Letter 1: Eurocodes

DEAR EDITOR,

Just a couple of issues I would like to bring up in the Monthly Bulletin of IEM. The first being the Bulletin magazine itself and the second being the Malaysia's stand on Eurocodes.

The Monthly Bulletin of IEM has long been regarded as the voice of the engineering profession in Malaysia. However, this prestige is now being challenged more and more by the quarterly publication of Ingenieur by the Board of Engineers, Malaysia.

In the 2005 membership subscription renewal notice, we were asked to suggest ways of improving the IEM publication. I am sure many members like me would like to hear more about this matter and for that matter the suggestions received.

From a personal note, I would like to see the IEM Monthly Bulletin devotes each month for each State in Malaysia and the Federal Terrorities on topics and issues in engineering and construction. The local branch of the IEM could help or even contribute in such publications.

There is also a great similarity as far as layout design and presentation between the IEM bulletin and that of the magazine of the Institution of Engineers, Singapore. This comes as a no surprise as both publications are handled by the same publisher. Perhaps it's now time that IEM repackages its Bulletin to have a more distinct outlook as well as content, on par with that of ICE magazine.

On the subject of Eurocodes, I read from the Eurocodes Expert web site at www.eurocodes.co.uk that ".....The Governments of Malaysia and Vietnam have announced they will base their future national structural design standards on the new Eurocodes, in consultation with British Standards Institution (BSI).....".

Could this announcement a bit premature? The fact is that IEM has so far only released a Position Paper on the adoption of Eurocode 2 on the design of concrete structures. Eurocode 2 is only a part of the suite of Structural Eurocodes and it is also unclear that authorization for the use of Eurocodes will come under which Malaysian authority.

I would be most grateful if the IEM can enlighten fellow engineers on this issue. Perhaps more reporting on this matter in the Bulletin would be beneficial to the engineering community.

Yours truly,
Ir. Albert K. W. Tam
(FIEM 05941)

EDITOR'S COMMENTS

We thank you for your letter and hope that our IEM members take note of the contents. We welcome contributions from all members to make this IEM monthly bulletin a joy to read and a treasure to receive.

Best regards,
Ir. Mah Soo, IEM Bulletin Editor

Letter 2: No Status in Australia Too

DEAR EDITOR,

After reading the letter by Ross Harlen (No Status Overseas) in the May 2005 issue, I am convinced that whatever crossed boundaries mutual recognition arrangements, it does not and will not really work. Yes, I would agree with Ross that international recognition are almost impossible to enforce, and more so when the people running the respective initiative, be it the APEC Engineers Register, the EMF International Engineer Register, the Engineering Council of South Africa, Engineers Australia, the Institution of Engineers Malaysia, to name a few, have the "better than you" mentalities.

I graduated from an Australian University sixteen years ago and recently have taken up residency in South Australia. Throughout my engineering career I have always made it a point to maintain a high level of professionalism and expectation required from being an engineer. I lectured industry base courses to young engineers, presented papers in conferences all on a voluntary basis, as my good friend used to say, "... giving back to society". To cut a long story short, I am a Member of Engineers Australia, a Fellow of The Institution of Engineers Malaysia, an APEC Engineers Register, an International Engineer (EMF) and an ASEAN Engineers Register. Similarly, thinking that these registrations would be transferable to any of those nations that had mutual recognition arrangement. It was not to be the case.

Through my enquiries to Engineers Australia in South Australia and the feedback from National HQ, basically, I am required to present myself for the entire assessment to obtain the CPEng qualification. Reason given was that I am unable to provide the documentation that I submitted for my APEC Engineers Register in Malaysia. To this effect, the pieces of paper carrying the registration number "MY A 00088" and "MY E 00088" does not even worth the weight of paper it is printed on. It does make me wonder, among the five engineers in my current employment, why am I the only MIEAust?

Ir. Huey Liew, MIEAust FIEM'sia
Mawson Lakes, South Australia

EDITOR'S COMMENTS

We thank you for your letter and I am sorry for publishing your letter so late as I was indisposed. After reading your letter, I wish to extend my sympathy to your predicament. I have consulted some of the more knowledgeable peers in the IEM and the analogy that could be given for this matter is as follows. Every country has its own rules and regulations. International passports of citizens from countries having diplomatic relations are accepted as valid travel documents but some countries still impose the requirement of application of Visa for entry. There are instances that some applications for Visas are turned down due to some reasons and it rests with the prerogative of the respective country.

From your letter, the reason given was that you are unable to provide the documentation that you have submitted for your APEC Engineers registration in Malaysia. Meanwhile my suggestion would be that you furnish them with all the relevant documentation as requested and extend one copy to IEM attention to me. I will personally approach some of the more knowledgeable peers in the IEM to assess how best we could assist you in this matter.

Best regards,
Ir. Mah Soo, IEM Bulletin Editor