

## Minutes of the November 10, 2011 EDTF – NME Subgroup meeting

Room 210, 40 Sheppard Ave. West

**Participating:** Alana Lavoie (t/c), Gerry Margaritis (t/c), Brian Haydon, Roger Jones, Laura Deakin (t/c), Jordan Max (staff advisor)

**Regrets:** Yuri Kuzyk, Corneliu Chisu, John Yeow, Dave Adams, Marios Ioannidis, Peter DeVita

The meeting started at 4:05 p.m., however, quorum was not present.

### 1. Review of agenda

The agenda was reviewed and approved without changes

### 2. Review of October 3, 2011 minutes and follow up on action items

The minutes were reviewed. Gerry mentioned that he would forward some recent nanotechnology reports coming from the European Union.

**Action: Gerry to forward to Jordan copies or links to the EU reports**

### 3. In-depth review of Phase 2 Report version 3 (modified and sent out November 2, 2011)

Jordan recapped that at the last meeting, much of the discussion was about the Table of Contents and the ordering of sections, and that Yuri had done significant revisions to the report. He reported that he had suggested that we needed to add sections for Academic Requirements and Professional Practice Guidelines. The subgroup revised the Table of Contents to place industry standards before legislation/regulations, and added a section on International Standards. In reference to a question, Jordan indicated that the Ontario Toxics Reductions Act did not apply to laboratory or research facilities, only to manufacturing ones (industries with a NAICS code of 31-33 or 212).

**Action: Jordan to forward information on the TRA to Gerry. Jordan to revise the Phase 2 report according to the new Table of Contents and circulate the revised paper, after which everyone would add content. Jordan to replace Laura's section with an updated version provided by her.**

### 4. Next meeting(s) date(s)

The next meeting dates set were Thursday, December 8, 2011 (4-6:30pm) and January 12, 2012

### 5. Adjournment and dinner with CIE subgroup

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00pm. Over dinner, Bernie Ennis, Director of Policy and Professional Affairs and the staff advisor for the Professional Standards Committee, gave a presentation on professional guidelines and standards objectives, criteria and process, and answered questions. (Note: copies of these documents have been posted in Central Desktop) Key points in the discussion included;

- Guidelines/standards are not intended to be best practices, but rather the minimum standard of practice.

- Compared to standards in Regulations, the degree to which guidelines would apply as an expected standard of practice for Disciplinary cases varies from Discipline panel to panel
- It would be helpful for the EDTF to draft Terms of Reference for PSC to use in considering the development of guidelines and standards and the formation of sub-committees if so approved by PSC and Council
- In terms of process, a proponent needs to gather and present evidence that would satisfy PSC's Criteria for drafting guidelines or standards, which is then reviewed by PSC and a recommendation made to Council for approval of the work to commence, after which PSC would form a sub-committee of experts in the relevant field
- It was recommended that NME and CIE would address public safety risks and how professional engineering practice could mitigate those risks
- It was suggested that the development of professional practice guidelines would be useful for emerging disciplines as it would help to define the technical knowledge and practice considerations to assist current P.Eng.s who wished to practice in those areas.
- It was further suggested that the scopes of practice of NME and CIE be broken down into specific activities or functions which would require practice guidelines as opposed to defining the discipline(s), which continue to evolve.