

12 December 2008

New Zealand Institute of Valuers
P.O.Box 27 -340
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Email: Blue.Hancock@qv.co.nz

Mutual Recognition Review
Productivity Commission
LB2 Collins Street East
MELBOURNE VIC 8003
AUSTRALIA

Email: mutualrecognition@pc.gov.au

Submission:

By the Zealand Institute of Valuers (NZIV);
On the Review of Mutual Recognition Schemes by the Australian Government
Productivity Commission;
Subsequent to the Wellington AGPC meeting - 26 November 2008.

Preamble

This submission by the NZIV relates to certain aspects of the AGPC Draft Research report of November 2008, the subject of the Wellington meeting.

1. The NZIV confirms its recommendations under item 22 of its previous submission.
2. Further, it concludes that changes to the TTMRA are made to allow the new jurisdiction to require conditions of equivalence to overcome inadequacies in either experience or qualifications of the jurisdiction from where the applicant comes.
3. This may possibly be helped by Ministerial Declaration to “describe conditions that will achieve equivalence”. We would qualify this by stating that we would wish to review examples of how this has worked before confirming this as a suitable approach. We also note the various comments in box 5.9 on page 109 referring to the cumbersome nature and inconsistencies.
4. The NZIV does not accept that the “current blanket” approach of simply stating that an occupation is equivalent because of registration, therefore has mutual recognition is a rigorous enough approach to protect the public interest. The APEC Engineers and Architects project examples seem to have merit.
5. Additionally, the NZIV supports the Commission’s proposals to;
 - a. Clarify the mutual recognition legislation especially in the area of conditions and equivalence;
 - b. Provide for criminal record checks
 - c. Allow for ongoing CPD requirements
 - d. Provide for undertakings and remedial action to be transferable.

- e. Provide for recency of practice.

We believe there was good support for the above from those at the meeting.

With regard to national licencing and the commission's recommendations 5.10, we are yet to consider our position on this but in the mean time given our discussions with the Minister of Land Information regarding the review of valuer occupational regulation we shall now seek the governments status possiton on this.

- 6. Attendees at the round table meeting of 26 November in Wellington NZ, raised the issue of requiring adequate 'English' from applicants

We support this, noting the examples given and that non English speakers may bring other benefits to our society and occupations. We agree with this but consider adequate spoken and written English to be a necessity of TTMRA applicants.

Thank you for the opportunity of making this submission.

Yours faithfully,
New Zealand Institute of Valuers

D A Culav
Councillor.



J. L. Hancock
President.