

## MINUTES of the 64<sup>th</sup> GENERAL MEETING OF THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL OF CIVIL ENGINEERS

**21<sup>st</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2016, Athens, Greece**

### **PARTICIPANTS:**

#### **Executive Board (National Delegate = ND):**

<b>Surname, First name</b>	<b>ND</b>	<b>Member Organization</b>	<b>Country</b>
<b>Szymczak, Włodzimierz</b>	President	Polish Chamber of Civil Engineers	Poland
<b>Branco, Fernando</b>	Immediate Past President	Ordem dos Engenheiros	Portugal
<b>Mariani, Massimo</b>	President - Elect, Vice-President	Consiglio Nazionale degli Ingegneri	Italy
<b>Geme, Vija</b>	Honorary Treasurer, Vice - President	Latvian Association of Civil Engineers	Latvia
<b>Natchev, Dimitar</b>	Member	1 <sup>st</sup> ND Union of Civil Engineers in Bulgaria	Bulgaria
<b>Saez, Jose Francisco</b>	Member	1 <sup>st</sup> ND Colegio de Ingenieros de Caminos, Canales y Puertos	Spain
<b>Humar, Gorazd</b>	Member	2 <sup>nd</sup> ND Slovenian Chamber of Engineers	Slovenia
<b>Karanasiou, Maria</b>	General Secretary	-	Greece

#### **National Delegates (NDs) and Other Participants from Member Organizations:**

<b>Surname</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Country</b>
<b>Thurriedl</b>	Klaus	Invited Ass 1 <sup>st</sup> Delegate	Austrian Federal Chamber of Architects and Chartered Engineering Consultants	Austria
<b>Simeonov</b>	Georgi	2 <sup>nd</sup> ND	Union of Civil Engineers in Bulgaria	Bulgaria
<b>Sever</b>	Zvonimir	1 <sup>st</sup> ND	Croatian Chamber of Civil Engineers	Croatia
<b>Paska</b>	Ivan	2 <sup>nd</sup> ND	Croatian Chamber of Civil Engineers	Croatia
<b>Dimitriou</b>	Georgios	1 <sup>st</sup> ND	Cyprus Council of Civil Engineers	Cyprus
<b>Stylianou</b>	Platonas	2 <sup>nd</sup> ND	Cyprus Council of Civil Engineers	Cyprus
<b>Theodotou</b>	Andreas	3 <sup>rd</sup> ND	Cyprus Council of Civil Engineers	Cyprus
<b>Kutruza</b>	Bora	4 <sup>th</sup> ND	Cyprus Council of Civil Engineers	Cyprus
<b>Oztemel</b>	Aydin	5 <sup>th</sup> ND	Cyprus Council of Civil Engineers	Cyprus
<b>Materna</b>	Alois	1 <sup>st</sup> ND	Czech Chamber of Chartered Engineers and Technicians	Czech Republic
<b>Kuda</b>	Frantisek	2 <sup>nd</sup> ND	Czech Chamber of Chartered Engineers and Technicians	Czech Republic
<b>Al Hadithi</b>	Adil	Invited Ass 1 <sup>st</sup> Delegate	EAMC and Federation of Arab Engineers (FAE)	Egypt
<b>Piirsalu</b>	Andres	1 <sup>st</sup> ND	Estonian Association of Civil Engineers	Estonia
<b>Ruben</b>	Tiia	2 <sup>nd</sup> ND	Estonian Association of Civil Engineers	Estonia
<b>Abdelhamid</b>	Marwan	Invited Ass 1 <sup>st</sup> Delegate	World Federation of Engineering Organizations (WFEO) Past President	France
<b>Monfort</b>	Sandrine	1 <sup>st</sup> D AM	Society of Engineers and Scientists of France	France
<b>Svanidze</b>	Iuri	1 <sup>st</sup> ND	Georgian Society of Civil Engineers	Georgia
<b>Kalabegishvili</b>	Mirian	2 <sup>nd</sup> ND	Georgian Society of Civil Engineers	Georgia
<b>Ahrens</b>	Carsten	1 <sup>st</sup> D AM	Institute of German Engineers	Germany
<b>Chatzidakis</b>	Aris	1 <sup>st</sup> ND	Association of Civil Engineers of Greece	Greece
<b>Bardakis</b>	Vassilis	2 <sup>nd</sup> ND	Association of Civil Engineers of Greece	Greece
<b>Szollossy</b>	Gabor	1 <sup>st</sup> ND	Hungarian Chamber of Engineers	Hungary
<b>Coleman</b>	Murt	Invited Ass 1 <sup>st</sup> Delegate	Engineers Irealnd	Ireland
<b>Monda</b>	Nicola	1 <sup>st</sup> ND	Consiglio Nazionale degli Ingegneri	Italy
<b>Hendriksone</b>	Helena	1 <sup>st</sup> ND	Latvian Association of Civil Engineers	Latvia
<b>Caune</b>	Aivars	2 <sup>nd</sup> ND	Latvian Association of Civil Engineers	Latvia
<b>Stragys</b>	Vincentas	1 <sup>st</sup> ND	Lithuanian Association of Civil Engineers	Lithuania
<b>Setkauskas</b>	Ramunas	2 <sup>nd</sup> ND	Lithuanian Association of Civil Engineers	Lithuania

<b>Gonzalez</b>	Alfonso	Invited Ass	1 <sup>st</sup>	World Council of Civil Engineers (President)	Mexico
<b>Fernandez</b>	Alberto	Delegate			
<b>Meyer</b>	Zygmunt	1 <sup>st</sup> ND		Polish Chamber of Civil Engineers	Poland
<b>Soares</b>	Paulo	1 <sup>st</sup> ND		Order of Engineers	Portugal
<b>Jovanovic</b>	Ranka	1 <sup>st</sup> ND		Serbian Chamber of Engineers	Serbia
<b>Moravcik</b>	Lubos	1 <sup>st</sup> ND		Slovak Chamber of Civil Engineers	Slovakia
<b>Zatkalikova</b>	Linda	2 <sup>nd</sup> ND		Slovak Chamber of Civil Engineers	Slovakia
<b>Zadnik</b>	Branko	1 <sup>st</sup> ND		Slovenian Chamber of Civil Engineers	Slovenia
<b>Tankut</b>	Tugrul	1 <sup>st</sup> ND		Turkish Chamber of Civil Engineers	Turkey
<b>Coughlan</b>	Paul	1 <sup>st</sup> ND		Institution of Civil Engineers	UK
<b>Harris</b>	Sean	2 <sup>nd</sup> ND		Institution of Civil Engineers	UK

**Apologies:**

*Surname, First name / Member Organization*

Borg, Ruben Paul  
 Djuranovic, Nebojsa  
 Lachinov, Mikhail  
 Slobodyan, Yaroslav

*Country*

Malta  
 Montenegro  
 Russia  
 Ukraine

**Friday 21<sup>st</sup> October 2016**

### **1. Opening of the Meeting**

ECCE President, Włodzimierz Szymczak, opened the 64<sup>th</sup> ECCE General Meeting thanking and welcoming everyone who joined our Meeting in Athens. He addressed a special welcome to the ECCE guests that joined our meeting, Alfonso Gonzalez WCCE President, Marwan Abdelhamid WFEO Past President, Aidl Al Hadithi FAE General Secretary, Nicola Monda EAMC General Secretary, Vassilis Bardakis ACEG President, Klaus Thurriedl ECEC General Secretary and bAIK Vice Chairman. Also, he welcomed Murt Coleman who attended our meeting as observer of the Engineers Ireland. Last but not least he welcomed Anna Papadopoulou, Vassilis Economopoulos' widow who joined us in order to attend the tribute to Vassilis Economopoulos. He wished a fruitful meeting and a pleasant stay in Athens.

After the opening of the meeting, ACEG President Vassilis Bardakis addressed a welcome speech thanking the European Council of Civil Engineers and stressing its significant value for Civil Engineers for now and for the future.

### **2. Tribute to Vassilis Economopoulos**

Aris Chatzidakis, National Delegate for Greece and TCG representative took the floor to give a tribute speech about Vassilis Economopoulos, ECCE Past President, who passed away one year ago. He took the audience to a trip down memory lane speaking about the life of Vassilis, his professional development and contribution to the civil engineering society and the way they started their involvement in ECCE from the early years of its establishment. The presentation with photographic material can be found [here](#). Marwan Abdelhamid took the floor to say a few words about Vassilis and his involvement in WFEO, describing him as an Engineer of the world. Next, Anna Papadopoulou Vassilis' widow thanked the President and all the ECCE Members and guests for honoring Vassilis and for giving her the chance to be there among the "second family" of Vassilis. Anna Papadopoulou was awarded with an honorary plaque by ACEG President Vassilis Bardakis.

### **3. Introduction of ECCE Members**

All the representatives of the Full and Associate ECCE Members presented themselves and the delegation of their organization to ECCE. Participants are listed in the first couple of pages of the document. Next, the invited guests addressed a short welcome.

### **4. Presentation of the "30 Years of ECCE History" book**

During registration every participant of the meeting received a copy of the "30 Years of ECCE History" book. ECCE President said that the ExBo decided to launch this issue as a piece of history of our organization and also as a bridge connecting our history with our future. The book was based on materials that were gathered by ECCE Honorary President Yrjo Matikainen and also by Vassilis Economopoulos. A lot of work was contributed to this book by ECCE Immediate Past President Fernando Branco and also ECCE Past President Gorazd Humar and ECCE President Włodzimierz Szymczak contributed to the contents of this book. Finally, ECCE General Secretary Maria Karanasiou managed and arranged the proofreading, editing, designing and printing of the book.

Carsten Ahrens took the floor and thanked and congratulated ECCE for producing such a book which refreshes our memory with the history of our organization. He acknowledged the amount of work that one has to put in the production of a book referring to a previous ECCE edition about the Profession of Civil Engineering in which he was involved.

Gorazd Humar took the floor to congratulate ECCE and all those that were involved in the production of the ECCE History book. He said that the book shows briefly what ECCE has done all these years. He highlighted that ECCE has tradition and value which is represented in this book.

WS said that this publication was also used to promote the Individual Membership to ECCE as a couple of pages have been dedicated to this initiative.

## 5. 63<sup>rd</sup> ECCE General Meeting minutes approval

ECCE President asked if anyone has any remark regarding the Minutes from the previous meeting in Madrid.

Prof. Tugrul Tankut took the floor and congratulated ECCE General Secretary for the good work about the minutes which were carefully and precisely prepared and disseminated on time.

### **Resolution 64.1:**

***The Minutes of the 63<sup>rd</sup> ECCE General Meeting in Madrid were unanimously approved by the General Assembly.***

The minutes of the 63<sup>rd</sup> ECCE General Meeting can be found [here](#).

## 6. ECCE brief activity report since March 2016

ECCE President presented the ECCE brief activity report since March 2016. The presentation can be found [here](#).

During the presentation of the activity report ECCE President referred to the idea of identifying the year 2018 as the Year of Civil Engineering. This idea was initially presented by Mr. Dobrucki President of the Polish Chamber of Civil Engineers during our meeting in Warsaw in 2014. WS said that this issue is not closed yet but still under discussion. The idea is to start this Year in autumn 2017 in Warsaw with a big Civil Engineering Conference combined with the ECCE General Meeting. The final meeting ought to be held in Brussels combined with the 3<sup>rd</sup> European Engineers' Day. Between the opening and the closing events several meetings and events are going to be organized in different member countries with varying subjects concerning the civil engineering profession. The subjects for example could be on regulations, on engineering building law, on environment, etc. WS said that he had started discussions with ICE Executive Director and Secretary Nick Baveystock for the possibility of combining in 2018 the European Year of Civil Engineers with the UK Year of Civil Engineers. Sean Harris, ICE delegate, confirmed that 2018 will be the UK Year of the Engineer and for ICE is going to be their 200<sup>th</sup> Anniversary.

## 7. Closing of the project "Footbridges – small is beautiful" book

WS announced to the General Assembly that the ExBo decided to close the project of the "Footbridges – small is beautiful" book and a final decision was reached the previous day during the ECCE ExBo meeting.

Gorazd Humar, ExBo member and former Chairman of the Task Force on Civil Engineering Heritage took the floor. He said that this book was published two years ago and it has been distributed only to some of the ECCE Members. He explained that the book was printed in 2.500 copies and half of them were bought by ECCE Members. Various individuals from all over the world bought about 130 books and the remaining quantity of about 1.100 was bought by ECCE according to the decision of the ECCE ExBo. He said that out of 23 ECCE Member countries only 10 ordered this book. These countries received additional 10 copies of the book free of charge together with the package of ordered books. The 13 countries that didn't buy the book haven't still received this quantity which was from the first package of ECCE giving 10 books free of charge to each member. GH thanked all the ECCE members who contributed to this project as it was quite a hard job to collect all this amount of materials and photos and to create this book. He said that this is a great achievement of ECCE and this book as soon as it was published became a piece of history about the civil engineering achievements in Europe in the field of footbridges. He announced that the conclusion of the ECCE ExBo on how to manage the remaining amount of books was that additional amount of books will be distributed free of charge to all ECCE Members as a recognition to the work ECCE members have done. The ECCE Members that have bought a certain quantity of books and additional quantity of 40 books will be delivered free of charge. The ECCE Members that haven't bought any books will receive 20 books free of charge plus 10 books free of charge that weren't sent from the first package (so in total 30 books). The ECCE Associate Members will receive 3 books free of charge plus two books from the first package of ECCE books (so in total 5 books). ZDI is the only Associate Member that has already received the 2 books free of charge as they had ordered an amount of books in the past. Also, the shipping cost for delivering these books will be covered by ECCE.

## 8. ECCE individual membership and ECCE Card

Fernando Branco, ECCE Immediate Past President took the floor to speak about the ECCE Individual Membership and ECCE Card.

He said that after a few years of discussion and changing the ECCE Articles of Association we have achieved the concept of Individual Membership of ECCE and we adopted the name of European Civil Engineering (EUCivEng). During the past semester the bureaucratic issues were tested and now what we need is that each ECCE Member promotes in their own country the possibility of their members to become ECCE Individual Members.

The presentation regarding the ECCE Individual Membership can be found [here](#). The "European Civil Engineer" is mainly related to the European database that the European Commission wants to create. This database is not a single database but each country has their own database in the Chamber or Authority for Civil Engineers. The idea of the European Commission is to facilitate mobility across the EU countries through those databases that exist in each country. When you become a member of ECCE you get the information that appears on your card directly to your Chamber. Currently, the ECCE Individual Membership is open only to countries that are ECCE Full Members.

**FB invited everyone to translate these slides into each country's language and disseminate them among their members in order to promote our initiative.**

## 9. ECCE Position Papers

FB made an introduction of this topic reminding to the General Assembly that one year it was decided that the ECCE Standing Committees should stop and the work of ECCE should be continued in a different way which is developing Position Papers. Anyone can submit his proposal for a Position Paper or other activity / project to the ECCE ExBo for approval. After the Position Paper is adopted as ECCE position, it will be broadly distributed and sent to Brussels.

### Cyprus Position Paper on Water

George Demetriou, national delegate of the Cyprus Council of Civil Engineers and leader of the working group for the creation of the Position Paper on Infrastructure and Water Management took the floor to inform the General Assembly about the progress of their work.

He initially thanked the ExBo for approving their proposal. He explained the steps that were taken in order to create their proposal and he said that the kick-off meeting was held in July when they identified the content of the Position Paper and the steps that need to be taken for the preparation of it. The most critical point of this discussion was how to prepare a Position Paper that will integrate the experience and views from all the ECCE Member countries and not only from Cyprus. So, it was decided to deal with the main subjects of the Water Management and then give the draft to the ExBo to disseminate it to ECCE Members for comments and proposals. At the current stage a draft paper has been prepared which was presented to the General Assembly. After consultation with the ECCE ExBo the following remarks were made and steps were decided:

- Selection of themes – most important. (A group from technical committee to assess).
- Possible merging and addition/deduction/modification of work.
- Keep format – introduction, position and executive summary.
- Length of paper - close to guidelines.
- Check for duplication or merging of work
- Review/Complete draft.
- Expertise cooperation with Tomas Sancho ex chair of WCCE-president initiative – involvement on draft report.
- Via ExBo – To consider Water expert representatives from ECCE members to comment/suggest on themes of draft paper - open for cooperation with water management professionals in other countries? e.g. flooding, underground water, infrastructure management.
- Consider comments and reviews
- Details to References
- Grammar
- Finalize proposal of position paper to ECCE.

Gabor Szollossy made a remark about the importance of water in Hungary. He informed the GA about the 2<sup>nd</sup> Water Summit that is organized in Hungary in the end of November. He said that he will circulate information among ECCE Members with results from the Water Summit.

## **Spain Position Paper proposal on Professional Mobility 'Facing Europe's professional shortage in civil engineering'**

JFS said that the proposal for the PP has already been disseminated but a few amendments have occurred. He said that we are refurbishing one of the greatest projects assumed by ECCE back in 2005 which is the document of "Civil Engineering Profession in Europe 2005". The idea is to be able to update such documentation and also to add the food for thought to be able to arrange what was called a PP on Professional Mobility. The PP will comprise to documents, the one would be a general database with the updated information about Civil Engineering Profession together with the new information that was address by the Directives about temporary licensure, general system for recognition and other thing which is not directly under the professional domain. This is all the other elements that have to be addressed by professionals to be able to work as hosted professionals in another country. The effect of such information being the most interesting for SMEs, as it is quite possible for bigger corporations to have that information but what is true and it is something that is happening in our chambers is that most of those professionals that are hosted elsewhere have no information whatsoever not only regarding their professional issues but also elements regarding the social security, the health and safety or even their fiscal elements and that is to be added. Regarding the draft of contents what we are about to work is not only about the intra-EU mobility which is quite clear, but together with the facts of elements which are country specific. There is a need for definition, of which are the country-specific elements that would be able to somehow define a professional model or a professional market regarding civil engineering. There is a discussion regarding of what is known as the scope of professional practice in each country which differs what is the professional liability (there are different models regarding professional liability and they do have an impact on potential mobility), the fact of the code of ethics (there is a need to enforce ethics within civil engineering profession). In addition to this there is the element of regulatory status and licensure procedures, and that would be the basic classification of the different countries. Together with that there will be a short briefing regarding extra-EU mobility regulations. Most Chambers are completely ignorant of the importance and the influence that potential Free Trade Agreements bring as a framework for professional mobility for extra-regional mobility. And last but not least there is the discussion for intra-EU regulations and some final elements regarding the recommendations. The idea is to make general recommendations and discuss general concerns about engineering. Engineering is diverse and we have to be able to accept it. It is true that there is a shortage of engineers and if we are to make respectful work in some other country we need to be aware and be able to honor all professional elements regarding the culture.

There will be two types of deliverables. One of them will be the updated Civil Engineering Profession document together with some other Annexes and the other one will bring up intra-EU and extra-EU professional mobility frameworks and some final recommendations as food for thought for all other organizations which are stakeholders for civil engineering profession.

Tugrul Tankut took the floor to ask some questions. He said that he is very interested in this document and studied it very carefully but he was very confused. He said that he had the impression that this work is proposed to review the efforts of the Professional Recognition and Mobility Standing Committee over the last 10 years. JFS replied that one of the basic elements that we have in this topic is the need for compilation of the information. One thing is the combination of the information and one other thing is to be able to have lessons learned from other different frameworks. It's not a review or a type of judgement of the former Professional Recognition and Mobility SC activity.

WS requested the ECCE Member to actively participate in the process of preparation and evaluation of the PP as they have to reflect our common position if it would be possible. We represent the interest of 26 countries and it is difficult to come to a common point but this is the aim.

## **Greece Position Paper proposal on Deregulation**

Aris Chatzidakis took the floor and briefly presented the idea of his proposition to the ExBo for a PP on Deregulation. He said that his proposal was regarding another issue of the Directive which is the Deregulation process. There is an exercise of mutual evaluation if the restrictions to join the profession of CE in each country are too many or too little or if it is justified by the jurisdiction of the laws of community and if we have to demand less for accessing the profession, etc. He said that it is an ongoing process which he finds crucial for the CE profession and he thinks that the preparation of a PP on the topic is very important.

He said that he has already accepted the proposal to tackle this topic in combination with the proposal made by JFS as both items are come up from the implementation of the Directive.

WS asked Aris Chatzidakis and JFS to start their cooperation on this topic as it is very crucial for the CE profession.

Murt Coleman from Engineers Ireland, who attended the meeting as observer, asked if there are any member countries that have regulation and if yes, if they have considered registration.

JFS replied that most of the southern countries are regulated and most of them have a commitment for registration. If regulation and registration is enforced varies and depends on the countries. What happens is mainly based on professional liability and how it is assessed in different countries. Normally, when professional liability is indeed a liability people are more prone to registration whereas when the model is much more a civil case issue which in the end is corporate liability that brings an issue. The other document which is a real failure that we are having now in the Directive and needs to be somehow covered by any other instrument which is in the end professional practice monitoring. JFS stressed that professional practice monitoring is very important issue and it is now placed in the New Directive that there is a need to be monitored by the competent authority this type of practice or be more restricted. What is strange is that engineers are not included in that shortlist. He said that if we want to be a European Union, if someone is forbidden his practice in one country he should be forbidden in the entire EU.

## **10. Engineering Associations of Mediterranean Countries presentation by Nicola Monda**

WS gave the floor to Nicola Monda, General Secretary of the EAMC, to present the EAMC in which ECCE participates as an International Member.

The presentation can be found [here](#).

## **11. "Madrid Declaration, civil engineers, solar thermal energy – logical sequence of concepts of major importance for our environment"**

WS presented to the General Assembly the "Madrid Declaration, civil engineers, solar thermal energy – logical sequence of concepts of major importance for our environment" presentation which can be found [here](#).

WS informed the GA about his intention to submit this presentation to the ECCE ExBo as an ECCE Position Paper.

Murt Coleman asked WS if any other specific suggestions are discussed apart from solar thermal energy that WS suggests in his presentation. WS replied that of course there are many ways and solutions but in this presentation only one was discussed which is narrow point of view. He explained that he showed only one part of the issue due to time limitations.

Carsten Ahrens thanked WS for his presentation and said that even though only one part of the energy supply issue was presented which could be linked to Green Energy, Nuclear Energy, etc. he thinks that it is a very important part of the renewable energy but not the only one and it is important to show the other aspects too.

George Demetriou commented that it is very good to hear from a Polish engineer this kind of approach to energy supply issue knowing that in Poland coal used to be the main way of producing energy.

## **12. Updating of the ECCE Subscription Fees**

JFS took the floor and presented the deliberations and proposal for the ECCE Fees for 2017, on behalf of the ECCE ExBo.

JFS started by describing some prior considerations of the ExBo that brought up the final proposal. One of the activities that was to be addressed by the ExBo referred to the updating of the data of GDP and population that were fed into the methodology for calculating fees. The changes that were observed when changing the data brought up different fees with great increase in fees for several countries. That said, there were also several considerations to be put to the table that will be considered later. We had a problem regarding the source to be used according to which the data should be updated and finally we agreed to use the International Monetary Fund (IMF) report. Another consideration was that the minimum fees hadn't been raised since 2007. Together with this, there is no mechanism to update the minimum fees according to any element of inflation, etc. That said, we had a basic scenario which was just the former methodology applied with the updated data.

JFS showed to the GA the basic scenario highlighting the countries that had big increases such as Russia, Turkey (80% increase), Poland, etc. After some consideration within the ExBo the element that was concerned was that those elements were difficultly bearable and acceptable on the grounds of former budgeting proposals made by national organizations. On such grounds, what we have been discussing is bringing up a mechanism and a proposal to cut the increase of these fees. Several minor changes were made in the effort to keep the maximum change in fees up to a certain percentage and we came up with the proposed scenario.

JFS presented the changes that were made. He said that when we applied the basic scenario, the income was increased approximately by 6.900 Euros with only four countries assuming the 50% of this increase. The proposed changes include a minor increase in the minimum fee and the maximum increase in the fees for all countries have been cut to a 15%. In the basic scenario the value of one share was 2.100 Euros and the minimum fee was 33% of that value which is 700 Euros. That brings a contrast to the membership fee of Associate Members which is 850 Euros. There is an intention of the ExBo to be able to somehow harmonize the values of the minimum membership fee together with the fee for the Associate Members. On such grounds, and in order to be able to limit or cut those elements, the major changes were addressed and will be explained next. Basically, what has been changed from the basic scenario which is only the updating of the data is:

- The minimum membership fee has been increased by 7% on the grounds that there has been no change whatsoever during the last ten years. It is the intention to somehow make a mechanism that would bring up the potential increase of the minimum fees on a yearly basis according to some type of indicator.
- Changes in the categories for the initial shareholder values for reserved matters (Table 1). These changes were made in order to make it possible to reduce the increase of the fees for the countries that had huge increase in their fees (over 30%-40%).

The difference in the income is that in the basic scenario the income is 69.000 Euros and in this proposed scenario is 66.000 Euros. What has happened in the proposed scenario is that the impact has been much more fairly distributed among all member countries.

JFS concluded that this is the ExBo proposal to be put for voting and if this is not approved then we have to go for the basic scenario approach which in the end is much more cumbersome for national members and that would bring up more stress to some current member countries.

Tugrul Tankut said that as he understands the proposal will be put to voting and the decision will be finalized today, but he has the impression that these changes are meant to punish Turkey. He said that when he presented the proposals to his Chamber they said that they will wait for the final decision and then they will consider if they will stay in ECCE or not due to the high increase of the fees. He said that this is up to the Chamber to decide and he cannot do anything about it but he just wanted to reflect the situation.

In this point, WS suggested a break in order to leave time to the delegates to discuss the ideas and think over them and after the break the final proposal will be formed.

JFS added some elements to the discussion in order to explain the situation better. JFS mentioned that the last update of GDP was made in 2007 and updating it after so many years brings big changes to some countries. We are working on a transaction to be able to cut not only for this year but for future years, the maximum increment to be addressed from any country for a period. The period would be each Presidency period, which means that the fees that will be approved now will be the same for 2017 and 2018. JFS said that the maximum increase for the fees for all countries was limited to the value of the minimum ECCE Membership fee which is 800 Euros according to the proposal. This means that the increase to the fees for ECCE Members cannot exceed the amount of 800 Euros.

Zygmunt Meyer commented that from one year to the other there should not be such sharp increases to the fees because the member organizations must prepare their budgets accordingly.

### **Proposal:**

*The proposal that it's put to voting brings the following changes regarding the methodology for the basic scenario.*

*The update of the data of population and the GDP per capita PPP together with a change in the minimum fee provided that all increases in fees will be capped to the maximum amount of 800 Euros. The fees will be valid for the mandate of a President.*

George Demetriou commented that he finds the proposal unfair and that we just need to apply the existing rules and only deal with the countries that end up with a very big increase and not change the methodology.

WS said that if we look at each case separately we will end up with 23 different rules which is not our intention. We are trying to find and propose a common rule that will be applied to calculate the fees for all the countries. We cannot find a solution that will satisfy everyone even if we discuss this matter for years, but we have to move on and take the next steps. The ExBo believes that this proposal is a reasonable compromise for now and the future.

**Resolution 64.2:**

***The proposal of the ECCE Executive Board regarding the ECCE Subscription Fees for 2017 and 2018 was unanimously accepted.***

**13. Common Training Principles project – ECCE working group**

FB made an introduction to the topic. He said that what we are going to discuss now it is something that was discussed 10 years ago. He said that when he joined ECCE ten years ago he became Chairman of the SC on Professional Mobility and at that time there was a Directive on Professional Mobility and there was the beginning of discussion of the New Directive. At that time there was a big issue that was called the Common Platform. The Common Platform was something that appeared in the first Directive and whose idea was to find a kind of metrics where the engineers based on their qualifications could find some kind of updating to be recognized in another country. So, FB at that time he made some research and what he found is that a European civil engineers is something that is very difficult to say what it is because we have different types of academic degrees (3, 4, 5 and 6 years of education), we have different types of education in terms of wide or narrow (in some countries for example a civil engineers is an engineer that knows about foundations, for other countries a civil engineer is someone that knows a bit of hydraulics, infrastructure, geotechnics, and so on). We have different types of conditions to be professionals (in some countries if you have the academic degree you are a civil engineer, in other countries you need to be registered in a Chamber) and we have different types of professional associations. For instant, in southern countries usually we have real professional associations where there is a need to be registered whereas in other countries the associations are more like clubs and not real professional associations. That led to what we call regulated professions and we have countries where the profession is regulated (mostly southern countries) and countries where the profession is not regulated meaning that if you have an academic degree you can be a civil engineer and there are countries where you have partially regulated profession and you are regulated for some acts but not for others. So, this was the situation ten years ago and it is still the present situation. FB said that at that time we had large discussions for a Common Platform, we went to Brussels discussing that and the end we said that it's impossible to have a Common Platform and make these connections among such different types of civil engineers and we pushed for a different solution. And the different solution that appears after in the New Directive is basically two items: Engineers with different education and different formation from one country can be recognized in another country with two types of solution either temporary mobility (it means that you go to another country just to do a specific job and they check if the CV is suitable according to the job and you get authorization for this job) or partial recognition (it means that an engineer who knows only about foundation can go to a country where the engineering education concept is wider and be recognized and authorized only as an engineer who does foundations and not be allowed to do any other type of activity like hydraulics, transportation, etc.). So, this was a solution that came in the present Directive and for us seemed that it was a good solution and at least it could comply with the problems of the recognition of different types of civil engineers. After all this time the problem appears again and the Common Platform is waking up again.

JFS took the floor to continue with the Common Training Framework for Civil Engineers ECCE draft proposal. He said that one element that was presented in the basis for the discussion of final partial recognition was the element regarding Compensation Measures. Compensation measures was an element that was included in the Directive in order to be able to overcome potential dissimilarities or lacks in competence in one country or the other. Because of

the somehow abused or biased interpretation in the application of these compensation measures that brought partial recognition. So, that was the situation until now. What has happened in the evolution of what was called Common Platform in the former Directive is now identified as Common Training Framework. Basic changes between the Common Platform – former Directive and Common Training Framework – current Directive are based on the fact that there is a need for a minor number of supporters from the countries (first it was 2/3, now it is 1/3) when there are also some elements that within the definition of the CTF which is now in Article 49 on the New Directive are working for deregulation not the Eur-Ing but in practice of the factor. So, these considerations will be later discussed. The approach that has been discussed by the ExBo is to be able to focus on two elements. Basically, the ECCE position towards Common Training Frameworks in general and together the major concerns and risks that can be assessed due to CTFs. This is one of the reasons why the amended proposals that were presented have been erased from this document because they would possibly bring noise. The crucial discussion here is to be able to somehow agree to something as we have already done with the fees and create a final document that will be unanimously accepted. There are several major concerns in general that also appear in the CTF that they are also heritage for those former situations.

There is a concern regarding linking professional levels with educational frameworks. One of the discussions here is that the European Commission's approach to some of the topics is clearly inconsistent. The general system states in Article 11 a definition that refers to years of higher education either 4 or more years or 3 years. There is no mentioning whatsoever within the Directive for European Qualification Framework except in one Article that regards Common Training Frameworks. So, in the end it is an inconsistency in general. According to JFS's opinion EC was not bold enough to bring the risk of changing all the system with EQF basically because this is one of the elements that has addressed in some countries. Some countries have not clearly transposed their degrees to an equivalent to EQF and that would bring later problems in assessing that methodology for the general system in the Directive. For example in Spain, CICCIP had to fight with the government for 3 years to get their degrees recognized because as they were being former pre-Bologna degrees they were considered as degrees and not as Master Level. If we hadn't have made that change and if we were going to come to the CTF we wouldn't be able to enter the EQF lower set. So, that is an element that needs to be brought into concern because there are lots of countries that haven't made that change and they are not aware of that risk. But there are even some others that in the end they will be left out, so there is no use if there is going to be a CTF to from the beginning give up the lane for people opting out basically because you are not including them.

Another major concern is the element regarding output oriented requirements. Output oriented requirement and the facts of training are quite broad in the different approach that has been assessed. Basically, because if we go to some guidelines that are directly based on academic elements we are somehow leaving apart some considerations that have been assumed by national authorities regarding which are the elements and disciplines that conform their definition or the adequate competence or the civil engineer that is registered and able to practice in his country. If we only make those elements regarding academics we are losing one of the elements that is important which is the real regulation or the real state of competence to be addressed either by the host country or the guest country. That is addressed on output. In addition to this everything is not academics and is also accepted in the CTF that some vocation training and some experience can be added in order to be able to overcome that request.

The next issue is the scope of competence. As FB recalled we are very similar but we are not much the same and the problem here is that the one who is assessing the problem is not a civil engineer, not even an engineer. There is a need to be able to find common ground and core specifics of what we do similarly because otherwise this is a fake scope of competence. It is rather easy to make it full competence that is what European Commission would like basically because they are not going to hold any responsibility that would be the market.

Another concern is the professional practice monitoring. The professional practice monitoring is one of the biggest deficiencies we are now having with the Directive, the former and the current one. If we have malpractice in civil engineering profession we are risking public health. We are responsible as professional organizations to be able to hint which are the inconsistencies of the European Commission and to safeguard the final interest not only of our organizations but society in general.

Another concern is regarding liability. It is unthinkable that someone is able to practice some physical risk as a building without liability requirements. We need to bring common sense to these regulations and most of those activities and the monitoring are done by professional organizations which now in the ruling that we have in the Directive, especially in the CTF, are sidelined in favor of competent authorities which in some cases are also professional organizations. So, we somehow need to dedicate such role.

JFS said that this task group is reluctant to support this implementation of the CTF, because the potential benefit of the implementation does no overcome neither the implementation efforts, nor the implementation risks that can be brought up due to a faulty regulation. At least, the task group feels responsible not to be able to accept neither deregulation nor faulty regulation. It's our responsibility if we are to accept regulation to make it efficient, effective

and streamlined, otherwise we will be accused as bureaucrats which we are now somehow having at the other side of the table saying us that we are to blame for all the different inconsistencies in the regulation of our market.

Last but not least, there are two topics that can be brought up in the conclusion. It is true that CTF requires an ex ante fail-safe proposal as there is no need for experiments and educated guess. JFS said that this profession and all of us require the dignity to not be played as guinea pigs for some type of European Commission experiment. In another thing, the other end is that if ever a CTF needs to be addressed together for better regulation it is true that it needs further thinking and even questioning its former principles that were not assessed by the profession but the European Commission itself. So, somehow they need to be indicated and challenged. JFS said that any initiative regarding CTF referent to our profession needs ECCE to be involved in this proposal. JFS highlighted the need for ECCE to be present as ECCE (and only represented through its national members independently) in general common principles in any type of the proposal mostly indicating those elements that may be in principle contrary to the rules that are presented by the European Commission, but somebody has to talk about that. In addition to this, this topic is one of the crucial elements regarding the future of our member organizations and the members of our member organizations. On such grounds the idea is to be able to extend the scope of this task group together with the addition of what was considered before by Aris Chatzidakis regarding making an overall assessment of the different initiatives that have been assessed by the European Commission with the aim of better regulation or deregulation which are now CTF, the transparency exercise regarding deregulation and last but not least professional card.

Tugrul Tankut said that he was unaware of such an activity of ECCE until recently when he received this document and he has developed certain concerns. He said that he understands that EU Directives define CTF for civil engineers and he understands that ECEC have held a stakeholder workshop in June and on the basis of the discussions there they have prepared a draft and now we as ECCE are introducing certain modifications on that draft to develop an ECCE point of view which will be reflected by this Position Paper. He asked if what he understands is right.

JFS said that the issue here now and the topic we are now discussing on the document that was presented rather than bringing a proposal or enriching the proposal of ECEC is based on being able to indicate which are the major concerns of the ECCE. Former documentation was presented with some amendment proposals in order to be food for thought for potential work from this assembly onwards.

Tugrul Tankut said that he understands that ECEC and ECCE will take the case and views to Brussels authorities and try to modify the Directives if possible. TT said that when he was reading this document all of a sudden he came across references to the annexes at the end. Annex 1 defines European Civil Engineer Master Level, Bachelor level and so on. Chartered engineering system in his opinion is quite a different system. This CTF concerns mainly the educational background and when it comes to certification as a Chartered Engineer it is a totally different matter which requires a totally different system. In his opinion such a Certification System should never be related to the background education. It should be based on, as we see a number of examples in certain countries, examinations testing the basic principles of the candidate and it should be based on experience reflecting competent practice, and otherwise educational background can be anything as far as such a Certification System is concerned. He concluded saying that this was the main concern that he would like to express. Also he said that he fails to understand the relationship between the two when we were expressing our concerns on the CTF we all of a sudden make reference to a Certification System.

JFS said that the issue here is that we are suffering from a faulty multi-blend. What has been blended regarding the European Commission is trying to be able to address it other from an academic background which somehow in some of the countries also resembles the scope of competence of the final professional card. If you were discussing regarding the fact of the certification it may have been a wrong ratification but the point is referred to the documentation of the bureaucracy that is to be requested to any professional to be able to somehow declare either by a competent authority or by some other organization that he's got his capacity for license understanding that this element is addressed for non-regulated countries. JFS said that he is aware that the certification mechanisms are quite different and for example in Spain you become fully competent just after your degree, so there are several models that somehow were to be mixed. That was basically one of the elements of discussion and that is always brought up basically because professional mobility should be the key to a door which is a progress. For how it is read, the fact is that European Commission has already the key and is trying for somebody else to publish a door for themselves. So, the issue we are having here is that there are too many topics blended and messed up which are different in nature and it is very difficult to project that to the European Commission.

**Saturday 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2016**

#### **14. ECCE Management Accounts until October 2016 and budget for 2017**

ECCE Vice President – Honorary Treasurer, Vija Geme presented to the General Assembly the ECCE management accounts until October 2016 to inform them about the financial status of ECCE. All ECCE Members have fulfilled their financial obligations to ECCE apart from Russia which is not still clear if they will join ECCE or not and Ukraine.

Following this, the proposal for the ECCE Budget 2017 was presented to the General Assembly.

#### **Resolution 64.3:**

***The ECCE Budget for 2017 was approved unanimously by the ECCE General Assembly.***

#### **15. Forthcoming ECCE General Meeting**

WS said that the situation is a little bit complicated at the moment because over the past few months he had negotiations and discussions with our Russian member about organizing the next ECCE General Assembly in Moscow. There have been contacts and correspondence even with the Deputy Minister of Constructions and Infrastructure because Russia intended to establish a new entity for civil engineers that would become the Russian ECCE National Member in the place of the old one and once this entity was created Russia would be reactivated in ECCE and fulfill the past financial obligations. The Deputy Minister found the idea of organizing the Spring General Meeting in Moscow very interesting and he was positive about it and promised to keep us informed about this topic and about the progress of the creation of this new body that would activate in ECCE. Unfortunately, a few days before our GM in Athens we received a letter from Mikhail Lachinov stating that the planned action for organizing this special entity in Russia gathering all the Russians organizations acting on the field of civil engineering is stopped due to political obstacles. WS said that they had promised him that they would reactivate in ECCE from the second half of 2016 but it seems that all our plans concerning Russia have stopped now. He said that Mikhail Lachinov advised him in his letter to undertake a direct contact with the Deputy Minister and we will see what the result will be. Therefore, we cannot organize our spring GM in Moscow.

WS made a request to the ECCE Members to consider hosting the 65<sup>th</sup> ECCE GM in spring 2017 and send their offers.

#### **16. Closure of the ExBo Mandate**

WS said that the past couple of years the ECCE Executive Board consisted of himself as a President, Fernando Branco (Portugal) as Immediate Past President, Massimo Mariani (Italy) as Vice President / President Elect, Vija Geme (Latvia) as Vice President / Honorary Treasurer, Jose Francisco Saez Rubio (Spain) as Member, Dimitar Natchev (Bulgaria) as Member and Gorazd Humar (Slovenia) as Member. He said that in the ECCE ExBo works actively took part ECCE General Secretary Maria Karanasiou.

WS then briefly described the activities that ECCE ExBo undertook during his Presidency. The presentation can be found [here](#).

He closed his speech as a President saying that he hopes that he gives ECCE to the new President in a good shape and he expressed his appreciation to all ExBo Members for the cooperation over the past two years. He also highlighted the professional development of the General Secretary and thanked her for her assistance to the ExBo.

#### **17. Continuation of discussion about CTP Project**

WS asked Klaus Thurriedl CTP Project Director and ECEC Secretary General, to share with the ECCE Members his view on the CTP project.

Klaus Thurriedl took the floor and thanked WS and all ECCE Members for having him in our meeting. He said that he will give some background information regarding the project and what has happen until now and what will happen after that meeting. He said that last year, in November, the European Commission DG GROWTH and the Department 4 of cross-border services invited ECEC for a tender to make an offer to make a survey on what is going on in Europe about different regulation (it's only about regulated profession and in this case for regulated engineers) and then make a proposal on Common Training Principles. He said that yesterday we talked only about Common Training Framework but Article 49 speaks about Common Training Principles. This means that there are two possibilities to have a Common Training Test or to have the Common Training Principles. This should lead to mutual automatic recognition. He said that JFS told us yesterday that at the moment we have general procedure every single person for the service settling down in another country (not for one project as we said yesterday) has to have this procedure for recognition, every single case between the host country and the candidate country. The digitals think that the things would be better for the market to have this mutual recognition especially in regulated professions. So, they have invited FEANI and another company that was a legal advisor and ECEC had the best offer. He said that they had a kick-off meeting in Brussels, in April and then they started with the questionnaire to all competent authorities of countries of the EU and all Engineering Associations. So, especially ECCE was from the first minute a partner of this project. Mr. Frohn also told them that they should have a contact to FEANI who lost and didn't get the award. He said that the questionnaire was a hard thing to do and they got a very different picture now from the survey that's about the regulated engineering profession in Europe. KT said that out of this survey they made a first proposal after the first stakeholder workshop in Vienna and in a few days they have a Conference. Out of this workshop the first proposal has the two levels and it was common sense among the project team and all their partners that we do not accept that it is possible to substitute academic training with vocational training. But this first proposal was rejected by the European Commission because it is against the Article 49 and they had to change it as this way it was legally inadmissible and they added the word "equivalent". The word "equivalent" is still the core and it is possible to replace academic training through vocational training. On 27<sup>th</sup> October the stakeholder conference will be held in Vienna and he said that ECCE's comments are needed before the conference. After the stakeholder conference it is necessary to submit the final proposal on the Common Training Framework because the Common Training Test was considered as too complicated but in fact it turns out that the Common Training Framework is also very complicated. He added that after the submission of this proposal the Commission is not bounded to it and it's up to the Commission to set up a dedicated Legal Act and if the majority of the Member States accept this proposal then it can become a guideline in Europe. But at this stage of the project we don't know what the Commission will do.

Aris Chatzidakis said that he participated in the ECCE CTP working group and he would like to say a few words about the whole procedure. He said that he is afraid that the Commission is trying to over simplify things but this is not possible. They want to find a quite easy way to say that this is equal or equivalent in a very complicated situation and he doesn't know if we can satisfy such an ambition. It has been too many years that we have been trying to do this but without any success because it is true that we have a very complicated situation among the EU Members and he doesn't think that it would be acceptable by the National Organizations and the administration to admit that their system is not good anymore and that is needs to be simplified. He stressed out that it is very difficult to have a commonly agreed position on this topic in such a short time.

Sean Harris from ICE took the floor and said that the ICE process under the current proposals wouldn't be eligible and the ECTS would have them to opt out. In ICE the fact that somebody qualifies you with a degree isn't enough qualification and for them it requires another five years of training and a professional review over chartered professional competences. In UK it is an unregulated profession so you don't have to have a qualification in order to practice to be a civil engineer but the ICE will give a professional qualification of chartered requires MSc, plus five years' experience, plus the professional review and then every year thereafter Continuous Professional Development assessment. So, from the ICE's perspective they would like to be part of the working group to develop what was referred by Klaus as the "equivalent". If the CTP is supposed to rule the current proposal is restricted and the ICE would have to withdraw from the CTP because they wouldn't be eligible. He said that ICE would offer to people to the working group to try to develop outputs as opposed to inputs.

Zvonimir Sever, President of the Croatian Chamber of Civil Engineers (CCCE) announced to the General Assembly the CCCE statement regarding the CTF which was also sent to ECEC. The statement is as follows:

1. Basic University education could not be replaced with any case of training or experience.
2. Training or experience has the duty to extend the knowledge, not to replace basic education.

3. Training or experience is the base for routine job.
4. Knowledge is the base for investigation, invention and creation in Construction projects conceiving and development.

JFS said that what was presented was the basis for identifying the potential concerns of ECCE within the CTF. There are some elements that are mainly based on the scope of competence, the automatic recognition, and the vocational training and education. It seems that these are the hot spots and it seems to be quite difficult to make a transaction on those elements. It also seems clear that somehow requirements for access need to be redefined or at least clarified. This is something which we agree on and this is important as in the end it is correspondent to the core of what is one of the ideas that is behind the Commission's CTF. In addition to this he referred to what Klaus said earlier regarding the first proposal that was submitted to the Commission and was rejected as unacceptable. He said that if we are working on a proposal that it is not going to be used and it will only be food for thought he doesn't see the point why the Commission would consider it inadmissible and would require to change it. He said that one thing that we should do is to be able to identify which are all the weak spots that we find that did the work in the European Commission because in the end these are the conditions that would be very difficult to overcome. He said that he is not sure if there are other topics that aroused yesterday and that have been consciously or unconsciously available for common ground. One of them is the fact of practice monitoring, also the liability insurance and the assessment of education and training.

Fernando Branco said that the document of JFS presents several concerns about the problems that exist and besides that we understood that some countries, at least ICE, clearly said that they don't agree totally with this and they step out. He said that he thinks that the document could be organized in a way that shows the concerns and saying also that some of our members will step out of this agreement if it goes on. So, besides the concerns the document should also state that there is clear disagreement from some of our members.

Sean Harris said that in order to be clear, this is not ICE adopting sort of a Brexit position but this is ICE saying that under the conditions of the paper they wouldn't be eligible and they have to opt out because they don't conform.

JFS said that those elements regarding potential opt outs should be included under the major concern that refers to what is the relevance regarding the access and the discussion between the forms of training.

Murt Coleman asked if the CTF is to facilitate mobility in Europe and the condition seems to be regulation of the authorization and secondly how does it suit with the Washington Accord and the Dublin Accord and the Sydney Accord.

JFS said that the problem regarding the Washington Accord is a different approach regarding substantial equivalence of our academics. Those elements for substantial equivalence for academics are based on the need for potential mobility purposes mostly between countries which not only require academic requirements in order to practice but also experience in addition to the academic degrees. There wouldn't be so much impact on the grounds that the Washington Accord although it is on a global basis, is a private Accord made by different institutions that accept the substance of equivalence. It is not signed by governments. Regarding the first question, he said that the idea is that in the end there is another tool available for potential automatic recognition in case of mobility for professionals and in the end for firms. What happens is that it can be an additional tool or otherwise it can be a substitute. In the end what happens is that in the short term if there is a much easier way to be able to come to a total recognition, we are working about that substitute. If we are about to substitute the status of our framework, the former framework may be good or bad but it has become quite robust over the eight years of applying, whereas the new one, we build it from scratch. But even then, there is a need to maintain all the former requisites that were presented in the other one. The issue here is that it is difficult to address a Common Training Test, it is impossible that we concur especially with the diversity of engineering and it's really difficult to face the problem with the Common Training Framework basically because we are trying to be able to solve something that in the end is the diversity of professional models in Europe. So, the issue we are about to discuss here is that they are trying to simplify something because they are completely unaware of which are the repercussions.

Tugrul Tankut said that in the text there is a reference in the Annex where the Certification system is described, the Chartered Civil Engineering system, and he can't see any relationship of this Certification System with the CTF document which deals primarily with the education. The Chartered Engineering System is something totally different and not to be included. Therefore, his concrete proposal is that those Annexes should be taken out.

JFS said that the Annex shouldn't have been included in the document and it was about to be eliminated and only the concerns are to be expressed.

Alois Materna (Czech Republic) said he is very depressed and he recommends that everyone should go through the Directive and look at the Architects example. He said that if want to be EU we must regulated and our profession should be regulated because it is in public interest to have such a situation. He said that we must unify and be once like the Architects.

JFS said that he concurs with Alois Materna and the Architects were able to do this because the basic framework that was used was one of the most restricted applicable in Europe. So, it's much easier to go from the very restricted to a more loosened one whereas here the proposal has been the other way round.

## 18. Acceptance of new ECCE Member

WS closed this chapter of the discussion and announced to the General Assembly that the voting for accepting the Austrian Chamber of Engineers as an ECCE Full Member will take place.

### Resolution 64.4:

***The Federal Chamber of Architects and Chartered Engineering Consultants / Section for Chartered Engineering Consultats / Federal Expert Group for Civil Engineering was unanimously accepted as ECCE Full Member by the ECCE General Assembly.***

## 19. ECCE Elections 2016

WS announced the commencement of the elections procedure. The first duty is to form the supervisory committee for the elections. The supervisory committee consists of the following persons:

1. Wlodzimierz Szymczak (President) as defined in the ECCE AoA
2. Fernando Branco (ECCE Immediate Past President) as defined in the ECCE AoA
3. George Demetriou (Cyprus National Delegate) volunteered and accepted unanimously by the ECCE GA

WS explained that the elections will be held in two phases. In the first phase five (5) persons will be elected who together with Massimo Mariani as President and Wlodzimierz Szymczak as Immediate Past President will form the new ECCE Executive Board. At this point WS asked the six candidates to briefly present themselves to the General Assembly. He explained that all six candidates were assessed as valid by the ECCE ExBo.

The candidates are the following:

1. Aris Chatzidakis (Greece)
2. Paul Coughlan (UK)
3. Dimitar Natchev (Bulgaria)
4. Andres Piirsalu (Estonia)
5. Jose Francisco Saez Rubio (Spain)
6. Iuri Svanidze (Georgia)

The elections for the New ECCE Executive Board and Vice President / President Elect (2016 – 2018) were held in two phases according to the Articles 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the ECCE Articles of Association. The voting countries were 19 and are presented in the following table:

COUNTRY	NAME / SURNAME
1	Bulgaria
	Dimitar Natchev

2	Croatia	Zvonimir Sever
3	Cyprus	George Demetriou
4	Czech Republic	Alois Materna
5	Estonia	Andres Piirsalu
6	Georgia	Iuri Svanidze
7	Greece	Aris Chatzidakis
8	Hungary	Gabor Szollossy
9	Italy	Nicola Monda
10	Latvia	Helena Endriksone
11	Lithuania	Vincentas Stragys
12	Poland	Zygmunt Meyer
13	Portugal	Paulo Soares
14	Serbia	Ranka Jovanovic
15	Slovakia	Lubos Moravcik
16	Slovenia	Branko Zadnik
17	Spain	Jose Francisco Saez Rubio
18	Turkey	Tugrul Tankut
19	United Kingdom	Paul Coughlan

The results of the voting process are presented in the following table:

Surname / Name	Country	Number of votes
<b>CHATZIDAKIS Aris</b>	Greece	18
<b>COUGHLAN Paul</b>	United Kingdom	11
<b>NATCHEV Dimitar</b>	Bulgaria	13
<b>PIIRSALU Andres</b>	Estonia	18
<b>SAEZ RUBIO Jose Francisco</b>	Spain	15
<b>SVANIDZE Iuri</b>	Georgia	15

**Resolution 64.5:**

**After the elections procedure the ECCE Executive Board for 2016 – 2018 is thereafter composed of the following persons:**

<b>Massimo Mariani</b>	<b>President</b>
<b>Włodzimierz Szymczak</b>	<b>Immediate Past President</b>
<b>Aris Chatzidakis</b>	<b>Vice President/ President Elect</b>
<b>Dimitar Natchev</b>	<b>Vice President / Treasurer</b>

<b>Jose Francisco Saez Rubio</b>	<b>Executive Board Member</b>
<b>Andres Piirsalu</b>	<b>Executive Board Member</b>
<b>Iuri Svanidze</b>	<b>Executive Board Member</b>

Immediately after the announcement of the Elections results the New ECCE President Mr. Massimo Mariani addressed his first speech to the ECCE General Assembly.

## **20. Official close of the 64<sup>th</sup> ECCE General Meeting**

The 64<sup>th</sup> ECCE General Meeting was closed officially by the ECCE Immediate Past President Wlodzimierz Szymczak.

Minutes prepared by: Maria Karanasiou  
ECCE General Secretary