



A P E G S

*Association of Professional Engineers
& Geoscientists of Saskatchewan*

Member Q&A- June 9, 2026, Webinar

- 1. How can APEG S be more lean? Streamline processes more and reduce the overall membership costs. We feel that there are more things put in here that take more time away from working people.**

APEG S recognizes the importance of operating efficiently and being mindful of the costs borne by registrants. One of the objectives of the Act review is to modernize and simplify the regulatory framework so that it is easier to administer, easier to understand, and better able to adapt over time. Several of the proposed amendments are intended to streamline processes, reduce duplication, and provide greater flexibility by placing operational details in the Regulatory Bylaws rather than the Act.

APEG S continually reviews its programs, services, technology, and processes to identify opportunities for greater efficiency while continuing to meet its public protection mandate. As regulatory practices evolve, APEG S will continue to look for ways to deliver services effectively and responsibly on behalf of both the public and members.

- 2. It seems like APEG S is taking a bottom-up approach to making updates to the legislation, whereas APEGA is updating bylaws/policies/procedures in response to a top-down update of legislation in Alberta. How are the regulators working together to ensure alignment where possible (for example, CPD and registration requirements vary greatly across the provinces). How is Engineers Canada involved to help create alignment and consistency?**

APEG S' approach has been to modernize its Act first and build flexibility into bylaws to allow for future updates, while continuing to monitor and align with national trends and evolving practices across other jurisdictions. APEG S is working with other provincial engineering and geoscience regulators and Engineers Canada and Geoscience Canada to improve alignment across jurisdictions, including areas like CPD and registration requirements. Rather than aiming for complete standardization, the goal is to achieve a high level of consistency while still allowing for jurisdiction-specific differences.

Engineers Canada and Geoscience Canada are playing key coordinating roles by leading and coordinating national harmonization efforts and facilitating collaboration between regulators. This includes initiatives to simplify cross-jurisdiction registration and reduce duplication for members registered in multiple provinces. However, full alignment is limited by the fact that Canada does not have a federal engineering regulator. Each province has its own legislation and authority, so differences in areas such as titles, definitions of practice, and requirements will continue to exist.

- 3. I noticed that some important requirements, like registration criteria and disciplinary fines, may be moved from the Act into the bylaws. How will APEG S make sure any future changes to those bylaws are still transparent and include proper input from members and the public?**

Moving certain operational details from the Act to the bylaws allows those requirements to be updated more efficiently as professional practice, regulatory expectations, and public needs evolve. APEG S recognizes the importance of transparency when making bylaw changes. APEG S will continue to

communicate proposed changes and seek input from members and affected interest holders through appropriate consultation and engagement activities. In addition, regulatory bylaws would continue to require Ministerial approval and publication before coming into force. Decisions regarding regulatory and administrative bylaws would also remain subject to oversight by the elected Board with fiduciary responsibility to the organization.

- 4. Under the current Act, a company needs a COA when engineering is considered one of its principal or customary functions. Under the proposed Act, it sounds like the requirement may apply more clearly to internal engineering work as well. For an industrial company, where would APEGS draw that line, and what types of in-house engineering work would actually trigger the need for a Permit to Practise?**

This change is intended to create more consistent regulation of engineering and geoscience work, regardless of where it is performed. Rather than focusing on whether engineering or geoscience are a company's "principal or customary function," the emphasis shifts to whether professional practice is being carried out.

Under the proposed framework, any organization (including industrial companies) that is performing engineering or geoscience work may be required to hold a Permit to Practice, particularly where that work could impact the public. The overall intent is to ensure that all professional work is subject to appropriate oversight in the public interest, with consistent standards applied across both consulting and in-house environments.

- 5. Question asked during the webinar: "I see "skills" is added to the proposed Duties and Objects. How does APEGS propose to assure the public of a registrant's skills, separately from their knowledge, proficiency, and competency?". The answer given didn't really address the question. Would APEGS have some better definition of what they mean by skills at some future time? Do you mean skills like computer program proficiency, or skills like research and development and analysis? Or are you actually thinking of very specific proficiencies like screw pile design, to reference a recent APEGS posting?**
- 6. In the answer given to the above question, it was stated that as a self-regulating profession, it is up to the members to maintain their skills. Was this a misspeak? I had been under the impression that engineering was a self-regulating profession because APEGS/EGSK is responsible to regulate the profession. Did she truly mean to say that we are actually self-regulated because the individual registrant regulates themselves? If that's not the case, and she was just trying to express that members must maintain their skills, how does this relate to the question of what "skills" are, separate from proficiencies, knowledge, and competencies? Why is "skills" specifically a necessary addition?**

Questions 5 & 6 The addition of "skills" is intended to modernize and clarify the language describing professional competence. It is not intended to create a separate category of assessment, regulation or registration requirement. Rather, it recognizes that competent professional practice includes both what a person knows and their ability to apply that knowledge appropriately in practice.

APEGS helps assure the public through its registration requirements, experience assessment processes, continuing professional development requirements, practice standards, and investigation and discipline processes. Registrants also have an ongoing professional obligation to maintain the knowledge, skills and judgement necessary for the work they undertake and to practise only within their area of competence. The amendment does not change APEGS' role as the regulator of the professions, nor does it create new

obligations for members. It is intended to better reflect modern descriptions of professional competence and the expectations of professional practice.

- 7. In the schedule, the end of June 2026 was listed as the planned submission date. Why is that date so close to the membership and public feedback dates? It seems it doesn't allow time to incorporate any input you may find pertinent and get it through any appropriate reviews and approvals internally. It comes across as a box-checking activity and not an earnest seeking of feedback. Was this the intention?**

The intent of the consultation process is to genuinely seek feedback and ensure that proposed amendments are informed by the perspectives of members and other interest holders. The June 2026 engagement activities are part of a broader consultation process that has been underway throughout the Act review. Since 2023, APEGS has engaged members, government representatives, regulators, industry groups, and other affected organizations through meetings, webinars, surveys, engagement events, annual meetings, website updates, and ongoing communications.

The current consultation phase is intended to validate the proposed framework, identify any remaining concerns, and ensure that stakeholder perspectives are considered before finalizing the submission package. Feedback received through these sessions is being reviewed and assessed by APEGS and the Act and Bylaw Review Task Group and may inform further refinements where appropriate.

While a submission target of June 2026 has been identified, the review and approval process is ongoing, and the proposed amendments remain subject to Council consideration and the Government of Saskatchewan's legislative review and approval processes. The consultation activities are therefore an important part of the final refinement stage of the project rather than a procedural requirement or box-checking exercise.

- 8. Elections at a wide variety of levels all around the world have shown how one focused group with a mission can infiltrate these types of positions. It's not that I mistrust the current elected members or other engineers or geoscientists in general, but frankly, some people in small, focused groups do ruin things for others. Without membership voting on bylaws, what would stop such a group from pushing through ill-advised actions?**

Board members will continue to be elected by the membership and remain accountable to registrants through the election process. In carrying out their duties, Board members are also required to act in the public interest and in accordance with their fiduciary and statutory obligations under the Act that require them to act in the best interests of the organization and the public, rather than in the interests of any particular group.

This approach is not unique to APEGS and is in place among a number of professional regulators in Saskatchewan and across Canada. While members would no longer vote directly on bylaws at the annual meeting, APEGS would continue to communicate proposed bylaw changes and seek feedback from members and interest holders where appropriate. In addition, regulatory bylaws would still require approval by the Minister and publication in the Gazette before coming into force. These checks and balances help support informed decision-making, transparency, and public accountability.

- 9. How do we ensure that politics and political motives are not going to impact the Act and bylaws and the right to practice?**

APEGS is a self-regulating professional regulator established by legislation and governed by a Board elected by registrants. Its role is to regulate the professions in the public interest and apply the requirements of the

Act and Regulatory Bylaws fairly and consistently. Decisions affecting registration status, professional practice, investigations, and discipline are made through processes established in legislation and bylaws, not through political considerations. While the Government of Saskatchewan has authority over legislation and must approve regulatory bylaws, APEGS remains responsible for administering and enforcing the regulatory framework in accordance with its public protection mandate.

10. You just said that we are only discussing changing the operating name because "Association" comes from the Act. But we are also talking about changing the Act. Seems like now is the time to properly change the name, if a name change is truly required/desired.

11. Is there a need to change the operating name, if the legal name remains the same? Are we doing it because the other provinces do not have Association in their name?

Questions 10 & 11 The proposed change relates to APEGS' operating name, not its legal corporate name. The intent is to improve public recognition and better reflect APEGS' role as a regulator while maintaining continuity of the existing legal entity established by legislation. The proposal is not being made simply because other jurisdictions have adopted different naming conventions. However, APEGS did consider approaches used by other Canadian regulators and noted that several organizations use a public-facing operating name that differs from their legal name.

While the Act is being reviewed, changing the legal name of the organization was not considered necessary to achieve the objectives of the proposal. A legal name change would require updating references throughout the legislation and related governance and operational documents, whereas an operating name can provide greater flexibility while preserving the continuity of the existing legal entity. For more information on the name change, please visit: [New Name Proposed for the Association](#).

12. Why is the word 'Professional' being removed from the name? An earlier response I received to this comment is that some registered firms may not include professionals, which seems incorrect and more likely a contravention of the bylaws.

The proposed operating name is intended to improve public recognition and provide a simpler, more accessible public-facing name. The intent is not to diminish the professional status of members or suggest that engineering and geoscience are anything other than regulated professions.

The word "Professional" is already reflected throughout the legislation, registration categories, protected titles, and regulatory framework. Removing it from the operating name would not change who APEGS regulates, the qualifications required for registration, or the professional obligations of members. In developing the proposal, APEGS also considered naming approaches used by other engineering and geoscience regulators across Canada.

13. I'm curious about how the responsible registrant role would work in practice. How will APEGS define each area of professional practice and decide whether someone is qualified to oversee it? For example, would process engineering and process safety be treated as separate areas, or could one responsible registrant cover both.

The Responsible Registrant model is not a new concept. Under the current model, firms are required to identify their areas of professional practice and designate responsible members who are accountable for the professional engineering or geoscience work carried out on behalf of the firm. These responsible registrants are expected to have the education, training, experience, and competence necessary for the areas they oversee.

APEGS does not and would not approve individual responsible registrants for specific areas of practice. Rather, the firm is and would be responsible for designating registrants whose education, training, experience, competence, and declared areas of practice align with the professional services being provided.

Registrants are also required to maintain and periodically update their declared areas of practice. A responsible registrant may be designated for one or multiple areas of practice, provided they possess the necessary competence and expertise for those areas.

14. Is the Responsible Registrant Model part of adding requirements for a Professional Practice Management Plan similar to EGBC for registrant firms?

The Responsible Registrant Model, which is the model used today, provides a foundation to support the future development of a fulsome framework for firms. It builds on APEGS' existing oversight of firms, which are already regulated under the current Act and required to identify responsible professionals for their areas of practice.

APEGS intends to take a measured approach to any future framework for regulating the practices of engineering and geoscience at a corporate level. Similar to other jurisdictions, such a framework could include documented processes related to professional practice, ethics, quality management, continuing competence, and the designation of responsible registrants. However, the details of any future program have not been finalized. Should a Professional Practice Management Plan framework be developed, APEGS would consult with firms and other interest holders to ensure it is practical, proportionate, and appropriate for Saskatchewan. The goal would be to strengthen professional oversight while minimizing unnecessary duplication, particularly for firms already operating in multiple jurisdictions.

15. Currently PEO and EGBC do not require Mandatory Professional Liability Insurance but Mandatory Disclosure to all customers. I am seeking similar exemption to be add for Small incorporation company (Firm). Would APEGS consider this exemption for small incorporated firm?

It is anticipated there will be very few substantive changes to the insurance provisions from the current Act to the proposed Act. Some clarifications are proposed, including empowering the association to require professional liability insurance standards or otherwise participate in professional liability insurance programs that may be prescribed in the bylaws. To clarify, the proposed Act will not mandate specific professional liability insurance. What requirements may or may not be implemented, and what exceptions may be provided, are matters to be resolved in the future issuance of updated bylaws, after the proposed Act is approved.

16. Do the proposed changes not increase the powers of the Investigation Committee potentially empower them to be judge, jury and executioner, which adverse condition was what prompted the separation of powers to investigations and discipline committees separately back in 2004 (or so)?

The proposed amendments do expand the options available to the Investigation Committee, but they do not eliminate the separation between investigation and discipline. The Investigation Committee would continue to investigate complaints and determine whether a matter should proceed to the Discipline

Committee. The Discipline Committee would remain responsible for conducting hearings and making findings of professional misconduct or professional incompetence.

The additional powers proposed for the Investigation Committee are intended to provide remedial and voluntary resolution options for situations where a formal discipline hearing may not be necessary or proportionate. Investigation and enforcement requirements have become considerably more sophisticated than the current Act's provisions can support. These powers are modelled on, and are consistent with, modern Canadian regulatory statutes. Where concerns are serious, contested, or warrant disciplinary action, the matter would continue to be referred to the Discipline Committee for an independent hearing process.

17. Will the Appeals Committee be entirely distinct from the Investigation Committee and Discipline Committee? How will this committee be staffed?

The proposed Appeal Committee is intended to operate independently from both the Investigation Committee and the Discipline Committee. The purpose of creating a separate Appeal Committee is to provide an independent review of appealable decisions and to avoid actual or perceived conflicts of interest. Individuals involved in investigating or deciding on a matter would not also participate in hearing an appeal of that matter.

Under the proposed framework, the Committee is expected to include both APEGS registrants and public representatives, with no representation from the Board itself. This approach supports independence, transparency, accountability, and public confidence in the appeals process.

Like the Investigation Committee and Discipline Committee, the Appeal Committee would be supported by APEGS staff. However, the committees would remain separate, with distinct memberships, mandates, and decision-making responsibilities. Staff provide administrative support to the committee but do not participate in committee decisions. Staff assigned to support one committee do not participate in the work of the others and are required to maintain the confidentiality of committee proceedings and case-specific information.

18. Why not allow the Investigation Committee the ability to initiate investigations?

The proposed amendments do allow the Investigation Committee to initiate an investigation in limited circumstances. Specifically, the Committee may deem information available to it to be a complaint and investigate that deemed complaint. This authority is not intended to permit the Investigation Committee to raise complaints arbitrarily or without a basis. Rather, it allows the Committee to act where information already before it raises concerns that warrant further review. The Investigation Committee must still operate within the authority granted by the Act and base its decisions on the information available to it.

19. The concerns regarding medical conditions for the Capacity Assessment are legion. This could be used to essentially deny large groups of the population from practicing their profession (violating the Saskatchewan Human Rights Code and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms), and bring the Association into disrepute.

The proposed capacity assessment provision is not intended to prevent people with medical conditions or disabilities from practising their professions. The purpose of the provision is to address rare situations where there are reasonable grounds to believe that a registrant's ability to practise safely may be impaired

and may create a risk to the public. The focus is on public safety and fitness to practice, not on the existence of a medical condition itself.

A capacity assessment would not be triggered simply because a registrant has a physical or mental health condition. The concern must relate to whether the registrant's ability to practice safely may be impaired to the extent that it could pose a risk to the public.

The proposed framework also includes procedural safeguards. Registrants are provided an opportunity to be heard, and the Registrar or Investigation Committee must consider the circumstances and any remedial measures taken by the registrant before determining next steps. Consistent with approaches used in recently passed legislation. Decisions made under these provisions would be appealable directly to the Court, providing independent oversight of the process.