



MINUTES

ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE (ARC)

Friday, January 18, 2019

PRESENT

Members

Ramesh Subramanian, Chair
Waguih ElMaraghy, Vice-
Chair
Leila Notash
Remon Pop-Iliev
Amin Rizkalla
Shamim Sheikh
Stelian George-Cosh

Jüri Silmberg
Ian Marsland
Barna Szabados
Medhat Shehata
Michael Hulley
Bob Dony
Roydon Fraser
Gosha Zywno
Allen Stewart

Staff

Michael Price
Moody Farag
Pauline Lebel
Faris Georgis
Anna Carinci Lio
Esther Kim
Irene Zdan
Claire Riley

Regrets

Meilan Liu
John Yeow
Joe Lostracco
Seimer Tsang
Sanjeev Bhole

Judith Dimitriu
George Nakhla
Magdi Mohareb
Ross Judd
Amir Fam

Guests

David Kiguel, ERC Chair
Changiz Sadr, ERC Vice-Chair

1. Call to Order and Chair's Remarks

The meeting was called to order by Chair Ramesh Subramanian at 10:30 AM. He welcomed members to the meeting and wished everyone a Happy New Year.

He commended Leila Notash for her valuable contribution as ARC Chair for the past three years and members applauded in appreciation. He also wished her success as a candidate in the 2019 PEO Council elections as Councillor-at-Large.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The following matter was added to Item 10 – Other Business:

The letters addressed to the Attorney General of Ontario written by the Ontario Society of Professional Engineers (OSPE) and the Consulting Engineers of Ontario (CEO) regarding PEO.

MOTION

It was **moved** by Shamim Sheikh and **seconded** by Medhat Shehata that the agenda be approved as amended.

CARRIED

3. Approval of the December 7, 2018 Minutes

The following corrections were noted:

For Item 8.5 – ARC Distance Education (DE) Subcommittee – Bullet 3:

“He remarked that 85% of the work that engineers do is not related to the board sheets. He opined that board sheets represent only 15% of what engineers actually do.”

Should read:

“He remarked that according to a recent Harvard University study, only 15% of the job responsibilities of engineers relate to the technical subjects.”

And:

Moody Farag, Manager, Admission, reported on Canadian Engineering Qualifications Board (CEQB) syllabi noted under Item 8.2. – Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) Update, Bullet 3: The first two acronyms and the fourth referred to as CEAB should be CEQB.

MOTION

It was **moved by** Leila Notash and **seconded by** Waguih ElMaraghy that the minutes of the December 7, 2018 be approved as amended.

CARRIED

4. Matters Arising from the Minutes

There were no items to discuss.

5. Chair’s Report

There were no items to report.

6. Deputy Registrar’s Report

Deputy Registrar Michael Price reported the following:

- On behalf of PEO, he will be attending a Council of Ontario Deans of Engineering (CODE) meeting on January 19, 2019.

- Consultant Harry Cayton and his associates will be coming to PEO January 31, 2019 to conduct the external regulatory performance review through February 8, 2019. They will be meeting with various Committee Chairs and staff and will also be attending the Council meeting on February 8th.
- By-law changes for fee adjustments will be on Council's preliminary February 2019 agenda. These will be adjustments for the items Council approved as part of the budget changes discussed at its November 2018 meeting. There will be a presentation on how to go about the process and the actual changes will be considered at Council's March 2019 meeting. In addition, there will be an update at the March 2019 meeting as to modifying the Financial Credit Program (FCP) which was proposed for fee changes, as well as charging for Experience Requirements Committee (ERC) interviews.
- At the same February 2019 Council meeting, he will present a presentation on licensing at the plenary session. At the February 2019 ARC meeting, he should have all the year-end statistics to report. He pointed out that PEO issued more licences in 2018 than it ever has – 2,649 licences.

6.1 **Office of the Fairness Commissioner (OFC) – Update**

Deputy Registrar Michael Price reported the following:

- There was a meeting on December 3, 2018 with staff from the OFC, specifically the acting director and PEO's policy analyst to discuss the outstanding recommendations and the time frame the OFC gave PEO to meet the recommendations.
- Following the meeting, PEO sent correspondence to the OFC on December 11, 2018 outlining what was discussed as well as information to address their issues.
- On December 28, 2018, the OFC submitted a response via email, which was only received the first week of January and, by mail, it was received on January 17, 2019. In this correspondence, the OFC addresses the same four items that were deemed as being outstanding.
- **Item 2: *Engage a psychometrician to review the Professional Practice Examination (PPE) to confirm validity.*** PEO provided a copy of the engagement contract of a consultant and the OFC has asked that PEO submit a copy of the report the consultant provides.
- **Item 1** affects the ARC: ***Develop a policy to ensure internal review of applicant files are not completed by the same assessor who completed the initial review.*** When PEO met with the OFC on December 3, 2018, PEO left with the understanding that the OFC did not believe that the ARC's documentation was clear enough for a lay person to understand and that the OFC would work with PEO's Communications Department to simplify the documentation. However, in their response back to PEO, that is not what was indicated.

What PEO understood to be the issue is that if an applicant provided new information, the file would be given to the same assessor. If an applicant did not provide new information, then this is where PEO understood that the OFC had a concern. If there was no new information and there was a second assessor available in that specific discipline,

the OFC was agreed with this. PEO understood the OFC concern to be where there was not a second assessor available in the particular discipline, which is the case for some of the less popular disciplines. However, when the OFC wrote back to PEO, they stated that the remedial action for PEO to come into compliance is to adopt a policy and procedure applicable to all committee members and staff that internal reviews of applicant files are not completed by the same assessor who completed the initial review.

In reference to this, the OFC quoted the legal requirement for this as section 9, paragraph 5 of the *Fair Access to Regulated Professions and Compulsory Trades Act* (FARPACTA) – a section relating to registration decisions which is further defined in their legislation as being a decision to issue a licence, a decision to not issue a licence, a proposal to refuse to issue a licence, and issuing a licence with conditions. This does not seem to be applicable to an ARC assessment. PEO seems to be at an impasse with the OFC based on its belief that the OFC is not quoting the legislation correctly, PEO has referred this item to external legal counsel to review the legislation as well as any clarity that may be required to be given to the OFC.

- **Item 3: *Implement guidelines for decision-makers that include clear direction on what to do if they find themselves in a situation of potential bias.*** PEO asked the OFC to clarify bias. Previously, they were sent copies of both the ARC and ERC policies related to bias and conflict of interest and asked the OFC what it was that they wanted PEO to change in these documents and to send examples of what they think are appropriate policies from other regulatory bodies. Remedial action to be taken by PEO is to record what constitutes bias, types of bias and the need to avoid bias in appropriate policy documents and training manuals. And to explain procedures to be followed where potential for bias is identified.

PEO thought that types of bias might have been systemic bias, but it is not the case. The OFC presented PEO with a rather exhaustive document from other regulatory bodies. When one reads what they consider as bias in the examples, it seems onerous in terms of what the obligations are. PEO has also asked the external legal counsel to review what is written in the document and propose a bias and conflict of interest policy that will ultimately be considered by Council for all committees.

- **Item 4: *Develop and articulate timelines for responding to applicants' enquiries and requests.*** This recommendation came about as part of the intended upgrade to an online licensing system and was originally worded that this monitoring would occur after the online licensing system was in place. However, the OFC is now asking PEO to monitor staff responses to applicants even without a new system being in place. PEO has currently made a request to Aptify to see what is possible with the existing system that does not require extensive staff resources.

This is problematic because, in reading the actual OFC legislation, it does state that a regulated profession shall provide written responses to applicants within a reasonable time. They are requesting that PEO monitor how long it takes to reply to every single response staff makes to an applicant.

6.2 The Smith and Wolfe Awards

Deputy Registrar Michael Price reported the following:

PEO Council issues two awards based on recommendations by the ARC.

The V. G. Smith Award goes to an individual who was licensed in the previous year and completed an exam program of 5 exams or more and is based on the average of their top 3 exams. The individual being proposed is Li Ju Xue who became a member on February 15, 2018. He graduated from Beijing University with a Bachelor of Engineering in Chemical Technology. He was assigned 6 exams and obtained an average of 95% on his three highest marks, with an average of 80% in total.

MOTION

It was **moved by** Bob Dony and **seconded by** Shamim Sheikh that Li Ju Xue be selected as the recipient of the V.G. Smith Award.

CARRIED

The S.E. Wolfe Award is conferred annually on a member whose Engineering Report has been awarded the highest mark of all those presented during the year. For 2018, the Industrial Engineering Report is titled: *Comparison of Experimental Test and Computational Modelling of High Density Polyethylene to Set Reliable Input for Future Finite and Element Simulation*. The mark obtained was 91% and the recipient's name is Kamlesh K. Dave.

MOTION

It was **moved by** Barna Szabados and **seconded by** Bob Dony that Kamlesh K. Dave be selected as the recipient of the S.E. Wolfe Award.

CARRIED

7. Endorsements

7.1 Reading Assignment of Technical Reports/Synopses

There were four synopses: One in Manufacturing Engineering; one in Mechanical Engineering; and two in Electrical Engineering.

- The synopsis in Manufacturing Engineering is titled: Improvements of Modern Day Optics Cementing: submitted by applicant with File Number: 100513283. It was reviewed by Roydon Fraser and accepted.
- The synopsis in Mechanical Engineering is titled: HVAC Climate Control Report: Climate Discomfort in Office Space: submitted by applicant with File Number: 100201525. It was reviewed by Roydon Fraser and accepted.
- One of the Electrical Engineering synopses is titled: Smart Grid to Cognitive Grid: submitted by applicant with File Number: 100224809. It was reviewed by Barna Szabados and was not accepted.
- The second Electrical Engineering synopsis is titled: CCTV and Intrusion Detection System Design and Implementation: submitted by applicant with File Number: 100186441. It was reviewed by Roydon Fraser and accepted.

7.2 Issues Arising from ARC/Deputy Registrar Recommendations

There were no issues to report.

7.3 Issues Arising from ERC Recommendations for Applicants Referred by ARC

There were no issues to report.

8. Procedural and Related Matters

8.1 Licensing Committee (LIC) Update

LIC Chair Barna Szabados reported the following:

- The briefing note for the Internal Independent Review of Academic Assessments was rejected by the Legislation Committee (LEC). It will not be presented to Council for consideration.
- He noted that the briefing note was the subject of academic assessments and not academic decisions. He opined that the comments received from the LEC and OFC related to what happens after a Notice of Determination (NOD). Once an NOD is issued, the ARC has completed its objective. If there are concerns related to the NOD, the Registration Committee (REC) is involved and the NOD does not return to the ARC – unless the file was closed and a new one reopened.
- He posed the question as to why the ARC could not review its assessments. Normally, if new information is received and the file is returned to the same reviewer, he or she not only welcomes it but, at times, the reviewer actually requests new information. He does not see an issue with a file being returned to the same assessor.
- In its communication to the LIC, the LEC stated that, according to the Regulations, the ARC was prohibited from obtaining expert advice outside of the ARC. He noted that this aspect was corrected in the last submission of the briefing note by indicating that Council would appoint an expert or a panel of experts that would act as outside experts.
- There are two options that were proposed at the LIC meeting January 17, 2019:
 - a) He could make a presentation to the LEC; or
 - b) In the interim, before obtaining a legal opinion from external counsel, the LIC suggests that Stages 1 and 2 of the Internal Independent Review of Academic Assessments proposal be made formal as they are what the ARC currently implements.
 - **Stage 1: Review with New Information – Reconsideration on Request by the Applicant:** Staff may bring back files to the ARC with written requests for reconsideration of one or more program obligations. Applicants should provide additional academic documentation.
 - **Stage 2: Internal Review:** The reasons for the decision should be made clear to an applicant. If they still request a review and a second ARC expert is available, the second reviewer should perform a “blind” review. Each reviewer should independently discuss the file with either the ARC Chair or Vice-Chair overseeing the consistency of the process and consistency within disciplines and have a staff

member acting as a resource person. If a second reviewer in the discipline is not available, the original reviewer should present the reasons for the recommendation to the ARC Chair or Vice-Chair, in addition to a staff member. If there is no change in the recommendation, the file should be returned to the ARC for the reassessment.

- He suggested that since it is already the ARC's normal practice, Stages 1 and 2 be included in the Procedures Manual of the Academic Requirements Committee (the Red Book).

MOTION

It was **moved by** Barna Szabados and **seconded by** Allen Stewart that modified Stages 1 and 2, as outlined in the Internal Independent Review of Academic Assessments be included in the Procedures Manual of the Academic Requirements Committee (aka the Red Book).

CARRIED

- At the January 17, 2019 LIC meeting, members discussed two matters they would like to undertake:
 1. To define "Good Character" which is referred to in the *Professional Engineers Act*. The LIC proposes to change the reference title "Good Character" to "Suitability to Practice Engineering."
 2. To define the principles of the referees, to expand on what information PEO expects to see in their reports, in particular, what the Experience Requirements Committee (ERC) expects to see. Most of the information therein relates to the character references of the applicant rather than to what the applicant is *doing* in terms of competencies in engineering.

8.2 Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) Update

Bob Dony reported the following:

- The last CEAB meeting was held in September 2018.
- For the past two years, part of new initiatives during the CEAB meetings is to conduct workshops. He invited ARC members who are associated with institutions undergoing accreditation to meet and have discussions with the CEAB Chair on January 20, 2019.
- He noted that the new Ontario CEAB Representative, ARC Chair Ramesh Subramanian, will attending his first CEAB meeting in February 2019.

8.3 Canadian Engineering Qualifications Board (CEQB) Update

Roydon Fraser reported the following:

- There is work being done on pursuing the description of how to use the syllabi, similar to what the ARC does. Barna Szabados and he will also have discussions on the matter.

- For the ARC's review, he will distribute information as to what the CEQB is currently doing.
- PEO has allowed two "sanitized" syllabi to be used for distribution and he chose two Mechanical Engineering syllabi from the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) – the agency responsible for accreditation of engineering and technology programs in the United States.
- At the next CEQB meeting, he expects to hear about the status of the request by PEO for both the Aeronautical and Biomedical Engineering syllabi and whether these syllabi made it into the CEQB work plan.

8.4 Distance Education (DE) Sub-Committee – Update and Presentation

Prior to the meeting, a hard copy of the presentation was distributed to the Committee and DE Sub-Committee Chair Waquih EIMaraghy reported the following:

- The DE Subcommittee held its meeting earlier to the ARC meeting, attended by Remon Pop-Iliev, Barna Szabados, Leila Notash, Moody Farag and him.
- The mandate of the DE Sub-Committee is how to assess distance education and was formed a few months ago when PEO was not accepting distance education applications. Currently, the ARC accepts these applications but there is still no criterium on how to process these files.
- Previous DE presentations and reports had to do with the evaluation, assessment and classification of the types of distance education. In the 2019 CEAB Guide, there is an expanded appendix interpretive statement on DE and distance learning (DL). The Sub-Committee has collected and compiled ample information from the guide and added one of the objectives discussed at its December 2018 meeting, which is how can there be consistency in approaching DE and other Non-CEAB applications. However, the interpretation and decisions will be different depending on the number of online applications. He wants to align ARC's approach with using the CEQB syllabus.
- There are three issues related to DE: (1) The academic program itself in terms of breadth and depth; (2) What is the type of delivery, the resources provided to the students, the laboratory experience, the use of tools? (3) Exposure to professional engineering, the professional subjects, not soft subjects.
- He quoted two points from the CEAB DL interpretive statement: (1) Accreditation Board criteria do not limit accreditation to any particular mode of delivery; DL courses and programs are not excluded. (2) Assessment of DL assignments and student performance must be at the same level as any equivalent full or part-time courses being delivered by the academic institution.
- Important issues the ARC will be concerned about are the need to confirm the authenticity of the applicant and the veracity of the information submitted.
- There are three categories to classify DE: (1) The "high touch" which is structured very similar to the CEAB equivalent; (2) There is the "high tech" which is at the other extreme of the spectrum where the process is 100% online, no laboratory experience, no teamwork; (3) And there is the "blended" structure which is between high touch and high tech.

- Looking at all the worldwide requirements, including those of the CEAB, the Sub-Committee suggests looking at the following preliminary list in terms of discussion and the content of the applications:
 1. The breadth and depth of knowledge – which is the existing procedure, database and current board sheets;
 2. To enquire whether there was any laboratory experience or use of engineering tools;
 3. Engineering economics and risk assessment;
 4. Any indication of design experience and collaborative problem-solving;
 5. The impact of engineering on society, the environment and health and safety.

- In reference to the learning environment, the Sub-Committee would like the syllabi to be submitted with all applications. Regarding the assessment, will it be structured evaluation? How will the examinations take place?

- In summary, the Sub-Committee wants to know if it is on the right track? If not, what does the ARC suggest as an alternative approach? The Sub-Committee would like to the ARC to agree on the next steps in the process and to identify any gaps and, as well, to suggest remedies. Whatever is agreed to, he suggests that it is done on a simplified, experimental basis and to monitor the progression. The most important criteria will be defined by assessment methods.

- The Sub-Committee suggest that the DE process begins with the current, established guidelines in the Procedure Manual of the Academic Requirements Committee (the Red Book). Further issues to study in the future will be how to assess graduate online degrees. Ultimately, it is the objective that everything be done online so that information can be collected in an efficient manner.

- The DE Sub-Committee Chair finished the presentation and invited feedback and questions from ARC members. The Committee engaged in a lengthy discussion and informative exchanges followed.

8.5 Experience Requirements Committee (ERC) Report

ERC Chair David Kiguel reported the following:

- The ERC met on December 13, 2018 and it was a full day of activities with the training session in the morning, followed by the festive, end-of-year lunch, and in the afternoon, there was an ERC Business Meeting.

- At the meeting, the ERC approved a new procedure for addressing reinstatement of applicants whose licences have been cancelled due to non-payment of dues that had lapsed for over 2 years since the cancellation. The new procedure is not applicable for those members who resigned. The new procedure improves the process without any required changes to the Regulations.

- In addition to the application, payment of fees and the referee forms, the ERC also asks that they submit a record of how they have kept up to date with standards that apply to their discipline and practice – their professional development record. The process has been approved and already implemented. Faris Georgis, Manager, Registration,

informed him that there are already new applicants for reinstatement who are going through the new process.

- He reported on the matter of a past proposal from both the LIC and ERC to remove the monitor's 30-hour physical presence requirement per month at an engineer-in-training (EIT)'s workplace. At the request of President David Brown in December 2018, the ERC sought peer review by the Professional Standards Committee (PSC). They responded and asked the ERC to provide original documents outlining the purpose of the monitoring process. The PSC also asked that the ERC provide the original legal review obtained by the ERC regarding whether the current legislative framework permits PEO to explore such policy and alternatives related to the monitoring process.
- He responded to the PSC indicating that the introduction of the monitor concept and requirements were approved by Council in 2011. After initial approval by Council, the PSC presented further requirements, stating that the monitor should be a licensed professional engineer and, as such, the PSC requested and obtained approval from Council in 2013. The current guidelines include the 30-hour physical presence requirement. In his response, he also confirmed that the ERC was not precluding the physical presence of the monitor but only to replace the explicit reference to 30 hours per month with a mutually agreed upon number of hours by the monitor, EIT and his or her employer.
- On his second approach to resolving the matter, he wrote an email communication to President Brown and Interim Registrar Johnny Zuccon asking them to include the reconsideration of the monitor's hours at the February 2019 Council meeting since, he opined, the exchange with the PSC was not conducive to solving the matter.
- On February 6, 2019, he will attend an interview with Harry Cayton, the consultant conducting PEO's external regulatory performance review, and he will report back to the ARC at its February 2019 meeting.
- The next ERC Business Meeting is on February 22, 2019. Traditionally at this time, the ERC presents anniversary pins to ERC members who have dedicated 5 years or more of volunteerism to the ERC. In 2018, there were approximately 30 members who received anniversary pins and he expects the number to be close to the same in 2019. He also extended an invitation to the ARC Chair Ramesh Subramanian to attend the meeting. President Brown will also attend.

8.6 ERC Interview Referrals

Roydon Fraser brought forth the following:

- Appendix A. 4.6 of the Procedure Manual of the Academic Requirements Committee (the Red Book) states: *If an applicant has sufficient years of practice, he or she is referred to the ERC for an interview. Upon the ERC's recommendations, part or the entire examination program may be waived by the ARC.*
- He remarked that when there is an applicant who graduated 5 years ago and there is a referral to the ERC, there is no assessment of their experience at that stage.
- He posed these the following questions to the Committee:

- a) When an applicant has 5 years of engineering experience, do ARC members expect their file to be referred to the ERC?
 - b) If the applicant has 4 years experience, does the current system hold up the file from going to the ERC?
 - c) If an applicant is referred to the ERC, would members be surprised if the applicant did not go to the ERC, or was not asked to go to the ERC? Do members actually expect the applicant to be referred to the ERC.
 - d) As the ARC, what is the policy and expectation in reference to the referral of these particular applicants to the ERC?
- It was reiterated that the role of the ERC is analyze an applicant's experience. If the applicant does not have engineering experience, how can there be a decision to waive examinations? If the ARC chooses to interview an applicant, the interview should be based on academics.
 - He pointed out that a preliminary review of experience should be done by the ARC to assess whether the applicant has 5 years of engineering experience. However, an applicant can acquire an enormous amount of experience in just 3 years depending on their job role, the different levels, versus a slow buildup of experience. There should at least be a conscious review of what the situation is and whether there is a basis from which academics could have been built. He opined that 5 years seems to be an arbitrary number as there are diverse rates of acquiring experience and the ARC should be assessing these types of files. Further, what the ARC's intent is may have to reconcile how the process works with the ERC.
 - Member Al Stewart remarked that when looking through the Red Book, there are three references to experience: two references state "relevant engineering experience" and one simply states "relevant experience." He noted that the ARC has not actually defined what is meant by experience, which was brought to the table in 2018 but did not result in a conclusion as to its definition.
 - Further, Al Stewart asked whether the experience referred to 5 years post-undergraduate education once the ARC accepts the undergraduate education as acceptable? Is experience simply referring to 5 years from graduation? Or is it 5 years of engineering experience from graduation? When does the clock for experience start? His practice is to always look at the experience record the applicant provides and assess whether there are 5 years experience acquired in a job relevant to engineering and, if not, he does not recommend the applicant. He concluded by saying that: (1) If the ARC estimate of the experience was incorrect, or staff overrides the referral, he wants staff to inform the ARC reviewer. (2) Upon a referral to the ERC, the applicant should be notified that they have the right to apply for a review.
 - Bob Dony added that an ERC interview is an opportunity for the applicant to present an engineering project to provide evidence that they have applied engineering principles so that the depth of their educational experience is demonstrated during the interview to establish whether they are applying engineering academics to their project, to validate the actual experience involved.

MOTION

It was **moved by** Roydon Fraser and **seconded by** Bob Dony that whenever a file has had its referral to the ERC rejected, that that file be returned to the ARC and that this motion be included in the Procedures Manual of the Academic Requirements Committee [the Red Book].

CARRIED

9. New Procedural Matter(s) for Discussion

There were no items to discuss.

10. Other Business

Past ARC Chair Leila Notash brought forth:

- Letters addressed to the Attorney General of Ontario about PEO: One from the Ontario Society of Professional Engineers (OSPE), dated November 22, 2018; and a second from Consulting Engineers of Ontario (CEO), dated November 20, 2018.
- OSPE has raised concerns about the PEO carrying out its mandate with regard to the Protection of the Public – Continuing Professional Education, referencing PEO's Practice Evaluation and Knowledge (PEAK) Program report. Over 4 years have passed since the release of the report, and PEAK is neither compulsory, nor has it been effectively adopted by PEO's Council. OSPE wrote that out of the 22 professional engineers on the PEO Council, only 12 have participated in the PEAK Program because it is not mandatory. OSPE is also calling for the elimination of PEO's lobbying capability through the Government Liaison Program (GLP). OSPE believes there is a conflict of interest as PEO is a regulatory body and should not be lobbying the government.
- The CEO expressed concerns regarding the title of Consulting Engineers that PEO employs and the size of its Council, proposing that PEO would be best governed with a Council of 12 to 15 individuals and suggesting that 5 to 7 of these individuals should be laypeople. The letter expresses the opinion that the extent of non-regulatory activity gives the appearance of PEO being a "members' club with the club mentality permeating all aspects of PEO."
- She believes that the overlaps alluded to in the letters should be clarified and she hopes to have a briefing from PEO Councillors about these concerns raised by both OSPE and CEO.
- Bob Dony informed the Committee that the PEO Executive and Senior Leadership Team have discussed the letters and concluded that there is nothing specific referred to in the letters but, rather, open-ended accusations with of little substance. He said PEO is fulfilling its obligations under the *Professional Engineers Act*, including the designation for Consulting Engineers. He informed the Committee that PEO is entering into discussions with the Attorney General of Ontario. In conclusion, he noted that OSPE and PEO are two separate organizations with fundamentally different mandates.

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:55 PM
The next meeting is schedule for February 15, 2019