

26 August, 2014

Re: Review of the Occupational Regulation of Valuers

The Property Institute has approximately 2500 members throughout New Zealand and the world. It was formed in the year 2000 to act as the voice of the property professions and lead them into the new millennium.

The institute provides for and supports members with Continuing Professional Development, including online and face to face programmes. Development of standards in association with the Australian Property Institute. It has reciprocity agreements with a number of other international Institutes including Hong Kong, Institute of Chartered Surveyors, Australian Property Institute and others.

The Institute initially incorporated the membership of the New Zealand Institute of Valuers (NZIV), the Institute of Plant & Machinery Valuers (IPMV), and the Property & Land Economy Institute of New Zealand (PLEINZ). It now represents the interests of Valuers, Property and Facilities Managers, Property Advisors and Plant and Machinery Valuers.

The intention was always to fully merge the various institutes. This was achieved with all but the NZIV, which has been pending a review of the Valuers Act which incorporates it.

Each of the professions we represent has its own council to address issues relevant to that community, and in the case of Real Property Valuation, that council is also the NZIV council.

As a result, we support the NZIV submission, however there are a few issues we believe need to be expanded upon from the NZIV submission, namely:

1. We note the NZIV call for mandatory membership which we see as a short term public good. We believe, however, that there are difficulties created with mandatory membership where an Institute is unable to eject members or suspend them as members pending the outcomes of hearings. If the Government chooses to follow the mandatory membership route, we suggest that it be done in such a way that allows, at a minimum, for the mandatory body to at their discretion suspend a member who is subject of a complaint, pending its resolution.

2. We also support the NZIV submission that a formalised training program is needed between graduation and registration. The Institute some time ago attempted to institute the professional pathways program, based on the Australian equivalent. The VRB however took the view that as it was not in the Act, they were unable to require it for registration. The program has remained in place and is available, however few choose to take advantage of it due to the fact no formal learning program is required for registration.
3. We note the endorsement by the NZIV of the discussion paper's proposals on transparency. We also share this view, though believe some more specificity is needed around the publishing of cases. At present, the VRB have continued to refuse to publish outcomes of cases themselves, taking the view that the Institute should publish these on their behalf. We do not believe this is appropriate, and would like to ensure that increased transparency from the VRB includes their publishing of their own cases.
4. Again, we endorse the NZIV view on practice standards. We would also like to note that we take particular pride in the current standards development process. It works extremely well, and has resulted in world class standards which align with the premier international body as well as offering in-depth local guidance in conjunction with the Australian Property Institute.
5. Finally, the views of the NZIV on the capping of liability are worth repeating. The liability capping scheme works excellently in Australia and has succeeded in both protecting the public, by encouraging the maximum possible uptake of liability insurance, and in protecting the profession, through making that insurance affordable.

If you have any questions stemming from our few comments, you are welcome to contact Blue Hancock on [president@property.org.nz](mailto:president@property.org.nz), or 03 544 6622

Regards

J.L. (Blue) Hancock

President  
Property Institute of New Zealand