President’s Message

The Annual Report provides a snapshot of the many activities that have engaged staff, Council members, and volunteers during the past year, and gives you, our members, the opportunity to reflect on the work of the Institute. From my perch as President, it is rewarding to see so much accomplished and to see CIP’s work carried out with enthusiasm and passion – those key values that inspired so many of us to become planners in the first place.

Like most professional organizations, CIP strives to deliver activities that align most closely with members’ needs and aspirations, in keeping with the resources at hand. Accordingly, we have supported programs and projects aimed at strengthening the profession, not only internally from the perspective of our members, but also externally, from the perspective of the public, governments, and other stakeholders. Some of our key domestic initiatives this year include:

- **Planning for the Future project**: The culmination of five years of task forces, reports, CIP and Affiliate reviews, and member input occurred this past Spring with the by-law vote to implement new standards and new processes. As a result, we have strengthened the professionalism of planning, created clear systems of accountability, and enhanced the portability of credentials.

- **“Great Places in Canada”**: CIP’s first-ever nationwide competition engaged the public in numbers we could hardly have anticipated. More than 5,000 entries were submitted, coming from places big and small, from coast to coast to coast. We have made great strides in connecting the dots between “great places” and “good planning.”

- **“Water in Regional and Land Use Planning Issues”**: This commissioned report addresses a broad sweep of issues related to water and land use planning. Completed this past year, it will serve as the basis for an action plan to guide how planners can better integrate all aspects of water into their practice.

- **Census of Canada**: CIP was one of the first organizations to speak out against the cancellation of the mandatory long-form Census. Even though we, and 350 other advocates, did not prevail, we spoke out, and someone listened. CIP was one of a handful of institutions invited to give evidence to a House of Commons sub-committee (subsequently cancelled due to the election).

Of course, many initiatives were carried forward from 2010, including, for example, improvements to the governance of the Institute and advancing our flagship program on climate change. CIP’s work on climate change adaptation planning continues to provide a platform for national and international recognition. With the help of our Affiliates, more and more members have had the opportunity to partake in our climate change adaptation workshops. As we near the completion of our current partnership with Natural Resources Canada, we can be proud of the range of activities we have completed – from community climate change plans in the Arctic and the Maritimes to the design of a university-level lecture series.

On the international front, we have expanded our reach in Latin America and the Caribbean through our partnership in Guyana. We are fostering community planning locally, but at the same time, trying to establish networks of planners in a region with few planning institutions. Elsewhere, we work with the Commonwealth Association of Planners (CAP) to address issues of rapid urbanization in developing countries. This past year, we succeeded in establishing a Vice-Presidency for Canada within CAP.

As President of CIP, I have had the privilege of representing you and the planning profession for the past two years. I have seen first-hand how much can be accomplished by an Institute with only a handful of staff, whose dedication and commitment, in turn, support many volunteers from every region of Canada.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

Sincerely,

Marni Cappe, MCIP, RPP
President
Canadian Institute of Planners
Report from the National Membership Standards Committee (NMSC), formerly the National/Affiliate Membership Committee (N/AMC)

The National Membership Standards Committee (NMSC), which was formerly known as the National/Affiliate Membership Committee (N/AMC), met on two occasions since the submission of the last annual report. One meeting was held in Ottawa on July 8 to 9, 2010 and a second meeting was held on February 12 to 13, 2011 in Ottawa.

The focus of the work of the NMSC for 2010/11 and its main objective was the substantial completion of the reports and recommendations as well as communications related to the Planning for the Future (PFF) project. The NMSC also continued work associated with general membership procedures and practices, and the accreditation (recognition) review of university planning programs.

July 2010 Meeting
At the July 2010 meeting, Karen Russell MCIP was announced as one of two new Co-Chairs with Dana Anderson MCIP, RPP being considered as a Co-Chair for confirmation at the next meeting. The former Co-Chairs of the NMSC, Ron Keeble MCIP, RPP and Greg Hofmann MCIP, RPP, remained as members and Co-Chairs of the PFF project.

Planning for the Future
The majority of the discussion at the July 2010 meeting focused on the PFF project. Considerable feedback from Affiliates and stakeholders was received, including letters from several of the Universities’ faculty and student members on the Certification, Fellows, and Accreditation Task Force Reports. A considerable length of time was spent discussing the issues raised and whether changes could or should be considered. Several recommendations were endorsed to make modifications to the reports’ recommendations to address many of the issues and concerns raised. The NMSC also noted the need to proceed with clear structured timelines for next steps, which would involve the modified reports going back to the Affiliates and CIP for final endorsement and for continued communication to members on the process and the recommendations coming out of the PFF project.

It was agreed that the NMSC Co-Chairs would provide an information session for members on the PFF project at the annual CIP Conference to be held in Montreal in October 2010 and to meet with ACUPP (Association of Canadian University Planning Programs) representatives to discuss their concerns and the recommendations and modifications made to the Accreditation Task Force Report.

The NMSC also recognized the work started by the Administrative Task Force and noted that they would be looking at the “non-corporate classes of membership” and how to address and support those within this group.

Other Membership Matters
The NMSC approved the Site Review Panel report and recommendations for the five year review and accreditation of the two graduate planning programs (Masters and PhD) at UBC.

February 2011 Meeting
The meeting commenced with a motion to remove the report on consultation that occurred in January 2010 through a joint planning practitioner/ACUPP working group struck to address outstanding accreditation issues. The motion failed and the PFF Co-Chairs, Ron Keeble MCIP, RPP and Greg Hofmann MCIP, RPP, both left the meeting and announced their resignations. The joint practitioner/ACUPP report was discussed and received by the NMSC. The NMSC recommended that CIP and the Affiliates consider the establishment of an Accreditation Implementation Task Force to develop similar implementation tools and guidelines for accreditation processes as is being developed by the Administrative Task Force for membership processes.

The majority of the remaining February 2011 NMSC meeting was spent addressing the PFF project. The NMSC reviewed and endorsed, with several amended recommendations, the draft Administrative Task Force Report. The NMSC also approved the revised Membership manual which now reflects the new processes and standards.

This is to be circulated to CIP for approval.
The NMSC also discussed the Legislative Task Force and the next steps in PPF including ongoing communication, specifically the Q and As with students, and the preparation and timing of CIP and Affiliate by-law amendments.

Other items related to the timing of planning program accreditation reviews and CIP international reciprocal agreements as well as other general membership issues were also discussed.

The work completed by the NMSC over the past two years has been significant and the completion of the PFF project marks a significant chapter in our profession’s history and its advancement. It reflects an incredible amount of work by member volunteers across all Affiliates as well as dedication and work of Affiliate and CIP staff. It also reflects a willingness to address difficult issues and diverse opinions with a common goal to reach the best outcome on behalf of the profession. The current NMSC Co-Chairs would again like to express their gratitude to the former Co-Chairs, Greg Hofmann MCIP, RPP and Ron Keeble MCIP, RPP, as well as all of the dedicated volunteers and the project consultant, Jim Pealow, who have all contributed greatly to the PFF project over the last six years.

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Anderson, MCIP RPP and Karen Russell, MCIP Co-Chairs, National Membership Standards Committee
Report from the Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Meetings
CAPS Conference — University of Guelph:  
February 4 – 6th, 2010

Objectives for the Year
Complete MOU between CIP and CAPS: After six years of development between CAPS and CIP, the MOU is now complete and signed by both parties. John Atienza and Brad Bradford (current CAPS President) were instrumental in completing the work and getting CAPS financial reporting in order. The new MOU outlines the reporting relationship between CIP and CAPS, removes financial obligations on behalf of either party, and sets out the terms for how each group will support the other’s mission.

Attend CAPS Conference: Adam Cooper, Stephanie Chai, and Wayne Caldwell attended the CAPS conference. CIP hosted a lunch where the committee was able to speak to student reps from around the country about the Planning for the Future initiative and ways that we could improve communication about the project.

Support for Student Travel and Making Presentations at Conferences: Adam and Stephanie have met to discuss how to implement a Council motion that approves funding for student presenters, generated from past conference surpluses.

Adam is awaiting information from the CIP office on the average number of student presenters.
Determined funding should be available for out-of-province students first, and students must have applied for other funding sources first (Affiliate, school, etc).

CIP will reimburse students for travel expenses when presented with original receipts and a disclaimer that they have not received funding from other sources to pay for these expenses. The committee hopes to implement this funding mechanism for 2012 conference.

Review CIP Bylaws Re: Proposed Changes to Student Representative on CIP Council: This action is on hold as part of a larger governance review by CIP. It should be noted that some student candidates for 2011 are campaigning on examining the issue of overlapping terms or changes to the structure of the CIP Student Rep role.

Issues or Difficulties:
- Getting the CAPS/CIP MOU completed was challenging due to the changing nature of the CAPS organization and varying availability of proponents to pursue this discussion.
- Having a long-term committed CAPS Director and a committee chair with experience on this project helped to bring this long-standing issue to closure.

Respectfully Submitted,

Adam Cooper, B.A., B.A., M.A.
Chair, Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Revamp the Student Zone in the CIP Web Site: On hold as part of a larger strategy to revamp the entire CIP website.
Report from the National Continuous Professional Learning Committee

Since the Continuous Professional Learning (CPL) initiative commenced in 2002, four Affiliates have adopted mandatory CPL, while members in two other Affiliates record CPL units on a voluntary basis, and one Affiliate does not participate in CPL. Requirements respecting CPL expectations and logging of experience are for the most part standardized amongst those Affiliates where CPL is mandatory.

All Affiliates offer a range of learning opportunities. Some offer these directly, others partner with government and like organizations. Participation in these courses, workshops, and conferences is increasing as members strive to increase knowledge and skills necessary to meet the challenges of professional practice.

Committee Meetings
Since its Annual Report to Council in June of last year, the CPL Committee held five teleconferences on the following dates: November 15 and December 13, 2010 and January 24, March 1, and April 5, 2011. The committee’s annual in-person meeting will be coordinated this fall with a meeting of the National Membership Standards Committee to allow joint discussion of CPL matters including federation-wide CPL development and delivery needs/strategy in the context of the outcome of the Planning for the Future vote at the national and Affiliate levels.

Committee Objectives for the Year
The committee had a number of objectives for the year including: (i) increasing awareness of existing learning opportunities including enhancing the links listed on the Learning Net component of the CIP website; (ii) enhancing existing learning opportunities in the Affiliates including the use of the two-hour climate change modules developed as part of the Climate Change Project initiative; and (iii) initiation of discussions with the state Professional Development Officers (PDOs) of the American Planning Association (APA) (the equivalent counterparts to the CPL Committee Affiliate representatives) to discuss CPL-related matters common to both organizations.

Other items set out in the CPL Committee’s 2010–11 action plan included the continuation of committee discussions regarding consistency of allocation of learning units across Canada, strategies and implementation techniques to ensure a high percentage of compliance in provinces with mandatory CPL requirements, and consistency and fairness in the implementation of discipline for non-compliant members.

Committee Progress towards Achievement of Objectives

(i) The Learning Net feature of the CIP website has been enhanced with the posting of a brochure sharing Affiliates’ ideas for providing low-cost learning opportunities and a preface to the extensive inventory of movies with a planning theme listed on The Learning Net. Committee members also continue to populate the events calendar.

(ii) The Committee regularly discussed the challenges and opportunities for Affiliate use of the two-hour modules resulting from the Climate Change project and exchanged ideas as to how these modules could be shared with the membership on a low- or no-cost basis.

(iii) The CPL Committee Chair and PIBC CPL Committee representative Dan Wallace met with a group of the APA PDO’s on April 10, 2011 during the annual APA conference in Boston. We discussed the CPL Committee’s interest in promoting awareness, attendance, and cooperation for cross-border learning events, which was well received. A California PDO expressed interest in exploring Canadian content for the APA’s 2012 annual conference to be held in Los Angeles.

Respectfully submitted,

Vicky Simon, MCIP, RPP, AICP
Chair, National Continuous Professional Learning Committee
Report from the Recognition Committee

Objectives
The key objective of the Recognition Committee is to identify those projects submitted to the CIP Awards of Planning Excellence that are most deserving of recognition by the profession. Secondarily, the committee works to continually improve the categories, criteria and process for the Awards.

Meetings and Process
This year, the Recognition Committee recommended eight Awards of Planning Excellence and 5 Honourable Mentions for 2011 at Jury Meetings in Ottawa on March 12 and 13, 2011. No awards were given in the category of International. Awards will be presented at the National Conference in St. John’s in July.

These March meetings were the culmination of a review process, which started December 17, 2010 with a teleconference that introduced the new member of our ten-person committee (Stephanie Chai, CIP Council Liaison), confirmed a working timetable, and provided an opportunity to discuss procedures and issues.

On February 1, 2011 following the January 17 deadline for submissions, we convened a teleconference to identify 11 two- or three-person sub-groups that would focus on specific awards categories. A total of 44 submissions were received by the deadline.

Typically each committee member reviewed three or four different categories. Following individual reviews, each sub-group tried to identify a winning submission or at least a short-list of three submissions through ongoing email and telephone discussion. The short-lists were forwarded to Bianca Spence by March 7, 2011.

Issues and Resolutions
This year the committee recommended adjustments to clarify category descriptions. We found, in particular, that there were significant overlaps between submissions to the Environment category and others, and therefore renamed this category “Natural Systems Planning.” Definitions of the City Planning, Neighborhood Planning, and Social Planning categories were revised, and the former was renamed “City and Regional Planning.” The Transportation and Infrastructure definition was also revised. We also looked at ways to encourage submission of more built plans and considered, but did not approve, a category related to New Trends/Emerging Issues. Discussion of criteria emphasized the need to review the sustainability and health, public engagement, and innovation implications of all submissions. Another issue discussed was the need for representation from B.C., and perhaps greater diversity on the Recognition Committee. All members would like to come back next year.

I would like to sincerely thank all of the committee members for their substantial contributions of time, their thoughtful deliberations and their great company. In particular I would like to recognize Bianca Spence, CIP Program Coordinator, Communications for her tireless work in organizing committee meetings and teleconferences, and managing the overall Awards process, including: advertising, receiving and distributing submissions to the committee, arranging great meals, and coordinating final Jury Statements.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Hester, FCSLA, MCIP
Chair, CIP Recognition Committee
Meetings
The Plan Canada Editorial Board met in person in Montreal, Quebec on October 2, 2010 at the CIP annual conference, Climate Change + Communities. The purpose of that meeting was to discuss and ratify the magazine’s new publication model, as well as choosing a new Board Chair. Other issues included the need to upgrade the Plan Canada component of the CIP website to be more current and interactive and accessible. There were no conference calls held over 2010, although the intention is to make these quarterly in 2011.

Objectives
The editorial board’s prime responsibility for 2010 was to transition to a new structure geared towards centralizing and coordinating publication tasks. Michelle Garneau as Managing Editor will undertake the major responsibilities associated with producing the magazine, including communication with authors. This coordination means that members of the Editorial Board will no longer be tasked with rotating as Senior Editor on ‘theme issues’, nor will the Chair need to follow up with authors. The publication model will now be more flexible, with opportunities for “cover stories” arising from the nature of submissions or contemporary issues as they arise, rather than being decided a year in advance. The final issue employing the previous model was the Winter 2010 CIP conference issue.

Issues, Successes or Difficulties
A significant success over the past year was the 50th Anniversary issue which saw the magazine move to a new format and visual style with full colour and “newsstand-worthy” graphic design. It was also managed differently in that we had guest editors (Ian Skelton, Jill Grant and David Gordon) and greater CIP staff involvement with the production.

After six years of leadership, Mark Seasons stepped down after the fall issue as Chair of the Editorial Board and was replaced by Michael Dudley, who in the new arrangement will be tasked with coordinating the efforts of Board and communicating with the Program Coordinator, Communications, and the Managing Editor.

The Board is examining ways to use information technology to communicate and collaborate more effectively in between meetings.

The Plan Canada Editorial Board appreciates and thanks Michelle Garneau for all of her efforts in producing a terrific-looking publication, and further thanks Executive Director Steven Brasier and Bianca Spence, Program Coordinator Communications for their support during this transition.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Dudley, MLIS, MCP, MCIP
Chair, Plan Canada Editorial Board
Report from the Communications Committee

On behalf of the members of the Communications Committee, I am pleased to submit our annual report for 2010–2011.

During the past year, the Committee focused on launching the Great Places in Canada Program. The program went live on the Great Places in Canada website (www.greatplacesincanada.com) in November of 2010 and from its inception, attracted a significant amount of interest from the public. In fact, when the competition closed in March, almost 6,000 Canadians participated in the program and hundreds of places were nominated from coast to coast. The program met and exceeded the expectations of the committee. The program was able to attract traffic to the website because of numerous interviews undertaken with the committee members with various radio and television stations across the country. On May 16th, 2011, the Institute announced nine winners in three categories (Great Streets, Great Neighbourhoods, and Great Public Spaces). The judging panel includes a student member, a Fellow, a representative from the Council of Canadian Urbanism (CanU), and the Chair of the Communications Committee.

Launching this program did not come without some unanticipated challenges. After all of the submissions were reviewed, it was evident that there were two distinct types of individuals nominating places. Specifically, there were very detailed nominations that provided a photograph(s) and attempted to respond to all of the questions and criteria outlined on the website for a complete submission. Most of the detailed submissions were made by planners, but not all. The majority of the submissions received came in without a photograph or a detailed submission. We responded quickly to the problem of having no pictures submitted by making it mandatory to have a picture to complete the nomination. Next year, it will be mandatory to have a photograph as well as a certain minimum amount of information in the required entry form fields to ensure we receive more complete submissions. The challenge for the program is to find the appropriate balance between having very detailed submissions by professional planners who have a natural advantage in responding to planning issues and continuing to engage the public in a fun program that is not too laborious to participate in. We anticipate that the program will be tweaked on an annual basis until we find the correct balance.

Public participation in this program has given it the initial momentum to move it along and increase CIP’s media exposure. In April, the committee also focused on the work plan for the balance of the year. As Council is aware, the CIP web site will be redesigned in 2011 and the committee will be working with the National Office to ensure that these changes respond to our members’ needs. In addition, we felt that if resources were available to hire a summer student, that an inventory of CIP publications, booklets, and press releases would be helpful in determining what has been done in the past and whether this information is still current. The National Office is also working with the committee on establishing protocols for releasing information to the media. The committee also recognized that time will need to be set aside to respond to requests for assistance from either the National Affairs or Policy Committee.

In conclusion, the Communications Committee has completed its first major milestone by getting the Great Places Program off the ground. The committee is looking forward to continuing to expand its role by assisting Council in moving the strategic plan forward. I would like to thank Council and staff in the National Office for their ongoing support and look forward to working on new challenges in the future.

Respectfully submitted,
Alex Forbes, MCIP
Chair, Communications Committee
Report from the Policy Advisory Committee

Year in Review
The Policy Advisory Committee went through a year of transition in 2010. I succeeded CIP Policy Chair Mark Seasons, and the Policy Committee has been actively recruiting new membership. The Policy Advisory Committee continues to progress on developing proactive policy and related tools for CIP and the membership, stimulate timely new research and thinking on issues of concern to the planning profession, and provide a resource and voice for advocacy for issues of import to the membership across Canada.

In the past year, the Policy Advisory Committee has been progressing on two main fronts:

- development of new policy – specifically the Water Policy; and
- advocacy work in support of existing policy positions.

New Policy Development
Development of new policy has focused on development of the Phase A Water Policy conditions report engaged by a consultant, as directed by the Policy Advisory Committee. This material has been prepared as background material, and as context for the development of a CIP policy position on water and issues pertaining to water management including price, equity, management, environmental considerations, and other elements. This research will lead to the drafting of a technical whitepaper on the issue of the Water and the Public Interest, a draft Policy for Water, and technical tools for use by CIP, and the membership, to consider the management of water within the ability of the planning profession.

The Policy Advisory Committee will continue to track and provide guidance for the action phase of the research so as to provide continuity, while new committee members are brought up to speed.

Going forward, the Policy Advisory Committee will be building on previous steps and moving forward with the agenda on developing policy positions that are proactive, meaningful, timely, well researched, and relevant to the profession – and communicated effectively to the membership. A component of this will be the development of a consolidated policy resource guide, which will contain past policies and positions of the CIP on a wide number of fronts, provide guidance for future policy directions, and identify areas of synergy, or areas that require revisiting to retain relevancy.

Advocacy
John Wall, Manager of National and International Affairs, has pressed forward on advocacy work and in representing the positions of the CIP. CIP has taken a consistent stand against changes to the long form Census and has been constructively engaged to promote access to information that planners need to make effective decisions and recommendations for Canadian communities.

The coming year will include continuing work on water and planning, including tools and information for members, the consolidation of our new and existing policy statements, and further development of our proactive advocacy efforts.

Respectfully submitted,
David Wise, RPP, MCIP
Chair, Policy Advisory Committee
Report from the National Affairs Advisory Committee (NAAC)

In 2010, the committee held one in-person meeting in Ottawa, November 5–6th and a teleconference on March 23. The purpose of the in-person meeting was to identify possibilities for cooperation and synergy between the different topic areas in order to maximize overall effectiveness. An update from each sub-committee is provided below:

**Indigenous Peoples Planning Subcommittee**
This NAAC subcommittee has been actively working on a number of activities and initiatives. Building on the in-person meeting in Ottawa last year and the action plan developed, the committee has been focused on developing: outlines for two exciting initiatives – the Integrated Community & Watershed Planning Demonstration Initiative and the Strategic Plan for Indigenous Peoples Planning Education; IPPC Online Consultants’ Roster; IPPC brochure to communicate the committee’s role and activities; and International Indigenous planning connections.

**Climate Change Subcommittee**
The climate change subcommittee began scoping a number of projects in the areas of climate change mitigation, outreach to members and allied professionals, climate policy, and continued professional learning. Since the last update to Council, several efforts were completed or initiated, including a presentation on CIP climate change activities to the Canadian Association of Planning Students. The main feedback was a desire to see CIP collaborate more with allied professions; extensive CIP member feedback was gathered as part of the NRCan climate change project (benchmarking and focus group feedback). Building on that, the Climate Change Subcommittee will provide recommendations to strengthen the climate change policy. The subcommittee will aim to work with the Policy Committee on updating and strengthening the policy; the committee is planning to develop a series of webinars that draws on the material produced as part of the NRCan and INAC climate change projects. It is hoping to offer continuous professional learning credits for attending the webinar. The webinars are an opportunity to extend information, elicit member feedback, build a national community of practice around climate change, and test new webinar technology on behalf of CIP. The committee is seeking funds to develop a scope of work for a climate change mitigation module (similar to the adaptation module).

**Healthy Communities Initiatives**
This subcommittee structure is unique because it provides a national structure that includes representation from CIP’s Affiliates. This is necessary for several reasons: (1) Affiliate liaison is important to coordinate CIP’s work with existing activity under way by some Affiliates; (2) it provides the opportunity to learn about the work of health and planning professions at the provincial levels; and (3) since Affiliate capabilities on Healthy Communities differ across Canada, it is hoped that the integrated structure will also help increase Affiliate capacity for involvement. By September 2010, all CIP Affiliates were formally represented on the committee.

CIP enjoys a formal partnership with the Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada, and has obtained funded that it is being used by the committee to undertake various project activities developed in November 2010. Called “Taking the Pulse”, this CIP program proposes a number of learning opportunities, tools, and member services over a 15-month period. One of the overarching goals is to bring the health and planning professions together to address health issues associated with our built environment. Progress is being monitored regularly by way of sub-committee teleconferences. The partnership (formerly “CLASP”, but now called “Healthy Canada by Design”) includes a number of national and regional partners. At the national level, the partners include CIP, Heart & Stroke Foundation, Canadian Partnership Against Cancer, Urban Public Health Network, and National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy. The subcommittee also provides CIP representation on the Public Health Agency of Canada’s Age Friendly Communities initiative.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Leach, MCIP
Co-Chair, CIP National Affairs Committee

Karin Wall, MCIP
Co-Chair, CIP National Affairs Committee
This report of the International Affairs Advisory Committee outlines and updates our main activities for 2010. Due to turnover in staff with the arrival of John Wall, the transition of the chair from Ron Shishido, and our respective immersion periods, there has been a disruption in the committee’s meeting schedule and we did not have a face-to-face committee meeting. Despite the transitions, our international program and representation has continued to do well.

Canada/Guyana Community Planning Partnership
This CIDA-funded project has been proceeding on schedule, with the most recent activity being certificate-based training for Guyanese planning and related professionals conducted by Canadian and Caribbean trainers from November 2010 onward. During that period, planning was underway for a regional event in Guyana in April 2011 to bring together planning professionals from across the Caribbean and from the APA and CIP. The Commonwealth Association of Planners, CARICOM, and the Caribbean Land and Urban Management Network (blueSpace Network) collaborated to the organization of this event with an objective of developing a professional organization in the region.

Commonwealth Association of Planners
During the national conference in Montreal last fall, I was elected as Vice-President (Americas) of the Commonwealth Association of Planners, and we have a commitment from the other CAP Americas members that there will be a CIP representative on the CAP Executive on an ongoing basis (as a VP alternating between a CIP and Caribbean representative).

WorldLink Program
The WorldLink Program, our internship program, is proceeding on schedule, with 16 interns in the mid-to late part of their internships. A new internship cycle will take place beginning in March 2011.

Global Planners’ Network
With CIP staff, we continued to represent CIP at the Global Planners’ Network through regular communication and conference calls with our global partners. Our representation remains strong and during the last months, we planned our participation to GPN and international sessions to be held in April 2011 at the American Planning Association conference in Boston.

China Initiative
We received an expression of interest from the Ministry of Lands and Resources in China to renew our partnership with them on a revised basis. A planned mission to negotiate a new agreement in December or January was postponed to allow more time for development of a project concept and seek new sources of funding. We are appealing to members and members’ employers who export services to China or wish to join a potential CIP leaded trade mission. CIP staff and China Sub-committee volunteers have been examining the options in terms of funding and programming, in order to set a negotiation mission in the coming months.

Respectfully submitted,
Jacques Besner, urbaniste, MICU, MOUQ
Chair, International Affairs Advisory Committee
Message from the College of Fellows

I am providing this report to you as the Chair of the College of Fellows. The College is a group of 75 planners who have been elected as a Fellow of the Canadian Institute of Planners. This honour, and with it the right to be designated a Fellow of the Canadian Institute of Planners (FCIP), recognizes professional achievement of an exemplary nature to Canadian planning and society.

As with any similar group, our membership changes each year. The past 18 months saw the passing of three eminent planners, all members of the College – Jeanne Wolfe, Eli Comay, and Macklin Hancock. One of my unexpected functions as Chair of the College has been to coordinate the appropriate recognition of Fellows, including material for obituaries in the media.

Also, this year five new Fellows will join the College – Marta Farevaag of Vancouver, Diana Santo and John van Nostrand of Toronto, Donald Stastny of Portland, Oregon, and Alex Taranu of Brampton. We will welcome all of them in St. John’s at the National Conference.

The College is currently completing a report to CIP Council on how best it may contribute to the profession. We have reviewed other similar professional organizations, consulted widely, and will be publishing our report to Council early this summer.

Our work and consultations see the potential for us to continue our primary role of mentorship through a more structured organization, and in a more focused manner. We recently completed a detailed survey of our membership to understand what resources, experience, and energy would be available to serve the profession. The results show a very active and involved group of planners across the country who are eager to be involved in mentoring and advocacy at both the individual and institutional levels.

An example of this involvement would be our “Think Tank” sessions where Fellows provide their experience directly to a community on specific issues, asking only for expenses and a contribution to our scholarship fund in return. We hope to continue to serve as a resource to CIP Council on specific issues when asked. For example, one of our members has suggested that we might facilitate a discussion in the future on a new definition for ‘planning.’

This involvement will require a modest internal structure to ensure ongoing oversight and responsibility. To that end, we will recommend a structure and relationship to CIP in our report to Council. Watch the CIP website for further news on the College. If you have any ideas or suggestions on how we might contribute, send me a note bob@lehmanplan.ca.

Respectfully submitted,
Bob Lehman, FCIP, RPP
Fellows Representative
CIP Rosters — Committee Members
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INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

To the Members,
Canadian Institute of Planners:

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of Canadian Institute of Planners, which comprise the balance sheet as at December 31, 2010, and the statements of changes in net assets, revenue and expenditure and cash flows for the year then ended, and a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information.

Management's responsibility for the financial statements
Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles, and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors' responsibility
Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we comply with ethical requirements and plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

Opinion
In our opinion, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Canadian Institute of Planners as at December 31, 2010, and the results of its operations and its cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles.

OUSELEY HANVEY CLIPSHAM DEEP LLP
Licensed Public Accountants
Ottawa, Ontario
April 27, 2011
# CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS

## BALANCE SHEET
As at December 31, 2010

### ASSETS
#### CURRENT
- **Cash**: $345,453 / $536,769
- **Investments (note 4)**: $671,887 / $819,776
- **Accounts receivable**: $303,541 / $163,192
- **Prepaid expenses**: $61,343 / $50,410
- **Total Current Assets**: $1,382,224 / $1,570,147

#### PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT (note 5)
- **Total Property and Equipment**: $4,918 / $2,423
- **Total Assets**: $1,387,142 / $1,572,570

### LIABILITIES
#### CURRENT
- **Accounts payable**: $168,487 / $384,452
- **Deferred revenue**: $254,215 / $216,785
- **Total Current Liabilities**: $422,702 / $601,237

### NET ASSETS
- **Restricted for special projects**: $75,000 / $75,000
- **Unrestricted**: $889,440 / $896,333
- **Total Net Assets**: $964,440 / $971,333
- **Total Liabilities and Net Assets**: $1,387,142 / $1,572,570

Approved on behalf of the Institute:

[Signatures]

President
Executive Director

---

# CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS

## STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS
For the year ended December 31, 2010

### RESTRICTED FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS
- **Balance - beginning and end of year**: $75,000 / $75,000

### UNRESTRICTED
- **Balance - beginning of year**: $896,333 / $769,404
- **Net revenue (expenditure) for the year**: $(6,893) / $126,929
- **Balance - end of year**: $889,440 / $896,333
# Canadian Institute of Planners

## Statement of Revenue and Expenditure
For the Year Ended December 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership fees</td>
<td>$1,034,637</td>
<td>$1,012,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member services</td>
<td>720,219</td>
<td>899,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International projects</td>
<td>364,553</td>
<td>224,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National projects</td>
<td>755,047</td>
<td>414,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>20,254</td>
<td>30,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>2,894,720</td>
<td>2,581,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership services</td>
<td>855,033</td>
<td>961,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>37,304</td>
<td>6,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International projects</td>
<td>362,308</td>
<td>193,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National projects</td>
<td>656,121</td>
<td>398,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>257,414</td>
<td>213,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>733,433</td>
<td>681,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>2,901,613</td>
<td>2,455,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Revenue (Expenditure)</strong></td>
<td>$(6,893)</td>
<td>$126,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Statement of Cash Flows
For the Year Ended December 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net revenue (expenditure) for the year</td>
<td>$(6,893)</td>
<td>$126,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item not affecting cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net change in non-cash working capital items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>(140,349)</td>
<td>(122,577)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>(10,933)</td>
<td>(562)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>(215,965)</td>
<td>79,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue</td>
<td>37,430</td>
<td>(37,273)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>(335,655)</td>
<td>46,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investing Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale (purchase) of investments</td>
<td>147,889</td>
<td>(333,630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of property and equipment</td>
<td>(3,550)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>144,339</td>
<td>(333,630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase (Decrease) in Cash</strong></td>
<td>(191,316)</td>
<td>(266,778)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash - beginning of year</td>
<td>536,769</td>
<td>823,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash - End of Year</strong></td>
<td>$346,453</td>
<td>$536,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. PURPOSE OF THE ORGANIZATION

CIIP's core purpose, as stated in its Strategic Plan, is "to advance professional planning across Canada". The Institute's overarching long-term goal to "be the leading advocate for urban policy and community building across Canada" is supported by six other goals and related strategies for advancing various aspects of CIIP governance and operations.

The Institute is incorporated under the Canada Corporations Act as a not-for-profit organization and is exempt from tax under the Income Tax Act.

2. SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

These financial statements have been prepared in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles and include the following significant accounting policies:

a) Estimates and assumptions
The preparation of financial statements requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amount of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenue and expenditure during the reporting period. Actual results may differ from those estimates.

b) Financial instruments
Investments are classified as held-for-trading financial instruments and therefore are valued at fair value with unrealized gains and losses being recorded in the statement of revenue and expenditure.

Other financial instruments are measured at the initially recognized amount less appropriate allowances.

c) Special projects fund
The special projects fund is internally restricted and will be used for special opportunities identified by Council.

d) Property and equipment
Property and equipment are recorded at cost less accumulated amortization. Amortization is provided on the reducing balance basis at 20% per annum.

e) Revenue recognition
The Institute follows the deferral method of accounting for revenue. Restricted revenue is recognized as revenue in the year in which the related expenditure is incurred. Unrestricted revenue is recognized as revenue when it is received or becomes receivable. Membership fees are recognized as revenue over the period to which they relate.

3. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

Financial instruments of the Institute consist of cash, investments, accounts receivable and accounts payable.

Unless otherwise noted, it is management's opinion that the Institute is not exposed to significant interest rate, currency or credit risks arising from its financial instruments and the carrying amount of the financial instruments approximate their fair value.

4. INVESTMENTS

The Institute has provincial and bank bonds that earn interest at annual rates that range from 4% to 4.84% and mature between January 2011 and March 2013.

5. PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furniture and equipment</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$35,774</td>
<td>$30,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated amortization</td>
<td>$4,918</td>
<td>$2,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. COMMITMENTS

The Institute has leased office space at a minimum annual rental of $91,000 to November 30, 2016.

7. CAPITAL DISCLOSURE

The Institute defines its capital as its net assets, which are not subject to external requirements. Management's objective, when managing capital, is to safeguard the Institute's ability to continue as a going concern, so that it can continue to provide services in accordance with its mission.