

From: Ken Matchett
Sent: November-20-09 1:37 PM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP FEES REVIEW

I have read the proposed membership fee structure allowing for reduced fees for various circumstances and believe they are fair and appropriate.

Regards,

Ken Matchett

From: Strike, Tom (Corporate)
Sent: November-20-09 11:19 AM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: Response to AMF Proposal

Having read your consultation paper, my reaction is that the magic number would be probably more appropriately set at 90 rather than the proposed 95. As well, the income levels at which the fee reductions for “semi retirement” are proposed to be set at 5 – 25 times AMFs (\$5,000 - \$25000) seem inordinately low in light of current income earning capacity for professionals.

Regards, Tom

Tom Strike, CA, CF

From: Susanne Robertson
Sent: November-20-09 10:20 AM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: Consultation - Annual Membership Fees

It is evident that a lot of thought went into the proposal and it appears reasonable.

Susanne Robertson CA

From: j spence
Sent: November-20-09 10:22 AM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: Response to AMF proposal

AMF Committee

I graduated from the Manitoba Institute in 1965 at which time I moved to Ontario and joined the Ontario Institute. I have been paying annual dues to Ontario and paying Manitoba dues as a member of the Ontario Institute. I am fully retired and have been paying Ontario \$52.50 a year and Manitoba \$157.50 a year. I would be happy to continue paying the Manitoba fees if they were at the same level of Ontario. If not I will probably cancel my membership in Manitoba this year and just continue with my Ontario dues.

Yours truly,

John Michael Spence
C.A. Manitoba 1965

From: Barnabe, Carmelle
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2009 4:05 PM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: RE: Proposed Revisions to Fee Categories

To Whom it May Concern:

I have read the proposed revisions to the fee categories. I agree that a fee-break should occur for members that are semi-retired and retired.

However, my greatest concern actually relates to breaks for students. As it stands the proposed fee relief would be for a 50% reduction in the annual membership if a person is making 15x or less the annual fee. This would currently equate to making \$26,000 or less a year in order to receive a 50% reduction to a fee.

I am considering a PHD in accounting. It takes approximately 5 years to complete a PHD and unfortunately, there are no programs available in Winnipeg, therefore I would need to move to Alberta, Ontario or Quebec, which are incredibly expensive provinces.

Tuition costs alone range from \$8k - \$15k a year. Living costs can range from \$1k- \$1.5k a month at a minimum not including incidentals, etc. The typical PHD students can obtain grants between \$10k-\$20k a year. Without considering the annual membership fee, a full time PHD student would already be in a deficit position every year while obtaining their doctorate. As it stands, paying the full membership amount or even a reduced membership fee would be fairly prohibitive. And as I understand from talking to several PHD's, the ability to work during this period is fairly remote due to the workload. Exacerbating the financial situation is that I am single, and therefore do not have a significant other to rely on for financial support.

In considering this, I believe a larger fee relief should be in place for students that considers the type of program, length of program and whether it is full time or part time program. I would find it disheartening if paying annual membership dues would cut into the ability to pay for basic tuition and cost of living.

As the grooming of future CA's starts in the university classroom and because there is a shortage of good accounting profs and ones with a CA background, I think the CA profession should be doing something to encourage this career path, versus imposing additional barriers.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to my concerns.

Regards,
Carmelle Barnabe, C.A., MPAcc

From: Sue Cunningham
Sent: November-24-09 7:06 AM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: Proposed Fee Structure

As an individual on an extended career break for caregiving, I applaud your proposal. If approved, it will likely postpone my retirement from the Institute, thus securing an (albeit small) income stream for ICAM which would have otherwise evaporated.

Sue Cunningham

From: M Dickson
Sent: November-23-09 5:07 PM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: Response to AMF proposal

I am pleased to see this subject being addressed.

The paper is well presented and appears to cover most issues.

From my perspective, the determining factor will be the PD requirements, and not the fees, for semi-retired members.

If I have earned income of 20,000 and am not in public practice, I will think twice about the 120 hours of PD required to maintain my membership.

I cannot afford to pay 500+ for a day of PD.

Regards, M. Dickson

From: Bailey, Shauna
Sent: November-24-09 2:01 PM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: Proposed Fee Restructuring

I would like to comment on your revisions to the fee structure for those on caregiver leave. As someone who is contemplating taking a couple of years off for caregiver leave, when EI runs out and your employer is no longer paying for your fees, even a 50% reduction results in a cumbersome financial obligation. The prior rules of looking at financial hardship in my opinion should remain in effect for these individuals.

I know when I was on maternity leave and receiving full EI benefits, the month that I had to pay my CA dues would have eliminated almost one entire biweekly payment, even at the 50% rate. Some companies do not pay CA dues for individuals on leaves of absence (I am lucky in that my company does); if I were to go on an extended leave my company would not either. Also, if I were to continue taking PD courses to maintain my designation that would cause further financial hardship. While it may be temporary, the number of individuals in my situation are growing.

Thank you,

Shauna Bailey, CA

From: Byron Barker (Non-resident member, Czech Republic)
Sent: November-24-09 9:31 AM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: Response to AMF proposal

Having read the proposal, I am left with a couple of questions which were not clear to me from the document (I apologize if these matters were addressed elsewhere on the ICAM website):

1) Do the Annual Membership Fees (AMF) which are the subject of the document pertain only to the "ICAM Fees - Resident" (\$590 for 09/10) or do they also include the "Education Assessment - Resident" (\$100 for 09/10) or the "CICA fees" (\$460 for 09/10). It is hard to know when the document uses a \$1,000 AMF for its examples. I assume the CICA fees will not be subject to the ICAM decision on discounts, but perhaps I am wrong.

2) There is no mention whatever of the "ICAM fees - Non-Resident" category in this document, which was \$150 for 09/10. Will this category continue to exist and was it excluded from the document simply because it is not subject to the revisions under discussion.

Regards,

Byron Barker

Answer from ICAM: With respect to "resident" member fees, in general, CICA follows the same reduction policy as each provincial Institute. Therefore if we provide a 50% or 75% fee reduction on our portion of the fees, CICA does the same on their portion. Similarly, the education assessment applies to all resident Manitoba members so it will also be reduced by 50% or 75%.

There is no plan currently to change the fee structure for non-resident members, so that area was excluded from the discussion. However, if it appears that a large number of members may be entering "semi-retirement" internationally, it may become necessary to review that structure as well.

Under the proposal, semi-retired resident members (at the 50% level) at current fee levels would pay about \$575, while members outside of Canada (semi-retired or active) would pay \$610, which is not a large difference. Fully retired members who meet the income and magic 95 criteria receive a full fee exemption regardless of residence.

However, there may be a disadvantage to international members who have incomes below the 5X AMF threshold (they would continue to pay \$610 compared to \$288 for resident members) and if there are significant numbers of those members, it may be necessary to review that policy. As of now, we have roughly 35 international members who have advised that they are retired and all but one of them qualify for a full exemption.

From: Adrian Nagy
Sent: November-24-09 9:41 AM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: RE: Proposed Revisions to Fee Categories

November 24, 2009

Gary

I reviewed the proposed amendments and feel that the approach is reasonable.

Adrian Nagy

From: Henry F. Riendeau
Sent: November-26-09 3:26 PM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: Response to AMF proposal

I believe that you are taking a step in the right direction. I am looking at this as a person who has a combination of age and years of membership of 117. I have been retired from public practice for a number of years. My earned income for some years now consists of preparing personal tax returns for about 6 weeks of the year plus a director's fee for serving on a Board of Directors.

I would suggest that once you have reached the "magic number" for retirement the AMF should be replaced by a "percentage of fee" reduction. It somehow does not seem fair to me to be required to pay full fees if you have total earned income of say \$25,500 when a recent graduate earning \$70,000 would pay the same amount. I also believe that in the majority of cases the recent CA would have his fees paid by his or her employer whereas the retired Ca will likely have to pay his own.

There is also the professional development aspect which must be taken into consideration. This seems to be directly related to income earned and fees paid. This is then another added cost to the member earning say \$25,500 of earned income. The professional training should be directly related to the type of earned income. It does not make much sense to attend a course that will not help you in any way in earning your earned income.

In conclusion, I wish to commend you for making changes to keep up with the times.

Yours very truly

Henry F. Riendeau C.A.

From: Bob Wall
Sent: November-27-09 12:42 PM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: Response to AMF Proposal

I have read the consultation paper and I have some comments recommendations and concerns.

I appreciate that the ICAM recognises the value of the experienced members of the association and has created a category based upon age as well as experience. But I believe "magic 95" should be reduced. I understand that for many professionals upon retirement the magic number is 85. I recommend that this number for ICAM should be reduced to 90.

I recommend that the ICAM Council and administration work with a professional demographer in order to scientifically predict the future membership numbers and this impact on future revenue.

It seems to me that part of the process is to protect the future revenue stream to ICAM. Over the past many years the members of ICAM and their council have been good stewards of the membership fees collected and have created a surplus. Is it appropriate at this time to consider employing some of these surplus reserves to assist the budget until the demographics are more favourable?

I appreciate that the ICAM council has chosen to prepare and disburse this consultation paper to the members. I encourage you to continue to establish links with the members.

Thank you,

Bob Wall

From: J & K Giesbrecht
Sent: January-03-10 10:42 PM
To: Icam Administration
Cc: Icam Administration
Subject: Response to AMF Proposal

A comment on the AMF Proposal:

The “Earned income” used in the AMF calculation (in the Consultation Paper dated November 16, 2009 - Appendix A, Note 1) should be based on the CURRENT calendar year’s active income, not “the PREVIOUS calendar year”. Basing it on the previous year is unfair and retroactive. Someone who retired in 2009 does not have the income to pay the 2010 dues (in 2010) as if still employed. The 2010 fees relate to running the Institute in 2010, not 2009.

If the issue is proof of income - T4’s and or income tax returns for 2010 are available early in 2011 and 2010 fees could (and should) be adjusted accordingly at that time.

...John Giesbrecht

Answer from ICAM: Under the current fee structure, members are asked to estimate their income for the current fiscal year (April 1 to March 31) and then advise us later if their actual income is higher than the threshold amounts.

Our experience has been that many members who estimate that their early retirement income will be under the threshold do contact us later in the year to say that they have been more active than they estimated and therefore no longer qualify for reduced fees. We then invoice them for the balance of the AMFs. This current process requires follow up by both members and staff.

The proposal would address the need for members to contact us to change their status immediately and defer any changes until the next fee billing cycle. AMFs for the 2010-11 fiscal year would be payable on March 31, 2010 and members would simply claim a fee reduction based on their income for the calendar year 2009. We acknowledge that this defers a claim for an exemption during the first year of retirement, however, we believe that it provides greater clarity and requires less monitoring and administration for both members and staff.

We should also note that the reporting system will continue to be an “honour” system based on a signed application for a fee exemption or reduction. Only applications for special consideration under financial hardship require “proof of income”.

From: Bill Bodman
Sent: January-08-10 6:25 AM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: Reponse to AMF Proposal

I have read (twice) your consultation paper on the Annual Membership Fees. Sorry for waiting for the last minute to provide my comments.

My comments are in regard to " those members who have reached Magic 95 and who earn \$5,000 and \$25,000 would pay \$500 in AMFs".

In my opinion, by setting the fee at 50%, this a subsidy to the active membership.

You state you have a concern about the "younger members ... will bear the cost of sustaining the profession in the future". Members, who are practicing accountants and use the designation CA, should bear the cost of sustaining the profession now and in the future.

In retirement, if I were to work as a greeter at Wal-Mart's and earn \$15,000 in a year I would pay \$500 for my membership. This makes no sense!

In retirement, if I were to work as an accountant at Wal-Mart's and earn \$15,000 in a year, but I do not hold myself out as a CA, I should not have to pay 50% of the membership fee.

You should establish a retired membership category with, say, a set \$250 fee. This would encourage members to maintain their membership and they could use the title, if they wish, "retired CA". This would be similar to officers in the armed forces. For example, an admiral after retirement uses the title retired admiral which gives him the respect for his profession but clearly indicates that he is not an active member of the armed forces.

Bill Bodman, retired CA

From: Shelley Johnson
Sent: January-10-10 12:03 PM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: Response to AMF Proposal

Hello

Thank you for preparing and proposing this fee structure. A lot of thought has gone into this proposal.

I agree with the amendments.

It is important to treat our long standing members with respect. The new structure would accomplish this goal.

For members returning back to school full time, there should be a provision to reduce their fees to zero. This could be done on a case by case basis.

For members taking a leave of absence to become full time caregivers, a reduced fee is most welcomed.

The members that are earning an income from their CA designations should be the ones to support the Institute.

Thank you.
Shelley Johnson, CA

From: Sidney Halpern
Sent: January-08-10 9:52 PM
To: Icam Administration
Subject: RESPONSE TO AMF PROPOSAL

As a CA now 10 Years past what was once considered retirement age I suggest the following:

The structure should be much simpler than that proposed. I recommend the following:

Full fees should be paid always unless financial hardship is submitted as a cause for reduction

Financial hardship should recognize all income including investments and pension since the level of such income is most often as a result of our careers as CA's.

The rationale for full fee assessment is that altho a CA may not be involved in areas related to their careers as CA's they will always be perceived in the community as a CA and will be expected to act in accordance with the high levels of ethical and professional standards that the community expects of them and therefore we should be required to pay full fees and comply with professional development requirements and other professional standards.

And as stated in the demographic environment most CA's today do not enter a retirement phase and should they have even only one client at a modest fee that should still require full membership and ongoing professional development. The fees earned appears to have no intellectual basis for a fee reduction.

Sincerely,

Sidney Halpern