Date: November 5, 2011

Committee Name: International Committee

Chairperson: Thomas Haid

Committee Members: Roy Beeson (Vice Chairman); Joe Lawton

CMAA Staff Member: Andrea Pavon

Recent Activity: There were no CMCI International Committee meetings in 2011, although several telephone conferences were held between June and September to support the CMAA International Committee.

Progress toward Goals:

The activities of the CMCI International Committee since the last National Conference (October 2010) focused on supporting the CMAA International Committee’s efforts to investigate similarities or differences between the processes used between CMAA (USA) to award an individual with the CCM designation and CIOB (UK) to award the MCIOB designation.

October 2010. During the national conference, Chris Blythe of CIOB talked with CMAA about a collaborative effort to map the CIOB and CCM credentials over the next year with a view to possibly having some form of reciprocity. After the conference, the CMAA International Committee was requested to coordinate with CMCI which has a better understanding the CCM process. The CMCI Certification Manager noted that Roy Swift (of ANSI) made a presentation to the BOG and stressed that ANSI requires each of our candidates be mirror images of each other, that they all have the same experience. The CMCI Certification Manager raised the concern that reciprocity with CIOB would jeopardize our accreditation, unless CIOB requirements mirror CMAA, i.e. requires 48 months of RIC experience, an examination, etc. CMCI agreed to support the mapping exercise but our concerns about seeking reciprocity were forwarded to Bill Van Wagenen (CMAA International Committee) via emails on 10/26 and 11/04.

June 2011. Tom Haid participated in a phone call on 6/28 from London between members of the CMAA International committee (Robert Bennett and Palmina Teta-Whelan) and personnel from the Chartered Institute of Building (CIOB) including Saleem Akram (Director, Construction Innovation and Development, CIOB). Both elements wanted to get moving on “mapping” or comparing the requirements and processes each organization uses in their certification process. Robert Bennett stated the long-term goal was to pursue a way for reciprocity between the 2
certifications.

While there has been some initial mapping done by folks like Bill Van Wagenen and Paul Giammalvo, in order to move forward the group decided to have CIOB compare (“map”) the certification programs of both organizations and prepare a report for CMAA and CIOB management. CIOB has experience comparing programs, for example having done this with 27 European countries.

To assist the comparison, Tom agreed to gather public source material for CIOB that describes the CCM requirements and the process an applicant must follow to acquire the CCM designation. The group developed the following time schedule:

1-week Tom Haid provide CCM material
4 weeks CIOB compares requirements of both programs and prepares report
4-weeks CMAA/CIOB working group reviews report for accuracy
Report presented to CMAA & CIOB management

For public source documentation regarding the CCM process, Tom provided the CCM Applicant Resources from the CMAA web site (http://www.cmaanet.org/applicantresources) as well as some of the PowerPoint Presentation slides; Becoming a CCM, presented October 2009 at the National Conference in Orlando, FL.

July 2011. CIOB conducts preliminary mapping exercise.

August 2011. CIOB forwarded a draft mapping report on 8/1. On 8/10 the report was discussed by members of the CMCI International Committee and the Certification Manager. On 8/10, the Certification Manager sent an email to the CMAA International Committee indicating CMCI’s review of the draft report. Kate’s email indicated further effort to do a more detailed mapping may be fruitless, based on a verbal discussion between BOG members who read the CIOB report and identified (in terms of equivalency of processes) a number of differences between Chartered status (MCIOB) and the CCM designations including:

- Education:
  - MCIOB and CMM recognize different degrees as “qualifying” – only 5 types of degrees appear to be accepted by both designations.
  - MCIOB requires the individual possess a college degree; CCM does not.
- Work experience:
  - MCIOB requires less work experience (as little as 2 years if the individual has a qualifying degree); the CCM designation requires a minimum of 4 years RIC experience alone, which means that most candidates have a minimum of 8-12 years total work experience in the engineering or construction fields.
  - MCIOB does not have a RIC requirement
- Verification process: MCIOB process is more subjective, consisting of a professional review followed by an interview; the CCM process consists of a professional review followed by an examination.

- Personnel Certification: The CCM designation is ANSI accredited; the MCIOB is not.

The BOG members felt the differences were significant enough that the processes were not “equivalent” and therefore, a Chartered member would essentially have to go through the entire CCM process like any other candidate, and a CCM would have to do the same for applying for MCIOB status.

The CMAA International Committee reports that they have not done anything further on promoting our CCM designation internationally. We have an agreement with CMCI not to change the requirements for CCM for international expansion.

**Planned Activities:** Attend the 2011 CMAA National Conference & Trade Show in Washington, D.C. Continue to monitor the activities of the CMAA International Committee. CIOB and CMAA are expected to continue this discussion at the National Conference, November 5-8, 2011.

**Action Items:** None.

**Attachments:** Draft Mapping Report, CIOB, dated July 25, 2011 and transmitted August 1, 2011.