

## DETERMINATION DECISION 22-01

Cisco Systems Canada Co.

DESIGNATED FILER: Shannon Leininger

August 30, 2022

**SUMMARY:** The designated filer for Cisco Systems Canada Co. (Cisco) failed to list the name and address of its parent company contrary to s. 4(1)(g) of the *Lobbyists Transparency Act* (LTA). The designated filer received an administrative penalty of \$1500 for this contravention. It listed Ministries and Provincial entities in its registration that it did not lobby or expect to lobby contrary to s. 4(1)(k) of the LTA. The designated filer received an administrative penalty of \$3000 for this contravention. The total amount of administrative penalties is \$4,500.

**Statutes considered:** *Lobbyists Transparency Act*, S.B.C. 2001, c. 42.

**Authorities considered:** Investigation Report<sup>1</sup> 15-11, Investigation Report 14-12 and Investigation Report 20-02

### INTRODUCTION

[1] This report concerns an investigation under s. 7.1 of the *Lobbyists Transparency Act* (LTA). This section gives the Registrar of Lobbyists (Registrar) the authority to conduct an investigation to determine compliance with the LTA or its regulations. If the Registrar or their delegate believes that the person under investigation has not complied with a provision of the LTA or its regulations, s. 7.2 of the LTA requires the Registrar to give a person under investigation notice of the alleged contravention and the reasons for the Registrar's belief that the contravention has occurred. Prior to making a determination under s. 7.2(2), the Registrar must, under s. 7.2(1)(b), give the person under investigation a reasonable opportunity to be heard respecting the alleged contravention.

---

<sup>1</sup> Under the LRA Investigation Reports were equivalent to what are now named Compliance -Decisions under the LTA.

[2] The LTA recognizes two types of lobbyists: consultant lobbyists and in-house lobbyists. This report focuses on the activities of Cisco Systems Canada Co. (Cisco), an organization that employs in-house lobbyists. An in-house lobbyist is a paid employee, officer or director of an organization who lobbies on behalf of the organization or affiliate.

[3] Section 4(1)(g) of the LTA requires that the designated filer of an organization enter into its registration the name of its parent corporation. Section 4(1)(k) of the LTA requires the designated filer enter the names of the ministries of the government of British Columbia or Provincial entities of which it has lobbied or expects to lobby a public office holder (POH).

[4] Under s. 7(4)(d) of the LTA, the Registrar has delegated to me the authority to conduct this investigation.

### **ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION**

[5] The questions for consideration are:

- (a) whether the designated filer contravened s. 4(1)(k) of the LTA by entering into Cisco's registration return the names of ministries of the government of British Columbia or Provincial entities of which Cisco did not lobby or expect to lobby the POHs employed by or serving in these ministries of the government of British Columbia and Provincial entities;
- (b) whether the designated filer contravened s. 4(1)(g) of the LTA by failing to add Cisco's parent corporation's name and business address; and
- (c) If the designated filer did not comply with the requirements of the LTA, what, if any, administrative penalty is or penalties are appropriate in the circumstances.

### **RELEVANT SECTIONS OF THE LTA**

"designated filer" means

- (a) a consultant lobbyist, or
- (b) in the case of an organization that has an in-house lobbyist,
  - (i) the most senior officer of the organization who receives payment for performing the officer's functions, or
  - (ii) if there is no senior officer who receives payment, the most senior in-house lobbyist;

### **Requirement to file registration return**

3 (3) The designated filer of an organization must file with the registrar, within 10 days of the date the organization first has an in-house lobbyist, a registration return in the prescribed form and manner and containing the information required by section 4.

### **Form and Content of registration return**

4 (1) Each registration return filed under section 3 must include the following information, as applicable:

(g) without limiting paragraph (f), if the client or organization is a corporation that is a subsidiary of another corporation, the name and business address of the other corporation

(k) if a lobbyist named in the registration return has lobbied or expects to lobby a public office holder employed by or serving in a ministry of the government of British Columbia or a Provincial entity, the name of the ministry or Provincial entity and any prescribed information respecting the ministry or Provincial entity

### **Certification of documents and date of receipt**

5(1) An individual who submits a document, including a return, to the registrar under this Act must certify,

(a) on the document, or

(b) in the manner specified by the registrar, if the document is submitted in electronic or other form under section 6,

that, to the best of the individual's knowledge and belief, the information contained in the document is true.

### **Power to investigate**

7.1(1) If the registrar considers it necessary to establish whether there is or has been compliance by any person with this Act or the regulations, the registrar may conduct an investigation.

(2) The registrar may refuse to investigate or may cease an investigation with respect to any matter if the registrar believes that

(b) the matter is minor or trivial,

(c) dealing with the matter would serve no useful purpose because of the length of time that has elapsed since the matter arose,

---

## Hearing and administrative penalty

7.2 (1) If after an investigation under section 7.1 the registrar believes that a person under investigation has not complied with a provision of this Act or the regulations, the registrar must

- (a) give notice to the person
  - (i) of the alleged contravention,
  - (ii) of the reasons why the registrar believes there has been a contravention, and
  - (iii) respecting how the person may exercise an opportunity to be heard under paragraph (b) of this subsection, and
- (b) give the person a reasonable opportunity to be heard respecting the alleged contravention.

(2) If after giving a person under investigation a reasonable opportunity to be heard respecting an alleged contravention the registrar determines that the person has not complied with a prescribed provision of this Act or the regulations, the registrar

- (a) must inform the person of the registrar's determination that there has been a contravention,
- (b) may impose a monetary administrative penalty of not more than \$25 000, and
- (c) must give to the person notice
  - (i) if the registrar determines that the person has contravened a prescribed provision of this Act or the regulations, and the reason for the determination,
  - (ii) if a monetary administrative penalty is imposed, of the amount, the reason for the amount and the date by which the penalty must be paid,  
...
  - (iv) respecting how the person may request reconsideration, under section 7.3, of the determination of contravention and, as applicable, the imposition or amount of the monetary administrative penalty or the imposition or duration of the administrative penalty of prohibition.

## BACKGROUND

[6] This Determination Report considers two contraventions under the LTA. For the sake of clarity, I have arranged information under subtitles for each contravention. I have started with the contravention under s. 4(1)(k) of the LTA since this was the contravention that came to the

attention of the ORL first. The contravention under s. 4(1)(g) of the LTA was later brought to the attention of the ORL by Cisco's Director of Government Affairs Canada acting on behalf of the designated filer.

[7] On October 27, 2021 the designated filer submitted a Monthly Return under its Registration, registration number 7328-994. Cisco certified the information in the return to be true under s. 5(1) of the LTA.

#### **Section 4(1)(k) of the LTA**

[8] On October 27, 2021, ORL staff asked the designated filer if they lobbied or expected to lobby all the Ministries and Provincial entities it listed in its return.

[9] On October 27, 2021, a representative acting on behalf of the designated filer, stated to the ORL:

...Cisco adds all of the listed Ministries and Provincial Entities to all its registrations across the Country. Their portfolio is vast and includes potential contacts with all of the selected Ministries and Provincial Entities. Cisco's BC registration has been active for quite some time.

[10] On October 28, 2021, ORL staff returned Cisco's registration asking it to remove any Ministries and Provincial entities that Cisco had not recently lobbied or planned to lobby.

[11] The designated filer did re-submit its return on November 09, 2021.

[12] In an email sent to the designated filer on November 10, 2021, ORL Staff asked the designated filer to confirm whether or not Cisco Systems Canada Co. has either recently lobbied (within the last month or so) or had plans to lobby (within the next 3 months or so) all of the Ministries and Provincial Entities listed in its Registration Return.

[13] On December 3, 2021, Cisco's Director of Government Affairs Canada submitted the corrected registration return. They explained that in the past it erred on the side of over-reporting. The Director of Government Affairs Canada stated that Cisco intended to lobby between 12 to 18 ministries of the government of British Columbia or Provincial entities, and revised the Ministries and Provincial entities it lobbied or expected to lobby, reducing the number from 127 to 27 Ministries and Provincial entities.

#### **Section 4(1)(g) of the LTA**

[14] In the December 3, 2021 email to the ORL, Cisco's Director of Government Affairs Canada, acting on behalf of the designated filer, reported that Cisco Systems Canada Co. is a subsidiary of another corporation Cisco Systems Inc. (parent corporation). The ORL was not

aware of this information before Cisco brought it to this office's attention. This is information required under s. 4(1)(g) of the LTA that was absent from Cisco's previous registration return.

## **INVESTIGATION**

[15] The ORL commenced an investigation under s. 7.1 of the LTA to determine whether the designated filer had complied with ss. 4(1)(g) and (k) of the LTA.

[16] On April 21, 2022, the designated filer was provided with formal notice under s. 7.2(1)(a) outlining the basis for the allegation that Cisco had contravened ss. 4(1)(k) and (g) of the LTA. I invited the designated filer to respond in writing to the alleged contraventions and to provide any information or documentation pertinent to the contravention and any potential penalty.

[17] On May 12, 2022, the designated filer responded to the s. 7.2(1)(a) notice.

### **Section 4(1)(k) of the LTA**

[18] In their response, the designated filer argued that the phrase "expects to lobby" in s. 4(1)(k) of the LTA is vague. They pointed out there is a no guidance on how to interpret this phrase. Cisco took a broad rather than a narrow approach to its interpretation of "expects to lobby" in an attempt to be as transparent as possible.

[19] The designated filer noted that once the ORL clarified its expectations they immediately corrected their registration.

[20] The designated filer pointed out that Cisco did not gain an economic benefit because of the errors in their registration. The designated filer stressed that they understand the purpose of the LTA is to promote transparency and they have acted to improve compliance with its registration.

### **Section 4(1)(g) of the LTA**

[21] The designated filer apologized for not entering the name and address of Cisco's parent company in its registration return, explaining that this was an oversight that was corrected proactively without intervention by the ORL. The designated filer submitted that these are mitigating factors that should be taken into considering.

---

## DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

### Section 4(1)(k) of the LTA

[22] In the December 3, 2021 email, a representative acting on behalf of the designated filer admitted that Cisco lists all the Ministries and Provincial entities because there is the potential that it will contact all Ministries and Provincial entities listed in its registration return. The representative later stated that Cisco included all ministries of the government of British Columbia or Provincial entities to “error[sic] on over-reporting”. The representative stated that they intended to lobby between 12 to 18 ministries of the government of British Columbia or Provincial entities.

[23] In the designated filer’s May 12, 2022 response to the s. 7.2 notification letter, the designated filer argued the phrase “expects to lobby” was vague, with no guidance on how to interpret the phrase. Consequently, Cisco took a broad interpretation of its meaning.

[24] The purpose of the LTA is transparency, which means the public should be able to discern, at first read of a registration return, a general overview of lobbying activities that includes the topics of lobbying and the entities being lobbied. A registration return should indicate who and on what topic a designated filer “expects” to lobby. The term “expect” has a dictionary meaning: “to regard as likely to happen”, or you consider it is “probable or certain” to happen.<sup>2</sup> From the ORL perspective, that means that either a communication will take place (i.e. a meeting is scheduled, a letter will be sent) or there is a strong likelihood that a communication will take place.

[25] “Expect” should not be confused with “might.” If a designated filer is unsure of whether the organization will lobby a ministry of the government of British Columbia or a Provincial entity in the future, then they should not enter it into their registration return, as occurred in this case. The designated filer can add any further lobbying details and/or targets as other meetings take place during the timeframe of a registration.

[26] It’s clear, based on the information before me, that Cisco never intended to lobby all 127 ministries of the government of British Columbia or Provincial entities listed in its return.

### Finding on s. 4(1)(k) of the LTA

[27] For certainty, s. 5.1 of the LTA requires lobbyists to certify that the information they have submitted is true “to the best of the individual’s knowledge and belief.” In my view, one of the purposes of this section is to give pause, to encourage a review of the registration return to consider what has been entered into the return and to make required corrections to any errors that may exist, before submitting the registration return to the ORL.

---

<sup>2</sup> Merriam Webster <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/expect>, See also the Oxford Dictionary

[28] I find that the designated filer entered the names of ministries of the government of British Columbia or Provincial entities of which it did not lobby or expect to lobby a POH employed by or serving in the ministry of the government of British Columbia and Provincial entity contrary to s. 4(1)(k) of the LTA. The designated filer certified the information in their registration return to be true under s. 5(1) of the LTA.

#### **Section 4(1)(g) of the LTA**

[29] The organization has been registered with the ORL since 2011. In its April 29, 2011 and December 16, 2011 registration return it does not mention that it is a subsidiary of Cisco Systems Inc. In its registration returns filed between February 20, 2013 and September 25, 2017 it lists it is a subsidiary of Cisco Systems Inc (parent company). From April 20, 2018 to its recent registration return (which is at issue in this report) it did not identify in its registration return that it is a subsidiary of its parent company.

[30] An organization was required under the *Lobbyist Registration Act* to provide information about a parent company in its registration and this still remains a requirement today under the LTA. Past designated filers for Cisco have identified in Cisco Systems Canada Co.'s registration returns that Cisco Systems Canada Co. is a subsidiary of Cisco Systems Inc. Cisco states the omission in this case was an oversight, but an oversight does not excuse a designated filer from meeting their obligations under the LTA. A simple check by the designated filer of Cisco's previous registration returns would have identified Cisco was a subsidiary of Cisco Systems Inc.

#### **Finding on s. 4(1)(g) of the LTA**

[31] As I mentioned above, s. 5.1 of the LTA requires lobbyists to certify that the information they have submitted is true "to the best of the individual's knowledge and belief." This is to encourage a review of the registration return to consider what has been entered into the return and to make required corrections to any errors that may exist, before submitting the registration return to the ORL.

[32] Based on the evidence and reasons provided above, I find that the designated filer did not enter information into their registration return about its parent corporation contrary to s. 4(1)(g) of the LTA. The designated filer certified the information in their registration return to be true under s. 5(1) of the LTA.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY**

[33] Section 7.2(2) of the LTA provides that if, after giving a person under investigation a reasonable opportunity to be heard respecting an alleged contravention, the Registrar determines that the person has not complied with a prescribed provision of the Act or the regulation, the Registrar must inform the person of the Registrar's determination that there has been a contravention and may impose an administrative penalty of not more than \$25,000.



Such person must be given notice of the contravention determination and, if a penalty is imposed, “the amount, the reason for the amount, and the date by which the penalty must be paid”.

[34] Section 7.2 of the LTA confers discretion on the Registrar to impose administrative penalties. To provide a measure of structure in the exercise of that discretion, the ORL has published a guidance document “Registrar of Lobbyists: Guide to Investigations” (guide to investigations) to advise members of the public and those engaged in lobbying about what will guide the ORL in exercising its duties under the LTA and the regulations. As the Policy makes clear, its purpose is to structure discretion. It does not fetter discretion. It is not law. I have followed that guidance in the exercise of my delegated discretion to determine a penalty based on the facts before me.

[35] The guide to investigations first sets out a general financial range for particular infractions (depending on whether it is a first, second or third infraction). Second, it provides a list of factors that will be considered in determining the amount of administrative penalty. Finally, it includes a clear statement that the Policy “does not fetter the ORL’s ability to conclude that no administrative penalty is appropriate in the circumstances, or to fashion a remedy on either side of the range set out in the general policy, in special circumstances.”

[36] In determining the appropriate administrative penalty within that range, I have taken the following factors into account:

- Previous enforcement actions for contraventions by this person;
- The gravity and magnitude of the contravention;
- Whether the contravention was deliberate;
- Whether the registrant derived any economic benefit from the contravention;
- Any efforts made by the registrant to report or correct the contravention;
- Whether a penalty is necessary for specific and general deterrence; and
- Any other factors that, in the opinion of the registrar or their delegate, are relevant to the administrative penalty.

[37] I have considered these factors and the submissions made by the designated filer.

[38] The purpose of the LTA is to promote transparency in lobbying by requiring designated filers to disclose accurate, current and complete information about their organization’s lobbying activities. This is a solemn legal obligation. It reflects the legislative intent that while organizations have a right to lobby, the public also has a right to know that the information in the return is complete. Entering inaccurate information into a registration return undermines the goal of transparency.

---

### Section 4(1)(k) of the LTA

[39] I am not aware of any previous contraventions or warnings under the LTA or the LRA for Cisco. This is the designated filer's first contravention, which weighs towards a lower penalty.

[40] I now turn to the question of the gravity and magnitude of this contravention under investigation. Section 4(1)(k) of the LTA requires a designated filer to put in the registration return the names of ministries of the government of British Columbia or Provincial entities of which it has lobbied or expects to lobby a POH. In this case the designated filer listed 127 ministries of the government of British Columbia and Provincial entities in its registration return. Initially, Cisco's Director of Government Affairs Canada stated that they wanted to err on the side of overreporting. It follows that erring on the side of overreporting means one is listing more ministries of the government of British Columbia and Provincial entities than is necessary. In other words, it recognizes it has not or does not expect to lobby all of the ministries of the government of British Columbia or Provincial entities it has included in its registration return. Consequently, the designated filer entered information into the registration return that, given their knowledge of the information entered, had reason to believe was not true.

[41] Later, the designated filer stated that the term "expects to lobby" was vague. Stating the phrase is vague is not an excuse to enter incorrect information into a registration return. Looking up the dictionary definition of "expect" would have helped to clear up any ambiguity in its meaning. Furthermore, the ORL is available to help organizations understand the terminology in the LTA, either through its guidance documents or through discussions with ORL staff. The designated filer could easily have taken steps to clear up any uncertainty in the word "expect" and avoided entering inaccurate information into their registration return. Transparency is undermined or obscured when the public is provided with inaccurate or incomplete information in a registration return.

[42] Cisco Systems Canada Co. has been registered to lobby for several years. It has not made any effort to correct this error. It was not until the ORL brought it to their attention that they made the appropriate corrections.

[43] Failing to take even simple actions to clear up any ambiguity in the terminology of the LTA, by erring on the side of overreporting, in other words, knowingly entering inaccurate information into a registration, for a period of several years, increases both the gravity and magnitude of this contravention. This weighs in favour of a higher penalty for this contravention.

[44] The evidence before me leads me to believe the organization was thoughtless, disorganized, or careless in fulfilling its obligations under the LTA, but not deliberate.

[45] I must next consider whether Cisco derived any economic benefit from the contraventions. I found no evidence that would lead me to believe Cisco benefited monetarily from either contravention. This also weighs in favour of a penalty at the lower end of the scale.

[46] The ORL brought this matter to the attention of the designated filer. After some discussion with Cisco, the error was corrected.

[47] I have considered and rejected the view that this might be a case where “no penalty” is appropriate. The provisions of the LTA and that of its predecessor the LRA were in place from April of 2010. Recent amendments under the *Lobbyist Registration Amendment Act* did not change the lobbyist’s responsibilities in this case. The designated filer should be aware of their obligations under the LTA, including the obligations to enter accurate information required under s. 4(1)(k) of the LTA. The contravention in this case is clear.

[48] In my view, the circumstances of this case call for an administrative penalty both to encourage the designated filer to take their obligations under the LTA with the utmost seriousness, and to remind all designated filers of their legal obligations in keeping registrations current and accurate. Failure to take seriously their obligations under the LTA and ensure that information entered into their registration return is accurate and complete diminishes the purpose of the LTA.

[49] The penalty for failing to enter accurate information into a registration return has a range of \$1,000 to \$7,500 for the first instance of non-compliance.

[50] I have also reviewed previous decisions to seek guidance on an appropriate penalty. Two Investigation Reports, 15-11 and 14-12 deal with entering of inaccurate information into a registration return.

[51] In Investigation Report (IR) 15-11, a consultant lobbyist failed to enter the correct information, in this case the start date, into their registration return. The lobbyist did not have any previous contraventions. They did not receive an economic benefit, nor was the contravention deliberate. Aggravating circumstances included the fact that the registration was deemed to be almost four months late. Furthermore, the lobbyist lobbied when they did not have an active registration with the ORL. The investigator assessed a penalty of \$1000 for entering inaccurate information into the lobbyist’s registration return contrary to s. 4(1)(b)(ii) of the LRA.

[52] In IR 14-12 a consultant lobbyist failed to enter the correct information into their registration return, in this case the start date, in their undertaking to lobby. The ORL originally discovered that there was a potential contravention and brought it to the attention of the lobbyist. The lobbyist had one previous warning. They did not derive an economic benefit, nor

was the contravention deliberate. The investigator assessed a penalty of \$1000 for entering inaccurate information into the lobbyist's registration return contrary to s. 4(1)(b)(ii) of the LRA.

[53] Cisco has no previous contraventions or warnings. There is no evidence that the contravention was deliberate, nor did Cisco receive an economic or other benefit from entering inaccurate information into its registration return. This contravention was remedied after discussing it with the ORL. These are some of the circumstances weigh in favour of a penalty at the lower end of the suggested penalties.

[54] However, Cisco entered all the ministries of the government of British Columbia and Provincial entities indicating it lobbied or expected to lobby everyone of these ministries or Provincial entities. Erring on the side of overreporting, or claiming there was a misunderstanding with the terminology is not an excuse. An aggravating circumstance is the fact that the designated filer entered information in to Cisco's registration return that the designated filer should have known or ought to have known was incorrect. It certified under s. 5(1) of the LTA that this information was true to the best of their knowledge. This is exacerbated by the fact that Cisco has been entering incorrect information into its registration return for in excess of two years.

[55] Cisco misled the public on who it had lobbied and expected to lobby. Entering inaccurate information undermines the purpose of the LTA which is to provide transparency in lobbying. These circumstances warrant a higher penalty than that issued in the above investigation reports. I am imposing a penalty of \$3000.00 for failing to enter accurate information about the ministries or Provincial entities it lobbied or expected to lobby into Cisco's registration return contrary to 4(1)(k) of the LTA.

#### **Section 4(1)(g) of the LTA**

[56] I am not aware of any previous contraventions or warnings under the LTA or the LRA for Cisco. I am considering these contraventions together and these are the designated filer's first contraventions which weighs towards a lower penalty.

[57] I will now turn to the question of the gravity and magnitude for this contravention. Section 4(1)(g) of the LTA requires a designated filer to enter into its registration return the name and address of its parent company. Cisco did not enter information about its parent company into its registration return and certified under s. 5(1) of the LTA that the information in their registration return was accurate to the best of their knowledge. The designated filer stated its failure to enter its parent company was an oversight. However, in its past registrations Cisco did list its parent company, but failed to list it from 2018 onward. The fact that the designated filer entered the parent company in its registration return for several years and then suddenly stopped, only to discover and correct its error approximately three years later is not acceptable. I see this as less of a simple oversight and more of a lack of attention to its obligations under the LTA. Cisco realized its error and corrected its registration return

without the ORL having to intervene. This moderates the gravity and magnitude of the contravention and weighs in favour of a penalty in the mid range for this contravention.

[58] Again, I do not believe this was a deliberate contravention. I believe, based on the evidence, the organization was careless in fulfilling its obligations under the LTA.

[59] I do not believe that the Cisco benefitted monetarily from this contravention. This also weighs in favour of a penalty at the lower end of the scale.

[60] Cisco's Director of Government Affairs Canada did report the error respecting its parent organization to the ORL. This is a circumstance that weighs in favor of a median penalty for the contravention of s. 4(1)(g) of the LTA.

[61] I have considered and rejected the view that this might be a case where "no penalty" is appropriate. The provisions of the LTA and that of its predecessor the LRA were in place from April of 2010. Recent amendments under the *Lobbyist Registration Amendment Act* did not change the lobbyist's responsibilities in this case. The designated filer should be aware of their obligations under the LTA, including the obligations to enter accurate information required under s. 4(1)(g) of the LTA. The contravention in this case is clear.

[62] In my view, the circumstances of this case call for an administrative penalty both to encourage the designated filer to take their obligations under the LTA with the utmost seriousness, and to remind all designated filers of their legal obligations in keeping registrations current and accurate. Failure to take seriously their obligations under the LTA and ensure that information entered into their registration return is accurate and complete diminishes the purpose of the LTA.

[63] The penalty for failing to enter accurate information into a registration return has a range of \$1,000 to \$7,500 for the first instance of non-compliance.

[64] In arriving at an appropriate penalty, I have also reviewed IR 20-02, where a consultant lobbyist failed to enter information, that they were a former public office holder, into 13 of their registration returns. This error was brought to the attention of the lobbyist, who quickly corrected the errors. The lobbyist did not have any previous contraventions. Based on the evidence, the lobbyist did not receive an economic benefit, nor was there evidence the contravention was deliberate. However, the lobbyist had submitted 13 registrations missing the fact that they were a former POH. Since all 13 contraventions came to the attention of the investigator at the same time, it was treated as a first contravention. Taking these circumstances into consideration the investigator imposed a penalty of \$3,000.

[65] I would like to acknowledge that the designated filer did notify the ORL that it failed to enter information about its parent company in its return. This contravention would likely have

resulted in a higher penalty if it had continued for longer. However, the designated filer knew or ought to have known that it was a subsidiary of its parent company. This was evident since its past registration returns identified Cisco was a subsidiary of a parent company. This is compounded by the fact it took roughly three years before the designated filer realized they were not meeting their obligations under s. 4(1)(g) of the LTA before it corrected its registration return. The facts warrant a greater penalty than the minimum stipulated in the Guide, but lower than that imposed in IR 20-02. I am imposing a penalty of \$1500.00 for failing to enter the required information about its parent company contrary to 4(1)(g) of the LTA.

### **Conclusion**

1. The notice of alleged contravention has been substantiated.
2. I have imposed an administrative penalty of \$1,500 for contravening s. 4(1)(g) of the LTA and a penalty of \$3,000 for contravening s. 4(1)(k) of the LTA. The total amount of administrative penalties is \$4,500.
3. The designated filer must pay this penalty no later than **October 13, 2022**.
4. If the designated filer requests reconsideration under s. 7.3 of the LTA, they are to do so within 30 days of receiving this decision by providing a letter in writing directed to the Registrar of Lobbyists at the following address, setting out the grounds on which reconsideration is requested:

Office of the Registrar of Lobbyists for British Columbia  
PO Box 9038, Stn. Prov. Govt.  
Victoria, BC V8W 9A4  
Email: info@bcorl.ca

Date: August 30, 2022

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

---

Tim Mots, Investigator and  
Delegate of the Registrar of Lobbyists