

Friday, 9 June 2000

Architects Inquiry
Productivity Commission
LB2 Collins Street East
Melbourne VIC 8003

Att: Commissioner for the Inquiry

Dear Sir/Ms,

Re: A second submission

Following my first submission, dated last week, I wish to add some more comment. Generally I have no preference as to how the Architectural Profession is regulated, all models have their pros & cons. [refer caution -to follow]. What I do see is as an advantage to the consumer public in the retention of some form of distinction between a practicing /registered Architect and 'others'. This distinction could include but not be limited to:

- A requirement for recognized 'architectural' training [degree level],
- A requirement for recorded ongoing professional development following registration,
- A requirement for Professional Indemnity Cover,
- A requirement for adherence to a 'code of conduct'.

Caution -

National or Global registration is a 'foresighted' concept and should be considered in the context of 'practicing as an Architect in a particular region'. There are 'particular & local' conditions/ building regulations that need to be of 'a knowing' by a practitioner before 'reasonable' ability can be applied to providing service. Maybe there is a 'global' register of 'registered & practicing Architects' but with a 'legislatively geographically licensed to practise' restriction on those registered. I trust I have added to the understanding of the reason to retain the uniqueness of the title 'Architect' and how to maintain future consumer confidence in the practice of Architecture.

Respectfully yours	spectfully yo	ours.
--------------------	---------------	-------

(signature)

Geoff Grimes Architect.

Architecture & Building Inspections