Gagné, Canadian Environmental Network

Living the Codes – The Evolving Relationship

Karen Bron, A/Director, Innovations, Analysis and Integration Directorate, Justice
Canada

K. Ekuwa Smith, PhD, Senior Research Associate, Canadian Council on Social
Development

Table Discussion: Key Success Factors

Health Break Included

3:20

**Beyond the VSI – Future Directions, Opportunities and Challenges for
the Government – Voluntary Sector Relationship**

Allen Zeesman, Director General, Social Development Directorate, SDC

Jean Christie, Executive Director, Voluntary Sector Forum

3:45

Closing Remarks

Co-Chairs of the Joint Steering Committee

Susan Scotti, Assistant Deputy Minister, Social Development Canada

Monica Patten, Chair of the Voluntary Sector Forum and CEO Community
Foundations of Canada

4:00

Meeting Close/Networking

Appendix C: Keynote Address – Hugh Segal

“The Challenge of Integrative Citizenship”

My sense of appreciation for the leadership on the broad question of the role of civil society displayed by all of you here this morning, my admiration for the progress made in the last decade on a host of issues, from the VSI and tax policy to broad and unified engagement between the public and third sector is genuine and heartfelt. The leadership of the voluntary sector, the Privy Council Office, and departmental leadership have in the voluntary accord and charter achieved a great deal indeed. Almost a decade ago, when it was my privilege to serve as Research Director for the Non Profit Research Initiative of the Kahanoff Foundation, I had a chance to sense the excitement, feel the surge of momentum and witness the immense creativity around the dynamic of third sector outreach, new public policy definition around the third sector and the emerging understanding of the essential linkage between the civility of our democracy, the inclusiveness of our civil society and the capacity of the voluntary sector. It is normal that government move on to new perspectives and the sector shape its own unique dynamics, and that those dynamics and perspectives reflect the priorities that respond to the exigencies of the times, the specific voluntary organization and the “government du jour”.

In other words, the next decade will be different from the last; how the two will differ is very much a work in progress.

One compelling area of public policy and special challenge which I truly believe will be vital to the sustainability of our civil society in Canada, is the issue of citizenship – and by citizenship, I mean the way we sustain a common set of Canadian values, and advance the absolute obligation to integrate, (without assimilation!) those from the many rich ethnic and multi-cultural strains which now make up Canadian society. I call this the challenge of integrative citizenship.

We are blessed in what some have called a post modern multi-national country by a growing dynamic in our big cities of relatively recently arrived residents of Canada from a wide diversity of places. The Judeo-Christian host society, the society anchored by aboriginal, French and English founding peoples and cultures is being and has been

strengthened by arrivals from Africa, South Asia, the Middle East, China, Eastern Europe and elsewhere in ways that can only contribute to a diversity factor that is absolutely vital to our economic adaptability and critically productive linkages to the broader world in which Canada and Canadians must grow and prosper.

But as we have seen in other liberal democracies – like the Netherlands and France, the richness of this diversity does not exist in a vacuum without issues and challenges that do require public attention and public policy activity. The need for sensitivity and generosity in this sphere of public policy argues for a dynamic role for the voluntary sector, and, does not argue for ignoring the genuine risks of complacency or inattentiveness on any of our part.

Here are some questions we may want to consider:

1. What is the role of government in ensuring that core Canadian values – the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, public tolerance and generosity, our official languages, the respect for equality, are commonly respected, even among those who come from societies where only some of these premises are embraced?
2. How is that role articulated in a federal state? Education is provincial; immigration is largely federal; settlement and community development is often municipal, and NGO's often play a critical role.
3. What is the role of poverty and economic exclusion in the generation of tensions between people of different cultural or racial backgrounds? It has surely been an issue in the challenges faced by authorities in France and the Netherlands. What do studies that point to less promising economic progress by the children of recent immigrants tell us now about some structural problems ahead?
4. What is the likely genuine tolerance in Canada for government action on this front of “integrative citizenship”? How would any federal government initiative which has its own settlement and immigration program be received in Quebec, for example, on this front? Conversely, what are the costs of not acting – for any government, at any level, and for the rest of society that governments are sworn to serve?

5. What are the extra yields of succeeding in the initiative around successfully managing diversity? We know from Richard Florida's work of the economic benefits that accrue to community of immense and dynamic diversity.

I believe that this challenge of “integrative citizenship” will define much of the dynamics of our society going forward; our success in addressing it will define the strength and elasticity of our civil society – two dimensions vital to the desirability of Canada as a place to live, grow, work, invest and prosper. Clearly, our attraction to so many who have come to our shores since the second World War, is tied to the perception of Canada as a peaceable kingdom with enhanced prospects and opportunities for one's children, one's family, and oneself. If we fail to attend to the sinews of that core desirability, if we are unprepared to tend to policy issues underlined by “integrative citizenship” then we do risk a dilution of the very civility of a society where deemed and apparent civility is absolutely critical to the Canadian brand – as important to the tenth generation Canadian family as it is to the new engineering graduate from South Asia we eagerly welcome. And, as we embrace the challenge of integrative citizenship for those whom we now host, we must never lose sight of those who hosted us and our forbearers – our aboriginal fellow citizens – where social and economic challenges remain most urgent.

The IRPP has begun a challenging research project on the dynamics of this issue because we know there are tough public policy issues to be addressed, some that governments may well want to avoid, and which need to be fleshed out with empirical research that adds insight and new ideas to the marketplace of choices a civil society will face.

Intuitively, I believe that the not for profit sector, the broad range of organizations in the community that work across the full spectrum of voluntary sector pursuits, from recreation to domestic violence, from literacy to culture, from young people to welfare, from education to the environment, are likely better suited than many parts of government to be leading actors in this field, and less likely to be misunderstood.

Certainly, while resources are always scarce, and no one is under-burdened either in the sector, or in this room, the sector has agility, diversity, and community rooted

intensity that puts it very much at “the coal face” of the “integrative citizenship” challenge.

I will not put the John F. Kennedy exhortation of “ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country” this morning – because I do not think it is the right question, especially where the voluntary sector already does so much and facilitates so much being done that continues, in so many ways, to strengthen our country and community.

Let me, with respect to Bob Rae’s recent book, ask this question instead: “If the independent organizations that help shape our common citizenship, do not engage on this front, who will? And if you will not act to strengthen the role of others, who can? And if we do not begin now, then when?”

I am delighted to take your questions.

Appendix D: Written Questions/Comments

On the VSI and the Accord and Codes:

Q: Does the end of the VSI have implications for the Accord and Codes?

A: The VSI was a process that lent itself to the development of certain outputs and outcomes. The Accord and Codes were meant to influence how the two sectors collaborate over the longer-term and will continue to be referenced, used, talked about and implemented well beyond March 2006. These tools and their outputs, including guidelines, standards and goals, will continue to give meaning to the way in which the government and voluntary sectors aim to work together. While the Initiative is ending, the relationship with the sector is not; the foundations that have been established will continue and the Minister of Social Development Canada will continue to have ministerial responsibility for the voluntary sector and the Accord and Codes.

Q: Is anybody going to discuss how the VSI got started and what there was about that process that made it work?

A: The VSI Formative Evaluation Process, completed in the Fall 2004, serves this purpose. The report is available on the VSI website at www.vsi-isbc.ca. In addition, the VSI Summative Evaluation Process has been initiated and is scheduled for completion after all of the VSI components are completed in March 2006. These two evaluative processes will help to identify lessons learned and inform future directions and priorities for both sectors.

Q: Susan Scotti said that one of the noted weaknesses of the VSI was its perceived focus on large national organizations and not reaching out sufficiently to local groups. Has she any comment on how the Government might work to overcome this problem?

A: The findings of the VSI Formative Evaluation (i.e., strengths and weaknesses) will contribute, in part, to SDC policy and program discussions on priorities, challenges and opportunities with respect to the departmental mandate of meeting the social development needs of Canadians (e.g. childcare, communities, etc.).

Q: For Susan Scotti, the current mandate of the VSI ends in 2006. If there is less support for the sector with the end of the VSI, how will the sector have the capacity to obtain/develop the capacity to fill the possible gap?

A: Undoubtedly, both federal government departments and voluntary sector organizations will continue to see the importance and necessity of partnership and collaboration with respect to service delivery, community development and citizen engagement, and invest accordingly through existing and/or new program initiatives. However, it is also important that the voluntary sector access other levels of government funding and private sector investment opportunities.

On research findings and data:

Q: GDP [is] reported in the media. [Are there] plans to do likewise with the Satellite Account in order to realize one of the key objectives of increasing awareness and legitimacy?

A: A variety of dissemination activities are currently underway to increase awareness of the economic contribution of the voluntary sector.

Q: Are there correlations between it being harder to get volunteers and dollar value associated with the role of volunteers?

A: This question will be forwarded to officials at Statistics Canada for their consideration.

Q: We need to apply a gender lens to the correlation between women comprising a larger percentage of volunteers and it being difficult to retain volunteers due to their variety of roles.

A: This question will be forwarded to officials at Statistics Canada for their consideration.

Q: Isn't there a communications strategy (and budget) on the part of government to disseminate the Satellite Account results to provinces, regions and other relevant research bodies?

A: Dissemination of the Satellite Account findings is being done through a variety of mechanisms, including regular Statistics Canada channels.

On a third party mechanism to facilitate dialogue:

Q: Is there a need for a mechanism to facilitate the dialogue? (Maybe it needs to be a neutral body.)

A: It is not clear which dialogue is referred to in this question; however, dialogue between the government and voluntary sector in general is facilitated both informally and formally through many channels in their day-to-day business. Other formal and visible channels, such as the First Joint Champions Meeting, also serve as opportunities to engage in ongoing, open dialogue.

Q: While we agree that the Voluntary Sector has a key leadership role to play in our communities, particularly in connecting the silos within the sector as well as to government and business, we are concerned about their capacity to play that role. How do we deal with the reality that voluntary sector organizations rarely have the capacity to serve as intermediaries or in a "connecting" role? Is it their job to

facilitate community “commons” or “tables” to discuss and respond to real needs at the grassroots level or is there a need for a fourth sector or neutral organization to do this?

A: There is no “correct” answer to this question. Capacity for sector organizations continues to be a challenge in all areas. In some situations, subsector groups come together on issues; in others, groups such as the United Way and Social Planning Councils can play a convening role at the local level and in some communities/regions coalitions of organizations have been formed to be those intermediaries.

On funding:

Q: What is the Government’s position on core funding? (It seems to be inconsistent across departments)

A: As described in the Code of Good Practice on Funding (section 4.1, page 8) “Federal government departments and agencies make different types of direct funding available to voluntary sector organizations for a range of purposes and activities to ensure that government policy objectives are met in a flexible and appropriate manner. However, not all types of funding are provided by every department and agency. Each federal department and agency determines the type(s) of funding best suited to fulfil its mandate and policy objectives. Departments and agencies are guided by their individual policy and program priorities as well as by the terms and conditions of the specific funding programs they provide. Although most federal government funding is allocated for a one-year period, some departments and agencies also provide funding on a multi-year basis. All funding agreements are subject to the annual appropriation of funds by Parliament.”

Appendix E: Evaluation Results

What Went Well:

Overall Content and Format:

- Good balance of presentations and discussions – production.
- Excellent format – nice to have time for questions and answers.
- Kept speakers to time limits.
- Excellent comments and participants.
- Presentations, discussions and handouts
- Participant selection, but could be more representative of diversity of organizations, groups, etc.
- Presentations were very informative.
- Generally informative and challenging presentations and questions.
- Listening to practical experiences.
- The presentations and the commitment from all to move forward.
- Knowledge sharing. Information sessions.
- Presentation on National Survey and Mr. Segal’s presentation. Good cross-section of representatives: federal/volunteer.
- Presentation of practical information (e.g. research).
- Wonderful to see voluntary sector champions within the federal government! (Very encouraging!).
- Well organized and promptly delivered. Material clear. Presenters knowledgeable and effective.
- Dialogue kept on track and schedule.
- Overall format.
- Table discussions and presentations.
- Excellent organization.

Hugh Segal:

- Enjoyed Hugh Segal.
- Hugh Segal was great!
- Great keynote – set a good tone for the day. Great mix of government and voluntary sector people, flow and timing went well.
- Hugh Segal set good tone; research presentations were quite good; table discussions and networking opportunities were quite good.

Social Development Canada specific:

- Hearing that SDC has a commitment to championing some of the VSI issues – financing, capacity and advocacy.
- Dialogue grew to focus on post-VSI activity and where responsibility lies for on-going relationship between both the sector and private sector e.g. Minister of Social Development.
- SDC’s leadership was very visible.

Format / Table Discussions:

- Round table discussions with guiding questions.
- I enjoyed the opportunity to further explore issues in smaller groups during the mini-follow sessions at the table before Qs and As. It was great to be able to discuss these issues and benefit from the various issues around the table.
- Good idea to have groups talk together before asking questions.
- Information sharing at tables went really well but needed active facilitators.
- Informal table discussions (consider rotating?).

Facilities / Staff:

- Professional facilitation – kept us on track.
- Facilitation team was extremely professional. Excellent choice. Ditto for keynote speaker.
- Good facility, although a bit cold in the room.
- Logistics good (food, set-up, lighting).
- Choice of resource people.
- Well orchestrated by the MC.
- Technical issues – 1 microphone for all questions, etc. was effective – often this appears confused if organization is not well done.

General:

- Meeting new people.
- Good catch up.
- Great “meeting of minds” in some areas.
- Information transfer.
- Exchange of information and opportunity to raise questions and concerns
- Bringing government and the sector together.
- Time for discussion.
- The weather.
- Great opportunity to see people from both sectors on a common priority.

What Needs Improvement:

Format:

- Self-introductions would have been useful and would have helped to build bridges.
- Should have time to introduce one another.
- Might have had participants switch tables at lunch.
- More frequent discourse between government and sector.
- Provide more time for “official networking” opportunities (built in as part of the program).
- Objectives of the session were not really clear. We need more than discussion, after all, everyone here has been in agreement already on the VSI in general.

- More time for practical experiences and networking exercises between the two sectors.
- Use time as effectively as possible to exchange ideas.
- More time in discussion.
- The “panel” format in the afternoon became deadly. Either fewer groups on the panel or run through 2 or more concurrent working groups.
- Less one way information dissemination.
- Would have like to have had more time to interact and share with one another and with presenters.

Participants:

- More government participation and questions directed at government representatives for table discussions.
- Senior representatives from government need to attend (key players were not here).
- Political presence. A Minister or Secretary of State.
- Where were the NSNVO and Volunteer Canada?
- More sector reps attended but at my table there were more government than sector representatives.

Content:

- Information and questions needed to be provided in advance to participants.
- Needs to be more visionary (like Hugh Segal)
- Would have liked the day to focus on three inspirational thinkers who offer fresh thinking about the future.
- Although the information sessions were interesting, they were dry and too long-winded.
- More practical tools.
- Case studies and success stories for a range of activities addressing social issues
- More awareness building.
- Some segments a bit slow. Might want to build in more stimuli (e.g. moving tables) to promote different exchanges.
- More opportunities for regional grassroots to receive first hand information and chance for feedback.
- Sectoral discussions.
- More time on future directions and strategies.
- We must achieve a better reflection of the role “diversity” within the sector from all perspectives.
- The voluntary sector people are quick to fault government; the other faulting doesn’t happen publicly, should it? Is it time we all did self-appraisal? Voluntary sector people assume an attitude of entitlement.
- The day would have benefited from a more open evolution: here is what we hoped to achieve and here’s what we accomplished.

Issue Specific Content Comments:

- Reporting processes need to be streamlined so as not to create a “burden” especially for small organizations. Keep reporting focused, simple and relevant.
- We cannot encourage accountability and transparency if we do not practice it ourselves.
- A commitment [is needed] from government departments to take on the serious issue of ensuring the Codes are placed at the forefront of all departments.
- Case studies were a good idea but some examples which go beyond cosy relationship, that illustrate how the codes have been used to solve a problem, to assert the entitlement of a controversial organization, to government support.
- Linkage strategy for the VSI portal.
- Capacity, funding, longer-term planning (recognized as a key challenge) yet no focussed presentation/engagement on these issues to inform thinking.

Next Steps:

- Need a clear commitment to the sector and regular Joint Champions meetings

What Do We Need To Do To Maintain Momentum?

General

- It’s hard to know how this is really connected on a day-to-day basis with the participants here.
- Get back to participants with feed-back and a plea to continue to March 2006 and beyond.
- Work with existing networks.
- Why should this be important to organizations?
- Develop regional resonance.
- Implant the VSF’s ongoing projects in organizations that can carry them forward
- Continue to provide a leadership locus for the sector.
- Communicate! With and to community organizations.
- Ensure that there is a call to action for all of us.
- Make issues of not acting more publicly recognized. The best Champions for the voluntary sector are themselves through politicians and senior leaders.
- Maintain communication.
- Keep communication lines open between the sector and the Government and continue to find ways to work together and keep talking!!!

Accord and Code Specific

- More political will to implement the Accord. What will happen to Accord implementation with the VSI ending in 2006.
- Sell the benefit of the Accord and Codes.

- Ensure that the commitment towards the Accord and Codes recognition and implementation is maintained.
- Continue to develop awareness across the country and hold people accountable for living up to the Accord and Codes.

Research Dissemination

- Solving the challenges identified in research is key. We now have process and tools, let's drive to solutions.
- Involve voluntary sector networks to disseminate today's valuable information. Provide resources to have NSNVO and Satellite Account reports analysed for information of grassroots organizations, etc.

Government of Canada Specific

- Bring greater awareness and pressure to bear on government departments and agencies to implement the Accord and Codes.
- Capacity building in federal departments and regions.
- Enlist more Champions within government.
- Government departments have to:
 - Address problem of lack of horizontality;
 - Address growing burden of accountability processes that are essential risk aversion exercises and which are stifling the voluntary sector;
 - Need to address the core funding issue.
- Provide support services to smaller departments and agencies.
- If government doesn't work horizontally perhaps we need to really enable departments to design outcomes with the sector and work towards those outcomes.
- Needs to be more relevant (e.g. we should be meeting with the Auditor General so that she can hear how changes in auditing practices are affecting us).

Planning Issues:

- I would suggest targeting specifics that we can achieve from outcomes. It may be that we need to forget about government-wide for the time being and focus on key departments that can truly advance issues and share successes regularly by pulling in other departments.
- Plan beyond 2006.
- Develop an action plan for the next 15 months.
- Build now (plan to start at next meeting) on achievements to date.
- Identify new challenges (e.g. integration with communities and cities agenda).
- Develop a clear vision and priorities for moving forward.

Relationship Building:

- Need more government and sector networking (between and amongst).
- We need to own it as the voluntary sector and stop saying what is government going to do – we can do this locally too – it is all about relationships between people.

- The creation of a joint forum to deal with the “relationship” issues as the partnership continues to mature.

Governance:

- Find a means to establish a longer-term structure (like the Forum) to maintain momentum. It would be great if the federal government would provide some funding.
- End the accountability obsession / encourage risk taking.
- The voluntary sector must achieve consensus for a long term leadership structure (e.g. post VSF).
- The VSF needs a moving forward conversation, with no holds barred.

Other comments?

- What did the statement, “don’t equate the voluntary sector with community” mean?
- Need to find another name for the “Post-VSI-06” that will speak of the future and building from strengths.
- Would have been nice to have seen some examples of the messages from the awareness group – would have illustrated the achievement.
- This needs to continue.
- Probably should encourage greater use of French.
- Overall, this session was extremely useful and clearly generated animated, positive and creative ideas and solutions.
- StatsCan project is very useful.
- Social Development Canada must provide sustainable funding for agreed joint initiatives.
- Good Day!!!
- Need better connection to community based organizations – possible through Federation of Churches.
- Room was cold! Food was not sensitive to everyone’s needs.
- Thank you, well organized.
- When we will broaden the definition of “sector” beyond those in the room to include social entrepreneurs and socially conscious businesses?
- Congratulations to all involved – VSI has truly made some significant progress! It is especially important that we really are beginning to see that we are a sector!