



ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

IN THE MATTER OF THE *ARCHITECTS ACT*  
R.S.B.C. 1996 C. 17 AS AMENDED

AND

IN THE MATTER OF A CONSENSUAL  
RESOLUTION BETWEEN:

JOHN SALIKEN ARCHITECT AIBC

AND

THE ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

## CONSENSUAL RESOLUTION AGREEMENT

The *Architects Act* authorizes the AIBC to attempt resolution of disciplinary matters by way of consensual resolution. AIBC Bylaws 36.0 through 36.22 provide the specific processes and procedures by which the AIBC and a member or other registrant may reach agreement on a complaint that would otherwise proceed to a hearing and decision at a disciplinary inquiry.

All consensual resolution agreements must be approved by the consensual resolution review panel before they are effective. By statute, this panel must have regard to the public interest when deciding whether to approve a consensual resolution agreement. An approved consensual resolution agreement has the same effect as an order made by a disciplinary committee under the *Architects Act*.

On February 10, 2023, the AIBC transitioned to the authority of the *Professional Governance Act*. As part of this transition, the *Architects Act* (*Act*) was repealed, and the bylaws made under the *Act* were replaced with new updated [Bylaws](#). Pursuant to current AIBC Bylaw 7.51, the Consensual Resolution Review Panel may continue to exercise its powers and duties under the repealed *Act* and bylaws, where the respondent has agreed to enter into a Consensual Resolution before the date of transition. Pursuant to AIBC Bylaw 7.52, if this Consensual Resolution does not result in an agreement approved by the Consensual Resolution Review Panel, the matter is referred to Discipline Hearing and must be resolved under the processes established by the *Professional Governance Act* and the current AIBC Bylaws.

## 1.0 BACKGROUND AND AGREED FACTS

1.1 The parties agree that the relevant facts and circumstances leading to the investigation and this consensual resolution agreement (the “Agreement”) are set out below.

### A. Overview

1.2 This matter began as a potential complaint regarding John Saliken Architect AIBC with respect to the provision of architectural services for a nine-unit residential building located in Kelowna, B.C. (the “Project”).

1.3 Following its review of Mr. Saliken’s response to the potential complaint, the AIBC’s Investigation Committee (the “Committee”) initiated a complaint about Mr. Saliken in accordance with AIBC Bylaw 37.16(c).

1.4 Following its investigation, the Committee recommended that the matter proceed to a disciplinary inquiry for determination of whether Mr. Saliken breached certain sections of the *Architects Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 17 (the “*Act*”), the AIBC Bylaws and the applicable council rulings in the Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct (the “Code of Ethics”).

1.5 Mr. Saliken chose to pursue a consensual resolution with the AIBC.

### B. John Saliken

1.6 Mr. Saliken was first registered as an architect with the AIBC on July 3, 2015, and has maintained his registration since that time.

1.7 Mr. Saliken practises architecture through SUVA Architecture Inc. (the “Firm”), a corporation that holds an AIBC certificate of practice issued on July 3, 2015.

1.8 Mr. Saliken is the sole shareholder of the Firm.

### C. The Information Request/Complaint

1.9 In August 2021, the AIBC was contacted regarding a development permit (the “DP”) application for the Project submitted to the City of Kelowna. The person who contacted the AIBC expressed various concerns with the DP drawings including copyright ownership of the drawings, supervision of work, and the Firm’s contact information.

1.10 The file was opened as a potential complaint, pursuant to AIBC Bylaw 37.2. In December 2021, the AIBC contacted Mr. Saliken and requested his response.

1.11 At its January 2022 meeting, the Committee considered Mr. Saliken’s response dated January 10, 2022. While Mr. Saliken addressed many of the concerns identified, the Committee determined that there was sufficient basis to initiate a complaint against Mr. Saliken in accordance with AIBC Bylaw 37.16(c), relating to how the Project DP drawings were signed and sealed.

#### **D. The Investigation/Agreed Facts**

- 1.12 The investigation involved a review of the material submitted by Mr. Saliken to the City of Kelowna for the Project, including his response to questions asked by the Committee.
- 1.13 The facts in paragraphs 1.14 - 1.17 below are agreed to by the AIBC and Mr. Saliken, and are based on materials reviewed during the investigation.
- 1.14 On May 28, 2021, Mr. Saliken and his client entered into a fee proposal to provide architectural services for the Project.
- 1.15 On July 26, 2021, drawings for the Project were affixed with Mr. Saliken's seal below the Firm's titleblock. The seal affixed to the drawings was a password-locked PDF image of Mr. Saliken's seal and signature and not an original "wet" seal or an approved electronic seal.
- 1.16 In response to questions about the use of his seal, Mr. Saliken stated that he typically uses a rubber wet seal for applications. However, he stated that he forgot about the standards for use of the electronic seal in Bulletin 60, and instead used a secure, password-locked PDF image of his seal for the Project drawings.
- 1.17 Mr. Saliken stated he had previously held a digital certificate issued by Notarius, which he renewed immediately after receiving notice of this complaint and his review of Bulletin 60. Mr. Saliken informed the Committee that the DP drawings were re-issued to the City of Kelowna and sealed using his Notarius seal but did not provide copies of the new sealed drawings to the AIBC when requested. Instead, Mr. Saliken provided a document addressed to the local authority that was described as a design rationale statement that bore his Notarius seal dated February 3, 2022.
- 1.18 Following its review of the material gathered during the investigation, the Committee decided to recommend charges for determination at an inquiry by a disciplinary committee.
- 1.19 Upon being notified of the recommended charges, Mr. Saliken chose to pursue consensual resolution with the AIBC. A notice of inquiry has not been issued.

#### **E. Relevant Professional Standards**

- 1.20 Section 77(1) of the *Act*, AIBC Bylaw 34.2, and the professional standards in AIBC Bulletin 60 and 61 are relevant to the complaint about Mr. Saliken.
- 1.21 Section 77 (1) of the *Act* states:

##### **Architect's seal**

- 77 (1) An architect must apply a seal, with signature and date, to letters of assurance, certificates, drawings and specifications prepared by or under the architect's supervision, direction or control if the architect practises architecture

- (a) as a member of the institute holding a current certificate of practice,
- (b) as a sole proprietor or partner of an architectural firm, or
- (c) on behalf of an architectural corporation as a continuing employee or shareholder of the corporation.

1.22 The relevant AIBC Bylaws and associated council rulings in the Code of Ethics state:

**Bylaw 34.2 An architect shall seal the architect's work in accordance with the requirements of the *Architects Act* of British Columbia and the Bylaws and Council rulings.**

1.23 The relevant professional standards articulated in AIBC Bulletin 60 state:

...

1.6 Applying an image (picture) of an architect's professional seal and signature is not the same as digitally signing and sealing that document with a digital certificate. An image alone of a seal is not secure, and any such document is vulnerable to being seamlessly modified by others without the issuing architect's knowledge. It is fundamental to the protection of the public that the architectural seal applied by an architect is secure, i.e., that is can be reasonably relied upon as being accurate and not having been tampered with. **For electronically transmitted documents, the only acceptable means of signing and sealing is with the AIBC Digital Signature "digital certificate".**

[Emphasis added]

1.24 The relevant professional standards articulated in AIBC Bulletin 61 state:

4.0 **Practical Use of a Seal**

...

4.5 Members are reminded that since October 2009, the AIBC has permitted and encouraged the use of the electronic seal by architects. See AIBC Bulletin 60: Signature, Seal and Delivery of Electronic Documents for detailed information on the use of the electronic seal, including possible advantages when submitting multiple sets of drawings requiring an architect's seal. It is vital for members to understand that applying an electronic seal is a specific, highly-secure protocol that requires purchase of a license authorized by the AIBC. **The simple application of a seal graphic (such as JPEG, PDF, BMP, etc.) to documents does not constitute proper electronic sealing of such documents and invites considerable civil liability and professional conduct exposure.**

[Emphasis added]

## 2.0 ADMISSIONS

- 2.1 Considering the facts agreed to above, Mr. Saliken acknowledges and admits that he contravened section 77 (1) of the *Act*, AIBC Bylaw 34.2, and the professional standards in AIBC Bulletins 60 and 61, when he applied, or allowed to be applied, a PDF image of his seal to drawings for the Project that were submitted to a local authority.

## 3.0 PENALTY AGREEMENT

- 3.1 The following penalty and terms have been agreed upon by Mr. Saliken and the AIBC:
- 3.1.1 A reprimand will be recorded against John Saliken Architect AIBC;
  - 3.1.2 Mr. Saliken is required to pay a fine in the amount of \$2,000 to the AIBC, within 60 days after the approval of this Agreement by the Consensual Resolution Review Panel; and
  - 3.1.3 Mr. Saliken is required to attend and complete an education program or programs (agreed to in advance by the AIBC) that cover substantially similar material to the AIBC's course "Ethics, Act and Bylaws", at his expense, no later than March 31, 2024. The Director of Professional Conduct and Illegal Practice is authorized to provide a reasonable extension, upon request by Mr. Saliken, if he is unable to complete such course(s) by the prescribed date due to extenuating circumstances.
- 3.2 Mr. Saliken acknowledges and agrees that failure to complete the requirement in paragraphs 3.1.2 or 3.1.3 above within the time specified will result in his removal from the register of the AIBC.
- 3.3 Mr. Saliken acknowledges and agrees that if he is removed from the register for failure to complete any of the requirements of this Agreement, he must do the following within 10 days of being advised in writing by the AIBC of his removal from the register:
- 3.3.1 Return his professional seal to the AIBC, and if applicable, his digital seal as required by his agreement with Notarius, the Canadian company authorized to issue digital seals to British Columbia architects;
  - 3.3.2 Return the Firm's certificate of practice to the AIBC;
  - 3.3.3 Remove any project site signs under his or the Firm's name; and
  - 3.3.4 Provide the AIBC with a letter of undertaking confirming that he and the Firm have;
    - a) concluded all architectural business operations under his or the Firm's name;
    - b) assigned, with client consent, any ongoing projects under his or the Firm's name to another architectural firm holding a current certificate of practice. In this portion of the undertaking letter, Mr. Saliken is to provide the project owner's name, project name and location and the name of the architectural firm assuming responsibility for the project. This list must include all projects undertaken which are not completed;

- c) informed the appropriate officials and authorities having jurisdiction, in writing, of his or the Firm's status on any projects submitted for municipal approval as a development permit application, building permit application, subdivision application or any other municipal process. Such notification letters must be copied to the AIBC; and
- d) confirmed that he will not refer to himself as an architect and that he will not practise architecture or offer to provide architectural services as defined by the *Architects Act*, *Professional Governance Act*, and its regulations, until such time as he has been returned to the AIBC register.

3.4 Mr. Saliken acknowledges and agrees that if he is removed from the register for failure to complete the requirements of this Agreement, or if he resigns from the register prior to completing all requirements, he may not apply for reinstatement until he has done so. Upon completion of all outstanding requirements, he may apply for reinstatement and will be subject to all applicable fees and requirements for reinstatement.

#### 4.0 COSTS

4.1 Mr. Saliken agrees to pay costs for this consensual resolution, fixed at an amount of \$1,000, payable to the AIBC within 60 days following approval of this Agreement by the consensual resolution review panel.

4.2 The parties acknowledge that costs are not intended as a punitive measure reflecting the conduct that is the subject of this Agreement. The assessment of costs payable by Mr. Saliken is an acknowledgement of the AIBC's partial costs resulting from the consensual resolution process and is separate from the agreed-upon penalty.

4.3 The parties have referred to the AIBC's Consensual Resolution Costs Guidelines in agreeing on the amount of costs.

#### 5.0 PUBLICATION

5.1 This Agreement, including the attached Schedule, must be published by the AIBC including website publication and distribution to all registrants of the AIBC, in a manner that the AIBC deems fit in the public interest.

5.2 In the event Mr. Saliken is removed from the register for non-compliance with this Agreement, the AIBC may notify the public, registrants, and other interested parties where appropriate.

#### 6.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

**This Agreement may be executed and delivered in one or more counterparts, whether by facsimile transmission or other electronic means, with the same effect as if all parties had signed and delivered the same document and all counterparts.**

Mr. Saliken acknowledges that he has been given adequate opportunity to seek legal or other professional advice with respect to the negotiation, execution and consequences of this Agreement and has taken such advice or freely elected not to do so.

---

*The facts and terms of this Consensual Resolution Agreement are acknowledged and agreed to by John Saliken Architect AIBC and the AIBC, represented by Mark Vernon, CPA, CA, CPA (IL), CEO.*

*Approved by the Consensual Resolution Review Panel on December 7, 2023.*

**SCHEDULE – REASONS FOR PENALTY  
TO  
CONSENSUAL RESOLUTION AGREEMENT  
BETWEEN**

**JOHN SALIKEN ARCHITECT AIBC  
AND  
THE ARCHITECTURAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

**1.0 REASONS FOR PENALTY**

1.1 John Saliken and the AIBC agree that, in light of the agreed facts and admissions, the proposed penalty is proportionate, fair, and consistent with the public interest. A detailed analysis follows.

**A. The Public Interest and Principles of Sentencing (Sanctions)**

1.2 Consensual resolution of AIBC disciplinary matters operates pursuant to section 51.1 of the *Architects Act* and AIBC Bylaws 36.0 through 36.22. The proposed admissions and disciplinary action do not take effect unless the Agreement is approved by the consensual resolution review panel.

1.3 Under the process established by the *Act*, the consensual resolution review panel has a very important task: to review proposed disciplinary agreements in the public interest.

1.4 The role of a reviewing panel was discussed in *Law Society of BC v. Rai*, 2011 LSBC 2. In that case, a panel was considering an agreement between a lawyer and the regulator on agreed facts and disciplinary action. The panel conducted an analysis of its role in determining whether to accept the agreement as proposed. The discussion in that case is relevant to the AIBC's process. The panel stated:

[6] This proceeding operates (in part) under Rule 4-22 of the Law Society Rules. That provision allows for the Discipline Committee of the Law Society and the Respondent to agree that professional misconduct took place and agree to a specific disciplinary action, including costs. This provision is to facilitate settlements, by providing a degree of certainty. However, the conditional admission provisions have a safeguard. The proposed admission and disciplinary action do not take effect until they are “accepted” by a hearing panel.

[7] The Panel must be satisfied that the proposed admission on the substantive matter is appropriate. In most cases, this will not be a problem. The Panel must also be satisfied that the proposed disciplinary action is “acceptable”. What does that mean? This Panel believes that a disciplinary action is acceptable if it is within the range of a fair and reasonable disciplinary action

in all the circumstances. The Panel thus has a limited role. The question the Panel has to ask itself is, not whether it would have imposed exactly the same disciplinary action, but rather, “Is the proposed disciplinary action within the range of a fair and reasonable disciplinary action?”

[8] This approach... protects the public by ensuring that the proposed disciplinary action is within the range of fair and reasonable disciplinary actions. In other words, a degree of deference should be given to the parties to craft a disciplinary action. However, if the disciplinary action is outside of the range of what is fair and reasonable in the circumstances, then the Panel should reject the proposed disciplinary action in the public interest.

[Emphasis added]

1.5 As stated above in *Rai*, it is important to note that there will be a *range* of fair and reasonable outcomes in any particular file. The complexity of sentencing does not admit to only one appropriate outcome.

1.6 This principle was well-articulated in the case of *Peet v. The Law Society of Saskatchewan*, 2014 SKCA 109 where the Chief Justice wrote for a unanimous panel of the Court of Appeal:

[84] All of this is significant because sentencing of any sort, including sentencing for professional misconduct, is a difficult business. There is no single “right answer”. This is so because the sentencing authority must consider, balance, and reconcile a number of different considerations...

1.7 The parties submit that the penalty proposed in this case appropriately balances the mitigating and aggravating factors, and is consistent with previous decisions and the public interest in professional disciplinary matters.

## **B. Ogilvie Factors**

1.8 In determining an appropriate penalty, professional regulatory bodies in B.C. have often referred to the factors considered in the case of *Law Society of British Columbia v. Ogilvie* [1999] LSBC 17 (known as the “*Ogilvie* Factors”).

1.9 This involves an assessment of whether the *Ogilvie* Factors apply and if so, whether they are aggravating or mitigating. The *Ogilvie* Factors include the following:

- (a) the nature and gravity of the conduct proven;
- (b) the age and experience of the respondent;
- (c) the previous character of the respondent, including details of prior discipline;
- (d) the impact upon the victim;
- (e) the advantage gained, or to be gained, by the respondent;
- (f) the number of times the offending conduct occurred;
- (g) whether the respondent has acknowledged the misconduct and taken steps to disclose and redress the wrong and the presence or absence of other mitigating circumstances;

- (h) the possibility of remediating or rehabilitating the respondent;
  - (i) the impact upon the respondent of criminal or other sanctions or penalties;
  - (j) the impact of the proposed penalty on the respondent;
  - (k) the need for specific and general deterrence;
  - (l) the need to ensure the public’s confidence in the integrity of the profession; and
  - (m) the range of penalties in similar cases.
- 1.10 The *Ogilvie* Factors were subsequently consolidated and streamlined in the case of *Edward Dent (Re)*, 2016 LSBC 5. In that case the hearing panel acknowledged that the *Ogilvie* Factors are not all applicable in every case, and will overlap in many cases.
- 1.11 The panel in *Dent* consolidated the *Ogilvie* Factors into four broad categories:
- (a) Nature, gravity and consequences of conduct;
  - (b) Character and professional conduct record of the respondent;
  - (c) Acknowledgment of the misconduct and remedial action; and
  - (d) Public confidence in the profession, including public confidence in the disciplinary process.
- 1.12 Since the decision was issued in *Dent*, the consolidated framework (informed by the complete list from *Ogilvie*) has become the preferred approach in Law Society disciplinary proceedings. However, the jurisprudence acknowledges that the simplified approach may not be appropriate in every case. For example, the Law Society returned to the full *Ogilvie* analysis in a case that was “very difficult” [and] “unlike any previous discipline hearing”: *Sabota (Re)*, 2017 LSBC 18. The AIBC has also employed it in a recent case that was novel and complex.
- 1.13 The parties agree that the consolidated *Ogilvie* Factors are appropriate in this case. They are reviewed in detail below.
- (a) The nature, gravity and consequences of the conduct**
- 1.14 Mr. Saliken applied, or allowed to be applied, an electronic image of his seal to drawings prepared by him or under his supervision for the Project submitted to the local authority for a development permit.
- 1.15 An architect’s seal is a representation to the public that the architect who applies a seal is taking responsibility for the document to which it is applied. The lawful and appropriate use of an architect’s seal is established in the *Act* and the AIBC Bylaws and discussed in detail in AIBC Bulletins 60 and 61.
- 1.16 Mr. Saliken was required to apply his seal in the appropriate fashion: through its physical application, or through the approved secure digital seal software. The use of an image of a seal is not permissible. Such use undermines the responsibility an architect assumes by applying their seal and creates an avoidable risk of seal-tampering or unchecked modifications to the underlying document. This

creates client and public risk. The apparent “convenience” of applying an image of a seal does not overcome or address this requirement.

1.17 Overall, the misconduct in this case is moderately serious.

**(b) Character and professional conduct record of the respondent**

1.18 Mr. Saliken is 50 years old and has been registered as an architect with the AIBC since July 2015.

1.19 Mr. Saliken does not have a professional conduct record with the AIBC. This is neither a mitigating nor aggravating factor.

**(c) Acknowledgement of the misconduct and remedial action**

1.20 Mr. Saliken has been cooperative and candid in the course of the investigation and admitted that he had forgotten the professional standards condensed in Bulletin 60.

1.21 It is of note that Mr. Saliken had a Notarius seal and was acquainted with the terms of its use and requirements prior to this complaint matter.

1.22 Following the complaint, Mr. Saliken renewed his digital certificate with Notarius. Although he stated that the drawings were subsequently sealed in accordance with required regulatory requirements and re-issued to the local authority, he did not provide copies to the AIBC. Instead, he provided another document that he submitted to the local authority that was related to the Project bearing his Notarius seal.

1.23 Mr. Saliken’s participation in the consensual resolution process and admissions indicate he has acknowledged his misconduct. This acknowledgement suggests that the concerns arising in this matter have been brought to his attention in a meaningful way.

1.24 Both his acknowledgement and participation in the consensual resolution process are mitigating factors.

**(d) Public confidence in the profession, including public confidence in the disciplinary process**

1.25 This involves an analysis of whether there is sufficient specific or general deterrence in the proposed disciplinary action, whether the proposed disciplinary action upholds the public’s confidence in the AIBC’s ability to regulate its registrants in the public interest, and whether the proposed disciplinary action is appropriate when compared to similar cases.

1.26 ‘Specific deterrence’ means deterring the respondent from repeating the conduct in question. In this case, Mr. Saliken has engaged in a meaningful exchange with the AIBC to gain an understanding of the issues resulting in this consensual resolution agreement so that it does not occur again.

- 1.27 ‘General deterrence’ is a sentencing objective promoting reduction of improper conduct in the community by the example, message, or influence established by the penalty in the present matter. The proposed penalties in this Agreement will serve to caution and remind architects of the importance of sealing documents in compliance with the *Act*, the AIBC Bylaws, and council rulings.
- 1.28 The public has the right to expect that architects will understand and comply with all applicable professional standards. The public also has the right to expect that the AIBC will address instances of misconduct by its registrants through a process that is fair, proportionate, and consistent.
- 1.29 While no two files are identical, the following AIBC precedents demonstrate the penalties and sanctions that have been imposed in files where similar conduct was at issue.
- 1.30 Precedent files relating to improper application of an architect’s seal are typically accompanied by other contraventions of the *Act* or Bylaws. The penalty is an aggregate of all the contraventions at issue in the file. The files which are most similar to the one at hand are summarized below.
- 1.31 In AIBC File 19.05, the architect affixed a “jpeg” image of his seal and signature to the drawings he prepared for a project. When this was brought to the architect’s attention, he clarified that the first page of the drawings was appropriately wet-sealed, and the additional pages were affixed with an electronic image of his seal and signature in an effort to save time, money and reduce the file size for electronic transmission. Additional charges that were included related to providing architectural services prior to the issuance of a certificate of practice, entering into a client-architect agreement that did not have the required compliance statement and applying his seal to drawings when he or his firm did not hold a certificate to practice. A consensual resolution agreement was approved under which the architect received a reprimand, a \$3,500 fine, and was required to complete the AIBC course Ethics, Act and Bylaws.
- 1.32 In AIBC File 18.02, the architect sealed drawings with his Prince Edward Island firm’s name on the title-block. However, the firm did not have a certificate of practice with the AIBC. The drawings were revised at various times during the project and the architect applied a “jpeg” image of his original seal to the revised versions. The matter came to the AIBC’s attention when a building official noted that the image of the architect’s seal had a date that was earlier than the date of the revisions. Additional charges that were included related to providing architectural services without a client-architect agreement and holding his firm as being able to practice in BC. A consensual resolution agreement was approved under which the architect received a reprimand, a \$2,500 fine, and was required to complete the AIBC Ethics, Act and Bylaws course.
- 1.33 The above two precedents likely had higher penalty amounts imposed because they included additional charges which are not at issue in this case. Mr. Saliken’s case is less serious because his matter only pertains to the single breach of failing to apply his seal and signature as required by professional standards.
- 1.34 As noted in *Peet* above, there will rarely, if ever, be only one single appropriate outcome in a professional disciplinary file.

1.35 Mr. Saliken and the AIBC submit that, based on the cases above, and upon a careful review of the consolidated *Ogilvie* Factors, the proposed penalty is fair and consistent with the range of sanctions that have been imposed for similar conduct in the past.

## 2.0 PUBLICATION

2.1 This Agreement will be published as required by AIBC Bylaws, including website publication and distribution to registrants of the AIBC.

2.2 Publication helps fulfill the important transparency expectation that the public has of professional regulators and enhances the public's confidence in the integrity of the profession as a self-regulated entity. Publication to registrants acts as a further deterrent and as an educational message with respect to ethical and professional conduct matters.

## 3.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

**This Schedule may be executed and delivered in one or more counterparts, whether by facsimile transmission or other electronic means, with the same effect as if all parties had signed and delivered the same document and all counterparts.**

Mr. Saliken acknowledges that he has been given adequate opportunity to seek legal or other professional advice with respect to the negotiation, execution and consequences of this Schedule and has taken such advice or freely elected not to do so.

---

*The facts and terms of this Schedule – Reasons for Penalty to Consensual Resolution Agreement are acknowledged and agreed to by John Saliken Architect AIBC and the AIBC, represented by Mark Vernon, CPA, CA, CPA (IL), CEO.*

*For further information on the AIBC's discipline process, please contact the Professional Conduct and Illegal Practice department at [complaints@aibc.ca](mailto:complaints@aibc.ca).*