

# 211: Advancing the Provincial Consolidated System Information Resources Working Group Minutes, September 14, 2005

Present: Christine Berry (Information Oakville), Ross Cooling (Community Connection, Collingwood), Julie Giesbrecht (Information Niagara), John Allec (Findhelp Information Services)  
Regrets: Barb McLachlan (Information Windsor), Ian Kellogg (Findhelp Information Services)

## 1. Minutes of August 3<sup>rd</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> meetings

Minutes accepted as distributed.

## 2. Data/field elements

Although absent, Barb had distributed some initial thoughts and an outline of concerns, to be thoroughly discussed at the next meeting. Julie thinks that some flexibility should be left to individual centres, as long as data sharing works (eg hyphens or brackets for area codes). Meanwhile, Christine will think some more about the best way to proceed in the next few weeks.

## 3. Name authority

Consensus that the Canadian Red Cross would be a good test case for cross-province database naming and record sharing:

- The national office is in Ottawa (unclear whether there are services of I&R interest at that level –CIC of Ottawa currently only lists the Ottawa branch);
- The “Ontario Zone” office is in Mississauga (again unclear whether there are services of interest at that level). There are also maps indicating subregions – West Central Region, Northern Central Region, but apparently there are no actual regional offices. There are 3 other Zones in Canada.
- Many communities have a local branch;
- There is current a wide variety of how to name the organization itself, including:
  - Red Cross (Canadian)
  - Canadian Red Cross Society
  - The Canadian Red Cross Society
  - Canadian Red Cross Society [The]
  - Canadian Red Cross Society, The
  - Canadian Red Cross (this version, from Halton, seems to be the way the organization is currently branding itself. This may help clarify the issue of listing by legal name or “branding” name.
- There is also a wide variety in practice as to how branches are represented in the Organization Levels. Some examples:

- ORG1: Canadian Red Cross Society [The]. Simcoe County Branch  
ORG2: (program name)
- ORG1: Canadian Red Cross
- ORG2: West Central Ontario Region
- ORG3: Burlington Branch
- ORG4: (program name)  
[Note in this database, there are separate records for the Red Cross just at the ORG1 or ORG2 levels. This is likely to be our proposed standard practice.]
- ORG1: Canadian Red Cross Society, The
- ORG2: Niagara Area Branches
- ORG3: (program name)  
[Similarly, no separate records for the ORG1 level, unclear about ORG2]
- ORG1: CANADIAN RED CROSS SOCIETY
- ORG2:
- ORG3:
- ORG4:
- ORG5: Ottawa Branch

This variety of naming practices creates many problems in data sharing, making it very difficult to identify similar or even duplicate listings. If we can make a system work for the Red Cross across the board, we will have solved a lot of the naming and formatting issues. These include:

- Decision-making and communication processes for what the appropriate naming for a particular organization should be. The system also needs to work efficiently for name changes – ideally every data partner would process name changes at roughly the same time.
- As this workgroup is to disband at the end of the year, the processing for the above may have to fall to the person coordinating data sharing for the 211 Ontario projects (i.e. Ian Kellogg), working with members of the InformOntario Accreditation & Standards Committee.
- Policy issue of whether the legal organization name (the historic InformOntario standard) is to be preferred, or the way the organization commonly refers to itself (for example on stationery or web sites).
- How the above affects other fields, such as Record Type. Do we need a new Record Type specifically for head offices.

John will try to get more facts on the Red Cross's offices in Toronto.

#### **4. Next meeting**

Tuesday, September 27th, 10:30 a.m.