

17 March 2026

NUMBER 60/26

COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS
OF SASKATCHEWAN
TO COUNCIL

FROM: Registrar

SUBJECT: Prototype Evaluation Framework for New Jurisdictions

For Your Information

MEMORANDUM

Date: 2026-03-17

To: Council

From: Dr. Grant Stoneham, Registrar & CEO and Debra Wright, Director of Registration

Re: FMRAC Prototype Evaluation Framework for Jurisdictional Recognition

1. Decision to be made by Council

This memo has been prepared for information purposes only.

This memo and attached framework can be viewed as additional background information to the memo ([info 49 26](#)) prepared by Mr. Bryan Salte on a possible amendment to Bylaw 2.4 (e) to contemplate Council's support to recognize additional Jurisdictions, beyond the lists maintained by the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada (RCPSC) and College of Family Physicians of Canada (CFPC).

2. Background

As previously highlighted in the memo ([info 12 26](#)) reviewed at the January 2026 Council meeting, jurisdictional recognition was identified as the top priority by the FMRAC Partners at the FMRAC Annual Meeting in 2025.

The RCPSC currently maintains a list of 8 Countries with 29 jurisdictions that have been deemed as having substantially equivalent training to Canada. Applicants from these jurisdictions can apply to obtain exam eligibility and potentially obtain Canadian Certification. Unfortunately, at this time, the RCPSC has not indicated interest in expanding its current list of jurisdictions.

The CFPC currently maintains a list of 4 Countries that have been deemed as having substantially equivalent training to Canada. Applicants from these countries can apply for Certification with the CFPC, without being required to sit the CCFP Certifying exam. The CFPC has initiated work in fall 2025, to identify new jurisdictions to add to their existing list of recognized jurisdictions. Early outcomes have identified New Zealand and France as potential '*acceptably comparable*' jurisdictions to be taken forward to the CFPC Board for review and consideration.

On December 10-11, 2025, the CMLC, the FMRAC Board and a number of additional national representatives (CMA, CFPC, MCC, RCPSC, Canadian Armed Forces and ITP representatives) met in

Ottawa to determine how additional jurisdictions could be identified, particularly for Royal College recognized specialties.

From this meeting, there was agreement that FMRAC would assemble a project team to identify at least 4 new jurisdictions that could be added to the list for recognition, to support Medical Regulators in providing licensure with some assurance of the candidate's knowledge and training quality. The outcome of this work is expected to be presented at the FMRAC Annual Meeting in June 2026.

3. Assessment

On March 12, 2026 the CPSS Registrar received a copy of the finalized Prototype Evaluation Framework that has been developed by the FMRAC Jurisdictional Recognition Project Team.

FMRAC shared that the project team are now in the process of validating the framework, by assessing two existing jurisdictions that have been approved by the Royal College: New Zealand and Switzerland.

The project team will review results, and this may lead to further updates to the Evaluation Framework, before embarking on the selection of new jurisdictions for analysis.

This Evaluation Framework is being brought forward to Council at this time, to introduce the evaluation criteria that will most likely be used to identify new jurisdictions for specialty recognition. It would be these jurisdictions that would potentially be brought forward to the CPSS Council under the possible Bylaw 2.4(e) amendment being reviewed and discussed at this Council Meeting.

The overarching evaluation question that this framework is seeking to answer is: *Is this Jurisdiction likely to have physicians who can practice safely and competently in Canada?*

The answer is intended to be determined by evaluating the following four domains:

1. Undergraduate Medical Education
2. Postgraduate Medical Education
3. Specialty Certification
4. Regulatory Environment – Authorization and Oversight.

The project team postulates that by assessing these four domains, they will be able to confidently identify jurisdictions that could be defensibly recognized by Regulators for specialty medical practice in Canada.

4. Attachments

- a) FMRAC Prototype Evaluation Framework (page 3)



Jurisdictional Recognition Project Prototype Evaluation Framework

Overarching Evaluative Question:

Is this jurisdiction likely to have physicians who can practice safely and competently in Canada?

This question is answered through investigation of four domains:

1. Undergraduate Medical Education – Baseline

Are primary medical qualifications awarded by recognized institutions?

2. Postgraduate Medical Education – Development

Is specialty competence developed within a structured and supervised training system?

3. Specialty Certification – Determination

Is specialty competence formally assessed and recognized?

4. Regulatory Environment – Authorization & Oversight

Is entry to practice controlled, and ongoing professional conduct monitored?

Domain #1 Undergraduate Medical Education

Purpose:

To verify that primary medical qualifications originate from a recognized medical school.

Question:

Are medical schools within this jurisdiction listed in the World Directory of Medical Schools (WDMS)?

Domain #2 Postgraduate Medical Education

Purpose:

To assess whether the jurisdiction demonstrates structured, accountable mechanisms for developing specialty competence during postgraduate training.

Questions:

How does the jurisdiction structure and oversee the development of specialty competence during postgraduate training?

- Do recognized specialty training programs exist?
- Do training programs operate under defined oversight?
- Are trainees supervised and formally assessed during training?
- Does completion of training require meeting defined expectations?

Sub-Domains:

2.1 Structured PGME Pathway

Key Question:

Is there a recognized structure for specialty postgraduate training?

Indicators:

Recognized specialty training programs or pathways

Defined structure and duration of training

Clear distinction between trainee status and independent practice

2.2 Program Oversight

Key Question:

Is there identifiable oversight of specialty training programs?

Indicators:

Recognized authority responsible for overseeing or recognizing training programs

Mechanism for approval or recognition of training programs

2.3 Supervision & Assessment

Key Question:

Are trainees supervised, formally assessed, and required to meet defined expectations to complete training?

Indicators:

Training occurs under supervision

Training performance is formally assessed

Evidence of increasing responsibility over time (where documented)

Completion is contingent on meeting defined expectations

Domain #3 Specialty Certification

Purpose:

To assess whether the jurisdiction demonstrates a credible system-level mechanism for determining specialty competence prior to independent specialist practice

Questions:

How does the jurisdiction determine and affirm readiness for independent specialist practice?

- Is there a recognized body responsible for specialty certification?
- Is there a defined process to determine specialty competence?
- Is there a clear decision point for specialty recognition?

Sub-domains:

3.1 Certification Authority

Key Question:

Who certifies specialists, and is the authority credible?

Indicators:

- Evidence of a recognized body or mechanism responsible for specialty recognition
- Defined specialty scope or field delineation
- Transparent eligibility criteria for recognition

3.2 Assessment of Competence

Key Question:

Is there a defined point at which specialty competence is formally assessed and determined?

Indicators:

- Structured summative assessment mechanism (e.g., examination, portfolio, oral, workplace-based, or combination)
- Clear decision point regarding readiness for independent specialty practice within that system
- Evidence of quality assurance or oversight of the assessment process?

Domain #4 Regulatory Environment

Purpose:

To assess whether the jurisdiction demonstrates credible regulatory structures for authorizing physician practice and managing risk in the public interest.

Questions:

How does the regulatory system demonstrate oversight and accountability for physician practice?

- How is eligibility for licensure verified prior to independent practice?
- What regulatory information is publicly available or accessible?
- Is ongoing competence monitored after licensure?
- How are complaints and professional conduct addressed?

Sub-Domains:

4.1 Regulatory Authority & Mandate (Threshold Condition)

Key Question:

Is there a credible authority responsible for regulating physicians and protecting the public?

Indicators:

- Statutory or legally recognized medical regulatory authority
- Clear mandate framed in the public interest
- Defined authority to set standards and respond to non-compliance

4.2 Licensing Framework & Entry Controls

Key Question:

How does the system control entry to independent medical practice?

Indicators:

- Defined eligibility requirements
- Clear entry-to-practice decision process
- Structured verification that entry-to-practice requirements have been met

4.3 Oversight, Complaints & Discipline

Key Question:

What mechanisms demonstrate ongoing oversight of physician practice?

Indicators:

- Documented complaints and investigation processes
- Authority to impose conditions, restrict, suspend, or revoke licensure
- Mechanisms addressing fitness-to-practice and professional conduct

4.4 Transparency & Regulatory Information

Key Question:

How does the regulatory system demonstrate transparency and accountability?

Indicators:

- Public register of licensed physicians
- Ability to provide information regarding licensure status and disciplinary history

4.5 Maintenance of Competence

Key Question:

How does the regulatory system ensure that physicians maintain competence over time?

Indicators:

- Defined requirements for ongoing professional development or renewal
- Mechanisms for monitoring compliance
- Authority to address lapses in competence