



# The Path Towards a National Engineering Licence in Canada

by National Licensing Working Group

July 2026

## Acknowledgements

This report was developed through the collaborative efforts of dedicated members of Ontario's engineering community. OSPE gratefully acknowledges the contributions of the following individuals:

### Contributors

Sasha Harpe, P.Eng. (Chair)

Richard Bos, P.Eng.

Inga Hipsz, P.Eng.

Paul Ransom, P.Eng.

Bailey Sadowsky, P.Eng.

# Table of Contents

- 1. Executive Summary.....4
- 2. Problem Statement.....4
- 3. Background.....4
- 4. Data Gaps, Key Performance Indicators, and Actions.....6
- 5. Guiding Principles.....7
- 6. Options Analysis.....7
- 7. Recommended Pathway (Phased Implementation).....10
- 8. Roles & Responsibilities.....11
- 9. Governance & Compliance.....12
- 10. Cost & Funding Considerations.....12
- 11. Risks and Mitigations.....12
- 12. Immediate Next Steps.....13
- 13. Conclusion.....13
- Appendix.....14
- References.....15

# 1. Executive Summary

With the release of the federal [2025 Budget: Canada Strong](#), the Canadian government is demonstrating its commitment and urgency in building new projects that will require engineering support in less developed Canadian regions and in a condensed period of time. Labour mobility is being highlighted as one of the obstacles that provinces and territories need to address to be able to fulfill the new mandate.

Currently, Canadian engineers must hold a separate licence in every province or territory where they practise, paying separate fees and maintaining separate **Continuing Professional Development (CPD)** records under different standards and in different databases. In addition, engineering firms are required to maintain separate **Practice Management Plan (PMP)** records. This discourages cross-border practice and limits access to engineering expertise in smaller communities. The administrative duplication falls on engineers and firms with no measurable public safety benefit.

To start addressing the mobility barriers, the **National Licensing Working Group** of the **Ontario Society of Professional Engineers (OSPE)** recommends a phased approach, culminating in a national mobility endorsement, as identified in Option 3 (page 9), an add-on to the existing provincial/territorial licence, granting the right to practise in all jurisdictions under a single nationally recognized stamp, with a CPD and PMP registry. Fees would be distributed to provincial/territorial regulators on a per-capita of licensed engineers basis.

## 2. Problem Statement

Engineers and engineering companies in Canada are currently required to obtain and maintain separate licences in every jurisdiction in which they practise. Engineers are required to maintain separate records in separate databases for CPD and PMP, often to marginally different standards, and engineering companies are required to maintain separate professional management plans.

Collectively, this system discourages Canadian engineers from practising in multiple provinces or territories and limits Canadians' access to the highest level of engineering available. Additionally, some federal works are currently outside the scope of provincial/territorial regulation.

Limitations on the transferability of engineering licensure limit subject matter experts from sharing their expertise beyond provincial/territorial boundaries and limit small communities' access to that expertise. Finally, these limitations are detrimental to engineers' labour mobility, which is required to execute the direction of the *2025 Budget: Canada Strong*, specifically the new nation-building projects that require engineering involvement.

## 3. Background

### 3.1 What is Working

The existing system has evolved from the 1925 **U.K. Privy Council** decision in "[Toronto Electric Commissioners v. Snider](#)," in which provincial and territorial governments were determined to have jurisdiction over labour regulations. Since that time, each province/territory has adopted legislation that is significantly similar in nature, and which identifies engineering among a group of self-regulated professions.

In every province and territory, the engineering profession has developed a robust self-regulatory framework which provides a pathway to licensure, ensures engineers remain experts in their chosen field of practice, and most importantly, holds engineers accountable for maintaining public safety in the work they do. For engineers providing services in a single province/territory, this provides a robust regulatory environment.

Complementing the work of provincial/territorial regulators, **Engineers Canada** and their **Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB)** lead the provincial and territorial regulators' accreditation of undergraduate engineering programs, providing uniform accreditation across Canada and enabling students from any accredited program to pursue a career in any province or territory.

Provincial/territorial regulators maintain active reciprocity agreements that recognize registration in any province/territory as being functionally equivalent and provide a streamlined registration process.

### 3.2 Opportunities for Improvement

For Canadians seeking the best engineer for their project initiated in a jurisdiction, the current system excludes eligibility of engineers from any other province or territory. This exclusion exists despite the engineers having studied at the same universities, and the regulators' acknowledgement of reciprocity.

To practice engineering across multiple jurisdictions, the engineer or the engineering firm is required to maintain separate provincial/territorial registration, pay separate fees, and often maintain a unique record of CPD. Engineering firms are required to maintain individual provincial/territorial registrations and professional management plans.

Registration in multiple jurisdictions functionally prevents engineers from reasonably engaging in each regulator's governing framework, preventing them from participating in the self-governing nature expected of regulated professionals.

Federal work is currently excluded from provincial/territorial jurisdiction and, in some cases, has no regulatory framework.

### 3.3 Legislated vs. Regulated

Across Canada, engineering standards are set by provincial/territorial regulators using one of two methods. Core regulator empowerment always comes from legislation. In some provinces like Quebec and British Columbia, that legislation provides additional compliance requirements for regulated professionals. In other jurisdictions, like Ontario, most of the definition of engineering compliance remains at the discretion of the engineering regulator. Establishment of a national framework needs to be aware of and mindful of these variations as they will limit some regulators capacity to agree to a standard different than what is currently legislated in their province/territory.

### 3.4 Cost of Inaction

Existing research estimates the cost of interprovincial and interterritorial trade barriers to **Canada's Gross Domestic Product (GDP)** at between \$92 billion and \$210 billion, meanwhile no work was identified that estimates the costs specific to regulatory barriers to interprovincial engineering services.

The \$200 billion figure cited most frequently originates from the **Government of Canada's [November 2025 announcement](#)** on the **Free Trade and Labour Mobility in Canada Act**, which estimated that eliminating all federal, provincial and territorial internal trade barriers, including regulatory-related barriers like separate licensing, could boost GDP by as much as \$200 billion over time, equivalent to \$5,100 per person.<sup>1</sup> This figure has been further corroborated by a **[January 2026 International Monetary Fund \(IMF\) analysis](#)**, which found that regulation-related barriers between provinces are equivalent, on average, to a nine percent tariff nationally, rising to over 40 percent in heavily regulated service sectors, and that fully removing internal

<sup>1</sup> Government of Canada. (November 17, 2025). Government of Canada removes barriers to interprovincial trade and labour mobility. [accessed 2026 May 29]. <https://www.canada.ca/en/one-canadian-economy/news/2025/11/government-of-canada-removes-barriers-to-interprovincial-trade-and-labour-mobility.html>

trade barriers could increase Canada’s real GDP by approximately seven percent, or \$210 billion.<sup>2</sup> [Statistics Canada’s 2024 Canadian Survey on Interprovincial Trade](#) estimated the range at between \$92 billion and \$200 billion in potential GDP gains.<sup>3</sup>

Industries that rely directly on licenced professional engineers span the full breadth of Canada’s physical economy and contribute significantly to Canada’s GDP, like the oil and natural gas industry contributing \$88 billion,<sup>4</sup> or manufacturing at \$200 billion<sup>5</sup> in 2025.

Each faces potential consequences in labour shortages from fragmented licensure. According to the **Canadian Occupation and Projection System (COPS)**, shortage conditions across the 2024–2033 projection period are concentrated in occupations requiring university education (TEER 1) and college diploma or apprenticeship training (TEER 2 and 3); the classification levels that encompass all licensed professional engineers and engineering technologists in Canada.<sup>6</sup>

Across the engineering disciplines identified in *Table 1: Engineering Occupations: COPS Outlook 2024–2033*, which can be found in the appendix, moderate labour shortages are already present or projected in every major sector of Canada’s physical economy. The urgency of these labour market conditions makes the case for action to modernize licensing to enable interprovincial work by engineers. The cost of inaction is already visible in project delays, regional labour shortages, and a licensing system that was designed for a different era of Canadian infrastructure. Fragmented licensure could compound labour shortage risk during a time when engineers are called upon to deliver major projects that span provincial borders.

## 4. Data Gaps, Key Performance Indicators, and Actions

While research exists that estimates the cost of the interprovincial/interterritorial licensing system to Canada’s GDP at \$92 to \$210 billion annually,<sup>2,3</sup> no work was identified that estimates the costs specific to engineering.

Similarly, while Engineers Canada and each provincial/territorial regulator maintain detailed records on the number of engineers registered in each jurisdiction (323,360 registrations across Canada in 2023)<sup>7</sup> and how many individuals apply for new reciprocity in any year (6,826),<sup>8</sup> the data available does not identify:

- How many of the 323,000 registrations are the same engineer registered in multiple jurisdictions;
- How many engineers are maintaining registration in multiple jurisdictions over many years (in contrast to a new applicant); or
- How many engineers are registered in two, three, four, five, or more jurisdictions.

For instance, the 281 internal trade applicants noted in the Engineers Canada report account for approximately 3% of the engineers in Nova Scotia, yet the Nova Scotia regulator has shared that almost 25% of their engineers are from out of province according to the [Public Bills Committee Proceedings](#) on March 19, 2025.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Diez, F.J. and Yang, Y. (January 2026). Canada Can Grow Faster by Unlocking Its Own Market. International Monetary Fund. Cited in CBC News, January 27, 2026. [accessed 2026 May 29]. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/business/canadian-economy-report-imf-interprovincial-trade-97062567>

<sup>3</sup> Statistics Canada. (April 17, 2026). Analysis on interprovincial trade in Canada, 2023 and 2024. [accessed 2026 May 29]. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/11-621-m/11-621-m2026003-eng.htm>

<sup>4</sup> Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. (n.d.). Energy and the Canadian economy. CAPP. <https://www.capp.ca/en/our-priorities/energy-and-the-canadian-economy/>

<sup>5</sup> Statista Research Department. (2025, November 28). Canada: GDP by industry 2025. Statista. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/594293/gross-domestic-product-of-canada-by-industry-monthly/>

<sup>6</sup> Employment and Social Development Canada, “COPS Home - Canadian Occupational Projection System (COPS),” Government of Canada, accessed July 2, 2026, <https://occupations.esdc.gc.ca/sppc-cops/w.2lc.4m.2@-eng.jsp>.

<sup>7</sup> Engineers Canada. 2024. 2024 National Membership Information (National Membership Report — Data for 2023). Engineers Canada, Ottawa. Available: <https://engineerscanada.ca/reports/national-membership-report/2024-national-membership-information>

<sup>8</sup> Engineers Canada. 2024. 2023 membership tables [dataset]. Engineers Canada, Ottawa. [accessed 2026 May 29]. <https://engineerscanada.ca/sites/default/files/2024-10/2023-Membership-Tables-all-EN.xlsx>

<sup>9</sup> Nova Scotia House of Assembly, Standing Committee on Public Bills. 2025. Proceedings: Bill No. 36 – Free Trade and Mobility within Canada Act. 1st Session, 65th General Assembly. 2025 Mar 19. Halifax (NS): Nova Scotia Legislature. [accessed 2026 May 29]. <https://nslegislature.ca/legislative-business/committees/standing-public-bills/archive/public-bills/pb2025mar19>

## 5. Guiding Principles

Across all jurisdictions in Canada, the primary purpose of engineering regulation remains the same – to protect public safety. This objective is supported by the **Competition Bureau of Canada**'s report, [Self-Regulated Professions – Balancing Competition and Regulation](#).<sup>10</sup> As a first principle:

*“Regulation should have clearly defined and specific objectives... Restrictions should be directly linked to clear and verifiable outcomes. Regulation should be the minimum necessary to achieve stated objectives. The regulatory process must be impartial and not self-serving.”* (Competition Bureau of Canada, 2007, p.37-38)

Based on these values and Canada's regulatory principles, all efforts to update the regulation of engineers in Canada should:

1. Maintain public safety
2. Ensure engineering excellence
3. Provide for a sustainable, self-regulating profession to minimize the burden on the public purse
4. Minimize time-delay and administrative burden when practising throughout Canada — on the engineer, the regulator, and the engineering firm
5. Ensure there are no gaps within the engineering profession of unregulated work

## 6. Options Analysis

To identify and assess options for a registrant or firm to practise, there are two distinct conditions to be satisfied for both:

- **Registration:** obtaining the right to practise in a jurisdiction. This typically requires an application to the provincial/territorial regulator and associated fees. Regulators grant registration to various levels of practice (e.g. restricted scope, collaboration with a licensee, unrestricted practice) and multiple professions (e.g. engineering and geoscience) and, in some cases, make a distinction by location of residence.
- **Maintenance of Registration:** ongoing requirements to remain registered. This typically includes payment of an annual fee, identification of professional knowledge and practice risk areas, recording of CPD by individuals, and maintenance of a PMP by firms.

The regulators of the provinces and territories currently acknowledge a practitioner's registration in any province or territory as sufficient precedent for registration in any other province or territory. The one partial exception is the Quebec regulator, due to the additional language requirements. This is not a national licence, but it minimizes the documentation and investigation burden for licence transfer and extra-provincial/territorial licensure. However, it still requires discrete application to individual provinces/ territories and, in most cases, province/territory-specific training (e.g. ethics, practice standards) and CPD requirements and reporting.

This complies with provincial/territorial and federal initiatives to reduce interprovincial/interterritorial trade barriers but still requires substantial effort on behalf of the regulators and registrants. All administrative burdens — such as standards development, communication and education initiatives, practice oversight, and record-keeping — are maintained by each provincial/territorial regulator.

Unless noted, the following options are written to reflect requirements for licensees and firms.

<sup>10</sup> Competition Bureau Canada, “Self-Regulated Professions—Balancing Competition and Regulation,” report, December 11, 2007, <https://competition-bureau.canada.ca/en/self-regulated-professions-balancing-competition-and-regulation>.

## 6.1 Option 1 – Interprovincial/Interterritorial Licensing Reciprocity (Current Status) & Uniform Registration Maintenance

Registration for individuals and firms would continue to be managed at the provincial/territorial level on the basis of reciprocity between jurisdictions. National registration maintenance would be recorded by a central agent on behalf of all jurisdictions, ideally based on harmonized conditions (CPD, PMP) acceptable to all regulators. The agent could also provide applicant processing services. Jurisdiction-specific exceptions could be accommodated, though this is discouraged as it is contrary to the objective of removing barriers.

### 6.1.1 Key Components

- Create a single data framework for tracking CPD hours and PMPs, available to all regulators. This may be split to accommodate requirements common to all jurisdictions plus segregated requirements for each regulator's jurisdiction.
- A firm's PMP should be confirmed to be consistent with the professional practice guidelines in each operating jurisdiction. Audit status would be recorded.

### 6.1.2 Pros

- Engineers and firms can record CPD and PMP data through a single online portal regardless of the number of practice jurisdictions.
- Annual fees could be aggregated and collected for all jurisdictions according to their requirements.
- Single-jurisdiction registrants would not perceive additional effort or fees to maintain registration status.
- Provincial/Territorial regulator oversight is maintained without modification.
- Consistency in applicant processing — no applicant jurisdiction-shopping.
- Reduction in database maintenance costs for provincial/territorial regulators as various registries are now amalgamated into one.

### 6.1.3 Cons

- Does not remove barriers to registrants practicing in multiple jurisdictions.
- Each regulator would carry the same administrative burden for applicants.
- Without harmonization, does not address jurisdiction-specific variations in practice requirements (declarations, CPD, PMP) or reporting dates.
- Does not accommodate variations in scope of practice or professions (engineering, geoscience).
- Substantial modifications to provincial/territorial acts and regulations would probably be required to allow administrative management to be transferred to an extra-jurisdictional agent.
- Does not address the lack of regulation of professional engineering for federal employees or engineers providing services to federally regulated projects.

## 6.2 Option 2 – Option 1 Plus National Applicant Processing

With consideration of licensing reciprocity and harmonized documentation maintenance, the documentation maintenance agency would be positioned to provide applicant processing for new and multi-jurisdiction licensing. It is known that applicants are currently jurisdiction-shopping to bypass long processing schedules in some provinces/territories, placing a burden on receiving jurisdictions to register professionals who may not intend to practice there. This is enabled by provincial/territorial reciprocity, which allows the new registrant

to subsequently apply to their home jurisdiction and forfeit their original licence.

#### 6.2.1 Pros (in addition to Option 1)

- Consistency in applicant processing.
- No applicant jurisdiction-shopping required.
- A single applicant queue.

#### 6.2.2 Cons (in addition to Option 1)

- Does not remove barriers to registrants practising in multiple jurisdictions.
- The agent would be required to be familiar with regulatory requirements in all jurisdictions.
- Substantial modifications to provincial/territorial acts and regulations would probably be required to transfer administrative management to an extra-jurisdictional agent.

### **6.3 Option 3 – National Endorsement on Existing Provincial/Territorial Licence**

This option does not replace existing registration structures and procedures but adds a national endorsement to an existing licence. The registrant would not need to acquire and maintain registration in any other province or territory but would be enabled to legally provide professional engineering services in all jurisdictions.

#### 6.3.1 Key Components

- Engineers practising in any jurisdiction may apply for a national endorsement from their home regulator, granting the right to practice in any province or territory. The endorsement would be displayed by a nationally recognized engineering stamp. Additional fees would apply.
- Engineers with a national endorsement would continue to be regulated by their provincial/territorial regulator.
- Engineers practising under Canadian licensure would also be subject to the provincial/territorial regulator of the jurisdiction in which the work is performed.
- The national endorsement would be required to complete work under federal jurisdiction.
- Engineering fees from Canadian licensees would be distributed between provincial/territorial regulators on a per capita of regulated engineers basis, with minimum guaranteed funding for smaller jurisdictions to ensure they maintain their regulatory function.
- The home jurisdiction would manage the CPD of individual engineers and the PMPs of engineering corporations to a new consensus-developed standard meeting the minimum requirements of all engineering regulators.
- A national endorsement may be limited by scope (e.g. Civil, Mechanical).
- Standards for a national endorsement, distribution of fees, etc. can be administered by the designated national regulatory agent.

#### 6.3.2 Pros

- Coordinated practice requirements across all jurisdictions.
- New standards will be developed through an accredited democratic and transparent consensus-based process.

### 6.3.3 Cons

- Requires changes to provincial/territorial regulations to accommodate common practice requirements and authority over remote practitioners, which will also complicate authority over ex-jurisdiction non-registrants.

## **6.4 Option 4 – Single Federal Act and Regulator (Long-Term)**

If the practice of professional engineering were to be defined and regulated under a federal act, the provincial/territorial barriers for licensing could be removed. This would be effective to include federal employee professional engineers and establish conditions for other engineers working on federally regulated projects. There are many aspects that would need to be resolved, including how this might work for professional employees within the context of other provincial and territorial regulations, and how they might interact within firms that include non-licensed employees. There may be regulatory structures in place in other countries to be investigated for application in the Canadian context.

### 6.4.1 Key Components

- Create a single federal regulatory framework for engineers.
- This would be a direct replacement to provincial/territorial acts creating self-regulating professional organizations with the ability to enforce practice standards in all jurisdictions.
- This cannot be used to position individuals or firms outside the normal legal environments of the geographic location of the engineer, regardless of the location of their work product (e.g. applicability of employment standards and health and safety acts and regulations).

### 6.4.2 Pros

- Fully addresses interprovincial/interterritorial constraints on the practice of professional engineering and harmonizes the regulatory system for all engineers across Canada, requiring a single licence for engineers and engineering firms.
- Provides regulatory oversight for engineers providing services within federal jurisdiction.
- New standards will be developed through an accredited democratic and transparent consensus-based process.
- Reduction in costs for provincial/territorial regulators as various licensing processes are now amalgamated into one.

### 6.4.3 Cons

- Would require an act to redefine the federal scope over the engineering profession and the dissolution of provincial and territorial acts currently establishing the self-regulating professional associations.
- May not address the professional activities of federal employees outside the geographic limits of the country (e.g. vessels at sea, embassies, extra-national military operations).

## **7. Recommended Pathway (Phased Implementation)**

The plan for the recommended pathway for implementation below is for all options outlined above. The plan is for all options to be implemented in these phases, selecting the easier one first.

## 7.1 Phase 1 (0–6 Months): Set Up the CPD Foundation

All options to improve interprovincial/interterritorial mobility require the clarification and development of a common set of professional and CPD requirements. Therefore, the early steps in the process should be to:

1. Identify the reporting needs of all provincial/territorial regulators for engineers and engineering firms. This will become the basis of a new common standard.
2. Identify a reporting platform that meets the needs of all regulators.
3. Survey Canadian engineers to determine how many are currently registered in multiple jurisdictions.

The OSPE National Licensing Working Group recommends this eventually apply to PMP, a single PMP to capture all provinces/territories.

## 7.2 Phase 2 (6–12 Months): Operate & Optimize

1. Establish a group of willing regulators to progress a single CPD and PMP registry and national licensure. While buy-in from all regulators is preferred, significant progress and proof of concept may be achieved with a smaller group of participants. Initial key participants may include larger regulators from Ontario, Alberta, and British Columbia.
2. Establish a single universally accepted registry for CPD and PMP that every engineering regulator in Canada can use. As this is a voluntary program, it is possible not all regulators will immediately join; the national registry must meet the needs of participating regulators and should strive to meet the needs of all regulators.
3. Establish a benchmark national standard for CPD and PMP that meets the requirements of all engineering regulators in Canada.

## 7.3 Phase 3 (12–24 Months): Pilot the Mobility Endorsement

1. Leverage the tracking system and benchmark standard to create a national licence for qualified individuals among participating regulators.
2. Annually report on the uptake of national licensure.
3. Survey participants of all jurisdictions to test for membership benefits of non-participating regulators.
4. Regularly engage non-participating regulators to expand the program's reach.

## 7.4 Phase 4 (24+ Months): Long Term

1. Consult with other professional organizations (lawyers, doctors, etc.) to further define the costs and benefits of a single national regulatory framework.
2. Investigate practices in other countries that regulate professionals from the federal level and develop practices from lessons learned.
3. Investigate the means to integrate professional regulation at the federal level within the provincial/territorial setting and across jurisdictions.
4. Determine the interest of the federal government in taking on the role of regulator for professionals.
5. Remove the voluntary status of jurisdictional compliance from the provinces and territories.

## 8. Roles & Responsibilities

Developing a national licence or endorsement will require the active collaboration of provincial/territorial regulators. It is proposed that OSPE collaborates with **Professional Engineers Ontario (PEO)**, Engineers

Canada, and other provincial/territorial regulators to initiate discussions to advance the common framework identified in Section 7. Common criteria will need to be defined in a consensus process allowing all voices to be heard.

Ultimately provincial/territorial regulators will need to either leverage an existing infrastructure, create a new organization if one does not exist, or be willing to take on additional responsibilities as the agent. The new agent would validate and maintain a minimum common professional standard and distribute revenue across participating jurisdictions.

Ideally, the designated agent would have a history of demonstrated national standard implementation. They would be required to bring together provincial/territorial regulators in a pro-active manner to a set and evolving national standard. Their role would include the administration of a common CPD and PMP registry, and professional management standard to improve interprovincial/interterritorial mobility.

## 9. Governance & Compliance

Any interprovincial/interterritorial model should clearly protect each jurisdiction's capacity to regulate and ensure compliance of engineering work constructed in their region. In addition, any model should provide regulatory oversight for engineering in the federal domain.

Engineers Canada is already governed by provincial/territorial regulators and should remain that way.

## 10. Cost & Funding Considerations

A national registry would have initial start-up costs but should provide long-term savings for provincial/territorial regulators. It would require a critical mass of upfront investment.

The cost of registration for each regulator must be considered to prevent potential registrants from shopping for the region with the lowest price.

Cost sharing to maintain this national CPD/PMP system, including the database and administration, between the regulators must be considered based on the population of registered engineers in the jurisdiction.

## 11. Risks and Mitigations

As with any change, there are risks to both maintaining the status quo and to the initiative. The primary risks of the status quo have been outlined above — it creates additional burdens to trade, commerce, and growth, and limits the provision of competitive, high-quality engineering services to all parts of Canada without a clear benefit, which will be required to execute the federal 2025 Budget: Canada Strong projects. There is a risk of not evolving for the benefit of Canada, the industry, and engineers.

Potential risks and mitigations related to a change in the current regulatory environment include:

- 1. Clarity of Jurisdiction:** It must be clear who regulates an engineer for a given project. A consistent path to interprovincial/interterritorial regulation shared by all regulators can establish a clear definition — either the location of the work or the location of the home province/territory of the engineer. The jurisdiction for the consequences of enforcement actions needs to be established; provincial/territorial regulators must still regulate, potentially revoking national endorsements.
- 2. Rush to the Bottom:** Unfettered provincial/territorial equivalency may result in one province/territory providing the lowest barrier to entry to attract the most new registrants. Establishing a coordinated consensus standard and system for equivalency maintains engineering excellence, the protection of

the public, and the capacity for regulation in all of Canada.

- 3. Loss of Funding:** Regulators require funding to maintain their regulatory roles. Any national licensure or endorsement needs to distribute funds equitably to allow all regulators to perform this function. The cost of maintaining one process and one system may be more cost-effective overall. Regulators would need to contribute a fraction of the costs they currently spend to maintain their own processes and systems.
- 4. Alignment of CPD and PMP Requirements:** Most regulators have broad control within their local legislation to set CPD and PMP requirements, but some have CPD and PMP requirements specified within the legislation itself. This may lead to difficulties in harmonizing requirements at the national level.

## 12. Immediate Next Steps

The OSPE National Licensing Working Group has taken the time to analyze the emerging needs for national licensing, along with pros and cons of the outlined four options. Therefore, the Working Group proposes Option 3 and for OSPE to lead the initiative by engaging PEO, Engineers Canada, and other provincial/territorial regulators. It is suggested that they prioritize larger jurisdictions to achieve a critical mass of participation. The next steps would be to:

- Identify key reporting requirements for engineers and corporations for a national registry.
- Identify key performance requirements for a national licence.
- Obtain support in principle on the agent to manage a national registry and licensure.
- Engage with federal/provincial/territorial governments to achieve support in principle and identify and remove any regulatory barriers.

The Working Group additionally recommends that OSPE immediately:

- Engage Professional Engineers Ontario (PEO), Engineers Canada, and key provincial regulators to secure their support and endorsement.
- Define reporting, administrative, and performance requirements for a national CPD/PMP registry.
- Identify a regulatory agent that could administer the national CPD/PMP registry and obtain their agreement.
- Obtain support in principle from federal and provincial/territorial governments.

Details of implementation steps that would follow the positive onboarding of key allies have been outlined in Section 7.

## 13. Conclusion

Barriers in engineering labour mobility can be addressed with the implementation of a national licence for engineers. Through this document, OSPE's National Licensing Working Group has provided various options for achieving national labour mobility for engineers.

As Canada embarks on major national infrastructure projects, there is an urgent need for engineers to work freely across provincial and territorial boundaries. OSPE calls on Engineers Canada, provincial and territorial regulators, and federal and provincial governments to work together to deliver value to the public and make a national licensure a reality for Canadian engineers.

## Appendix

NOC	Occupation	Employment (2023)	Workers 50+	Job Openings (2024–2033)	COPS Outlook	Key Sectors
21300	Civil Engineers	65,600	30%	21,800	Moderate Shortage	Engineering R&D Services (60%), Public Administration (19%), Construction (12%)
21301	Mechanical Engineers	44,900	29%	12,000	Moderate Shortage	Engineering R&D Services (38%), Manufacturing, Energy
21310	Electrical and Electronics Engineers	41,300	32%	14,900	Moderate Shortage	Engineering R&D Services (44%), Electric/Gas/Water Utilities (17%), Electronics Manufacturing (14%)
21321	Industrial and Manufacturing Engineers	20,400	26%	6,800	Moderate Risk of Shortage	Automotive, Aerospace, Food and Beverage, Machinery
21330	Mining Engineers	5,300	22%	1,300	Moderate Signs of Shortage	Mining, Oil Sands, Resource Extraction
21331	Geological Engineers	3,500	26%	1,500	Moderate Risk of Shortage	Resource Extraction, Oil Sands, Environmental Services
21332	Petroleum Engineers	11,300	29%	2,100	Balance (National)	Oil and Gas Extraction — Regionally Concentrated in AB and SK

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, Canadian Occupational Projection System (COPS), 2024–2033.

## References

- Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. (n.d.). Energy and the Canadian economy. CAPP. <https://www.capp.ca/en/our-priorities/energy-and-the-canadian-economy/>
- Competition Bureau of Canada. 2007. *Self-regulated professions: Balancing competition and regulation*. Competition Bureau, Gatineau, QC. Cat. No. lu54-13/2007E. ISBN 978-0-662-47414-2. Available: <https://competition-bureau.canada.ca/sites/default/files/attachments/2022/Professions-study-final-E.pdf>
- Employment and Social Development Canada. (January 30, 2025). *Summary of results (2024–2033) — Canadian Occupational Projection System (COPS)*. [accessed 2026 May 29]. <https://occupations.esdc.gc.ca/sppc-cops/l.3bd.2t.1ilshhtml@-eng.jsp?lid=107&fid=64&lang=en>
- Engineers Canada. 2024. 2024 National Membership Information (National Membership Report — Data for 2023). Engineers Canada, Ottawa. Available: <https://engineerscanada.ca/reports/national-membership-report/2024-national-membership-information>
- Engineers Canada. 2024. 2023 membership tables [dataset]. Engineers Canada, Ottawa. <https://engineerscanada.ca/sites/default/files/2024-10/2023-Membership-Tables-all-EN.xlsx>
- Nova Scotia House of Assembly, Standing Committee on Public Bills. 2025. Proceedings: Bill No. 36 – Free Trade and Mobility within Canada Act. 1st Session, 65th General Assembly. 2025 Mar 19. Halifax (NS): Nova Scotia Legislature. [accessed 2026 May 29]. <https://nslegislature.ca/legislative-business/committees/standing/public-bills/archive/public-bills/pb2025mar19>
- Provincial Trade Report Team. 2026. Canada’s intraprovincial trade barriers stall growth. Provincial Trade Report. <https://provincialtradereport.ca/2026/03/25/canada-intraprovincial-trade-barriers-economy/>
- Statista Research Department. (2025, November 28). *Canada: GDP by industry 2025*. Statista. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/594293/gross-domestic-product-of-canada-by-industry-monthly/>



## Contact Us

Ontario Society of Professional Engineers  
5000 Yonge Street, Suite 701  
North York, ON, M2N 7E9  
1-866-763-1654  
[info@ospe.on.ca](mailto:info@ospe.on.ca)