

Review of the Occupational Regulation of Valuers



In general I think the existing Act is outdated having been written in the 1940s and in some instances does not relate to the world today, nor does it address how property transactions and professionals have progressed over the last 66 years. It needs updating. It needs to put processes in place to encourage good valuation practice, governance guidelines of property valuation for the understanding of both valuers and the public, and allow for a complaints process.

I think valuers should all be required to work to a prescribed standard which is currently under the title 'Registered Valuer' which seems to be self-explanatory and works well, but I do not agree that membership to a particular organisation should be mandatory. We (valuers) should want to work at our best and be members of a property organisation that we want to represent us, help and support us, and have a standard which we want to be a part of, not that we have to be a member of. I think that market forces will prevail and that major clients of valuation work such as property institutions and banks will determine the level acceptable to them, which will likely mean that they would require a valuer to be a member of a recognised and respected property institute / organisation, but not necessarily wish to be constrained by the current 'must be ANZIV'.

Responses in brief to Questions / Proposals as per LINZ Discussion Document July 2014:

1. Not necessarily, but I think this is perceived by the public.
2. Not necessarily but I think it could be better.
3. I agree with the suggestion to include 2/3 non valuers on the VRB but still have the majority being valuers, so that it can be better perceived as being independent.
4. Yes, I agree. It should be choice to join, but as mentioned above in general comments, I think this will be market driven.
5. Ethics.
6. Yes, I think a tiered complaints system is a good idea.
7. I think the introduction of a tiered complaints system would help to alleviate the reliance on check valuations.

8. Yes I agree with the proposed range of sanctions.
9. Yes there is a need for compliance monitoring. We currently are required to have an annual practicing certificate , largely based on having worked in the industry and completing 20 hours of CPD the previous year. I think this system works well and is currently issued via the VRB.
10. Yes I agree, but the VRB needs to be viewed / run as a professional body of panellists who are properly remunerated for their expert time, rather than just a volunteer service on the side.
11. Yes I agree that the title 'registered valuer' should stay and 'public valuer' is no longer necessary.
12. No I don't think registration should be extended. We have a lack of young graduates coming into the profession now, partly as a result of the time it takes to get qualified (and partly the remuneration,) so any extension would exacerbate the increasing shortage of new valuers.
13. See answer for no.12 above.
14. Yes, as it is important for valuers to 'move with the times'. New legislation affecting our profession becomes law every year and we need to be aware and compliant of it. Also, I believe the average age of valuers is mid 50's, and if you think of how valuations were undertaken in terms of paper, pencil and printed photos 30 years ago versus ipad, iphone and digital photos now, you can see how things have changed in just 1 small area.
15. Yes I agree that the profession should continue to set its practice standards as it has the best expertise in this area.
16. No, I don't agree that the government should set the ethical standards. It should either remain with the profession for the same reason as for no.15 above, or, and this would be my preference, to be a combination of the government combined with the profession.
17. I have no problem with the minimum age being removed as long as the person has suitable training, knowledge and understanding to be able to then sit and pass registration.
18. In general I agree with the proposals to protect the consumer and give better understanding to the public, but with the VRB being given further responsibilities refer to point 10 above also.

19. Not that jump to mind.

20. Not really.

21. I think the 3 years supervised experience is off-putting to many graduates who instead go into other areas of the property industry. I think it should be at least 1 year, probably 2, but the registration test must be thorough enough to assess if a candidate can practice independently. I would ideally like to see the introduction of the last year of the University course as being part time in conjunction with an employer so that a graduate can see how the profession works in practice while still completing their theory.

22. Not really, as once a valuer is qualified, then they can practice in any area. If a tiered system came in, then there will be many cases arising when a basic house valuation turns into something else eg has a shop attached, is sub-divisible, is an investment property, etc. Therefore I don't think this is practically workable.

23. I am dual qualified and have gone through this process and re-qualified in NZ. I don't know if one year's experience is needed, but at least 6 months is, together with some sort of interview, not necessarily the full-on registration interview, at the end prior to being awarded registration status.

24. Yes.

25. There are existing guidance notes within PINZ for insurance valuations.

26. No, I think 'registration' should mean 'registration' for all types of valuation work and not confuse the public.

27. No, see point 26 above.

28. Yes.

29. I am not sufficiently au fait with the universities to comment.

30. I think the market dictates that valuers have indemnity insurance as they would not want a valuation from one who didn't have it, and I suspect most if not all practicing valuers do. The only exceptions might be the non-practising ones.

31. Some form of capped insurance would hopefully encourage all valuers to 'opt in' and also keep compliance costs down.