

Re: Op-ed

From: "Angus, Helen (TBS)" </o=govon/ou=exchange administrative group (fydibohf23spdlt)/cn=recipients/cn=angus, helen (tbs)ffb">
To: "Skoberne, Vivienne (TBS)" <vivienne.skoberne@ontario.ca>
Date: Tue, 24 Apr 2018 16:57:33 -0400

Thanks. We need to discuss whether we are heading to an op ed or a factual correction. I would prefer not to be the author and end up a target.

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 24, 2018, at 4:39 PM, Skoberne, Vivienne (TBS) <Vivienne.Skoberne@ontario.ca> wrote:

|

Hi,

Comms has drafted the attached op-ed. It is currently with Cindy for review.

I am sharing it with you for your initial thoughts as I understand the SoC wanted it to go out before the PER is released tomorrow. That means we need to line up approvals lickety split!

A few comments:

Even written in plain English, it is cumbersome due to the subject matter.

Not sure you should be the author – some of the content is beyond your reach e.g. role of the OPS

- o Any sense of the SoC's comfort with being the author?

Need to confirm comfort with this sentence: *As professional public servants of the Ontario Public Service (OPS), it is our role to be factual, objective and non-partisan and conduct our due diligence in implementing government decision-making. For Ontario's Fair Hydro Plan, like any other government policy matter, our professional staff ensured the proper due diligence was completed in implementing the government's direction.*

See risks and mitigations flagged by Bryant below.

Thanks.

Vivienne Skoberne

T: 416-325-9084 | C: 647-287-3429

From: Sullivan, Bryant (TBS)
Sent: April 24, 2018 4:26 PM
To: Skoberne, Vivienne (TBS)
Cc: Miller, Amanda (TBS)
Subject: Op-ed

Vivienne, my team is running a comparison to ensure we're not contradicting ourselves – I think we're ok based on just talking with my team – the piece about “ordering” vs. “requesting” in the SCOPA transcript is not about the word itself, it's about “rate regulated accounting” vs. “market accounts.” Article says we directed them to adopt RR accounting, when in fact we asked them to review market accts – 2 different things.

Do you know if the SoC's office wants this to be submitted to the paper today? I'd heard that was the hope late yesterday, but that would mean we'd need to wrangle all approvals and fact checks extremely quickly, incl. the SOC himself. Not sure how realistic that is.

Wanted to flag a few general risks we all need to be aware of with going down this path – because we're moving so fast I just want to make sure we're all eyes wide open going in (this is just off the top of my head). This needs to be part of the discussion:

Risk	Mitigated by
G&M won't print it	Ensure we adhere to their standards (e.g. word count) and make fact based arguments
Publicly contradicting ourselves in our op-ed vs. what we've said publicly before	Reviewing the responses we provided to reporter and things said at committee on public record
Reporter/paper may print that we denied requests for in-person interviews where we could have conceivably clarified this before article ran	Reiterate we don't typically put officials forward for media
Reporter/paper may print Lawwin missed his Friday deadline	Providing fact based arguments
OAGO may submit her own op-ed that the paper would print, creating a public us vs. them narrative	No way to mitigate this, I assume we'd just stay silent

Bryant Sullivan, APR

Assistant Director, Corporate Communications

Treasury Board Secretariat

(o) 416-325-1378

(c) 647-330-5784

(e) Bryant.J.Sullivan@ontario.ca

<image001.jpg>

Communications Branch

Your Strategic Partner

| <G&M Op-Ed_20180424 v4_clean.docx>

TBS