



# Minutes

## Consulting Engineer Designation Committee

Meeting: August 25, 2022, Thursday (via Zoom)

Present: Dalila Giusti, P.Eng.  
Santosh Gupta, P.Eng.  
Andrew Lawton, P.Eng.  
Adrian Pierorazio, P.Eng.  
Don Plenderleith, P.Eng.  
Michael Rosenblitt, P.Eng. – Vice Chair  
Steve van der Woerd, P.Eng. – Chair  
Matt Weaver, P.Eng.

Regrets: Gordon Debbert, P.Eng.

Staff: Jose Vera, P.Eng.  
Ian Daniels, P.Eng.  
Imelda Suarez

### Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 10:00 am.

### 1. Agenda

Santosh Gupta moved to adopt the agenda; seconded by Adrian Pierorazio.

CARRIED

### 2. Minutes

Michael Rosenblitt moved to adopt the minutes of the May 26, 2022 meeting; seconded by Santosh Gupta.

CARRIED

### 3. Business Arising from the Minutes

#### 3.1 Chapter Strategy

- Santosh Gupta moved that the regional subcommittee chairs should make a push for presentations to the chapters; seconded by Michael Rosenblitt.

CARRIED

#### 3.2 Changes to the Consulting Engineer Designation and Redesignation application forms

- The committee wants to know if the forms can be modified to make them easier to understand and complete for the applicants. Jose Vera will investigate if changes require approvals from higher ups.

### 4. Changes to CEDC Membership

Steve van der Woerd announced changes to the committee membership. Richard Kamo has resigned from the Northern subcommittee and the main committee. Matt Weaver is replacing Richard as the Northern subcommittee's representative to the CEDC. Dalila Giusti is a new member of the Toronto subcommittee and the CEDC.

### 5. Letter to RPLC

Steve van der Woerd's memo to the RPLC was sent on July 13. Jose Vera reported that this might be dealt by staff as there might be a need for a legal opinion. He will be following up regarding the status of this matter.

### 6. Regional Sub-Committee Reports – Designation/Redesignation

#### 6.1 Western Region

Santosh Gupta moved that applicants 1.1 to 1.2 from the Western Subcommittee report be recommended for **designation**; seconded by Matt Weaver.

CARRIED

Santosh Gupta moved that applicants 2.1 to 2.8 from the Western Subcommittee report be recommended for **redesignation**; seconded by Michael Rosenblitt.

CARRIED

6.2 Eastern Region

Andrew Lawton moved that applicants 1.1 to 1.4 from the Eastern Subcommittee report be recommended for **designation**; seconded by Santosh Gupta.

CARRIED

Andrew Lawton moved that applicant 2.1 from the Eastern Subcommittee report be recommended for **redesignation**; seconded by Don Plenderleith.

CARRIED

6.3 Toronto

Michael Rosenblitt moved that applicants 1.1 to 1.4 from the Toronto Subcommittee report be recommended for **designation**; seconded by Dalila Giusti.

CARRIED

Michael Rosenblitt moved that applicants 2.1 to 2.17 from the Toronto Subcommittee report be recommended for **redesignation**; seconded by Santosh Gupta.

CARRIED

6.4 Southern Region

There were no applicants for designation.

Adrian Pierorazio moved that applicants 2.1 to 2.4 from the Southern Subcommittee report be recommended for **redesignation**; seconded by Matt Weaver.

CARRIED

6.5 Northern Region

There were no applicants for designation.

Matt Weaver moved that applicants 2.1 to 2.2 from the Northern Subcommittee report be recommended for **redesignation**; seconded by Santosh Gupta.

CARRIED

7. Permission to Use the Title “Consulting Engineers”

Santosh Gupta moved that applicants 1.1 to 1.2 be **approved** for the Permission to Use the Title “Consulting Engineers”; seconded by Michael Rosenblitt. CARRIED

8. Activity Reports

Jose Vera reported on:

- The goals of PEO’s 2023-25 Strategic Plan
- FARPACTA
- Resumption of on-site meetings after September 23. More information to come on immunization requirements etc.

9. Questions Regarding the Consulting Engineer Designation

Dalila Giusti raised questions regarding the designation, which will be consolidated in an email after the meeting.

*Staff Note: The response document is attached as Appendix A.*

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:02 am.

**Responses to questions regarding the Consulting Engineer Designation (CED)**

1. What is the purpose of the CED?

The consulting engineer designation is a reserved title that identifies a subset of practitioners who provide engineering services to the public. The designation helps promote recognition of engineers in independent practice. (*Engineering Dimensions, Volume 42. No. 1, Jan/Feb 2021 and PEO Website*)

2. Does it provide a higher standard of conduct than a P.Eng.?

No. Both the professional and legal standard of care are identical whether the person is designated or not. (*source: Enforcement team*)

3. Why would someone who does not practice in Ontario need or want a CED?

It is case by case; however, someone who currently does not practice in Ontario may want a CED if they are planning to return to Ontario.

4. By having a CED does it provide higher/different assurance to the clients/public?

Although the designation doesn't necessary signify a higher level of technical experience, it does indicate that the individual has obtained a minimum level of experience [currently five years] beyond that required for licensure. Receipt of the designation also means the applicant has been subject to both the screening process and to peer review by the professional engineers on the CEDC. (*Engineering Dimensions, Volume 22. No. 2, Mar/Apr 2001*)

5. Does the PEO bear any liability if a person has a CED but does not practice in Ontario? For example, if a project goes sideways in another jurisdiction can the PEO be held responsible because the individual has a CED issued by the PEO?

PEO is not a guarantor of any of its license holders no matter what their designation. With some very limited exceptions, professional regulators owe no duty of care in negligence to individual members of the public. The exception is cases of gross negligence where a regulator fails to take any action against a license holder despite persuasive evidence that they are engaged in wrongdoing the regulator has an ability to investigate. (*source: Enforcement team*)

6. If an individual has a CED and there are issues with a project in another jurisdiction does the PEO sanction the holder of the CED?

PEO's jurisdiction is based on an individual's license or a company's certificate of authorization. We can investigate, refer to discipline and sanction any license or C of A holder whether or not they're designated as a consulting engineer. Our jurisdiction is *in personam* – it attaches to the individual and not to the place where the misconduct or incompetence took place. (*source: Enforcement team*)

7. If the PEO does sanction the individual, is it different than the sanctions if you have a P.Eng. but not a CED?

The sanctions that may be imposed by a discipline panel upon conviction are identical except that a consulting engineer can have their designation revoked or suspended under 28(4)(g). (*source: Enforcement team*)