

These minutes were the result of discussions and review last evening with the four members of Carwithoutborders that were allowed to attend the session.

The session leader, Mr Kash Ram has been copied. We have requested his comments, and views. We certainly welcome any input that might lead to a more accurate account. Any input from any of the other attendees would be welcome, if not in a letter of e-mail, they could post their comments on the website, at www.carswithoutborders.com and we will update the minutes as required.

Interesting session today;

- Mr. Kash Ram the Director General, hereby noted as the Leader of the Conference, welcomed us to the teleconference. There were only 4 people in attendance on the phone. Robert, CY, and Carl representing carswithoutborders and a gentleman representing the CVMA. Later on, Serge joined in for a few minutes then had to leave due to commitments at work. An individual from GM joined the session in progress.
- Mr. Ram informed the group of the possible outcomes of these consultations:
 - The proposed amendment is accepted, or
 - The proposed amendment is rejected, or
 - The proposed amendment is accepted with minor changes
- CY opened up the proceeding describing the process that he went through. His 2008 Honda Civic manufactured in September, was approved and has been plated. He crossed over the border in late October and had no problems or issues obtaining his registration. He described the conversations that he had with certified technicians in Virginia, USA. Reviewed research he had undertaken and he indicated that he had come to the conclusion that the anti-theft device in his car was exactly the same as the one installed in the Canadian version of the car.
- The Leader indicated that even though this might be the case, that the self-compliance process was still in effect and that it was the Manufacturers prerogative to indicate either it meets the standard, it does not meet the standard, or they can't determine if it does or not. They are not obliged to give an explanation.
- When asked if Transport Canada could waive the 15 day waiting period and allow the RIV to start approving our cars, The Leader kindly reviewed the process with us and explained that the only organization that could override this process, was the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat*(see notes below). He suggested we contact them. It was the Transport Ministries objective to fast track these changes and attempt to resolve our issues as fast as humanly possible, within the constraints of the process.

- When asked if this would be concluded prior to the Holidays, we were given no commitment other than they would try their best.
- We expressed our thanks for being invited, with Carl, Cy and Serge to the Public Consultation process to represent carswithoutborders, a group representing close to 1000 individual Canadians, of which 150 had been identified as having “a car without a Country” We requested that since we had not been able to attend the previous two sessions that he might be able to provide us with an update of which organizations attended and the positions each took. The Leader reviewed who the key stakeholders in the process were as follows:
 - The Canadian Public
 - Importers
 - Those Importers caught up in the immobilizer problem.
 - The Canadian Manufacturers
 - Insurance Companies
 - The Provinces and Territories
 - 3rd Party Immobilizer Companies
 - Several Consumer Groups
 - Automobile Dealers Associations
- When asked if he would consider using “Webcasting” for the next two sessions, in order that more of our members would be provided with the convenience of tuning in, he indicated that he would look into it, but it might be difficult on such short notice.
- When asked if our group be permitted access to the transcripts minutes or tapes of the previous sessions, we were told that these sources were for internal TC use only. ** (refer to notes below)
- The Leader then ran thru the Associations that had been represented at the table the previous week and attempted to indicate the position taken, he reminded us a couple of time that it was difficult because he did not have his notes, but we were nevertheless thankful for the time taken to bring us up to speed.
 - Tuesday’s session had 2 consumer groups, Edmunds and Lemon aide. These groups generally favored the solution as drafted in the proposed amendment issued last Friday. GM and CVMA attended but had no opinion.
 - Wednesday’s session included over thirty individuals representing 4 groups.
 - Consumer focus groups the APA, CAA
 - A mix of Manufacturers, and their respective associations CVMA,IAIMC
 - Some of the provinces and the Insurance Industry.
 - After Market 3rd party immobilizer companies.

In essence the Manufacturers and their representative associations blamed Transportation Canada for the current problems and were more inclined to keep the status quo.

The majority of the people representing the other 3 groups were in favor of amendment as written on Friday.

After receiving the update, discussion then moved on to the 2nd portion of the proposed change that would apply if a car did not have an immobilizer. As per the change the Manufacturer would still have the prerogative make the car inadmissible even though the installation of a 3rd party immobilizer would enable the car to meet the Standard.

We then discussed the two immobilizer standards in the US and Canada, and the Leader informed us that no such standard existed in the US. We indicated we had read something different last night on FMVSS 114, but that we would recheck it again.

Editors Note: (We think the difference is that in the Canada we have a standard for the anti-theft device and it is a mandatory requirement. The U.S., does have a standard, but it is not mandatory. – this would explain the misunderstanding we have of the position that Transport Canada has taken in recent press articles.)

We asked permission to present our formal position on the new proposed amendment and the signature list of our petition on Thursday at Noon. The Leader did not see a problem with this but he maintained due to sparseness of available telephone lines that he did not want to have more than four individuals from our group attending each of the other two sessions.

Our questions with regards to the RIV and TC were favorably received and taken under consideration. 50 expulsion notices have been retracted and the end consumer informed of the new regulations; letters went out to that effect this past Friday. We asked for a listing of such, indicating Model and Manufacturer. We were told it was not possible. The leader indicated that he did not think it appropriate to update the VAFUS list directly. We indicated that this was a primary spot to ensure the public was aware of the current situation. We raised concerns that people might not be properly informed. The leader agreed to take it under advisement.

When prompted about the current regime whereby manufacturers do not need to explain their reasons for (in)admissibility, the Leader replied that the current regime is a voluntary one although he did suggest that their office is exploring the legalities of making them disclose such information.

We also requested that the RIV personnel be directed to review all our cases and ensure that everyone's file would be ready to be released immediately upon acceptance of the regulation. We asked that all other impediment's to each member's file be addressed and

rectified during the consultation period. If resources were an issue, we offered to support an initiative to have any overflow directed to our website. The Leader explained that the RIV must enforce the current regulations and cannot speculate on which option (if any) will get registered.

We also inquired as to whether the VAFUS would be updated immediately once this amendment became law or whether we would have to wait for the auto manufacturers to update it. The leader was of the sound opinion that this was a real opportunity for all interested parties, including auto manufacturers, to work together to ensure that there are no further delays in resolving the administrative burden that continues, for example regarding the VAFUS and the backlog at the RIV.

During the final few minutes, we asked that the two emails, we sent prior to the meeting be accepted into the record. We asked for copies of the tapes and transcripts in order to update our membership over the website. The leader indicated that he could not release this information to us and that prior to posing any audio clips he recommended we seek legal advice.

We thanked him for his time and the session was ended.

Some actions we have taken with us and recommending are:

*We direct the members to write directly to the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat. This is the only organization that has the authority to intervene in the process. They have the ability to issue an order today, that any Canadian citizen that is caught up in this issue be granted their approved form 2 and the right to proceed with the registration of their vehicle. The consultation process would still continue and the regulation accepted. But since we have no guarantee that it will be completed prior to the holiday period we would encourage our members to start writing to the members of this committee. You could start by using the letter we sent to the Consultation Committee, it is posted on the web as "Addendum to invitation"

<http://www.carswithoutborders.com/wordpress/wp-content/initialrequest-addendum.pdf>

We have included the links to The Treasury Board and to the President below.

http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/index_e.asp

The chairman is Vic Toews

<http://www2.parl.gc.ca/Parlinfo/Files/Parliamentarian.aspx?Item=ab143dd3-e5b4-43fc-bc61-1279f1c395e9&Language=E&MenuID=Lists.Members.aspx&MenuQuery=http%3A%2F%2Fwww2.parl.gc.ca%2FParlinfo%2FLists%2FMembers.aspx%3FParliament%3D%2>

[6Riding%3D%26Name%3D%26Party%3D%26Province%3D%26Gender%3D%26New%3DFalse%26Current%3DTrue%26Picture%3DFalse%26Language%3DE](#)

Telephone: (613) 992-3128
Fax: (613) 995-1049
E-Mail: Toews.V@parl.gc.ca

Is it possible for the members of the Media team to draft up a more professional sample letter the members could use, or we could stick with the letter noted above? Your call Media team. We would also suggest writing to the other 10 members of the Treasury Board.

** The other item that caught our attention was the overall lack of transparency of the public meeting. We have three recommendations to the Leader noted below. Again as noted above we have copied the Leader on this e-mail/posting and would welcome any feedback. If implementing any of these recommendations will delay the process, then consider them only for the next series of Public Consultations.

- 1) We felt that the system used for the conference call was intimidating. Many “beeps” could be heard in the background. This usually indicates that a person has joined or left the conference. Yet when the leader asked for any new people to identify themselves, no one came forward. We would suggest that the sessions be totally transparent to the public and use the services of a “webstreaming” company. Such as those used by private companies for the public reporting Quarterly and Annual results.
- 2) We were told that some of the manufacturers were submitting their position in the form of confidential letters. We were surprised that a public consultation would allow this to occur and that everything must be open to the public.
- 3) The tapes and transcripts of the previous sessions and of this session were declared a for internal TC use only. This surprised many of us, since we were under the impression that these consultations were “Public”. We also discouraged to find that we could not post this information on our web site so as to keep our membership informed.

Finally we do not want to be seem as impeding the process in any way. We are still reviewing your comments prior to formulizing our final submission.

Robert Lamb
Serge Bergeron
Carl Paquin
Cy Daly

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.