

Moved: Ignacio Marcial Figueroa
for: Mexico

Seconded: Richard Wright
for: Canada

Approved unanimously

**d) Translators: Translation shall be provided in the following languages (if necessary)
Spanish, English, and French**

Motion No EUM/C –2: That the requirement for French translation during Meeting No. 1 is hereby waived and that the translator be excused.

Moved: Wayne Brubacher
for: Canada

Seconded: Ignacio Marcial Figueroa
for: Mexico

Approved unanimously

e) Appointment of person or persons to take minutes for the present meeting.

Ing. Braulio Mercado Gutierrez agreed to take minutes in Spanish and Wayne Brubacher agreed to take minutes in English.

f) Approval of Agenda and addition of items.

The draft agenda was modified by removing “Old Business” because this is meeting number one and by combining items h) and i) because they are the same.

Motion No EUM/C– 3: that the agenda be approved as amended.

Moved: Lino Solís López
for: Mexico

Seconded: Dick Wright
for: Canada

Approved unanimously

g) Recognition of observers and guests.

No observers or guests were present.

New Business

h) Discussion of MRA-EUMC1

Informal discussions had been held on April 16 and April 17 as well as drafts sent by email before the meeting. Minor changes had been made that satisfied the Canadian and Mexican delegates prior to the meeting. As a result there was no further discussion requested from the Canadian delegate. Ing. Braulio Mercado Gutierrez indicated that the MRA was acceptable for consideration by FECITEUM A.C. but that there would be some homework to do. When FECITEUM A.C. and CCLS have reviewed it, proposed additional changes will be circulated by email. It was agreed that the committees should recommend the MRA as it was presented to their respective national associations for consideration at this time.

i) Discussion on issues within the current draft of the MRD

At this time, the first page of the MRA-EUMC1, being the Table of Contents was read into the record in Spanish and in English.

Chair Solis asked if there was any discussion regarding any part of the proposed MRA. Wayne Brubacher said that the Canadian delegation for CCLS had no comment or question based upon the fact that the two delegations (Canada and Mexico) had worked for a few days on the draft prior to the formal meeting and had been informally in

agreement and satisfied that it substantially provided the same opportunities and safeguards that the earlier MRD had provided.

Rather than attempt to get complete word for word translation between Spanish and English, Mr. Brubacher proposed that the meaning and intention should be the same and that could be verified by each delegation asking their respective NAFTA commissioners to look at the two documents as written in the two languages and request their opinion as to whether the two documents were the same in intent and would produce the same result when put into practice.

It was agreed that each delegation would proceed in this manner.

Motion No EUM/C-4: that MRA-EUMC1 be accepted for presentation to FECITEUM A.C. and CCLS for consideration.

Moved: Wayne Brubacher
for: Canada

Seconded: Lino Solís López
for: Mexico

Approved unanimously

j) University Exchange Programme

Mr. Brubacher introduced the idea of a University Exchange Programme between Canadian and Mexican students as suggested by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada (DFAIT).

The delegates were informed that the FECITEUM A.C. had not made contact with or been contacted by Lic. Angelo Villalobis, the NAFTA commissioner in Mexico responsible for professions. It was felt that the student exchange programme might be a useful talking point to use as an introduction to the commissioner for other NAFTA related subjects, including the MRA. The Canadian delegation promised that it would keep DFAIT apprised of the exchange programme discussions and seek advice or comments.

FECITEUM President Lino Solis stated that all universities in Mexico have student exchanges with universities all over the world but if we want to concentrate on the surveying profession, then the easiest way to do it is for local surveyors across the country to contact the university from which they received their diplomas and promote the idea. Ultimately, though, the universities would be the facilitators of such a programme. Ing. Solis stated that student exchanges is good for the profession.

A plan of action will need to be developed once the initial contacts with the Universities have occurred and the Mexican and Canadian NAFTA Committees have received feedback. In the short term, each National Association should coordinate the contacting of the Universities to introduce the concept and identify contact persons within each university so that international communication can occur at the university level. This communication may, in the end, be the best plan, limiting the committee work at the National Survey Association level.

k) Promotion of business opportunities in each country.

Now that a draft bi-lateral agreement exists and assuming that it is accepted by the professions in both countries, it is time to consider ways to make it productive and useful. Are there projects in either or both countries that could be joint-ventured? What professional skills or commercial processes exist only in one country that could be marketable in the other country either solely or as a joint venture? What firms have experience in certain aspects of Geomatics from which a commercial advantage could be drawn. Canadians have more and longer experience in cadastral systems and the land records systems that are needed in a modern society whose financial base is the cadastre.

A proven example of that is Dr. John MacLaughlin's work (University of New Brunswick) in the State of Colima, Mexico.

At this point in the meeting, it was decided that a trade mission would need to be organized and that the item would be given high priority at the next meeting. The subject resurfaced under the heading "Time and place of the next meeting".

l) Objectives for future meeting.

The sole purpose of the current meeting was to reach agreement at the committee level and for the committees to return to their respective National Associations with a draft for detailed discussion with the Provinces and States. This will have been accomplished. Homework between this meeting and the next is expected. Revisions will likely result as the States and Provinces add their specific requirements. Exchanging proposed revisions between Mexico and Canada will be done by email and eventually, an MRA will result that will satisfy at least some of the jurisdictions and that might be sufficient reason for the National Associations to sign Appendix A. After Appendix A is signed, there is no requirement for any jurisdiction to sign Appendix B if they do not wish to avail themselves of the provisions provided by the MRA.

The next meeting will occur when both national associations are prepared to sign Appendix A. Any jurisdiction could sign on to Appendix B at that time. Accordingly, the presidents would attend the meetings instead of the committee members.

Other objectives would be to further the student exchange programme and the opportunities for commercial activity based on the MRA.

m) Discussion of Annexes used by World Trade Organization (WTO)

The Canadian delegation provided a Spanish language hard copy set of Annexes used by World Trade Organization countries when preparing MRA. It was noted that the draft agreement, MRA-EUMC1, was not in conflict with these Annexes, but that a few recommended items were left out. Since these were not substantive, it was decided that any revisions made after the official signing of the MRA should be done at the three year sunset provided by the agreement and that they should be consistent with these Annexes or any other WTO Annexes or Guidelines prevailing at that time.

Miscellaneous.

n) Update NAFTA representatives' list; phone, address, email

Periodically, the NAFTA committee members change personnel or the members change contact information. In order to keep communication as effortless as possible the existing spreadsheet will be updated from business cards exchanged at the meeting or by providing information by email. The persons taking minutes at the meeting will correlate and distribute this information to everyone present as soon as possible.

o) Time and place of the next meeting.

Chair Lino Solis suggested that since the next meeting will be the signing meeting, it should be in the format of a Congress that FECITEUM A.C. would host. The Presidents of the two National Associations, Presidents of any Provincial Association or State Collegio that wish to sign at the same time, other officers, educators and business men within the geomatics profession would be invited to attend the Congress. It would be a

truly historic event. The Congress would provide an opportunity for Canadian and Mexican professionals in the Geomatics field to network, to promote their expertise or expert processes and tools and to investigate joint-venture possibilities. Our respective federal and state/provincial governmental trade departments and ministries would likely be happy to assist.

If this idea meets with enthusiastic approval, the planning would be done by email and would commence after the MRA had been circulated for comment and was found generally acceptable. To keep up the momentum, the meeting should not be more than two years in the future. The idea was supported by all present. It will be investigated by both FECITEUM A.C. and CCLS for its feasibility and acceptance.

The Chairs of the respective NAFTA committees signed a page attached entitled;
**Accepted for Presentation
this 18th day of April, 2007**

to signify agreement and support for the MRA.

At 2:15 Central Daylight Savings Time on April 18th, 2007 the Chair closed the meeting with expressions of praise and appreciation for the cooperation and hard work and for the close bond and harmony between our two nations.