

## **Review of Registration and Licensing**

### **Summary of Submissions received in relation to first round of consultation 20 May – 15 July 2015**

#### **1. Summary of submissions received.**

1.1 In total the Board received 142 submissions.

Included in that number are 24 responses that support the submission of the Plumbers, Gasfitters and Drainlayers Federation of NZ (The Federation).

#### **2. Issues consulted on:**

- Should there be an additional “journeyman” class of registration introduced?
- Should the work that people are permitted to do under the “exemption under supervision” provisions be restricted?
- Should there be other registration classes for people wanting to undertake just a limited range of plumbing, gasfitting or drainlaying work?
- Should there be one or two classes of registration for qualified tradespeople?
- Are the current registration class names appropriate?
- Should there be terms and conditions of registration.
- Should the certifying examination be part of a NZQA qualification?
- What changes (if any) should be made to the CPD scheme?
- What changes (if any) should be made to the supervision requirements?

#### **3. Issue 1**

**Should there be an additional “journeyman” class of registration introduced?**

3.1 **102submitters** responded to this issue.

**YES- 71(70%)**

**NO-31(30%)**

**Federation-supports the creation of a class of this type**

**Master Plumbers –supports the creation of a class of this type**

#### **3.2 Comments supporting yes**

- yes people who don't pass their registration papers can still work for qualified people under supervision.

- Yes. There are many instances where an apprentice is in limbo where he or she has completed their apprenticeship and has their National Certificates but haven't sat the exams to Register
- Yes. There are many tradesmen that have worked for many years (over 5) in the industry for a plumbing company. These guys are generally older and will never get formally qualified. And they are competent.
- I support a "journeyman" class of registration replacing the current "exemption under supervision" authorisation practice.
- Journeymen should sit a short course or practical test and have a limited licence for each type of work completed. 95% or higher to pass.
- Yes. After 5 years of continuous plumbing registration holding an expedition licence.
- Yes as long as the person has ability to do work. Etc pump technician, dairy shed designer and water system
- Yes. We own a business installing milking machines, water pumps and filtration. There is no need to be a qualified plumber to be installing the above. We do our own training & qualifications through the MPTA.
- YES; we are not interested in doing a plumbers job; behind the wall in domestic situations etc....
- I think the term should be restricted; journeyman is a very old term. I agree that long term persons in the industry should be legitimised, it is degrading and unfair to persons who lack the written skills to pass examinations are made to feel as they are second class citizens.
- Yes. At the moment there are tradespeople who have done an apprenticeship and not passed registration exams who are in "limbo" legally who could be in a journeyman class. There are also people who have not done a formal apprenticeship but have served time and are of a good "hands-on" standard but may not be of a mind to do any exams who could also fit in this class. However if too many rules or restrictions or requirements or competency points requirements are put in place for these people, they will "run" a mile. So a lot of thought needs to be put into place to actually make this class of person different from a person who is a person that is a "working under a exemption under supervision " person.
- Yes, otherwise a large section of the industry is ignored.
- Yes, I feel there is not enough training and guidance from employers between registration and obtaining a certifying licence.
- Yes this makes sense, and would be better than the current limited license, which groups a tradesman of say 10 years or more in the same bracket as a new starter.
- yes to replace the exemption licence
- It has always been disappointing that a person completes an apprenticeship and it is invalidated by the current legislation. A journeyman cannot currently supervise an apprentice to do anything not even hemp a nut. This makes it

very expensive to hire and train apprentices. The entire reason for the title journeyman is to journey an apprentice through their time. These people with national cert should at least be able to supervise an apprentice.

- Yes as it used to be. 7 years in the trade under supervision then have to sit registration exam.
- There used to be this class and it worked fine for plumbers who completed an apprenticeship but did not pass their exams.
- There should be a journeyman class for say labourer's helping tradespeople in the trade and the cost minimal for printing of cards.
- Yes I think there are plenty of guys out there who have worked several years in the industry who have done an apprenticeship or simply worked for 5 years or more as limited cert holders but not sat their registration. We need to recognise experience. Generally plumbers work with their hands and are not suited to office work or doing exams.
- Consider a "mind mapping" type of test for the journeyman to achieve this status.
- Not too concerned how but limited certificate holders should not be exempt from full supervision and should be made to undertake CPD as proof they wish to continue to learn the trade.
- Yes, this would help get people interested in getting ahead
- Yes. There always was a journeyman class before "certifying" class was introduced. I think there is a place for this class provided he/she is supervised by a fully qualified tradesman.
- I do agree if these journeymen complete an online correspondence as you would do in drainlaying and have completed the recommended hours of an apprenticeship equivalent or more as proved by payslips and checked against company records or an exemption licence. Then they should be eligible to sit the national cert or registration exams and then progress from there as normal
- Yes, provided a training provision has been completed they can then apply for journeyman licence which should be the person they are working under not any Tom, Dick or Harry.
- Yes. Definitely
- Yes. I believe that there should be a Journeyman's class or similar named class, but it should have a maximum time limit before mandatory progression to the next level of the licensing process. They should be brought into the fold but not be allowed to stay there indefinitely.
- Yes I believe there should be,
- This depends on the eligibility criteria, and whether it would be viewed as an alternative to an apprenticeship, or whether it is recognition of current exemption holders that have a long period/history of holding a licence. For future licence holders no.

- Having considered the question and then referenced the 2006 Act, I am in support of adding a third class of registration but do have a number of reservations to the workings of a third class of registration.

I understand that this third class of registration would effectively seek to move the majority of those people that currently work in the industry under sections 19, 21 and 25 into the new class of registration and that the Board would then seek to provide limited scope of work under the existing exemptions.

By providing a third class of registration I understand that the Board wishes to facilitate greater jurisdiction over a group of tradespeople who do not hold the National Certificates but may have worked in the trade for some time. In doing so the Board states that this will ensure that such individuals are subject to disciplinary action and limitation of practice with conditions imposed on the practicing licence where appropriate; they will also be subject to various fees and levies imposed on registered tradespeople and of course undertake continuing professional development. All of which I think is valuable given none of these can be imposed on the current exemptions for sanitary plumbing, gasfitting or drainlaying, making it difficult to regulate these individuals directly.

There is also another good reason to create a third registration tier and that is to prevent employers from entrapping individuals (particularly those persons from other countries with little or no knowledge of New Zealand's regulatory system) in the exemption classes to avoid paying higher fees and levies themselves, as the fee is derived currently from the Certifying tradesperson. By introducing a third tier of registration this practice would cease.

#### Value proposition

While the concept of a third class may be appropriate, I am concerned what the incentive is for an individual to move from this class to next class of registration. Essentially what is the difference between this class and the class above it in terms of restriction and freedom. Given that the proposed third class registration would likely follow many of the exemption 19, 21 and 25 restrictions such as working in the presence of a registered tradesperson for the first year or two there is nothing I can see that would encourage an individual to move into the current licence class of registration, albeit, the prospect of a potential remuneration benefit from an employer.

One way to facilitate the progression of individuals from one registration class into the next is for the Board to work with the Industry Training Organisation ("ITO") to facilitate an additional qualification at level 2 or level 3 so that such individual holds at the very least health and safety qualifications which staircase naturally into the next tier of registration.

#### Whats in a name?

With respect to the use of the term "journeyman" I believe that the proposed name would appear to be very old, ambiguous to any person that is not from the trade and some might say sexist considering women too work in the trades! I will address the name proposal more specifically in question five.

## Summary

I support the Boards proposal to create a third class of registration to capture a majority of those currently working in the exemption 19, 21 and 23. In doing so though careful attention must be given to what restrictions are placed on such individuals so to create an adequate differentiation between each of the three classes.

### 3.3 Comments supporting no

- NO. There needs to be simple titles that are able to be understood by the public. Too many "classes" will only confuse things.
- No there should not it would take away the value of the study and hard work undertaken by apprentices and lessen the value of the qualification if somebody could do the same job without the study.
- No you are qualified or not no in between
- No - I feel this would be a step backwards and also de-value the qualifications that all of us who are qualified have worked very hard to gain. I would say "maybe" if they were working toward some form of qualification in a FORMAL training situation. See Q3.
- What a load of garbage I suspect that the board will do as it has always done and restructure things to suit an agenda of taking money from the trades for no good reason. The trade does not need more classifications it needs less. In the last 10 years all the board has done is add cost to the trade. Why is this email page set up so that it is hard to use and reply or is it because you are trying to stop unwanted comments? You are a total bunch of time wasters and you should be ashamed at the costs that you're continually creating to try and control the industry.
- No. Every plumber should be able to pass registration level and have to attend a training course to assess their competence. Journeymen I have seen don't have a grasp of the basic trade sciences.
- no enough classes already.
- No it is confusing enough for the public with the three classes we have now and they cover all trade requirements.
- no, this may be confusing to the public if they look at the licensing card as to what type of trade's person they are getting. I believe the three tier system works well, apprentice/limited, registered, certifying.
- NO, it is a weakening standard of the bench mark set for plumbers and gasfitters.
- No, either you are qualified or you're not.
- no, the public and the trade deserve qualified tradespeople, with a sound trade knowledge otherwise we will end up with another "leaky homes" type outcome
- No - this registration should not be introduced. It is an old fashioned term which in years past was applied to people who unable or unwilling to gain any formal qualification. In my experience: such people had left school with

minimal qualifications (barely School C); this is not the way of the modern education system which strives to provide qualification pathways for even the most challenged learners. Qualifications are the entire way of education and the future.

- No, with the licensed and certifying class already in place I do not feel another classis needed
- current procedure in place, works well. NO

### 3.4 **Federation view**

“The Federation believes there are a large number of partially qualified people in the industry who for various reasons have not obtained their registration. Some of these people operate illegally in the industry and others in the black market. The journeyman qualification is one way of recognising the effort these people have put in to completing their apprenticeship in the industry and encouraging them to stay legal.

The industry needs to retain skilled people and giving them an incentive and further chances to gain experience and qualifications is one way of doing that. In addition the Journeyman class would allow for the regulation of partially qualified individuals and eliminates the current situation where supervisors are responsible to regulate exemptions under supervision.

One pre-requisite the Federation supports to become a Journeyman would be that the individual has completed an apprenticeship in the trade to which they apply for journeyman status. If this was not the case it would simply be another form of exemption.

There would still be a requirement for a named supervisor who we feel should be in the same company/organisation.”

### 3.5 **Master Plumbers**

“MPGD believes that classes, classifications and distinctions between tradespersons need to be reviewed first before the inclusion of another name or class of tradesperson.

The real issue seems to be the issue of unregistered people and limited certificates. These issues will not, we believe, be solved through establishing another category.

MPGD believes that other issues such as mutual recognition of trade qualifications and designations also need to be addressed. Mutual recognition would enable tradespersons trained both in New Zealand to have their trade skills and knowledge recognised in another jurisdiction and tradespersons from overseas would more easily have their trade skills and knowledge assessed and recognised in New Zealand.

In the mediaeval traditional the journeyman is an individual who is educated in their trade or skill has completed an apprenticeship to their master. The journeyman then undertakes a period of travel in order to learn their trade better, before establishing their own shop or studio and applying to their Guild to become a Master. In the modern New Zealand context of apprenticeships and registration this traditional concept would seem quaint, at best.

Master Plumbers believes that a clear, simple, aptly named and well regulated system is more appropriate and suggests the following structure:

1. Certifying Tradesperson (Self-certifying)
  - a. An individual who certifies their work and that of their employees and manages and instructs an apprentice.
2. A Licensed Tradesperson
  - a. An individual who has completed their licensing examination and is able to instruct an apprentice.
3. A Registered Tradesperson (Journeyman)
  - a. An individual who has completed their apprenticeship but has not completed their licensing examination and cannot instruct an apprentice.
4. An Apprentice
  - a. An individual, who under the supervision and training of a Certifying Tradesperson, or the training of a Licensed Tradesperson, learns the trade.
5. An Exemption Holder
  - a. Is an individual who has a specified exemption to complete a specific task or group of tasks under the supervision of a certifying tradesperson? The requirement for holding an exemption should include CPD training in specific courses (not product related) each year."

#### 4. Issue 2

**Should the work that people are permitted to do under the "exemption under supervision" provisions be restricted?**

4.1 **117** submitters responded to this issue.

**YES- 93(79%)**

**NO-24(21%)**

**Federation: Yes**

**Master Plumbers: Yes**

#### 4.2 **Comments supporting yes**

- Yes, otherwise there is no incentive to get fully qualified.
- Yes it should be. There are people that have businesses that install or commission plumbing and gas equipment and they should be supervised.

- Yes. If people want a gasfitter/plumber they have to pay for one or employ one simple as that.
- Yes the supervision is loose
- Yes. Definitely. Otherwise you reduce the incentive to become qualified if you have no desire to be self-employed. I believe any person working in our industry should be qualified or at least working towards a qualification.
- Yes, I believe the "exempt under supervision" permits should be restricted to specific work and they should be required to work under direct (within earshot) supervision of a Certifying tradesperson at all times. They should be deemed competent to undertake the specific work under supervision by an independently competent certifying tradesperson.
- Yes. The PGD Act should be amended to provide flexibility to allow additional scope for suitably skilled persons to carry out work associated with sanitary plumbing in rural and commercial pumped areas and to allow the milking and pumping industry to continue to carry out the work that they have traditionally undertaken.
- Yes as pump engineers do not want to get involved in house plumbing (behind the wall etc.)
- If by restricted you mean NOT to hook up toilet pans, behind the wall plumbing and sanitation work YES.
- IF you mean a trained plumber must do all behind the wall plumbing in a domestic dwelling - YES, we are only interested in milking machine pipework, filtration and water pump install; we are highly trained and so is our staff through courses at the MPTA.
- The supervision needs to be direct supervision. The number of exempt workers per supervisor needs to be defined and enforced.
- Yes they should have to be employed by the person supervising them. That is the reason for this classification
- If a journeyman class is brought into existence then this "exemption under supervision" person needs to be made into a different beast. An exemption should cover the people like students doing work experience, or plumbers and drainlayers labourers who can't work by themselves. An exemption under supervision could also cover a person like an electrician who wants to be employed by a plumber, gasfitting firm and work on repairing the electrical components in plumbing and gas appliances.
- Only by their original qualification.
- Yes, as an ex building inspector (Drainage) I found on many occasions the only person installing Drainage only held an Exemption Licence. There was no supervisor onsite. When questioned the Supervisor/Employer the response has been varied. From he knows what is doing or is too busy to be onsite all the time.
- Only with live gas installations.
- Yes, must be physically employed by the person supervising them or contracting to them, not a mate signing off their work.

- Yes, get your licence or get out of the trade.
- Yes, as there seems to be no difference between exemption plumbers and licenced plumbers.
- Yes they are not generally qualified to carry out everything. Need some sort of assessment.
- Restricted to the person who supervise them.
- Yes - many 'exempted' persons have good reason for not becoming trade certified - age, inability to still pass written exams etc but should be restricted to certain workers only, again full supervision should be applied.
- yes, otherwise it belittles the qualifications and abilities of the other license classes
- Yes - the scope of work being exempt under supervision needs to be reviewed, and more responsibility taken for the work carried out under Supervision.  
The exemption status seems to cover-off people who haven't completed their qualifications, and as noted above, that is an old fashioned way of thinking and approaching education and the Trade career path.
- Yes, but problems will arise trying to police it
- I agree, as more often than not these persons are not working under direct supervision of a registered or certifying plumber.
- Yes, this should maybe be a class of licence for a person taken on a part time basis, who is not qualified and has not completed an apprenticeship.
- Yes. People who have an exemption license should have limitations to what they are able to do. I.e. Manufacturers could have appliance technicians who are only allowed to work on their products providing the manufacturer has met certain training criteria and audit procedures.
- To be able to answer this question one must understand what parliament was envisaging when it introduced exemptions 19, 21 and 25 in the 2006 Act which are general exemptions without limitation or scope but require supervision.  
Sections 18 (sanitary plumbing) and 20 (gasfitting) are quite different in that provision has been made in these exemptions for the Board to assess the competency of an applicant and where appropriate place limitations on the scope of work they are entitled to undertake. These exemptions also allow the holder to supervise others undertaking restricted work within the exemption, as referenced in section 19 and 21. Drainlaying, on the other hand does not have any comparable exemption.

The legality of the current *Gazette* Notices with respect to exemption 19, 21 and 25 is questionable and in my role with the Board I know that it had advice on this from a number of stakeholders including the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment ("MoBIE").

It is my understanding that parliament has provided a means for a registered certifier or a person holding the appropriate exemption (with the exception of drainlaying) to permit an unregistered person to undertake a scope of restricted work that the supervisor considers them to be competent to do.

#### The dilemma

Should I be proven right this would effectively torpedo any proposition of creating a third tier of registration without effectively dealing with the supervised exemptions, because their very existence undermines any attempt by the Board to introduce a third registration class.

#### What's the solution?

Is it possible to make a provision in the new tier of registration that effectively captures people who have worked in the industry continuously for a specified time to be registered, while still allowing the exemption 19, 21 and 25 to operate as intended by Parliament. If this can be achieved, although not ideal, it does allow the Board to work within the legal framework of the 2006 Act while also capturing those individuals that should be held accountable for their work and be subject to continuing professional development as all registered individuals should be.

#### The ultimate solution

The ultimate solution of course is to petition officials at the MoBIE for changes to the 2006 Act and the removal of the general exemptions so that the 2006 Act can be better administered.

### 4.3 **Comments supporting no**

- Not necessarily, it may depend on the journeyman class and if that is acceptable.
- The work is already restricted enough, except if you are a Chinese developer.
- No, if it's being supervised and the person is competent then the responsibility falls on the supervisor who has given permission.
- If a "journeyman" class is brought into existence then this "exemption under supervision" person will need to be different in order to incentivise people to license as a journeyman. An exemption should cover the people like students doing work experience, or plumbers and drainlayers labourers who can't work by themselves.  
An exemption under supervision could also cover a person like an electrician who wants to be employed by a plumber, gasfitting firm and work on repairing the electrical components in plumbing and gas appliances.
- No, as long as the supervisor is qualified to supervise for the work being undertaken.
- They already need supervision if they have not held a licence for a minimum time. The only reason we have it is due to the journey persons having no recognition and the removal of the old limited certificates. Would it not be better to determine their competency?
- No, assuming supervision requirements are met.

- No, I think that this comes under the ticket of the person who is supervising them it's his ticket that is at risk so he/she will make sure it's done right. You have to remember that to employ all trades people which has a short fall in numbers would put jobs at risk
- No. As long as they are registered with the PGD Board.

#### 4.4 **Federation view**

"Exemption Under Supervision currently seems to be used as a qualification class that is not regulated and creates supervision issues. The creation of the Journeyman status would remove a lot of the issues surrounding exemptions under supervision.

The Federation feels exemptions under supervision should be for specific tasks and yes there should be restrictions placed on these exemptions. These should be stringently policed for the protection of the public.

Any exemption under supervision should be under the supervision of a person in the same organisation or on a service contract basis which the PGD Board can review."

#### 4.5 **Master Plumbers view**

"Yes: This work should be restricted to the level and type of CPD training the exemption holder has received. Supervision would then be aligned to the competency of the exemption holder, not the ability of the supervisor.

MPGD is aware of a growing number of exemption holders for whom English is a second language and that their difficulties with written English rather than their knowledge of plumbing and drainlaying, is the reason for them retaining an exemption."

### 5. **Should there be other registration classes for people wanting to undertake just a limited range of plumbing, gasfitting or drainlaying work?**

5.1 **127 submitters** responded to this issue.

**YES- 50(39%)**

**NO-78(61%)**

**Federation: No**

**Master Plumbers: No**

5.2 **Comments support yes**

- Yes. Only for gasfitting

- Yes, these other tradespeople are much better skilled to undertake certain roles i.e. Tradespeople who work in the water / effluent / pumping fields are the well versed in the requirements for pump selection and performance, and requirements for rural water reticulation including supply to and through a dairy shed and supply to a rural domestic dwelling. They do not do connections of sanitary appliances.
- students in plumbing should be given some way of making a buck that does not require a supervising registration, as it is pointless them working in other industries while trying to be plumbers and study. This could be based on their interim results and attendance records as a reward or on application or recognition of other study e.g. engineering, building etc.
- Yes. The PGD Act should be amended to provide flexibility to allow additional scope for suitably skilled persons to carry out work associated with sanitary plumbing in rural and commercial pumped areas and to allow the milking and pumping industry to continue to carry out the work that they have traditionally undertaken. (x22)
- Yes. The PGD Act should be amended to provide flexibility to allow additional scope for suitably skilled persons to carry out work associated with sanitary plumbing in rural and commercial pumped areas and to allow the milking and pumping industry to continue to carry out the work that they have traditionally undertaken. The PDG makes no allowance for ECANZ / MPTA members that support billion dollar industries; we are industry trained professionals in mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, and electronics, hydraulic and pneumatic systems, water reticulation system design, planning and installation, animal husbandry and welfare, milk and water quality, environmental and effluent management, workplace health and safety, and business advisory services. Our industry simply cannot be overlooked.
- Yes our business is only wanting to install pumps, UV and water filtration and dairy shed water because we are more qualified to design and install this type of work, we have under taken courses for these areas.
- Yes, as far as I can see there's no cross over of jobs between installer of pumps, milking machines etc and a qualified plumber installing behind the wall plumbing or sanitation plumbing, we are not interested or qualified to do so, just as plumbers are not trained or qualified in plumbing in pumps, filtration etc... We pay for our staff to be qualified in these areas through the courses at MPTA.
- Yes. There should be other registration classes for people to specialize in a limited range of work in the industry but not involving sanitary plumbing and drainlaying and hot water systems.
- Yes. The PGD Act should be amended to provide flexibility to allow additional scope for suitably skilled persons to carry out work associated with sanitary plumbing in rural and commercial pumped areas and to allow the milking and pumping industry to continue to carry out the work that they have traditionally undertaken.  
In addition as a company who have been supporting the rural/dairy industry for over 30 yrs we strongly support the NZMPTA submission.
- In the previous point I talked about an electrician working for a plumbing and gasfitting firm repairing electrical components in appliances, if this person

also wanted to legally disconnect and reconnect plumbing and gas appliances then the exemption under supervision wouldn't be enough. Then this new class could be the holder of a tradespersons plumbing and gasfitting restricted certificate. They could be awarded this after a period of study and a block course and exam. I am thinking along the lines of the tradespersons electrical certificate that I have. An engineer could also fit into this new category.

- I can't see a problem with this; the UK runs a system like that.
- It seems very odd that a plumber cannot do drainage at least lay and connect a drain. It's the same as plumbing just in the ground. There should be a considerably reduced training to be a drainlayer if already a plumber. I know solar installers want to get a licence for just that. What about shower installers or kitchen installers or bathroom installers, washing machine installers and lastly hot water heater installers. Piping installer? Hang on a minute that's the uk system. Then employers could get apprentices through piece by piece. Re gasfitting It should be possible for a plumber to run gas pipes, under supervision as long and long as the job is certified by a gas fitter.
- Once having passed your registration you should be able to undertake work without supervision and be responsible for your work. If other classes are introduced they should be A plumber, B Plumber or C plumber. That is A Plumber having passed Certification. B being completed full apprenticeship and having passed registration. C being Journeyman having passed registration. D being still in an apprenticeship.
- Yes, electricians and the like.
- Yes, there is a big difference in maintenance work in plumbing, gas and drains compared to new construction /renovation type of work. Commercial or residential
- Yes they have to have some sort of training
- Yes, a registration class should be available for the Electrical appliance service person to be able to carry out repair work or maintenance on gas appliances as there are not enough authorized or trained gas fitters in the industry to carry out the work as it currently is. Current situation is Costs are high for consumers and suppliers and also delays in service for home appliances.
- Yes. This should apply to current registered plumbers who are not certifying plumbers. This group of trades people should be able to carry out basic specified plumbing tasks. E.g. most maintenance work, bathroom and kitchen upgrades and the like, and perhaps even up to single story dwellings.
- As an Electrical Service Technician I believe there should a be a limited registration for gas/electric oven repairs and reinstalls to current installations. It just makes sense. The electrical board have had to adjust to different trades with differing registrations ie. Heat pump installers, Fire and house Alarm techs etc.
- Yes - but these options should only be applied to people stepping back or winding down their trade career, and should only be applicable to people who have previously attained their full qualification. For example, a "limited" plumber should only be applied to a tradesman who has been a "full" plumber

first, not as a stand-alone qualification or a stepping stone up, to being a "full" plumber

- It is a good idea but may add further confusion to the public.
- unsure as this could make rules more confusing than need be
- Yes. Companies who can prove that they have the correct structure and processes in place should be able to utilize their existing tradesmen. I.e. suitable qualified electricians to carry out general servicing and specified, limited installation work if all safety and training requirements can be achieved. Any changes to eg the gasfitting standard should be reflected in updated training modules (where relevant) for the tradesmen. The scope should be limited to specific company products in the gasfitting and plumbing areas. All work must be signed off by a certifying gasfitter who is either in their presence or who certifies via real time video link (see Q9 below). Given the commitment to training, plant and equipment, employer licenses (and/or whatever new registration classes are developed) should be granted for the full 5 years, subject to an annual audit.
- Yes only if it is a restricted scope/range of work - i.e. boats and caravans, or appliance servicing sector. If the range is too big then they should train as a gasfitter etc. It is too much of an ask for someone to commence a 4 year apprenticeship when their practice is very limited. The policing of it would be critical.
- We Regard Sanitary Plumbing with Regard to Human Sanitary Waste/Drainage from Kitchens, Toilets, Wash Rooms to be & remain the Domain of Registered Plumbers. We wish to continue undertaking Rural Water Supply to Rural Dwellings, Plumb Water requirements for dairy sheds, plant & equipment, Bore Water Supplies & the Like. Hopefully Common sense will prevail & some exclusions can be made for our Trade that has been servicing the Industry for near 80 years.
- To summarise we are equipped in our area of work, we are installers of milking machines, water filtration units and water pumps. We are not interested in installing toilets, basins, showers or any other area of plumbing nothing behind the wall. BUT we are qualified in our field MPTA qualifications for the areas mentioned. I'm sure plumbers don't want to be crossing over to our field as there field is specialised and ours is too.
- Summary; please realise there are a lot of businesses like ours that have trained / qualified staff to perform the duties we have been doing for years- installing water pumps, filtration, water supply to cowsheds (through the MPTA training).... we are NOT interested in behind the wall plumbing and in the sanitation areas as we are not qualified to do so. We just want to carry on doing what we are trained for. PLEASE think this through as there is a lot of trained staff performing these duties now which have never been classed Plumbing and DON'T need to be.
- TO SUMMERISE: we have a staff of 7 in the Wairarapa and we only do rural milking machine work, water pump repair and install and water filtration; we are all trained and skilled in these areas; COME On we are specialised in our field and PLUMBERS are specialised in their area. PLEASE think about this. There has to be some flexibility involved in this and sensible thinking.
- Don't restrict knowledgeable experienced reputable servicemen

- Tradesmen in the Pumping and irrigation industry have more experience in this field of work than most typical Plumbers and restricting this to only registered plumbers would be one big step backwards. Also this would destroy business who carry out this service and are not in the plumbing industry. The question should be asked are plumbers experienced enough to take on these large demanding jobs? I know of plumbers who get us in (Pumping and irrigation tradesmen) because they are inexperienced in this field of work.

Dairy farmers or any business who requires this type of specialized service will be let down and would cause major loss of production and income. Restricting this to plumbers only bloody crazy!!!
- Yes, as stated earlier, there needs to be recognition for Electricians or engineers who wish to legally work on servicing repairing replacing plumbing and gas and drainage appliances that have electrical componentry. There is a shortage of current plumbers gas fitters and drainlayers who also like (or are not scared of) electricity. A servicing tradesperson as opposed to an installer /replacer of pipes and fittings is a different mind-set and we have been in business 50 years and have always struggled to have enough competent service people on our staff. Fault finding servicemen are a different mindset to other tradespeople. They want to follow the reasons on why something is malfunctioning and want to repair it. With the increasing amount of electrical componentry in our trades, we as a trade don't really train for this servicing person. It needs the right mindset and experience to do this work and today's young plumbers and gasfitters and drainlayers only want to replace replace replace, they don't want to repair. It does seem to be an anomaly in the legal framework that plumbers and gasfitters can get an electrical tradespersons electrical certificate yet it can't happen the other way for electricians. I am also strongly of the view that Registered people should not be allowed to run a business and have certifiers as staff members or have separate certifiers take responsibility for their work.
- I would support other classes of registration. I am aware of a number of subsectors within the construction and primary industries that would benefit from recognition of their qualifications. As set out in the Board's discussion paper on the suggested third tier of registration these individuals would be subject to ongoing training, disciplinary recourse, and be required to pay practicing license fees and levies.

The Board derives its income to carry out its statutory responsibilities largely from registration fees, license fees and levies. Currently the numbers of people registered is relatively small compared with other regulated trades and this has presented the Board with challenges to effectively regulate the trades on its current income without increased fees and levies. Increasing the numbers of registered people will increase revenue.

**Sanitary Plumbing**

Some of the trades that would benefit from registration would be the likes of those working in the dairy sector undertaking the fit out of dairy sheds. Similarly, there are those who sell and install water pumps who also would benefit from being regulated. Another sector is the solar sector, which largely works illegally but do have their own qualification.

**Gasfitting**

In the gas sector I believe there should be a tier of registration for electricians to gain a limited registration to connect and disconnect gas appliances. This would be similar to what the Electrical Workers Registration Board provide for plumbers and gasfitters enabling them to do limited

electrical work under the Associated Electrical Workers Certificate. There are also those individuals who work for a specific manufacturer who only service equipment under warranty and who would likely benefit by being able to undertake limited gasfitting work.

#### Drainlaying

In drainlaying there are onsite wastewater manufacturers who have individuals who are trained to commission their specific systems, however they cannot install their specific system, particularly the effluent disposal portion of the system which is often specialized in its design.

#### Initial training

In suggesting alternative registration options I am mindful that for anyone to be considered for registration there should be an adequate training and assessment regime in place, therefore the Board needs to be satisfied that there is formal training and assessment in place for each sector to fulfil the 2006 Acts purpose set out under section 3. Where individuals have been working in the trades for some time but don't have formal qualifications an appropriate recognized prior learning process must be in place to assess their competency to become registered.

### 5.3 **Comments supporting no**

- NO. You are either a plumber or you are not.
- No. It would be too difficult to 'police' and where does their work stop and start?
- No. because people with these qualifications will always overstep the limits of what they are allowed to do.
- NO!!!! Please don't devalue our industry any more than you already have. What next a 3 week course on how to fit a hot water cylinder. Or a 3 week course on installing waste pipes or sink taps. These are all things that for some people take many years to perfect.
- What is a limited range, keep it simple you are qualified or not. The hotels in Queenstown and other sectors all do plumbing themselves no body from the board ever checks so it is a joke.
- You need to concentrate on prosecuting these people and do it your self home owners; you get a bigger fine being qualified than a home owner gets so why get qualified.
- No!! Again I feel this would greatly de-value our trade.
- Apart from a journeyman class no definitely not!!!!
- No. If you break the trade up you will devalue it. Who will police it to see that people stay within their range or class?
- No, a full skills range is required.
- No I do not believe so. Whilst it may be convenient for individuals to have an exemption, from my experience of seeing electricians replace gas hob and water pumps and try to do HWC it is completely obvious they do not have the skills or training to undertake this work competently. This will also open up the old argument "I was replacing like for like so I thought it was ok." At the

moment it is very clear that no one but a plumber can touch the pipes. I think it is best to leave it this way and not allow confusion to enter the market place.

- Absolutely NOT.
- No, this would only fragment the industry and cause more illegal work.
- no, the three tier system otherwise this may cause confusion to the public/inspectors and/or get these people out of their depth of knowledge if they take on jobs that are a bit more than they thought.
- No, who polices what they can and cannot do.
- No, definitely not. If you can't get the licence to do the whole scope of work, dont do it at all.
- Absolutely not! This will be seriously abused!
- Definitely not.
- No, get qualified.
- No - we should not allow this as it will lead to a 'dumbing down' of the industry and lead to reducing overall skills etc in our industry.
- not generally, these groups of people have consistently overstepped the line when it comes to sanitary plumbing gasfitting, by giving them some rights to work you will be only allowing them move further into the work of Qualified licensed practitioners  
as a Tutor at an ITP I find the need for a new class of license to cover the trainees who are doing sanitary plumbing, drainlaying, and gasfitting while attending block courses. At present these trainees are of the opinion that the Tutors are their supervisor while they are here, this is not the case, looking through the licensing and supervision policy there is no neat fit for this to happen without us working outside the PGD regulations; I think we need a Provider License similar to that of an Employer license. This will enable everyone to be able to work within the current regulatory requirements. This is a big issue, if we are training the next generation of practitioners in areas of their roles and responsibilities in our industries, yet allowing them, while they are on block course to work outside of the Licensing and Supervision [policies we must all adhere to.
- NO definitely not, that is not productive to a safer industry.
- No. Only for registered people in the trade.
- we do a lot of rural work and there is already quite a lot of unauthorised work being carried out (of a dubious quality) by other contractors who think they are plumbers. I.e Dairy shed fitters doing sanitary plumbing and some drainage, suppliers and installers of water pumps are doing similar things and people who are installing backflow preventors without plumbing tickets/license.

The councils/territorial authorities don't seem capable of supervising/policing these matters, as it is at the moment and if there are any other changes the problem will only escalate.

As an example for today, I spoke to the Team Leader at the Selwyn District Council and all they rely on is the registration number on the form submitted to them. This council and Ashburton in all the time we have been working in the area (5 years) neither myself, nor my employees have been asked for their cards. Which I think speaks for itself.

#### 5.4 **Federation view**

"The Federation believes it is not in the best interests of the industry or in the interests of the safety of the public to have registration classes for a limited range of issues.

It is very easy for the scope of the limited range to be "inadvertently extended" by the people holding these classes. The regulating and policing of such people would seem to be an issue.

The creation of such classes would impose additional enforcement costs on registered people in the industry. These costs are already excessive."

#### 5.5 **Master Plumbers view**

"No: MPGD does not support this initiative.

The complex nature of plumbing and the need to deal with septic water creates a risk to the public of unsanitary plumbing. MPGD is concerned as to how such a provision would be managed by the PGDB and would ask the following questions:

1. How would the PGDB manage the training and who would supply it?
2. How would competency in plumbing be proved by a non-plumber or drainlayer?
3. Would this also apply to gasfitting; and
4. How would the PGDB ensure compliance with Energy Safety New Zealand standards and ensure safety to the public?"

#### 5.6 **Submission from Gas Association of New Zealand**

The Association proposes a licence class of Associated Trade Electrical:

1. A licence class of Associated Trade Electrical should be created.
2. Granting of this licence should be conditional on completing a prescribed course of study.
3. The course of study should be approximately equal in duration to that required to obtain EWRB Associated Trade licences.
4. Provided the applicant for such a licence is a currently licenced electrical person, there should be no other experience requirement for the granting of a licence.
5. The scope of work able to be undertaken by the holder of such a licence must include all domestic servicing work, including removal and same appliance or like-for-like replacement."

## 5.7 Southern Institute of Technology

The Institute is concerned at the legal status of plumbing gasfitting and drainlaying work performed by Trainees when under the supervision of Tutors. They suggest the introduction of a new class of licence called a "Training Provider Licence"

They comment:

"We believe that the best option would be to utilize the current consultation and review process to introduce another class of license, perhaps something similar to an employer license for gas, but maybe called a "Training Provider License" covering all 3 trades.

In practice this would mean that when a trainee attends block course they come under the "control and direction" of the training provider. This is similar to the process now where a supervisor delegates oversight to a registered trades person. The supervisor remains responsible for the supervisee over all; however the Training provider i.e. SIT ensures the "control and direction".

We would see this type of license as being the most beneficial. No doubt terms and conditions would be included such as - having suitably trained and qualified tutors, physical resources, management structures/ procedures etc. The extra administration for all parties involved would be minimal.

I understand that notices to Registration and Licensing changes may not be gazetted until mid-2016, this delay is not ideal given the risk that sits around our current situation. I am not sure if there is any way to expedite the process?

Although perhaps not immediately obvious, this is a far-reaching issue that affects industry as a whole. Every provider, trainee and their supervisor, the tutors, the Skills organisation is, as we see it, currently working outside the supervision and licensing policies and the PGD Board Regulations."

An individual submitter also supported this approach:

"As you may be aware I have been petitioning SIT management and the Skills Organisation for some time regarding the supervision of Trainees whilst they are on Block Course at a training provider. Currently as I see it Employers, Trainees, Skills, Providers and tutors are enabling people to perform Sanitary plumbing , gasfitting and drainlaying outside of the appropriate supervision requirements stated in the Act, policies and notices. The practice at this level unfortunately seems to me to be promoting a disregard for the fundamental purposes of the competency and licencing regime and essentially a general "shrug the shoulders

attitude" towards any sort of regulatory compliance. My personal concern is that the process as it stands currently puts the Tutors at risk unless we become the supervisor while they are here. We had a recent incident involving a Trainee performing a malicious and potentially downright dangerous act while on block; it again raised the following questions- Who is the supervisor? Certainly not me it's stated on his card. Did SIT and Skills know he was working outside of the supervision requirements? Yep certainly, I have raised this issue numerous times. Who was the certifying person in charge of the trainees? Me... Am I failing to comply with the Act? Yep essentially I am. Should I follow the current process and be nominated as supervisor for each trainee while they are with us? Yep technically I should, but I hardly know these guys I only see most of them 3 times per year and there's more than 100 of them. If a notifiable incident were to occur who is ultimately responsible?? Probably me. So hopefully this has finally prompted SIT and Skills to take some action and you will have received a copy of their submissions. I have suggested to them the possibility of some type of "provider licence" may be a possible solution as it affects every trainee, provider and tutor."

## **6. Issue 4**

### **Should there be one or two classes of registration for qualified?**

6.1 **108** submitters responded to this issue.

**one-55 (51%)**

**two-53(49%)**

**Federation: one**

**Master Plumbers: Supports the creation of new classes**

### **6.2 Comments supporting one**

- One level would be much easier for our customers to understand. Once we were either "registered' or not, and everyone understood that. Only those within the industry now understand the difference between registered, licenced, craftsman or certifying. stick with the same terminology as used by LBP register. LICENCED Only.
- No. never should have been Apprenticeship then registration exam. After 2 or 3 years a refresher course.
- This is a valid point. However if you look at the industry people self-select at the moment. I have experience in the domestic sector, I am not going to go and suddenly start piping out industrial sites. I believe this is more of a theoretical problem than a real problem. The complication this will introduce is not worth the administration hassle. If there are documented cases on the public being put in danger then fair enough, lets us see the evidence.
- One class, everyone should be personally responsible for their work and their actions.
- Licensed plumbers are already self-employed. We seem to have lost the reason for needing certifiers. The purpose of the training in what??? If it's just a technical qual either licensed or certified there is not much point in two quals.

- If the above journeyman licence is put into place there would only need to be one licence, the current system confuses the public, a longer time served will create better tradesman.
- No. As there is no time frame for an apprentice, just a recommendation of 8000 hours' time served, you need 2 classes and an experience timeframe before a tradesman can progress through the existing categories.
- This depends on the limitations or range of what a tradesperson should be able to know and do, and be competent at. Also the length of experience does have some weighting but should not determine the registration class. One class could work if viewed as follows - Qualified person = tradesperson, to achieve a licence 12 - 24 months time as a tradesperson, and advanced training = registered/licenced
- after 8000 hour apprentice, block courses, registration exam you should be able to be a plumber. one class for all save thousands in admin & remove the confusion of licensed/licensing for the general public

### 6.3 **comments supporting two**

- two classes
- Yes Registered And Certifying
- No. Although it does work in Australia
- Two, the level of work undertaken and the responsibilities between a licensed practitioner and a certifying practitioner are totally different.
- don't you already have that with Certifying and Registered, Why split it up even further?
- Yes it's an experience thing you are always learning registration. Then craftsman /certifying after 4 years you do not know it all you have the basics
- Definitely Two!! Ask yourselves why the certifying (previously 'craftsman') class of license was introduced in the first place. Why do we want to go there again?
- there should be two types but these should be able to be sat one after the other if required, i.e.no time limit registration takes long enough. degrees take less time. The current system is almost for doctors.
- Yes, we do regarding milking machine work. We pay for our staff to be trained to test milking Machines.
- YES - there is that grey area; where you don't need to be a qualified plumber to pipe out a farmers pump in the middle of a paddock for example. Toilet install, behind the wall plumbing for houses etc...
- We and our staff are trained in our field and have no interest in doing any domestic plumbing - our cowshed work and farming water pump and filtration is the core of our business and has been for many years. We are qualified through MPTA courses and want to keep on doing rural plumbing work that we are qualified and trained to do.

- The two we have now is good.
- There should remain TWO. There should not be the ability for a person who only has registration exams to be able to run a business and hire staff that he is then legally liable for under other acts of parliament e.g. H&S but he is not legally liable for the staff's work under the Plumber Act .There should always be a class of trades person who wants to extend his study and gain extra exams and run a business and have staff that he supervises. Call him a craftsman or call him a certifier but he needs to be recognised for his extra study and achievements and running a business with staff.  
It should not be allowed that a registered person could run a business and have a staff member who is the certifier. What happens when that staff member leaves and the registered person can't get a replacement? He will continue to work and hope nobody notices.
- Perhaps
- again, the three tier system, limited - registered – certifying
- Yes, In the Drainage sector as there are too many different types of installation. Residential is different from Commercial and Civil. I have found that not all Drainlayers can do all and find it difficult to grasp all sectors.
- tradesmen and certifying only.
- two classes, licenced and certifying.
- No. this will lead to a relaxing of the qualification.
- YES LICENCED AND CRAFTSMAN.
- Definitely keep the registration (licensed) and certifying separate.
- Is this the journey man class?
- Yes, Happy to look at a gas serviceman ticket versus an installer. With a grandfather clause.
- No - skills are learnt with experience, books and exams are no replacement for experience. If anything, it could be more stringent in that proof of skills should be provided on a regular basis as part of the journey to becoming fully registered, qualified and certified.
- There should be two classes of registration. One classification for those who qualify in the Trade to undertake work in that trade; and a Second classification for those who would oversee others doing that work. For example in an Employee and an Employer situation.
- I Agree there should be 2 classes as running a business and certifying work is far more challenging than working as a registered tradesman. The standard of work being signed off would drop significantly and create hazards if this were to happen.
- Yes. Trades people who have been in the trades for a long time and with good/high-quality workmanship should be graded higher. Poor trades people should be of a lower grade

- I understand that there has been lobbying by one particular group to roll the clock back to a single registration which existed prior to the 1976 Act. Under that system an apprenticeship was 10000 hours. The current apprenticeship is 8000 hours.

Whilst administratively and certainly from a public understanding of who can undertake restricted work it would be simpler to have a single class of registration. This would however, invite a backlash from the majority in the trade who have gained their registration in the certifying class of registration; largely because of the effort and cost these individuals have invested to obtain this class of registration.

Therefore, I absolutely oppose any suggestion that the current two class registration system should be combined into a single class of registration.

#### 6.4 **Federation view**

"The Federation is a strong believer of only one class of registration being Registered Plumber, Registered Gasfitter and Registered Drainlayer. The one class of registration would require a longer apprenticeship of around 10,000 hours (i.e. definitely longer than the current apprenticeship).

One registration class supported by the introduction of the Journeyman class would make for a strong knowledge and skill base with limited supervision issues to deal with, unlike the current system.

The Federation believes the classes of registration currently in place causes confusion and only holds a portion of the industry wholly accountable for their actions.

Currently there are licensed Certifying Plumbers, Gasfitters and Drainlayers and licensed Licensed Plumbers, Gasfitters and Drainlayers. Those who obtain the Licensed Qualification are not permitted to apply their trade unless they are under supervision which creates supervision issues. This in its self creates problems with individuals being accountable for their own work. It also creates a "Black Market" where licensed class tradespeople are operating on their own.

The PGD Act 1976 referred to doing an apprenticeship but that has been excluded from the PGD Act 2006 which has resulted in people being given qualifications by the Board when those individuals have never completed an apprenticeship or even sat relevant exams. This needs to be rectified. Some people have reached Certifying Class with no apprenticeship or having sat any relevant exams. Complaints about this have been ignored.

The Federation does not see how an individual without the relevant training can be deemed safe for the public solely based on the PGD Board's word. Others with vast experience who have done apprenticeships and passed most exams have been denied the same opportunities - double standards exist."

## 6.5 Master Plumbers view

“MPGD believes that the structure of registration needs to be clear, concise and understandable by the tradesperson and the public and that the designation used should describe the role or work or supervision undertaken by the designation holder

Earlier in this submission, under question one, we have suggested a new structure of four levels of trade recognition with the four designations of Certifying Tradesperson, Licensed Tradesperson, Registered Tradesperson and Apprentice:

1. Certifying Tradesperson: An individual who certifies their work and that of their employees and manage and instruct an apprentice.
2. A Licensed Tradesperson: An individual who has completed their licensing examination and is able to instruct an apprentice.
3. A Registered Tradesperson (Journeyman): An individual who has completed their apprenticeship but has not completed their licensing examination and cannot instruct an apprentice.
4. An Apprentice: An individual, who under the supervision and training of a Certifying Tradesperson, or the training of a Licensed Tradesperson, learns the trade.

An exemption holder does not hold a designation. The description “Exemption Holder” is not a registered status or designation but an exemption from a registered status or designation. The exemption should be given under specific conditions and for specific functions.

The exemption should identify the specific trade skills for which the individual holds the exemption. For an individual to hold, and continue to hold, an exemption they should be required to undertake CPD training, each year, in the trade skill for which they hold the exemption.

MPGD believes that the present length of the apprenticeship is sufficient and lengthening it would adversely impact on the recruitment of apprentices and those to train them.

MPGD also believes that a simplification of the registration and licensing process would be achieved through establishing the certifying class as a class of self-certification. This would achieve three things:

1. It would establish that the designation “certifying” describes the function and the legal status of the holder;
2. The licensed tradesperson is known as qualified, but not self-certifying status;
3. The Registered Tradesperson is someone who has completed their

- apprenticeship but is not able to work without supervision; and  
4. The apprentice is seen as a part of the industry.”

## 7. Issue 5

### **Are the current registration class names appropriate?**

7.1 95 submitters responded to this issue.

**YES- 44 (46%)**

**NO-51(54%)**

**Federation does not support the current names**

**Master Plumbers does not support the current names**

### 7.2 **Comments supporting yes**

- Yes these are appropriate.
- they are adequate
- They are ok. There was nothing wrong with the old names.
- Yes let's not change them again.
- Yes, but when will my certifying Plumber and Drainlayer be correct?
- Yes, I think so.
- You cannot keep changing the names of things as the public never keeps up. Government agencies are always changing their names and us plumbers are just as daft for doing it too! Pick a bloody name and keep it forever, this name changing is becoming a national obsession
- current yes
- Yes, the previous ones were better.
- Yes. While it is said Plumber/Drainlayer does not 'certify' his work we are expected to provide Producer Statements etc so we should be considered 'Certified' and this level stands us above those not willing to 'go the extra' mile for their trade.
- yes , we don't want to change again it will only confuse the public, many tradespeople are still referring to the old craftsman designation as it is, further change will only add to this confusion
- Yes, granted that plumbers don't certify as such but then you would end up with licensed and certifying gasfitters and what would you call plumbers. It would also increase confusion amongst the public who don't seem to understand the differences now
- Current titles are appropriate YES

- I agree and they are only names. Why disrupt a working system.
- No change required

### 7.3 **Comments supporting no**

- craftsman was better
- Once we were either "registered" or not, and everyone understood that. Only those within the industry now understand the difference between registered, licenced, craftsman or certifying. PLEASE stick with the same terminology as used by LBP register. LICENCED. Only.
- No a certifying tradesman means nothing as a plumber because you are not certifying anything that is the job of local government, it is appropriate for a gasfitter however as he certifies his work.
- I think it is confusing for the public they say to you what's a certifying plumber. The old system registered plumber then craftsman plumber was easier to explain to the public
- I agree with 'certifying", but I think the lower qualification title is a bit ambiguous. Perhaps it should be known as 'non certifying tradesman' and 'certifying tradesman', and educate the public about the difference.
- I believe that they could be more appropriate registration class names and that confusion exists around the current names - especially to the general public. I suggest the current 'licensed tradesperson' class is simply named a "plumber, gasfitter or drainlayer". I suggest the current 'certifying tradesperson' class is named a "craftsman plumber, gasfitter or drainlayer"
- As far as I can see, there is no cross over in duties we don't want to be and aren't plumbers.
- No. The public have no idea who is qualified. It's hard to explain that a registered plumber is not qualified. This, and the exempt under supervision, makes it ridiculous to try and promote the (ask for the card) campaign.
- Licenced is not a good name
- no, licenced may indicate to the public a person is fully qualified
- No I believe the term licensed is not clear to the public. I know first hand of dodgy plumber showing the license to the consumer which says licensed and the homeowner thinks the person is legitimate. I have always been a fan of Trainee for an apprentice Limited for journeyman Restricted Certified
- There should be a registered person who has a practicing (be it annual or two yearly) license and he has to work for a certifying person, his boss. There should be a registered certifying person who holds an annual or two year license and he can have staff whose work he is responsible for by certifying that work.
- limited, journeymen, registered and certifying

- No! When Plumbers were just registered everybody understood it!
- Licenced is very confusing. As everyone has a license.
- Certifying Plumber should be someone that is dealing with the high end of plumbing. Not necessarily on the tools and who is an employer of apprentices and journeyman
- 1. Registered plumbers/gasfitters/drainlayers 2. Certifying plumbers/gas fitters/drain layers but people need to be licensed to work in the trade.
- No. I believe that the "pre-certifying" titles best describe our qualified trades people. i.e. Craftsman Plumber and Registered Plumber. the title Craftsman certainly has a better ring to it and traditionally describes the elite of any trade.
- The current names as Licensed Licensed and Licensed Certifying are confusing. The Previous names of Registered and Craftsman were understood and accepted in the trade and the community.
- No, Registered electrician / Registered plumber or is that too easy : )
- No, I feel the old names of registered and craftsman were more appropriate than the new names licensed and certifying.
- It is imperative that the class of registration name reflects to the public what a practitioner is legally able to do.

#### Certifying

I strongly disagree with the Board assertion in its discussion paper that the certifying class of registration does not certify. The certifying class of registration more and more certifies or validates work where a Building Consent has been uplifted. Most councils require registered tradespeople to sign off a producer statement for foul water systems and hot and cold pipe tests. Of course Certifying Gasfitters sign off Gas Safety Certificates and Gas Compliance Certificates.

This said, I have been looking at a number of states in Australia and I think the name that struck me as sensible as a replacement for the current certifying class, if the Board considered this necessary, would be a Contractor's registration. This I think better reflects to consumers what it is that makes this registration class different from the next tier down.

#### Licensed

The licensing class of registration name is problematic as pointed out in the Board's discussion document with the silly situation where a registered person in the license class does not hold a current practising licence which makes them an "unlicensed licensed tradesperson".

Accordingly, I would suggest that the appropriate name for this class of registration be the Tradespersons class of registration which reflects that they are able to work but cannot contract with the public without the express permission of their supervisor who holds the contractors registration.

#### Third tier of registration

Should the Board adopt a third tier of registration which I support in principle then I would suggest the name for this tier of registration be called the Restricted class of registration.

#### 7.4 **Federation view**

"The current registration class names are not appropriate and never have been. They are misleading and confusing. There are Licensed Licensed Tradespeople and Certifiers who don't certify anything. Totally ridiculous.

Members of the public only want to know if a person is authorised to do the work. They don't really care what the name is but the more classes of registration there is the more confusing it is.

One class name is required and that is "Registered," this would also bring us in line with our colleagues in the electrical industry."

#### 7.5 **Master Plumbers view**

"Certifying" and "Licensed" are appropriate and can be retained in the present system on the proviso that they are used to refer to a legal and trade status: certifying needs to refer to a self-certification status (as with gasfitters and electricians) and licensed to the status of practice. In this way each term would name and recognised the appropriate level of training and experience.

MPGD would support the introduction of two additional "class names" of Registered Tradesperson and Apprentice for reasons of clarity to the public and to show the pathway or progression within the industry."

### 8. **Issue 6**

#### **Should there be terms and conditions of registration?**

8.1 **88** submitters responded to this issue.

**YES- 40 (45%)**

**NO-43(49%)**

**Unsure 5(6%)**

**Federation: No**

**Master Plumbers: NO**

8.2 **Comments supporting yes**

- Responsibilities.
- you should loose registration if performing work outside your limitations

- Yes. A registered person has to work for a certifying person who supervises his work and a registered person has to have a practicing license to be able to work.
- Only for people with serious criminal records, not for people with health problems.
- yes and the public should be made aware of this
- Just the up skilling requirements and NZ approved.
- Yes. A registered plumber should have limitations on what he should be able to undertake such as new commercial or multi storey buildings. These should be run by a certifier.
- Registered plumbers should not have to do CPD or similar as they are not 'Certifying' or 'Craftsman' plumbers and do not have the income or responsibility to require this
- Certainly. Surely there are already terms and conditions that apply to all trades people.
- Yes - there must be conditions met to be, or maintain, registration, particularly with regard to our Trades
- There always has to be terms and conditions else it will be a free for all and you will end up like the building code. Leaky buildings everywhere.
- Yes I believe there should be terms and conditions of registration which should include CPD points.
- Where a person is able to carry out limited gasfitting works under one of the registration classes, an exemption or an employer license, maintaining the training deemed necessary for that limited work should be sufficient without having to gain CPD points for an unrelated area.
- yep certainly
- I support the proposal for terms and conditions under section 30 of the 2006 Act allowing the Board to prescribe terms and conditions on registration. I particularly support the suggested term and condition requiring a person convicted of a criminal offence, or a regulatory offence, in any jurisdiction, to notify they Board of such offending throughout the term of their registration. This would then enable the Board to undertake a fit and proper person assessment

### 8.3 **Comments supporting no**

- There already is. It's called the Plumbers, Gasfitters and Drainlayers ACT. If a plumber does not comply and puts the general public's health and safety at risk they can have their licence taken away and struck off the registration list.
- I done my apprenticeship, registration and certifying exam and also cpd points why add more
- That's a loaded question what are the terms yes

- Are there not already? Continue with requirements for CPD.
- Like what?
- No they are covered by the Act
- Its setting a dangerous precedent if the board starts getting into areas that are the responsibility of the employer eg if they are a fit and proper person. If a person is convicted of theft or traffic conviction or drugs that is a matter for the employer and not the board our fees are high enough as it is without the board empire building. Fair enough if it is a plumbing conviction. I think too there would not be public support if acts restricted who could get a job after all
- not sure what you mean as there are plenty of terms and conditions to operate under already
- No need to change too much here except CPD should be relevant to specific trades only.
- No, time served exams passed, no competency training BS or over regulation.

#### 8.4 **Federation view**

“There should not be terms and conditions of registration. This is simply a veiled attempt to impose more regulation on the industry. Most of the issues mentioned in the consultation document already have provisions for their enforcement in the PGD Act 2006. The PGD Board appears to be wanting to legislate itself more power. They have already done this with their application of Section 32 which is discussed later in this submission.

If such terms and conditions were imposed the tradespeople would again be expected to fund the policing of the extra terms and conditions and in saying that, to what extent would the extra enforcement action go? If it was a term and condition of registration would it mean the removal of the tradesperson's name from the register thus removing their qualifications. Would they need to re-qualify?

If terms and conditions were imposed on registration would there be a need for annual licensing because in effect they would become the same.

The PGD Board attempted to make it mandatory for attendance at a competency review and this was rejected by the industry. The cost of the review was to be the responsibility of the tradesperson. Section 53 of the PGD Act is adequate for the review of competence if the PGD Act is followed. Here the Board is trying to make it a term and condition of registration.

A review of competence can be such that the individual does not need to be involved. The PGD Board should have in place monitoring, they can check on complaints made, they can check with local councils and if nothing is identified then no further action is required.

The onus is on the PGD Board to prove incompetence, not for the individual to prove competence at the PGD Board's whim. As with a lot of issues the PGD Board are attempting to shift responsibility and cost to the tradespeople and to legislate themselves more power to control an industry that is rejecting them.

The question needs to be asked – "How many times does a tradesperson need to prove their competence and at what cost, and why is the industry rejecting the PGD Board?"

#### 8.5 **Master Plumbers view**

"The introduction of terms and conditions for registration would add an additional layer of complexity to the industry and potentially an additional layer of confusion for the customer. If this regime were to be introduced, MPGD would want to see a greater level of clarification around the certifying and licensed status, the purpose and regulation of registration categories, the ways in which a term or condition of registration might change, or be changed.

MPGD believes that the introduction of terms and conditions are only valuable once the real question of certifying, licensed, registered and apprentice are thoroughly worked through and the status of the exempted person is clarified."

### 9 **Issue 7**

**Should the certifying examination be part of a NZQA qualification?**

9.1 **102** submitters responded to this issue.

**YES- 71 (70%)**

**NO-29 (28%)**

**Unsure-2(2%)**

**Federation: Yes but with only one class of registration**

**Master Plumbers: Yes, subject to issues they raise**

9.2 **comments supporting yes**

- Yes. I support the creation of NZ Certificates in plumbing, gasfitting and drainlaying (Level 5) as qualifications for tradespeople to up skill themselves further and act as a study path available for acquiring the knowledge needed to pass a certifying class examination.
- Absolutely 100% and it should be tough; the apprenticeship training programme is a joke. You basically can't fail at Unitec anymore, if you do then Unitec don't get paid. It is nonsense that the provider of training only gets the full payment if certain pass rates are achieved. The result of this stupid policy is that Unitec change the course structure by dumbing it down to make it easier and easier to pass, You can have remark after remark, extra time, make up classes. It is just bullshit, if you can't pass the course you can't pass, it's that simple. There is no trust in the system at Unitec; the only standard that you can trust is NZQA.
- Yes in conjunction with the PGD Board
- Yes it should be taken from the Plumbers Board scope of work and given to the NZQA people who are experienced at designing and examining courses. This could leave the Plumbers Board to concentrate on its other reasons for being in existence which would be to make sure all registered people are working legally and not working off other peoples licenses.
- Only if the exam is still set by the PGDB Training Institutes cannot be trusted to set and test. They have to many bums on seats ,collect the money, everybody passes attitudes in their staff
- Yes as it shows that the trainee is completely competent.
- yes it would be better to keep an apprentice involved and in the system until they are certified
- I'm shocked to learn that it is not already! All exams and levels should be NZQA
- Yes, I am appalled by the hopeless quality of my apprentice's block courses provided by Skills and would welcome a 'shake up'
- They should still have to do the certificate for PGD for NZQA and can do the paper for "licensed PGD" at the same time, but I reckon they still need the experience of time in the actual trade after they have qualified. The certifying exam should still be done after the two years after they qualify. I have been working in the UK for the last few years and they have a fast track system and the quality of workman ship is appalling and is not overseen by a local authority.
- Yes - the extra cost, time and commitment confirms the applicant wants to be fully qualified and proud of his industry.
- If that means recognition through a technical institute (trade university) then yes. I always remember after completing my apprenticeship and passing my registration exams my boss at the time said that I was entitled to write RP after my name recognizing the fact that I had successfully completed five or six years of study and learning. Perhaps there could be something like a diploma in sanitary and practical plumbing.

- Yes, it would provide a comparative qualification for people wanting to work abroad.
- Yes, one exam to reach registered status, far too much of a barrier at present.
- Yes, but in time. If a level 5 programme/qualification is developed it should originally be introduced as an alternative to the certifying exam i.e. completion of the training should equal eligibility to register for as a certifying. So eligibility would be time on a licence, passing an exam or completion of a level 5 qualification. This will minimise the impact of cost on the industry and provide an option/alternative to the exam.
- I am really excited to see new qualifications being introduced for the current certifying registration class. For too long individuals have been disadvantaged by not having a prescribed training and assessment pathway but instead have had to largely self-direct their learning before attempting to sit and pass the Board's registration examinations. I believe the establishment of a Level 5 qualification would help overcome this problem.

#### Potential disadvantage

If this was the only pathway to sitting the certifying examinations, the Board have raised a concern that it may create additional costs and time commitment for some tradespeople. However, this issue can be mitigated by using the recognised prior learning pathway that sit in the current National Certificates for people who have previous experience or have an allied qualification. This allows such individuals to gain credits toward the level 5 qualification so that they do not have to complete the entire suite of assessment standards.

#### Board examination

I am fully supportive of the Board examination as being the capstone requirement to registration and in no way should this be removed in lieu of the Level 5 qualification but should form part of the qualification; in other words it should have its own assessment standard.

### 9.3 Comments supporting no

- no you have to sit a test.
- No needs to be separate. You have already devalued the license by taking out the business requirements from the exam, which "every certifier should know" after all what sets a certifier apart from a registered plumber. The way you have it now, NOTHING. A certifying plumber is required to set themselves apart for all the other licenses especially in regards to supervision or running a business; however the examination now is not as good as the one I sat originally. The ridiculous thing is you are now wanting me the self employed plumber for 22 years to upgrade my skills to meet current trade requirements, now that's a joke. I would suggest 90% of young people passing a certifying exam would not or could not run their own business "without supervision".
- No. It should remain a separate qualification.

- NO!! NO!! NO!! In my experience NZQA national certificates are far too easy and relatively worthless. They are also inconsistent in their delivery from different training providers.
- are there any good reasons for this?
- NO, not at all!
- Why two exams? A registered plumber should be able to start their own business. What or who benefits from two different classes? Pick one of the exams, registration or certifying.
- No and what for?
- no, it needs to be separate to guarantee value of qualification and capability of individuals
- No I value experience over the ability to pass an exam.
- No, there should only be 1 class of registration.
- no, I think the board having autonomy in this process is vital given the lack of consistency and professionalism with some providers and the Skills Organisation around training and assessment
- No, it is currently another way of ensuring that the apprentice has the correct knowledge to work as his license gained permits him to. It also gives time to gain experience before he progresses to the next level.
- Nope, I don't believe The Board will be fulfilling its obligations under the Act if it delegates authority to ITO's and Training Providers to ensure competency.

#### 9.4 **Federation view**

"The Federation supports the certifying examination being part of an NZQA qualification, but emphasizes there should only be one qualification that of "Registered"

The Federation feels the current exam fees and cost of first time registering are placing a barrier to entry into the industry."

#### 9.5 **Master Plumbers view**

"The advantage of integrating the certifying examination, as part of an NZQA qualification, is to benchmark the training and experience of a certifying tradesperson nationally and it would provide great educational structure and support for those sitting the qualification.

However, qualification benchmarking would have to ensure that the interests of both practical workplace learning and theoretical classroom training are maintained. Moderation of practical learning and theory-based training is necessary to regulate the efficiency of the qualification.

If this proposal were to be accepted, MPGD would expect to see how learning delivered by training providers and training delivered in the workplace would be integrated and moderated. MPGD would suggest that if this proposal is accepted then an industry working group should be established to ensure that the structure and delivery of the qualification is both valuable and achievable

for the end user.

The disadvantage is to create a qualification where one is not necessarily needed and to lose control of the content, approach and purpose to organisations with other desired outcomes.

“Qualifications” can escalate otherwise reasonable training outcomes beyond where they are of value to the end user. Additional qualifications tend to create income streams for the providers and additional costs for the end user. Therefore, MPGD suggests that care needs to be taken by the PGDB when considering the value, and the outcome, of this proposal.”

## **10 Issue 8**

### **10.1 What changes (if any) should be made to the CPD scheme**

**93** submitters responded to this issue.

**Submissions supporting changes- 74 (80%)**

**Submissions favouring status quo -19(20%)**

**Federation supports change**

**Master Plumbers supports change**

### **10.2 Comments in support of change**

- it should be dropped
- I think the CPD scheme has given rise to individuals taking advantage financially of the boards desire to present our trade as competent to the public. In my view it is a role that the manufactures etc play in keeping the trade up to date with the latest products and their correct installation. Rinnai is a good example of a company promoting its own products and how they should be installed without charge. I believe the CPD scheme should be limited to FIRST AID and WORKPLACE SAFETY courses as the responsibility of the board and upskilling a natural by product of the industry as it moves forward.
- Needs more advertising as to where courses are available
- Ensure courses are of sufficient worth. Some I have sat thru are so superficial and lightweight that it makes a joke of the system. Some providers give out answers to all attendees to write down.
- Should be Removed
- we should not have to pay
- CPD SHOULD BE DROPPED IF YOU ARE QUALIFIED.
- CPD seems to be controlled by the manufacturers of products not by the actual plumbers themselves. We need courses that add genuine value. Some courses that plumbers invest a lot of time and money in should be automatically recognised, just because they are not on your list doesn't mean

they are not valuable. How can you compare a 3 day course costing a plumber \$1000 to a beer and BBQ course from a valve manufacturer? You can't! Yet your points system would most likely give them the same value, that's if you even recognise it? Additionally anyone that is presenting a course to plumbers, if licenced should also be recognised for CPD

- I find it the biggest hassle and I think that's why the board gets all the shit thrown at it and a lot of plumbers hate the board. We need to support the board all of us it's a two way partnership. If we could do the cpd online it would certainly make things easy you often cannot get a cpd coarse you need in your area
- Encourage more industry partners to develop worthwhile and relevant courses. More on-line options should be developed. Alternatively the Board could develop some form of online brief exam to be undertaken to assess skill/knowledge prior to annual license renewal.
- Broader range of things that CPD points can be accredited for. A higher percentage of CPD points able to be accredited for self directed learning - up to 50%.
- Allow registered plumber to become certified at any time after registration.
- Plumbers already pay levies and fees these courses are compulsory so they should have no additional charges .e.g.: all CPD courses should be free!
- Do away with the CPD scheme just a waste of time.
- less repeating of courses
- Time lapse before a course can be repeated if completed successfully
- CPD scheme = compulsory sales pitch .A compulsory 1 or 2 day refresher course every 2 or 3 years or so, through the polytechs, showing latest methods or products and how to implement them. This won't suit the office plumber so no chance of that.
- More online courses
- get rid of it
- we need more courses available to the non main centres as it can be hard to get appropriate courses
- would be better provided by NZQA backed training organization to ensure relevance and standardization
- More courses in the regions please.
- CPD is a con at the moment, there are very few courses which actually deliver upskilling, and I have done a few which have been great from Rinnai and Solahart.  
By and large the intention is good but the reality is woeful.  
It is hard to find the time, it is expensive and you don't learn much, I can't really see any benefit to the homeowner for such an imposition on everyone.

- It should cover a two year period. Consideration should be made on the work the Certifier undertakes. I have a business and employ 42 staff I am pricing, designing, and researching new products every day why would I need to show I can crimp two pieces of pipe together to retain my licence. I believe most certifier work hard at staying up to date with requirements to work in our industry.
- I have previously emailed the former registrar about this. The current way of earning CPD points by just turning up to a new appliance or fitting or fixture information BBQ at the merchants is a nonsense. Sure you can attend these functions but only a minor amount of points should be allocated. Serious upskilling courses where a time commitment of 2 or 3 hours are willingly undertaken because of a desire to upskill and stay relevant should be rewarded with more points.  
If new classes like the previously mentioned journeyman class was started then cpd POINTS COULD BE A WAY OF KEEPING TABS ON THOSE PERSONS ABILITY TO STAY UP TO DATE. The CPD points would also be good for the people like electricians and engineers working under exemption to prove they are staying relevant.
- You should be able to nominate unregistered courses on an individual basis  
EG If I go to a lawyers presentation on the changes to consumer lays I should be able to claim points by submitting the Hand outs or content of the course. Obviously this will need careful administration. The carrying over of more points.  
Otherwise it is quite a good system
- most plumbers and gasfitters only do the cpd to keep their licences ,we need to think more about upskilling for knowledge not just complying
- Should be an exemption for retired Plumbers who want to keep Registered as a matter of pride.
- It's a joke at the moment teaching plumbers how a trap works just to get points its making a mockery of the reason it was introduced. A lot of suppliers of cpd of real training have left the scene after the last change to allow anything to be approved as having some value.
- Not to be made a condition of getting your licence. As many things are already being learnt on the job and life is extremely busy as it is. Perhaps if anything free instruction should be given on the Regulations and the building code so as to keep plumbers up to date with changes rather than just viewing some companies' products.
- MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMERCIAL COMBUSTION AND CONTROL SYSTEMS,IE RIELLO,NUWAY BURNERS AND CONTROL SIEMENS ETC
- Keep it but make it easier for tradesman to do more courses for free PGDB could set up courses for free. I find it difficult to not be able to access the non free courses to do as they do not interest me as much as the free ones.
- Get rid of the CPD. The courses available are not anything new.
- Do not accept payment for the license unless there are enough cpd's for the relevant license. I recently had a heap of cpd's -a lot were gas so didn't work for plumbing. I wasn't aware of that as bosch hot water course only applied to gas cpds which is odd. Payment was taken but no license arrived and no notification why until I followed up a month later

- I don't believe this cpd is needed most of the courses I have attended are just product advertising
- CPD should only related to the work you are authorized to do
- All courses should free. Approval by the board on courses is not required and the silly tests at the end are just a joke.
- All courses should free. Approval by the board on courses is not required and the silly tests at the end are just a joke.
- Points schedule is OK BUT it is too easy to get points by doing any CPC course and many are not relevant to the trade e.g. I can do a course on Hot Water Cylinder but as a Drainlayer is this going to provide me anything but a few 'easy points'. Courses must be relevant to the specific trade cert held by the individual.
- Delete it.
- I've never been a supporter of the current CPD scheme. I realise that there are some cowboys out there but I don't that is going to change. Unfortunately trades people in general have unfairly been blamed for a large number of failures in the building industry when the problem lies with the government for introducing flimsy regulations (1991 Building Act) and designers and manufacturers pushing the boundaries way too far. However, I guess the scheme is here to stay, so anything that eases the burden of plumbers having to chase CPD points will be a bonus. Currently, living in a rural area, I have to travel almost 200 kilometres to attend enough courses to attain the number of points I need to renew my licenses. Perhaps more minimal cost (preferably free) online courses could be provided. Maybe there should be more scope for self-directed learning. The Board could put out relevant information and publications for this purpose.
- The CPD scheme is easily manipulated by too many self-interested parties. Up-Skilling is important; however history tells us that the present scheme has not been effective in communicating important information. For example the changes to Gas certification work; Tradesmen busily accrued points to register, from manufacturer product displays, while there was no concerted education provided on a major law change. Coordination is required
- delete CPD CHANGES TO INDUSTRY WRITTEN OR HANDS ON PROCEEDURE ARE RELAYED TO PRACTITIONERS THROUGH PGDB OR APPROPRIATE LEGISTLATION.
- What's wrong with it : ) It's now become a great social event with often beer and nibbles!  
If you want people to advance you have to encourage and give merit not threaten and stand over with a big stick. All licensed people should be responsible for their own learning, if every trades person had an online profile on the PGDB site it would be in there best interest to keep that in the green, as this is monitored and then maybe could drop off the public view or be flagged as not completing learning. This could be simply by sending in courses completed, books read, visual learning (in other words everyday stuff) the individual would be responsible for updating their profile. This could also help the consumer to hire a trades person if they could get a background of the person / company.

- There should be a mandatory CPD course set up by the PGDB to be attended by all licensed Plumbers, Gasfitters and Drainlayers to review new policies Q & A and share ideas. They should also be made to gain a proportion of their CPD points in their normal scope of work and not irrelevant subjects that they do not practice.
- A more robust moderation process of CPD courses to ensure value and consistency
- There should be specific CPD for overseas learners around legislation, and good practice.  
It should be targeted, have learning outcomes, and not be onerous.
- The CPD is a disaster and should be scrapped. The PGDB should employ people to gather new information and supply it to all Plumbers as part of our fees.
- The person under supervision like everyone in the industry should be required to do CPD. A certifying plumber is required to set themselves apart for all the other licenses especially in regards to supervision or running a business, however the examination now is not as good as the one I sat originally in 1993. The ridiculous thing is you are now wanting me the self employed plumber for 22 years to upgrade my skills to meet current trade requirements, now that's a joke. I would suggest 90% of young people passing a certifying exam would not or could not run their own business "without supervision".  
Stop devaluing our trade. A failed student out of a school does not mean automatically, "will make a good plumber". The trade and its requirements have moved on, the skill level and needs of today's Craftsman Plumbers (certifying) is higher today than 20 years ago, (I know I have been in the industry for over 30 years). Especially if this industry is to be recognised for what it is. A highly skilled and trained "PROFESSIONAL"
- I feel anyone in our industry should be required to be in some form of formal training until at least they have gained initial 'licenced' class of registration. "exemption under supervision" should be required to pay annual licence fees and participate in CPD otherwise they are getting somewhat of a free ride.
- Having returned to the trades in 2013 I have been dismayed at the poor level of training available to senior tradespeople like me, in fact I am down-right embarrassed with the current offering as a whole. The only courses that I have done to date that I would rate, would be the Rinnai Tradesmart training for gasfitting, and courses developed by organisations such as Top Drawer and St Johns First Aid. The majority of the courses are simply marketing. If there is one area that tradespeople will continue to rile against that is the Board's current continuing professional development regime which I can now testify is a failure. There is no way the Board can rely on the current regime to measure competency as in most cases I have witnessed just showing up will earn points.  
It is my view that it is high time that the Board took leadership on this matter and instead of copying what other regulatory bodies are doing it should provide a regime that is measurable, meaningful and purposeful to those it regulates.

### Suggested replacement

A risk based regime should be introduced. There should be no points, just competent or not yet competent. The training required should be based on hard evidence gathered by the Board on specific areas where there are demonstrable weaknesses in trade knowledge or deficiencies in practices. One example would be where new legislation or a major compliance standard was being introduced. Another example may be where evidence from a third party such as the MoBIE, statistically highlight health and safety failures in the construction sector or compliance failures that had a bearing on the trades. The Board's own disciplinary processes may find areas where it may consider trades people should improve their knowledge, for instance, it has regularly raised issues with respect to supervision.

The new regime would see the Board giving the trades a period of reasonable notice that training and assessment must be undertaken by registered practitioners with a licensing date that competency must be achieved by. The training and assessment would then be facilitated by organisations who met the Board accreditation to provide such services using the Board's current course assessment processes.

I believe if the Board were to adopt this suggested process then it would be able to demonstrate to the trades that the training and assessment is necessary, which would likely be supported by the tradespeople it regulates.

### 10.3 Comments opposing change

- I think the CPD system is working fine. There are more suppliers coming on board and most courses are free. There could be some more Practical courses for us hands on plumbers.
- Seems to be working
- Seem Ok
- None. It is working fine.
- I personally do not have a problem with the current CPD scheme, it works well.
- We need to STOP tinkering with things that aren't broken
- no changes
- No, leave it alone.
- It's pretty average as it is, I don't want it changed to take up even more of my time.
- I personally am quite happy with the cpd scheme as it stands
- I feel that they are working
- None. Happy with the status-quo

#### 10.4 **Federation view**

The current Continued Professional Development (CPD) scheme in our opinion has no credibility and does not achieve its perceived purpose.

The section on competence programmes in the PGD Act 2006 section clearly states the purpose of a competence programme is for examining or improving the competence of persons who do or assist in doing sanitary plumbing, gasfitting or drainlaying. It makes no mention of buying points to prove competence on subjects that tradespeople are already qualified in.

This section poses the question that if CPD is a competence programme and a person buys their required points, is deemed competent by the PGD Board and is given authority to do sanitary plumbing, gasfitting and drainlaying then what happens if they are ordered to do a competence programme as a result of action under discipline? What competence programme do they do if they have already been deemed competent by the CPD scheme? This shows CPD is not a competence programme and is unlawful as a term and condition of licensing.

The so called CPD scheme has been implemented by the PGD Board claiming it is a competence programme. The Federation believes what has been implemented by the PGD Board is nothing more than a "mechanism" to implement a Competence Programme.

The term Competence Programme needs defining as it has implications throughout the entire PGD Act from terms and conditions of licensing to discipline order issues.

The Federation agrees there needs to be clarity of the meaning of competency, supervision and upskilling but this needs to be taken into the context of what is good for the tradesperson. No matter how many points a tradesperson buys to have the PGD Board deem them to be competent that person is only as good as their knowledge and skills and their willingness to apply them.

The existing CPD Scheme is a total failure and does nothing to encourage tradespeople to improve their skills, in fact it is quite the opposite - more time is spent avoiding the scheme they do not support, or looking for free courses than actually looking at the competency and knowledge needs.

The PGD Board have been claiming incompetence based on points rather than having monitoring and analysis systems in place to assess what knowledge, skills and competence are needed. Not every piece of information that is useful is a competence and needs to be in a formal course setting. Some organisations have less relevant training now than ever before because they need to save the time and resources for buying their CPD points for licensing.

The Federation believes a competence programme is designed to protect the public's health and safety and the protection of property by ensuring licensed practitioners are fully competent within the Plumbing, Gasfitting

and Drainlaying industries by ensuring the correct information is being supplied and monitored by the governing body.

The PGD Board should be able to accurately assess each individual, class of registration and the industry as a whole. The PGD Board must be able to fully comply with the expectations of the Executive, intent of the PGD Act 2006 and better serve its purpose by protecting the public's health and safety.

The Federation feels competence programs should be split into three key areas of importance:

- Disciplinary Competence Programmes
- General Competence
- Compulsory Competence Programmes

By splitting the competence programmes into the three key areas the system will allow practitioners and the Board to identify an individual's area of deficiency that can be rectified without delay and is not restrictive. The system will also give the Board a transparent path to achieving the outcome of an industry that is up skilling on a frequent basis with relevant and current information.

Individuals know what is best for them and should be left to control their training. The PGD Board's function is to monitor the training and deal with people who fail to achieve expectations of training and up skilling.

More on CPD and Principles guiding prescribing of registration and licensing matters is discussed later in this submission.

#### 10.5 **Master Plumbers view**

"MPGD has already made its view clear on the need for change in the present CPD scheme. We consider the present scheme devalues training and upskilling; it uses a limited training model and is too heavily dependent on a limited number of technical categories. MPGD would like to see a new model of points' allocation, a clearer structure of learning assessment, a faster process for the assessment of content and an increase in the categories of training for CPD.

The points system should be simplified to one point for each hour of training; no one should be able to achieve all their points at one presentation; there should be a distinction between product-based CPD and other types of training or learning.

The proposed review of the CPD system is, in the view of MPGD, a waste of public money and Board time. The present system has little or no industry support; it is derided by tradespeople and struggles to show any real value to the consumer."

## 11 Issue 9

### What changes (if any) should be made to the supervision requirements?

11.1 85 submitters responded to this issue.

**Submissions supporting changes- 66(78%)**

**Submissions not supporting any changes -17(20%)**

**Unsure-2 (2%)**

**Federation-supports change**

**Master Plumbers-supports change**

### 11.2 Comments supporting change

- If been employed more than 1 year, may work unsupervised on stuff they've been trained to do
- More audits. Must be in same town. Must visit actual jobs. Should have time limits.
- Have a max of 5 people under 1 supervisor
- you have to be on site to see the job
- Supervision should mean supervised.
- They should actually be enforced
- Supervision should mean that the person actually works in the same business and the same town. Not somewhere else in the country, or completely remotely.
- I have found the supervision is an unmanned joke it depends on how good your firm is to how much supervision that the young we guys get some get sent to do work that they don't have the skills to do.
- This doesn't work as it was set out to, and is costing plumbing businesses extra money. Qualified industry reps from tertiary or other agencies could perform programmed site observations of those under supervision as part of the NZQA qualification. Illegal workers should be dealt with by MBIE
- Possibly a record of time spent supervising.
- There should be a ratio of 1 certifying plumber, gasfitter or drainlayer to 5 registered or limited certificate license holders, as hopefully the certifying license holder is actually supervising them not sitting behind a desk and barking orders.
- clearer definitions regarding supervision
- Make it easier to understand exactly what is required ie clear definition of "in the presence of"

- If a registered plumber isn't allowed to do plumbing without the supervision of a certified plumber, why is he permitted to supervise a group of apprentices or exempt workers????? Direct supervision by the certified plumber.  
Who goes to court if the exempt person gets killed while under the direct supervision of the registered plumber who's under indirect supervision of the certified plumber.
- Clarification of the meaning of supervision
- get rid of it
- introduce paper certificate for each job to ensure compliance to current rules
- The person being supervised must be employed by the same company as the supervisor.
- Supervision should be "As the supervisor feels is necessary"  
Some supervisees are more competent than others
- As per question 2. The supervisor can't be there all the time in small business operations, some experience for the limited licence holder has to be taken into consideration.
- They should be enforced more. Once a trainee looks like he or she knows what they are doing the employer or supervisor generally leave them to it.
- a plumber or gasfitter or drainlayer who is under supervision should not be allowed to work in his own business
- people being supervised should be directly employed or subcontracting to the certifier
- Make sure the certifying tradesman, does check every job.
- This current policy is a joke for all concerned. A lot of employers don't train in a lot of the trade and after a time period they are allowed to do anything. This skills needed to be unsupervised needs to be checked off before allowing them to be unsupervised eg a list of tasks needs to be set eg toilet installation, low pressure hot water replacement etc and when the employer has passed them off this list it is sent in to the tech and a certificate issued of competence. Not just 1 year in the trade and then let loose. If all they have done is dig holes and put clips on pipes that is not a reason to allow them to work with less supervision.
- A Registered Plumber should not have to have a supervisor in order to work in the trade. I have been in the trade for 40 years yet still need a supervisor. 10000 hour apprenticeship, 16 hours of practical assessment and 12 hours of external exams. 1st Qual, 2nd Qual, Third Qual and Registration and every year having to complete 12 C.P.D points of ongoing learning. I have been working for myself for 13 years. Without a supervisor I will be unemployed.
- Employers License!!!!!!Currently nobody working under a Employers License carry a card. Is it legal to work on a gas installation if you do not carry a card.

- I can't see anywhere that proof is required as to if a person is being supervised. We are allowing a great many people to 'cruise' along and never learning the 'correct way' of carrying out many tasks.
- Perhaps the direct supervision (i.e. being on site) could be relaxed for some classes of plumber.
- Better policing is needed, I have met people at licensing exams who admit they work on gas and plumbing unsupervised from almost the first day
- I see many big companies employing many apprentices and maybe a couple of tradesmen if they are lucky. These apprentices are learning bad habits from unqualified workers and therefore go about their work the wrong way. It is no way forward. Each company should be regulated how many apprentices they can have per registered plumber or certifier and this allows apprentices a good chance to learn
- The current supervision requirements deregulate a section of the industry and takes away personal responsibility from those who are supervised. The introduction of the Journeyman class would assist in the tightening up of responsibilities of all tradespeople for their work.
- The use of new technology enables supervision to be achieved via digital media tools from a separate location provided special criteria (see below) can be met.  
Special criteria should be
  - The certifying gasfitter works from a checklist relevant to the job and ticks off the requirements through question and answer with the tradesman.
  - A record of those questions and answers is then signed by the certifying gasfitter and kept electronically.
  - Video is used to check the work before the gas is turned on
  - Photographic evidence of the work done is retained on file.
- I think self certification for plumbing and drainlaying must be implemented. It works well for our gasfitters and electricians with each job being signed off with a COC. At the moment a plumber or drainlayer can undertake some work and all the consumer gets is a bill. The COC would have to be signed off by a certifier so the consumer is assured an adequately licenced person has done or overseen the work. It would be a backward step not to move to self certification.
- I would like to see the board allow a licenced plumber gasfitter or drainlayer able to sit their certifying exams straight after they have qualified for their registration as they are in study mode, but they would have to have 12000 hours under their belt still before actually receiving their certifying qualification. Also licensing fees need to come down and you shouldn't be charging a full years license fee from when you become certifying from registered. The license should be paid for on a month by month basis.
- I would like to see further criteria required from applicants such as:
  - a. The nature of the relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee. For instance is there a training agreement, is the person an employee or are they working under a contract outside the employment relationship.
  - b. The home address of the supervisor and the supervisee as well as the employment address.

Where the criteria above identifies potential risk with respect to appropriate supervision the Board may ask further questions of the supervisor such as whether there is an effective contractual arrangement which mitigates risks such as distance, communication and one which clearly sets out procedural matters such as notice to undertake specified work, inspection requirements and regulatory compliance requirements.

This I feel would go some way to challenging the inappropriate supervision that some apply within the industry.

### 11.3 **Comments opposing change**

- I think the system is adequate now, but it is easy to ignore the rules. Almost every business with apprentices does not follow requirements, and I'm sure many are unaware of obligations.
- I don't have a problem with Supervision, except that you need to be able to get a restricted license for anyone in the industry so that they can share in the liability
- I think they are pretty good as they are. They are tough but fair. To be a certifying person who supervises others is not to be taken lightly as some people currently do.
- This works in its present form, an employer knows who is capable of doing the job he gives them to a good standard and without being a danger to the public, after all he alone is responsible for that persons work.
- We need to STOP tinkering with things that aren't broken
- Nothing as far as I can see.
- OK as is

### 11.4 **Federation view**

"The Federation believes the current supervision requirements deregulate a section of the industry and takes away personal responsibility from those who are supervised.

The introduction of the Journeyman class would assist in the tightening up of responsibilities of all tradespeople for their work.

Supervision is more than being held accountable if anything goes wrong and at the moment that is all that is achieved by the current supervision requirements.

Supervision requirements should only be met by people employed in the same organisation or by way of a contract of service that the PGD Board can hold on file."

## 11.5 Master Plumbers

"Supervision requirements are reasonable in their present form and recognise the distinctions between the persons being supervised. However, there is evidence to suggest that the supervision rules are not well understood.

If the class "certifying tradesperson" was amended to mean "self-certifying" then MPGD believes this would strengthen the supervision requirements and supervision best practice, because it would have a real impact on the name and reputation of the certifying tradesperson.

Self -certification and supervision, together, could form a strong synergy and add value to the industry and the safety to the public.

MPGD believed that the introduction of self-certification for plumbers and drainlayers would enable each trade to issue a Code of Compliance. The Code of Compliance would operate in the same way as it presently does for electrician and gasfitters. It would be more easily policed by the PGD Board and would place the responsibility for quality workmanship with the certifying tradesperson."

---

## 12 Final comments

**Do you have any other points that you would like to raise in relation to the review of registration and licensing requirements?**

### ***Cost related***

- We need to make the costs lower like other trades, there is too much fat in the running of the PGDB.
- LOWER THE YEARLY REGISTRATION FEES. WE SHOULD NOT BE PAYING TO PROSECUTE OTHERS THAT SHOULD BE UP TO THE GOVERNMENT.
- Like everybody else, the cost.
- Since 1978 this exercise has been carried three times to my Knowledge. what a waste of time and money
- The annual license is very expensive compared to other trades particularly considering we usually need more than one. Often 3 licences  
2. Some apprentices get through the skills quicker than others and there is no list of competencies they can tick off to move them through more quickly. They have to just wait it out. 3. It seems the problem of determining competence is put right at the end instead of checking them earlier along the way and issuing a proper 1st qual. 2nd qual certificate and allowing them some tasks to do with less supervision. There is a confusing issue at the moment with licensed building contractors where the public are being educated plumbers are not permitted to do roofing or anything to do with

roofing or flashings. The current building act is not clear on who is allowed to do this work. It would be nice if our license had the words licensed building contractor on it and be pulled in as part of the Building Act as well as the PGDB act.

- The cost!!!! And what we are paying for. Police should be used to prosecute people breaking the law. We pay cops (taxes) and the board (fees) to prosecute offenders. Also it is so expensive to register every year. We pay the most expensive fees to practice our chosen trade. REDUCE THE COST.
- I believe the cost of registration is too high and any cost relating to prosecution should be removed, the costs of prosecutions should be paid by those that are being prosecuted not by plumbers following the rules.
- over the years I have paid thousands of dollars in registration fees, especially uplifting an initial licence, I have not seen tangible return from the board for this investment, I am aware it gives me the ability to practice my trade however what has the board done for the tradesman ?
- There must be many Qualified Plumbers like myself who are retired or semi retired that cannot justify the cost of retaining yearly rego for doing a little bit of part time work (or for family and friends) and therefore cannot use skills that there are supposedly a shortage of out there. It's frustrating that the only paid work I do now is not plumbing work.
- We all need to stick together as plumbers and the board  
The more the board talks to the people on the ground the better the communication is the less hassle. Is there any way to get the fees down for registration discount for firms with 4 or more men etc the cost is hard on these larger firms that pay the registration

### ***Photo ID***

- Photo id should be introduced. Certification with each job and a paper/electronic confirmation from Territorial Authority for each job completed back to the Certifying Tradesman, to ensure no fraudulent use of tradesmen's personnel details, (as these are available to the public)
- Put the photo of the licence holder back on the licence like they used to be, what use is a card to show a home owner if they have no idea if it belongs to the person in possession?

### ***Unlicensed plumbing***

- Many plumbers won't own up to journeyman's hours worked as they fear prosecution & illegal employment-i.e. persons worked off and on for years as required , so didn't have the journeyman on limited license
- The biggest problem that I see with the gasfitting industry is that unqualified people can walk into any supply shop & purchase any gasfitting material or appliances. While this continues there is no control over who carries out gasfitting work.
- I feel that the pgdb should be on the lookout for plumbers working who aren't paid up or are unlicensed who are running their own business ,these people are making a mockery of the whole system ,they have done their

apprenticeship ,left the company they are working for ,jump into a van without any training ,insurances, licence and undercutting the companies/certifying plumbers who are doing everything correctly. every day in Auckland when driving around 60% of the plumbers vehicles that I see are unsign written, no phone number and unknown -how many of these plumbers are trading correctly-maybe we should as an industry enforce sign written vehicle and also have the certifying number of the company in plain view for the public. If a penalty system was put in place whether by fines, hours for additional upskilling or additional training ,then we might be able to clean up the inherent apathy of plumbers trading and working without the skills and licences

### ***Call for simplification***

- Keep it simple. !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- The whole document has turned into a complete mess. It is so complicated you would need to be a lawyer to understand it. Simplify the system. You can do your apprenticeship sit certifying exam in 5 years, anyone knows you need time and experience in a trade .Because the pgdb changed the system a few years ago has cut people like myself out, or u expect me to sit exams after 35 years in the trade, it's a joke, you got it wrong big time. Plus a business paper before you can trade as a plumber is out of date when anyone can start any company because you must go through an accountant, I myself look after services in a large factory and contractors, I show people how to do things, yet I need to be supervised if I repair, replace a potable water line for example, yet some someone that only has 5 years in trade can be my supervisor is wrong. You have made a situation where if you are good at reading, sitting exams, you are good enough to be a plumber; well I have news for you. I do agree with up skilling every year with cpd points.

### ***Overseas people***

- PLEASE recognise UK Plumbers and Gasfitters! My personal experience after 8 years working in NZ is that the Boards negative attitude towards UK trained people is totally unjustified!
- “Over the last 17 years I have been in business I have employed many persons from overseas who gained residency on the strength of their qualification only to have the qualification not recognised by the PGDB. Moreover the pathways to registration are so onerous they are in fact a barrier to obtaining a license. The approach taken by successive Registrar is oppressive and downright unfair and detrimental to these people.

I find this appalling and a breach of a person basic rights to be heard. The board need to bring into practice a practical examination of a person's skill set in the workplace. These people have language problems not practical skill problems.

Yet because the board can't assess a bit of paper they are deemed as not suitable. This approach is arrogant and insulting. The tradesmen we employ do not sit in offices looking at paper they are in the field installing pipes and fittings.

It smacks of hypocrisy that some rule made by a person sitting in an ivory tower far removed from the reality of the real world denies wonderfully skilled

people from a pathway because a piece of paper doesn't match what the board wants.

The board has to understand a bit of paper from Unitec or from Germany is absolutely worthless unless you have the practical skills to back it up. Yet the board provides no pathway to assess practical qualifications.

It is ironic that the board in Wellington wants bits of paper yet the industry wants skilled tradesman. It is a disconnect that the PGDB has yet to grasp or rectify.

On this note the PDGB is in breach of the act of preventing harm arising to the public.

Because the Board has put such onerous and difficult processes in place to try and become registered, the resultant outcome of this is that the overseas tradesmen are now working unlicensed and unsupervised in the industry.

Therefore the PGDB is inadvertently breaching the intention of the act by forcing suitably trained individuals to work in the industry

The PGDB can't bring out the argument that the rules of supervision apply and therefore the supervisors are responsible. Whilst this is a technical argument it is not a practical one.

If there can be demonstrated that the rules are being thwarted and ignored on a daily basis then the rules are worthless and the will of parliament is not being enacted. This then sets the board up for a failure to administer its duty properly.

This is the nub of it, the rules and regulations have to work for the industry and reflect the situation that exists as it is on the ground."

### ***Training related***

- As about ten years ago 1st qual 2nd qual tradecert advanced trade worked for years don't see why it had to change.
- Please get this right this time. I started my plumbing career at a time when it seemed the board went out of its way to ensure it limited the amount of future plumbers. There seems to be a generation of plumbers who never got to certifying level. Now that the exams realistic, why would you want to break it into different skill sets? Check how many registered plumbers there are that could start up in business if you changed the requirement. This would mean you wouldn't have break up the skill level.
- I do not want to see a return to the days when you go to polytec finish your apprenticeship and you are a registered plumber. There needs to be a set exam to test knowledge and skills I think an assessment of practical work should also be undertaken
- The pathway under section 52 is woefully inadequate...
- I want to see the trades of Plumbing and Gasfitting, remaining whole. I see any splitting up, of the trade skills, as being a weakening of standards and the people that will be doing this work. If you can't get the qualification to do the whole job, then you don't belong to this industry.

- If you look back over my file I have raised these issues several times and it pains me to see that you don't listen or make allowances yet you choose to make I understand 3 engineers certifiers who have never been in the trade. I have applied under section 53 to have my case heard and you declined not even recognising that I had done a 10,000 hours apprenticeship and saying that I was only a time served plumber as that of a journeyman.
- I don't feel the two year period between first licensing and being able to become certified is relevant in many scenarios
- Still make it difficult to get certifying as we want this trade to strive in this country and be the best it can be
- I believe the ability to sit your examination whilst still training as an apprentice has been removed.  
For a very long time if you were doing your apprenticeship you were entitled to sit your exams at any time and once your time was served your results of time served and exams would allow you to become registered.

This was a great system for the following reason.

The ultimate aim of all our systems should be for all our trainees to end up certifying.

Any barriers that we put in the way of achieving this should be removed.

Here is the practical way it plays out.

As a young person doing training, you get stuck into it, in your third year your apprenticeship is coming to an end, you are on top of your studies and if you work at it you could pass the examinations at the end of the year, then next year you only have to finish your time and you are finished.

Then if you are motivated you can keep your studies up the next year and sit our certifying examinations. This means you can finish your time and keep doing your hours and you will be certified.

The amount of staff I have seen who give up after the registration exam, the attitude is now I have to get registered and that takes months and is expensive. When they finally do get registered they are then out of the mode of study and it never happens.

There are some key reasons why this happens, a lot of the lads are still living at home when doing their apprenticeships, if they can stay at home they can complete their studies.

When these lads move out of home, they then have the pressure of work life and often social life becomes a priority.

If the focus of the industry is too make it easy to do your examinations this can only be good for the industry which is good for the public.

As a general rule there should be no restrictions at when or who can sit the examinations. (The only restriction being that you must be in the industry or on a pathway to registration)

We want to encourage everyone to train and learn and make it possible to get to certifying.

### ***Miscellaneous***

- Demerit points should be introduced for plumbing employers that break the employment relations act or acting in any illegal way in the interest of profits over safety and professional work. These points should be displayed on the plumbers' board website. (maybe)?
- Better record keeping. We often get guys returning from overseas applying for jobs with us who have done their apprenticeship and want to renew their license and /or sit exams but can't get past go.
- Gas servicemen must have their electrical technician's ticket and this should be made more public. There should be a restriction from repairs to appliances or equipment if you do not have it.

- I remember well the events leading up to the introduction of the Plumbers, Gasfitters and Drainlayers Act 2006 in 2010 ("the current Act"). The implementation of the current Act started in 2007; the Registrar and the Board at that time conducted its first public consultation. However, in January 2008, the administration and Ministerial responsibility transferred from the Ministry of Health to the Department of Building and Housing (DBH). Accordingly, DBH officials advised the Board that its previous consultation was flawed and that further consultation was required to gather more in-depth input from a wider group of stakeholders. In July 2009 the Board re-consulted as instructed.

A back drop to this intervention was the deteriorating relationship between the Board and its Chief Executive/Registrar which culminated in the Board suspending that individual in October 2009.

These factors had a tremendous effect on the time frame in which the new 2006 Act was to be implemented and any meaningful input from stakeholders. In fact the easiest means to ensure the new 2006 Act came into effect on time was to change very little and utilise where possible elements already used in the former 1976 Act.

The 2006 Act was implemented on time but not without controversy, some of which the Board has had to deal with as a result of actions of some of its stakeholders, by seeking Parliament's intervention to change the law on occasion or to seek changes to its *Gazette* Notices. This all largely reflects the unrealistic time constraints and lack of support afforded to the Board by officials in DBH in the months leading up to the Acts go live date of 1 April 2010.

Whilst I applaud the Board for providing the opportunity to comment on classes of registration and the current use of exemptions, I still feel that largely the 2006 Act itself undermines any attempt to regulate the trade effectively because, putting it quite bluntly, the legislation is an ass, and stymies any attempt to rectify legitimately its various incongruous impositions, some of which I will outline in my responses.

## **Federation**

“The Federation made a number of further suggestions and comments which can be seen in the attached submission. They can briefly be summarised as follows:

- They disapprove of the large numbers of exemptions
- They ask when does a trainee cease to be a trainee
- They criticise the exemption for householders
- They question the legality of and the wisdom of the exemption under supervision
- They suggest practicing licences of up to 5 years.
- They question the legality of the existing cpd scheme.
- They consider that ongoing competence, knowledge and skills should not be linked to relicensing.
- They question the difficulty overseas qualified people face entering the industry.
- They are critical of the governance provided by the Board.”

## **Master Plumbers**

“Registration and licensing could be simplified through the use of a Code of Compliance as a statutory requirement for every plumbing and drainlaying job in New Zealand; the same model that is currently in place in the electrical and gasfitting industries.

The issue of non-licensing, too many exemption holders and deferred registration is due in part to the present fee structure used by the PGD Board. The high cost of fees is partly responsible for tradespersons not registering themselves or avoiding registration classes they do not need for business purposes, but nevertheless use in their day-to-day work. MPGD would urge the PGDB to look again at the higher than reasonable cost of compliance in the industry and consider ways to significantly reduce this.

The use of exemptions is a growing trend, especially for those for whom English is a second language. It appears that the PBGB does not support the educational needs of ESOL learners through the provision of reader/writers or through the provision of examination texts in a variety of languages. MPGD is concerned that the legitimate needs of ESOL learners are being ignored and would strongly suggest that the PGDB provide learning and examination services that would assist those learners achieve licensed status.

There were also a number of other questions and comments about the proposed review, and about unrelated matters. These can be viewed in the individual submissions.”

### **13. Other issues for the Board to consider**

The Board didn't ask any specific questions about the following issues and although the consultation document mentioned them there was very little feedback about them.

### 13.1 **Removal of pathways to registration**

A number of pathways to registration set out in the current Gazette Notices were included to provide for transitions from earlier regulatory schemes. In particular:

- The five year pathway that requires a person to have held a limited certificate under the 1976 Act for five years, or for three years under the 1976 Act and then to have worked under a section 19,21, or 25 exemption for two years (plus pass the relevant examination),
- The pathway that requires a plumber or gasfitter to have completed the third stage block course in the other trade (plus pass the relevant examination) to be registered in the other trade.

These pathways are now generally redundant and should be removed from the Gazette Notices. If there are still people who would have qualified for registration under the transitional provisions, they would need to apply for an exemption under s52 of the Act to achieve registration, if the transitional provisions are removed from the Gazette Notices.

There was one comment received about this issue:

- “The pathways to registration set out in the *Gazette* Notices need to be updated. In particular the transitional sections from earlier regulatory schemes.  
The five year pathway is no longer relevant as those who wished to transition should have by now.  
The pathway that requires a plumber or gasfitter to have completed the third stage block course in the other trade (plus pass the relevant examination) to be registered in the other trade.  
Exemption under section 52 of the 2006 Act provides a means to achieve registration, therefore these provisions in the *Gazette* Notices are redundant.”

### 13.2 **Provisional licence holders**

In some circumstances, provisional licences are issued to people who are waiting to complete registration requirements. The group most commonly issued provisional licences are overseas trained tradespeople.

Provisional licence holders are generally under the supervision of a certifying tradesperson and operate in a similar way to a licensed level tradesperson. Provisional licences are not intended as a long term form of authorisation but sometimes a person will hold a provisional licence for more than one year.

Section 30 of the Act provides that the Board can prescribe requirements for the completion of competence programmes for people who hold or apply for provisional licences. Currently the Board does not do so. This means that provisional licence holders do not have the same requirement to undertake ongoing training to maintain their competence.

There are a number of ways that competence programmes for provisional licence holders could be established including:

- Requiring provisional licence holders/applicants to comply with the Board's standard continuing professional development requirements.
- Developing an alternative competence programme, for example one that needed to be completed before a provisional licence is issued for the first time.

There was one comment received about this issue:

- "I understand that in most cases a provisional licence is issued for a year to an overseas trained person while they work towards their registration. I am not in favour of the individuals being subjected to the current continuing professional development regime registered practitioners are currently subjected to as outlaid in question 8.

However, I think a specific competence programme that targets areas such as compliance, the industry structure and legislation would be beneficial, given that they may indeed be proficient in undertaking the practical aspects of their trade but certainly would not have the appropriate knowledge in areas I have highlighted. For instance, New Zealand is one of the only countries in the world that has a performance based building."

### 13.3 ***Recognition of overseas qualifications***

Section 31(1) (d) of the Act provides that one way the Board can prescribe minimum standards for registration is by recognising registration with, or a licence issued by, an overseas organisation that performs functions similar to those performed by the Board.

The Board does not currently recognise any overseas registration or licence, other than through the Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition Act 1997 (TTMRA).

While the Gazette notices provide that a person applying for registration on the basis of an overseas qualification may seek recognition from the New Zealand Qualification's Authority that their qualification is equivalent to a particular New Zealand standard, there are no overseas qualifications that are automatically recognised as equivalent within the Gazette Notices.

Should the Board recognise specific overseas registration or licences (other than through the TTMRA) as satisfying the competence aspect of its minimum standards for registration?

Should the Board recognise specific overseas qualifications as being equivalent to a particular New Zealand minimum standard?

Such recognition would make registration options much clearer for both applicants and the Board.

The cost of assessing qualifications from the United Kingdom and South Africa to determine which of those could be recognised as minimum standards of registration is estimated to be \$28,000.

There was one comment received about this issue:

- “The Board currently relies on the NZQA to assess overseas trained tradespeople. In doing so this provides a seamless process that is instep with Immigration New Zealand’s processes for issuing work visas and residency. As the past has demonstrated, the Board, when it had its own assessment processes was often portrayed as being out of step with the immigration process. I fear that by the Board carrying out its own recognition process of overseas qualifications that it will find itself repeating past mistakes.

I am also opposed to such a process due to the costs involved and the likelihood that keeping up to date with each country’s qualification equivalency will prove to be an ongoing cost.”