

RICS, Disciplinary, Registration and Appeal Panel Rules 2019

Part VI, Regulatory Tribunal Single Member Decision

Regulated Member: Kevin Ryall
Case Number: REG0000162889
Single Member Decision of: Gregory Hammond
Date of Decision: 28 February 2022

CHARGE:

The formal charge against the Regulated Member is:

“Between 1 January 2020 and 1 February 2021 you have failed to comply with RICS’ requirements in respect of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) in that you have not completed and recorded, or caused to be recorded, at least 20 hours of CPD on the RICS CPD portal.”

Contrary to Rule 6 of the Rules of Conduct for Members 2007

The Regulated Member is therefore liable to disciplinary action under Bye-law 5.2.2(c)

BACKGROUND

1. RICS Members are required to complete 20 hours of CPD activity by 31 December of each calendar year and record it, or cause it to be recorded.
2. Rule 6 of the Rules of Conduct for Members 2007 version 6 states: **Members shall comply with RICS’ requirements in respect of continuing professional development.**
3. The requirements of the Rules are as follows:
 - (i) All RICS members must undertake a minimum of 20 hours’ CPD each calendar year (January to December).
 - (ii) Of the 20 hours, at least 10 hours must be formal CPD. The remainder may be informal CPD.
 - (iii) All RICS members must maintain a relevant and current understanding of RICS professional and ethical standards during a rolling three-year period. Any learning undertaken in order to meet this requirement may count as formal CPD.
 - (iv) All members must record their CPD activity online by 31 January.
4. The CPD requirements confirm that for a first breach of this Rule the member would receive a fixed penalty caution which will remain on the member’s disciplinary record for a period of 10 years. A second breach will result in a further caution and a fixed penalty fine of £150 or equivalent. Non-payment of this fixed penalty within 28 days of notification will lead to the fine being increased to £250. A third CPD breach is likely to result in a referral to disciplinary proceedings.

FINDINGS OF FACT

5. I have been provided with a hearing bundle of 79 pages which includes a CPD printout from RICS' online system held for Mr Ryall and a witness statement from a CPD administrator.

6. I accept that if the printout does not contain an entry for a particular year, this indicates that no CPD was recorded for that year. There was no entry on Mr Ryall's CPD printout for the year 2020. I note that there is no evidence that Mr Ryall has applied for any RICS Exemption or Concession which would have allowed him to avoid that requirement.

7. Accordingly, I find the factual allegation proved based on the documentary evidence provided.

DECISION AS TO LIABILITY FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION

8. I am satisfied that the RICS' requirements to complete and record CPD are reasonable and that Mr Ryall's failure to comply with these requirements is sufficiently serious to give rise to a liability for disciplinary action. In reaching this decision, I have taken into account the fact that the CPD policy has been approved by the Regulatory Board and is expressly stated in RICS' Rules. In addition, the Sanctions Policy makes it clear that even a single breach of CPD requirements is sufficient to give rise to a liability for disciplinary action. I note that the purpose of the CPD requirements is to ensure that there are consistent standards within the profession and, further, that members maintain up to date knowledge in their areas of expertise in the interests of protecting the public and the wider public interest in maintaining confidence in the profession. I note that all members agree to adhere to the RICS Rules, Regulations and Bye-laws and accept that they may be subject to disciplinary action if they fail to do so. I am satisfied that Mr Ryall has been given every opportunity to comply with the CPD requirements.

9. Accordingly, I find that Mr Ryall is liable to disciplinary action.

SANCTION

10. I have borne in mind that the purpose of sanctions is not to be punitive, although they may have that effect. The purpose of sanctions is to declare and uphold the standards of the profession, to safeguard the reputation of the profession and of RICS as its regulator, and to protect the public. Sanctions must be proportionate, and my decision must take account of all the circumstances of the case including any aggravating and mitigating factors.

11. I have noted that, in addition to no hours' CPD being recorded by Mr Ryall for 2020, no hours were recorded for 2019 and only 3.5 hours for 2018. In each of the previous years for which records were provided, which were 2013 to 2017, Mr Ryall exceeded the minimum CPD hours.

12. I have taken into account the RICS Sanctions Policy and Mr Ryall's disciplinary history, which is as follows:

2018 – Caution

2019 – Caution and fine.

13. The case bundle sets out that Mr Ryall's RICS membership fees have been paid, but the disciplinary fine issued in 2020 for the 2019 breach remains outstanding.

14. In the evidence bundle RICS confirms that a minimum of five reminders were sent to the Regulated Member by email at regular intervals from November 2020, all of which contained the following paragraphs:

“All practising RICS members are required to complete at least 20 hours of CPD (including 10 hours of formal CPD) by 31 December 2020 and record it online by 31 January 2021.”

“Our records show that you have not yet recorded this minimum requirement. As per the RICS Rules of Conduct for Members and Sanction Policy, because you have already been in breach twice of the CPD Rules of Conduct for Members, and received a Fixed Penalty (Caution & Fine) within the last 10 years, if you do not complete and record the 2020 required minimum of 20 hours of CPD (including 10 hours of formal CPD), you may be in breach for the third time and therefore at risk of referral to Disciplinary Panel with presumption of expulsion.”

15. Evidence was provided that at least one of the emails from RICS to Mr Ryall’s nominated email address was not delivered. This email address, which ends ‘gov.je’, appears to be associated with Mr Ryall’s employment. However, a hard copy letter along the same lines was sent to Mr Ryall’s nominated postal address in May 2021. On 12 October 2021 the RICS investigator made telephone contact with the employer Mr Ryall was believed to work for, and they explained that Mr Ryall had retired in 2016 for health reasons; the investigator asked for a message to be passed to Mr Ryall to contact RICS urgently. Mr Ryall called the investigator himself on the same day and explained that *“he has not been working since 2016 due to medical issues”*. The investigator advised him that he had an option to apply for a concession and sent the application forms to a personal email address. There was no further contact from the Regulated Member, and another attempt by the investigator to call him on 1 November rang out without a facility to leave a voice message.

16. Members are required at all times to keep RICS updated with their contact details. I am satisfied that RICS has made reasonable efforts to contact the Regulated Member to remind him of his obligations. In paying his membership fee, Mr Ryall has engaged with this aspect of his RICS membership and thereby maintained his option to continue practising within the profession. However, he has not responded substantively to any of the CPD reminders or applied for a concession.

17. RICS is a professional membership organisation and sets standards for its members as a condition of membership. The recording of CPD is an RICS requirement to ensure the maintenance of professional standards and in turn give protection to the public and uphold the reputation of the profession. Compliance is not optional. It is not difficult to record CPD online and the CPD requirements are not dependent on RICS sending requirements to members. Mr Ryall has demonstrated from 2013 to 2017 that he knows how to record CPD and he comfortably exceeded the required hours in each of those years.

18. I find the following aggravating factors in this case:

- There has been no substantive engagement with the CPD process from Mr Ryall since he recorded 3.5 hours’ CPD in 2018, and the charge found proved is therefore his third breach of the CPD requirements in three years.
- Mr Ryall has already received a caution for his first CPD breach, and a caution and fine for his second CPD breach.
- The fine has not been paid.
- Mr Ryall has failed to respond substantively to the repeated reminders from RICS sent to his nominated postal and email addresses.

19. I find the following mitigating factor in this case:

- Mr Ryall's verbal indication to the RICS investigator that he was not working for medical reasons.

20. I first considered whether to impose no sanction. However, I concluded that Mr Ryall's repeated failure to record CPD was serious and, in the absence of any exceptional circumstances, such as evidence for his medical condition and/or an application for a concession, imposing no sanction would not be appropriate or proportionate. In reaching this decision, I noted that Mr Ryall has been sent numerous reminders by RICS. Whether or not he received these reminders, it was his responsibility as a Regulated Member to ensure that he complies with his CPD obligations.

21. I went on to consider imposing a caution. I decided that a caution would not adequately reflect the seriousness of the case, recognising the cumulative pattern of non-compliance and the fact that a caution has already been imposed for previous breaches.

22. I also considered the imposition of a reprimand, but determined that this also would not reflect the seriousness of Mr Ryall's repeated failure to comply with his CPD obligations.

23. In considering whether to impose an undertaking, I took into account the mandatory nature of the CPD requirements. I noted that the CPD requirements are designed to ensure that the skills and knowledge of RICS members are kept up to date and ultimately to ensure public protection. I considered that Mr Ryall's failure to record any or sufficient CPD for three years in succession, and his lack of meaningful engagement, indicated that he would be unlikely to comply with any undertaking. I therefore decided that it would not be appropriate or proportionate to impose an undertaking, and that such a sanction would undermine public trust and confidence in the regulatory process.

24. I then considered whether to impose a fine. I was mindful that a fine was imposed on Mr Ryall for his second CPD breach in 2019. I noted that this fine has not been paid. I concluded that in these circumstances a further financial penalty would serve no useful purpose as the previous fine has not resulted in compliance with the CPD requirements to date. Instead, a further fine would undermine both the need to uphold the standards expected of all members and the deterrent effect on other members of the profession.

25. I went on to consider imposing conditions. I took the view that imposing conditions for non-compliance with the CPD requirements could be proportionate in some circumstances. However, I would need to be satisfied that the Regulated Member had demonstrated a willingness to engage with the regulatory process and a willingness to comply with any conditions imposed. In this case, because Mr Ryall has repeatedly failed to comply with the CPD requirements in the past, and has failed to respond to repeated written and telephone reminders to record his CPD, I could not be satisfied that he would comply with conditions. I therefore concluded that it would not be possible to formulate conditions which would be realistic or achievable. Furthermore, in the absence of any remorse or insight, I determined that Mr Ryall's non-compliance with the CPD requirements demonstrates a disregard of his obligations as a Regulated Member and consequently undermines public trust and confidence in the profession. I decided that conditions would therefore not be proportionate in this case.

26. Having decided that conditions would not be the appropriate sanction, I considered expulsion from RICS membership. I recognise that expulsion is the sanction of last resort and should

be reserved for those cases where there is no other means of protecting the public or marking the wider public interest. I decided that Mr Ryall's case falls into this category. His repeated failure to record CPD and failure to engage substantively with the RICS to provide assurance that he will comply in future, or request a concession, are actions that are fundamentally incompatible with continued membership. In reaching this conclusion, I was mindful of the RICS Sanctions Policy paragraph 22.1 which states that there is a "*presumption of expulsion*" in respect of a third breach of Rule 6 of the Rules of Conduct for members within 10 years of receipt of a caution for breach of the same Rule.

27. In reaching this conclusion, I have carefully balanced the wider public interest against Mr Ryall's interests and his professional standing. I have had regard to the impact expulsion may have on Mr Ryall, but determined that his interests are outweighed by my duty uphold public trust and confidence in the profession and in RICS. In all the circumstances of this case I am satisfied that no lesser sanction would protect the public or adequately mark the public interest.

DECISION

28. Having read all the evidence and written submissions in this case, in accordance with Part VI or the Disciplinary, Registration and Appeal Panel Rules, I make the following order:

That Mr Kevin Ryall shall be expelled from membership of RICS

COSTS

29. In accordance with Rule 119 of the Disciplinary, Registration and Appeal Panel Rules, I make the following order in respect of costs:

That Mr Ryall shall pay costs in the amount of £350.00

TAKING EFFECT OF THE ORDER

30. The following Rule of the Disciplinary, Registration and Appeal Panel Rules applies in this case:

"114. Following the expiry of 14 days from service of the Single Member's decision upon the Regulated Member, the Regulatory Sanction will be deemed to be accepted by the Regulated Member and the Regulatory Sanction imposed will take effect forthwith, unless notification has been received under Rule 116."

31. The Regulated Member must notify the Head of Regulatory Governance and Tribunals within 14 days of receipt of this Single Member decision if he does not accept the decision, failing which the order will be deemed accepted by the Regulated Member and will take effect.

PUBLICATION

32. This decision will be published in accordance with Rule 120 of the Disciplinary, Registration and Appeal Panel Rules, which states the following:

"120. In accordance with the Regulatory Sanctions Publication Policy:
a. pending the expiry of 14 days following service of the record of decision upon the parties, the Regulated Member's name, charge(s) and the Single Member's

- decision as to whether the charge(s) were found proved or not proved, and Regulatory Sanction if applicable will be published in accordance with the Regulatory Sanctions Policy and*
- b. the Single Member's Record of Decision will be published following the expiry of 14 days."*