

BACKGROUNDER TO TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE

It is proposed that the International Trade Committee and the role of the NSPS Liaison person be combined within a new committee to be named the International Committee with appropriate Terms of Reference. Although T of R should be generic and not a description of tasks at hand, it is useful to review what tasks the International Trade Committee and its predecessor, the NAFTA Committee has undertaken and the role of the NSPS Liaison person has played.

1. The representation at NSPS semi-annual national meetings and NSPS representation at CCLS annual and special meetings was formalized about 1990 when a Memorandum of Understanding was entered into between the two national bodies. This cross fertilization of ideas and the gaining of substantial insight into the workings of the profession in each country has been continuous without interruption since its inception. This continued liaison should be a major component of the proposed T. of R.
2. The current Committee has been developing and negotiating an MRD under the NAFTA. Although this phase is a “task”, there is still a bumpy road ahead before an MRD is signed. The European Union and FIG are in various stages of preparing and entering into MRDs. Therefore the tracking, development and negotiation of trade agreements is the second-most important Term of Reference.
3. The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) and Industry Canada (IC) are two departments with which the current committee regularly meets or corresponds with respect to NAFTA activities. These departments are also Canada’s representatives on the Working Group for the World Trade Organization (WTO). The Committee works with these departments and 182 world members of WTO toward the harmonization and transparency of entry requirements to the profession.
4. The committee has frequently helped other organizations, usually at no expense to CCLS. Examples are:
 - a. ACSM/NSPS Task Force on Standard Industrial Classifications for Surveying and Mapping. Dec. 6, 1994
 - b. The development of North American Industrial Classification Codes in conjunction with ACSM. 1995
 - c. APEC Human Resource Development Working Group Towards The Recognition Of Qualifications In The APEC Region, ~1996
 - d. AOLS and Ontario Government response to World Trade Organization questionnaire respecting transparency in licensing requirements. 2003 – present.
 - e. The Parliament of the European Union will entertain MRDs from every EU member next month (June). Through the AOLS, the committee is monitoring these activities. 2004 – present.
 - f. The Committee monitors the FIG MRD and has met with its author in Washington.
 - g. The current committee helped substantially with the evaluation of the comments on the MRD by NCEES and its selected advisors.
 - h. The *ad hoc* committee struck by NSPS to write the proposed changes includes the both members of the current committee.

The committee is poised to be aware of these world events and can actively take part.

5. The Pan American Alliance of Professional Surveyors has asked for Member Organization (MO) status with ACSM. It will be corresponding with the professional associations in Canada, too. The International Committee is the obvious portal for the exchange of information to the world.
6. Homeland Security is becoming a major concern for the US and its allies. The Federal Emergency Response Agency (FEMA) which concerned itself mainly with natural disasters such as floods, forest fires, pestilences etc., has been taken over by the Department of Homeland Security. FEMA employs many land surveyors, provides certification for surveyors to provide services to the agency and always makes a presentation at the NSPS meetings. The phenomenon of threats to the security of Canadian citizens and the role that the industry may play in concert with our government bears watching.

COMMENTS ON THE GROWING NEED TO CONTINUE WITH AND TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS OF THE JOINT US, CANADIAN AND MEXICAN COMMITTEES DEALING WITH NAFTA.

It is appropriate to revisit the purpose and need for the continuing involvement in NAFTA by the CCLS because Directors of CCLS change frequently.

There was a period during the 90's that the member associations of the CCLS questioned the need to continue to support the CCLS. Dick Wright, as the CCLS president, made a plea directly to the board of the AOLS to continue to support the CCLS because land surveyors in Canada needed a national body to promote the profession beyond the provincial borders and to avoid thinking in a parochial fashion. Also the CCLS never stopped pursuing its quest to bring Quebec back into the fold of the CCLS, not because it needed the money (it survived for 10 years without Quebec's financial contribution), but because it recognized the benefits to both the Quebec land surveyors and the land surveyors in the rest of Canada; the benefits being strength in numbers when it comes to dealing with government and other organizations, a more unbiased and consistent approach to the problems that land surveyors are confronted with from time to time, the sharing of information between the provinces, the accreditation of the land surveying schools, labour mobility across the country, the PLI program, to name a few.

The same parallels or reasons can be extended to the NAFTA accord. If the Canadian land surveyors choose not to continue to pursue an agreement under NAFTA with its neighbours in the geomatics professions then they will miss the opportunity to:

- i) create their own model, built by land surveyors for land surveyors;
- ii) promote the profession on an international basis;
- iii) be recognized as the professional entity that not only is the custodian of the cadastre (vis-à-vis the boundary surveyor), but also the recognized entity for most other geomatics sectors;
- iv) avoid parochialism and instead create a group of professionals that will be able to think beyond its borders (out of the box);
- v) grow in mind and as professionals through insight into foreign practices;
- vi) provide leverage to influence governments to change legislation
- vii) penetrate the foreign market in the fields of Photogrammetric, Topographic, Geodetic, Mining, and Pipeline surveys and GIS products and services. and to

Additionally, if the Canadian land surveyors choose not to continue to pursue an agreement under NAFTA:

- i) The profession will have reneged on its obligation to try to develop sub-agreements (MRDs) under the NAFTA.
- ii) The possibility of an imposed MRD emerges. The existence of an MRD satisfies the government that the sector is complying.
- iii) We will have left international agreements on surveying and mapping as unclaimed territory. Lack of presence by the surveying community in international agreements may be seen as an abandonment of our historical rights and markets. **The void will be claimed by others.**
- iv) The industry will miss the opportunity to observe and report on events and developments unraveling in the US and Mexico. Some are opportunities - some are threats!
- v) Our lack of presence will constitute a lack of pressure to keep the playing field level. Without an MRD, some state licenses restrict geomatic activity to license holders. Foreign surveyors now need to obtain a state cadastral license for non-cadastral activity in that state.
- vi) The economic interest of the survey sector would be unprotected!