

Stakeholders Workshop 14 November 2017

Warren Haynes: Awards Programme Restructure – Celebration of Excellence

Impediments:

- Head down, bum up syndrome – surveyors are quiet achievers and client feedback is more important to them
- Need client buy-in, eg, must allow their project to be publicised
- Local awards bring better exposure eg chamber awards
- Lost time, small businesses harder hit, eg, less able to let one of two staff take part
- Clarity of requirements re categories, eg, day-to-day works may seem unworthy of recognition
- Existing awards tailored to 'old NZIS'.
- Awareness that they still exist
- Absence of constant reminders
- Timing, start of work season
- Value proposition: public profile etc
- Awards not high profile enough.

Motivation:

- Company attitude
- Branches with good levels of activity will discuss awards but time factors involved.
- Status of organisation issuing the awards is important
- Need better recognition of individual awards over company awards
- Encourage more members to take part
- Need low effort to enter

What turns heads?

- A project that is out of the ordinary which can built momentum
- Need more recognition of projects like that needed through the industry and publicised, using social media etc.

Encouragement to raise profile

- Use branch structures to publicise it to members
- Need financial benefit; link with commercial sponsors
- Have awards at conference, not AGM
- Need pomp and ceremony
- Publicity of award winners and exam successes
- Could have separate surveying and spatial awards, but not too many.
- Framework needs to be clear for members, clear criteria for categories.

- More surveyor related entries
- Surveyors not self-promotional types so have a panel to look at jobs being discussed around branches to put forward
- Must be high profile
- Sponsor for awards
- Better publicity with feature of award winning projects in public arena.
- Surveyors (quiet achievers) need to be seen in the context of raising the industry generally rather than just self-promotion and get behind them.

RPSurv Certification – John Hannah

Preamble: Master-trainee relationship. Little professional accountability. A marked difference in levels of competencies of trainees signed off has been evident. It is an issue (an ethical issue?) If limited to just the sign-off, not so serious, but if linked to a trading agreement, then it is a big problem.

(is this outside the certification of the person trying to be a master surveyor?)

1. Diff titles, diff competencies and path (3-year degree minimum) RPSurv in a specific area.

Ongoing competence and testing. We move into different areas and to retain that status even if it no longer relates to the work we do, do we have to get retested? And changes within your own PD?

Q1: P& M capability across all streams except spatial. Does this define a surveyor? Core competency?

The P&M post - nominal needs to be there but another needed for another group of people, eg, Chris Crook at LINZ, IT guys etc so another category needed. Split into 2? GIS has to disappear. It's about spatial? P&M need to define competencies then spatial can define theirs.

If P&M is included in each stream, why is it separate, not just part of each. So: Some people's competency is P&M so RPSurv (no name)?

Q2: Separate stream for planning?

- Easier to sell if you go to councils to separate it out from engineering.
- Planning, engineering, surveying, three separate professions.
- Draft planning competences in document need to be expanded (a separate stream). Who would spell out those? No response.

Two quite different areas. but separate streams may be too diluting. A separate Land Dev stream? When we go to council, having RPSurv (Land Dev) will add status. In terms of the columns, maybe need 2 separate columns, regardless.

Q3. URISA GIS accreditation?

We believe it should be kept at 3 years if you start putting knowledge and competency together, the lines become blurred

Q4. Equity and PD reporting process?

Yes, must be accommodated. And there's others that will have to be considered too.

Q5. Grandparenting?

Short answer yes but with qualifiers. Must show relevancy and must ensure that RPSurv (Cadastral) are still actively practicing in that area. Timeframes for complaints, etc must be shorter for RPSurvs.

No, no grandparenting. it devalues it like the current RPSurv. Must be recertificated. If professional interviews already done, then a recertification process.

(Document has a recertification process – does this meet concerns?)

General discussion:

Mark Allan asked about business managers signing off projects who have the experience but not necessarily the current competencies. Dropping of RPSurv not intended but may end up with just as RPSurv (no name).

- Could it tie in with CSNZ as the RPSurv (no name) body?

IPENZ problems with CPENZ: how do we know that people are still working in those areas?

Need to be really clear about professional v technical competencies.

Exam Panel perspective: how do students choose their stream early on? Initially become LCS and RPSurv(cad). Test for Land Dev will be higher.

Have to go to 5 separate panels? No different to now.

Are we going to stuff up by pigeonholing ourselves? Need multiple sign-offs. Do we drop post-nominals and just hold an internal register of titles/competencies? TAs need to be able to check competencies.

Don't drop the endorsement – waters down RPSurv. Once someone has passed the board requirements to be a cadastral surveyor, need more to be RPSurv (Cadastral). (Board reqs gone from 2-3 years, and project requirements in document).

For someone leaving university, is there a degree of crossover between cadastral and land development? Multi-disciplinary? Response: Not 6 years tertiary but must meet stream's requirements – time can be remitted.

LCS signing off young surveyor. How can that be tied in with better mentoring from NZIS? More robust transparent process needed.

Advocacy

Should NZIS advocate for early nationwide adoption of NZVD 2016?

Yes, should be January at the latest.

Yes, no-brainer, good opportunity for advocacy with local government and educating them.

Nelson/Tasman already there; Christchurch, Gisborne dragging their heels.

Unanimous acceptance.

LINZ relationship: Integrated property services, ASaTS, Surveyor-General – what are the key advocacy issues for NZIS with LINZ?

Should LINZ advocate for the institute?

Workable cadastral rules

Landonline issues need to be addressed before ASaTS introduced.

Lack of consistency with cadastral surveyors at LINZ.

Workshop in Kaikoura raised issues...

Professional standards outside cadastral; stewardship of data standards; technology should not override good survey practice.

Don't neglect Landonline while ASATS is being developed.

Data standards

What data standards matter?

National, machine control, council – referred to SCIRT process – a good thing to come out of the quakes and council now uses that standard.

Issues? – Too many different software suppliers, less consistency.

How to advocate – Find best existing tool, choose the best and take it to local govt.

Common approach needed – Councils have different requirements.

Data storage/TAs plans and how they present those important

Cost, quality, advocacy with TAs.

Lack of accuracy, consistency around engineering standards

Specialist area, public good so public agencies should hold that capability

Water standards – who captures it? is it reliable? Must be digital & open.

Should NZIS engage with NPS and what RM problem areas are there?

Big yes to NPS

People processing our applications generally don't understand the commercial side of it; too much emphasis on the 20 days; TAs writing rules outside of the RMA.

Different interpretations of rules, district plans are unwieldy.

Change of Govt = special housing legislation up in air, RMA recent changes likely to be changed again.

National environmental standards: contamination might be an issue, streamlining of Act didn't work.

Submissions on Urban Development Authority: Big disjoint between central and local govt; vastly different plans, hard to get consistency.

Practical aspects and outcome-based results have been lost.

How should NZIS support local action?

Facilitate discussion on what are local and national issues.

Standard presentations for local members

Branch workshops to thrash out issues

Talk to Planning Institute; NZIS needs to push central govt to allow the implementation of a national policy for generic planning issues then allow local issues to be worked through on that level.

Coordinate submissions with National Office involvement.

What is happening that NZIS is not advocating or delivering on?

Gisborne branch wants NZIS to formulate a generic letter to go to LAs to outline surveyors' longstanding special skills in resource consent applications, subdivisions and land dev engineering to counter the erosion of the acknowledgment of their skills.

Raising the profile of surveyors, re control of projects: Nationally, use Google Ad words to promote NZIS; have something in the councils with NZIS logo etc.

Stronger advocacy from National Office with the Law Society re cross leases etc., especially in Canterbury and Auckland – a big problem. Real estates as experts in this is rubbish

Specific group of upper level NZIS reps need to do roadshow around LAs to streamline and speed up processes.

Education: Standard website with pathways for individual streams for tertiary students; more support for women in spatial, eg mentoring, more relevant material, meetings; advocacy on BIM....

Info for Stakeholders – Comms, PR, CPD, conference, support to branches

Communications, PR

Do you think NZIS communicates too little, too much, about right?

Otago branch thinks it's about right. Suggests putting more on website and sending out an email every one or two months alerting members to key articles on the site. They also had suggestions about updating the website. It is not the frequency but the quality of the comms that matter. Bombarded with too many on CPD which may mean other communications get lost amongst them. Maybe CPD information should be going out to relevant streams only. Notification/reminders about dates of CEO Connect or Surveying the Scene would give branches time to organise meetings to discuss the items in them.

Also about the quality, enjoy face-to-face discussions. Website: if we looked more of an intranet feel, more current, more people might use it as their home page. Lots comes from CEO but not so much from streams, work groups, Board and Council.

Manawatu: More visits from councillors and stream reps to revitalise the branch. Work their way around the branches. Face to face is a little light at branch level.

How can we communicate better?

Rather than lots of individual emails, a periodic email with links to various articles, info etc would be better.

Make more use of branches which should have direct links to Council. President to front up to branches every two years. (West Coast, Gisborne). Personal rather than electronic contact preferred.

Stop calling it NZ Institute of Surveyors if you want spatial to engage, an online forum for questions for discussions.

Develop a blog for smartphones, with it also on website, rather than clogging up inbox. Streamline social media, combine all streams.

Comms with stakeholders and public

LINZ: About right

Local Govt, TAS: Too little

IPENZ: About right

Legal: Don't know

Spatial: About right

Architects: Don't know

General public: Too little.

We don't have enough visibility with general public. Missed opportunity with earthquakes and role of surveyors.

Too little; lost opportunities; not having a clear story to tell. What do you want us to talk about?

Public: Way too little. Surveyor standing by the roadside with a theodolite. status needs elevating to a professional level, eg lawyer, doctor.

Why should NZIS communicate. Then we can look at how? Do you want to drive knowledge? business?

Get a spokesperson who is the long-term face of NZIS beyond the term of a president. Message must be coordinated.

Got to develop relationship with stakeholders, public. Make surveying 'sexy' again.

Media training of key people.

'Daisy chaining' with other partners, eg Diamond Partners, so social media is more saturated, unified message.

Re FIG last year: you need to be way quicker with info. NZIS needs more advice about social media.

Key messages

Should be around technical capabilities linked to society, the economy – how land underpins world economy; highlighting our role in high-profile events, eg, Waterview Tunnel, earthquakes.

We are a professional body, build clients' confidence

cf: Master Builder Brand – make a video of what we do (good news story?)

Public awareness

Not doing enough. We have a new Green minister. Disconnect for surveyors. We are not part of the discussion around housing and we should play a bigger role

We need better stories. Need to use journalists to deliver professional product.

52% say NZIS are doing a good job but it's probably really only 14% as most would tick Box 3.

What do good comms look like?

Exciting, relevant, timely lot of pictures (a photo competition?)

Needs to have an objective, don't put up 'noise', define areas of expertise, extra skill sets required.

Accessibility especially for people outside the industry, eg on the marae, with young people. Get message across that surveying is for everyone.

Being seen as a thought leader, timely comms, repurposing information for different avenues, eg website, LinkedIn etc.

Videos, 2min-5min, little bulletin updates.

CPD/Training

Kudos for Auckland Engineering Stream event which got a lot of traction – more similar events needed
Provinces/regions – not enough people but still want more face-to-face time. Webinars are effective – need to iron out technical glitches.

Urban v rural needs

Conference: Make it more technical, with parallel practical sessions, outdoors event

Urban/rural: travel constraints for provinces, too much time to get there, topics probably better received in rural

Events such as conferences need to be sold to employers – create a business case for them so they will release YPs to attend.

Mentoring session for YPs at conference

YP-themed conference in big centre, specialised YP training events, social events.

Support for branches

Hard to get young people to step up, survey firms, CSNZ members need to attend meetings as eg for YPs

Manawatu branch: Board, Council members to attend to attract people to meetings. Role from National Office – give branch leaders more help, arrange NZIS people to attend meetings.

Marlborough: 5 min video of something topical. putting names to faces

Add CPD topic to each branch meeting to attract people

Waikato – need more support from senior members, CSNZ

Relying on branches to contact councillors but councillors should be assigned branches that they are to liaise with, and if they can't attend a meeting, at least report back.

Branches quite disjointed. Auckland v Canterbury doing v different things. Run an annual get-together for branch leaders to compare notes.

Voluntary organisation. Do councillors have the time? Happy to pay more fees for better liaison with Council, Board etc

Info on running meetings etc – it's all there, members should not expect to be spoon-fed. A comms issue to make the info more palatable.