Consultation submission form

Licensed Building Practitioners Regime

Supervision, licence classes and minimum standards of competence

# How to submit this form

This form is for feedback on proposals in the discussion document *Licensed Building Practitioners Regime – Supervision, licence classes and minimum standards of competence*.

When completing this submission form, please provide comments and reasons for your views. Your feedback provides valuable information to help the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) think about how to respond to the issues raised.

**You can submit this form by 5pm, 31 May 2021 by:**

* Email to: building@mbie.govt.nz with subject line ‘LBP consultation 2021’

Or

* post to:

Building Policy

Building, Resources and Markets

Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment

PO Box 1473

**Use of information**

The information provided in submissions will be used to inform MBIE’s policy development process, and will inform advice to Ministers on the Licensed Building Practitioner scheme. We may contact submitters directly if we require clarification of any matters in submissions.

**Release of information**

MBIE intends to upload PDF copies of submissions received to MBIE’s website at www.building.govt.nz. MBIE will consider you to have consented to uploading by making a submission, unless you clearly specify otherwise in your submission.

If your submission contains any information that is confidential or you otherwise wish us not to publish, please:

• indicate this on the front of the submission, with any confidential information clearly marked within the text

• provide a separate version excluding the relevant information for publication on our website.

Submissions remain subject to request under the Official Information Act 1982. Please set out clearly in the cover letter or e-mail accompanying your submission if you have any objection to the release of any information in the submission, and in particular, which parts you consider should be withheld, together with the reasons for withholding the information. MBIE will take such objections into account and will consult with submitters when responding to requests under the Official Information Act 1982.

**Private information**

The Privacy Act 2020 establishes certain principles with respect to the collection, use and disclosure of information about individuals by various agencies, including MBIE. Any personal information you supply to MBIE in the course of making a submission will only be used for the purpose of assisting in the development of policy advice in relation to this review. Please clearly indicate in the cover letter or e-mail accompanying your submission if you do not wish your name, or any other personal information, to be included in any summary of submissions that MBIE may publish.

# Submitter information

MBIE would appreciate if you would provide some information about yourself. If you choose to provide information in the “About you” section below it will be used to help MBIE understand the impact of our proposals on different occupational groups. Any information you provide will be stored securely.

1. About you

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Email address: |  |

1. Are you happy for MBIE to contact you if we have questions about your submission?

Yes  No

1. Are you making this submission on behalf of a business or organisation??

Yes  No

If yes, please tell us the title of your company/organisation.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. The best way to describe your role is (tick more than one if applicable)

Licensed building practitioner  Engineer (please specify below)

Non-LBP tradesperson (please specify)  Residential building owner

BCA/Building consent officer  Commercial building owner

Education/training/skills  Other (please specify below)

Designer (please specify below)  Prefer not to say

Please specify here.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# Supervision

|  |
| --- |
| Pages 21 to 24 of the discussion document talk about potential issues with supervision of LBPs. |

## Questions for the consultation

1. Do you believe that supervision is currently working as it should be? Why/why not? If not, what do you think can be done to improve it?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you believe that remote supervision is being carried out correctly? Are you aware of instances of it being abused? If so, what can be done to remove the risks that can occur when remote supervision is abused?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you believe that supervision of specialised non-LBPs is a problem within the sector? If so, what are the problems is causes?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you believe that supervision should only be available to certain LBPs? If so, what criteria should be used to decide if an LBP can supervise restricted building work?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you believe that the ability to supervise restricted building work needs to be addressed within the competencies?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# Licence classes

|  |
| --- |
| Pages 25 to 29 of the discussion document talk about reviewing the licence classes for the LBP scheme. |

## Questions for the consultation: do the current classes accurately reflect what needs to be regulated in the building industry?

1. Do you believe that specialised professions where members are not LBPs are being adequately monitored and operating correctly under the current scheme?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you believe any of the current classes no longer need to be covered by the LBP scheme? If so, why?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you think the classes can be expanded to include specialised professions, without resorting to adding a class for every profession? If so, how?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. What professions do you believe need to be covered by the LBP scheme that aren’t already? Why?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## Questions for the consultation: does the way areas of practice work result in substandard work?

1. Are you aware of instances where LBPs are operating in areas of practice within their licence class but outside of their competence level?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you believe that the way areas of practice operate should be amended? If so, how? What impact do you think amending the Area of Practice structure may have?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. What is your opinion on the way Site and Design areas of practice are separated (i.e. by building complexity)? Do you think this needs to change?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## Questions for the consultation: how can the Site Licence be improved?

1. Do you believe the building sector in New Zealand still needs the Site licence class?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Can the Site licence be amended to make it more useful or make the purpose clearer? If so, how?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Have you previously held a Site licence but chosen not to continue with it? If so, why?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. For current Site licence holders: How do you make your licence worthwhile? What methods do you use to promote it?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Are there ways that restricted building work and supervision can be added to the Site licence? If so, how?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. In what ways can responsibility be added to the class without the level of risk to the holder becoming too high?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## Questions for consultation: Is the LBP scheme too flat and should it offer more for experienced LBPs?

1. Do you believe that the LBP scheme should recognise those who have more experience in the industry? If so, how?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you believe that the LBP scheme should offer a tiered system to separate inexperienced LBPs from those with more experience? If so, how should it be set up?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you believe that a tiered licence would solve any issues? If so, what issues could it solve, and how?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# Minimum standards for entry and continued licensing

|  |
| --- |
| Pages 30 to 35 of the discussion document talk about minimum standards for entry and continued licensing. |

## Questions for the consultation

1. How well do you think the LBP scheme currently ensures new applicants and existing LBPs are sufficiently competent?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. What specific parts of the scheme do you think are driving low confidence?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Should we lift minimum standards of competence in the LBP Rules? What level should they be set at, are there particular gaps that need to be covered?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Should formal qualifications be required for anyone in the scheme? If they were required, are there any issues MBIE should take into account?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. How can assessment and skills maintenance requirements support confidence that practitioners meet minimum standards, and are keeping their skills and knowledge up to date?

|  |
| --- |
|  |