

MINUTES OF THE 199th ENGINEERS CANADA BOARD MEETING

December 9, 2019 8:30am-3:00pm ET – Hilton Garden Inn and Homewood Suites Ottawa Downtown
 361 Queen Street, Ottawa, ON

The following directors were in attendance	
D. Lynch, President (Chair), APEGA J. Boudreau, President-Elect, APEGNB A. Bergeron, Past-President, PEO C. Bellini, PEO * T. Brookes, NAPEG J. Card, PEGNL L. Champagne, OIQ D. Chui, PEO L. Doig, APEGA J. Dunn, Engineers PEI G. Faulkner, APEGA	D. Gelowitz, APEGS S. Gwozdz, OIQ J. Holm, Engineers & Geoscientists BC C. Lamothe, OIQ D. Nedohin-Macek, Engineers Geoscientists MB K. Reid, PEO J. Tink, APEGA R. Trimble, Engineers Yukon M. Wrinch, Engineers & Geoscientists BC C. Zinck, Engineers Nova Scotia
The following directors sent regrets	
K. Baig, OIQ	C. Sadr, PEO
The following advisor was in attendance	
J. Landrigan, Chair, CEO Group	
The following direct reports to the Board were in attendance	
B. Dony, Vice-Chair, CEAB, for L. Benedicenti, Chair, CEAB G. McDonald, CEO	R. LeBlanc, Chair, CEQB S. Price, Executive VP Regulatory Affairs & Secretary
The following observers were in attendance	
J. Bradshaw, CEO & Registrar, PEGNL* D. Lake, President, CFES *	J. Nicell, Chair, EDC * L. White, CEO & Registrar, Engineers Nova Scotia *
The following staff were in attendance	
M. Arrietta, Manager, Foreign Credential Recognition * S. Francoeur, Director, Human Resources R. Gauthier, Executive Assistant * B. Gibson, Manager, Communications J. Langlois, Manager, Operational Infrastructure* C. Mash, Governance Administrator J. Monterrosa, Controller M. Ouellette, Manager, Qualifications C. Polyzou, Manager, Diversity, Equity & Inclusion	A. Ryan, Executive Assistant J. Southwood, VP, Corporate Affairs & Strategic Partnerships E. Spence, Legal Counsel J. Taylor, Manager, Public Affairs * H. Theelen, Manager, Organizational Excellence L. Tremblay, Meeting & Event Planner M. Warken, Accreditation Manager B. Strawczynski, Manager, Regulatory Research & International Mobility *

* Indicates participation via webinar

1. Opening

1.1 Call to order and approval of agenda

D. Lynch called the meeting to order at 8:32am (ET) and welcomed the participants. Meeting attendees were invited to introduce themselves.

D. Lynch requested to move item 4.11, generative discussion, to follow item 5.8.

Motion 5793

Moved by J. Holm, seconded G. Faulkner

THAT the agenda be approved and the president be authorized to modify the order of discussion.

Carried

Participants were reminded of the meeting rules:

- Raise hand to be added to the list of speakers as maintained by the president-elect.
- Speak for only two minutes (time projected on the screen).
- Speak a second time only if everyone else has had a chance to speak.
- Not restate or reiterate the same point. New information is suggested if individuals speak again. A safe environment is encouraged.

D. Lynch shared a safety minute with the Board, noting that flu season is upon us. Although largely preventable, the flu is a pandemic that can be fatal, regardless of age or general health. Simple precautions can reduce the possibility of contracting the flu, including getting an annual vaccination, hand washing, and refraining from touching the facial area.

D. Lynch also presented a diversity moment. In acknowledgment of the work Engineers Canada is doing towards Indigenous access to engineering, this moment was focused on further acknowledging Indigenous peoples, and their long-standing presence on the lands where we live, learn, and work.

1.2 Declaration of conflict of interest

No conflicts were declared.

2. Executive reports

2.1 President's report to the Board

A detailed report was pre-circulated. The following feedback and questions were addressed:

- One correction was brought forward, that Len White was recognized for 20 years of service in Nova Scotia by the naming of a "young engineers award" and not an annual scholarship as noted.
- There was interest from directors in obtaining more information on two of the professional development sessions listed in the report; the unconscious bias session hosted in Nova Scotia and the microaggressions in professional and educational settings session at the Ingenium conference in Manitoba. D. Lynch also noted that Engineers PEI recently hosted a plenary session on unconscious bias and that he will request supporting materials for circulation to the Board where they are available.
- It was noted that the information resulting from the generative discussion held at the Association of Consulting Engineers Canada's (ACEC) National Leadership Conference is relevant to, and should be considered for, incorporation into the Engineers Canada strategic plan environmental scan.

ACTION: D. Lynch to follow up with Engineers Geoscientists Manitoba, Engineers PEI and Engineers Nova Scotia to request materials shared on unconscious bias and microaggressions following the sessions hosted at their meetings.

2.2 Q3 Interim performance report to the Board

The report was pre-circulated with results up to September 30 (Q3). G. McDonald and B. Dony reported on the initiatives currently marked in yellow, notably:

- Affinity programs: the first two months of data received from TD, following APEGA's exit from the affinity program, indicate that the impact is less severe than originally anticipated, although this will continue to be monitored closely by the Finance, Audit, and Risk (FAR) committee.
- Accountability in accreditation: Although the work was shifted due to a delay in securing a consultant, it is now on track for completion.
- AU consultation feedback: It was noted that this work is delayed to ensure that the deans' request for extra time to provide input is honoured.

An update was provided on regulators who are using the competency-based assessment system. Participating regulators now have access to their own administration platform, which was previously managed by Engineers & Geoscientists BC. Engineers & Geoscientists BC was commended for their leadership in this area.

A question was raised about the enforcement of marks and how long a provider typically has access to a name before it is blocked. E. Spence explained that Engineers Canada reviews trademark requests during the federal incorporation stage. On a monthly basis, newly advertised federal incorporation trademarks are reviewed for legitimacy. Engineers Canada canvasses the appropriate regulators about licensure and permit to practice for any questionable applications, and action is taken to block those that are deemed inappropriate.

Following a question received, G. McDonald provided background on the recent shift in the Manulife employment insurance participation. Engineers Canada administers this program for most of the regulators, where they can choose the coverage they require based on a menu of options available. In an effort to gain more control over their employment insurance provider, APEGA issued a call for proposals earlier this year. A Manulife representative in Alberta, not aware of the existing relationship, submitted a bid through the broker that APEGA employed to manage the process. The presented proposal was less expensive than the one currently available through Engineers Canada, with a corresponding increase in risk to employee coverage. Engineers Canada expressed their displeasure with this situation and Manulife agreed to offer the same proposal to APEGA through the Engineers Canada program. It was also communicated to APEGA that the new program did increase their level of risk with the coverage that would be provided to employees. Ultimately, APEGA decided to discontinue their participation in the Engineers Canada program in favour of signing an independent contract with Manulife. It was noted that there are no affinity revenues associated with the employment insurance program and there is no impact to Engineers Canada's rates at this time, although there may be an impact when the contract is renewed in two years due to the reduction in the participation numbers. With the increased risk for employees, Engineers Canada will not be considering a program similar to APEGA's contract.

The report was commended for its clarity. Discussion was had around exploring the use of more indicator colours, or perhaps arrows for individuals who are colour blind, to demonstrate more nuance in the future.

ACTION: Management to implement enhanced indicator colours/arrows for future performance reports.

3. Consent agenda

3.1 Approval of minutes

- a) THAT the minutes of the September 6, 2019 Board meeting be approved as presented.

3.2 Qualifications Board leadership

THAT the Board approve the appointment of the Qualifications Board leadership for the period July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021:

- a) Frank George as Vice-chair;
- b) Mahmoud Mahmoud as Chair; and,
- c) Ron LeBlanc as Past-chair.

3.3 Accreditation Board leadership

THAT the Board approve the appointment of the Accreditation Board leadership for the period July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021:

- a) Pierre Lafleur as Vice-chair;
- b) Bob Dony as Chair; and,
- c) Luigi Benedicenti as Past-chair.

Motion 5794

Moved J. Card, seconded L. Doig

THAT the consent agenda items 3.1a), 3.2a), b), c), and 3.3a), b), c), be approved.

Carried

3.3 Approval of minutes

- b) THAT the minutes of the October 4, 2019 Board meeting be approved as presented.

This item was removed from the consent agenda due to an amendment required under Operational Committee review, that one instance of “their” be changed to “his/her”.

Motion 5795

Moved J. Card, seconded L. Doig

THAT the minutes from October 4, 2019 be approved as amended.

Carried

4. Board business/required decisions

4.1 Review of action items from previous Board meetings

D. Lynch presented the matrix of action items arising from previous Board meetings. No questions or comments were received.

4.2 Approval of 2020 Budget

An updated budget document was circulated onsite including new information received after the agenda book deadline. Following the draft that was presented in October, L. Doig highlighted the changes made to the forecast numbers that now include revenues resulting from PEO’s decision to not participate in the affinity program. Additionally, expected revenues from the Manulife affinity program that were included in the budget but not in the initial Q3 forecast have been added.

Given current known revenues for 2020, the operational budget is balanced, with a deficit occurring as a result of significant projects, funded with reserves. The 2020 budget would result in a surplus should PEO decide again to not participate in the affinity program. It was noted that typically, PEO makes their decision to participate in the affinity program after the budget is approved. This year is different since the decision was communicated earlier.

In response to questions from directors, the following clarifications were provided:

- The TD marketing expenditure is a result of the contractual obligation in the event a participating regulator decides to leave. The marketing expenditure resulting from APEGA's decision to leave the affinity program is not applicable to PEO since they have never participated in the program.
- Due to the delay with the service provider for the accreditation improvement program, work has shifted from 2019 to 2020 resulting in a 2020 budget increase, and a corresponding decrease in 2019 expenditures.
- The IIDD database project will be undertaken by consultants. In-house resources are not currently available for this work.
- There was concern that the current budget format does not allow for analysis on potential areas of waste. FAR will be reviewing internal controls, where this concern will be addressed.
- There was a suggestion to implement an IT steering task force to leverage director expertise and ensure that the right solutions are implemented. G. McDonald noted that the organization's IT spending is reasonable in comparison to other organizations of similar size and that considering the costs of licenses and salaries, there is no waste. It was also noted that FAR will be looking at procurement processes and that a task force should only be implemented in times of big change.
- With the significant portion of revenues being attributed to the affinity program, a suggestion was made to have a committee focused on insurance, to engage experts in this area to ensure that the program results are maximized. D. Lynch noted that as new agreements are considered, the Board will be fully informed and responsible for approving proposed contracts.
- Certain areas of the budget are flow-through expenses, where revenue is received from other organizations to cover the spending. In these cases, the net effect is presented to ensure the expenditures are not inflated.

Motion 5796

Moved L. Doig, seconded T. Brookes

THAT the 2020 operational budget of \$11.3 million in revenue and \$12 million in expenses be approved.

Carried

Motion 5797

Moved L. Doig, seconded J. Card

THAT the 2020 capital budget of \$107,200 be approved.

Carried

Motion 5798

Moved J. Dunn, seconded J. Card

THAT the CEO be directed to use \$838,000 from reserve funds on the following significant projects:

- ***Accreditation Improvement Project***
- ***Space Program***
- ***International Institutions and Degrees Database Improvement Project***
- ***Competency-Based Assessment Project***
- ***National Membership Database Improvements***

Carried

4.3 2020 CEAB work plan

B. Dony provided introductory comments to the work plan, which was initially provided as a draft in October. The work plan has since been updated to include developing appropriate ways within the accreditation process to incorporate the goals of the 30 by 30 initiative, as decided at the October meeting.

The following information was provided as a result of director questions:

- Regarding the Fall visit schedule, M. Warken clarified that institutions submit their request for accreditation by January 1, 2020 and, as a result, the schedule is not reflected in the work plan. The work is somewhat predictable, and resources will be planned appropriately.
- The CEAB should review the visit materials to ensure regulators are listed as a stakeholder for the accreditation process.
- It was confirmed that the CEAB has a formal process in place for appeals and complaints.
- Concerning the process applied to a focused program visit at one of the higher education institutions (HEIs), B. Dony clarified that it resulted from issues arising from the initial visit. The time between the focused visit and the initial visit allows the institution to make progress on changes to address raised concerns. Moving forward, the accountability in accreditation project outcomes will ensure the Board is informed of CEAB decisions and feedback received.

Motion 5799

Moved J. Card, seconded L. Champagne

THAT the Engineers Canada Board approve the CEAB work plan.

Carried

4.4 2020 CEQB work plan priorities

R. LeBlanc provided introductory comments to the work plan priorities, which were initially provided as a draft in October. The work plan priorities have since been updated to include producing a guideline for engineers and engineering firms on the topic of diversity and inclusion, as decided at the October meeting.

The following feedback was provided:

- All instances of “white paper” will be updated once consensus is reached on a replacement term, to be further addressed under item 5.
- With regards to the public guideline for engineers working internationally and the suggestion to include a note that practitioners could be disciplined for international work if it doesn’t meet the Canadian regulators standards, the CEQB should follow up with regulators to ensure their acts provide the ability to discipline in these cases.

Motion 5800

Moved J. Dunn seconded L. Doig

THAT the Engineers Canada Board approve the CEQB work plan priorities.

Carried

4.5 Approval of the 2020 Board consultation plan

J. Boudreau presented the pre-circulated consultation plan, including the operational plan for information only. No questions or feedback were received.

Motion 5801

Moved K. Reid, seconded A. Bergeron

THAT the Engineers Canada Board approve the 2020 Board consultation plan.

Carried

4.6 Operational imperative 9 (OP9): Sub-strategy on Indigenous access to engineering

In addition to the materials included in the agenda book, a letter was received and circulated prior to the meeting from the Engineering Deans Canada (EDC) that raised concerns with the section of the proposed motion focused on the direction to the CEAB. D. Lynch provided background on the communications he had with EDC, that attempts have been made to meet in person and collaboration on scheduling is still underway.

The Board agreed to go in camera to discuss the EDC letter.

Motion 5802

Moved by J. Holm, seconded by A. Bergeron

THAT the meeting move in-camera and be closed to the public at the recommendation of the Board.

The attendees at the in-camera session shall include Board members and staff.

Carried

Following the conclusion of the in-camera discussion, the Board moved back into the open session.

Motion 5803

Moved by A. Bergeron, seconded by K. Reid

THAT the meeting move back into open session.

Carried

It was agreed to split the motion and to consider the CEQB direction first. Caution was raised around ensuring the guideline is produced using culturally appropriate methods and the CEQB will be planning this activity carefully.

Motion 5804

Moved by A. Bergeron, seconded by L. Doig

THAT the Engineers Canada Board direct the CEQB to produce a guideline for engineers and engineering firms on the topic of Indigenous engagement and consultation.

Carried

Motion 5805

Moved by S. Gwozdz, seconded by C. Lamothe

THAT the Engineers Canada Board defer the decision to direct the CEAB to develop appropriate ways within the accreditation process to incorporate Truth and Reconciliation efforts to February 26, 2020.

Carried – motion deferred to February 26, 2020

To support the deferral of the CEAB direction, the Board agreed that removal of the two tactics relating to engineering programs and the CEAB on page 6 of the sub-strategy.

Motion 5806

Moved by A. Bergeron, seconded by D. Nedohin-Macek

THAT the Engineers Canada Board approve the proposed sub-strategy for Operational imperative 9 as amended.

Carried

ACTION: Staff to amend the sub-strategy to remove the two tactics relating to engineering programs and the CEAB.

4.7 Approval of policy updates from the Governance Committee

J. Holm presented the pre-circulated policy amendments and rescindments. L. Doig noted that the FAR committee will also be reviewing the policies that relate to finance. It was noted that the preamble for “Role of the Board” policies should include monitoring of the CEO.

Motion 5807

Moved J. Holm, seconded G. Faulkner

a) THAT the Engineers Canada Board approve the following revised policies:

- i. Policy 1.5 About this manual**
- ii. Policy 4.9 President’s role**
- iii. Policy 4.11 Board management delegation**
- iv. Policy 5 Executive duties and limitations**
- v. Policy 5.3 Financial condition**
- vi. Policy 5.4 Communication and support to the Board**
- vii. Policy 5.7 Compensation and benefits**

Carried

Motion 5808

Moved R. Trimble, seconded A. Bergeron

b) THAT the Engineers Canada Board approve the new policy 7.10 Consultation.

Carried

Motion 5809

Moved J. Holm, seconded M. Wrinch

c) THAT the Engineers Canada Board approve rescinding the following policies:

- i. Policy 4.6 Accountable to the Board**
- ii. Policy 5.8 National position statements**
- iii. Policy 5.9 Image protection**

Carried

4.8 Engineers Canada Awards Program

G. McDonald provided background on the report that resulted from discussions when formulating the 2019-2021 Strategic plan. The award recommendations were made following extensive stakeholder consultation and should result in the program aligning with Engineers Canada’s purposes and supporting the strategic priorities. The report was commended for clarity and quality of consultation.

Motion 5810

Moved T. Brookes, seconded D. Gelowitz

THAT the Engineers Canada Board approve the recommendations from the Awards program review.

Carried

4.9 2022-2024 Strategic Plan Task Force work plan

J. Boudreau presented the pre-circulated work plan. The Board will be updated regularly as this work progresses. It was noted that this work plan complies with the newly approved planning policy.

Motion 5811

Moved C. Lamothe, seconded K. Reid

THAT the Engineers Canada Board approve the 2022-2024 Strategic Plan Task Force work plan.

Carried

4.10 Canadian national entry to practice examination(s)

In addition to the pre-circulated documents for this item, a letter was received from A. English, CEO of Engineers & Geoscientists BC, and G. Faulkner, author of the briefing note, provided a response. These communications were circulated in advance of the meeting. G. Faulkner presented the history on this item, noting that his concerns relate to the inconsistent treatment of non-CEAB graduates across the country. This exam could be used by the regulators as needed, and how they use it may vary by jurisdiction (confirmatory, screening). Considering national mobility requirements set by the federal government, all regulators have an interest in establishing a fair and transparent process.

The following feedback was provided by Board members:

- The National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES) exams currently used by the majority of Canadian regulators to assess non-CEAB graduates may not be the most appropriate for the Canadian market considering they are produced in the United States and that the content can differ from national standards. Additionally, the regulators that utilize the NCEES's Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) exam do not typically use the Professional Engineering (PE) exam even though these exams are meant to be used as a two-step process to ensure the candidate is suited to licensure.
- The CEO Group discussed the issue at their recent meeting, and it was agreed that this issue should be discussed through the National Admissions Officials Group, with a resulting recommendation made to the CEO Group to provide the opinion of the regulators that will be affected by this initiative.
- It was noted that APEGS is not in favour of the proposal.
- Removing evaluation in favour of an exam may be considered unfair to late-stage engineers who are specialists in certain areas and not able to pass a general engineering exam.
- Although this initiative is not supported by the current strategic plan, the timing may be right to consider it for the 2022-2024 priorities.
- An option to have the Strategic Plan Task Force (SPTF) manage the work instead of striking a task force was discussed. It was noted that this work does not fit within the SPTF mandate, and that the SPTF is focused on facilitating the production of the plan and not building the content.
- With Engineers Canada staff fully committed to the *2019-2021 Strategic plan*, work would need to be deferred if this motion is passed.
- Although the intent is to consider this option for non-CEAB graduates at this time, the deans will need to be consulted. If the exam is implemented and is successful with non-CEAB graduates, it could be considered as a support to the accreditation process. It could also relieve some of the pressure that

the accreditation process causes for the deans. During the CEO discussion, it was noted that several jurisdictions that have fairness commissioners believe that implementing an exam for non-CEAB graduates would most likely result in the exam eventually being required for CEAB graduates as well.

- This is a useful evaluation of a potential tool that should be considered. For this project to be considered in a future strategic plan, information will need to be gathered in advance to ensure regulators understand the implications. The evaluation should move forward, and perhaps there may be opportunities for the CEQB to manage the analysis as it fits in their mandate. R. LeBlanc noted that should the motion be amended to direct the CEQB, the CEQB's extensive work plan consultation process could result in the evaluation work being rejected.

An amendment to the original motion was proposed to direct the CEQB to undertake this work, in place of striking a task force. The mover and seconder agreed to the amendment.

Motion 5812

Moved G. Faulkner, seconded L. Doig

THAT Engineers Canada Board direct the CEQB to consider for their 2021 work plan the production of an analysis and recommendation regarding the feasibility of developing and/or managing national, psychometrically valid, Canadian engineering technical exam(s) to be used by regulators for non-CEAB applicants for engineering licensure within their jurisdictions.

Carried

5. Reports to the Board

5.1 Accreditation Board update

B. Dony presented the report slides. Board members were reminded to complete the accountability in accreditation survey. No questions or feedback were received.

5.2 Qualifications Board update

R. LeBlanc presented the report slides. The QB is working on finding a replacement term for "white paper" and it has been difficult to achieve consensus. "Position paper" was considered most appropriate as a replacement. However, feedback was received that this term causes a false sense that the paper would reflect the position of all regulators. No questions or feedback were received.

ACTION: Board members were asked to provide suggestions on replacement terms for "white paper" via email to R. LeBlanc and/or M. Ouellette.

5.3 Update from the FAR Committee

L. Doig presented the report slides. It was noted that the quarterly update provided as additional information to the update is also subject to the new forecast information as provided onsite. No questions or feedback were received.

5.4 Update from the Governance Committee

J. Holm presented the report slides. No questions or feedback were received.

5.5 Update from the HR Committee

D. Lynch presented the report slides. It was clarified that the Board and director assessment surveys will result in recommendations for continuous improvement and inform nomination and committee appointment processes.

5.6 Update from the Board's 30 by 30 Champion

S. Gwozdz presented the report slides. Additionally, recent interviews have taken place on CBC Radio Canada to further outreach. No questions or feedback were received.

5.7 International Institutions and Degrees Database (IIDD) feasibility study

G. McDonald presented the pre-circulated report, resulting from the budget discussions in 2018, when IIDD was brought forward for consideration by the Board. Following consultation, the consensus reached was that the IIDD is useful for the regulators and the improvements should be implemented. No questions or feedback were received.

5.8 Risk register

L. Doig presented the current risk register and highlighted the new column that indicates the committee owner of each risk. Each committee will be encouraged to discuss their risks at each meeting and to provide updates to FAR. Additionally, FAR will be undergoing deep-dives on sections of the risk register, beginning with strategic risks reviewed at their recent meeting.

G. McDonald reported on the operational risks. With the newly approved travel policy, risk 12 has been reduced. The most impactful risk at this time is risk 19 financial, relating directly to the affinity program participation which has shifted to severe given the recent APEGA decision and feedback from Nova Scotia. Risk 27 Internal support to staff will be decreased on the next register presentation with the executive assistant roles having been recently filled. Following questions received, the following was noted:

- While the PIEVC divestment risk was reduced for the October report due to negotiations beginning with a bidder to take over the program, this risk will only reduce further once the contracts have been signed.
- The risk associated with paper files in the office will reduce as the documents, mainly consisting of historical information and confidential HR files, are converted to electronic storage.
- Failing to resolve issues with accreditation will have a significant impact on the risk 35, holism of the federation. Although this is specifically referenced in risk 26 Accreditation process, there is a strong linkage. It is challenging to demonstrate the intersection between the risks.
- Consider an edit for the symptoms of risk #26 to list "Dissatisfaction of a regulator and/or HEI with Accreditation".
- The consultation program engagement will track how many consultations there were, how many people were invited and how many participated.

G. McDonald noted that for the February meeting, one-page documents will be produced for risks marked as red that provide background on the issue, with details on how the risk is being managed and when it will be reduced.

4.11 Generative discussion

It was agreed to table this item to the February meeting agenda to ensure adequate time for discussion.

6. Other business

It was noted that the May meeting coincides with Canadian Coalition of Women in Engineering, Science, Trades and Technology (CCWESTT) 2020 and that it would be valuable to try to coordinate an opportunity to have the Board participate, as scheduling permits.

7. Next meetings

The next meetings of the Engineers Canada Board are scheduled as follows:

- February 24-26, 2020 (Ottawa, ON)
- April 8, 2020 (teleconference)
- May 21-23, 2020 (Winnipeg, MB)
- June 15-16, 2020 (Fredericton, NB)

The Board was reminded that the deadline to submit items for the February agenda is December 11, 2019.

6. In-camera sessions

Motion 5813

Moved D. Gelowitz, seconded J. Holm

THAT the meeting move in-camera and be closed to the public at the recommendation of the Board. The attendees at the in-camera session shall include Board directors, the Engineers Canada CEO, the chairs of the CEAB and CEQB, the CEO Group Advisor to the Board, and the Secretary.

Carried

Motion 5814

Moved K. Reid, seconded C. Zinck

THAT the meeting move in-camera and be closed to the public at the recommendation of the Board. The attendees at the in-camera session shall include Board directors and the Engineers Canada CEO.

Carried

Motion 5815

Moved D. Chui, seconded G. Faulkner

THAT the meeting move in-camera and be closed to the public at the recommendation of the Board. The attendees at the in-camera session shall include Board directors.

Carried

7. Closing

Motion 5816

Moved D. Gelowitz, seconded A. Bergeron

THAT the meeting be terminated.

Carried

Minutes prepared by C. Mash for:

David T. Lynch, PhD, P.Eng., FEC, President

Stephanie Price, P.Eng., CAE, Secretary to the Board