



*The Council of European Geodetic Surveyors*

*Comité de Liaison des Géomètres Européens*

*27 March 2002*

**STANDING COMMITTEE OF CLGE**  
**Brussels, Belgium, 26 Jan 2002, 10.00 – 15.00**

*MINUTES*

---

**Venue**            **Maison du Géomètre, Union Belge des Géom, Rue du Nord 76, 1000 BRUSSELS**

---

**Participants**   **Henning Elmstroem** (chair), Klaus **Rürup**, Gerda **Schennach**, Rene **Sonney**,  
Bernard **Bour**, Martin **Coulson**, Jean-Jacques **Derwael**, Emmanuel **Ouranos**, Felix  
**Peckels**, Vaclav **Slaboch**

**Apologies**      Stig **Enemark**, Otmar **Schuster**

---

## **1. Opening**

CLGE Vice-President H. Elmstroem chairs the SC meeting for the first time and opens the meeting with a welcome to all participants. He gives a short statement about his own expectations for the future. CLGE should become the leading organisation for the profession in Europe and it should be the only organisation for surveyors in Europe. These vision can only be realised by reducing the non producing costs and improving the communication.

There are a number of reservations about this very strong representation of the North in CLGE from some members of the SC. E. Ouranos proposes to continue the discussion for new statutes to get a second Vice-President and to replace regional representatives by representatives of special interest groups.

## **2. Reports of the Working Parties (initially item 3)**

### **Report of the WP on Education**

The WP has been closed. The translation of the Delft seminar report has not yet started. J-J. Derwael investigated if translation is feasible by the EU. There are no possibilites for external papers. G. Schennach proposes to get the booklet translated by professionals of the national member associations to keep it cheap and to get good quality by native speaker professionals. H. Elmstroem considers the translation to be a national responsibility for each member association. Translated copies could be posted on the website.

V. Slaboch proposes to continue the WP for implementation of ideas and distribution of the results of the Delft seminar. It is agreed that this will be proposed to the General Assembly in Lausanne.

### **Report of the WP on Property Report**

Chairperson S. Enemark is not attending and therefore no report is given. The SC has decided earlier this year to fund a research grant with estimated costs of about 10 000,-- Euro. A project plan

and a proposal for this joint CLGE/FIG project is obligatory, S. Enemark is in charge to produce a project plan and present this in the GA in Lausanne and one week later in the FIG meetings in Washington.

### **Report of the WP on Market Report**

E. Ouranos reports about proceedings. The proposal of Malaga was to nominate as new chair of the WP O. Schuster. M. Coulson considers the proposal for the project by O. Schuster in Malaga to be quite complicated and the amount of work for the national associations to be too much. The proposal has to identify clearly what the WP intends to deliver. Important issues are how the market is developing and where future activities will focus. K. Rürup reminds that the WP found out earlier that there are no exact figures available in all countries. A good estimate of the size of the market can prove the importance of the surveying profession as part of the EU market. E. Ouranos points out that figures are very unprecise and for some countries only general figures are available due to black market e.a. In these cases the WP will use salaries, they are available and make an estimation of the figures possible. O. Schuster will be asked to present a report at the next General Assembly in Lausanne. This will only be possible if he gets the figures at least one month before the meeting.

### **Report of the WP on Quality**

F. Peckels, chair of the WP, reports that he did not get one single answer to this circulated draft report. He is nearly alone with his work and requests more new members. He proposes that one person from outside the WP has to check the report from another point of view. M. Coulson proposes to add more introduction and more explanation about the ideas of the report to the draft. The focus of the report is a review of the national quality framework in the countries. H. Elmstroem suggests that M. Coulson assists in defining the purposes of the report. A final draft will be prepared for Lausanne, publication should be done in autumn 2002. V. Slaboch reports about a EuroGeographics seminar on implementation of quality of European mapping agencies in November 2001 in Prague. Results have been published in booklets, which are handed over to Felix. Further presentations on quality issues will be given in the FIG Congress in Washington.

## **3. Report of the ExBoard Meeting in Bottrop, 11-12 Jan 2002**

K. Rürup has hosted the ExBoard Meeting in Bottrop. The local newspaper reported about this event, a copy is circulated.

Conclusions from the meeting are that CLGE must act more politically and promote the ideas outside the profession. Key words for the future are consumer protection, data protection e.a. CLGE will be successful only if there is a better approach to the publics and to the politicians in the EU. The organisational structure regulated by the statutes and internal rules has to be improved. Activities have to be promoted in the public by means of participation in discussions and WPs and by developing the website. WPs have to look for a timescale and strictly hold on it. Some of the activities and services have to be contracted out and as the budget is limited CLGE will have to find funds. A merger of CLGE and GE will be discussed further. Contacts with RICS will be continued, a meeting with the RICS president will soon take place.

Every national member association has to take care of the Allan Report and its updating and should provide a translation for the members within their national association. Former CLGE President P. Prendergast is suggested to stay for ESF and GATS issues as he has got a lot of experience with these two groups.

H. Elmstroem proposes to implement a website with searching machines, links to national associations and possibilities for members to change content concerning themselves on their own

responsibility.

E. Ouranos refers to the strategy of CLGE, which is the only way to get to an European level and to represent our profession as a union.

#### **4. CLGE Strategy (initially item 3)**

Statutes and Internal Rules have to be adjusted. The current status shows three layers of organisation, the General Assembly, the Standing Committee and the Executive Board. The costs for ExBo and SC are one third of the budget. The GA is the most important meeting, where important issues are discussed with all delegates. The role of the SC as a medium layer between GA and ExBo has to be reconsidered and how can the information from the SC meetings to the national member organisation not represented in the SC be improved. New Statutes and Internal Rules have to clarify procedures.

B. Bour points out that it has been decided that the regional representatives in the SC are responsible to inform the other members represented by them. K. Rürup wants to clear the basic function of the SC. If it is seen as a strategic group more decisions are needed. Decisions must be taken in a very short time. G. Schennach proposes to define missing regulations about decisions, if SC is considered to be a consulting group to the EB we will have to find regulations for the EB in the statutes and internal rules.

E. Ouranos sees the main task of the SC to produce proposals and to prepare decisions for the GA. The EB has to execute the decisions. If the EB is obliged to take the decisions you diminish the power of the GA. H. Elmstroem proposes that statutes and internal rules will be circulated with the minutes and comments will be welcome and considered for a draft to the GA.

#### **5. CEPLIS and other links (eg GE, WPLA, FIG, EuroGeographics ...)**

B. Bour circulates the CEPLIS newsletter. He reports that CEPLIS was not admitted to take part in the social dialogue in Europe. CEPLIS has joint its efforts with UEAPME (European Association of Craft, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises) for more efficiency but keeping full independency. The two offices are in the same building, ECOSOC (UN Economic and Social Council) with two CEPLIS members in the Board will be very close to this building. ECOSOC could fund CEPLIS activities to a great extent.

CEPLIS held an interesting SC meeting chaired by Mr. Stoodley from the EC about mutual recognition of diplomas in Europe, Mrs. Froehlinger chaired a second session about internal market of services. B. Bour and K. Rürup attended the meetings. In France there are many difficulties with both directives which open the profession to BAC + 3 people from some other EU-countries to practice in France. Ireland has changed to BAC + 5. Mr. Stoodley has informed that all sectoral regulations will disappear end of 2002 by a new general directive on mutual recognition which will be voted on in the EP end of 2002. There are efforts to get an appendix with some specificities to consider our profession. BAC + 5 + 2 years training is proposed the minimum qualification for an European engineer. The next GA of GE in Paris on 22 February 2002 will discuss about the content of the appendix of the General directive considering our profession. For details see the FEANI (European Federation of National Engineering Associations) website [www.feani.org](http://www.feani.org).

In France the profession goes the contrary way to European liberalisation trends, by getting a very strong protection of the profession (for example land has to be surveyed before you sell it). BUKO, the Interprofessional Austrian organisation is no longer member in CEPLIS.

E. Ouranos reminds that FEANI is very important for the profession, there is a Greek representative of each profession in FEANI. M. Coulson mentions that not all schools are put on the FEANI database which will be necessary to practice on European level. It might be that „Fachhochschule“

is agreed by FEANI. A lot of unimportant local schools are now calling themselves universities and trying to get into the profession. H. Elmstroem sees a need for national activities and proposes to send out the directive for comments to national associations. A responsible person has to be appointed only to manage the European papers to be sure that all items are discussed from the beginning as statements must be brought in at the starting stage, afterwards it is without effect. The FECP paper (Forum of European Construction Professionals) is enclosed. FECP is a small group not a competitor to CLGE focussing on engineering surveying and constructing surveying.

M. Coulson doubts that CEPLIS is representing the interests of the profession after joining the UEAPME. K. Rürup proposes that CLGE as European Group should prepare and represent a joint opinion in the sessions of FIG rather than to represent national interests. This is not agreed as FIG delegates are mainly sent by their national organisations which are different to the members of CLGE. E. Ouranos summarizes that in special cases issues could be discussed within CLGE to find a common strategy in the following discussions towards FIG.

## **6. Accounts 2001 (initially item 2)**

Treasurer R. Sonney has not received contributions of Bulgaria, they will get a reminder in February with announcement that they will be expelled unless they pay until a deadline. The bank needs a confirmation that a new treasurer has been elected, G. Schennach will prepare this paper and send it to Rene.

E. Ouranos suggests in order to save expenses to chose cheap meeting venues. The central place is not the best place.

H. Elmstroem will try to get funds for other countries like the Baltic States to get new members.

## **7. Future events**

1st Congress on Cadastre mid of May in Spain, participation of CLGE has to be clarified.

Program for the next CLGE GA in Lausanne is finished, invitations will be circulated mid of February.

Summer SC Meeting probably 19/20 July 2002 in or near Innsbruck.

## **8. Any other business**

K. Rürup visited Malta on 3-4 January 2002 attending a meeting of the ExBo of MALTESE association. They have strong expectations in CLGE to help them to change their law. There are no strict regulations for surveyors on boundary measurements. The architects have the whole license for property surveying although they deliver it to the surveyors in practice. F. Peckels reports that in Luxemburg they intend to liberalize the profession.

Closing of the meeting with thanks to J-J Derwael for hosting.

Gerda Schennach  
Secretary-General

Enclosures: Statutes  
Internal rules  
FECP Paper Problems on mutual recognition

D:\Eigene Dateien\CLGE\MinutesStandComBrussels2002.doc