Minutes of the July 18, 2012 EDTF – CIE Subgroup meeting

Room 210, 40 Sheppard Ave. West, Toronto

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

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

The meeting started at 7:04 pm.

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

2. **Approval of June 19th, 2012 meeting minutes and follow up on action items**
   The June 19th minutes were reviewed and approved without amendment. Motion to approve: Peter/Tyson; passed. All follow up items were completed.

   Tyson reported that he was in the process of revising Version 1, and had identified a number of gaps;
   - We should be using IP based protocol instead of "cyber" since we are not going to be engineering the internet, just our systems and networks;
   - There should be conclusions for each section;
   - More content should be moved to the Appendix to keep the document lean and succinct;
   - Threats to all 10 critical infrastructure areas should be spelled out, not just financial and utilities; and
   - There should be a common theme and structure throughout the report, namely, Design, Implementation, Oversight and Audit; and
   - The table of contents should be leaner and only have 2 levels of headings.

   Tyson indicated that he was going to upload his comments the next day.

   It was agreed that we need to adopt a protocol for editing the merged document to avoid situations where someone edits the document while someone else has the document checked out. To do this, it was requested that reviewers always check out the document so others know it is checked out and they should not make any changes which could be lost when the first reviewer checked it back in. Checking out should not last longer than a couple of hours.

   There was also discussion about the intended audience of the report. It was concluded that it would be Council, the engineering profession, PEO staff and volunteers who would be implementing the content, and government staff.

The discussion continued about the Purpose section of the report, which is the essential "story line" giving shape to the report. It was recommended that a brief recap of critical infrastructure be added, as well as "good character" determination as evidenced by security clearances. There should be some reference to Stuxnet's novelty in altering code in machines, as well as its being reverse engineered and in the public domain.

With respect to the section on Complaints & Discipline, the staff comments were reviewed. Much of the first paragraph's comments were deemed inapplicable since the staff reviewer did not have access to the entire report, only the complaints & discipline section. It was suggested that the process description be removed as superfluous for the report, and that the application of complaints & discipline to limited licence holders be mentioned, as well as the implications of professional practice guidelines and standards for Disciplinary hearings of evidence of good and reasonable engineering practice. It was also suggested that competent professional practice in CIE include staying current with technical and news reports, as CIE is a fast-developing field (particular malicious external threats which appear to be increasing in frequency, intensity, and impact). Risk management is considered to be a key engineering activity for CIE.

Actions: Tyson to complete his red-lined comments and upload them to Central Desktop for everyone else to review. **Everyone** to send comments to Colin regarding the Complaints & Discipline section.

3. **Timelines for Phase 2 Report**
   There was discussion on the timing for presenting the draft report to Council. While it is unlikely that the report would be ready by September's Council meeting (September 4th for submission), there would be merit in providing Council with a progress update in the form of an Information briefing note. This is separate from a request to stand down the EDTF later this year once it has submitted its final NME and CIE reports to Council, to be replaced by a standing committee on Emerging Disciplines. It is recommended that the standing committee be funded on the same basis as the EDTF.

4. **Adjournment**
   Motion to adjourn: Colin/Peter – passed. The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 pm.
   Next meetings: Wednesday, August 15, 2012, and Wednesday, September 19, 2012, 6-9pm.