



APEGA RECOMMENDED ORDER TO THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER OF THE *ENGINEERING
AND GEOSCIENCE PROFESSIONS ACT*

AND

IN THE MATTER OF THE CONDUCT OF

Romano Viglione, P.Eng.

Registrant No: 60303

IC File: 2025-12

APEGA RECOMMENDED ORDER TO THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

**In the Matter of the *Engineering and Geoscience
Professions Act***

and

In the Matter of the Conduct of

Romano Viglione, P.Eng.

The Investigative Committee of the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta (APEGA) has investigated the conduct of Romano Viglione, P.Eng., (the registrant) with respect to a complaint initiated by Allan Ng, P.Eng., Director, APEGA Professional Practice (the complainant) dated April 30, 2025 (the complaint).

A. The Complaint

The complainant alleged that the registrant engaged in unprofessional conduct, as defined at section 44(1) of the *Engineering and Geoscience Professions Act*, RSA 2000, c E-11 (*EGP Act*) with respect to the registrant's conduct by failing to follow/complete mandatory requirements as directed by the APEGA Practice Review Board (PRB).

The Investigative Committee's investigation focused on the following allegations:

Whether the registrant, subject to a Practice Review as part of discipline order (DC# 18-014-FC, case 2016-50), fulfilled the requirements and obligations for the review regarding mandatory actions directed by the PRB to be completed by the registrant, more specifically:

- 1) The registrant did not provide the required information/documents by the due date of March 9, 2025.
- 2) The registrant did not respond promptly and appropriately to duly served communication of a regulatory nature per the *EGP Act* Bylaws, s.32.1.

B. Agreed Statement of Facts:

As a result of the investigation, it is agreed by and between the Investigative Committee and the registrant that:

(i) Background:

1. The registrant has been a member of APEGA since 1996.
2. The registrant holds a B.Eng. in civil engineering, 1982.
3. The registrant was bound by the *EGP Act* and the APEGA Code of Ethics during the relevant time.
4. The registrant cooperated with the investigation.
5. Professional Practice is a branch of APEGA that ensures licensed engineers and geoscientists in Alberta meet regulatory obligations by setting and enforcing standards, providing guidance, and overseeing practice reviews. Which includes also maintaining practice standards for Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and authenticating professional work products (PWPs).
6. The PRB is one of APEGA's statutory boards, primarily responsible for developing and maintaining professional practice standards, guidelines, and bulletins; evaluating the professional practice and competence of professional members, licensees, permit holders, and certificate holders against the practice standards and guidelines, which includes the practice review of registrants and permit holders; and administering and enforcing the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) program.

(ii) Facts Relating to the Allegations:

- (iii) In 2016, APEGA received a complaint concerning the registrant (2016-50), which was investigated by the Investigative Committee. The investigation occurred between November 2016 until approximately November 2018. In summary, 2016-50 involved allegations of unprofessional conduct related to the registrant's role concerning inadequate field reviews, an authenticated letter with deficiencies, and inadequate record keeping for work related to a single-family residence.
- (iv) The finding on case 2016-50 resulted in a referral by the Investigative Committee to a formal discipline hearing; that hearing occurred in October 2019. During that hearing, the Discipline Committee accepted an agreed statement of facts (ASF) and sanctions from the Parties. The date of the Discipline Committee's decision was issued in June 2020, and the Parties were formally notified in July 2020. One of the sanctions was that the registrant had to undergo a practice review.
- (v) The Order stipulated that the practice review was to start within a three-month period of the official hearing committee decision. This indicated that the practice review was to begin prior to the end of October 2020 (published DC# 18-014-FC, par. 70.b.i.ii and 70. c refers):

- b. *“The registrant shall undergo a practice review conducted by the PRB, to be initiated within three months after the issuance of the Discipline Committee’s order regarding penalty;”*

“(i)In the event unprofessional conduct or unskilled practice is discovered during the practice review, the PRB may refer it to the Investigative Committee for investigation.”

“(ii)In the event deficiencies with the registrant’s practice are identified during the practice review, and the registrant fails to remedy such deficiencies as directed by the PRB, the PRB may refer such failure to the Investigative Committee for investigation.”

- c. *“The registrant shall not be permitted to act as a Responsible Member until the practice review has been completed, and the registrant has remedied any deficiencies identified by the PRB.”*

10. The practice review did not start with the registrant until March 2022, approximately 17 months later. APEGA acknowledges that there was a delay between the Order’s noted timeframe and the start date of the practice review. The delay was a result of several factors, which involved administrative causes between the hearing committee, APEGA’s discipline department and Professional Practice. The delay for the practice review was in part because Professional Practice was in the midst of developing/finalizing an Independent Practice Review process (IPR), an enhanced version of a typical practice review, and it was not approved for use until January 2022.
11. APEGA recognizes that the timeframe and lack of communication leading up to the IPR was understandably a source of frustration for the registrant. It is, however, noted that the delay did not negate the Order, inclusive of its sanctions or the additional authority of the PRB to implement any follow-up requirements/actions for the registrant deemed important.
12. The registrant cooperated and participated with the IPR, which took place between March 2022 and July 2023. The findings of the IPR were presented to the PRB in early August 2023. Upon review, the PRB rendered a decision that more information/material was required from the registrant. The PRB issued a notice of "Mandatory Actions" that were required to be completed by the registrant within a six-month period (by February 2024) to facilitate the potential conclusion or next stage of the IPR. The registrant was notified.
13. The February 2024 deadline passed, and no information was provided to Professional Practice from the registrant. Allowing additional time, Professional Practice deferred communication until September 2024, at which time they still had not received anything from the registrant. A reminder was sent to the registrant reiterating the registrant’s obligations and requirements to complete the mandatory actions. Professional Practice

allowed an extension until December 30, 2024.

14. On December 27, 2024, three days before the due date, the registrant responded to the September letter and requested an extension until June 2025, citing out-of-country reasons and that the registrant was unable to meet the December deadline.
15. On January 15, 2025, Professional Practice responded to the registrant's extension request, acknowledging that the registrant's travels could make accessing the documents challenging; in that communication:
 - The registrant's request for an extension until June 30, 2025, was denied.
 - A final extension/due date of March 9, 2025, was granted.
 - It was restated to the registrant that:
 - "The Engineering and Geoscience Professions Act Bylaws, 32.1 states that, Professional members, licensees, permit holders, life members, professional licensees, provisional licensees, members in training, joint firms, or certificate holders, shall respond promptly and appropriately to any duly served communication of a regulatory nature received from the Association that contemplates a reply."
 - "The Discipline Decision of June 30, 2020, 70(a)(ii) states that, In the event deficiencies with Viglione's practice are identified during the practice review, and Viglione fails to remedy such deficiencies as directed by the Practice Review Board, the Practice Review Board may refer such failure to the Investigative Committee for investigation."
 - The registrant was notified of potential repercussions if non-compliance occurred.
 - "Failure to respond in whole by March 9, 2025, by providing all of the documents requested in the letter dated September 12, 2024, and uploading CPD activity supporting documents will be considered as failure to respond promptly and appropriately to a duly served communication of a regulatory nature. This will also indicate to the PRB that the identified concerns have not been remedied. These may result in a complaint to the Investigative Committee."
16. No other communication was received from the registrant after his December 27, 2024, request for an extension.
17. On April 30, 2025, Professional Practice referred the matter to APEGA's Investigation department.

18. The registrant did not agree with all the findings in the IPR, but acknowledged the mandatory requirements imposed upon him in August 2023 by the PRB.
19. The registrant acknowledged being aware of the follow up communication from Professional Practice that included due dates and possible non-compliance options should the registrant not comply with the PRB requirements.
20. The registrant was of the opinion that APEGA should have sent him regular reminders before the due dates and also suggested he did not understand the meaning of some of the mandatory actions that were required to be completed by him. However, the registrant admits he did not communicate with Professional Practice or anyone at APEGA to seek assistance.
21. The registrant asserts that his non-compliance was not designed to ignore his ethical and professional responsibilities; rather, his non-compliance was attributed to regular absences from the country, lengthy timeframes, communication concerns from and with APEGA, and his frustration with the entire process.

Specific to Allegation 1:

22. The registrant participated and cooperated with the IPR until the mandatory actions were imposed in August 2023. The PRB required additional information from the registrant and therefore issued notice to complete and provide to Professional Practice the mandatory actions as part of the review.
23. The timeframes and expectations were clear to all parties (due dates of February 2024, December 2024, and March 2025) for submission of all information and material required from the registrant. The registrant did not meet any of the due dates nor provide what was required.
24. The registrant had sufficient time to complete the actions (18 months) and if warranted, contact Professional Practice at any time with any questions or concerns the registrant may have had, which he did not.
25. The registrant believes that APEGA should have sent him regular reminders before the due dates; however, it is a professional responsibility to comply with clearly defined deadlines of the PRB or Professional Practice.
26. The registrant has not completed any of the mandatory actions, leaving the review and follow-up incomplete. The registrant acknowledges that it is necessary for the process to continue, and to respond to the directions of the PRB/Professional Practice as the process continues.
27. The registrant recognizes it is not only a matter of failing to act with the PRB's direction, but also a matter of potential public safety as per the intent of the

original discipline order requiring the practice review.

28. The registrant admits that the conduct described above constitutes unprofessional conduct.

Specific to Allegation 2:

29. From the date of the discipline decision until March of 2022, Professional Practice and the registrant had not communicated. Professional Practice acknowledges this gap. However, during the IPR from March 2022 until July 2023, it is noted that all parties communicated in a timely manner.
30. The registrant did not communicate with Professional Practice or anyone from APEGA after August 2023 with the exception of the registrant's one email in December 2024, the registrant's extension request (one time in 18+ months).
31. A final extension date was granted until March 9, 2025. The practice review process continued, was clear in its expectations and possible repercussions, and the registrant accepts this.
32. The registrant acknowledges that there were three distinct communications from the PRB/Professional Practice: August 2023 (February 2024 due date), September 2024, and the January 2025 letter from Professional Practice, none of which he met.
33. The registrant stated that he did not believe communications from him would change the outcome as he was out of the country often and admitted he was waiting to see what would occur. The registrant accepts this was not a good approach.
34. The registrant admits that the conduct described above constitutes unprofessional conduct.

C. Conduct by the Registrant:

35. The registrant freely and voluntarily admits that at all relevant times the registrant was bound by the *Engineering and Geoscience Professions Act* and the APEGA Code of Ethics.
36. The registrant acknowledges that the conduct described above constitutes unprofessional conduct as defined in Section 44(1) of the Act:

Section 44(1) Any conduct of a professional member, licensee, permit holder, certificate holder or member-in-training that is in the opinion of the Discipline committee or the Appeal Board

(a) is detrimental to the best interests of the public,

(b) contravenes a code of ethics of the profession as established under the regulations,

(c) harms or tends to harm the standing of the profession generally,

(d) displays a lack of knowledge of or lack of skill or judgement in the practice of the profession, or

(e) displays a lack of knowledge of or lack of skill or judgement in the carrying out of any duty or obligation undertaken in the practice of the profession,

Whether or not that conduct is disgraceful or dishonorable constitutes either unskilled practice of the profession or unprofessional conduct, whichever the Discipline Committee or the Appeal Board finds.

Rules of Conduct of the APEGA Code of Ethics state:

1. Professional engineers and geoscientists shall, in their areas of practice, hold paramount the health, safety, and welfare of the public and have regard for the environment.
 2. Professional engineers and geoscientists shall undertake only work that they are competent to perform by virtue of their training and experience.
 3. Professional engineers and geoscientists shall conduct themselves with integrity, honesty, fairness, and objectivity in their professional activities.
 4. Professional engineers and geoscientists shall comply with applicable statutes, regulations, and bylaws in their professional practices.
 5. Professional engineers and geoscientists shall uphold and enhance the honour, dignity, and reputation of their professions and thus the ability of the professions to serve the public interest.
37. The registrant acknowledges that the conduct described above is conduct that is detrimental to the best interests of the public and contravenes the Code of Ethics as established under the regulations.
38. Further, the registrant acknowledges that the conduct described above constitutes a breach of Rules of Conduct 3 and 4.

D. Recommended Order - Registrant:

39. On the recommendation of the Investigative Committee, and by agreement of the registrant with that recommendation, and following a discussion and

review with the Discipline Committee Case Manager, the Discipline Committee hereby orders that:

- a. The registrant shall be reprimanded for their conduct and this order shall serve as the reprimand.
- b. The registrant shall pay a fine of \$1000.00. The fine is a debt owing to APEGA and shall be paid within six (6) months of the date this order is approved by the Discipline Committee Case Manager.
- c. The registrant shall provide the Discipline Manager, within six (6) months of the date this order is approved by the Discipline Committee Case Manager, written confirmation that they have reviewed the following APEGA publication(s) and that the registrant will comply with the requirements therein:
 - i. Professional Practice Guideline - Ethical Practice (August 2022).
- d. The registrant shall contact the Manager, Corporate Practice at corporatepractice@apega.ca, within one (1) month after this order is approved by the Discipline Committee Case Manager to schedule a meeting with a practice reviewer. The registrant's meeting with the practice reviewer shall result in the re-commencement of the registrant's practice review as ordered by APEGA's Practice Review Board.

The registrant shall comply with all directions and requests made by the practice reviewer.

The registrant shall complete all requests for action made by the practice reviewer within six (6) months after this order is approved by the Discipline Committee Case Manager.

- e. If there are extenuating circumstances, the registrant may apply in writing to the Discipline Manager for an extension prior to the deadlines noted above. The approval for extending the deadline is at the discretion of the Discipline Manager. If such an application is made, the registrant shall provide the Discipline Manager with the reason for the request, a proposal to vary the deadline, and any other documentation requested by the Discipline Manager.
- f. If the registrant fails to provide the Discipline Manager with proof that they have completed the requirements noted above within the specified timelines, or any extended timeline granted, the registrant shall be suspended from the practice of engineering for a minimum of thirty (30) days. If the non-monetary requirements in this Order are not completed within six (6) months of the

suspension date, the registrant shall be cancelled. In the event of cancellation, the registrant will be bound by APEGA's reinstatement policy.

- g. This matter and its outcome will be published by APEGA as deemed appropriate and such publication will name the registrant.

I, Romano Viglione, P.Eng., acknowledge that before signing this Recommended Discipline Order, I consulted with legal counsel regarding my rights or that I am aware of my right to consult legal counsel and that I hereby expressly waive my right to do so. I confirm that I agree with the facts and admissions as set out above in this Recommended Discipline Order, and that I agree with the Orders that are jointly proposed.

Further to the above, I acknowledge that a copy of this Order and my identity shall be provided to the APEGA Practice Review Board.

Further to the above, I acknowledge that I have reviewed APEGA's Good Standing Policy. I understand that I will not be considered to be a member in good standing until I have fully complied with the Orders set out above, and I understand that good standing status may affect membership rights or benefits, including the ability to become a Responsible Member, or the ability to volunteer with APEGA in any capacity.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned agrees with the Agreed Statement of Facts and Acknowledgment of Unprofessional Conduct in its entirety.

Registrant

Romano Viglione, P.Eng.
Signed with ConsignO Cloud (2025/10/08)
Verify with verifio.com or Adobe Reader.



Romano Viglione, P. Eng. (#60303)

APEGA Investigative Committee

Kevin Willis, P.Eng.
Signed with ConsignO Cloud (2025/11/08)
Verify with verifio.com or Adobe Reader.



Kevin Willis, P. Eng. (Panel Chair)
APEGA Investigative Committee

APEGA Discipline Committee

Robert Swift
Signed with ConsignO Cloud (2025/11/12)
Verify with verifio.com or Adobe Reader.



Case Manager

November 12, 2025