

Fireside Chat- September 9, 2025:

Question & Answer

Question:	Submitted By:	Answer:
There were multiple questions about whether or not the motion to change the name of OACETT is an ordinary or special resolution.	--	Upon further consultation with legal counsel, OACETT has been advised that a special resolution is required only if the legal name of the organization is to be changed. It is the intention that the new name will be a "business" or "trade" name, which is what also allows the change to be made without the need to amend the OACETT Act right away. As this doesn't involve amending the Articles of Incorporation, Clause 103 of ONCA does not apply and the original advice of an ordinary resolution stands. This approach also serves to preserve OACETT as the historical legal name of the organization and it would continue to be referenced in all contracts and other legal obligations.
In the "Answer" Column you will find the link to the referenced materials - you will need to log in with your membership credentials. The key benefits anticipated from these changes, as well as the potential drawbacks, are identified in the "Pro's and Con's" document within this link. There is a link to OACETT's by-law as well.	--	https://oacett.powerappsportals.com/membership/membership-benefits/ https://oacett.org/getmedia/259b86db-f264-4c11-a1fd-505f21d5d0cc/By-Law-20-v2.pdf
<p>Per Roberts Rules - Amendments would be allowed if seconded? This is my understanding.</p> <p>Also will there be debate allowed of Pro and No change like in a true democracy? I understand these meeting and reviews. At the meeting the Pro</p>	<i>Eric Gottfried</i>	The Chair has determined that amendments will not be accepted from the floor, as amendments will disenfranchise the large number of limited proxies that have already been submitted - this approach has been confirmed with our Parliamentarian. However, if an amendment was intended to clarify or to add additional information, then additional motions would be entertained to capture that

Yes and No Change should have a chance to speak.		information. As per Article 7.3 of By-law 20 "Motions and Resolutions", motions brought to a special meeting without prior notice of business will not be considered binding on the Board of Directors but will be taken under advisement. And as has been our practice at virtual member meetings for the past several years, all comments and feedback, Pro and No, will be shared through the Q & A and Chat features, which are visible to all members.
The proposed designation P. Tech. separates the professional, versus certified, qualities of our Association's certifications. Are not Certified Technicians also Professionals?	Larry McHenry	The rationale for the use of the Professional and its linkages with Professional Engineer is provided in the Q & A materials in the portal.
What is the driving force (reason) for the proposed C.E.T. designation title change?	Scott Dally	This is explained in the materials in the Member Portal - the main driver is the goal of a common national title for certified technologists.
What is the difference between C.Tech and P.Tech? As a technologist, I spent three year to be called a technologist. I do not wish to correct employers that P.Tech stands for Professional Technologist and not Professional Technician.	Ryan Klein	In the materials in the Member Portal, we note that we spoke with those provinces that current offer both C.Tech and P.Tech and they have had no issues with confusion between the two - it would certainly be a marketing focus.
Can you please clarify the timeline for the P.Tech change, should it be approved by the member? Did you say by 2030 - five years from now, or did I mis-hear that?	Rod Langford	As per President van Dop's introduction, OACETT has established a deadline of five years for the TPC member organizations to reach agreement on the common title for certified technologists. If not achieved by then, an OACETT vote in favour would be abandoned.
What is OACETT's plan to educate the industry on these changes?	Rob Smith	A full marketing plan has been budgeted for and will be developed if there is approval to proceed. It will be informed by the Member Engagement and Services Committee and the Board of Directors and executed by staff.
Will the new title P.Tech. be recognized in other provinces, similar to the P.Eng titles?	Gabriela Moncada	As noted in the materials, the goal is that P.Tech becomes the common title in all the provincial members of TPC (which currently excludes Quebec) - however; "right to practice"

		legislation like the engineers enjoy is something different and is being pursued by some provinces, notably BC and Alberta.
Will the voting results be fully transparent?	Rob Smith	The number of votes for "in favour", "opposed" and "abstain" will be shared for each vote at the Special Meeting, prior to announcing the decision.
<p>I believe that a special resolution (2/3 vote) is required for a name change. Did I hear that our legal council advised that we only need a 50% majority, is that right?</p> <p>https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/10n15#BK114</p> <p>"103 (1) A special resolution of the members is required to make any amendment to the articles of a corporation to, (a) change the corporation's name;"</p>	Scott Barbacki	As noted above, re further investigation with counsel.
Which industries?	Ryan Klein	Assuming this related to the salary survey, we are waiting for the final breakdown which has not yet been prepared by the consultant.
I'm concerned that P.Tech is getting people confused with technicians and technologists	John Nell Felarca	See note above re: feedback from other provinces that currently have the two titles.
Why do we need to change the NAME?	Sachin Bhatt	The motivation for changing the name is included in the materials in the Member Portal - in short, the current name is seen as long and cumbersome and a new, shorter name is seen as something that will fresh and innovative to the next generation of members, as per the statement from the Student Representative on the Board.
Which employers?	Ryan Klein	See note above re: salary survey.
Will The P.Tech designation have a Provincial Act enabled similar to the Professional Engineers	Lance Dutchak	That is not anticipated at this time - OACETT has consulted twice with government relations specialists and members have been advised

Act?		that the current government and environment are not favourable to trying to bring this forward at this time. We are watching with interest the advances in this direction in other provinces, specifically BC.
How competitive is the new title P.Tech. in comparison to the P.Eng. which is recognized Canada wide?	<i>Pavan Thadani</i>	Because the P.Tech is not a required certification by law, the same way that the P.Eng is, there is always going to be a challenge having the same level of recognition. That said, our 21,000+ members are indicative that the certifications are well-recognized in Ontario, and we will ensure that the messaging and marketing of a change would enhance, not diminish, that recognition.
P-Tec. Will the members certificate annual renewal cost increase?	<i>Patricia Harris</i>	As per the materials in the Member Portal, member fees will not increase to fund the name changes - the changes will be funded from reserves. That said, dues may increase annually at the same rate as the cost of living, which is current part of OACETT's membership dues and fees policy.
When we hear the new designation P. Tech people might think its a Professional Technician how does OACETT planning to market this for the member so that the industry does not confuse technologist from the technician?	<i>Shophan Daniel</i>	This will all be part of the detailed marketing plan, but at minimum, the full title will always be used with the acronym for the first little while.
With respect to the P.Tech title having to be adopted by all provinces and as stated, Alberta already has a variance of the P.Tech title. Is there any indication that this may be a sticking point in adopting a national title?	<i>Rob Daley</i>	See response above about the changes that will be needed in Alberta and which they have committed to exploring.
The PEO recently changed their requirements where Bachelor of Science graduates could not get P.Eng certification as the program was less rigorous than the Bachelor of Engineering program. Has Oacett looked at only requiring members with Engineering technician and	<i>Logan Yule</i>	At this time, OACETT will continue to recognize both engineering technology and applied science programs within our agreed disciplines. And as certification is currently provincially regulated, it is unlikely that there will be a national amalgamation. The Technology Professionals Canada alliance is what helps to bring us together on common issues.

technology diplomas? Second have all the engineering Technician/ Technology organizations across all of Canada considered amalgamating into one organization instead of each province having their own organization?		
Some of the associates are in the process of obtaining their license. Will they receive the C.Tech or P.Tech designation?	Suresh Shrestha	C.Tech and P.Tech would be different. C.Tech will not change and will be available to Associates seeking certification as a technician. For the change for technologists, the timing would be dependent on agreement from all TPC member provinces.
The Alberta association (ASET) grants P. Tech the ability to practice engineering/geoscience within a defined scope (i.e limited license). Will a P. Tech in Ontario grants us the same. Or will we still have to obtain an LET?	Brian Schuyler	As noted above, the expectation is that the use of P.Tech would change in Alberta for a common title to be possible. An LET would still be required in Ontario.
How long will the implementations process take?	Shervin Reyhani	A full multi-year plan will be developed and shared with members once we know the decisions next week. Timing for the P.Tech is dependent on the decision of the other provinces.
The quorum is a guideline, however not always necessarily what should happen. When still in school, a 51% may as well be a failing grade. Can we consider a stronger majority, perhaps 70%, should be required to change? This could better show a strong representation of members that want the change.	Erik Nikiforuk	As noted above re further investigation with counsel.
How can only the first 40 members decide the fate of this when we have over 20000 members?	Ryan Klein	Please see notes above re: by-law definition of quorum and actual anticipated participation.
OACETT has always viewed all its certified members as professionals. So, if the designation change is approved,	Shervin Reyhani	Please see note above about the choice of "Professional" being selected for its alignment with P.Eng. We don't feel that the change will be interpreted as those with other certifications

will this not imply that members with C.Tech and ASCT designation are not professionals?		(including those who choose to stay with C.E.T.) being unprofessional.
P.Tech is not designated as Engineering title. Isn't it?	Richard Alfred	No, only PEO confers engineering licenses in Ontario.
The industry is different today than 30 yrs ago-agreed. Can someone explain how the 2 proposed changes will benefit current and future members and the industry. Sorry if this has been answered already but think this is important.	Mike Seiling	Full explanations of anticipated benefits can be found in the materials in the Member Portal and in the President's introductory remarks during the Fireside Chat.
If this is being decided on a national level, how much say do we as members actually have? It sounds like a rebranding of some type is in the books one way or another.	Nicholas Lambert	As noted in the materials in the Member Portal, this will fully be an OACETT member decision, based on all the information shared. There will be no changes in Ontario if the motions are defeated by the members.
will this recording be accessible to members?	Ryan Klein	Yes, it is linked from the website in the News and Announcements section.
I am really concerned that Engineering won't be reflected in the new designation.	GLENN SCANLAN	live answered
What happens to C. Techs transitioning to C.E.T. ?	Nnamdi Amajor	That transition will continue. If the P.Tech is implemented, based on national agreement, then C.Techs would transition to P.Techs, when they are eligible to be certified as technologists, at the time the P.Tech becomes effective. There will not be a choice once a new title is in effect.
Why don't we have an AI certification yet? That would be a WAY better way to spend \$750K.	Dale Phippen	As discussed at the meeting, this initiative does not preclude OACETT from exploring multiple other opportunities.
What will be OACETT cost and which programs of OACETT will be delayed or affected?	Rasheed Khan	The detailed budget is available in the materials in the Member Portal. Based on the anticipated timing, current initiatives will not be impacted, and next week's decision aligns with OACETT's initiative planning for next year.
What are the main reasons these changes are being made? Are these changes really necessary to spend so much capital vs spending towards contributing to solving a problem that affects	Bassanio Seecharan	As noted above, the full rationale is in the materials in the Member Portal. And these changes do not preclude other activities like those noted.

society and eventually everyone?		
With no measurable return on investment, is it not wiser to spend time and money on initiatives that will elevate the entire membership regulatory status, increase membership number and work to retain membership?	<i>Shervin Reyhani</i>	Such activities are underway and will continue to be underway even with this investment. The name changes would be in addition to, not in place of, all the great work that OACETT regularly undertakes to recruit and support members.
How much transparency will there be in the voting, the survey results have 600 pages of very negative reactions to this proposal as does the comments from all your members here	<i>Rob Smith</i>	Voting transparency has been addressed above.
Ontario's LRT is Alberta's P.Tech. If we call our CET's P.Tech will this not create confusion across the provinces?	<i>Alan O'Neill</i>	See notes above re: Alberta.
The change of Title from C.E.T to P.Tech there should be a survey from members and the engineering industries hiring professionals.	<i>Ather Kidwai</i>	As per the materials in the Member Portal, there was a well-subscribed survey of members that informed these discussion, thought not conclusive. Survey results from employers were shared at the meeting, with 2/3 of employers indicating that they were neutral about the change.
Why is it that so many people on this forum are against the name change but your survey as you mentioned have no opinion. (Was it 69% who had no opinion?)	<i>Wayne Gushue</i>	The survey results are available in the Member Portal - one third were in favour, one third were opposed and one third were neutral, for both name changes. It will be the votes next week that will determine the final outcome. It is potentially to be expected that opposition to a change will be more vocal than support.
If there is alignment between the provinces regarding OACETT name change as well as P.Tech designation, will we now become federally controlled as opposed to provincial?	<i>David Lupton</i>	We are not becoming nationally controlled and the other provincial members have no say in OACETT's name change. The agreement to explore P.Tech was reached mutually by all the member provinces - there was no "national" direction.

<p>Would the P. Tech designation be recognized in all provinces? If so, should I understand then that it will be easier for professionals to work in all provinces.</p>	<p>Shawn Brathwaite</p>	<p>It is felt that it would be easier because employers would recognize a common title.</p>
<p>The reason for a previous request of proposal was to reinstate Applied Science Technologies (A.Sc.T.) in addition to Certified Engineering Technologists (CET) or alternatively create a new technologist title ie. Certified Technologist, (C.T.) removing Engineering from the title was to rejuvenate the inclusiveness of all Technologists. This was to become more diverse to encourage Applied Science Technology as well as Engineering Technologist applicants and support ALL disciplines as emerging technologies are growing exponentially and the majority of technology programs does not include the word “engineering”. Please comment on the bridge to this scenario and why can we not revisit the A.Sc.T.?</p>	<p>Dennis Martin</p>	<p>Professional Technologist is proposed as being more inclusive of those from the applied sciences and potentially makes revisiting the A.Sc.T. even less of a requirement.</p>
<p>Curious to know if OACETT body has reached out to PEO for their insights/ thoughts on type of designation being proposed and which would be most recognized by PEO engineers in Ontario?</p>	<p>Marcin Krzeminski</p>	<p>Discussions with PEO are noted in the materials in the Member Portal. They have no concerns about our proposed changes but would not be in a position to advise what would be most recognized. That is for us communicate to employers.</p>
<p>Can you expand on the political changes driving the rebrand in other provinces? This makes it sound like Ontario (and other less motivated provinces) are footing the bill for other interests.</p>	<p>Nicholas Lambert</p>	<p>This is not accurate. All provinces, including Ontario, agreed on the benefit of pursuing a common national title and that P.Tech was the preferred option to explore</p>

Sounds like we are moving to a smorgasbord of titles...perhaps there will be a lot of confusion that CET has developed and acceptance by industry, and professional associations and buyin collaboration by PEO, OAA, etc.	<i>Eugene Stodolak</i>	OACETT has successfully changed titles in the past and we anticipate a successful transition once again in the event of a vote in favour. That will be the focus of marketing efforts.
I feel the name change is positive. Could the designation not be PTech (Eng)? Could we not require a 4-year practice to get the designation?	<i>William Logie</i>	As discussed at the meeting and in the materials on the Member Portal, the title being explored was agreed by the members of TPC and it was agreed that we would not be exploring a title not currently used by any of the member organizations. And there was no intention to change the requirements as part of the name change.
What are the by law 20 requirements with respect to this vote?	<i>Rob Smith</i>	Section 7 of by-law 20 provides the requirements for meetings of members. Please see notes above for finding a link to our by-law on the website.
Please tell us how Premier Ford's "As of Right" legislation will impact interprovincial mobility of regulated professionals, including OACETT members. Why do we then need a national designation?	<i>Dale Phippen</i>	We feel that having a common national title will demonstrate our profession's commitment to better facilitating inter-provincial mobility. Similar legislation is being brought forward in multiple provinces.
How will this harmonize with all other provincial associations? In BC, P.Tech is a senior ASCt with at least 4 years continuous registration. Also in BC, there is a push for a reserve practice for ASTTBC registrants. In Alberta, P.Tech(Eng) is equivalent to an L.E.T. How is this being coordinated with other provinces? What is the timeline for national harmonization?	<i>Karl Franco</i>	Please see notes above about the specifics in BC and Alberta. There is no specific agreed national timeline on reaching agreement, but as noted in our motion, OACETT is creating a requirement to reach agreement by 2030.
Will membership fees be increased even more than usual to cover the costs associated with this change?	<i>Kim Stacey</i>	No - as noted in the materials in the Member Portal, this initiative will be fully funded from OACETT's unrestricted reserves.
Many posting call for "engineering" background. How	<i>Neal Smith</i>	We don't see the name change impacting the ability of members to demonstrate their

will that affect us moving forward?		engineering background.
Can I change my designation to (A.Sc.T) as opposed to ptech	Wayne Gushue	No, A.Sc.T. is a grandfathered credential that is no longer conferred by OACETT and therefore can no longer be selected as an option by members.
What's the legal repercussions of reappealing the motion to have the name change instead of Ptech to PET instead?	John Nell Felarca	As noted above, OACETT is not considering proposing any other title options as the main motivator is arriving at a common national title and all provinces have agreed to explore P.Tech only.
I feel like we need more name options (for the new CET replacement name) that include "Engineering" and possibly "Professional". Is it possible for members to vote on other name options?	Bogdan Stanciu	See note above.
Why a Title Change or name change is so important now. OACETT, CET, C.Tech are well known by every one long time.	Tauseef Siddiqui	The timing has mainly been driven by the re-unification of all the provincial associations within Technology Professionals Canada and the pursuit of the agreed national strategic priority of harmonization of our credentials across the country.
I agree P.Tech. appears to be a strong title and I would support this. If chosen why would we not put this into effect immediately. Why wait for 5 years and possibly not get Canada wide acceptance. If it's good let's do ourselves as some other Provinces have already.	Angelo Innocente	As the Board has put this forward to members as being motivated mainly by the goal of a common national title, proceeding without national unanimity is not aligned with that intent.
If a quorum only requires 40 members, and 50% + 1 is what's needed to approve these changes, then in theory, 21 members could approve this change that affects thousands of members. That does not seem fair or appropriate.	Rod Langford	See notes above that the theory will not be the reality of next week's votes.
I have been unable to find the information in the members portal related to this name change. How do find the information in the members	Scott Dally	The link was provided in the meeting chat and is here again: https://oacett.powerappsportals.com/membership/membership-benefits/ - you will need to log in with your member

portal that you have been referring to?		credentials
The proposed designation P. Tech. separates the professional, versus certified, qualities of our Association's certifications. Are not Certified Technicians also Professionals?	<i>Earle DePass</i>	See response to similar question above.
If the goal is to align with a national name reduction, is there any opportunity to coordinate with other provinces in order to avoid a future name change?	<i>Trevor Hitchon</i>	There is no national discussion currently about trying to align the names of the provincial organizations. OACETT's proposed option does fairly closely following the name of the national alliance, other than the addition of the word "Engineering".
The term "Professional" in our title will be challenged by many like PEO and OAA that are Provincially regulated and I believe the 750K will not be enough of a war chest my experiences over the years has led. The LET was a hard fought battle for years.	<i>Eugene Stodolak</i>	It has been discussed in advance with PEO, who had no concerns and will assist us with potential changes needed to their Act. We are less closely aligned with OAA and have therefore not consulted with them, but we did with the Electrical Safety Authority, with the Ontario Society of Professional Engineers and with the Association of Consulting Engineering Companies-Ontario.
What if it doesn't get passed by one or more of the others? And if not - do we revoke the P.Tech in Ontario - HOPEFULLY we will NOT have issued any until that time.	<i>David Saunders</i>	As indicated in the motion language, the P.Tech would not come into effect until approved by all the provinces, so nothing will have been conferred.
The proposed designation P. Tech. separates the professional, versus certified, qualities of our Association's certifications. Are not Certified Technicians also Professionals?	<i>Dale Phippen</i>	See response to similar question above.
Not for profit act on Ontario states, to change name, 2/3 majority vote is required. I don't see any plan on how to get enough votes to achieve the minimum required. One cannot rely on only the ones that vote, if this is applicable for name change of organization and not designation.	<i>Rasheed Khan</i>	As noted above, we are double-checking with legal counsel on the ONCA provisions.

is it true that if you are not an engineer you cannot have the word engineer is your title or business name?	Wayne Gushue	This question is outside the scope of the name changes. That said, it would be expected that engineers would look to protect the titles in their Act the same way we protect ours at OACETT.
By having the name change, will this allow members to be certified in the other provinces that will also go through with the name changes, and further will this allow employers to bring in talent from out of province?	Amy Mejia	Yes, the name change is intended to help facilitate inter-provincial recognition and mobility.
<p>Regarding Scott B's question item c I think is the appropriate clause and it appears that OACETT is only changing the name not the class of membership correct? If this is the case then a Special Resolution shouldn't be required: 103 (1) A special resolution of the members is required to make any amendment to the articles of a corporation to,</p> <p>(a) change the corporation's name;</p> <p>(b) add, remove or change any restriction upon the activity or activities that the corporation may carry on or upon the powers that the corporation may exercise;</p> <p>(c) create a new class or group of members;</p> <p>(d) change a condition required for being a member;</p> <p>(e) change the designation of any class or group of members or add, change or remove any rights or conditions of any such</p>	Bob van den Berg	As noted above, further investigation with counsel.

<p>class or group;</p> <p>(f) divide any class or group of members into two or more classes or groups and fix the rights and conditions of each class or group;</p> <p>(g) add, change or remove a provision respecting the transfer of a membership;</p> <p>(h) subject to section 30, in</p>		
<p>I definitely agree the Association name should be shortened. Why wouldn't: "TPO - Technology Professional Ontario" be a stronger candidate and logical to use. Our National Association TPC - Technology Professional Canada makes sense. Each Province could then insert their Provincial name to harmonize across Canada.</p>	<p>Angelo Innocente</p>	<p>As noted in the materials in the Member Portal, the Board is proposing ETPO because it was the option supported by 60% of the member survey respondents who were in favour of a change to the name of the organization. National alignment on organization names has not been raised as an objective.</p>
<p>Is this a special resolution being submitted to a special meeting of the members? If so does it not require 2/3 vote?</p>	<p>Rob Smith</p>	<p>As noted above, this is being further investigated with counsel. Their initial response was that both votes were ordinary resolutions.</p>
<p>With the recent push to remove internal trade barriers within Canada by all level of governments, is there a pathway that we can take to bring this to provincial and federal government to help put a push to synchronize the uses of the designations across all organizations?</p>	<p>Erik Nikiforuk</p>	<p>It is felt that this can be synchronized across the provinces through Technology Professionals Canada and doesn't need government intervention, though we will definitely check if there are any funding supports available.</p>
<p>Since the last time these questions were put to vote the membership seemed very apathetic to the change, will the vote on the 16th only be a yes and no to be more definitive?</p>	<p>Julian Wiesner</p>	<p>The vote options will be in favour, opposed and abstain. As per President van Dop's remarks yesterday, our hope is that members will avoid abstaining, as technically that vote does not count and should really only be employed in an individual feels that they don't have enough information to make a decision. The purpose of yesterday's meeting, the materials in the</p>

		Member Portal and these answers is to provide that information
Did this name change come due to OACETT Board members? And if so, are there any future benefits to all members (such as recognition from Employers)? I still can't seem to find the reason behind it yet. This is our Identification OACETT CET (Engineer).	<i>Konstantinos Nakollaris</i>	The motivation of the common national title is outlined in more detail in the materials in the Member Portal.
Is the job market asking for this? Would it matter to them?	<i>Jaydip Atodaria</i>	Anecdotally, our BC partner has heard from employers with offices in multiple provinces that a harmonized title would be a big help in their job descriptions, etc.
Will there be a timeline in which a person will have to decide if they want to keep their CET or adopt P.Tech?	<i>Amanda Springer</i>	Yes, a timeline will be established and communicated if the decision is made to proceed and we have national unanimity.
It was mentioned 9 provinces are participating in a common name. Which province is not participating?	<i>Marvin Evans</i>	Quebec is not currently a member of TPC.
True or False: Any title including the word engineer or a related abbreviation can only be used by those who are licensed. Engineers Canada defines the practice of engineering in the Public Guideline on the Practice of Engineering in Canada.	<i>Wayne Gushue</i>	As noted above, this falls outside the current name change discussion.
Since close to 80% of employers surveyed saw no benefit or where opposed, what is the justification and benefits to members?	<i>Domenic Celeste</i>	The employers indicated no strong opinion one way or the other, which is not the same as saying there was no value. It will be our job, as it currently is, to market and communicate the value to employers.
If the name change is successful will each member be provided with an update Wallet Card?	<i>David Lupton</i>	OACETT no longer distributes physical wallet cards - a membership card is available on-line through the Portal, which would automatically be updated with a change in title.

Would the OACETT/ETPO name change take place immediately?	Andrew Westcott	No, the earliest a change would happen would be in 2027, but if it is tied to a change to P.Tech as well, then that timing will be dictated by reaching national agreement on the title.
<p>1. Other provinces have gone ahead with this change without dependence on others. If Ontario waits for others to definitively choose to change and all remaining provinces adopt a conditional change like we do, how does it actually trigger a change?</p> <p>2. Why are we doing a conditional change rather than deciding outright like others?</p> <p>3. In the motion "the end of 2030" is too vague and nebulous - I recommend a specific date such as December 31, 2030, unless the vagueness is on purpose.</p>	Jeff Jongsma	See earlier notes about the language of the motions and the rationale for not proceeding with the change without national agreement.
I see that a copy of the stream will be posted, but will a transcription do the discussions also be posted so that we can read it?	Nick Najdenov	A transcription of some elements in the Chat will be made available, alongside the recording. A lot of the chat was "hello" and "thank you".
<p>What was our representative's position with regards to the name/title changes during the meeting of 9 individuals?</p> <p>Was there any attempt to convince the other provinces to align with Ontario's current titles to avoid costs related to a name change?</p>	William Gresham	As with most Boards, there is a duty of confidentiality. The members of the Leadership Council of TPC made a decision and that decision is supported by all members of the Leadership Council, which operates on consensus. All the options of the existing titles were considered and the decision was made to explore P.Tech as the proposed unified national option.
If I understand correctly, one of the most key reasons for making these name changes is to improve "brand" awareness and increase recognition of members in their various industries, where is the value added spending such	Brian Barker	The common name is to give all of us within TPC the basis for unified marketing, messaging and advocacy. This has not been driven by industry demand.

a large amount, coupled with the increased confusion of designations, when based on the overall survey results show that the vast majority of those in industry do not appear to care if there is a change or not?		
Will P Tech in Ontario be equal to P. Tech in other provinces?	Rasheed Khan	Yes, that will be part of the requirement of a common national title - it has to mean the same thing and be at the same level in every province.
Could you explain why, if the Ontario Not-for-Profit Corporations Act (ONCA) says "A special resolution requires at least two-thirds (2/3) of the votes cast by members at a duly called meeting", of which it name change as one, why does this vote only require a 50%+1?	Wil Stonehill	As noted above re further investigation with counsel.
Based on my earlier question, if there is one hold out province that doesn't decide to change their designation would we take another vote again in 2030? Is there a reason we don't rip the band-aid off now and decide on a definitive yes or no?	Cody May	Please see earlier responses about the main motivator being a common national title and a reluctance to proceed without that outcome.
How is the new P. Tech. being clarified and defined as technologist given Tech. stands for Technician and T. for Technologist up to this point and continue in protected titles (C.E.T. and A.Sc.T. are still technologists)?	Dennis Martin	As noted above, in early marketing the focus will be always include the full term Professional Technologist in addition to P.Tech.
We don't currently use the word "professional" in any OACETT titles. Does the current OACETT Act provide certified members with professional level rights, privileges and legal obligations in any way similar to the weight of the Professional Engineers Act?	Allan Henning	No, OACETT's Act provides right to title. The Engineering Act provides right to practice and creates a reserved practice for licensed engineers.

B.C. and Alberta are not currently defining P.Tech as equal to a C.E.T. - what are they prepared to do to bring their designations in line with the remaining provinces?	David Saunders	BC and Alberta fully understand that the expectation is that their titles will mean the same as they do in other provinces. BC has already addressed this in their work on the regulations for their new Provincial Governance Act. Alberta would need to see changes within Alberta the same way we are seeking changes within Ontario.
<p>1. For the vote, is there a reason we are not voting electronically like we do for election votes? Wouldn't this potentially get better "voter turnout" and be a better measure of all the eligible voting members?</p> <p>2. Can you please clarify why the 2/3 of cast ballots being the baseline for a successful vote is not being used as is outline in Bylaw 20 for Special Meetings of the Members?</p>	Tara Welbourn	Our by-laws require a special meeting of members to make decisions of this nature - an on-line election doesn't satisfy that requirement. That said, the limited electronic proxy that has been distributed does allow members to direct their vote if they cannot attend the meeting in person. On the second vote, as above, we are seeking clarification from legal counsel as to why their preliminary advice was the both votes qualify as ordinary resolutions, requiring a simple majority.
<p>Has the legal reviewed the Not For Profit Act section E appears that we are changing the designation from C.E.T. to P.Tech and if this is the case then a Special Resolution is required. Not an ordinary Resolution.</p> <p>(e) change the designation of any class or group of members or add, change or remove any rights or conditions of any such class or group;</p>	Bob van den Berg	As noted above re further investigation with counsel.
Are all certified members in good standing being sent a Proxy?	Dale Phippen	Yes, all certified members will receive the update tomorrow.
PTech is equal to Ctech, what would be equal to CET?	Maria Magdalena Seres	P.Tech will be equal to C.E.T. C.Tech. will not change.
You have answered in the Q & A section that removing the word "engineering" with the new title would be more inclusive. Why	Angelo Innocente	Please see notes above and in the materials in the Member Portal the rationale for ETPO vs. TPO.

have you now re-inserted "Engineering" into the proposed new Name change? ETPO undoes what you have supported by taking "engineering" away and recommending P.Tech. The Association name should harmonize with our Title change. Let's consider TPO - Technology Professionals Ontario and move on.		
If members are still able and going to keep using C.E.T. designation with no obligation to change, is there really value added for changing the designation for a select few?	Brian Barker	As per both our Student Representatives comment and remarks from the President, this is very much a decision about the future vs. the present. OACETT has always grandfathered credentials when changes have been made in the past because we know members are proud of what they have earned. But the new title is what would be conferred on future technologists.
Will OACETT ever consider lobbying legislation similar to what ASTTBC is pushing in BC with the Professional Governance Act? Will OACETT be pushing provincial legislator to pass legislation to make OACETT/PTech a registered and recognized professional title?	Karl Franco	See earlier notes above advice received on the lack of appetite for such a change currently in Ontario.
To Brian Baker question, there is no value to existing members with this change at all.	Rasheed Khan	We definitely see value to all members in the marketing and awareness of a new title and name.
Are we part of the national body?	Ryan Klein	Yes, OACETT is a member of Technology Professionals Canada
Can E.P.O Engineering Professionals Ontario suggested for change?	Ather Kidwai	See notes above about the options being presented for consideration. This particular option would definitely run afoul of PEO.
If all other provinces decide to change to P.Tech except for Ontario, will we/could we have this vote again in the future (assuming we decide to keep C.E.T. for now)?	Tyler Watters	That would be a decision for the Board of Directors to bring to the members in that eventuality.

There seems to be a great deal of confusion over these changes, and many questions going unanswered, or not well answered. How well has this been thought through? Was there any pre-consultation or workshopping done with the membership or other relevant stakeholders to assess interest and identify and address issues and concerns? Should the Association maybe pump the brakes on this until all of this confusion is resolved?	<i>Rod Langford</i>	OACETT has been in consultation with members for a full year, starting with the sentiment survey in the fall of 2024, discussions at Annual Chapter Meetings, discussions at every Fireside Chat and at the ACM. Materials have been prepared that have already answered the vast majority of questions that members have brought forward at this meeting, but those materials have clearly not been accessed by all members.
Will OACETT honor friendly amendment to the two motions?	<i>Shervin Reyhani</i>	Because amendments to the motions will invalidate the large number of limited proxies that are anticipated against the motions as written, it is not anticipated that amendments will be entertained.
Is there a reason we are not having Nation Vote? S we are not waiting?	<i>Neal Smith</i>	Not clear on what is meant by the question.
I would like to better understand the issue of interprovincial mobility... Isn't this a matter of each province's certification process? For example, if a national standard name is adopted, would Ontario possibly grant/transfer title to applicants who didn't write a tech report if it wasn't required by the province from which an applicant originates?	<i>Dan Coffin</i>	There are interprovincial mobility agreements in place now among the members of TPC. The common title will simply enhance that process and in particular will create greater clarity for employers. It will also enhance national advocacy and awareness initiatives. There are other initiatives underway among the Registrars across the provinces as well to better harmonize things like the requirements and rigor.
Will we receive new stamps as well?	<i>Dwayne Hofstetter</i>	Yes.
Is this meeting recording going to be sent to all members via email or available on the OACETT website?	<i>Sydnee Botham</i>	The link is available on the OACETT website: https://www.oacett.org/news-announcements/fireside-chat-with-oacett-leadership-recording
Is there a study on what is the impact of the name change in	<i>Royce Gaw</i>	No, such a study has not been undertaken.

terms of value in employment? may it be in Ontario or other province.		
If Federal requirements to change the title then Federal can give money to change the title. Why OACETT members pay the title change?	<i>Vinayak Patel</i>	It is not a Federal government requirement. It is a collective agreement among the members of TPC, which means that we would each fund the resultant changes within our own jurisdictions.
Point of clarification: If I understand correctly, certified members are not considered professionals, is there a plan to change that?	<i>Julian Wiesner</i>	Please see notes above re: use of "professional".
Are we not concerned with legal definition of the title "professional" where Professional Technologist may mislead the expectation and misrepresentation of being "licensed"? Current C. Tech, C.E.T., and other protected titles including A.Sc.T. are responsible to get out own Licenses to practice unless operating under a licensed professional? I see OACETT is in a good place to award P.Tech. as soon as OACETT provides licenses.	<i>Dennis Martin</i>	The legal definition of "professional" only relates to the specifics of the legislation where it is used. This is not a concern for OACETT where there is currently a right to title only.
<p>P.Tech.</p> <p>Effective January 1, 2024, P.Tech. applicants who are graduates of a program not accredited by TAC must successfully complete the ASET Certification Exam. Applicants who completed the ASET Certification Exam for their C.E.T. application will not need to rewrite the exam.</p> <p>Professional Technologist registration takes your career to the next level. P.Tech. (Eng.)/(Geo.) registrants have the right to practice engineering or geoscience independently</p>	<i>Ryan Klein</i>	As noted above, this would have to be agreed to change in Alberta.

<p>within a defined scope of practice and in accordance with established codes and standards. With this right, a registrant may sign and stamp their own engineering or geoscience work.</p> <p>To qualify for P.Tech. (Eng.)/(Geo.) registration, applicants must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be C.E.T. registrants of ASET in good standing • Be graduates of a 2-year technical post-secondary program • Have at least 6 years of post-graduate technical engineering or geoscience experience, including at least 2 years under the supervision of an Alberta P.Eng. or P.Geo. <p>The above is from Alberta.</p>		
<p>They only require a person who graduated from a two-year program to be called a Technologist. How is this comparable?</p>	<p><i>Ryan Klein</i></p>	<p>This is related to differences in the education system and college requirements across provinces.</p>
<p>Why was A.Sc.T stopped as a designation ten or so years ago and C.E.T adopted their after?</p>	<p><i>Wayne Gushue</i></p>	<p>This predates the staff leadership but our understanding of the reasoning is that the use of wording of technologist for both C.E.T. and A.Sc.T. caused confusion for the public. Compounding the issue was that an A.Sc.T. didn't have the same certification requirements (ie. missing a technology report) as a C.E.T. and because of this there was a decision to only have one type of technologist to be granted starting 2010 and that was the title of C.E.T.</p>
<p>Can you talk about any Ontario government approvals that might be required to update our by-laws and have we discussed this with anyone in Premier Ford's government</p>	<p><i>Scott Martin</i></p>	<p>Only member approval is required to update our bylaws - government approval is not required. If we look to update the OACETT Act, we will need to find an MPP to sponsor it.</p>

Comment: The industry I work in, Gas, all provinces are finally trying to harmonize regulations. This includes allowing gas fitters to work in any province. We have one national code, CSA-B149.1. This concept has been accelerated to reduce trade barriers. A sign of the times we're in.	Marvin Evans	Comment left for information.
Can we refocus funds on developing new OACETT members, at the high school level, and at college levels. Also can we instead focus \$\$ on industry?	Larry McHenry	All of these initiatives are already underway and investing in these changes does not preclude investment in further initiatives like that.
If engineering is a key part of the organization name why isn't it part of the proposed title change?	Rob Smith	That rationale on both counts is outline in similar answers above and in the materials in the Member Portal: https://oacett.powerappsportals.com/membership/membership-benefits/
For people that use the stamp, would the member have to buy a new stamp?	Dan Timpano	As noted above, new stamps will be provided for those who wish to change their title.
Would there be a logo change should ETPO be accepted?	Jessie Soos	It is anticipated that would be part of the rebranding and has been included in the budget.
Why the management is not attending the question about 50% plus 1 and 2/3 majority?	Rasheed Khan	As noted above re further investigation with counsel.
A Cornwall chapter member wants to ask this question, but is on audio only: One question I had but can't ask: will the name change include a name in French? As in "Technologues professionnels en génie de l'Ontario"? (or Professionnels en technologie du génie de l'Ontario?)	Dale Phippen	Although OACETT has just translated the PPE exam and study guide into French and allows members to submit their technology reports in French, there is no plan at this time to offer or support French versions of the titles.

Can there be an option in the survey going out as part of the vote to something of the effect of: if a future credential/designation/acronym name change is considered it needs to include the word "engineering". P.E.T. or P.E.Tech etc. as the term technologist does not imply engineering at all, and could be related a vast number of non-engineering related fields. If you are qualified to whatever extent in an engineering discipline that should be respected.	<i>Paul Ready</i>	Please see responses above and in the materials in the Member Portal on the rationale for where engineering is and is not being preserved.
Would it be possible for the board to share more data or feedback they've gathered that supports the need for this change? It would help members like myself feel more informed before participating in any poll or vote	<i>Konstantinos Nakollaris</i>	The rationale has been fully explained in the various Fireside Chats, Chapter meetings and in the materials in the Member Portal.
Why does the proposed new organization name not mention or include the "Technicians"	<i>Shawn Dawson</i>	Because it references "Technology Professionals", which encompasses both technologists and technicians.
Provinces that already have P.Tech, did their members have the option of a new title? or are they not voting for change as they are all ready using P.Tech?	<i>Neal Smith</i>	Some already use it, some have brought it forward in new legislation, some made the decision just within their Board/Council and some, like us, will be taking it to their members.
Is the Board of Directors recommending a "YES" vote to the change or are they neutral?	<i>Yvan Rodrigues</i>	The Board of Directors is recommending that the members need to consider and make these decisions - it is not their intention to attempt to sway the vote in one direction or the other but simply to ensure that the members have all the possible information in order to make their decision.
Will any changes require approval by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario under a new/revised bylaw to change the current BillPR25? IF so, how long is this expected to take and is there currently provincial	<i>Carmen Vetrone</i>	As per the materials in the Member Portal, these changes can be made without amending the OACETT Act. It is likely that this will be part of the plan in the event of approvals, but timing can be difficult to predict based on legislative cycles. We would need to identify a private member to sponsor the amendments and there

backing?		are certainly champions whom we can approach.
You talked about communicating with employers within electrical technology field. Have you been in talks with the chemical technology stakeholders in the market?	<i>Andrii Ligun</i>	The only direct outreach to employers in advance has been through the salary survey. That outreach is anticipated to be part of the marketing follow up.
Will changing the name to P.Tech and ETPO be enough motivation for OACETT to push provincial legislation for RESERVED PRACTICE instead of just a "protected title"?	<i>Karl Franco</i>	Please see notes above re: lack of appetite within the government
What does PEO think of this change? Have we consulted with our Professional Sibling organization on how this can not only impact OACETT or the PEO?	<i>Ryan Klein</i>	Please see notes above and in the materials in the Member Portal re: outreach to sibling associations.
Do P Techs elsewhere have an increased or decreased median salary?	<i>Rob Smith</i>	At this time the comparison would not be valid because the requirements are different in Alberta and BC.
OACETT act is legislation the would require the membership to admin the by-laws would it not. i.e. OACETT remains our legal name but the new one is our public name until the ACT is amended?	<i>Eric Gottfried</i>	See notes above re: intent to preserve OACETT as the legal name and only change the "business" name. That requires amending the by-laws but not the Act.
It was mentioned that 3 Provinces already use P.Tech. How many other Provinces currently use C.E.T. (the remaining)?	<i>Jason Scandolari</i>	No, some were using A.Sc.T.
Is OACETT going to bring back A.Sc.T. designation?	<i>Dwayne Hofstetter</i>	This is not planned at this time.
I am a Technician grandfathered in as a CET. what will be the impact on my designation with the title change?	<i>Darren Maine</i>	As noted in the materials in the Member Portal and in the President's opening remarks, there will be no change to grandfathered C.E.T.'s who are technicians.
so why not add a designation of Certified Applied Science Technician or technologist?	<i>Chris Ledsham</i>	It was felt that Professional Technologist effectively represented all disciplines.
If from us fails to change the	<i>Christian</i>	We don't yet know what the TPC response

names, will the national body ask us back next year to vote for this name change again?	<i>Soesianto</i>	would be in that event - we would communicate any outcomes back to the members.
I am a CET and currently use a CET stamp for my work. Will I receive a new stamp when the designation name changes?	<i>Quinn Truong</i>	Please see notes above - yes, a new stamp will be provided.
I believe there are a number of other pieces of ONT. Legislation will be required to be changed where C.E.T.s are listed as qualified professionals.	<i>David Saunders</i>	To our knowledge, those that would require changes have been identified and consultations have taken place with those organizations.
Why every year membership fee goes up?	<i>Pedram Zamani</i>	While this is technically outside the scope of the name change issue, please see earlier responses re: dues being linked to the annual Cost of Living increase in Canada. Dues increase because costs increase.
Has staff or board members researched any other organization name and certification changes such as \the accounting field CMA, CA, CGA? What are the Pro/Cons? or learnings from their experience?	<i>Michel Jerome</i>	There has been no formal research but certainly learnings that have been shared through association management professional development events that are regularly attended by staff
Just wanted to ensure you had this (not just in the busy chat) OACETT is also noted in Wells regulation -O.Reg. 903/90 under the Ontario Water Resources Act	<i>Michael Spicer</i>	Thank you - this will be flagged.
Can we use both C.E.T. and P.Tech designation at the same time?	<i>Ferdie Olazo</i>	As per the President's introductory remarks, it will not be appropriate or ethical to claim two designations when you technically only hold one. Current C.E.T.'s would be required to decide which designation they wish to hold in the event that a change is made.
Would we keep C.E.T. if chosen forever or is there an expiry date and then everyone eventually gets merged to P.Tech? (Samantha Grainger).	<i>Grainger Samantha</i>	There will be no expiry date on grandfathered titles.
Do the other provinces using or considering P.Tech have equivalent certification requirements?	<i>Dan Coffin</i>	As noted above, there are some differences, typically driven by the provincial education systems, but the Registrars are working to harmonize those requirements as well.
Duplicating the question asked	<i>Andrii Ligun</i>	At this time, such a change is not anticipated. It

in the chat. Would it be possible to use the discipline of the certification in the brackets after the title? E.g., P.Tech. (Chem)		could certainly be considered by the RPPC.
Robert's Rules of order apply in the meeting next week correct?	<i>Eric Gottfried</i>	Yes, and we will have a Parliamentarian providing support for the meeting process.
When you say 40 people need to be present to form a quorum, do they need to be in person? or just virtual?	<i>Leanna Burgess</i>	The meeting is virtual, with no in-person component. So 40 virtual attendees will be needed to achieve quorum.
How the voting will go? Can we vote online?	<i>Zafar Ul Islam</i>	Next week's meeting and vote is completely virtual. If you have not received your unique registration email, please email admin@oacett.org .
What is required to keep the name OACETT and harmonize with all provinces?	<i>Natalie Beauregard</i>	Not sure what is being asked in this question - there is no intent to try to harmonize the provincial organization names at this time - only the P.Tech title.
Will there be a new P.Tech stamp?	<i>Arnold Mikolajewski</i>	Yes.
Is the timeline for transitioning the organization name from OACETT to ETPO, and the designation from CET to PTech, expected to follow the same 4 to 5-year schedule?	<i>Egdon Samson</i>	The five year timeline only reflects the maximum time that OACETT is leaving our fellow provincial organizations to come to agreement (or not). These changes could happen sooner if agreements are reached sooner.
Are there funds set aside to cover the costs that would be associated for those who choose to update/revise certifications and stamps to the new designation? My concern is this driving membership due fees up.	<i>Michael Rende</i>	The budget that is coming from reserves (not by increasing member dues), includes replacing certificates and stamps for those who wish to change to the new title.
If the designation were to change, why is the grandfathered designation still being used? Adding another among C. Tech., A.Sc.T., Certified Engineering Technicians and Certified Engineering Technologists seemingly will add to the confusion.	<i>Julian Wiesner</i>	Grandfathering of credentials has been a longstanding OACETT practice out of respect for member preferences for the designation that they originally had conferred.

But it was just suggested that two different efforts - Designation change independent of the Association change is not effective . . . Christopher just said that if P.Tech is hung up - we'll go at the Association name change right away. How is this not moving on one and not the other?	<i>David Saunders</i>	This is not the intent of what was communicated. There are four possible combinations of decisions next Tuesday. If both the title change and the name change are approved, they will need to happen together in order to achieve the efficiencies identified. That timing will be driven by when national agreement on the title is reached.
What is OACETT doing for professional recognition in the public? I work for a public department where OACETT is totally unknown from colleagues. PEng are all over the place. They even have their membership dues reimbursed by the employer.	<i>Christian Yav</i>	We see the name changes as an ideal catalyst for this kind of public awareness campaign. OACETT is also happy to support any of our members in generating greater awareness in your workplace. You just need to reach out to us.
Can we have the name change to PET, Professional Engineering Technologist, that way we keep engineering in the name?	<i>Ramsin Sotouadeh</i>	Please see other responses on the reason for the choice of P.Tech.
With the balance of CETs in Ontario; why are the other provinces not encourage to follow our designation instead of creating something new. We could probably fund this at a less expense	<i>Bruce Fudger</i>	This was certainly raised as part of the discussion within TPC but was ultimately not the agreed direction.
Will a more detailed cost breakdown be provided to address the impact of future OACETT member associate fees as result of this proposal to change title and association name?	<i>Marcin Krzeminski</i>	As previously noted, a detailed budget has been included in the materials in the Member Portal. There will be no increase in member dues to fund the changes because they are being funded by the financial reserves of the association.
It was mentioned that new stamps would be sent to anyone that would like to change their title from CET to P.Tech. Was this considered in the cost of the changes?	<i>Drew Lehman</i>	Yes, it is included in the detailed budget.
I ask again, will a friendly amendment be allowed?	<i>Shervin Reyhani</i>	Please see note above.

Kevin, are there other provinces who are voting on the P.Tech soon as a title change or are we the first to do so. there was a mention that if the vote goes through, we hold for 5 years. does this mean we are allowing other provinces up to 5 years for a change	Anil Kolassery	Yes, by the way our motion is worded, we are allowing the other provinces up to five years to make a decision. The Board determined that the decision should not be kept completely open-ended in approving the motion language.
Why are we adding “engineering” to the organization name, then why take it away from the designation?	Kara St. Hillaire	The Board has proposed the organization name that was preferred in the survey responses and there were a number of concerns expressed about losing it from the organization entirely. Removing it from the title is still seen as the most inclusive of all disciplines.
Mark Balonzo - If the vote does not pass next week, will there be another opportunity to vote in the future.	Mark Balonzo	It is unlikely that the same vote would be brought back to the members again, at least not in the short or medium term.
So for the next 5 years will be using Cet and PT designation both at the same time	Ramsin Sotouadeh	No, we will not be using P.Tech at all until such time as there is national agreement on the title, at which point a timeline would be established to replace C.E.T. with P.Tech. They will never be conferred at the same time, but current C.E.T.'s could opt to keep their title through grandfathering provisions.
Where is this material you keep referring to?	Rod Langford	See link at the top of the page.
Why not PET (Professional Engineering Technologist) instead of P.Tech? That way engineering is still in the title?	Kyle Jamison	See responses to similar questions above.
is the change will affect the yearly dues? thank you	Yana Fomin	As noted in the materials in the member portal, this will NOT impact dues.
Is the name OACETT being changed or will we be operating under a new name and keeping OACETT name for tax and legal purposes?	Shervin Reyhani	See the note re: legal consultation above - the change will be to the business name only, not the legal name.

Which vote will happen first - designation name change or organization name change? I think we should either change both names at the same time or leave them both alone	<i>Tyler Watters</i>	The agenda for the Special Meeting has been distributed - the vote on the designation name will take place first, immediately followed by the vote on the organization name.
I agree with Kyle C.'s comments regarding the C.E.T. designation. At this point, the title is well-established and widely recognized. Could you explain the main reasons for making a change now? What benefits or improvements are expected compared to the current designation? Is there evidence that this change will strengthen professional recognition or knowledge standards? Also, why was the decision made at this specific time, and why were similar changes not pursued earlier?	<i>Omar Cuesta</i>	Answers have been provided in various places above.
If this goes through, and an individual chooses to change to P.Tech but is applying to a job that requires a C.E.T. designation, can something be provided to indicate to the potential employer that they are the same?	<i>Leanna Burgess</i>	Yes, we will ensure that supports like that would be available to members.
Just kindly look into the name and acronym if OACETT has considered the fact that ETPO is already used by other organizations—such as the European Trade Promotion Organisation in Europe and the French construction firm Entreprise de Travaux Publics de l'Ouest—which could lead to potential confusion or branding overlap? On the bright side, I haven't found anywhere in Canada using this acronym.	<i>Egdon Samson</i>	We did have our trademark lawyer conduct that search in advance of proposing the title and also didn't identify organizations that raised any significant concern about pursuing this title.

It sounds like we're moving to a national organization oversee all of the provinces, if that is so, what will happen to OACETT?	<i>Ryan Klein</i>	See notes above - that is not an accurate interpretation of the information shared to date. OACETT maintains autonomy, which is why these decisions are coming to the members.
Where do we get the certificate for CPD?	<i>Bassam Elsaraj</i>	It will be emailed to you - please wait at least a week before following up.
Will there be a concrete date for when I need to decide to change my title? Will I always have the option to change from my grandfathered CET designation to the new P.Tech at a later date?	<i>Kyle Place</i>	Yes, there would be a transition period communicated to all current C.E.T.'s with lots of lead time and multiple reminders. Once that transition period has passed, a member could still choose to transition at a later time, but the replacement of a certificate and/or stamp after the transition deadline had passed would be the responsibility of the member to fund. During the transition period, that replacement cost is part of the name change budget and would be covered by OACETT.
What about retired members?	<i>Jagdish Patel</i>	Retired members who are C.E.T.s would have the same options as those who are full active members, with a choice to remain with the grandfathered C.E.T., or change their certificate and record to P.Tech if the change is approved.