

**Q1 Do you agree that there is a lack of accountability and transparency in relation to the VRB's operations?**

A1 Lack of transparency whilst accountability  
is average.

**Q2 Do you agree that the composition of the Valuers Registration Board is problematic? If so, how?**

A2 Could breed new blood into the board and  
limit the length of term.

**Q3 Do you agree with the proposal to constitute a new board which would include lay people with specialist expertise?**

A3 I believe lay people could give balance but amount  
it should be limited. The majority should  
still be valuers.

**Q4 Do you agree that it should not be mandatory for registered valuers to join NZIV or any other professional association?**

A4 It should still be mandatory to provide  
a cohesive body which still has control.

**Q5 What if any issues do you think would need to be managed if professional association membership was voluntary?**

A5 Loss of Public confidence in profession.

**Q6 Do you think that a tiered complaints system could deliver the benefits outlined above? If not, why not and do you have any thoughts on how else those benefits might be realised?**

A6 I believe it could help manage the  
smaller issues quicker and faster making  
the process more efficient.

**Q7 Do you think it is possible to reduce the reliance on check valuations and, if so, how might this be done?**

A7 Peer review could be a way of mitigating  
the need for so many check valuations.

**Q8 Is the range of sanctions proposed above adequate? If not, what other sanctions would be appropriate?**

**A8.** A name and shame process similar to the way real estate agents are dealt with could be beneficial otherwise the sanctions are adequate other than fine warnings.

**Q9 Is there a need for compliance monitoring and if so by whom?**

**A9.** Yes there is which is why a professional body should be mandatory. Maybe through Pw3 Quality Assurance System.

**Q10 Do you agree with the proposal for the VRB to undertake more analysis of complaints and outcomes? Why/why not?**

**A10.** Yes. It should also be public knowledge in order for the public to be more informed.

**Q11 Do you agree that "registered valuer" should be the only protected title? Why/why not?**

**A11.** Yes. Public valuer should be disbanded as there is no difference generally and it is not well understood.

**Q12 Do you think it is necessary or desirable to change the existing registration period and/or registration renewal requirements? Why/why not?**

**A12.** I believe the registration period is suitable. A better link between Annual Practising certificate and CPD compliance could be beneficial.

**Q13 If you have answered "yes" to the above question, please indicate whether you prefer one or other of the suggested approaches or another approach.**

**A13.** Suggested approaches are reasonable.

**Q14 Should CPD be mandatory? Why/why not?**

**A14.** Yes. Continued education should be mandatory.

**Q15 Do you agree with the proposal for setting practice standards? Why/why not?**

**A15.** Yes. As long as the administrative costs will not be greatly increased.

**Q16 Do you agree with the proposal for setting ethical standards? Why/why not?**

A16. Yes although there should be a process in place where current valuers can raise an issue with the board ~~for~~ if they believe valuers have breached these standards.

**Q17 Do you agree that the minimum age requirement should be removed?**

A17. Yes. It is not important.

**Q18 What do you consider are the benefits and costs of implementing any or all of the proposals?**

A18. Benefits would be public protection and trust although costs are likely to increase in order to monitor this.

**Q19 Do you think there are any aspects of the current occupational regulation scheme for valuers that impede competition in the supply of valuation services? Please specify which aspects and how they impede competition.**

A19. Am not aware of any aspects which impede competition although more needs to be done to encourage young valuers to enter the profession and have proper training.

**Q20 Do you think the occupational regulation of valuers should be liberalised? If so, what aspects of the scheme should be liberalised and what benefits would this have?**

A20. NO I do not think it should be liberalised

**Q21 Do you think the three year supervised experience period for New Zealand graduates is too long? If so, how long should the experience period be?**

A21. No. It is sufficient if not enough. There is a lot to learn in that time frame.

**Q22 Do you favour a tiered registration system that provides for provisional registration (with less experience and other requirements) as well as full registration?**

A22. NO. This could be confusing and potentially expensive to set up and monitor. The cost would outweigh the benefits.

**Q23 Should the requirement for overseas valuers to have at least one year's practical experience in New Zealand be retained?**

A23. Yes.

**Q24 Do the existing degree courses and post-graduate training requirements provide registered valuers with the expertise required to do sum insured valuations?**

A24. NO. Not enough emphasis at university is placed on insurance valuations.

**Q25 Is there a need for practice standards covering sum insured valuations?**

A25. Yes there should be

**Q26 Could registration requirements be reduced for some types of valuation?**

A26. No it should not be. Public protection needs to be first and foremost

**Q27 Are the current registration requirements excessive for valuers who only carry out residential valuations? What would be the risks and benefits to consumers if the requirements were reduced?**

A27. No. These should not be reduced. Residential valuers still makes mistakes after three years and should be supervised for that time period

**Q28 Are there any risks in allowing registered valuers who have not passed degree courses in valuation to do rural valuations?**

A28. Yes. Lack of experience in this field could cause issues.

**Q29 Are the valuation qualifications offered by the accredited universities fit for specialist purposes? If not, what are the problem areas?**

A29. No. Not enough valuation papers. Emphasis could be reduced on law/planning or a four year degree could be beneficial where valuation papers and construction papers are emphasised

**Q30 Do you think any changes are required to the existing professional indemnity insurance arrangements?**

A30. No I do not

**Q31 If so, do you favour either of the options outlined above or have an alternative suggestion?**

A31. Disclosure of insurance cover would be beneficial to the public

**Other Issues**