



4th Council of Presidents and 114th CGC Meetings,
 26 - 27 November, 2005; GSC Ottawa; Harrison Hall, 601 Booth Street
 09:00 - 17:00, Saturday, 26 November; 09:00 - 15:00, Sunday, 27 November

DRAFT MINUTES

Attendees:	Representing	Role
1. Becker, Dennis:	Canadian Geotechnical Society (CGS)	President
2. Collins, Barry:	Canadian Council of Professional Geoscientists (CCPG)	President
3. Douglas, Marianne:	Canadian Quaternary Association (CANQUA)	President
4. Grieve, Richard:	Earth Sciences Sector, Natural Resources Canada (NRCan)	Chief Scientist
5. Hanmer, Simon:	No affiliation for present purposes	Facilitator
6. Holysh, Steve:	International Association of Hydrogeologists, Cdn Chapter	President
7. James, Don:	Committee of Provincial Geologists (CPG: Sunday only)	Representative
8. Kontak, Dan:	Mineralogical Association of Canada (MAC)	President
9. Marcotte, Norman:	Natural Sciences & Eng. Res. Council (NSERC)	Representative
10. Moore, Richard:	Prospectors & Developers Assoc of Canada (PDAC)	Representative
11. Morgan, Alan:	Canadian Geoscience Education Network (CGEN)	Head
12. Mummery, Bob:	Canadian Geoscience Council (CGC)	Executive Officer
13. Ollerhead, Jeff:	Canadian Association of Geographers (CAG)	Representative
14. Packard, Jeff:	Canadian Society of Petroleum Geologists (CSPG)	President
15. Piper, David:	Geological Association of Canada (GAC)	President
16. Potvin, Paul:	Natural Sciences & Engineering Research Council (NSERC)	Representative
17. Reinson, Gerry:	Canadian Geoscience Council (CGC)	Director
18. Rutherford, Ian:	Cdn Meteorological & Oceanographic Society (CMOS)	Executive Director
19. Schreiner, Bryan:	Canadian Geoscience Council (CGC)	Director
20. St-Onge, Denis:	Canadian Geoscience Council (CGC: Sunday only)	CGC PAGSE Rep
21. Thorleifson, Harvey:	Canadian Geoscience Council (CGC)	President
22. Vavrek, Jean:	Canadian Institute of Mining (CIM)	Executive Director
23. White, Joe:	Council of Chairs of Cdn Earth Science Depts. (CCCESD)	Chair

09:00, Sunday, 27 November 2005

1. Welcome, Introductions

Harvey Thorleifson opened the meeting at 9 am

2. Approval of Agenda

The agenda previously circulated was discussed and the consensus was to table most of the reports circulated prior to the meetings and finish the Saturday Council of Presidents' meeting. The focus was to be on coordination/collaboration among member societies and the establishment of next steps. There also was agreement to set aside time after completion of the planned 1:00 p.m. annual meeting for discussion of outreach and international affairs. Motion to revise the agenda as discussed: **Moved by Reinson. Seconded by Holysh. Carried. (CGC Motion #1.)**

3. Minutes of the 113th Council Meeting

A motion to approve the minutes of the 113th Council meeting held in Calgary on June 19th 2005 as circulated was made. **Moved by Mummery. Seconded by Packard. Carried. (CGC Motion #2.)**

4. Report from the Council of Presidents

Council of Presidents (CoP) Roundtable: The Renewal Initiative

- *Facilitators: Simon Hanmer & Jeff Packard*

Planned agenda for the Saturday, 26 November Council of Presidents Roundtable

1. Welcome and Introductions	9:00 – 9:05
2. Expectation of outcome of meeting	9:00 – 9:10
3. Roadmap to Renewal: idealized timeline and key steps	9:10 - 9:20
4. The American Geological Institute: Another case history to ponder	9:20 - 9:50
5. Legal constraints on change and executable renewal options	9:50 - 10:00
 <i>Break</i>	 10:00 – 10:15
5. Reaffirmation of the renewal process	10:15 – 10:45
6. Reaction to proposed model: criticisms & suggestions for improvement	10:45 – 12:15
 <i>Lunch</i>	 12:15 – 1:15
7. Discussion of criteria for CGC presidential candidates	1.15-2.30
8. Discussion of the common services to member societies that will underpin the renewed CGC and the taking of their "ownership" by the CoP	2:30 - 4:45
9. Adjournment of Saturday meeting	4:45

Summary of the Council of Presidents discussion

1. Welcome and Introductions

Packard and Hanmer called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM Saturday, and representatives present introduced themselves.

2. Expectation of outcome of meeting

Packard reviewed the anticipated outcome of the meeting: this included reaffirmation by member societies of their will to buy into and take ownership of the process of renewal for mechanisms of national earth science coordination, steps to be taken towards a consensus organizational structure, a discussion of potential funding options, agreement on the criteria for selection of presidential candidates for the renewed organization, agreement on which sector will provide the presidential candidate and for what term, and discussion on the nature of core services and mechanisms for their provision to underpin the concept of a renewed national geoscience federation. It was proposed that the group not strive for a finalized, fully fleshed-out organizational and financial model, as it seemed not to be feasible to do so, and also it was deemed preferable for the new president and finance-director to have their input into the final design. To some extent, the name Canadian Geoscience Institute (CGI) was used as a placeholder name for the renewed organization, while recognizing that adequate consideration of the most appropriate name has not yet been undertaken.

3. Roadmap to Renewal: idealized timeline and key steps

Packard then presented an idealized timeline for the key steps that will lead to the formal installation of a revitalized national umbrella organization for the Earth sciences in Canada. The proposed key milestones were summarized as follows:

Feb 28 2006	Nomination of President
March 15 2006	Ratification of President by CoP
March 30 2006	Nomination of Finance Director
April 15 2006	Ratification of Finance Director
June 15 2006	New President presents proposed organizational and funding model
Sept 15 2006	New model put to ratification vote by CoP
Nov 30 2006	Inaugural meeting of renewed organization

Specifically, it was proposed that, for the February 30th milestone, groups such as the CSPG, CSEG, and CWLS, in consultation with GSC Calgary, CAPP and APEGGA, and facilitated by Packard and Hanmer, will have a willing consensus Presidential candidate. By March 15th 2006, an e-mail ballot by the CoP will ratify the nominated president-elect candidate. By March 30th 2006, the president-elect will nominate a willing finance-director, and the selection of same will be aided by suggestions from all quarters. By April 15th 2006, nomination of the finance-director elect will be ratified by e-mail ballot of the CoP. By May 15th 2006, full understanding of the legal impediments and ramifications of creating a new organization will be achieved and communicated (onus on CGC executive-director and new president and finance-director elect). By June 15th 2006, at a CoP/CGC Meeting in Calgary, the President-elect and finance-director-elect will present an organizational plan, and a tentative 3 year

rolling business plan and a budget. Between June 15th and September 15th 2006, final iterative tweaking will be completed. By September 15th 2006, the organizational plan, 3 year rolling business plan and budget are to be put to an e-mail ballot of CoP. Between September 15th and November 30th 2006, there will be a publicity blitz in all society newsletters, etc., as well as recruitment of other key executive nominees, recruitment of an Executive-Director, and initial solicitation for Geoscience Board of Directors. By November 30th 2006, the inaugural meeting of the renewed organization will be held, and in 2007, a funding drive, website launch, and other services and communication initiatives started.

A brief discussion ensued, and there were no major objections to the proposed timeline. The timetable was recognized as being ambitious, and it was agreed that continuity in representation around the CoP table, perhaps as Past-Presidents in some cases, will be beneficial in maintaining the timeline.

4. The American Geological Institute: Another case history to ponder

Hanmer briefly reviewed the issues, history and structure of national federations in the biological, chemical and engineering communities in Canada that he had previously presented at the June 2005 CoP meeting. Following this, he provided a review of the American Geological Institute (AGI), as a direct analogue for the Earth Science community in Canada. In all cases, successful national science federations were seen as being able to (i) provide clearly needed core services more effectively than individual member societies, and (ii) serve as an effective national voice for the science community as a whole and thereby ensure national representation. These organizations have known their ups and downs, as well as internal dissensions, none too different from those that can be identified in the currently fragmented Earth Science community in Canada. Hanmer pointed out that funding mechanisms among these analogue communities are variable, ranging from reliance on a head tax such as the fee that covers about half of the revenue for the Canadian biological organization, to reliance on other revenue streams as is the case with Canadian chemists. In summary, the example of the chemists and the AGI indicates that a combination of sponsorships, national grants, and revenues generated by member societies and the federation itself is the most effective way of funding the provision of core services. AGI has a staff of 60, so a per capita comparison would imply a Canadian national earth science office staffed by six. This was seen as feasible if we pool our resources and share our capacities.

5. Legal constraints on change and executable renewal options

Mummery presented an overview of the current CGC by-laws with regard to how this may impact any substantial changes made to the organization. It was concluded that there are no legal impediments to a fundamental overhaul of the CGC, including a possible change of name or a transfer of assets to a new organization.

6. Reaffirmation of the renewal process

Following a short mid-morning break, during which time Douglas, Holysh, Ollerhead, and White joined the meeting, Packard and Hanmer tabled three motions that were to serve as an affirmation by the CoP of the renewal process started at the Calgary 2005 meeting. All three motions were passed unanimously after “earth” was changed to “Earth”. The CMOS representative, who preferred to

present himself as an observer, abstained on each vote, while concurrently expressing strong interest in collaboration. These three motions were worded as follows.

CoP Motion #1. Be it resolved that the council of geoscience presidents is strongly supportive of an effective, representative, accountable and "owned" national umbrella organization for the Earth sciences in Canada. **Moved by Piper. Seconded by Moore. Carried unanimously.**

CoP Motion #2. Be it resolved that the Council of Geoscience Presidents declares that such an organization will only succeed if the individual communities making up such an organization willingly contribute their respective expertise in a collaborative fashion such that the organization capitalizes on the strengths of each and reduces duplication of effort and/or services, while respecting the integrity of members. **Moved by Becker. Seconded by Moore. Carried unanimously.**

CoP Motion #3. Be it resolved that the Council of Geoscience Presidents proposes that the organizational model presented at the CoP meeting of June 18th, 2005 in Calgary be the "basis" for such a national umbrella organization for the Earth sciences in Canada. **Moved by Piper. Seconded by White. Carried unanimously.**

A broad and constructive discussion on the considerations that will drive renewed coordination ensued, filling the late morning time slot. Discussion addressed the shortcomings of the previous CGC arrangement that had to be overcome, in particular the cause of perceived lack of buy-in and commitment, and the failure of CGC to convincingly present itself as a legitimate community voice. The need to reduce the previous reliance of CGC on GSC funding was noted, to ensure that the new coordinating body will mature in a more self-reliant manner, as was the need for the body to reflect the large role that earth-science-reliant industries play in our economy. It was recognized that the CGC successor needs to do the things that are needed, but can not be done by the constituent organizations, including tangible benefits such as a community-wide publication, and effective efforts to demonstrate the essential role that our world-class earth science plays in the lives of Canadians. It was regarded as beneficial that the constituent groups only be Canadian societies or chapters, and clarity on exactly who the group will speak for was called for. It also was recognized that some things are best done separately, such as the small, specialized conferences that are required to balance the larger events. There was recognition that weighted voting will be undesirable, as any reliance on weighted voting is unlikely to lead to a happy outcome. Collins discussed whether the CGC successor might be a science body that CCPG would observe rather than being a member of, while it was noted by Becker that care will be required to avoid implying that the CGC successor will be responsible for licensing and accreditation. While it was recognized that additional effort and adequate recognition of the 'fluid Earth' will be required to ensure that environmental earth science organizations will be willing to fully buy into the structure, it also was stated that buy-in by the full spectrum of earth science will be essential for our success. Additional feedback from the environmental earth science community therefore was called for, to ensure that these views can be accommodated in developing an acceptable mechanism. This broad late morning discussion on governance and funding thus set the stage for the afternoon discussions.

7. Reaction to the proposed model: criticisms and suggestions for improvement

Feedback to the organizational model presented in June 2005 was discussed after the Saturday lunch break. Written responses received by Packard and Hanmer were described, and are here summarized in Appendix A. A roundtable discussion was then held wherein each society/organization representative verbally summarized their concerns with, and suggested modifications to, the model, and these contributions are here summarized in Appendix B. It was indicated that this feedback will be used as background to developing a final structural model in consultation with the member societies, and in recruitment of leadership. Discussion addressed whether internal organization should be by economic sector such as energy, minerals, environment, surveys, and research, or by discipline, and cases in support of both approaches were made. Production of knowledge was seen as our unifying theme, while activities such as education are essential contributors to this role.

8. Discussion of criteria for CGC presidential candidates

The planned discussion on desired qualifications and attributes for Presidential candidates, and related matters, was deferred until later in the meeting.

9. Discussion of the common services to member societies that will underpin the renewed CGC and the taking of their "ownership" by the CoP

Hanmer then opened the discussion on "shared services", reminding participants of the central role of such functions in binding member societies to the core of their federations in other scientific communities, both in Canada and the U.S. While other science communities had taken 50-100 years to build their national federations, Earth Science in Canada could learn from their precedents and achieve the same result in a decade. Meanwhile, the key to catalyzing a renewed organization is to share services via a virtual core organization coordinated by a renewed successor of CGC.

Suggestions from GAC that were presented by Piper served to launch a detailed discussion on this theme. The GAC presentation included having offices such as the GAC HQ as one of a number of nodes for the renewed organization, a broadened agenda of joint conferences through more frequent GeoCanada-style meetings largely under CSPG leadership, extension of the GAC-MAC format, broadening of specialty NUNA meetings, and increased sharing of conference services. With respect to publications and communications, broadening the scope and availability of Geoscience Canada to the full spectrum of Earth Sciences in Canada was proposed, as was the potential broadening of GEOLOG as a Newsletter for Earth Sciences, expanded availability of digital publications, and sharing of existing e-commerce facilities with the broader community. In student recruitment, cooperation and collaboration regarding university-based student chapters for the mutual advancement of the community was proposed, as was coordination of national lecture tours, and provision of shared services regarding administration of memberships and dues.

This led to a comprehensive exploratory procedure designed to identify needs with respect to services to members that could be better addressed through shared capacity, current capacities being used by organizations to provide services to their own members, and strengths that were seen as services that could be extended at cost to other member societies of the Earth Science community. The result of the

exercise is provided in Appendix C. It was noted that whereas some groups may have previously seen a revamped CGC as a threat, the theme of the day instead was on empowering constituent groups through more efficient provision of shared services.

At the conclusion of the exercise, Hanmer reminded the representatives that, without providing real core services that would entail some surrendering of currently held jurisdiction for the common good, a renewed organization is unlikely to succeed. He challenged them to carefully consider whether they had achieved one of the key stated aims of the day: to come to an agreement on the nature of core services and mechanisms for their provision to underpin the concept of a renewed national geoscience federation. The meeting was then adjourned for the day.

Completion of the Council of Presidents' agenda on Sunday morning

Packard began the re-convened Council of Presidents' session by summarizing the previous day's meeting, which had terminated on somewhat contentious grounds. Overnight, many representatives had reflected on the previous day's deliberations and arrived at various states of epiphany. Hanmer summarized his perspective on what had been achieved. He acknowledged that for some CoP members, the day had been one of discovery of the nature of the CoP and its potential to sit down and start to pull together for the common good of the Earth Science community in Canada. However, he reiterated, fragmentation of the Earth Science community and the need to be able to speak with a common voice was the key issue, and it is essential that this meeting result in a set of tangible actions that would lead to measurable outcomes that clearly contribute to addressing that issue. In other words, the CoP must move beyond discovery, and identify a number of tangible shared services that can be provided by member societies and organizations, and establish a plan for national collaboration.

Hanmer noted that the tables of needs and capacities (supply and demand) generated the previous day (Appendix C) indicated that many of the areas where an ability to share strengths had been identified were ranked as lesser priorities, while capacity for collaboration on higher priority "needs" had yet to be identified. He also pointed out that the tables suggested that only 3 organizations (CIM, CSPG and GAC) appear to have capacity to share, and asked if this is sufficient. Packard then reviewed the key areas of responsibility where progress would have to be made if a renewed organization were to be successful in the next 5 years. He noted the convergence between these and many of the stated "needs" (e.g. coordination, advocacy, human resources) identified on Saturday, but not captured in the tables of Appendix C, including the following, in descending order of assessed priority:

- National Liaison, Coordination, collaboration
- Advocacy/representation
- Human resources/staffing/intellectual renewal
- Communications
- Continuing Education/professional development
- Advisory Role
- Professional accreditation/mobility/curriculum
- Research Funding
- International Projects and Liaison
- Outreach
- Ancillary Services

General discussion ensued. Ollerhead commented that good progress had been achieved on Saturday, particularly noting that three motions had been passed that had firmly established the desire and commitment for a national Earth Science organization. There is a need to identify areas for cooperation among members and a need for shared services in some areas such as insurance and meeting planning. He also noted that key issues required collaboration to properly define and propose solutions. Piper commented that identification of key issues and areas of responsibility need to be pushed back to societies for effective solutions. White commented that before selecting a president for the new organization, there is a need to discover what the body of that organization should look like. Rutherford suggested that we are “skating” around the real issue, which is how to finance this new umbrella organization, and it was suggested that we may be able to fund it through savings brought on by increased efficiency resulting from collaboration. It was acknowledged that a factor in achieving collaboration will be to surrender some degree of sovereignty. Kontak noted the need to distinguish between services needed by the community as a whole, and those that would benefit individual constituent organizations. Ensuing discussion focused on the need to serve groups in order to enable the larger agenda.

As a result of this discussion, several committees were established to examine how best to address the provision of shared, common or core services to members and member organizations within a renewed CGC successor organization. These committees will be resourced by member societies, with one among them taking the lead. The mandate of these committees is to analyze the needs in more detail, identify current inefficiencies, make suggestions for improvement, and assess resources needed to address the issue. Hanmer offered to prepare a template that can be used to gather information. Several committees were established, as listed in Appendix D. It was agreed that progress be assessed by the end of February, to leave time for action to be taken to ensure adequate progress by spring.

- **Discussion of criteria for CGC presidential candidates**

The previously deferred agenda item on criteria for presidential candidates and related considerations was then addressed during the late Sunday morning time slot. Desired qualifications and attributes for Presidential candidates that were discussed included available time, intra-sector recognition and respect, passion/motivation, communication skills, consensus building, organizational experience/skills, innovative problem solving, negotiating skills, multi-sector experience, higher degree, and language skills. With respect to Geoscience Board Director Candidates, desired qualifications and attributes discussed included intra-sector high level recognition and respect, communication skills, some recognition across sectors, excellent connections to sector decision makers, financially independent, established contributor to applied or research geoscience, familiar with interfacing with government and bureaucracies, available time, higher degree, effective delegation, decisiveness, and very efficient. Discussion focused on relative weighting of these qualifications.

Packard and Hanmer then proposed that the following motion be considered: Be it resolved that the Council of Geoscience Presidents authorizes those communities in the Energy sector to nominate through a consensus process a president-elect for the new national umbrella organization for Earth sciences in Canada; and further that the term of office for this inaugural president shall be two years. **Moved by Moore, Seconded by Holysh. Carried.**

The vote was not unanimous, and further discussion centered on the inadequate clarity conveyed by the term “Energy Sector”. As a result, the previous motion was withdrawn by a vote on a motion to rescind moved by Ollerhead and seconded by Piper, and the following revised motion was then tabled.

CoP Motion #4. Be it resolved that the Council of Geoscience Presidents authorizes the CSPG, CSEG, CWLS and CSCSOP in consultation with CAPP, MngAC, GSC and CCPG to nominate a president-elect for the new national umbrella organization for Earth sciences in Canada; and further that the term of office for this inaugural president shall be two years. **Moved by Piper. Seconded by Vavrek. Carried unanimously.**

A discussion of funding options followed. Hanmer reviewed analog organization funding strategies, and Packard laid out possible sources of revenue that could be considered, including a levy by member surcharge or single assessment, grants from federal agencies, provincial agencies, and private sustaining memberships, fees for service such as host server, registration, subscription, and convention, conventions, specialized conferences, publications, short courses, web-based, newsletter, or conference advertising, investment. Additional, more speculative funding ideas mentioned public outreach, immigration services, demurrage, kits for schools, contract work, fee for job placement, and public field trips. It was acknowledged that a renewed CGC will need a major source of funding outside of member fees, such as sponsorships, grants, and business revenue. However, there was recognition that a head tax will solidify member buy-in. A Resourcing Subcommittee therefore was established to investigate funding models (Appendix D).

10. Adjournment of Council of Presidents meeting

The CoP meeting continuation ended at 12:20 pm with a hearty vote of thanks to Jeff Packard and Simon Hanmer for their efforts in organizing the Ottawa CoP meeting.

5. CGC Annual Meeting

6. Outreach

Following the efficiently completed, early afternoon CGC Annual Meeting, Alan Morgan presented the report from the Canadian Geoscience Education Network (CGEN), dealing with a proposal for education, outreach and communication in Canadian geoscience. Specific targets in the plan are to ensure 1) that Earth Science is adopted into the school curriculum and recognized as a science subject area equal in importance to biology, chemistry and physics, 2) seamless integration of all aspects of Earth science education from kindergarten right through to university, 3) production of educational materials that will allow the public to realize the importance of the Earth sciences, 4) accurate assessment of the needs of industry, government, and academia for employment of Earth scientists, 5) recognition by governments at all levels of the critical importance of the Earth sciences, and 6) recognition of the public at large of the contribution to society made by Earth scientists on a daily basis. Morgan requested approval of the Council to continue the investigation into the Status of Education, Public Awareness and Outreach in Geoscience in Canada. There also was discussion about continuation of \$5k in funding for CGEN and a further \$5k to be proposed later for the report. A

separate application for funds will likely go to GSC. The following motion was tabled, and it was noted that Earth Science is meant to encompass the full range of earth sciences, including atmospheric and ocean sciences.

- that we very strongly endorse the CGEN program as presented in the assessment of the state of earth science education and awareness in Canada. **Moved by Piper. Seconded by Reinson. Carried. (CGC Motion #3.)**

7. International

Bryan Schreiner presented the report of the Canadian National Committee (CNC) - International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS), which described the work of the CNC, the current CGC role in supporting IUGS activities, and the nomination of Dr. Peter Bobrowsky of GSC as IUGS Secretary General. He then outlined International Geoscience Program (IGCP) activity, including current developments within UNESCO. In 2005 Canadians were involved in 26 IGCP projects with many projects having Canadian Leaders. Ten projects led by Canadians or where Canadians were involved received funding from CNC-IGCP to support travel and other minor expenses to enable Canadians to contribute and gain from this international work. The International Year of Planet Earth initiative was also described.

Richard Grieve reported that Canada is paying a fee for membership in ICDP, and our membership may be allowed to expire in 2006 due to lack of proposals.

8. Other Business

Piper presented a report on the potential for wider circulation of Geoscience Canada. He described potential costs, and the desire of GAC to retain its status as a journal. Appreciation for this analysis by GAC was expressed.

Ollerhead presented a report on the CGC web site. Several recommendations and considerations were discussed for short term and longer term enhancements. It was noted that we need to protect potential domain names, and appreciation for current efforts to maintain the web site was expressed.

Morgan reported on the work of the Canada Prize Foundation, whose names are registered as the property of CGC. It is anticipated that the Foundation will request that this ownership be transferred from CGC to the Foundation. CGC will await a formal proposal.

Packard reported on excellent progress toward GeoCanada 2010. This format is meant to achieve the broadest possible earth science community representation at an occasional multi-society conference on a scale much larger than multi-society meetings currently held more frequently. This approach previously was a great success at GeoCanada 2000 in Calgary. Lead sponsors have agreed to hold the next GeoCanada in 2010, and there have been indications of a desire to adopt this format more frequently, such as every five years in Calgary, subject to approval by the Geotriad Group (CSPG, CSEG and CWLS). The possibility for meetings in this format more frequent than every five years was not seen as feasible, due to the burden on volunteers and staff. Each society, but particularly the CSPG, would have to look very closely at the reduced profit split on such a short cycle relative to its annual

capital requirements. More frequent megaconferences might be possible if the focus is not on energy in every case. The larger format promotes a sense of community, and results in increased revenue and exhibitor exposure. More ambitious field trips can be planned. On the other hand, the format strains volunteer, and a regular return to the same venue might become tedious. It was acknowledged that any party wishing to share in profit will need to be fully prepared to share in any potential loss. For the CGC successor to benefit financially from conferences, participating societies would perhaps need to donate a percentage of their profit, unless the scope of the organization evolves such that CGC staff play a large role in conference organization.

White reported on very active discussions toward renewed and enhanced coordination and planning of NSERC-funded research. Compilation of statistics and a questionnaire are underway, and a meeting will be held in February 2006. A grassroots workshop perhaps somewhat comparable to the workshop that led to Lithoprobe will be held when the NSERC-funded research community is prepared to do so.

9. Adjourn

White made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

Appendix A

Précis of Written Comments from the Geoscience Community on the Strawman Model

Endorsement and Support

- We feel that the great strength of the proposal is that it binds the existing societies into the renewed organization, rather than having what seemed to be just yet another organization in the CGC. (GAC)
- The Canadian Chapter of the International Association of Hydrogeologists is in support of the proposed revisions to the Canadian Geoscience Council and will work with geoscientists across the country to make the revised structure work. (IAH)
- The Canadian Society of Petroleum Geologists strongly endorses this effort to revitalize a national umbrella organization for the geosciences in Canada. We agree in principle with the proposed structure and look forward to a final proposal and funding structure. (CSPG)
- This is excellent (CSCS)
- Sounds good to me and it should work (PDAC – 1st)
- We appreciate this effort to reorganize the CGC to make it a more responsive organization and look forward to playing an active role in its affairs. (PDAC – 2nd)
- For the record, I have reviewed the documents on the CGC renewal initiative and am all for it, in principle. I don't have any specific comments to make at the moment, and I look forward to the discussions in November. This is an important directive that is being taken on. (CANQUA)
- In principle we support the initiative, the details of which remain to be sorted out and finalized.... a thoughtful approach to getting improved representation for the geosciences in Canada (CGS)
- Provides a reasonable framework for proceeding with a restructuring (CAG)
- Our concerns are not major and we think that a suitable structure can be agreed upon (PDAC)
- We are supportive of the concept of such an organization. I feel confident that SEG would become a funding member of such a group, though that decision would have to be presented to our Council

for approval. The Society of Economic Geologists will be pleased to continue to participate in discussions on how to structure a new Canadian umbrella organization. (SEG)

- The approach that is suggested seems reasonable What has been achieved so far in moving towards re-invigorating the earth sciences discipline is commendable. (NSERC)
- The response to the restructuring plan is positive supports adoption of something at least close to this structure, and the intention of CCCESD to commit to its success. (CCCESD)

Areas of Concern

Clarity

- In the document, you refer to the provision of strategic direction; you might want to be more explicit as to who and how this strategic direction will be developed as it is not totally clear. (NSERC)
- I find it comprehensive, but "over-wordy" (the proposal)..... In addition, as a new person trying to understand the "org chart" I am completely confused. there has to be a way of simplifying the whole thing (CWLS)
- There seems to be some confusion between licensing and accreditation. (CGS)
- Confusion about the role of the Canadian Geoscience Board and as a result general concern about its activities (GAC)
- We understand that CGS, as a technical society, would be directly represented in the Canadian Council of Geoscience Organizations, but not directly in the Canadian Geoscience Institute. (CGS)
- We finally concluded that much of the problem was in our perception of the nomenclature. We would call the "Canadian Council of Geoscience Organizations" the Board. We would call the "Directorate" the Executive, and we would call the "Canadian Geoscience Board" an Advisory Council. (PDAC)

Functionality

- (tripartite structure) too complex to be effectively implemented and to maintain day to day coherence. (GAC)
- The "Communications ? and Publications" and the "National Geoscience Coordination and Collaboration" standing committees need some rethinking. GAC feels strongly that the "scientific well-being" (to quote our mission) of the entire geoscience community needs to be addressed by one standing committee. This isn't about lobbying for money - its about the provision of scientific services such as publications, technical meetings, lecture tours, medals and awards, short courses, etc. There is a second function that is quite distinct, which is coordination and collaboration. We coordinate and collaborate in scientific matters, but also in lots of other things, including headquarters functions such as membership and bookstore activities. This involves inter-society communications such as a common web site. (GAC)
- EIC is a bit like your current Council of Presidents CoP. It consists of senior Presidents, VPs, Past-Presidents, etc. of the engineering societies. Its principal role is to provide leadership and advocacy. It does not, for the most part, undertake its own programming. (An exception is next year's conference on engineering solutions to problems associated with climate change.) EIC represents the wishes of the engineering community in PAGSE and in the quadripartite body. We

see value in strengthening the CoP and essentially allowing it to become CGC. EIC went through this process about 20 years ago with considerable success. (CGS)

- We believe the proposal to be quite cumbersome. (PDAC)
- With respect to the standing committees of the Directorate, it might be possible to combine the "outreach and the "communication" committee. (NSERC)
- In terms of reporting, we would suggest that the committees should report to the Board (our term) rather than the Executive (our term). (PDAC)

Representativeness/Balance

- The weighting of the vote of Directorate members will be counterproductive. How will the renewed organization attract people to become involved as Chairperson of important standing committees if their vote is weighted less than the vote of other Executive members of the Directorate? Who wants to be labeled "second class member" of any organization? (GAC)
- The CSPG remains concerned about a CGI that does not adequately represent the geosciences in Canada. In the proposed model although there is provision for the position of President of the Directorate to rotate equally between sectors, the rest of the executive (members and officers as defined in the model) could potentially all be nominated from a single sector. The CSPG strongly suggests that no one sector have greater representation on the executive than 60%. If enforced, this requirement might induce a higher degree of ownership. (CSPG)
- It is unclear in the model for what term the executive officers of the Directorate might serve. (CSPG)
- Essential that the academic community be represented directly (CCCESD)
- The idea of different vote weights for executive for executive members – the CAG wonders whether this will discourage people for volunteering for standing committees or other duties? Given past efforts to encourage participation and to be inclusive, using different vote weighting (while logical) might send the wrong message to people considering executive duty.

Inclusiveness/Membership

- Give some thoughts as to who or what "body" will accept new organizations as part of the CCGO. (NSERC)
- Geotechnical engineering is mentioned only once, as part of the geoenvironmental section. In our case, we actually see geoenvironmental as a part of the wider field of geotechnology – it forms one of our technical divisions. The relationship is more clearly defined in the document on the existing CGC, which talks about technical societies. The new document apparently does not.
- I also wonder how some aspect of environmental earth sciences such as those represented by the Canadian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society (CMOS) would be considered by this Geoscience Institute. (NSERC)
- It is our understanding that the new Canadian Geoscience Institute will become the 'umbrella' body for all geosciences, including CCPG, which manages licensing and accreditation in the provinces. We envisage some difficulty with this. Our experience suggests that keeping CCPE as an umbrella body of the (provincial) professional associations, while EIC is the umbrella body for the national technical societies has merit. There still needs to be an overall body that is represented currently by the informal 'quadripartite' group. The new proposed model is attractive in some ways but it's a big step that needs very careful handling with CCPG. (CGS)

- CCPG should as a minimum have strong observer status on the new CGC. (CCPG)

Conflict of Interest

- If the CGI were to play an advocacy role (re. the Geoscience Board), then the direct participation of government agencies in the CGI may not be tenable for reasons of conflict of interest. (GSC)

Funding/Staffing

- The next step is to understand the financial implications of what you propose. A first year of operation pro-forma budget identifying major costs and revenues including contribution asked from members would be nice. (GAC)
- In terms of administration, the documents propose one paid professional doing two jobs part time, one for the Canadian Council of Geoscience Organizations and the other for the Canadian Geoscience Board. This position will need to be filled by a fairly senior person with significant credibility in the community. The remuneration for this essentially full-time work will be \$70k, which may not be sufficient to entice a well qualified senior person. Perhaps it is viewed as a semi-retirement position. Secretarial assistance does not appear to be considered or included. Based on our experience, we don't see this working. EIC has a part-time Executive Director with full time secretarial/administrative assistance. This is also the case in CGS. (CGS)
- The possibility of CGC funding by a dues assessment against members of the CCPG constituent associations would likely not fly. (CCPG)
- Engineering generally takes the position that government doesn't owe us anything. A thoughtful and self-sufficient (sustainable) business plan is needed. (CGS)
- The CSPG believes that the CGC has in the past been over-reliant on government funding. In order for true ownership of the CGI to be taken by its constituent societies, they must take a greater stake in its fiscal foundation. (CSPG)
- Funding – the CAG has a somewhat unique 'issue' (perhaps) in that the proposed fee of \$5 per registered member would apply to a whole group of people who belong to the CAG but yet are not geoscientists in any way. The majority of our members are in fact Social Scientists who would not participate in the OTBNL (organization to be named later). We also wonder how one distinguishes between a "professional" society and a "technical/scientific" society? (CAG)

Communication

- The single most important issue that I would wish to stress is the need for a vehicle of communication. I have voiced this concern before and will reiterate it again. We need a mechanism to introduce all members of the different Societies to the members of the allied Societies – who they are, what they do, where they are, why they are relevant, etc. Perhaps when we collectively understand the needs and goals of each other we may be able to more effectively work together. To this end I again endorse the need for a national publication, one that might rise to a higher cause than the existing Geoscience Canada with a new name and take on a similar façade as the very successful Elements magazine. (MAC)
- The role of CGC in publications – the CAG would prefer to see the CGC avoid starting an e-journal as many member organizations already have journals of their own. The CAG would prefer to see the CGC publish Geoscience Canada or something like it in conjunction with the GAC

(news and overview articles) and concentrate on inter-societal communication and outreach activities. (CAG)

Advice

- I urge those seeking to utilize the existing institutions to create a new and stronger umbrella organization to keep pressing onwards. The current demand for new geoscientists throughout the world in the resource, environmental, engineering, and hydrology sectors demonstrates the importance of geoscience to the modern world. Canada needs an organization to help the different sub disciplines better understand what is happening in geoscience at a national level and to give Canadian geoscience a “one stop shop” where it can interact with policy makers throughout the country.The SEG believes it is important that Canada have a national umbrella organization for the geosciences that can represent geoscientists from across the country including those that are SEG members. We believe the important areas of responsibility for such an organization are national liaison, coordination, and collaboration of different geoscience groups as well as a body that can undertake advocacy and representation of Canadian geosciences at both provincial and federal levels. ... we feel that a Canadian umbrella organization must be broad based and include all of the disparate portions of the geosciences in the country. While representative groups in the organization should include professional societies such as the Society of Economic Geologists, the organization also needs to reach out to the business community. To be successful, a new Canadian umbrella organization will need to be inclusive of all sectors of Canadian geoscience. It will have to have sufficient funding (from member societies and corporate entities) to support at least a modest staff. It will also have to utilize the services of dedicated volunteers willing to serve the new group and work on issues of importance throughout the country. (SEG)
 - Our impression is that the geoscience community is as fragmented as the engineering community, and perhaps more so. It may be difficult to reach a consensus that collaboration in a common interest may be more beneficial than pursuing one’s own interests. (CGS)
 - Please feel assured that the geotechnical community values the CGC, but we do not see it as being able to undertake significant programming in its own right. We suggest that it should be left to the constituent societies, with encouragement for collaborative efforts when possible and as appropriate. (CGS)
 - There is clearly a necessity to have an umbrella organization that can be used to coordinate the interests of the many related Societies belonging to CGC or its successor. In particular is the close collaboration and integration of the needs of the different Societies and recognition of their mutual overlapping interests, for example demographics in the work place, student enrolment, outreach programs, societal issues such as the environment, resources, and climate change. So one area of great concern is to focus on what can be done to stimulate such relationships in the future.....There are common issues that we all have which are the ones to focus, that collectively drive the need for a larger encompassing society and why I think we continue to strive towards this common goal – we all feel it is necessary. (MAC)
-

Appendix B:

General Concerns and Thoughts (verbally expressed at the CoP meeting) on National Umbrella Organizations with Feedback on the Proposed Structural Model

CGS

- The CGS believes that organizations should be self-reliant, bottom-up driven, that function through a high degree of volunteerism.
- The CGS is a federation in of itself
- The acid test for provision of services is to charge a fee. If no one pays, then the service was never really needed.
- Important to neatly dovetail and distinguish the efforts and roles of technical societies and professional regulatory bodies.

CCCESD

- Concern expressed over the mistaken notion that the Geoscience Board must be made up of retirees. If these are the spokespersons for the Earth sciences then they must be fully connected to the discipline.

NRCAN

- The CGI is essentially a partnership; the obvious question is how does this partnership benefit NRCan.
- NRCan disputes the conclusion that there is a paucity of recognition of the value of Earth science (witness current funding of NRCan).
- NRCan recognizes that CGI could help build public (and governmental) recognition of the importance of Earth science and the role of Earth scientists
- Major concern is funding. Reliance in the past on NRCan has not been healthy for either CGC or NRCan.
- CGI must take fiscal ownership
- If CGI adopts an defined advocacy role, then NRCan would have to be an observer, rather than a full-fledged voting member for reasons of conflict of interest.
- In this formative process, the CoP should identify issues where conflict between societies and organization exists and not pursue these in structuring the new organization
- Concern expressed as to which Earth science (e.g. solid vs. fluid) can or should belong to the CGI

NSERC

- Concern expressed over who is included and who isn't
- In proposed structure the 'science' aspect is not strongly/sufficiently depicted.
- Suggestion made that 'research funding' subcommittee be rolled into a science committee

CCPG

- No clear statement in the background documents as to why CGC is in its present predicament. (general discussion ensued around ownership, lack of funding, fragmentation, turf protection, etc, etc)
- CCPG sees no duplication of effort (or conflict) between the professional regulatory organizations and the science side.
- Communication – typically in national umbrella organizations, the word doesn't get back to individuals (National Federation Disease)
- The Web is a passive agent of communication (it sits there waiting for individuals to access it). Individuals need a tangible product

PDAC

- Initially had some nomenclature issues.
- Reporting lines not adequately emphasized. Important that ultimately the standing committees must report to the CCGO (GAC felt that the CCGO should be strengthened relative to the Directorate).

GAC

- Within the committee structure, science needs more emphasis (CMOS commented that they have a science committee whose primary role is to deal with science policy and research funding)
- Concerns that funding will be contentious and that collaboration will impact different communities in different ways.
- A science committee could handle scientific services (awards, short courses, conventions, etc).
- Major concern is effective internal communication and lines of upward reporting, and how this might be achieved.

CIM

- Initial comment that CIM came more to listen than advise.
- Distinguish between outreach and advocacy versus lobbying. (support the former, not the latter). Better arm individuals to play the advocacy role.
- work done by committees – this will drive the structure

MAC

- MAC itself is composed of many sub-disciplines
- The national umbrella organization must be a vibrant, relevant organization
- The CGI needs specific programs and an agenda
- CGI definitely needs a tangible publication to call its own (along the lines of Elements)

CMOS

- Concern over the nomenclature used, in particular council versus board

- Environmental Earth sciences not adequately reflected/represented in the proposed structure (is sector representation appropriate)
- Ideal structure should reflect the integration of solid and fluid Earth sciences

CANQUA

- Strongly supports efforts to defragment the Earth science community
- CGI must identify those issues critical for smaller societies
- CANQUA believes outreach (to schools) is critical.

IAH

- Relevance is the key and critical issue; CGI must be relevant
- IAH is somewhat of a hybrid – it has both engineers and geoscientists; as a consequence there is a measure of disinterest about CGI in some sectors of IAH
- In general, IAH is supportive of the proposed structure

CAG

- Determine what individual societies do well and don't duplicate; allow the societies to maintain ownership.
- Concern over what sort of publication the CGI might get involved in; CAG would not be keen on an e-journal (as this would duplicate what many societies have).
- Concern over weighting of votes on the executive – understand the logic but feel it would be a disincentive to serve.
- If consensus approach can't be achieved on executive, then what is the point?

Brian Schreiner

- We need an international voice, at arms length from government and representative of all Earth sciences
- International activities can play a positive role for CGI
- Another facet of Canadian geoscience, that we all can take much pride in.

Gerry Reinson

- Collaboration and advocacy are the key roles that CGI must play and play well

Alan Morgan

- Remind delegates that CGC has had many successes in the past, such as in relation to free trade and professional mobility

Harvey Thorleifson

- CGC/CGI is the meeting place of business, science and profession
- GAC, to a large degree, represents the 'science'.

Appendix C: Tables of Society Needs, Strengths, and Capacity

members' needs/shared services	MAC	CIM	GAC	CAG	IAH	CGS	CANQUA	CSPG	CMOS	PDAC	CCPG	NRCAN	CCCESD	
1 Outreach	1	1			1			1	1	1	1	1	1	10
2 Advocacy					1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
3 Insurance & Liabilities				1	1	1								6
4 Memberships	1		1		1	1	1	1		1	1	1		5
5 PR		1						1					1	4
6 Annual Conventions	1				1		1							4
7 Education Materials					1	1			1					3
8 Translations						1				1	1			3
9 Student Chapters					1			1						2
10 Short Courses				1									1	2
11 Websites			1											1
12 Continuing Education			1											1
13 Publication Sales	1													1
14 Payroll & Financial Accounting - Audits				1										1
15 Specialist Conferences														0
16 Hard Copy Publications														0
17 Digital Publications														0
18 Newsletters														0
19 Scientific Journals														0
20 Lecture Tours														0
21 Technical Luncheons														0
22 Public Lectures														0
23 Advertising														0
24 Sponsorships														0
25 Trusts & Foundations														0
26 Storage and Archiving														0
27 Awards & Scholarships														0
28 Office space														0

members' strengths	MAC	CIM	GAC	CAG	IAH	CGS	CANQUA	CSPG	CMOS	PDAC	CCPG	NRCAN	CCCESD	CSEG
Advertising	1	1						1						
Advocacy									1				1	
Annual Conventions		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1				1
Awards & Scholarships	1		1			1	1	1	1					
Continuing Education						1								1
Digital Publications			1									1		
Education Materials	1		1						1	1		1		
Hard Copy Publications						1						1		
Insurance & Liabilities		1												
Lecture Tours		1	1			1		1						
Memberships		1	1			1			1	1				
Newsletters	1	1	1				1							
Office space							1							
Outreach			1					1	1	1		1		1
Payroll & Financial Accounting - Audits	1													
PR								1	1					
Public Lectures									1	1				
Publication Sales			1									1		
Scientific Journals	1		1	1			1			1				
Short Courses	1					1	1	1	1					1
Specialist Conferences	1	1	1			1								
Sponsorships						1		1	1					
Storage and Archiving														
Student Chapters				1	1									
Technical Luncheons						1			1					1
Translations			1	1										
Trusts & Foundations			1			1		1	1					1
Websites	1		1			1	1					1		

supply	MAC	CIM	GAC	CAG	IAH	CGS	CANQUA	CSPG	CMOS	PDAC	CCPG	NRCAN	CCCESD	CSEG
Outreach			1					1	2	2		1		1
Advocacy										2			2	
Insurance & Liabilities		2					1	1	1	1				3
Memberships		2	2			1	1		1	1				4
PR		2	2	1		2	1	2	2	1				5
Annual Conventions		2	2	1		2	1	2	2	1			1	6
Education Materials	1		1						1	2		1		7
Translations		1		1										8
Student Chapters			2	2										9
Short Courses	1					1	1	1					1	10
Websites		2		1		1	1					1		11
Continuing Education						1							1	12
Publication Sales			2									1		13
Payroll & Financial Accounting - Audits		2												14
Specialist Conferences	1	2	2			2								15
Hard Copy Publications						1						1		16
Digital Publications				2								1		17
Newsletters	1	1	2				1							18
Scientific Journals	1		2	1				1	1					19
Lecture Tours		1	2			2			1					20
Technical Luncheons						1			2				1	21
Public Lectures									2	1				22
Advertising	1	1							2					23
Sponsorships						1			2	1				24
Trusts & Foundations			1			1			1	2			1	25
Storage and Archiving														26
Awards & Scholarships	2		1			1	1	2	1					27
Office space							1	2						28

Appendix D

CoP/CGC Committees Struck to Investigate Collaboration and the Possibility of Shared Services

Insurance and Liabilities (including the possibility of self-insurance)

Lead : **CIM**
Contributors : PDAC, CCPG

Technical Publications (technical journals, short course and field trip manuals)

Lead : **GAC**
Contributors : MAC, CSPG, CMOS, CANQUA

Internal/External Communications

Lead : **MAC**
Contributors : IAH, CAG, NRCAN, GAC

Memberships

Lead : **CSPG**
Contributors : CMOS, CIM

Lecture Tours

Lead : **CGS**
Contributors : GAC, CMOS, CSPG, CIM

Annual Conventions

Lead : **GAC**
Contributors : CSPG, CSEG, CMOS, CIM, CGS

Jobs/Recruitment

Lead : **CIM**
Contributors : IAH, PDAC, CSPG, CCCESD, CGS, CGEN

Resourcing and In-kind Support

Lead : **CGC**
Contributors : NRCAN, CSPG, GAC