Draft Minutes
CIP Board of Directors Meeting
December 19, 2025
Virtual

Present:

Janice Barry PhD, RPP, MCIP	Director
Paul Bell RPP, MCIP	Director
Beate Bowron RPP, FCIP	Director
Lesley Cabott RPP, FCIP	Director
Raida Chowdhury	Director
Jason Ferrigan RPP, MCIP	Director
Laura Hartney RPP, MCIP	Director
Eliza Hydesmith	Director
Raymond Kan RPP, MCIP	Director
Robert Priebe RPP, MCIP	Director
Andrew Ramlo RPP, MCIP	Director
Brandon Umpherville LPP, MCIP	Director

Regrets:

Dan Huang RPP, MCIP	Past President
Olimpia Pantelimon, urbaniste, RPP, MCIP	Director

Staff:

Deborah Morrison	Chief Executive Officer
Delphine Robitaille	Governance and Member Services Officer
Rebecca Judd	Specialist, Policy and Government Relations

1.0 In-Camera session	*Action*
No in-camera session was held.	

2.0 Call to order	*Action*
Lesley Cabott, acting as Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and confirmed quorum had been achieved. As part of a land acknowledgement, she invited all attendees to share where they were connecting from, including the Indigenous Peoples who are the original custodians of the lands and waters on which they were joining. She led by sharing that she was joining from Whitehorse, Yukon, the traditional land of the Taa'an Kwächän and the Kwanlin Dün. CEO Deborah Morrison and the CIP staff in attendance acknowledged they were joining from CIP's offices on the traditional land of the Algonquin Anishnaabe people, now known as Ottawa. After all Directors shared which Indigenous communities' traditional land they were joining from, the meeting was called to order.	

3.0 Adoption of Draft Meeting Agenda	*Action*
Related material: November 27th, 2025 Draft Meeting Agenda	

The Board considered the Draft Meeting Agenda. Lesley Cabott proposed removing the November 27th Draft Meeting Minutes from the consent agenda to give the Board additional time to review them. There was agreement amongst the Board that they would be moved for approval at the next Board meeting, and they were struck from the consent agenda. No further amendments were proposed. **Motion 2025-2026/15** **Moved: Brandon Umpherville / Seconded: Eliza Hydesmith** *"That the agenda for the December 16th, 2025 Board of Directors meeting be approved as presented, with the November 27th draft minutes removed from the consent agenda."* **CARRIED.**	

4.0 Declaration of Conflict of Interest	***Action***
Lesley asked if there were any declarations of conflict of interest. There being none, the meeting continued to the next item.	

5.0 Board Business	***Action***
5.1 Reconciliation Action Plan Related material: November 27th, 2025 Draft Meeting Agenda Deborah Morrison thanked the Chair. She noted the presence of Rebecca Judd, who works as CIP's Specialist, Policy and Government Relations, at the meeting. She highlighted Rebecca's significant work on the plan over the last months, from liaising with the consulting firm Indigenous Community Engagement (ICE) and the Indigenous Advisory Committee (IAC), to diligently collecting and implementing Board members' comments. She also expressed her appreciation for the Board members' ongoing commitment to this project and for their thoughtful contributions. She acknowledged the feasibility concerns raised by members and reassured the Board that the presented plan realistically considers staff capacity and that further help can be obtained through summer student work and contracted research. Laura Hartney noted that significant changes had been made to the 2026 Implementation Plan and to the RAP itself since the last round of Board comments, resulting in a document that more clearly reflects the organization's role. She asked about the perspectives of the consultant firm ICE and the IAC on edits to the document, specifically regarding the level of latitude CIP has with the content and the associated risks, including reputational or relational risks. Deborah Morrison clarified that both ICE and the IAC's drafting work were completed and that it was understood that the CIP Board would now take ownership of and be accountable for the document. She added that she did not believe there was a risk of backlash since this phase of the project was anticipated.	*Staff to implement discussed changes to the RAP and to prepare to launch it in February 2026.*

Beate Bowron asked whether creating a new Indigenous Board position would require revisions to the existing equity-based Director position, currently held by Raida Chowdhury. Lesley Cabott advised leaving the existing position unchanged, which was agreed upon.	
Andrew Ramlo raised concerns regarding Pillar 6 (Advance Equitable Employment Practices), noting that from an HR and human rights perspective, language such as “prioritize Indigenous recruitment” could be interpreted as exclusionary, and asked whether alternative wording should/could be considered. Janice Barry observed that acceptable terminology may vary by province.	*Staff were delegated to amend language as may be required in accordance with HR standards and practices with respect to equity recruitment*
Andrew Ramlo also noted that the Implementation Plan table, particularly references to “collaboration with affiliated professions,” contained repetition and potentially unclear distinctions between “affiliated” and “allied” professions. It was agreed that this would be reviewed and streamlined.	
It was noted that the term “knowledge holders/keepers” was used interchangeably in the document. Janice Barry expressed a preference for the word “keepers”, adding that “holders” may imply ownership.	
Janice Barry further asked for clarification on the source of the definition of Indigenous sovereignty, questioning whether it came from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission or the 1996 Royal Commission. Staff agreed they would confirm this information and report back.	
Several members discussed the appropriateness of using the word “decolonize” versus “Indigenize,” and whether non-Indigenous people can do either. Janice Barry flagged that the word decolonized was, in her view, used incorrectly in this context, as non-Indigenous people cannot claim to decolonize practices or a space. It was agreed that the word Indigenize would be used.	
Janice Barry raised concerns regarding commitments to student research, noting variability in research quality and oversight, and suggested exploring MITACS funding, which would include faculty supervision and stronger research methodology. There was agreement, and staff were asked to explore this option.	
Beate Bowron requested that items be addressed one at a time to improve meeting flow. She emphasized the importance of avoiding overcommitment and considering the role of future Boards in medium and long-term goals. She added that we should carefully frame and evaluate commitments that carry higher risk or implications and ensure that RAP commitments do not inadvertently detract from other important organizational work. She asked whether prioritizing Indigenous recruitment might conflict with commitments to other equity-deserving groups. She also questioned how a national organization could advocate for structural planning reforms that fall under provincial and territorial jurisdiction, and whether this would require working through PTIAs. She expressed support for creating an Indigenous	

Board position and suggested removing references to legislative review and advocacy and instead focusing on promoting Indigenous approaches. This would require updating Page 9 and deleting a bullet on Page 14.

Laura Hartney asked whether the IAC would be comfortable with these deletions.

Lesley Cabott noted that the RAP is now the organization's plan and reiterated concerns about scope and capacity, stating that the organization is not positioned to undertake legal advocacy through counsel.

In response to Beate Bowron's question about CIP's jurisdiction, Deborah Morrison assured that all this work would have to be done in collaboration or consultation with the Professional Standards Board and the Provincial and Territorial Institutes and Associations (PTIAs). Specifics are predicated on understanding that we must work with others.

Raymond Kan stated he was encouraged by revisions to Pillar 5**,** noting they better articulated the organization's value-add, particularly in convening and facilitating conversations among interest-holders. He suggested adding "research" to the list of value-added activities. He reiterated earlier concerns that the organization is not perceived as becoming a de facto legal advocate or legal aid body for Indigenous issues and stressed the diversity of Indigenous perspectives. He requested that a risk assessment be added to the implementation plan, particularly regarding scenarios such as requests to intervene in litigation. He supported the creation of an Indigenous Board position and suggested striving for more than one Indigenous Board member over future election cycles to avoid tokenism.

Lesley Cabott noted that planners frequently work within contexts involving unceded lands and historic treaty frameworks, with a reference made to recent developments involving the Cowichan Tribe. She emphasized that it is the role of the courts adjudicate such matters. Planners can play a constructive role by supporting and facilitating informed conversations, and by providing evidence, information, and transparent processes to assist communities in navigating and resolving these issues.

Raida Chowdhury noted that the revised document reads more clearly and expressed support for changes to Pillar 5, the creation of an Indigenous Board position, adding she did not view recruiting for Indigeneity as tokenistic, and the proposed 5% Indigenous procurement target, which she felt was well-justified. She supported amending references to "decolonized planning" and asked why the Call-to-Action document was included as an appendix rather than more prominently in the main document.

Deborah Morrison explained that the RAP directs CIP's activities, whereas the Call-to-Action document invites individual planners and planning organizations to act in their own work. She added that a separate communication plan would be developed to promote this tool to members, which Raida Chowdhury was pleased to hear.

Robert Priebe expressed appreciation that the consultant had provided reassurance that the organization could move forward with the plan. He raised concerns that revisions appeared to scale back the organization's advocacy role too far and questioned whether the RAP should contain bolder commitments beyond interest-holder engagement. Lesley Cabott responded that the organization must be bold within its mandate, scope, and member expectations.

Paul Bell later stated that, with implementation guardrails in place, he was comfortable with Pillar 5 and did not believe it obligated the organization to activities such as Supreme Court litigation. He asked for confirmation that the IAC supported an Indigenous Board role, which was confirmed by staff. He emphasized that Indigenous representatives often remind his firm that no one individual speaks for all Indigenous peoples. He expressed optimism that the RAP sets a strong trajectory over the next three to five years and stated that his remaining concern is implementation capacity, which he found more manageable given the research focus. He suggested using the broader term "planning" rather than listing sub-disciplines such as land-use or environmental planning.

Laura Hartney confirmed that references to advocating for planning laws and to conducting legislative review would be removed, including associated references on Page 9. She suggested softening some public-facing language (e.g., "begin to develop") to better manage expectations and reputational risk. She also raised concerns about the lack of legal advice regarding ethically tracking Indigenous identity, and the need to understand what information can be collected, how it should be collected, and how it should be stored.

Deborah Morrison responded that using developmental language allows progress to be framed transparently over time and acknowledged that data collection is sensitive and best practices need to be researched. The current RAP budget does not cover legal counsel, and further exploration will be required.

Janice Barry raised the need for language defining Indigeneity for the proposed Indigenous Board position, noting risks to organizations when identity fraud occurs in positions reserved for Indigenous people. She shared that in her experience, universities recognize that colonization and discriminatory provisions of the Indian Act have disrupted community connections, meaning that only accepting formal status cards alone may be insufficient. She emphasized that Indigenous citizenship is reciprocal and that communities must recognize individuals, often through letters from elders, knowledge keepers, or band council members, which she described as standard and accepted practice. Janice Barry reiterated support for removing direct legislative advocacy language but cautioned that national-scale research is essential to credible advocacy. She suggested incorporating research explicitly into Pillar 5 commitments.

Lesley Cabott acknowledged the explanation and confirmed that identity verification may involve confirmation from the individual's Nation. She indicated a desire to conclude the discussion and move in camera and invited final comments.

Brandon Umpherville supported Janice Barry's points and cautioned against weakening advocacy language. He referenced recent success in development charge advocacy as evidence of the organization's effectiveness and stressed the importance of maintaining strong policy advocacy at all levels of government when implementation plans identify benefits for Indigenous peoples. He stressed the importance of signaling that the RAP is a living document, open to amendment, critique, and evolution over time. He suggested expanding language related to the RAP as a living resource.

Lesley Cabott noted that the document already refers to itself as a living resource and suggested expanding that language to better reflect ongoing adaptability. She thanked participants for the thoughtful discussion and confirmed that staff had captured the proposed changes.

Deborah Morrison sought clarification on the decision-making process, noting that the discussions appeared to lead to friendly amendments to the plan. She advised that a motion should clearly reflect the adoption of the plan as amended during this meeting. She further noted that the plan contained specific Board decisions, including procurement changes and the addition of a new Board member, which would require explicit Board approval. She explained that adding a new Board member required immediate action, as it involved a bylaw amendment and timing considerations, while other items could be deferred to the February Board meeting. She thanked the Board and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to support the implementation of this important initiative.

Staff left the meeting, and the Board met in-camera.

Motion 2025-2026/16
Moved: Robert Priebe / Seconded: Beate Bowron
"That the draft Reconciliation Action Plan and proposed implementation approach plan be adopted by the Board with the friendly amendments discussed. That the CEO be directed to work with staff to finalize the document and work plan to reflect the Board's input and prepare a communication strategy for the public launch of the plan in Vancouver adjacent to the February Board meeting.
CARRIED.

Motion 2025-2026/17
Moved: Bob Priebe / Seconded: Janice Barry
"That the Board accept on principle a bylaw amendment creating an Indigenous Director seat, which shall be open for election in the

upcoming cycle. That staff be tasked with drafting wording to be reviewed by the governance committee and presented at the next meeting of the Board for adoption."
CARRIED.

6.0 Consent Agenda

Relevant Materials:
~~2025-11-27 CIP Draft Board Meeting Minutes~~ (struck)
2026 Proposed Board & Committee Meeting Dates

The consent agenda was approved with the adoption of the meeting agenda (item 3.0).

Staff to send out meeting invites for 2026 Board and committee meetings.

7.0 In-Camera Session

The Board held an in-camera session to discuss a human resources matter before adjourning.

<u>Motion 2025-2026/18</u>
Moved: Andrew Ramlo / Seconded: Paul Bell
"That the CIP Board of Directors meeting convene in-camera."
CARRIED.

<u>Motion</u>
Moved: Andrew Ramlo / Seconded: Robert Priebe
"That the CIP Board of Directors meeting be adjourned."
CARRIED.

The next meeting of the Board of Directors will be held in person on February 6th and 7th in Vancouver, BC.