

Compulsory Purchase Association

Notes of Special General Meeting 22 February 2016

Note prepared by Rebecca Clutton, Francis Taylor Building

(Due to the speed of the original proceedings, it has not been possible to produce a completely verbatim note. Where it was not possible to record the words used, the note-taker sought to record the message)

Speaker	Comment
RICHARD GUYATT - CHAIR	<p>The Chair introduction. set out the background to the QI process. Further work ceased following the request for the SGM being received.</p> <p>As Chair, RG is neutral on the QI Proposal. He has made no decision about QI, positive or negative. Although he has in the past voted on a few occasions for the process to continue, since the call for the SGM both he and PM have abstained from votes and substantive discussion.</p> <p>The SGM was meeting to assist the membership in forming a view on QI. Views were to be recorded and a note taken.</p>
PHILIP MAUDE - HON. SEC.	<p>This is the 1st SGM - there was no precedent.</p> <p>Attendees have seen the letter from Richard Asher which sets out the purpose of the meeting. The Committee reflected on the call for further consideration of QI, and proposed that the QI ought to be put to a whole membership vote.</p> <p>The Committee has discussed with Richard Asher the basis for proceeding and collectively they had agreed two proposed resolutions.</p> <p>Resolution 1 ('R1') is for an e-vote of the whole membership. This will [amongst other advantages described] give people the opportunity to take time to consider the proposals before voting.</p> <p>Resolution 2 (R2) is intended to be the issue that is put to the e-vote.</p> <p>It has been decided that, following the debate, there will be a vote on Resolution 2 as originally put. The vote will be a vote of the meeting and NOT the whole membership. It will not be binding but the vote will be recorded and notified to the wider membership to help inform the QI debate – this being a specific request of Richard Asher, which the Chair and Hon Sec were happy to agree to.</p> <p>R2 has been drafted to seek a direction for the QI group on the nature of the proposal to put to the membership, if QI is to proceed. . It makes clear that a vote in favour of R2 'in principle' does not preclude a member from voting against the detail. There is a safeguard of a second vote once the membership have the worked up detail of the accreditation scheme.</p>

	<p>The CPA is a voluntary organisation and people give up a lot of time to work on these matters. The Committee does not want to out in that time if membership is not interested in accreditation.</p> <p>Statements for and against the proposal will be on the website and provided to the membership when the matter is put to the e-vote.</p>
Richard Asher	<p>Statement:</p> <p>I called this SGM along with 28 other members because the announcement of the proposal for an accreditation scheme announced at the AGM as the Tony Johnson memorial lecture raised genuine concerns. As a founder member of the CPA, and a former chairman I have very great regard for the CPA and what it stands for. It has achieved great things: It has become a very well respected organisation with members who represent the finest professionals in Compulsory Purchase and compensation; it has the ear of government on CPO matters, something I do not think we expected when we first started over 15 years ago; it has created a thriving Young Members group to ensure that us oldies do not have things entirely our own way.</p> <p>I support R1. The issue is so important that the whole of the membership must vote on it. It is also important to have a debate with both sides of the argument put to the membership.</p> <p>Re R1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Both sides of the debate need to be heard - We need to ensure the e-vote is conducted properly so all can vote in a proper manner <p>Re R2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I intend to vote against this - the Working Group produced a detailed plan but seem now to have departed from that - was it because of significant opposition? - To be a CPA member, you already have to be a member of other professions. They all have their own entry requirements, cpd, qualifications etc - It is also a key ethical requirement that a person have sufficient experience to act. If a person is in breach of those rules, they should expect to be subject to their disciplinary body's procedures. - I don't see how the CPA can fill that role - RICS is looking into whether it should take further action regarding CPO accreditation. - The CPA is not the right organisation to accredit the wide range of disciplines it represents - c. 18 separate professions are eligible to join. That is a vast requirement in terms of cost/time to have separate

	<p>assessments for each.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Much of the support against accreditation has come from the legal and other professions. - The CPA committee, taken aback by the opposition and criticism have said they can produce an acceptable scheme - That is not my point. I do not think it should be involved in accreditation of any kind. - I would ask you to vote against R2 if you agree.
Henry Church	<p>Statement:</p> <p>CPO is one of the most catastrophic events in property terms. Accreditation should be an opportunity for a route map to knowledge and experience.</p> <p>Purchasers of our service, who only buy once, should be able to buy with confidence.</p> <p>Doing nothing is not an option. There is little education at undergraduate and postgraduate level.</p> <p>Some say we should leave it to the RICS. Pleased to say that they are now doing something and showing an interest. But I still think we need to take it further: we need a kite mark.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RA has misinterpreted R2 [. If R1 is passed, but R2A not passed, what would the question to members be? - Regarding the criticisms of changing our mind - we have listened to consultation.
Richard Asher	Happy to support R1 and the question in R2A but would vote against R2
Marnix Elsinaar	Isn't R2 conflating two issues? [Missed detail]
Henry Church	<p>The proposal is ask the membership to vote on principle.</p> <p>If there is support for the principle, detailed proposals will come forward.</p> <p>Then there would be a further vote on the detailed proposals.</p>
	<p>Vote put</p> <p>R1: Resolution carried by a large majority, no count was needed.</p> <p>R2A: For - 26; Against - 35. Resolution lost.</p>
Virginia Blackman ('VB')	<p>Proposes</p> <p>"I agree to the principle of the CPA investigating further a voluntary scheme of accreditation, which will be subject to a future vote of the CPA membership"</p>
Emmanuel Pitman ('EP')	Why does it say 'voluntary'?
RICHARD GUYATT - CHAIR	My understanding is that the scheme is voluntary. It would be up to the individual practitioner whether or not they join. The standards board would sit outside the CPA.

	<p>Resolution proposed in the same form proposed by VB:</p> <p>"I agree to the principle of the CPA investigating further a voluntary scheme of accreditation, which will be subject to a future vote of the CPA membership"</p> <p>Vote taken. Passed. by a large majority that meant there was no need for a show of hands against.</p>
	Debate opens.
Roger Bedson, Hinson Parry ('RB')	<p>Two points</p> <p>1. Examinations - the CAAV experience is that lots of members spend a lot of voluntary time running exams. This would be a quantum leap for the CPA. Who are those exams aimed at? I would worry it would be difficult to set exams suitable for all.</p> <p>2. Disciplinary measures - feedback is that professional bodies have their own procedures and members do not need more red tape.</p>
Henry Church	<p>We will be focussing on these areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a retired member of the CAAV, i know how much effort went into exams. As such CPA were minded to put exams out to another body, e.g. College of Estate Management - We are looking at exams in principle. Thinking also about an application and interviews. - We don't want to exclude people who should want to join. - Accept other bodies take sanctions but if you are running an accreditation scheme, you must have some sanctions.
Duncan Field	<p>I have a more fundamental issue. I thought the CPA was a networking association not a consumer protection/regulatory body.</p> <p>This has the whiff of a cartel about it. I wonder if the Committee has taken competition advice?</p>
Henry Church	<p>We are cognisant of this issue too. This is not a cartel. It's voluntary. You will be able to practice if you are not accredited. E.g. the CAAV.</p> <p>It's about giving people a ladder to knowledge and demonstrating a differential.</p>
Emmanuel Pitman	There might be discrimination in the market against those who choose not to be accredited.
RICHARD GUYATT - CHAIR	We take Duncan's point and will consider it.
Ian McCullough, BDB	From 'voluntary', I had inferred I could join the CPA and then seek to be accredited or not. Will accreditation be an entry requirement for the CPA?
Henry Church	No obligation for CPA members to be accredited.
DB	Is there recourse to the CPA if a purchaser of a service is failed by an accredited person?
HC	Don't believe so. It would be like an MOT - a person was satisfactory on the day of their assessment. The CPA not responsible if that changes after.

David Baker	Then what's the point of accreditation?
Henry Church	No different to being a chartered surveyor. RICS doesn't carry the can if at a later date I fail as a chartered surveyor. My PI takes the hit.
Mark Henderson, Cushman & Wakefield	Working up detail will be a challenge given the broad church that is the CPA. Working up an exam that applies to all professions will be difficult.
Henry Church	That is a valid point, which is why we are not looking at a one size fit all approach. Each profession would have to manage its own standards within the overall umbrella. I can't see the Bar doing it. Not clear if sols and planners would.
Richard Asher	There are potentially 18 different routes of entry which is the point of my argument.
PHILIP MAUDE - HON. SEC.	Requests a show of hands for the question - Should accreditation involve an exam? Concluded that more hands were against than for.
James Dewey, Cushman and Wakefield	Is the scheme just for surveyors at this stage?
Henry Church	Yes
	So why is this going to a vote for all?
Henry Church	Have thought about this. But it's because it's an issue of principle.
Virginia Blackman	So if we are looking at this as an issue of principle, the committee can't simply drop this after the surveyor process is established
Henry Church	I take the point and will take it on board.
Marnix Elsinaar	How would solicitors be accredited as CPO advisors? It can't be silo-d off in that way. Take a regen scheme - this will involve advising on matters other than CPO. The same point applies to DCOs.
Henry Church	Some lawyers might do more CPO, some might do less. Some might see value in accreditation.
RICHARD GUYATT - CHAIR	The QI team have not looked at legal accreditation at this time
James del Mar, Knight Frank	Are we getting hung up on accreditation or are we simply seeking something that helps us stand out?
HC	The latter is what we are looking for.
Virginia Blackman	Following the AGM I am pleased how much time the CPA and working group has taken. But I wonder how much work has been done on how to achieve the objectives in a different way? That has certainly not been discussed with the wider membership. Could the Committee and working group think about this in the context of outreach?
Kate Russell	The CAAV perspective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our members are nearly all RICS - The only barrier to entry of the CAAV is an exam - No competition issues ever raised - Our members see value in differentiating themselves - Recently approached by Northern Ireland body who see the value in accreditation - It works for us and I would be happy to talk to others
Roger Bedson	I suggested workshops/seminars or 1/2 day, dealing with a case study.

	In effect, a high-powered tutorial with cross profession representation. This would bring the professions together. I would find it valuable. Maybe this could be a route to accreditation? Probably better than an interview.
Emmanuel Pitman	Have costs been considered?
Henry Church	Yes. Should not be onerous. Once it is set up costs should not be high. Would be disappointed if it was anywhere near RICS valuer costs. This is not a money making exercise.
Richard Asher	What is the CAAV subscription cost
Kate Russell	£300+ [NB precise figure missed]
David Van der Lande	Any member of the public can report people falling short of their professions standards to the relevant professional association - couldn't the CPA do the same?
Henry Church	Nothing stops the CPA referring
David Van der Lande	Couldn't CPA better act as a policemen, rather than setting up a whole new system? Also the position on costs of administering the scheme seems naive.
Richard Asher	Expresses support for David Van der Lande's view on policing.
Henry Church	Take the point.
	Chairman confirmed no one had any more comments they wishes to air. No more comments forthcoming.
PHILIP MAUDE - HON. SEC.	Put revised Res 2 (as follows) to a vote. "I agree to the principle of the CPA investigating further a voluntary scheme of accreditation, which will be subject to a future vote of the CPA membership" It was confirmed that the vote is not binding but that RA has asked and the Committee has agreed to communicate the outcome of this vote to the membership when it takes its vote. For - 35. Against - 28. Resolution carried for the purpose of the meeting only.