

International Committee Report, September 17, 2005

This report has been written hurriedly without recourse to original documents. If errata is present, I will correct it as part of my presentation at the CCLS AGM in Winnipeg. See Page 3 for the full names of groups and associations that are represented by acronyms herein.

There will be five new directors at the 2005 CCLS AGM who may possibly be exposed for the first time to the International Committee and its activities. It would be worthwhile to review the scope of the committee and its terms of reference on the CCLS Web site before attending the annual general meeting. I will review the history as briefly as I can at the meeting and after a few statements about the present and future, ask for input from the directors.

Let's start with future.

On Thursday September the 15th I will have been at the meeting with my NAFTA contacts in Ottawa to acquaint ourselves with the current situation and to examine options for the future. Later that day, I will take part in a workshop to consider the wording for the draft Canada-Korea Mutual Recognition Document as it pertains to the profession of Accountancy.

Friday Saturday and Sunday, of course, I will be at this meeting.

From October the 20th to the 25th of will be at the ACSM-NSPS meeting in Arlington Va. All that has happened over the past nine years with respect to the mutual recognition document (MRD), all the strategies that could be planned in Ottawa on October 15th and all the discussions that we will have here, are contingent upon what happens at that Arlington meeting in October. Nine years of work between three countries could either evaporates into mist or distill into progress.

Here are the main issues that I have brought that have brought us to this point:

1. MRD7 as developed by CCLS was adopted at Victoria B.C. in 2001. It is signed by the president and a copy is lodged with the DFAIT.
2. In the spring of 2003, NSPS board of governors approved MRD7 and recommended that the Board Of Directors send it to the U.S.T.R. for comments.
3. During the summer of 2003, the NSPS NAFTA Chair was asked by the NSPS President to not send it to the U.S.T.R. before NCEES sees it. A breakdown in communication occurred and a NSPS NAFTA committee member took it to the U.S.T.R. in accordance with the Motion of the Board Of Directors but without knowledge of the conversation between the president of NSPS and the NSPS NAFTA Chair.
4. In the fall of 2003, the NSPS Executive Board secretly fired the U.S. NAFTA committee.
5. During the winter 2003-2004, NCEES commented negatively with respect to the MRD7.
6. In the spring of 2004 the defunct NAFTA Committee tried to get the Board Of Directors to send it into the trade representative. Instead the Board sent it to a Review Committee for study. This Review Committee spent all summer on the study and produced MRD8, the U.S. version, in time for the fall 2004 meeting.

7. At the fall 2004 meeting the U.S. NAFTA committee members discovered that they had been fired a year ago notwithstanding that they, together with Richard Wright and the writer assisted the US NAFTA Review Committee all summer to produce the U.S. version.
8. At the same time, Mexico invited the NAFTA committees of Canada and the U.S. to a NAFTA meeting in Mexico at the committee level. We could not respond until the NSPS fall meeting had been held to determine if the U.S. NAFTA Committee received any direction. Since it was fired and since the Review Committee had filed its final report, there was no U.S. NAFTA Committee.
9. At the spring 2005 NSPS meeting the Board Of Governors pressured the Board Of Directors to "get on with it". The Board Of Directors held a vote on a motion to send MRD8 in to the U.S. Trade Representative and it resulted in a vote of 8 in favor and 7 against. President Jerry Goodson ruled that he could cast a vote to create a tie which would cause the motion to fail. He did! It did! No one in Canada interprets Robert's Rules that way. After the meeting, President Goodson said that he would ask the Chair of the defunct Review Committee for a report by August 2005. It has not been prepared.
10. In September 2005 I followed up with an e-mail to President Goodson and was told that it cost NCEES \$36,000 to have the attorneys look at the engineers' agreement. He also said that there is no funding in the draft budget for the committee. He had also learned that FIG has a MRD in place dated February 2002 and that it would cover all of his concerns. He said that the Board will have to make a determination on whether to proceed or withdraw at the October meeting.
11. I have been corresponding with Stig Enemark of Denmark who is the vice-president of FIG and responsible for mutual recognition in the European Union. As I expected, there is no document to use at this time. He pointed me to a policy paper that will be the basis of future MRDs. We will continue to correspond. We had met earlier in Washington.

The DFAIT is willing to allow a bilateral agreement between Canada and Mexico if there is evidence that the USA wants out. Judging from the President's letter, it appears that they will indicate that they want out at the meeting in Arlington Va. next month. The future for a mutual recognition document with NSPS does not look bright for the next two or three years because the current and to future presidents are all NCEES devotees and they will continue to stall progress.

It may not be advisable to second-guess what will happen at that meeting but I expect that the Board Of Directors will continue to ignore the wishes of the Board Of Governors who represent the grass roots members whose dues provide for the continuation of the Society.

I will not ask for direction from the CCLS Board Of Directors because the NSPS management is too unpredictable. I will, however, appreciate and listen carefully to any comments and advice that you can give Richard Wright and me as the International Committee members try to serve the international interests of CCLS as best they can.

Wayne Brubacher, Chair
International Committee.

Dated Sept. 13th, 2005

List of acronyms in the order of appearance and their meaning.

CCLS AGM	Canadian Council of Land Surveyors Annual General Meeting
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
ACSM-NSPS	American Congress of Surveying and Mapping – National Society of Professional Surveyors
MRD	Mutual Recognition Document
MRD7	Version approved by CCLS
U.S.T.R.	United States Trade Representative federal NAFTA contact for US professionals
NCEES	National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying
MRD8	Version presented by the US NAFTA Review Committee
DFAIT	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (Canada contact)