

MEMORANDUM

To: Serge Arsenault, Data Systems Coordinator
Emile Fuchs, Data Systems Coordinator

From: Tripartite Panel Members
Sandra Haydon, Haydon & Associates
Bob Fiege, General Manager, Edmonton FIR
Gord Howe, CATCA Classification Analyst

cc: Trevor Johnson, Vice-President, ATS Service Delivery
Anthony MacKay, Assistant Vice-President, ATS Service Delivery
Elizabeth Cameron, VP, Labour Relations
Peter Duffey, President CATCA
Sheri King, Director Labour Relations CATCA
Anoop Busuttil, Manager, Job Evaluation
Bill Crawley, Director, Systems Integration

SUBJECT: Data Systems Coordinator – Appeal Outcome

Date: October 17, 2019

Background

During the appeals presentation, September 19, 2019, the presenters requested that both of the (i) Problem Solving and Complexity and (ii) Leadership and Development of Others sub-factors be re-evaluated. The panel considered the background documentation and materials presented in the session in relation to:

- the number and requirements for inter-operability of technologies and the requirement for increased specialization (role as OPI)
- requirements to undertake local adaptations and identify and support changed or new system functionality
- role of DSC in system testing and loading
- participants and processes for system reporting and resolution
- the number of MRs that are created in the field
- participation in HIRAs
- the responsibilities related to project leadership
- scheduling the work of DSCs

Below we summarize our key conclusions and related rationale.

Problem Solving and Complexity

The members of the panel confirm that a level 4 is the appropriate level for the Problem Solving and Complexity sub-factor.

While acknowledging that there have been multiple new systems introduced into operating environments, we are of the view that the scope and breadth of challenges that are encountered and require resolution is reflective of “moderate in scope” rather than level 5’s requirement of “very broad.” DSCs primary focus is on a specific operating environment rather than the broader air navigation system.

We were also cognizant of the reality of the additional resources that are available for solution development at a national level thereby limiting the scope of DSC responsibility. This still allows for recognition of a “significant degree of creativity” required for solution development at level 4.

Overall, the panel understood that the systems for which the DSC is accountable are designed and built elsewhere and that the role of the DSC focuses on local adaptation that does not include, for example, base design, coding and programming. The local adaption actions focus on resolving specific, tactical issues rather than fundamental changes to underlying system architecture. In this context the loading of software is required to follow a set of procedures that allow for a limited range of change. The role of the DSC focuses on the user interface and the interaction with other systems, and not the design of the underlying technology. DSCs primary focus is on troubleshooting rather than broader system design

Leadership and Development of Others

The Leadership and Development of Others subfactor focuses on a job’s responsibility for the direct oversight and direction for human resources. There was significant information presented to the panel for consideration under this sub-factor including:

- the role DSCs have in supporting the scheduling of work of other DSCs to ensure that system expertise is available when required (versus workforce planning oriented scheduling)
- participation on hiring panels and ad hoc input to performance management discussions when requested by the MATCOR
- the role of DSCs in the role of project management with a focus on coordination of logistics and processes more so than project team members
- the training role of DSCs, both on site at their specific locations (on-going) and the occasional responsibility of a DSC to provide formal training to broader groups in a national context – focus on content development and delivery more so than the responsibility for the on-going performance of a training team
- the role of DSCs during hours of operation when there is not a manager on site and the focus on accountability for the interface between user and technology more so than the responsibility for the performance of the user per se

While each of the above is a component of supporting human resources development, the panel concluded that the totality of the activities did not meet the full definition of a level 3 rating where there is an expectation for on-going and consistent responsibility for the direction of other NAV

employees. The panel concluded that the relationship to other employees was a function of the subject matter expertise of the DSCs and that this expertise was fairly valued in other sub-factors within the system, notable knowledge and problem solving/complexity.

Panel Recommendation

The Panel recommends that the Data Systems Coordinator remains appropriately evaluated as an ATC-6.

As explained to participants when the review hearings were conducted, this panel was designed to render its decisions using the majority opinion principle - that is, a 2 out of 3 majority is sufficient to render a final and binding decision. All panel participants agree that this principle was respected.

The Tripartite Panel thanks Serge Arsenault and Emile Fuchs for their efforts in describing the complexities of their job. Any questions on the results or this process should be directed to Anoop Busuttill – busutta@navcanada.ca or Gord Howe – howeg@navcanada.ca.

Sincerely,
Tripartite Panel
October 17, 2019