

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- [Fees Review Apology](#)
- [Regulations Review Committee](#)

IN OTHER NEWS



***Should the apprenticeship and registration scheme be looked at so that when an apprentice qualifies they can work unsupervised as a qualified plumber, gasfitter or drainlayer?***

Yes, 'Look to the past to see the future.'

Again a very well put together 'Fellow Practitioner' your team excels itself every week and would be an ideal replacement for the Board, thanks to all, Cheers

.....

Damn right it should be looked at as it would meet the industries needs far better and our costs would come down.

Look at how much money is wasted in enforcing supervision rules where if people

**Fees Review Apology**



It's a big "SORRY" from the crew this week.

We were hoping to give you our thoughts on the Board's decisions regarding the recent Fees Review but the week got away from us.

However, we will have it to you next week. You never know - the Board may change

its mind over some of its decisions.

The jungle telegraph has been red hot this week, with reports and rumours of more privacy issues and investigations gone wrong.

CPD has been a hot topic now that people are realising they are buying points not competence. Suppliers are starting to see sense and are seeking advice on the direction of CPD and the industry.

We have the feeling times are changing and on that note we would like to welcome the 12 people who joined the Federation this week. They take our numbers to 980. One thousand by Christmas would be a great achievement.

**Regulations Review Committee**



Remember a complaint was laid with the Regulations Review Committee regarding the Offences Fee, the content of the Discipline Levy and the use of the Discipline Levy and the Offences Fee as a restriction on licensing.

Mr Jackson the Deputy Chairman of the Board announced in a Special Issue of the "Info Brief" dated July 2012 that the Regulations Review Committee had decided not to proceed with three complaints made against the Board.

He stated **"The Board is pleased but not surprised by the decision as, in it's view, the complaints had no substance"**

He later added *"The Board has gone to great lengths to ensure that its processes are robust and legally complaint and this is borne out*

were actually qualifying to do the work there would be less problems. Keep up the good work

.....

How stupid is it that we have a licensed licensed plumber, gasfitter or drainlayer and they can't do the trade for which they are trained. I'm for the recommendation.

.....

I'm an apprentice and I've never given this much thought but now that you mention it I've been conned.

I've signed up for an apprenticeship, paid all the money and I can't do a bloody thing when I finish my time except work under someone else's supervision.

I would sooner do a longer apprenticeship and qualify totally, not end up with a part qualification.

.....

Dear Editor

How is this stupid CPD scheme going to help me with digger driving as part of my drainlaying skills? It's practice on the digger that counts and looking at the lay of the land not sitting in the classroom. Hours of experience are my competence

.....

*by the RRC's decision".*

**"NEK MINIT"** the Regulations Review Committee decided to hold a hearing into the complaints. Three members of the Federation Committee led by Allan Day attended the hearing on Thursday morning this week.

The Federation argued the Board had no right to impose the Offences Fee in the manner that it did and that other avenues were open to the Board for action against non registered people. It was submitted that the Board had imposed a fee when it was in fact a levy which the Board had no legal right to impose.

It was submitted the Board was charging \$235,883.00 to practitioners annually for events that only occurred once when the initial review was conducted. Note: the Federation have consistently questioned the accuracy of the allocation of staff hours to functions which are used to work out the allocation of wages and overhead percentages.

It was put to the Regulations Review Committee that the Board have imposed on all relicensing applicants a mandatory system when that mandatory requirement infringes on the statutory rights and opportunities of the applicants and has been implemented without the relevant consideration of the regulation process.

The mandatory system referred to is the electronic payment of the Discipline Levy and Offences Fee and the manner in which it is linked to licensing.

The implementation of this mandatory system is a condition of licensing in that it restricts, or limits licensing. The simple question put to the Committee was "is the payment of the Discipline Levy and Offences Fee mandatory in the standard relicensing process" and the answer is "yes it is".

It was also asked what the Discipline Levy and the Offences Fee have to do with licensing. Nothing!!!

It was submitted the Board have exceeded their statutory authority (yet again!). They have not consulted on this mandatory system but have implemented it in what appears to be an attempt to ensure payment of the fee and have claimed it is part of due process.

We know the Act does not provide for any mandatory refusal of a license for the non payment of any fees unrelated to the application but it clearly gives a practitioner the right to submit their application under Section 50(2) as long as it is accompanied by the prescribed application fee.

It seems a huge use of time and resources, but don't forget a complaint was laid with the Board regarding this matter under their General Complaints process but was declined as it was - "a General Complaint".

At the hearing the Board denied the allegations but one very interesting point was the Office of the Auditor General was also

Editor.

You always seem to be in a battle with someone and taking a dig at them. What's up, do you need some chill pills?

**Ed:** We try to treat everyone the same so.....



represented at the hearing and had formed a similar view of the Offences Fee as Allan Day and the Federation had formed.

So from here the Regulations Review Committee will look at the evidence and come up with a decision, so only time will tell. If they do decide the Federation is right this may affect the current Fees Review which the Board has just finalised.

We feel a wise Board would hold off until the decision is released or agree now that they possibly got it wrong and get out and do the consultation with the industry. To go ahead now would only leave them exposed to the risk of further Regulation Review Committee complaints.

It's a pity that common sense doesn't prevail where all these people on the Board use their negotiation and conflict resolution skills to speak with practitioners to get these issues resolved.

As it stands they have taken a "no back down stance" with everything they are challenged about. It is as if they are taking it all personally rather than doing what they are paid to do and that is operate an efficient regulatory service.

You are receiving this email as a member of PGDF or because you signed up online.

[Edit your subscription](#) | [Unsubscribe instantly](#)

Plumbers Gasfitters and  
Drainlayers Federation 3  
Jupiter Grove Trentham  
Upper Hutt 5018 Ph (04)  
5277977 Mob  
0276564811 Fax (04)  
5277978  
[information@pgdf.co.nz](mailto:information@pgdf.co.nz)