



Minutes

**The eighth meeting of the Repeal of the Industrial Exception Task Force
Wednesday, July 20, 2011 at 5:00 p.m.
Room 507-A, PEO Offices, 40 Sheppard Ave. W., Toronto**

Present: Mr. Peter Broad, P.Eng. (Chair)
Mr. Duncan Blachford, P.Eng.
Mr. Clarence Klassen, P.Eng.
Ms. Ranee Mahalingam, P.Eng.
Mr. Thomas Chong, P.Eng.
Mr. Ken Warden, P.Eng.
Mr. Ahmad Khadra, EIT (by teleconference)

Absent: Mr. Chris Maltby, P.Eng. (Vice-Chair)
Mr. Eduard Guerra, P.Eng.
Mr. David Adams, P.Eng.
Mr. Michael Wesa, P.Eng.
Mr. James Lowe, P.Eng.
Ms. Tracy McColl-Galizia
Mr. Edward Poon, P.Eng.
Ms. Stela Stevandic, P.Eng.
Mr. Wayne Kershaw, P.Eng.
Mr. Julien Samson, P.Eng.

Staff: Ms. Marisa Sterling, P.Eng. (Staff advisor)
Mr. Steven Haddock (Staff advisor, Secretary)
Ms. Maria Ianonne (Staff support)

1. Welcome and Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:17 p.m. with Mr. Broad in the Chair.

2. Approval of Agenda

It was moved by T. Chong, P.Eng, seconded by R. Mahalingam, P.Eng.

That the agenda be approved, with the addition of a discussion of preparation of an implementation plan to be included under “Timeline”.

CARRIED

? joined the meeting by teleconference at 7:20 p.m.

3. Approval of minutes of June 22, 2011

It was moved by T. Chong, P.Eng., seconded by D. Blachford, P.Eng.

That the minutes of the meeting of June 22, 2011, be approved, with the change of “Machinists and Tooling” to “Tooling and Machinists”.

CARRIED

4. Approval/introduction of new members

The chair agreed to contact applicants to the task force, Tilak Gunaratne and Chirag Shah, to determine their reasons for joining the task force before recommending to Council that they be added.

Mr. Khadra joined the meeting by teleconference at 5:27 p.m.

5. Communications with industry associations

We are starting to follow up with the associations who did not respond to our initial inquiries. We will also be reaching out to the Canadian Association of Independent Business. The Chair asked staff to provide a list of the associations that have replied and which haven't.

6. Communications with PEO members

Our current plan is to send out an e-mail to all members once the web site is up and running. We hope to have it live by the end of July. The domain name will be engineeringinontario.ca.

7. Communications with employers and employees

Ms. Sterling and Mr. Haddock visited a large industrial employer in early August. We reviewed the type of engineering work they performed to help them determine what work requires licensure. They had reviewed their employee's job functions and our database. They identified about 10 persons who need a license who could qualify for a P.Eng., and about 40 more who could qualify for an LEL. They are willing to comply, but given their current work load, they may not be able to make a major effort until February 2012.

One of the strategies for licensing we discussed was whether large groups of applicants could be moved through the system together, e.g. handling applications, use of a single admissions representative, special exam sittings, local ERC interviews, PPE preparation presentations, etc. This would help us insure applications are complete and people are moving properly through the system.

The task force agreed that if we helped one employer and they were satisfied with the level of service we provided, it would be more likely that others would comply. It is clear we have to demonstrate some flexibility in our processes. Staff will liaise with licensing to get an idea of the logistics involved.

Staff does not see an issue with providing ERC members who have experience with industrial engineering.

Once we get an idea of the logistical possibilities, we will get in touch with the employer to let them know what we can provide for them.

Our only issue from an operational standpoint is just how many applicants can be processed at any given time through any point of the system. As it stands, any current delays are due to pinch points in the system where demand for staff attention exceeds the average staffing levels. We have no difficulty dealing with such demand when the applicants are spread through the process. Our difficulty only starts when there is unusual demand along one point in the system.

It was discussed whether the experience reviews could be performed before PPE sittings rather than after.

It should be anticipated that as this licensure requirement is unique to Canada, other large multi-jurisdictional corporations may question the need for it. In addition, most companies will see themselves as meeting or exceeding the educational, experience and ethical requirements for licensure already. However, we did manage to convince them that this requirement is for the broader public good. They agreed with that rationale as they had a bad experience with an outside firm that did work for them that was costly to correct.

Our next meeting is with representatives of the power generation industry. They have already spoken to our senior management.

Task force members were encouraged to distribute our communication materials as they saw fit and to refer any inquiries back to the attention of staff.

Mr. Haddock will brief the Enforcement Committee and the Task Force on any federal-provincial jurisdictional problems that may arise from attempting to enforce the *Professional Engineers Act* in a federal facility.

8. Communication Materials

Staff will prepare the text of the FAQ before the next meeting.

Staff is still trying to compile examples of where common sense does not work in an engineering context. It encourages the task force to provide additional examples.

9. Paths & Hurdles

Our current licensing process distributes applicants largely by the first letter of their last name. This may not be appropriate for licensing large numbers of persons from the same company as it leads to poorer lines of communication between PEO and the corporations sponsoring persons for licensure. We do have a specialist who handles only persons who are already licensed elsewhere or have been licensed.

Another problem will be licensing persons from companies that have no professional engineers. Such problems should be documented and brought to Council to implement a licensure plan and make special provisions in the regulations for such cases. We do have a program in place to attempt to match up non-supervised applicants with members, but there is no guarantee any particular applicant will obtain one.

10. Timeline

The task force will prepare a formal implementation plan for approval by Council.

11. Budget

Any request for funds for next year would have to be made immediately. At present, our costs for implementing task force policy have been modest and can be worked into the existing budgets for the Enforcement Committee and the proactive enforcement initiatives. We also believe that task force activities will most likely be completed by early 2012.

12. Next Steps

The task force reviewed the steps to be taken before the next meeting:

- The chair will contact potential new members for the task force.
- Staff will provide details of feedback from the industry associations who have replied to us.
- Staff will report on the meeting with the power generation industry.
- Staff will meet with licensing to determine what logistical efficiencies can be implemented.
- The task force will develop the implementation plan to forward to Council.

We still have to find a way to efficiently contact smaller companies that may not have a professional engineer on staff.

14. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting was set for Wednesday, September 14, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. at the PEO offices.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:24 p.m.

Mr. Peter Broad, P.Eng., Chair

Mr. Steven Haddock, Secretary