Minutes of the October 24, 2012 EDTF – CIE Subgroup meeting

Room 104, 40 Sheppard Ave. West, Toronto

Participating: George Comrie, Roger Jones, Jim Finch, Peter DeVita (t/c), Colin Cantlie (t/c), Jordan Max (staff advisor)

Regrets: Corneliu Chisu, John Clark, Tyson Macaulay, Ian Marsland, Alana Lavoie

Following dinner, the meeting started at 7:10 pm.

1. **Approval of Agenda**
   The agenda was reviewed. Motion to approve the agenda: Jim/Roger – approved without amendment

2. **Approval of September 19th, 2012 meeting minutes and follow up on action items**
   The draft minutes were reviewed without amendment. Motion to approve the September 19, 2012 minutes: Peter/Jim – approved

   On matters arising from the minutes, George advised that he had forwarded to Jordan the recent ICTC White Paper on Cyber Security, who in turn had posted it in Central Desktop. The White Paper contained references supplied by George on PEO's CIE efforts to date.

   George reported that he was still working on revising Section 1 of the Phase 2 report.

   With regard to stakeholder consultation, he reported he had spoken recently with Guy Boone of the Ottawa PEO chapter about a future consultation, but the timing was uncertain.

   Jordan reported that the 2013 Work Plan had been prepared, signed off by Peter, George and Gerry, and had been submitted to People Development to include in the November Council package for approval.

   Roger reported that the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) has established an Industrial Sub-Committee (PSISC) to identify industry issues within the practice of professional engineering related to industrial product design, manufacturing and associated machinery. The subcommittee shall propose practice guidelines and if required performance standards to address these issues. Furthermore, the subcommittee shall prepare terms of reference for other subcommittees that will be created in order to develop these practice guidelines and performance standards. PSISC will also examine the effect of the repeal of the IE on, primarily, manufacturing

industry. The Society of Manufacturing Engineers (SME) is expected to be source of expertise on manufacturing industry reaction to the repeal of the IE, also on the notion of an, at present, informal "discipline" of Manufacturing Engineering, should this ever be contemplated.

Note: Roger has ceased to be PEO's Official Liaison person to the *Society of Manufacturing Engineers'* (SME) 'Take Back Manufacturing Initiative' (supported by PEO and OSPE) when he left Council in May 2012. However, he will continue SME liaison as Chair of the *Professional Standards Industry Sub-Committee* (PSISC), as noted in the PSISC Terms of Reference. SME is expected to be an information source for TBM, also for issues related to the *Repeal of the Industrial Exception.*

It is advisable that our section on the limited licence parallel the process to be used for software engineering and the removal of the industrial exception.

Peter noted that he has proposed that the CIE meet with the chairs of PEO's regulatory committees (ARC, ERC, PSC, ENF, COC, DIC) to discuss how to get started on regulating CIE. He is concerned that PEO may miss the opportunity to regulate in this area if we delay too much and other organizations act first regarding certification. He proposed the following motion:

> **That CIE arrange a meeting with the chairs of all of PEO's regulatory committees (ARC, ERC, PSC, ENF, COC, & DIC) to discuss what they need to know from CIE in order to be able to start regulating CIE practice.**
> Moved by Peter/Roger – motion passed.

> **Action: Jordan** to contact the chairs of PEO's regulatory committees to try to set up a meeting with the CIE group in Toronto (Peter, George, and Jim)

3. **2013 Staffing Plan**
   Jordan reported that in preparing the Roster for 2013, he had attempted contact all members of the CIE group to see if they wished to continue for 2013. Colin has requested to switch to Observer status. Peter, George, Jim, Tyson, Roger, and Ian have indicated their desire to continue on as members. John Clark could not be reached and apparently (as evidence from the RMC website and LinkedIn) he is now working for the Department of National Defence and is based in Edmonton. George offered to contact John to clarify his status with the CIE subgroup.

   > **Action: George** to attempt to contact John Clark regarding his continued status on the CIE subgroup.

4. **Other Business**

- Software Engineering Definition comments

Jordan reported that he had forwarded Engineers Canada's draft definition of Software Engineering to the group, and that Tyson had already posted comments on Central Desktop. The deadline for PEO to submit comments to Engineers Canada is November 12, but that internally the deadline was November 2. Colin commented that he thought that several of the "engineering principles" cited on page 3 of the report were not really so, such as uniqueness or complexity. He suggested that reference to Personal Software Process (PSP) be used. It was agreed that everyone should review the draft definition document and provide comments to George by November 1 so they could be compiled into one set of comments to Engineers Canada from the CIE group.

George indicated he would contact Michael Price to determine if any other PEO committees or task forces were likely to provide comments.

> **Action: Everyone** to provide comments on the Engineers Canada draft definition of Software Engineering to **George** by November 1st so he could compile them and submit to Engineers Canada via the CEO/Registrar on November 2nd. **George** to contact the Acting CEO/Registrar to determine if any other PEO committees or task forces were planning on submitting comments.

5. **Phase II Report**
   Jim reported that he had prepared a "Missing Parts" gap analysis document on the Phase 2 report. The group filled in names of who was responsible for completing each section and for ensuring that each section had conclusions and recommendations (where applicable);

   Sections 1, 4 and 8 – George
   Section 3 – Jim
   Section 7.5 – Tyson
   Section 9 – Jordan (to roll up all conclusions throughout the report)

   It was agreed that everyone should review the entire document, but only check it out (and lock it) for a short period of time, then check it back into Central Desktop, to avoid duplications and overwrites.

   > **Action: Everyone** to complete their respective sections, and to review the entire document so that we have a completed document to review at the next meeting.

6. **Next meeting and adjournment**

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, November 28 from 6-9pm. The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 pm.