

## Governance

<p><i>Is there a High-Level Steering Committee and/or Technical Committee (or similar) for your SW? If yes, kindly indicate which agency takes the lead (e.g. Ministry of XXXX, Presidents Office, etc.) and list all government and private sector agencies that participate.</i></p>	<p>The Single Window Initiative (SWI) developed its governance structure to support the successful completion of project activities and provide for the necessary level of oversight, review and contribution from all required stakeholders. Committees were established at the agency and project level with defined levels of authority providing oversight throughout the project lifecycle while ensuring stakeholders were engaged and decision-making was streamlined</p> <p>An escalation process was also established as part of the SWI Governance Structure. The purpose of this process was to obtain decisions and approvals from the necessary governance bodies in a timely fashion.</p> <p>The main oversight committees were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SWI Assistant Deputy Ministers' (ADM) Advisory Committee:</b> The SWI ADM Advisory Committee was established and led by the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) to support the project objectives, as well as to offer advice and provide strategic direction on project milestones. The Committee was established to oversee and directed project delivery while ensuring that coordinated decisions were being made among relevant stakeholders. (Frequency: Ad-Hoc or as deemed necessary by the Chair)</li> <li>• <b>SWI Directors' General (DG) Steering Committee:</b> The SWI DG Steering Committee was established and led by the CBSA to support the project objectives, as well as to offer advice and provide strategic direction to the SWI Project Management Working Group (PMWG). The Committee was established to oversee and direct project delivery as well as ensure that coordinated decisions were being made among relevant stakeholders. (Frequency: Quarterly or as deemed necessary by the Chair)</li> <li>• <b>SWI PMWG:</b> The mandate of the SWI PMWG was to provide a forum for discussion between the Participating Government Departments and Agencies (PGAs) to ensure that the SWI project remained consistent with its project charter, plans and schedules. The Working Group, led by the CBSA, acted as the initial focal point for identifying and escalating risks and issues for mitigation and/or resolution.(Frequency: Monthly or as deemed necessary by the Chair)</li> <li>• <b>SWI IT Working Group:</b> The mandate of the SWI IT Working Group was to provide a forum for discussion between PGA's IT representatives to ensure that the SWI project remained synchronized with the CBSA. The Working Group, led by the CBSA, served as the initial focal point for identifying and escalating IT related items for resolution. (Frequency: Monthly or as deemed necessary by the Chair)</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>Note: Numerous Governance Bodies were established throughout the SWI Project Lifecycle outside of the four named above including those that were established to align the Canadian SWI to the World Customs Organization (WCO) Data Model and the US Customs and Border Protection SWI.</p> <p>A comprehensive view of the SWI Governance Structure and Escalation Process is available on request.</p> <p>Internal Clients can refer to the following link:  <a href="http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/lisapi.dll/Overview/658420">http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/lisapi.dll/Overview/658420</a></p>
<p><i>Is it enshrined in national legislation? (please list the legislation[s])</i></p>	<p>No, the use of the SWI IID Release Service Option (SO 911) is not enshrined in national legislation. It is important to note however; that the data being collected is regulated. From conception the CBSA worked with the PGAs to ensure that the proper legal authorities were in place to collect, share and store the data. Please refer to the 'Legal Aspects' section of this template for further details.</p>
<p><i>If you have one, how does your SW Committee relate to the National Trade Facilitation Committee (NTFC), if one exists? Is it under the jurisdiction of the NTFC or separate?</i></p>	<p>A SWI Implementation Working Group has been established in addition to various governance working groups with the Participating Government Departments and Agencies, including the CBSA and Senior Management. The purpose is to provide a platform to discuss the continued onboarding and uptake of the SWI IID Release Service Option. These groups are not affiliated with a National Trade Facilitation Committee.</p>
<p><i>How is coordination between the participating government agencies in the SW managed? And how often does the above Committee meet, if one exists?</i></p>	<p>Please refer to the response provided for Governance Item #1</p>
<p><i>Is there more than one SW official government sponsored facility operating in your country? If yes, how is this managed?</i></p>	<p>There is no centralized facility operating in our country in regards to the SWI. Trade Change Partners submit an IID in an Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) format as per the specifications as defined within the Electronic Commerce Client Requirements Document (ECCRD).</p>

## Establishment

<p><i>Have you notified the establishment of a SW as category A, B or C type of measure under the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement (Article 10.4)?</i></p>	<p>No, we have not notified the establishment of a SW as category A, B, or C Type under the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement.</p>
<p><i>What is the current status of the facility (study, pilot phase, running)?</i></p>	<p>The Canadian Single Window is currently in Production ('running').</p>
<p><i>What motivated the establishment of your Single Window (SW)?</i></p>	<p>The "Beyond the Border: A Shared Vision for Perimeter Security and Economic Competitiveness" announced by Prime Minister Harper and United States' (US) President Obama on February 4, 2011, established new long-term partnerships that support trade and commerce between Canada and the US, while strengthening security and regulatory cooperation. Two key areas of cooperation identified were addressing threats early at the border by developing common practices, and streamlining procedures for customs processing and regulatory compliance.</p> <p>As a result of this declaration, a joint action plan was developed, the Perimeter Security and Economic Competitiveness Action Plan (hereinafter the "Action Plan"), and announced on December 7, 2011. The SWI was identified as one of 32 joint priorities that will facilitate trade and align regulatory approaches to protect health, safety and the environment while supporting growth. The Action Plan committed the CBSA and United States Customs and Border Protection (US CBP) to providing importers with a single window through which they can electronically submit all information required to comply with government import regulations, resulting in more efficient border processes.</p> <p>The SWI creates a streamlined approach for the electronic collection and dissemination of commercial import data between the Government of Canada (GoC) and the import community and establishes an integrated solution for the commercial import process that balances the needs of government departments and agencies with today's globally competitive business environment.</p>

*What year was it established?*

Implementation Timelines:

The development of the IID for commercial imports that included all PGA data requirements was completed September, 2012.

As of December 2013, the CBSA began receiving and storing the IID from, and sharing relevant data with, the following PGAs in a test environment:

- Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA);
- Global Affairs Canada (GAC);
- Health Canada (HC);
- Natural Resources Canada (NRCan); and
- Transport Canada (TC).

The implementation of the SWI into Production in March, 2015 introduced two new Release Service Options (SOs) into the Accelerated Commercial Release Operations Support System (ACROSS): IID – SO911 and License, Permit, Certificate and Other (LPCO) Documentation Image – SO 927. The release documents, governed by the existing release protocol, allowed for the automatic transmission of the IID to the appropriate PGAs, for a release decision/recommendation where required.

As of March 29, 2015 the following PGA Programs moved to Production under the SWI:

- GAC
  - Import Controls of Agricultural, Steel and Textiles and Clothing Products)
- HC
  - Importation of Consumer Products, Cosmetics, Radiation Emitting Devices, and Pest Control Products.
  - Importation of Human Drugs, Natural Health Products, and Medical Devices Regulated by the Food and Drugs Act.
  - Importation of Controlled Substances and Precursors
- Natural Resources Canada (NRCan)
  - Importation of Energy-Using Products.
  - Kimberley Process Rough Diamonds Program – Import of Rough Diamonds.
- Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC)
  - Human and Terrestrial Animal Pathogens and Biological Toxins.
- Transport Canada (TC)
  - Importation of Vehicles with the exception of the Appendix F process

	<p>As of March, 2017 all 9 of the PGAs and their associated 38 programs were in Production; the remaining being as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CFIA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Animal Health (including: Terrestrial Animal Health, Aquatic Animal Health &amp; Veterinary Biologics), Feed, Fertilizer Safety, Food (including: Agrifood, Fish &amp; Seafood, Meat and Imported &amp; Manufactured Food), Plant Health, Plants with Novel Traits, and Seeds.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Nuclear Substances &amp; Equipment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Environment and Climate Control Canada (ECCC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hazardous Waste &amp; Hazardous Recyclable Materials, New &amp; Existing Substances, Vehicle &amp; Engine Emissions Transportation, Wildlife Enforcement (CITES), Environmental Enforcement, and Ozone Depleting Substances &amp; Halocarbon Alternatives</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Trade Tracking, Aquatic Invasive Species, Aquatic Biotechnology/New Substances Notification</li> </ul> </li> <li>• NRCan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Explosives</li> </ul> </li> <li>• TC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Vehicles Appendix F, Tires</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><i>How did the SW interface with legacy systems (systems that existed prior to the SW project – if applicable)?</i></p>	<p>The SWI directly interfaces with ACROSS and B2B legacy systems. Most of the communications between SWI and the legacy systems is through MQ, and Web-Service. Some of the data that ACROSS shares with SWI uses Scratchpad (DB Table).</p> <p>TCPs are able to submit a permit image through B2B web-service, and then B2B processes the image message to send to SWI through MQ.</p> <p>TCPs submit the IID to CECP using EDI format, and then CECP processes the IID, converts it to ACRF format and sends to ACROSS. ACROSS sends a trigger via a queue to SWI and then SWI retrieves the IID on the ACROSS Scratchpad prior to re-constructing the IID in XML format.</p>
<p><i>Did any other country's SW model serve as inspiration or model? (which ones)</i></p>	<p>Since inception the Canadian SWI worked in close partnership with the World Customs Organization (WCO) through participation in both the WCO Information Management Sub-Committee (IMSC) and the WCO Data Model Project Team (DMPT).</p> <p>The Canadian SWI also collaborated as part of the Canada-United States Regulatory Cooperation Council (RCC) and the GoC's Red Tape Reduction Commission (RTRC).</p>

	<p>Furthermore, Canada worked alongside both the US and Mexico throughout its implementation specifically in regards to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data Alignment</li> <li>• PGA Mandate/Mission Alignment</li> <li>• Joint Trade Outreach Strategies</li> </ul>
<p><i>What process was followed in setting it up? Was there a pilot project? How long did it take the facility to become operational? Give clear indication on what is the point of starting and what is the operational phase (eg: how long it took from the day the decision was officially taken to implement a single window and the first effective SW transaction )</i></p>	<p><b>What process was followed in setting-up the SWI:</b></p> <p>As a result of the “Beyond the Border: A Shared Visions for Perimeter Security and Economic Competitiveness” declaration the Perimeter Security and Economic Competitiveness Action Plan was developed in 2011. At this time the SWI was identified as one of the 32 joint priorities that will facilitate trade and align regulatory approaches to protect health, safety and the environment while supporting growth.</p> <p>The Action Plan committed the CBSA and United States Customs and Border Protection (US CBP) to providing importers with a single window through which they can electronically submit all information required to comply with government import regulations, resulting in more efficient border processes.</p> <p>In order to proceed with the initiative the CBSA underwent the Memorandum to Cabinet (MC), Treasury Board (TB) Submission and Parliamentary Approval Process as described in greater detail in the ‘Business Model’ Section of this template with approval to proceed granted in Fiscal Year 2012-13.</p> <p>This exercise provided funding for all ten PGAs (including the CBSA) to develop and implement the End State Single Window.</p> <p><b>Was there a pilot project?</b></p> <p>Although an official pilot project was not conducted the SWI was built on existing Government of Canada (GoC) investments in border protection and facilitation within the CBSA.</p> <p>In 1997 the CBSA implemented the exchange of electronic information with five PGAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two-way data exchange with CFIA and GAC</li> <li>• One-way data distribution to Statistics Canada, NRCAN and TC.</li> </ul> <p>Further investment resulted in the Advance Interdepartmental Reporting Initiative (AIRI), which enabled the CBSA to conduct the analysis on the import processes for GoC related goods. The analysis established a single window framework that identified an approach to the collection, use and dissemination of required import data. Using this framework, a mechanism called ‘Pathfinder’ was developed to distribute import data from the CBSA to PGAs. Pathfinder provided 7 departments encompassing 11 programs with commercial customs data that enabled them to more effectively monitor compliance for goods they regulate. The SWI leveraged these investments to incorporate new PGA data and new programs for more efficient processing of</p>

border-related decisions, enhanced permit verification and compliance monitoring.

The AIRI component of SWI took place over 5 years during which time only the CBSA was funded to research and develop the SWI concept. The PGAs were unfunded during this time however; were fully involved in the process including the compilation of data requirements as well as in the development of Legislation/Regulatory Scans, involving the Department of Justice, to determine whether or not the legal authority was in place to request, share and store the required data.

AIRI was then leveraged to move forward with the SWI MC and TB Submission process as outlined in Business Model Section 2 of this template. The Parliamentary Approval which was granted at this time (2012/13) provided funding for all ten PGAs (including the CBSA) to develop and implement the End State Single Window.

SWI Framework - E-Commerce Solutions and Partnerships to Facilitate Secure Trade:

[http://www.wcoomd.org/~media/wco/public/global/pdf/topics/facilitation/activities-and-programmes/sw-initiatives/canada/single\\_window\\_framework\\_canada\\_en.pdf?la=en](http://www.wcoomd.org/~media/wco/public/global/pdf/topics/facilitation/activities-and-programmes/sw-initiatives/canada/single_window_framework_canada_en.pdf?la=en)

***How long did it take the facility to become operational?***

Once funding was granted in 2012/13 it took five years to implement the SWI with all ten PGAs and their 38 associated programs.

Following is a timeline of the major milestones:

- The development of the IID for commercial imports that included all PGA data requirements was completed September, 2012.
- As of December 2013, the CBSA began receiving and storing the IID from, and sharing relevant data with, the following PGAs in a test environment: Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA); Global Affairs Canada (GAC); Health Canada (HC); Natural Resources Canada (NRCan); and Transport Canada (TC).
- The implementation of the SWI into Production in March, 2015 introduced two new Release Service Options (SOs) into the Accelerated Commercial Release Operations Support System (ACROSS): IID – SO911 and License, Permit, Certificate and Other (LPCO) Documentation Image – SO 927. The release documents, governed by the existing release protocol, allowed for the automatic transmission of the IID to the appropriate PGAs, for a release decision/recommendation where required.
- As of March 29, 2015 five of the PGAs and 8 of their associated programs moved into Production.
- By March, 2017 all nine of the PGAs and their 38 associated programs moved into Production.

	<p>To summarize, from Concept to Production it took 5 years to implement the SWI with the first official IID submitted on September 8, 2015 with a total of 8 IID submissions received during that first month. In June, 2019 1,130,292 IIDs were submitted.</p>
<p><i>What kind of training for the staff was required in the establishment and how was it organized?</i></p>	<p>Staff Training was provided to the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Headquarters - Programs, Operations</li> <li>• Field Operations – Border Service Officers (BSOs), Administrative Support, Chiefs, Superintendents, etc.</li> <li>• Trade Chain Partners</li> <li>• Other Government Departments and Agencies</li> <li>• All areas of Management Services, Help Desks, Technical Commercial Client Unit (TCCU), Business to Business (B2B) Support, Customs Electronic Commerce Platform (CECP) Support, etc.</li> </ul> <p>Training Tools utilized include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Webinars</li> <li>• Video Training</li> <li>• Online SWI Tool Box</li> <li>• Manuals for BSOs and Other Field Operational Staff</li> <li>• Internal &amp; External Websites – Updated to include SWI Information, Processes, etc.</li> <li>• Presentations were drafted and presented to Trade Chain Partners and Trade Chain Associations</li> </ul> <p>Note: In addition first line support to Trade Chain Partners, CBSA Operational Support and Other Government Departments and Agencies has been extended in order to help with the transition to the IID in regards to responding quickly and efficiently to questions regarding onboarding, issues and training.</p>

## Services

<p><i>What services does the SW provide? What process/ documents/ information (data) are covered? (include a check list of key business processes and/or documents here)</i></p>	<p>The implementation of the SWI provided the following high-level business outcomes for stakeholders:</p> <p>A. Improved electronic data submissions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow for the electronic assessment of regulatory compliance;</li> <li>• Are aligned with the World Customs Organization (WCO) Data Model; and</li> <li>• Enable timely border-related decisions.</li> </ul> <p>B. Improved information requirements for imports that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are aligned with the US;</li> <li>• Have redundant information requests eliminated;</li> <li>• Are based upon consultations with the importing community; and</li> <li>• Are limited to that which are essential for regulatory compliance and transactional border-related decisions.</li> </ul>
--	--



- C. Improved business processes that:
- Eliminate redundant processes between PGAs;
  - Enable future risk assessment and inspections; and
  - Eliminate paper-based processes after a transition period.

Specifically, as identified in the Treasury Board Submission, the scope for the Initiative was as follows:

1. Development of the technical and business capacity for PGA programs to accept CBSA commercial import data in support of their mandates.
2. Design, development and implementation of consolidated business processes between all stakeholders to maximize operational efficiencies while fulfilling all regulatory mandates. This includes the use of the IID for commercial goods.
3. Expansion of advance trade data requirements and capacities as needed by PGA programs, including technical, business and legislation.
4. Replacement of permits and associated paper forms with electronic references and improved business processes that incorporate timely electronic border-related decisions
5. Identification of new methods of identifying import data requirements through enhanced commodity identification.
6. Program alignment of import requirements between Canada and the US, to the maximum extent possible.
7. Trade outreach improvements for the import community that includes coordinated communication channels among all departments. (e.g. Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), bulletins and Directive Memorandums)

The following documents outline the data elements pertaining to the SWI:


Electronic Commerce Client Requirements Document (ECCRD): The ECCRD provides Importers and Customs Brokers with the data requirements for PGA technical and systems information related to the Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) transmission of the Integrated Import Declaration (IID) and the Web Service transmission of License Permit Certificate or Other (LPCO) images

Participants Requirements Document (PRD) for the Document Image Functionality (DIF): The PRD describes how to authenticate and connect to the CBSA Web Service to enable the uploading of a LPCO image.

For the latest version of these documents please refer to Chapter 23 – Single Window Initiative Integrated Import Declaration (IID) via the following link:

<https://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/eservices/eccrd-eng.html>


<p><i>How many transactions per day are handled?</i></p>	<p>The following table depicts the number of 'Monthly IID Transactions' for the period April, 2018 to June, 2019.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="630 371 1198 1048"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Month</b></th> <th><b>IID</b></th> <th><b>% Increase</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Apr-18</td><td>36,206</td><td>35%</td></tr> <tr><td>May-18</td><td>42,552</td><td>18%</td></tr> <tr><td>Jun-18</td><td>59,932</td><td>41%</td></tr> <tr><td>Jul-18</td><td>80,441</td><td>34%</td></tr> <tr><td>Aug-18</td><td>101,037</td><td>26%</td></tr> <tr><td>Sep-18</td><td>145,582</td><td>44%</td></tr> <tr><td>Oct-18</td><td>187,566</td><td>29%</td></tr> <tr><td>Nov-18</td><td>169,431</td><td>-10%</td></tr> <tr><td>Dec-18</td><td>161,476</td><td>-5%</td></tr> <tr><td>Jan-19</td><td>229,339</td><td>42%</td></tr> <tr><td>Feb-19</td><td>313,353</td><td>37%</td></tr> <tr><td>Mar-19</td><td>510,478</td><td>63%</td></tr> <tr><td>Apr-19</td><td>837,397</td><td>64%</td></tr> <tr><td>May-19</td><td>1,146,382</td><td>37%</td></tr> <tr><td>Jun-19</td><td>1,130,292</td><td>-1%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Month</b>	<b>IID</b>	<b>% Increase</b>	Apr-18	36,206	35%	May-18	42,552	18%	Jun-18	59,932	41%	Jul-18	80,441	34%	Aug-18	101,037	26%	Sep-18	145,582	44%	Oct-18	187,566	29%	Nov-18	169,431	-10%	Dec-18	161,476	-5%	Jan-19	229,339	42%	Feb-19	313,353	37%	Mar-19	510,478	63%	Apr-19	837,397	64%	May-19	1,146,382	37%	Jun-19	1,130,292	-1%
<b>Month</b>	<b>IID</b>	<b>% Increase</b>																																															
Apr-18	36,206	35%																																															
May-18	42,552	18%																																															
Jun-18	59,932	41%																																															
Jul-18	80,441	34%																																															
Aug-18	101,037	26%																																															
Sep-18	145,582	44%																																															
Oct-18	187,566	29%																																															
Nov-18	169,431	-10%																																															
Dec-18	161,476	-5%																																															
Jan-19	229,339	42%																																															
Feb-19	313,353	37%																																															
Mar-19	510,478	63%																																															
Apr-19	837,397	64%																																															
May-19	1,146,382	37%																																															
Jun-19	1,130,292	-1%																																															
<p><i>What percentage of total transactions? [what % of a) total export declarations and b) total import declarations]</i></p>	<p>Export requirements were not included as part of the SWI scope. The table listed above represents IID Import statistics.</p>																																																
<p><i>Does your SW cover all types of transaction (maritime, air, railroad, road or one or few of them)?</i></p>	<p>The SWI IID is available in all modes; Air, Marine, Rail and Highway.</p>																																																

<p><i>Who are the clients of the SW? And how many clients does the SW have at the present time?</i></p>	<p>The following table outlines the metrics for the SWI IID <i>as of June 13, 2019</i>.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="443 264 1171 1010"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>SWI IID (Stats from February 17, 2017 to Present)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Applications Received</td> <td style="text-align: right;">516</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Clients in Testing</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>12</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Line of Business Stats:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Broker</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Importer</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Service Providers</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Clients Certified for PROD</b></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><b>504</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Line of Business Stats:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Broker</td> <td style="text-align: right;">268</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Importer</td> <td style="text-align: right;">236</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Service Providers</td> <td style="text-align: right;">13</td> </tr> </table>		<b>SWI IID (Stats from February 17, 2017 to Present)</b>	Applications Received	516	<b>Clients in Testing</b>	<b>12</b>	Line of Business Stats:		Broker	10	Importer	2	Service Providers	3	<b>Clients Certified for PROD</b>	<b>504</b>	Line of Business Stats:		Broker	268	Importer	236	Service Providers	13
	<b>SWI IID (Stats from February 17, 2017 to Present)</b>																								
Applications Received	516																								
<b>Clients in Testing</b>	<b>12</b>																								
Line of Business Stats:																									
Broker	10																								
Importer	2																								
Service Providers	3																								
<b>Clients Certified for PROD</b>	<b>504</b>																								
Line of Business Stats:																									
Broker	268																								
Importer	236																								
Service Providers	13																								
<p><i>Does your SW provide a full “single entry point” service? If yes, explain briefly how this operates.</i></p>	<p>Yes, the SWI IID Release Service Option provides a full ‘single entry point’ service that can be used for both regulated and non-regulated goods. If regulated, then the required Participating Government Department and Agency (PGA) data for each PGA that is included in the transaction is forwarded to the PGA(s) and a consolidated release decision is arrived at and communicated back to the client. At this point, the transaction (if approved) will remain in a ‘recommended release status’ until the related cargo is in an ‘arrived state’. Once the cargo arrives, the goods are released.</p> <p>Note: Model 1 PGAs make ‘active decisions’ where Model 2 PGAs make ‘passive decisions’ that are based on business rules that are housed in the SWI Business Rules Management System (BRMS).</p>																								
<p><i>How does your system interface with systems that are out of scope of the Single Window, such as Single Submission Portals (Port Community Systems, B2B eCommerce systems, etc.)?</i></p>	<p>Please refer to the following document:</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>SWI Systems and Operations Mode.d</p> </div>																								

## Operational Mode

<p><i>How does it work? (step by step functioning)</i> <i>What is the operational model for the SWI (describe the operational structure)?</i></p>	<p>Please refer to the same document as provided in response to the previous question.</p>
---	--

## Business Model

<p><i>What is the business model?</i></p>	<p>Please refer to the following document:</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>SWI Business Model.docx</p> </div>
<p><i>How is it financed (government, private sector, Private-Public partnership)?</i></p>	<p>Funding for the SWI was granted through the following process:</p> <p><b><u>Step One:</u></b> Memorandum to Cabinet (MC): An MC is used to seek Cabinet approval of a policy or new initiative. The first step for securing approval and funding for the SWI was through the development and presentation of an MC.</p> <p><b><u>Step Two:</u></b> Treasury Board (TB) Submission: The TB Submission's main purpose is to seek program authority from TB ministers to carry out a new initiative which has already received Cabinet approval and a source of funds. Funding for the SWI was secured via SWI TB Submission # 836674 - Funding for the Implementation of the SWI.</p> <p><b><u>Step Three:</u></b> Parliamentary Approval: The final stage to secure funding is to seek and obtain Parliamentary Approval. It is after this that the funds are released to the organization. Parliamentary Approval for the SWI was granted in Fiscal Year 2012/13 and provided funding for all ten PGAs (including the CBSA) to develop and implement the End State Single Window.</p>
<p><i>Have parts or the entire development and/or management of the facility been outsourced to a private contractor?</i></p>	<p>None of the work was outsourced to a private contractor. Independent Consultants were utilized to complete certain project artefacts based on their Subject Matter Expertise (e.g. Threat Risk Assessments, Statements of Sensitivity, etc).</p>

<p><i>What were the costs of establishment of the facility?</i></p>	<p>The CBSA along with nine other PGAs secured \$82,409,608 M (including Employee Benefit Plan (EBP) Harmonized Sales Tax (HST) and Accommodations) in funding over 5 years beginning in fiscal 2012/2013, of which \$30,843,833 M (including EBP, HST &amp; Accommodations) was allocated to the CBSA directly to develop the SWI. The remaining allocation was disseminated amongst the 9 PGAs as outlined in the TB Submission.</p>
<p><i>How were the costs initially performed? (assessment, tender...) Did you have assistance establishing the estimate?</i></p>	<p>The initial costing exercise for the SWI was conducted based on the three viable options that were being considered during the 'Concept Phase' of the initiative.</p> <p>The business outcomes to be achieved within each option were then analyzed and a base effort in regards to Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) was estimated for each. This base effort assumed the programs involved were small and had minimal border interaction desired.</p> <p>Next, the scope and complexity of each program within each PGA was analyzed according to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permits Required (Importer, Goods)</li> <li>• Inspection Required (pre-border, at-border, post-border)</li> <li>• Volume of Imports</li> </ul> <p>The 'effort' of some outcomes was then increased if warranted by the program's complexity.</p> <p>This effort was then distributed amongst FTEs and Operations &amp; Maintenance (O&amp;M) line items depending upon the availability of internal expertise to deliver each outcome. Standard government overhead costs were then applied to the FTE portions yielding a grand total estimate for each option, by department, within the SWI.</p> <p>Each PGA was responsible for determining what balance of Commercial Off-the-Shelf (COTS) vs. in-house development was appropriate to deliver the required outcomes for the recommended option.</p> <p>Resources, specifically O&amp;M line items, were further adjusted to account for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional project management and reporting to satisfy ATIP and CBSA performance management obligations</li> <li>• Leveraging of existing IT systems and IT projects already underway</li> <li>• Additional project coordination and project management effort between PGAs</li> <li>• Economic increases throughout the expected five-year project duration</li> <li>• Required outside expertise</li> <li>• Necessary hardware, software, publishing and other capital costs</li> <li>• SWI will be implemented by enhancing the existing Pathfinder Solution until eManifest Risk Assessment and the Enterprise Foundation B2B have been delivered, at which point SWI will leverage those components. As such it is estimated that 30% of the total level</li> </ul>

	<p>of effort is for custom in-house development and 70% is for configuration, customization and enhancement of COTS technologies.</p> <p>In the end “Option - #2’,as outlined in the SWI Interdepartmental Business Case., was chosen as the preferred option as it provided the most overall satisfaction in terms of outcomes and benefits delivered , for the least amount of cost and risk.</p> <p>Standardized Costing Templates were utilized to capture the costing requirements of all relevant parties including the 10 PGAs, and the following Internal CBSA Stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Programs Branch</li> <li>• Information, Science and Technology Branch <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Commercial Portfolio Directorate</li> <li>○ Business Applications Services Directorate</li> <li>○ Enterprise Services Division</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Human Resource Branch</li> <li>• Comptrollership</li> </ul> <p><u>Note:</u></p> <p>The CBSA along with nine other PGAs secured \$82,409,608 M (including Employee Benefit Plan (EBP) Harmonized Sales Tax (HST) and Accommodations) in funding over 5 years beginning in fiscal 2012/2013, of which \$30,843,833 M (including EBP, HST &amp; Accommodations) was allocated to the CBSA directly to develop the SWI. The remaining allocation was disseminated amongst the 9 PGAs as outlined in the TB Submission.</p>
<p><i>What are the ongoing operational costs (annual)? How do these compare with the initially estimated costs?</i></p>	<p>During the original TB Submission process, all departments and agencies had their ongoing funding requirements reduced and/or removed. In the end the CBSA was the only PGA to receive ongoing funding.</p> <p>As part of the original TB Submission CBSA was granted \$1.9M in ongoing funding which was to be used to maintain the following new SWI assets/services in FY 2017/18 and beyond:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IID Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) Message Map (encompassing 9 PGAs and 38 Programs)</li> <li>• Enhanced Pathfinder Services</li> <li>• New Service Options Related to the IID for Release</li> <li>• SWI Business Rules Management System (BRMS)</li> <li>• PGA Registration and Enrollment (PGARE) WEB Application</li> <li>• Interconnectivity and Interface with 9 PGAs for SWI</li> <li>• Electronic Client Requirements Document (ECCRD)</li> </ul>

<p><i>What are the user fees (if any) and annual revenue? Model of payment (fixed price per year, price per transaction, combination, other model)?</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Is the long-term financing model integrated into public budget or self-sufficiency funding? Do you think these sources of revenue are enough to ensure a certain degree of self-sufficiency?</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Do the revenues generated cover operational costs or do they make a profit?</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Are the revenues (if any) reinvested in the SW?</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>

## Technology

<p><i>What technology is used?</i></p>	<p>The SWI application contains the following main components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWICore – Developed using EJB, and JMS technology, and runs on IBM Websphere</li> <li>• SWIPGAREWeb – Developed using JSF, and runs on IBM Websphere</li> <li>• BRMS Rules – Developed using EJB and IBM ODM, and runs on Oracle WebLogic.</li> </ul> <p>All components are configured as ‘Cluster’ environments. If one part of the Cluster stops working, the system will continue to function.</p>
<p><i>How are data submitted (electronically – what type of format/language; paper – what forms; combination – what kind of combination)?</i></p>	<p>There are two main categories of data submission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. TCP Data – IID and Permit Image <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCPs submit an IID in EDI format as per the specifications defined in the ECCRD.</li> <li>• TCPs submit Permit Image in MIME format through a web-service</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. PGA Data – Decision and Permit Reference Data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PGAs send PGA Decisions in XML format to SWI</li> <li>• PGAs send Reference Data in XML format to SWI</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
<p><i>Where are data sent and stocked (government or private entity)?</i></p>	<p>TCP Data is disseminated to SWI in two ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCP(IID) – Sent via the Customs Electronic Commerce Platform (CECP), then via the Accelerated Commercial Release Operations Support System (ACROSS) followed by SWI</li> <li>• TCP(Image) – Sent via the B2B Integration and Customs Electronic Commerce Platform (B2B) followed by SWI</li> </ul> <p>The TCP Data is also shared with PGAs via SWI:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWI(IID) is sent via B2B to the PGAs</li> </ul> <p>PGA Decision and Reference Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PGAs send data via B2B followed by SWI</li> </ul> <p>All data is secured in government storage (e.g. Database)</p>
<p><i>Who can submit data (importer, exporter, agent, customs broker)?</i></p>	<p>Data can be submitted by Brokers, Importers and Software Service Providers</p>
<p><i>If the submission of data is electronic, are individual data elements submitted only once? Or are there potential of submitting the same information multiple times?</i></p>	<p>Yes, if the same data is required by more than one PGA the data is submitted once to the CBSA and then shared with all of the relevant PGAs as required.</p>



<i>Can client systems interface directly with the SW?</i>	No, client systems cannot interface directly with the SW.
<i>Is an electronic signature used in you SW? if yes it is mandatory and for which processes?</i>	No, electronic signatures are not utilized in the SW.

## Promotion and Communication


<i>How did you promote the Single Window facility?</i>	<p>The complex nature of the SWI demanded that consultation, collaboration and strong communication mechanisms be built into the planning and execution of the project. The SWI aimed to bring together a large and varied group of stakeholders, each with their own issues, dependencies and perspectives. This included ten PGAs, as well as a wide range of TCPs including carriers (marine, air, rail and highway), brokers, importers and exporters. Ongoing communication was key and provided stakeholders with the opportunity to provide input and feedback on changes to commercial practices that ultimately changed the way trade and PGAs interact and conduct business at the border.</p> <p>Throughout the project the CBSA and US CBP coordinated and partook in joint presentations and shared messaging in regards to the initiative, utilizing websites such as ITDS.gov and CBSA.gc.ca to reiterate key messages and progress of SWI as well as extend invitations to trade participants and PGAs for upcoming engagement activities including; webinars, teleconferences, and trade association events.</p> <p>Additionally, collaboration between the CBSA, PGAs, and TCPs was essential to the success of the initiative. By working to ensure on-going validation of requirements, and open communication concerning timelines and milestones, the SWI was assured of an on-time, on-budget, and quality project.</p> <p>Consultations included the following and stakeholders were engaged continuously throughout the initiative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBSA/US CBP/Mexico Alignment</li> <li>• CBSA/PGA Program Specific Trade Consultations</li> <li>• SWI Trade Technical Design Sessions</li> <li>• Trade Outreach Improvements</li> </ul>
<i>How are all stakeholders kept informed about the facility's progress?</i>	<p>The CBSA, in collaboration with the PGAs, leveraged existing industry forums to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote trade outreach;</li> <li>• Support TCP efforts in regards to SWI IID uptake;</li> <li>• Reiterate key messages; and</li> <li>• Provide current update on SWI progress.</li> </ul>

	<p>Examples of forums attended include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Canadian Produce Marketing Association’s (CPMA) Government Issue Management Working Group</li> <li>• Border Commercial Consultative Committee (BCCC)</li> <li>• Association of International Customs and Border Agencies (AICBA) Annual Conference</li> <li>• Canadian Society of Customs Brokers (CSCB) Annual Convention</li> <li>• Canadian Association of Importers and Exporters (I.E. Canada) Regional Conference</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the following outreach tools were developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customs Notices - Implementation of the SWI</li> <li>• Single Window External Website</li> <li>• Updates to existing Customs D-Memorandum to reflect changes to the various PGA Programs</li> <li>• SWI ECCRD</li> <li>• SWI PRD DIF</li> <li>• Development of internal stakeholder tools as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Standard Operating Procedures</li> <li>○ Operational Bulletins</li> <li>○ Quick Reference Guides</li> </ul> </li> </ul>								
<p><i>What kind of training is provided for users?</i></p>	<p>Extensive training has been provided to both internal and external stakeholders over the life of the project and training manuals, tools, and procedural documents were provided as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="448 1211 1385 2020"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="448 1211 1385 1272"><b>Internal Stakeholders</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="448 1272 823 1525">Training Demos</td> <td data-bbox="823 1272 1385 1525">Throughout April 2015, WebEx training sessions were conducted for operational staff including an overview for the submission of electronic release requests under the SWI. Each session focused on specific goods regulated by a PGA.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="448 1525 823 1778">Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) SWI</td> <td data-bbox="823 1525 1385 1778">An SOP was developed to provide operational guidelines to Border Service Officers (BSOs) and other operational staff responsible for the electronic release of commercial goods, via all modes, into Canada.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="448 1778 823 2020">Integrated Customs System (ICS) SWI BSO User Guide</td> <td data-bbox="823 1778 1385 2020">The guide is used to instruct field users (BSOs &amp; Superintendents) on how to use the Single Window interface for the following functions; retrieval of PGA decisions, LPCO Images (where applicable) and PGA detailed information and document status.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Internal Stakeholders</b>		Training Demos	Throughout April 2015, WebEx training sessions were conducted for operational staff including an overview for the submission of electronic release requests under the SWI. Each session focused on specific goods regulated by a PGA.	Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) SWI	An SOP was developed to provide operational guidelines to Border Service Officers (BSOs) and other operational staff responsible for the electronic release of commercial goods, via all modes, into Canada.	Integrated Customs System (ICS) SWI BSO User Guide	The guide is used to instruct field users (BSOs & Superintendents) on how to use the Single Window interface for the following functions; retrieval of PGA decisions, LPCO Images (where applicable) and PGA detailed information and document status.
<b>Internal Stakeholders</b>									
Training Demos	Throughout April 2015, WebEx training sessions were conducted for operational staff including an overview for the submission of electronic release requests under the SWI. Each session focused on specific goods regulated by a PGA.								
Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) SWI	An SOP was developed to provide operational guidelines to Border Service Officers (BSOs) and other operational staff responsible for the electronic release of commercial goods, via all modes, into Canada.								
Integrated Customs System (ICS) SWI BSO User Guide	The guide is used to instruct field users (BSOs & Superintendents) on how to use the Single Window interface for the following functions; retrieval of PGA decisions, LPCO Images (where applicable) and PGA detailed information and document status.								

Quick Reference Guide 32: IID Procedures - SWI	Supports CBSA personnel in processing the new IID SO 911 and the new LPCO Image SO 927.
SWI Demonstration	A demonstration of the SW system has been developed and recorded. The SW system demonstration assists users with processing an IID
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational Bulletin Shift Briefings</li> <li>• SWI Border Information Service (BIS) Lines including; Questions &amp; Answers</li> <li>• Wiki Page</li> </ul>
<b>External Stakeholders (e.g. PGAs &amp; TCPs)</b>	
SWI Web Page	<p>Internet (English): <a href="http://nexus.gc.ca/prog/sw-gu/menu-eng.html">http://nexus.gc.ca/prog/sw-gu/menu-eng.html</a></p> <p>Internet (French): <a href="http://nexus.gc.ca/prog/sw-gu/menu-fra.html">http://nexus.gc.ca/prog/sw-gu/menu-fra.html</a></p>
Customs Notices	<p>Customs Notices have been issued to inform clients about the proposed changes to customs programs and procedures as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CN 15-014 Implementation of the SWI</li> <li>• CN 15-031 Update</li> <li>• CN 15-034 Update</li> <li>• CN 15-038 Update</li> <li>• CN 16-022 Update</li> </ul> <p><a href="http://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/publications/cn-ad/menu-eng.html">http://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/publications/cn-ad/menu-eng.html</a></p>
D-Memorandums (D-19 Series)	<p>D-Memorandums provide guidance and reference material to external stakeholders and have therefore been updated and revised to reflect SWI implementation.</p> <p><a href="http://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/publications/dm-md/menu-eng.html">http://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/publications/dm-md/menu-eng.html</a></p>

	ECCRD	<p>The ECCRD provides Importers and Customs Brokers with the data requirements for PGA technical and systems information related to the Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) transmission of the IID and the Web Service transmission of LPCO images.</p> <p>For a copy of the SWI ECCRD, please contact the Technical Commercial Client Unit (TCCU) at:  <a href="mailto:tccu-ustcc@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca">tccu-ustcc@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca</a></p>
	PRD for the Document Image Functionality	<p>The PRD describes how to authenticate and connect to the CBSA Web Service to enable the uploading of a LPCO image.</p> <p>For a copy of the PRD, please contact the TCCU at:  <a href="mailto:tccu-ustcc@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca">tccu-ustcc@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca</a></p>
	IID Application Form (BSF373)	<p><a href="http://cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/publications/forms-formulaires/menu-eng.html">http://cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/publications/forms-formulaires/menu-eng.html</a></p>
	External WebEx Training for Trade	<p>Between 2013 and April 2018, the CBSA hosted 42 sessions with internal and external stakeholders in regards to the IID.</p> <p>Please note that this does not include sessions that were hosted by various external stakeholders in which the SWI Team participated.</p> <p>A document depicting the External WebEx Training that was conducted for Trade is available upon request.</p> <p>For Internal Clients please refer the following link:  <a href="http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/llisapi.dll/Overview/37623797">http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/llisapi.dll/Overview/37623797</a></p>
<p><i>Did you have a change and transition management program for your SW?</i></p>	<p>Once the SWI was implemented into Production it was necessary to develop a Transition Strategy for transferring the initiative to the Programs area.</p> <p>The purpose of the SWI Transition Plan was to describe the tasks and activities that are required to support the close-out of the project and to transition some of the on-going tasks internally.</p> <p>This plan includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transition Approach;</li> <li>• Transition Team Roles &amp; Responsibilities;</li> <li>• Training and Knowledge Transfer Requirements;</li> <li>• Transition Schedule;</li> <li>• Total Ongoing Costs;</li> <li>• Ongoing Technical Support Resources;</li> <li>• Ongoing SWI Resource Requirements;</li> <li>• Transition Risks and Risk Mitigation Plans; and</li> <li>• List of Transition Plan Resources including the Project Schedule</li> </ul>	

	<p>A copy of the SWI Project Transition Plan is available upon request.</p> <p>Internal Clients can refer to the following link:  <a href="http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/lilisapi.dll/Overview/9459195">http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/lilisapi.dll/Overview/9459195</a></p> <p>In addition, following implementation, it was necessary to develop the ECCRD and BRMS Governance Frameworks to document the Change Management Process. Copies of these documents are also available upon request.</p> <p>Internal Clients can refer to the following links:</p> <p>ECCRD Governance:  <a href="http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/lilisapi.dll/Overview/37620725">http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/lilisapi.dll/Overview/37620725</a></p> <p>BRMS Governance:  <a href="http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/lilisapi.dll/Overview/37622530">http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/lilisapi.dll/Overview/37622530</a></p>
<p><i>Do you provide any helpdesk or customer service?</i></p>	<p>External Client Technical support for the Single Window Initiative is provided by the Technical Commercial Client Unit (TCCU).</p> <p>External clients can contact the TCCU to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obtain a copy of the IID Test/Certification Package</li> <li>• Apply, test or certify for the IID</li> <li>• Request a copy of the SWI IID ECCRD or PRD DIF</li> <li>• Ask questions relating to the exchange of data with the CBSA</li> </ul> <p><u>Business Hours:</u></p> <p>Monday to Friday (Except Holidays)  8 a.m. to 5 p.m. (ET)</p> <p><u>Telephone (for Urgent Inquiries 24/7):</u></p> <p>Canada and the United States: 1-888-957-7224  Overseas: 613-946-0762  Email: <a href="mailto:tccu-ustcc@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca">tccu-ustcc@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca</a>  Fax: 343-291-5482</p> <p><u>Mailing address:</u></p> <p>Canada Border Services Agency  355 North River Road, 6th Floor, Tower B  Ottawa ON K1A 0L8</p>

	<p><u>Online Information</u></p> <p><a href="https://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/prog/sw-gu/menu-eng.html">https://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/prog/sw-gu/menu-eng.html</a></p> <p><u>TCCU Bulletin re: Program/Policy Support and Matching Criteria Contact Info</u></p>  <p>TCC19-047 - Contacts informatio</p>
--	--

## Legal Aspects

<p><i>Is use of the facility obligatory or voluntary?</i></p>	<p>Use of the SWI IID is not mandated. However; CBSA is looking to sunset some of their existing Service Options in favour of the IID.</p>
<p><i>Do participants need to sign an agreement with provider/agency in order to participate? What are the requirements?</i></p>	<p>Clients and their Service Provider must complete and submit a formal application. The application form provides the CBSA with basic information on the client, a description of their automated system, and their anticipated volumes. A senior representative of the client's firm must sign the formal application. The application may be submitted by the client's agent with a letter of authorization on the client's letterhead signed by an officer/senior representative with legal signing authority.</p> <p>During the application process, the Technical Commercial Client Unit (TCCU) can provide assistance on matters such as interpretation of the message standards and code sets.</p> <p>Completed application forms can be sent to the TCCU by email, fax or mail. Once the application has been processed, a client profile will be created and, if necessary, the testing process can begin.</p> <p><u>Online Information re: Application Process:</u></p> <p><a href="#">Becoming a Client/application process</a></p>
<p><i>Was specific legislation (or change of old legislation) necessary? (Please specify)</i></p>	<p>No, the SWI IID Release Service Option is not legislated.</p>
<p><i>How is the privacy of information protected?</i></p>	<p>The following documents were developed in regards to the privacy of information:</p> <p><b>Legislative &amp; Regulatory Scans/Written Collaborative Agreements (WCAs):</b> From conception the CBSA worked with the PGAs to ensure that the proper legal authorities were in place to collect, share and store the data. The CBSA first worked with policy experts to verify data definitions and to establish whether or not the information was necessary to fulfill the mandate of the particular PGA and its associated program(s).</p>

It was then incumbent on the PGA legal counsellor to demonstrate that the legislative and regulatory authority for those required data elements existed. The findings were documented in various project artefacts including Legislative/Regulatory Scans and Written Collaborative Arrangements between the CBSA and each of the PGAs and their associated programs.

**Regulatory Framework:** Each one of the PGAs, including the CBSA, completed a Regulatory Framework template depicting the following: Legislative Authorities, Privacy Protocols and Information Sharing Agreements.

A copy of the Regulatory Framework is available upon request.

Internal Clients can refer to the following link:

<http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/lisapi.dll/Overview/37618164>

**Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA):** Since the SWI concerns commercial information of importers and not the collection, use, disclosure, retention or disposal of personal information a PIA was not required. However; in lieu of a PIA, the Treasury Board (TB) Chief Information Officer Branch (CIOB) requested the SWI to develop a SWI Privacy Impact Framework (PIF). The CBSA took the lead for the overarching PIF with each one of the PGAs feeding into the report by completing individual Privacy Impact Questionnaires (PIQs).

A copy of the Overarching CBSA PIF is available upon request (Note: Copies of the Individual PGA PIQs are also available):

Internal Clients can refer to the following link:

<http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/lisapi.dll/Overview/37623206>

**Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs):** Relevant MOUs have been identified as Supporting Privacy Documentation in each one of the individual PGA Regulatory Frameworks mentioned above.

**Information Management Security Framework (IMSF):** The IMSF outlines how the SWI Project ensured that Information Management (IM) and recordkeeping requirements were identified and addressed during the SWI System Design, while at the same time aligning to the requirements as set out in both the CBSA Policy and the TBS Policy on IM. The IMSF indicates:

- How IM was coordinated to ensure the reliability, authenticity and quality of the information.
- How the PGAs, including the CBSA, ensured the quality and authenticity of electronic records.
- That appropriate standards were used to capture the records, that quality control was performed and that the records were transmitted and stored in such a way as to meet security and recordkeeping requirements.

Note: As part of the IMSF PGAs were asked to complete an Information and Records Management Requirements Checklist (Annex A) that was attached as an Annex to the overarching IMSF. The Annexes further supported and

	<p>detailed the due diligence undertaken by the SWI to ensure that all security requirements for the initiative had been considered and met.</p> <p>A copy of the IMSF Framework is available upon request.</p> <p>Internal Clients can refer to the following link:  <a href="http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/llisapi.dll/Overview/37623845">http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/llisapi.dll/Overview/37623845</a></p>
--	---

## Standards

<p><i>What is the role of international standards (UN/EDIFACT, UNLK, UNLOCODE, UN/CEFACT Single Window Recommendation, etc) in your SW?</i></p>	<p>Throughout the development of the Canadian Single Window, the CBSA developed and implemented their Single Window (SW) in accordance with the United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) Recommendation 33 - Recommendation and Guidelines on Establishing a SW; Recommendation 34 - Data Simplification and Standardization for International Trade; and Recommendation 36 - SW Interoperability.</p> <p>As the lead agency, the CBSA ensured that representatives from all relevant public and private sector agencies were invited to participate in the development of the SW from initiation through implementation. The CBSA established a strong governance structure to support all project activities and to provide the necessary oversight, review and contribution by all stakeholders including Participating Government Departments and Agencies (PGAs), Trade Chain Partners (Importers, Carriers, Brokers, and Freight-Forwarders) and International Partnerships (UN/CEFACT, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), World Trade Organization (WTO), World Customs Organization (WCO), and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC)).</p>
<p><i>Do you use an international standard for your data library (the UN/CEFACT Core Component Library, the WCO Data Model, other)?</i></p>	<p>Canada is considered a leader in the international data harmonization effort and was the first country to implement the import, export and cargo data sets as part of the Advance Commercial Initiative (ACI).</p> <p>Since inception the Canadian SWI has continued to work in close partnership with the World Customs Organization (WCO) through participation in both the WCO Information Management Sub-Committee (IMSC) and the WCO Customs Data Model Project Team (DMPT).</p> <p>The CBSA has played a major role in the development of the WCO Data Model, which focuses on border management by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Defining the Single Window concept and;</li> <li>○ Developing data and electronic messaging requirements that meet the requirements of Other Government Departments and Agencies involved in the cross border movement of goods.</li> </ul> <p>The WCO Customs Data Model is based on the G7 Data Sets, developed by Canada and the other G7 nations during the G7 Harmonization Initiative to standardize and simplify Customs procedures between 1996 and 2000. CBSA has actively participated in numerous technical and policy working groups to advance the development of procedures for the management, maintenance</p>



	<p>and promotion of the WCO Data Model and the Single Window and UCR concepts.</p> <p>From a Canadian standpoint, the CBSA considers the WCO Data Model as the primary means to collaborate with other customs administrations and industry associations to develop harmonized international trade data sets and electronic messages that facilitate the development of harmonized customs procedures and EDI initiatives such as Advance Commercial Information (ACI), E-Manifest, and the Advance Interdepartmental Reporting Initiative. CBSA fully supports the development of the WCO Data Model and has actively participated in the development of the model to ensure the inclusion of Government of Canada requirements.</p> <p>Through continued participation the CBSA aims to align to the latest version of the WCO Data Model which includes its data sets, Message Implementation Guides (MIGs), and the GOVCBR and Response messages that supports the requirements of Other Government Departments (OGDs) for imports, exports and in-transit shipments.</p> <p>Continued participation also provides the CBSA updates regarding the WCO's submission to the Core Component Library and continued ongoing alignment with UN/CEFACT, WCO-IATA-ICAO Guidelines and the IMO FAL compendium, the Unique Consignment Reference Number (UCR), and Single Window activities.</p>
<p><i>Have you used UNECE Recommendations 33, 34, 35 and 36 in developing your SW? If so, please explain how this was done.</i></p>	<p>Throughout the development of the Canadian Single Window, the CBSA developed and implemented their Single Window (SW) in accordance with the United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) Recommendation 33 - Recommendation and Guidelines on Establishing a SW; Recommendation 34 - Data Simplification and Standardization for International Trade; and Recommendation 36 - SW Interoperability.</p> <p>The CBSA began by assessing the needs and challenges associated with the cross-border movement of commercial goods regulated by government departments through the development of PGA specific Needs Assessments. Over 1800 commercial data elements were analyzed resulting in the consolidation and the planned elimination of major redundancies through cataloguing and mapping to the WCO Data Model. In doing so the 1800 required data elements were reduced to 80.</p> <p>From conception the CBSA worked with the PGAs to ensure that the proper legal authorities were in place to collect, share and store the data. The CBSA first worked with policy experts to verify data definitions and to establish whether or not the information was necessary to fulfill the mandate of the particular PGA and its associated program(s). It was then incumbent on the PGA legal counsellor to demonstrate that the legislative and regulatory authority for those required data elements existed. The findings were documented in various project artefacts including Legislative/Regulatory Scans and Written Collaborative Arrangements between the CBSA and each of the PGAs and their associated programs.</p>

The CBSA chose to develop a Single Automated System, in accordance with industry Project Management Lifecycle principals and standards, which created a streamlined approach for the electronic collection and dissemination of commercial import data between the Government of Canada (GoC) and the import community. Its creation established an integrated solution for the commercial import process that balances the needs of government departments and agencies with today's globally competitive business environment through the development and utilization of the Integrated Import Declaration (IID) and the Document Imaging Functionality (DIF).

Three PGA Risk Assessment Information Sharing Models were developed for participation in the Canadian SW which were customized to suit the needs of the specific PGAs and their programs:

- Model 1: PGAs review the IID data and provide an active recommendation to the CBSA.
- Model 2: PGAs do not provide an active recommendation to the CBSA
  - The information on the IID is validated, electronically, by the PGA.
  - The CBSA maintains a list of PGA rules via a Business Management Rules System
- Enhanced Pathfinder Delivery - Provides participants with commercial trade data, currently collected by the CBSA, through the use of data extract files.

With more timely, complete and accurate information being provided by importers and brokers, via the SW, the CBSA is in a better position to make release decisions. Automated functions such as business rule validation and the use of the new Document Image Functionality (DIF) allows the Agency to position Border Service Officers (BSOs) in roles and locations which modernize its border management framework. The PGAs, in turn, are able to perform more effective risk assessments when making recommendations to the CBSA. Additionally, PGAs are further able to participate in real-time admissibility determinations along with the CBSA because of the advanced trade data and technical means introduced with the SW.

As of March 31, 2017 all ten PGAs and their 38 associated programs were in Production for use of the IID as follows: Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA); Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA); Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC); Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC); Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO); Global Affairs Canada (GAC); Health Canada (HC); Natural Resources Canada (NRCan); Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC); and Transport Canada (TC).

Canada continues to ensure interoperability through continued collaboration with U.S. CBP and Trade Chain Partners in addition to ensuring ongoing alignment with international recommendations and standards through continued partnership with UN/CEFACT and in the ongoing development and implementation of the WCO Data Model.


## Benefits

<p><i>Can you indicate the reduction in time and cost for import and export procedures as a result of implementing the SW for users?</i></p>	<p>A direct comparison cannot be made due to the lack of available statistical data. However; clients have advised that once they are familiar with how to submit an IID they are finding that they obtain a release decision sooner. In addition, SWI IID Transactions have been obtaining 'Release' within 0-15 minutes consistently, 80% of the time.</p>
<p><i>What are the benefits to clients and to participating agencies?</i></p>	<p>Benefits for participating include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplified Import Process</li> <li>• Reduced Paper Burden</li> <li>• Decreased Cost of Doing Business</li> </ul> <p>For further details please refer to Item 1 under the 'Services' Section.</p>
<p><i>What was the impact on Customs revenues?</i></p>	<p>This data is not available and/or being tracked.</p>

## Lessons Learned

<p><i>What were the crucial success factors?</i></p>	<p>The complex nature of the SWI demanded that consultation, collaboration and strong communication mechanisms be built into the planning and execution of the project. The SWI aimed to bring together a large and varied group of stakeholders each with their own issues, dependencies and perspectives. This included 10 PGAs, US CBP as well as a wide range of TCPs including carriers (marine, air, rail and highway), brokers, importers and exporters. Lessons Learned therefore become an invaluable tool for gaining information through experience in order to improve the productivity and efficiency of a process, in this case, within an interdepartmental, multi-year project.</p> <p>To track and monitor the Key Performance Indicators for the SWI, the SWI produced both a Benefits Realization Plan in addition to a final Benefits Realization Report at the time of project closure. These reports documented the two main benefits specific to the CBSA and measurable and attributable to the SWI as follows:</p> <p><u>Benefit 1</u> Service: Streamlined commercial import processes for PGA regulated goods at the border</p> <p>This benefit will be achieved if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PGAs and their programs are onboarding;</li> <li>• Trade use of the IID increases to a significant level;</li> <li>• CBSA and PGA systems are integrated and functionality is optimized</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p><u>Benefit 2</u> Security: Increased ability to detect inadmissible goods regulated by PGAs</p> <p>This benefit will be achieved if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trade use of the IID increases to a significant level;</li> <li>• Commodity identification mechanisms are enhanced and implemented by CBSA and PGAs and are accurately used by trade;</li> <li>• PGAs are onboard and their system capabilities are optimized.</li> </ul> <p>The reports documented the following Key Performance Indicators that would be measured to track, monitor and determine benefit realization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KPI 01-% of IID usage in comparison to total number of releases</li> <li>• KPI 02- Number of PGAs supported by the IID</li> <li>• KPI 03- Number of PGA programs supported by the IID</li> <li>• KPI 04- Number of types of LPCOs converted from paper processes to electronic*</li> <li>• KPI 05- Number of clients approved to use the IID</li> <li>• KPI 06- Number of PGAs that are capable of interacting (systems) with CBSA through the SWI</li> <li>• KPI 07- Number of Programs using a commodity IID</li> <li>• KPI 08- Number of commodity IIDs being used</li> </ul> <p>*LPCO information is electronically referenced in the IID or, when required by PGAs, LPCOs can be submitted as an electronic image attachment (service option 927).</p> <p>A copy of the Benefits Realization Plan is available upon request.</p> <p>Internal Clients can refer to the following link: <a href="http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/llisapi.dll/Overview/6221799">http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/llisapi.dll/Overview/6221799</a></p> <p>A copy of the Benefits Realization Report is available upon request.</p> <p>Internal Clients can refer to the following link: <a href="http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/llisapi.dll/Overview/37612429">http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/llisapi.dll/Overview/37612429</a></p>
<p><i>What were the greatest obstacles?</i></p>	<p>Many of the obstacles faced throughout the implementation of the SWI have been documented in the Lessons Learned Report (link provided below).</p> <p>Some of the greatest obstacles include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWI Funding – SWI funding was granted via a joint TB Submission across 10 PGAs. Without the ability to report funding at an interdepartmental level it was difficult to report on and track funding for the initiative as a whole.</li> <li>• SWI Obligation – As the SWI was not mandated it was difficult to promote the uptake of the IID across the CBSA, PGAs and TCPs.</li> <li>• Benefits Realization Management – Without a clear indication of how the SWI would benefit its stakeholders (e.g. time &amp; cost savings)</li> </ul>

	<p>uptake proved difficult. In addition, for interdepartmental initiatives with numerous sub-projects, benefits may not be realized until well after project close-out. For a project like the SWI, which encompassed 9 PGAs and their 38 associated programs benefits took longer to realize.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance – Executive-level governance is just as important in the final months/years of the project as it is at inception. Without access to key executive decision-makers throughout the lifecycle of the project decisions are unable to be expedited in a timely manner potentially affecting the advancement of the project objectives.</li> <li>• Time (Schedule) Management – Without a comprehensive Roadmap outlining all impacted initiatives, timelines and deliverables it is difficult for internal and external stakeholders to prioritize and align their work amongst conflicting priorities.</li> <li>• Legislation/Regulation – With such a large and varied group of stakeholders it was difficult and time consuming to ensure that all legal and or privacy issues concerning the sharing of data was addressed throughout the project lifecycle through appropriate vehicles such as existing legislation and/or Written Collaborative Agreements or Memorandums of Understanding. Please refer to the ‘Legal Aspects’ Section of this template for full details.</li> </ul>
<p><i>What are the main lessons learned? What could have been done differently?</i></p>	<p><b>Appendix B</b> contained within the following document is a copy of the Lessons Learned Report for the SWI:</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>SWI Project Closure Report April 13 2017</p> </div> <p>Internal Clients can refer to the following link:  <a href="http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/lisapi.dll/Overview/8850408">http://apollo.omega.dce-eir.net/livelink/lisapi.dll/Overview/8850408</a></p> <p>Note: In order to compile a comprehensive Lessons Learned report the CBSA reached out to internal and external stakeholders (e.g. PGAs, US CBP, Regions, Department of Justice, Relevant Projects (e.g. eManifest), and Trade). The document provided above contains a rolled-up version of the Lessons Learned throughout the SWI Project Lifecycle.</p>

### Future Plans

<p><i>What are the plans for further development of the SW?</i></p>	<p>The CBSA is focused on increasing uptake of the SWI IID. In future, additional PGAs will be approached and reviewed to assess whether or not the SWI IID would be a viable option for them moving forward (e.g. RCMP Firearms etc.).</p>
<p><i>What are the biggest obstacles to further development of the SW?</i></p>	<p>Currently, the biggest obstacle re: further development of the SWI is competing priorities for Information Technology (IT) and PGA resources.</p>

<i>Do you intend to make agreements concerning SW cooperation on the regional level?</i>	Not Applicable.
<i>Are you planning to have agreements for exchange of data with SW running in other countries?</i>	There are agreements in place for exchange of data with SW running in other countries however; this is not handled by the SWI program area.

Source for further information and contact person:

**Franco Germano**

Acting Director General, Commercial Portfolio Directorate  
Information, Science and Technology Branch, CBSA

[Franco.Germano@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca](mailto:Franco.Germano@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca)

Tel: 343-291-6147