

## Please explain your answer for your rating of option 1 – full cost recovery

Answered: 363 Skipped: 40

### RESPONSES

The cost for initial registration in Option 1 is simply too high for a graduate attempting to register. Graduates earn less than technicians and way less than registered architects, it will be unrealistic for a grad in a small company, who might still have a study debt to pay off, to burden themselves with another big loan. Universities teaching MArch Prof would likely be affected with a decline in the number of students. Graduates would rather pursue an LBP pathway.

I consider that removing cross subsidization of initial registration fee would set that fee at a prohibitively high level for most new entrants to the profession - Being a deterrent for initial application and also widening a potential inequality gap between those people with and without financial backing, which would further limit a representative societal cross section for entry into the profession

I don't know enough about the financial position of the NZRAB to know where they are at, or exactly where the proposal is coming from. However, for pathway 1 candidates will have invested in at least 5 years of Tertiary education. The proposed fee is similar to an additional year of study. This feels like the organisation is out of touch with the financial investment Architectural Graduates have already made vs the reality of what they actually earn, particularly in the current economy. There is a concern high fees will create a monoculture the profession is probably trying to disrupt as it seems to be trying to develop a more diverse population.

The proposed cost increase in this option for initial registration is roughly 500%. At the pay rates for graduates, this is a huge barrier for those wanting to become registered and will ultimately dry up the pool of future architects in the industry.

Prohibitively expensive for initial registration

I do not think it is appropriate to charge initial registration candidates the full cost of registration. While I assume most candidates will have registration fees paid by their employers, this isn't always the case and as a profession I believe we should be encouraging our graduates to seek registration in NZ, not putting obstacles in their path. However, I support increasing fees for QEAP and pathways 3 & 4 and introduction of user pays fees for the other services.

This is madness. We as members of the NZRAB, benefit most from new people joining the body as registered professionals. We should not be putting up more barriers to conscientious, enthusiastic professionals from joining our ranks.

Removing the subsidy would create a huge cost barrier if the fees for initial registration were to increase to the proposed amounts. It would certainly delay or stop me from becoming a registered architect. Discouraging graduates from pursuing registration would be very unfortunate for the industry or create an elitist attitude with only those affording the fees able to become registered.

This would significantly impact architectural graduates looking to get registered, the cost is extremely prohibitive in comparison to average salaries for architectural graduates. In my opinion, I do not believe many practices would contribute towards this cost for potential architects, apart from maybe larger practices. Personally it would be a big cost and would likely delay me from registering as there are other things that money would be better put towards (for example saving for a house). The salary increase for being registered would not be worth it.

We would like to formally register our feedback regarding the NZRAB consultation for a change in registration fee structures. We are concerned about the financial impact on our practice as we currently cover both our team members initial registration fees and their ongoing fee. Despite this though, our primary concern is accessibility of initial

registration to a diverse base of graduates. At our firm we actively work to encourage and support a more diverse industry than has been traditional. We struggle to see how anyone on a graduate salary would have the financial means to pay a respective initial registration fee under Option 1 \$6,520 or Option 3 \$3,150, in the instance that they work for a practice that do not cover this. Based on the NZIA Salary survey results in 2023, there are only 28 practices that cover the cost of registration and 11 that cover professional membership ongoing. In particular, the costs proposed in Option 1 are extremely prohibitive to a graduate that does not have family or independent support. We are concerned that each of the three options have a cost proposed for voluntary suspension. We see this as disproportionately impacting women and at a time where their finances are often most pressed. In our experience, it is primarily women who use this option when going on parental leave. Despite the impact on our firm and the estimated net cost increase gross per annum, we consider that option 2 is the least prohibitive to graduates seeking to obtain registration.

---

The proposed fee increase for initial registration is excessively high, especially considering that registrants typically spend a significant amount of time and effort preparing for registration, often while earning lower pay compared to fully registered architects. Furthermore, charging the same fee for repeat attempts creates a perverse incentive to fail the first attempt and discourages the re-application.

---

Increasing the cost of registration this significantly will create a huge barrier for architectural graduates looking to progress. The cost of a 5 year degree and typically low pay rates found in the architectural industry and highly prohibitive of saving significant money to pay for professional development.

---

This option would be a serious deterrent if not complete obstruction to pursuing Registration for architectural graduates, leading them to other careers, accreditation (LBP etc) or overseas. The long-term impacts for the profession would be serious as the pipeline of future architects would be significantly weakened. For any architects who have gone through registration in the last year, it would be tantamount to pulling the ladder up behind them, having benefitted from cross-subsidisation and to then benefit in reduces ACR fees. This is deeply unequitable. For full-cost recovery to be even remotely palatable, the NZRAB would need to seriously look at how to make the Initial Registration operative cost significantly more affordable and efficient.

---

Looks like to me they have thrown number on a page, how does one fee increase 500% and the other a cost saving of \$200?

---

Fee is grossly unreasonable for architecture graduate and some practice would opt out of helping to cover fees for initial registration

---

This option will be financially challenging for both the company (if the company pays) and the individual (if the individual has to pay).

---

Removing all cross-subsidy for registration is completely prohibitive for myself in attaining registration. My options, if this was to be brought in by NZRAB, would be registration overseas within a mutual recognition agreement country, and I would also consider a LBP license. The benefits of registration do not offer much enticement over this cost, especially considering the far too high possibility of paying for a repeat attempt. While currently the cost of a registration first attempt may be possible for employers to cover, if they were to even consider covering a 162% increase for a single employee's career pathway/retention, the implications for a graduate's employment contract would likely be a few more terms & conditions. I personally believe this approach to fees will significantly reduce members of diversity and minority groups to grow in this career if we can no longer do so on our own terms. Note opinions are my own, and do not speak for my employer's.

---

As a graduate looking to get registered in the next couple of years, this option makes registration almost entirely out of reach - especially if a second attempt was required. If this option was adopted, I would most likely explore other options like going overseas or the LBP route.

---

too expensive for grads

---

See answer for Option 2. Removing the subsidy will significantly impact the architects profession and lead to less graduates seeking registration and increase the growth of those practicing as architectural designers and similar.

---

It's an incredible demanding and expensive degree in the first place to achieve. Most that I know come out with student loans in which they are paying off for many years and the general wage brackets within New Zealand are far below the likes of AUS / UK / Canada. I believe the option 1 cost is just too high for what the general populus can cover if paying for it themselves - it's prohibitive and will likely result in gradates seeking work / registration overseas or just not at all.

---

These fees would be a barrier to anyone seeking registration. I also do not support a fee for voluntary suspension, as many females taking maternity leave would then have to pay a fee to pause their CPD. These fees are also significantly higher than the cost to become a lawyer in NZ (as a comparison). These fees are likely to push more people towards LBP, which is a risk to the future of the profession.

---

The process of getting registered requires a significant amount of time commitment, graduates at this stage of their career will normally have student debt, and not all employers will help fund initial registration. If we don't want to grow old and crusty as a profession, we need to limit the obstacles for new professionals to enter.

---

Hiking the initial cost of rego will deter more people getting registered

---

This will discourage young graduates to apply due to financial reasons and therefore would hinder their future prospects, as you are aware once you are registered this will increase your earning potential and opportunities. Which is more in line with maintaining a higher yearly fee as your salary is higher.

---

If the cost of initial registration was \$6,520 I think there would be a decrease in people seeking registration they would choose instead to become licensed building practitioners.

---

It is absurd to expect young professionals with high levels of student debt who are generally poorly paid by the profession, to take on this additional debt when the value of the benefits of registration is up for discussion. My own son is on the path to registration, and I would advise him not to apply if these are the costs. I doubt many would apply so self defeating.

---

The NZRAB needs to invest in the future of the profession. Architects could pay a higher registration fee rather than increase the cost of registration.

---

It will deter a lot of people from becoming registered. We already have come out of uni with large debts from a 5 year degree and then our wages are terrible for about 4years minimum. It doesn't add up financially especially when it takes so long to be come registered and cost so much along the way.

---

This would ultimately produce a significant hurdle to those architectural graduates coming out of study and starting out in their careers that are dealing with paying back student loans and etc on starting salaries.

---

Removing the subsidies completely reinforces the registered professions exclusivity, and only discourages the next generation (who are essential for change and growth in our industry) from pursuing registration.

---

As a student about to join the workforce, this price increase is daunting and makes the process feel unachievable

---

Cost prohibitive for aspiring architects

---

The road to becoming a registered architect is hard enough as is, without the additional burden of having to self fund the full costs of registration,

---

---

The proposed fees in Option 1 may hinder many aspiring architects from applying for registration due to cost barriers. With an initial registration fee for first attempts proposed to increase by nearly 450% at \$6,520 and a substantial increase in fees for pathways 3-8, this model could reduce the accessibility of registration and affect overall participation. This model shifts all cost burdens to new applicants and may disincentivise entry to the profession, limiting the talent pipeline and diversity among future architects.

---

Graduates wouldn't be able to afford this option. It would change the way that initial registration is sought with companies having to pay for their graduates to become registered. Or if you expect graduates to pay this then their wage needs to be increased significantly.

---

This disproportionately puts the financial burden of the NZRAB on those applying for initial registration while those people are the worst paid out of the people paying fees to the NZRAB. \$6k+ is easily 10% of a graduate's salary post tax. This cost increase will severely discourage applicants from applying for registration. Further, it will make the profession more inaccessible to minorities.

---

Cost so prohibitive for new architects

---

I would be happy if my ACR cost went down. As a sole practitioner we have high outgoings and all savings help - BUT, if it cost \$6,520 to get registered when I went through I probably wouldn't have done it.... Would that make Registered Architects more in demand? Could we then raise our fees?! (Not sure!)

---

As a sole practitioner of a small business, we have many outgoings that if they keep going up will be hard to stay on top of. But I also understand that the cost to graduates trying to register will also be out of reach, so I don't agree but I also don't disagree with this option

---

Limiting and removing peripheral barriers to initial registration is important. I would consider Money/registration fee to be a peripheral barrier.

---

I'm looking at registering in 2025 (finally) basically because it's there - the final professional confirmation. It's a personal ambition that I doubt will have an actual financial benefit. At a \$6500 cost that personal benefit is outweighed. As a licensed Building Practitioner I can already fulfill every client want and need anyway, I can't justify the extra \$6500 - it will simply not be worth the money to be a registered architect - simply not a good business decision.

---

We need to build a community in this profession and need more Architects. The NZIA/Emerge itself is not providing enough resources to support/education for graduates in their professional development - leaving grads to do this in their own work time or rely on workplace to invest (not efficient, bringing the whole industry up and establishing good practices/standards). On top of it, the increase in cost will deter any grads to go for registration - for those paying for it on their own.

---

To increase the cost of applying to be a Registered Architect from \$1,200.60 to \$6,520 simply makes it unattainable for many applicants. The cost would be too high for the vast majority of applicants, especially considering that there is no guarantee that their application will be successful on the first attempt. Many months of saving are required for a Graduate to raise \$6,520. This represents a significant portion of a Graduate's annual income and is a cost that most would not choose to spend on Registration. Preventing Graduates from applying will limit their career prospects and likely limit their earning potential. Raising the cost of applying so significantly will also disproportionately affect those with lower incomes and those who come from lower income backgrounds. Meanwhile, graduates from wealthy backgrounds will gain an even greater, unfair advantage. This will affect the demographics in our profession and likely reduce diversity. As the NZIA Emerge Committee have noted, raising the cost the Registration application will likely push graduates to other pathways, such as Architectural Registration overseas or the Licensed Building Practitioner programme. This will ultimately weaken our profession and reduce the NZRAB's funding in future due to the reduced number of members. To increase the cost of applying for registration in order to reduce the cost of on-going membership is inherently unfair. Registered Architects who enjoyed a low cost application when they applied will now also get a reduction in their annual fees. By comparison, for graduates who become registered after the increase, the reduced cost of annual membership will never balance out the increased cost of the initial application.

---

Our architecture grads need to know they are supported to move forward into our profession

---

---

This option would severely dissuade young graduates from obtaining registration without significant financial support.

---

We need to encourage appropriately qualified and experienced people to gain registration and the costs in this option are prohibitive.

---

It is already expensive enough and hard to afford for a graduate. For those who are lucky enough to have it paid for by their work, means more pressure on both fronts to pass and do well in an already taxing and stressed out environment. Also what is the justification for the exorbitant fee, and where does all this go towards? We should be encouraging people to be registered and get registered, to then help shape the organisation and the world around us, not deter them with such high fees which seems almost impossible for some. This will only relegate registered architects to the elite, which means less diversity and in turn a lukewarm and pale organisation which people won't even want to be a part of anymore.

---

The fee for initial registration is too high and not encourage people to work towards this.

---

Forcing costs on those least able to pay (start of their career) is as cynical as any funding proposal could be. Barriers to registration like this are, by far, the worst kind of funding that could be proposed. This proposal seems like ill-concieved protectionism, rather than an honest attempt to discuss how the NZIA should be funded.

---

This cost is too high for most graduates, particularly without support from their employers and reduces the incentive to become a registered Architect in NZ. It is also significantly higher than other comparable industry registration processes such as Landscape Architecture & Engineering.

---

\$6000 is prohibitive. Even more so on a graduates wages

---

Higher fees make it prohibitive for architectural graduates (who are usually of a younger age and facing other cost of living hardships) and will likely discourage registration.

---

Will be cost prohibitive for some/most seeking to get registered.

---

Option 1 would lead to a significant drop in graduates seeking registration in New Zealand. These changes would weaken our profession's future and harm the NZRAB's financial sustainability due to fewer fee-paying architects.

---

It seems unfair to remove the benefits we enjoyed from those who are coming up after us.

---

The cost is not affordable and is unreasonable for a graduate. All registered architects need to nurture and support their graduates into the profession like we were.

---

Applicants for initial registration are typically at the start of their career or have postponed application to have a family and we want to encourage graduates into registration. If fees are too high they are more likely to apply for LBP than architect registration

---

This option creates a significant barrier to the growth and development of our profession.

---

As a graduate, this would no longer be a feasible path for me to take to work as an architect. I would choose a different path or look to seek registration overseas.

---

Is it better to have more architects paying a lower fee then to have fewer architects paying a higher fee? The initial registration fee is high for new graduates, the ongoing fee to maintain registration, etc. are also increasing. Reward below director level or larger firms in central cities are low, reward in architecture is low compared with other professions.

---

No one will bother to become an architect, further marginalising our profession. Strength in numbers people!

---

Option 1 will ensure that graduates are discouraged from pursuing registration in NZ. This will have a disastrous flow on effect for the profession. The average graduate salary and pay scale in NZ already doesn't reflect the amount of time, effort and money it takes to become a registered architect. The registration fee jump from \$1200 to \$6500 is outright ridiculous.

---

This will be a major deterrent to those who are aspiring to become architects. Especially considering those less fortunate to afford such fees, and those who are unsuccessful on the first go. People will highly likely seek alternate careers such as LBP or look to register elsewhere overseas.

This would create a high barrier to initial registration

registration fee itself is already a very fair amount for both parties: the applicant and the examiner; any increase of price shall be justified with strong proof. Public votes shall also be considered carefully.

This option puts great financial barrier to become registered. The jump from \$1200 to \$6500 over a year for registration fee seem extremely unfair regardless of the reasoning behind.

\$6520 for registration for both the 1st attempt, and any subsequent attempt is prohibitively high for an architectural graduate to cover by themselves, especially given the number of candidates who require more than one attempt to register. If the fee is covered by an employer, for small practices such as the practice that I work for, this is also prohibitively high. I can imagine that the relationship between an architectural graduate who did not pass on the first attempt and their employer could be compromised with a fee as high as this, if the fee is covered by the practice.

The significant increase in cost will deter several, or many, graduates from applying for registration. There are already reasons why some don't or delay applying because they do not see the value for \$/time in doing so.

Any financial barrier to becoming a registered architect should be mitigated to encourage increased diversity of architects. In 2013 the examination fees were significantly increased and then reduced the following year. The decision points to this issue being raised before and being reversed in the subsequent year after reflection.

The cost is too high for applicants to bear. Especially for those resitting.

The initial registration fee is cost prohibitive and result in less graduates becoming registered, and the title of 'Architect' and NZRAB eventually becoming irrelevant.

Registration shouldn't be cost prohibitive to our graduates

I thought the objective was to encourage more people to become registered architects? Surely it is better to cost more for those further in their career, than to drastically increase the fees for people at the beginning? I have already had graduates in our practice come to me very concerned at this increase, and concerned that they won't be able to go for registration.

6000 for a young graduate is too much money ( this will decrease the amount of young architects as most will only be able to apply after 10 to 15 years after graduation)

I support cross subsidisation.

I believe such a high registration cost would deter applicants.

I find this model completely unrealistic - a jump from \$1200 to \$6000 is excessive. With the cost of living going up all around, first time applicants are already having to scarp together the funds to siting the initial registration, especially when their practices are not willing to support them financially. In most cases, the ongoing architectural registration is covered for by practices as part of their employment contracts, whereas initial registration is not. This is especially true for smaller regional architectural practices like mine.

\$6,520 is extremely unaffordable in today's climate, and would discourage me from going for initial registration. I would look to LBP instead. The further \$6,520 for any repeat attempts is again unsustainable from my perspective, and would be a real hindrance to me.

Unaffordable for grads in small practices who won't pay for them

This is a bit too extreme an increase for initial registration applicants.

---

For graduates that are not well off, it could become a hurdle for them to getting registered. The socioeconomic and demographic factors are a consideration here to support diversity in the profession. I would support incentivising the companies that are employing the graduate to make a contribution in some way, then that allows the annual fees to be a bit lower?

---

This would make registration unattainable to many, and I believe a lot of firms that would have previously supported graduates in the cost would retract from doing so as the investment is huge. A lot of graduates aren't earning high amounts as is and this would further create a culture of exclusivity within the industry. The increase in cost would also result in quite a long pay-off period before you'd be breaking even with the potential reduced fees - assuming the first attempt is successful that's still over a 10 year payback period, while I don't think a lot of people would even bother with the second attempt with that cost.

---

We need to provide an equitable industry so that we remain relevant, and not put financial pressures on our younger peers to attain registration. By empowering more people to attain registration we will improve the design industry as a whole.

---

At \$6520 I would not have got registered as I would not be able to afford it. I would change career or move to Australia. \$6520 for repeat attempt also puts a huge amount of pressure on candidates in an already stressful situation.

---

I think this would make registration inaccessible for graduates wanting to complete this career milestone and we should be supporting people to do this, not making it more difficult for them.

---

In our recent discussion with peers, we were taken aback by the proposal to increase the fees by over 400%. It seems there is no Professional Body contemplating such drastic hikes. Currently, the fee of \$1,200.60 already poses a significant obstacle for many, particularly in today's challenging economic climate. Many graduates lack the disposable income needed to absorb such costs. To illustrate, the proposed fee of \$6,520 would require individuals to save the equivalent of one year's typical academic fees, all while managing substantial student loan debt from previous studies. If 'Option 1' is implemented, those pursuing Initial Registration will need to consider ways to offset these expenses, likely turning to their employers for financial support. This situation may drive many to explore alternative pathways, such as obtaining licensing through ADNZ under the LBP scheme, or even relocating abroad in search of more favourable conditions. The implications of such a fee increase could severely impact the professional landscape, limiting access and opportunities for many aspiring professionals.

---

A high cost for initial registration won't put people off. It will help to ensure that they are truly ready before applying.

---

1) I have been working in the industry for 7 years, and I believe that many employers will simply refuse to subsidise a \$6,500 application fee. In my experience, employers prefer to employ highly skilled graduates / technicians as draughtspeople, instead of investing in the future generation of architects. Many people who pass registration will immediately resign, either to move to another company, or to start their own business - thereby providing no financial benefit to the company or employer who subsidises their application. 2) I believe that repeat / subsequent registration attempts should be cheaper than first attempts, given some of the competencies would already have been demonstrated in the first attempt. 3) Many graduates are still paying off Student Loans, trying to start families and get onto the property ladder. If their employer refuses to subsidise their application, these graduates are stuck in a role which offer no registration opportunity, which risks a sharp decline in registration interest. 4) According to recent NZRAB survey, 51% of architects are 50+ years old. I believe that raising fees will discourage younger people from seeking registration, thereby leading to a decline in architect numbers. Although it could be argued that matching Australia's registration charges is fair and equitable, NZRAB needs to consider the statistical likelihood of continued "Brain Drain" for young graduates leaving to live in Australia. New Zealand is already experiencing shortages in other professionals (eg. average age of GPs, and difficulties in filling nursing / teaching positions). We don't need this problem replicated in the architecture sector.

---

I think it would be cost prohibitive to most people. Additionally, it would be unreasonable for architecture firms to subsidize the full fee without some sort of bonding, and if that employee were to leave it would be very difficult to get that money back. With the raising of current costs of living registration could effectively become non-essential, especially if that employee is working for a practice there is no advantage other than possible salary increase.

---

---

I am looking to register next year, pathway 2. I am a young adult, with a baby looking to buy my first home. As you know, it is financially very difficult for our generation to buy our first home. Having capital is key. I couldn't afford to register at this price. My company pays for the annual NZIA fee, not the initial registration cost.

---

The proposed reduction of ACRs fees in conjunction with the extreme increase in initial registration fees is not an accurate representation of NZ's architectural profession. This option goes against the supportive and encouraging ethos of the profession and its ability to nurture and entice graduates to become registered in NZ. Based on NZIA's Remuneration Survey 2023, the mean remuneration of a pre-registration architectural graduate (5-years of experience) is \$78,000. With the proposed option 1, the NZRAB is proposing the initial registration 1st attempt will exceed 10% of a young professional's annual salary.

---

This would incur a huge decline in graduates applying for registration. This would be a significant barrier for applicants.

---

Removing cross-subsidisation will be barrier.

---

Full cost recovery would disincentive grads from pursuing registration. It also seems unfair when we've all had the benefit.

---

This will heavily discourage myself and others to get registered. Being currently ready for registration, if this comes into effect I would have to wait another 5-10 years to save up that kind of money, significantly limiting my career options. For a new graduate having finished a 5 year masters degree for \$50k, having to wait 5+ years to gain experience and then save another \$6-12k for registration is not a particularly appealing career investment on top of the already underpaid Architectural profession

---

Which graduate-level aspiring architect can afford over \$6K for initial registration? If you implement this you can expect new registrations to fall off a cliff. Myself included unfortunately.

---

I believe that the industry as a whole should be investing in our graduates rather than a simple few.

---

Too prohibitive

---

I believe in supporting our graduates towards registration, and this is an important part of that support. I also think the higher fee would discourage many graduates from applying to become a Registered Architect. It could also create the risk that Registered Architects Framework is seen as discriminatory and elitist, as only those who could afford the high application fee will apply.

---

Our daughter is an architectural graduate carrying a student loan. In today's tight market she is lucky to have a job in architecture at all - most of her fellow graduates don't but many of them earn more than her. The concept of paying \$6,500 to attempt registration means that she would not even bother trying. Option 1 is beyond her means, and I know that will apply to many in her group.

---

This is ridiculously high and means most people won't apply as they can't afford it. Even businesses will struggle to afford this for their staff

---

I believe going ahead with option 1 will significantly reduce the number of applicants and therefore reduce the number of new registered architects

---

Defiantly NOT. This will basically categorically stop our graduates from registering.

---

Whilst I understand the balance between encouraging graduate architects to register, many Registered architects are struggling to continue in practice and need to be considered as well.

---

The architecture registration fee is too high for the state of the institution in New Zealand. See answer to No. 7 below.

---

---

Very unreasonable and highly unlikely for grads to consider applying for registration with cost being a very big factor. The pay scale for a grad also does not reflect potential savings towards the cost for registration. New architects who have already applied through the subsidy system get the benefit but not future grads. Also indicates that existing architects are not supportive of grads.

---

Are you kidding? Why would a graduate get registered when they can get LBP for a fraction of the cost and effort?

---

this will heavily disadvantage young graduates and people with families who have low discretionary income. The only new architects will be nepo babies or people who spend a long time saving up for it

---

This is far to expensive for graduates. This will result in fewer registered architects. It is already too expensive

---

This is going to put a lot more pressure onto graduates as by increasing the cost of registration, some smaller practices who would usually fit the bill might renege on that offer due to the increased costs.

---

Graduates targeting registration are very unlikely to be earning at the same level as a registered architect so it would seem unfair to require them to pay a disproportionate share. It would also likely reduce the number of graduates targeting registration due to unaffordable applications.

---

Architectural graduates with relevant experience to go for registration are approximately aged in their late twenties/early thirties, already on low salaries, struggling with high cost of living, and large student loans. Some graduates wouldn't even expect a \$5,000 pay rise in one year, let alone having to pay \$6,520 in a lump sum (and then again if the initial registration is not successful which would be over \$13,000. Graduates at this age do not have this type of money to put towards registration - they are trying to navigate cost of living, buying homes etc). Unfortunately, if the fees are this high, registration just will not be a priority for graduates, especially if their firm can't subsidise the costs. The large fees promote an elitist attitude towards architects and the industry and feels as if only the 'rich' can either both study architecture, and then do their registration. Anyone that may have financial difficulty, will even further be setback in an industry that is already incredibly difficult. This really deters the younger generation getting registered and is a huge setback and will create a drop in overall numbers of registered architects in NZ. Even if paying that large amount and being successful, there is no guarantee that the costs will be recovered from practices giving the applicant a pay rise. The rise in costs will also completely deter any financial subsidy from the applicants firm to help pay for the fees. This would not be desirable for any small practices, and overall hinders the applicant for a longer period of time, and further delays any successful registration, promotion and salary increases that come with being a registered architect. Many young graduates do not have over \$6,000 in spare money to pay for registration. The average salary for a graduate in Auckland is just under \$70,000. After tax, the increase fee cost is more than 13% of their annual salary. A 540% increase in fees are completely absurd, considering the majority of the work (case study) is from the applicant themselves. In Australia, depending on the State, it is approximately \$1,200 for Parts 1-3 of the registration process. This means that many young graduates will take their talents to Australia, where fees to register are lower and salaries are higher. I highly, highly disagree with this huge increase in fees.

---

I feel this makes the initial cost of registration to daunting for young graduates and less people will enter the profession. With AI looking to be a big disruptor I feel we should be encouraging younger members to join the profession.

---

There are already a number of barriers in the way of getting registered which puts people off or delays the process for people for a longtime. I believe putting the cost of initial registration up by that much will create an elitist environment where only those with more significant wealth can afford to be registered, and particularly become registered in the early years out of university.

---

I think this would create a barrier to initial registration and disadvantage certain members of the graduate cohort.

---

---

I strongly disagree with Option 1, which proposes removing cross-subsidy for services and implementing full cost recovery. This is neither suitable nor realistic in the current economic climate. As someone who had been preparing for architectural registration and planning to apply next year, I have now decided to abandon this goal entirely. Several factors influenced my decision: Exorbitant Costs: The proposal to increase registration fees by more than five times during a recession is both insensitive and ethically questionable. With the rising cost of living, widespread job losses in the architectural field, and a significant contraction in the building industry, this fee hike is unachievable for many. Personally, I have not received a salary increase in two years to even match inflation, making the new registration fee simply unattainable. Lack of Industry Support: After last year's decision by MBIE, which failed to differentiate between Licensed Building Practitioners (LBP) and registered architects, I was disappointed by the NZRAB's inadequate response. This lack of strong advocacy for our profession has diminished the perceived value of registration or even the high cost of education in this field as majority complete the architectural degree to get registered. Unjustifiable Fees: I struggle to understand how NZRAB's operating costs justify this significant fee increase. While annual registration fees for already registered architects are often included in company running costs, the cost of becoming registered is usually borne by the individual graduate at the beginning of their career. With fees increasing fivefold, it is unlikely that many companies will be willing to subsidize this cost, especially given the higher turnover in today's job market and the uncertainty of return on investment for employers. Overseas Opportunities: Given these circumstances, I am now considering pursuing registration in my home country in Europe, where the costs are significantly lower, and the title is easier to transfer within the EU. Many graduates may also opt for Australia, where registration conditions are more affordable. In conclusion, if NZRAB proceeds with this approach, it will likely drive talented graduates away from New Zealand. Additionally, with declining interest in architecture programs at universities since the pandemic and aging population with dropping demography, the profession may in future face a shortage of architects which will affect the quality of environment we live in.

---

too tough on people early in their career

---

This creates an immense barrier for people with less means to be able to afford registration.

---

The exam should not be cross-subsidised but should be cheaper. Maybe a similar system as NCARB (NZ\$2470) or Australian (NSW: \$1248) type exam could reduce the costs. In NCARB exam, thanks to modular structure, a failed part can be retaken for NZ\$412. I don't think that the exam should be subsidised, because, if to treat the registration as a competitive advantage, why architects should pay to strengthen their competition. Additionally, some potential increase in salary over time, should offset the initial cost of registration exam, for newly registered architects. In my opinion, the exam form and organisation need to be changed to reduce the cost of exam, considering pricing of exams in other countries with reciprocal licences. As well as, when considering the cost of LBP license in NZ, e.g. LBP3 exam cost \$1,262.

---

We want to encourage people to register and this cost will be prohibitive, (also after spending ~\$70,000 on a 5 year architecture degree). It also means people that are funding their registration fee themselves, as opposed to the practice paying for the registration are even less likely to register than in the current situation. This may also discourage practices from paying for graduates to register as this is a large investment per person who then may leave the firm post registration. We are likely to see more bonding from practices where a grad agrees to continue working for the practice for 1-5 years if they cover registration costs which again makes it less appealing for the grad to register.

---

The proposed cost increase of initial registration would be a huge percentage of a graduates income while the ARC cost decrease would be almost negligible as a percentage of income. We must continue to encourage graduates to get registered to future proof the industry

---

Architecture has a problem of being elitist, Architecture students with financial assistance to fund models and printing and then financial support when working unpaid internships do have a leg up. Creating another financial barrier to entry to the profession will further reduce the diversity of thought that is required to produce design that address problems in all communities.

---

---

Option 1 penalises first-timers significantly and might detract future Architects to pursue registration.

---

Too expensive for what it is.

---

Will not support new registrations

---

I am planning on getting registered next year but at \$6,520 I simply couldn't, and would look at different pathways including LBP. On a graduate's salary, this option wouldn't be viable due to cost. I believe this will marginalize the lower socioeconomic cohort. It would be catastrophic for emerging graduates and deter the majority from registering. I also think this will drive a lot of graduates to Australia or England, where we the registration process can be completed and cross-credited back to NZ.

---

option one would significantly impact graduate architects attempting NZRAB registration due to extraordinarily high costs, 420% increase on existing. Recently graduated students have faced an unprecedented number of obstacles from experiencing teaching during COVID-19, rising cost of living, scarce job market and bearing the grunt of increasing University fees often amounting in large student loans, most of which will not be paid off within 5 years postgraduation. Forcing Graduates to subsidise the NZRAB is an insult to the hard-work recent grads have experienced. There will be an even more clear divide between privileged individuals and those who have had to endure the hard end of the recent socio-political challenges.

---

I think this will be too prohibitive to initial registration and repeat attempt applicants.

---

Cost prohibitive for applicants. Having just completed my registration last year, this is significant investment. My workplace didn't contribute to the application fees and the salary increase is not enough to offset the investment.

---

How is this amount justified? It is close to the domestic cost of one year of University. This is an unrealistic, and unaffordable threshold for any graduates who are not already wealthy and we'll off. I would have struggled to pay this to achieve registration. The reality for most graduate is that they are on low salaries compared to other professions, they have high living costs, they may have family to support, and most architectural offices do not contribute to the cost of registration. The cost of registration needs to be accessible, to support a diversity or practitioners from different economic backgrounds. Setting a high fee will limit registration to a select few, regardless of talent, and will only make the profession less relevant, less diverse, less resilient, and less equitable in the future. It will entrench current inequities, and limit the attraction for diverse clients to turn to and value architects.

---

I just think the proposed fee is unreasonable and probably unaffordable. We should encourage participation within the profession. By all means make the application thorough and comprehensive.

---

It might kill the industry, especially after talking to the students in architectural school. They said they won't choose learning architecture if it would cost that much to get registered.

---

This option is a huge financial burden to graduates and could cause significant decrease in number of registrations. This can then have impact on architectural offices and the whole industry as the number of experienced architects will be decreasing with age, but less graduates will be seeking registration.

---

Fees that high for new registrants would definitely result in barriers to people wanting to register, that had lower incomes. The savings to the ACRs are minimal in comparison (\$3.74 a week!)

---

It is not up to practicing architects to subsidize people wanting to join the profession

---

This could be a barrier to registrations for some people however larger organisations like ours tend to pay for their staff to become registered so doesn't impact them personally

---

It be too cost prohibitive to the extent the amount of applicants will likely significantly dwindle, which will cause harm to the future of profession.

---

---

This makes the registration costs completely inaccessible to many, especially the most marginalised in our society.

---

This option creates a financial barrier for those entering the architectural registration process; it reduces the costs for those already registered, and increases the cost significantly for those attempting to get registered, meaning that it's an attempt at pulling the ladder up behind those that have already achieved registration. For those grads that already are hamstrung by the cost of study, and the fact they'd already be earning less than those registered, why shift the financial burden so far?

---

High cost for initial registration may be prohibitive to gaining new registered Architects

---

The Cost of Going for Registration by the Removal of this would greatly discourage people from getting registered and impede on practices financially supporting graduates to get registered. This will push people to other options such as LBP.

---

I think it affects junior staff entering in to the profession and aiming to be registered. I think this will likely impact the number of people to go through the registration process and create a formidable barrier. Possibly promote moving and do through Australian registration process.

---

The initial registration costs are prohibitively high for graduates, making it difficult for them to afford this lump sum. As a result, this could lead to a decline in the number of graduates pursuing registration, ultimately resulting in fewer ACR numbers issued in the coming years.

---

I think this option introduces a very high financial hurdle for new applicants, particularly during financial hardship or early in people's careers

---

This is too prohibitive to initial registration, including the repeat attempt cost. As you noted, this will likely impact initial registration - and particularly impact diversity of applicants if it is such a financial barrier. I understand the introduction of fees for Pathways 5,6,7 and 8. I'm surprised they're so high, particularly given the trilateral agreements that have been instituted to aid the recognition of some overseas registrations.

---

Initial and repeat registration costs are prohibitively high

---

It's a very big cost for graduates, have in mind most would just have started their career with not a lot of savings, student loans etc. In result there won't be many applicant, a big decrease in numbers

---

Students graduate into practice with high debt levels and at low income levels and into practices with varying levels of graduate support. Raising the cost to register will likely reduce numbers registering and cannibalise the size of our future profession.

---

I think it is fair and reasonable to pass on actual costs of providing services. We (and I am sure a lot of practices) either cover or contribute to the costs of this so i would expect the full cost is rarely solely covered by the applicant

---

The costs of initial registration would be way too high. People will opt in for LBP registration over NZRAB registration.

---

As noted under the documentation, this will highly reduce the number of applicants, risking growth of the future Architect community which will impact further development of the field. Also noting many people who aim to get registered have a lower income and will struggle to pay for the full amount.

---

It will make it impossible for people.

---

I do not support this option. If those going for registration had to pay a fee of over \$6,000 then no one would attempt it as generally this is paid for by the individual and not the employer. It would significantly disadvantage those working part-time due to family or other commitments and those on lower incomes. Registration is usually paid for by the individual and not the practice.

---

This will be an unsurmountable barrier for graduates. Registration, which is already a difficult process, will become accessible only to the wealthy.

---

---

It is unreasonable and unsustainable to expect architectural graduates to shoulder the \$6,520 initial registration fee especially given the disparity in pay bands between registered and nonregistered architectural practitioners. Even with practices offering to pay 50% of the fees, \$3,260 is still a significant amount of money. Increasing the fee by OVER 400% does nothing to incentivise practitioners to get registered and has potential repercussions on the profession in years to come. The barrier to entry will likely exacerbate inequity that already exists if only people with more money are able to afford getting registered.

---

It will make the registration process for graduates and overseas professionals difficult, making the institute seem elitist and out of touch with those living in a different economic reality — not a good look.

---

I believe this would become extremely cost prohibitive for people considering registration. It's unlikely a work place would cover the full cost, which would leave it to the applicant. Ultimately, this would push people away from registration, which seems like the opposite of what NZRAB should be trying to do.

---

To apply for registration, individuals typically need work experience. In many cases, the registration fee is covered by their company, making it less of a barrier compared to the costs faced by students who have just graduated. Professionals pursuing registration are generally less concerned about financial burdens than newly graduated students. Additionally, for sole practitioners or small practices, paying ongoing ACR fees can be challenging. Therefore, maintaining lower practice fees is advisable.

---

The cost to register will put people off registering as an Architect. This process is already difficult enough without adding a larger financial barrier.

---

Cross-subsidy should be retained as previously agreed by the profession. The proposed 'Option 1' changing this to full-cost recovery will be a significant barrier as mentioned in the provided outline. In discussion with peers, we were shocked by the suggestion to raise the fees, by more than 400%. We're not aware of any Professional Body considering such increases. The current fee of \$1200.60 is already a barrier for many, especially in these current economic times. Graduates do not have such high levels of disposable income. At \$6,520 the equivalent of one year's typical academic fee's would need to be saved, in addition to paying down large student loans for past study. If 'Option 1' is pursued, those seeking Initial Registration will consider how they can recoup costs from employers. They will most likely seek alternative licensing under ADNZ, via the LBP scheme or move overseas.

---

I think it's a backwards step - the subsidy model works well and I don't think we should remove it in its entirety. I fear the huge increase of initial registration costs will place it out of reach for some graduates.

---

This would be very big sudden step up and I believe so many people will avoid going for registration as it is very high fee, specially that the repeat attempt is exact same fee as first attempt.

---

The system massively disadvantages new applicants. Lawyers are admitted to the bar effortlessly and for no fees... why do we make it so difficult in the first place? Given that the way people get registered will remain super-complex for our poor new architect-hopefuls I definitely do not agree that we also make it unaffordable. Who's idea is this, ridiculous!

---

Shifts the expense of registration onto lower paid graduates, this will discourage the step to registration. Matching the repeat fee will likely limit the number who can afford this even further. Not to mention the cost of living crisis we are currently experiencing, this would be a ruthless and ill considered step to take in an already precarious climate.

---

Cost is too high for Initial registration. We want to support people to become registered, and to set a high standard for the design quality of our built environment.

---

To encourage the continual growth of the profession and support for the initial registration process the cross subsidy needs to be in place in some way or form.

---

unsure of what effect rising costs will have as a barrier to applicants

---

Times have changed and full cost recovery is now normal practice in all things in life

---

---

I highly disagree with Option 1. I believe that the cost of \$6520 to attempt registration is a major barrier for many graduates. Having already attempted the registration process and been unsuccessful, I feel like the repeat attempt is also very unreasonable. I would consider the LBP process as another option if this was to be proposed, and from speaking with colleagues this is also something they would investigate. Recent registered architects had the benefit of the cross-subsidy and so believe this should continue to allow a fair process.

---

too much of a barrier

---

The initial registration fees would be a deterrent for graduates to seek registration

---

It seems surreal that Graduates have to pay a high fee to then become member and pay for the membership. Most of us have families and mortgage and achieving registration is a mean to step up financially. I am on the way with my case study to apply in March/2025, if fees are approved I would have to postpone my application until I have gathered the money, it sounds horrible. Plus I would add how come to become an Architect is more expensive than becoming a citizen? Costs will be a barrier.

---

I agree with lessening the ACR full year fees. For solo practitioners or small practices, the annual fee of \$530 would be reasonable. Although initial registration fees would be too high.

Perhaps all the initial registration and pathways should all cost the same to balance costs.

---

Those fees are a huge barrier to entry to become an architect. As someone who is already on the fence this is strong reason to deter me from trying to register and instead just pursuing LBP.

---

Despite it lowering the fees for myself and the practice (more ACRs than grads), Option 1 feels like it would be the "Paula Bennett" solution of user-pays fee adjustment. Younger grads as Initial Registration candidates are (generally) the least able to pay large sums for registration and accordingly, more likely to be discouraged from seeking registration and, therefore, more likely to decamp elsewhere professionally (or overseas) as a result, especially if the first attempt is unsuccessful and they get hit for another \$6.5k to try again (naturally, all the BoMD nepo kids will stay though - rich people will still need mansions). I think the effect on the profession would be discriminatory, even more than the already is.

---

This is a massive burden for initial registration, particularly for those financially struggling and whose practices do not support them. It will disinsentivise people getting registered, and is simply unaffordable for many. Personally if this is the case I will at least delay registration and possibly reconsider it.

---

The cost balloons by almost x5.5 times. That is not a pill easily swallowed by a graduate, even if accounting for inflation.

---

Either pushing graduates to pursue registration overseas or the to only apply for jobs where the firm willing to pay for registration causing an unbalanced job market

---

This option would be a disaster for the profession and less people would get registered. It will heavily disadvantage young graduates and people with families who have low discretionary income

---

I spoke with fellow Architectural Graduates in the office and we all agreed that this would be a huge barrier for registration. Most of us would not bother with getting registered if this is the associated cost. Architectural Graduate salaries are fairly modest relative to other professional careers. If you don't pass your first attempt at registration, the effective cost would be \$13,000. This is outrageous and it would cause a ridiculous amount of pressure on a graduate to pass the first time. I suspect this would cause most graduates to wait until they are much older before getting registered.

---

This would make it very financially non-viable for first and second registration attempts

---

Sole practice is getting increasingly difficult. I cannot afford to subsidize new registrants. The subsidization of new registrants is the responsibility of the firm that engages them. This was always the case when I became registered. Happy to pay related increases (inflation etc).

I do not support this at all. This will heavily disadvantage people at the start of their careers (who are not particularly well paid anyway) and disincentivize those who may have failed at first attempt. We should be encouraging graduates to put themselves forward for registration and see it as a reasonably achievable goal. Graduates studying for registration are a direct benefit to employers such as myself. A lot of graduates will simply not attempt if the cost risk is too high.

It will completely be a barrier to graduates looking to get registered

This is too much of a change and the costs to apply for rego are too onerous for some.

CURRENT ANNUAL REGISTRATION FEES ARE ALREADY EXPENSIVE PLUS THE INCREASED COST OF LIVING AND DECREASED PROJECT ACTIVITIES.

hinders and discourages young peoples registration

Registration fees will be too high for new Grads and a possibly barrier to registration.

LBP Design registration cost is \$1000(LBP1) to \$1260 (LBP3) and \$240 per year relicense cost. Option 1 will drive graduates to the LBP process.

impact graduates heavily. don't think this is a sustainable solution.

to the best interest for the board member it is to remove high cost of the service subsidy. to the long term member it is good to have more management for the goal of healthy finance of NZARB organisation. For people need partical susidy it is still needed to be discussed

It's already an expensive process to get the degree. The board shouldn't increase the cost and discourage one to become an architect.

Cost will be a significant barrier to those wanting to apply for initial registration, also a significant burden to organisations who subsidises graduates on their initial registrations. If we want to maintain the number of registered architect in the field, this is not the option proceed. No objection on increasing fee for Pathway 3-8 and voluntary suspensions. It has not been made clear how the % subsidy from NZRAB ACRs changed over the years (if significant increase, reason why) and neither has it been made clear where else the revenues from ACRs will be redirected to. Understand NZRAB is a non-profit organisation.

1/ The increase in registration fees would strain a graduate's budget, especially individuals with student loans, rent, and day-to-day living expenses. 2/A steep hike in fees will force grads who are in entry positions (and are working towards registration), to allocate funds away from essential living needs or delay the professional registration. This could go 2 ways, 1) borrow, thus increasing credit or loans to cover the cost. 2) To not register at all. 3/The cost increase, if it's not appropriate to the services provided, the grads will feel exploited, and the unfair situation will make them question the value of receiving the registration. 5/The strain of the financial burden would cause mental and emotion strain. 6/A significant fee increase will certainly make the grads discouraged, especially if the fee becomes an obstacle in their career progress and would question themselves if they have chosen the right field.

This option significantly raises the barrier for entry for new architects, which is not in the longer term interests of the profession.

This is prohibitively expensive and will discourage graduates from registering.

\$6,520 is an exorbitant amount for a graduate to pay for both first AND second attempts. I applied for initial registration this year, and covered the costs myself.

This option would be cost prohibitive for me as I am a parent and work part time.

It will be difficult for graduates to afford the initial registration cost, especially when starting salaries are not high. This could discourage many from pursuing registration.

I understand it's hard to subsidise those wanting to get registered by paying more every year but I feel it's a service we need to make for growth in our industry. Architects already get registered (on average) a lot later than other professions.

---

we will most likely see a decline in the number of registration entrants

---

The pathway to registration is a serious step in a persons career. Most register and leave a practice or the practice subsidises the registration costs with the assurance that the applicant stay on for a fixed term. The increase of in application costs increases the severity of the registration process. Most graduates working towards registration are are working professionals and should be able to make arrangements for their registration like they do for all other aspects of life.

---

This is far to cost prohibitive for graduates to obtain. To the extent it will put off people becoming architects.

---

Makes the registration process inaccessible

---

Graduates are often paying for their initial registration out of their own pocket, especially if they do not pass the first attempt. This \$6520 cost is prohibitively high on a graduate salary.

---

As an architectural graduate myself and seeking to undertake the registration process in the coming years, this increase would deter my goals, as a 6.5K initial cost would put me back financially. I think this would apply to most/ALL people in my similar position.

---

The costs are significantly high as an individual, as these fees are not covered by our practice. In case one doesn't clear in the first attempt, the second attempt fees are the same which makes the investment \$12k to become registered.

---

I support subsidise initial registration to encourage graduates (and others) to become registered

---

Agree with the observation that the true cost (being as high as it appears to be) will act as a barrier for people choosing to become registered architects, which in the long term is not good for the profession.

---

This is an extreme jump in costs for those who are planning for registration and will out many off from registration. This will only negatively impact the number of future NZRAB members that can, once registered, contribute more to the association. The organization also does not cover membership which is additional costs. As a graduate within the field which is not high paying this cost is extreme.

---

This creates a HUGE financial cost for those seeking registration. Along with the large amount of time taken to write a case study and study for the conversation this seems completely unsustainable for not only young grads but older grads too. This will very negatively impact the profession and could see many grads moving to Australia or other overseas countries to obtain registration creating a drain on the profession.

---

This is a crazy increase in the cost to register, this would prevent me from being able to register at the time I want. My organisation does not cover registration fees.

---

The cost to get registered is prohibitive with this proposal and will be a serious obstacle to diversity and inclusivity in the industry.

---

Cross subsidisation allows the total cost of registration to be spread over an Architect's working life. It still gets paid, just not all in the first year. So whilst it sounds like one group subsidising another, it is actually just spreading the payments over a number of years. My registration was through the cross subsidisation system, so to change it now would mean that I didn't end up paying for the full cost of my registration process. So whilst that is a bonus for me personally, it isn't exactly fair.

---

Increase the fees to 6k for initial registration would definitely put many graduate put their registration plan on-hold.

---

I believe the full cost recovery for registration will create a barrier to new registrations.

---

I successfully undertook initial registration in June this year. Fees of this metric for initial registration would have been a significant barrier to completing the process. Fees as described in Option 1 do not promote or encourage registration as an architect, and by implication the practise of it.

The initial cost for Option 1 seems very high for a graduate/intermediate salary range in the profession. This will likely become a dissuasive barrier of entry for many in the profession and discourage young architects from registering. One must consider that today's university graduates are graduating with 50-90 thousand dollars of debt to enter this field in the first place, which they are struggling to pay off even in a full time role. Additional costs like this may be detrimental to young architects looking to make a career.

The profession has a responsibility to support & foster development of younger practitioners. This includes financial support such as subsidizing initial registration costs.

This makes a cost barrier to registration prohibitive, particularly to those from minorities, or from less privileged backgrounds & support. It is also hugely out of step with LBP Design class 3 fees. Has an assesment been done to the effect on diversity within the profession of proceeding with this option?

This will make it extremely difficult and stressful for grads to get registered unless there workplace is willing to pay the exorbitant fee. On my current grad architect income, and mortgage it would be impossible for me to save \$6500 in the next couple of years which is when i am hoping to sit. It also discourages people who are already feeling anxious / nervous about registration as the cost and implication of failing is so great, why even try. There are 3 grads in my office including myself, hoping to sit registration next August intake but at \$6500 per grad it will be a huge ask for our workplace to be able to pay this for all 3 of us at the same time , or at all.

Unreasonably expensive, especially when you compare to the other pathways with very little difference (case studies). The additional cost will deter many people as it is just not feasible.

This option would make registration unattainable from a financial stand point for a lot of graduates

\$6.5k for registration is not encouraging or promoting the practice of architecture

It's already hard enough to gain initial registration. Increasing the cost five-fold will be too high a cost for many people. Could not disagree with this proposal more.

As a architectural graduate who is currently struggling to exist in a state of high cost of living, this would keep me in the position - with the opportunity for the higher salary which may come with becoming registered- for much longer. This is a very significant chunk of money that I just don't have.

Full cost recovery will create a barrier to registration that only supports the wealthy. The system should be equitable, not just for those that can afford it.

it will make many people not to apply registration. The fees are too high for unregistered designer which is not paid well as registered architect.

Putting a huge increase in cost is not going to get more people registered. It will do the opposite.

With such an increase this would create a large barrier to registration. I also worry this would skew the amount of minority groups going for registration. Additionally, with a similar fee amount, a graduate could register in the UK and also receive university education through a part 3 course (including lectures, tutorials and study groups). Less incentive to register in NZ, or at all, or to stay in the country.

I could never pay this on my salary and would completely remove my option of getting registered.

Given the current climate (cost of living/job stability with the recession) and that architectural graduates are paid less this would significantly reduce the opportunity for many only allowing a few privileged individuals to achieve registration.

6.5k is an extortionate rate for registration, let alone that having the same follow up cost in the circumstance that one fails. It's ridiculous to consider this as an option given the current cost of living circumstance and how marginally architectural graduates are paid relative other professions in the industry.

I believe that this would hinder and put a considerable burden to those wanting to undertake registration, and for practices who often subsidise and cover expenses for the registration process.

We should provide some cross subsidy to encourage new registrations.

As someone who is looking to sit my registration within the year, the increase cost of doing so would stop me from sitting it, as I would need to save for a whole year to be able to afford this fee. Some would argue that it would be the employer taking on this increased cost instead of the graduate, however, I know from talking to many architectural graduates and recent architects that this is not the case. More often than not it is the graduate covering the cost of their initial registration and any resits.

Massive cost burden on those entering the profession is disproportionate. Paying a fee for voluntary suspension seems unfair given the title of Architect can no longer be used. For those practicing overseas, going on maternity leave or experiencing financial hardship they get little or nothing in return from the profession other than not being removed from the register altogether which is not a good message at all. lowering the annual renewals for the masses is good political point scoring but shifts costs onto those who are least enfranchised in many cases. Also not a good incentive to join the register at all since salaries will not rise to compensate. This hands powers back to employers to tie graduates down for even longer contract periods if they pay the fees for pathway 1. Those who use the register should shoulder more of the costs together. I would pay a small fee for the 5 yearly competence review because I would have something given back in return.

Increasing registration costs by that much would mean less will be able to afford to register.

The price of registration would become a huge financial burden on those wanting to become registered even putting registration out of reach for individuals. Its putting a younger generation who are already struggling even further behind. This then impacts career progression, opportunities and salary.

This answer is probably relevant to all three options. These price increases are a huge leap. I have been working toward pathway two registration and in any of these options the price increase is hugely disproportionate to some others. Option 1 i am looking at a 409% increase in cost for registration

This will remove incentive for graduates to register.

Fees at that level would put a huge burden and barrier on young people trying to get registered and will widen the gap of privilege and financial privilege for getting registered. Essentially the richer you are the better off. It would also put people off registration due to being so high. Why pay my life savings when I won't get a pay rise in my firm once registered. That is an obscene amount of money. I wouldn't do registration at all and stay as an LBP. It would cost \$9k for me to do the QEAP and then registration!?! Absolutely not. I was going to attempt registration next year but if this happens I will not

As a graduate this would be a huge road block for me going for registration. It is a huge jump from previous fees and seems unobtainable for a graduate to pay for this out of their own pockets. It will instow a fear of not being able to pay the 6.5k fee again if for some reason the first attempt is unsuccessful. When this is compared to LBP and ADNZ fee structure it would become more favourable to go down that route.

---

I already understand the barrier that exists towards registration. Such a financial barrier will have a significant impact on those looking to register. Graduates will be far less likely to enter the registration process at the risk of spending \$12,500 on fees alone from 1 failed attempt. The relative pay of the graduate community is far less than other professions that require 5 years of study - this is not the community to be seeking funds from. This change is limiting for young people who are already struggling in this industry. It's important to support and encourage graduates and create a streamline transition from study, work experience, to getting registered.

---

I think the cost for architectural graduates would simply be unattainable, especially at current salary rates which are lower than what you can earn working in a cafe. (50,000 NZD yearly) starting. The cost for registration at this price is almost 10% of our salary. This is on top of a degree which is 5 years equating to 100,000 dollars of debt if you don't have any financial support from family. Growing numbers of registered architects should be a strength to the profession.

---

I see it as a huge barrier for graduates to get registered.

---

This will create a further disincentive to registration for many graduates and further erode any gains in diversity achieved in recent decades if the examination fee is the same as a second hand hatchback.

---

This option makes it harder for people to become registered.

---

Removing the subsidy for registration in already tough economic environment will make it nearly impossible for architectural graduates to approach registration as a realistic pathway.

---

I don't think many people would get registered for that cost. There are practices that currently support registration by paying the fee, and I doubt many of them would be able to fully or mostly cover that cost for their employees, so I think there would be a drop in people going for registration.

---

We need to support the young grads coming through the system to get registered

---

---

This proposal is beyond insulting to the many graduates who have spent upwards of a decade studying and practicing to become architects. To increase the fees fivefold is so out of touch I can not even comprehend it. If it's costing upwards of \$6000 per attempt, then the flaw lies in the registration methodology. It is nothing but irresponsible to then pass that on to graduates. Reassess the registration process before you quintuple the fees for everyone. Feels like another "pull the ladder up behind you" move young people have become so accustomed to. In the midst of a time where young people (majority of graduates) can barely save and pay groceries or inflated rent, you expect them to fork out \$6500 for an attempt and another \$6500 if they fail? Thirteen thousand dollars... These same young people are straddled with tens of thousands of student debt (50k+), many missed years of income and savings due to grueling outdated studies, and to graduate into a volatile market profession with some of the worst wages in the professional world. In a profession plagued by redundancies, market trends, growing costs (software, compliance), and low wages you dared to think that this proposal was appropriate? That's multiple years of a graduate's entire savings for even one attempt. Imagine the heartbreak of failing knowing you just lost close to \$7000 because you examined poorly. I'm registered and on a good wage and I can barely even save that these days... The difference between a graduate on 80k with a student loan, and someone on minimum wage is \$14,000... Then realise that many many graduates are only on 60-65k. That's about a 7k difference per year the same as the new fee. An entire year's savings compared to minimum wage is gone because you had a bad exam or missed an area that your practice never gave you experience in. Why even study architecture? Easier to work minimum wage right? Same outcome when you factor this in, minus the years of study and significant debt of course. That leads to a different point of how difficult registration is without incentivizing grads to constantly jump firms for experience areas but that's a topic for a different day. The NZRAB needs to get a reality check. As a recently registered architect and with friends with whom I have already discussed this, I can guarantee you I would never have even gone for an examination at this cost. I would have gone for my LPB2 and called it a day on my career progression; and if this option passes, I will encourage every single graduate I meet to do just that. The profession is already considered gatekept, and this will cement it. You've already noted in reports that half our architects are 50+, expect that to be 2/3 and growing if this goes ahead. I can not support this one bit, and this option is just completely ignorant of graduates' current economic and professional circumstances. If the NZRAB and NZIA want to increase fees they need to justify it. We already feel like we're paying for nothing but the right to exist. Our representative bodies have done nothing to address poor wages and ballooning costs such as BIM software monopolies and rising insurances. Why don't you start by helping graduates instead of hurting them, mandate NZIA practices meet minimum salaries for graduates similar to the Australian awards rates. Stop them being taken advantage of. Pay them fairly and maybe they could live with option 2, which is the only appropriate response. And then while we who are registered pay \$1000 a year to exist, maybe we can get something for our fees too. We should not be cutting our own costs by a couple of hundred dollars to create a more user-pays system. The boomers already did that to education and I'm \$100,000 more in student debt because of it after they got theirs for free. If \$200 is what it costs us to keep it accessible to graduates then so be it; none of this neoliberal user-pays junk. If we architects are so tight about \$200 each to ensure that graduates have a fair shot, then I question all of our ethics. This option makes about as much sense as the tax cuts for landlords while we have hiring freezes on nurses and doctors.

---

ACR is ridiculously expensive compared to other countries, like Australia. I have written to the Board previously about this and been told 'that's what it is'. Whereas I can see from this survey that it isn't. We are subsidising people to come into the profession when there are already far too many people in it. The Board seems to think it's a good thing that anyone can become an architect. However, professions are by nature exclusive and people need to pay their own way. You need to abandon the 'socialist utopia' model, stick to your core activities, and user pays. An overall reduction in the number of architects would not necessarily be a bad thing. But in any case this is not for the Board to socially engineer - which I see is what you have happily been doing.

---

I have been declined registration twice. Once at 7yrs industry experience and twice at 10yrs industry experience. Based on my experience I do not feel that raising or changing the cost is justified unless there is a structural change to how re-application is arranged. Currently the application process is highly subjective and dependent on 'on the day' performance.

---

You'll only get graduates who are wealthy going for rego. The normal graduate wouldn't be able to afford the fees especially with the housing crisis and wages not going up, some have families to support and children. This scenario only benefits those who's re registered

---

---

I think 6k is too much of a barrier to entry. It would mean architects would all have to essentially need family money to register, as graduate wages aren't high enough to be easily able to fund that.

---

Removal of the cross-subsidy for services disadvantages those not already registered, many of whom work for lower pay. In disadvantaging and disincentivizing graduates (many who will not receive pay increases if they pass and many who do not have employers subsidize registration), you push them towards LBP registration which is out of line with the stated goals of NZRAB and the NZIA which actively seek more people to register. The financial repercussions of failure in particular are severe and will put many people off.

---

It should be a user pays system. Costs to be paid by the person creating the work for the NZRAB.

---

Cost for initial registration is too prohibitive. ACR should not be cut at the expense of supporting new members to become registered. This would stunt the profession and progress of architecture in NZ.

---

Seems fair

---

I strongly disagree with the NZRAB's proposed fee increase for initial registration from \$1,200.60 to \$6,520. This exorbitant rise places an undue financial burden on architectural graduates, many of whom are already facing the pressures of student debt, modest salaries, and a high cost of living. Such a steep fee increase is not only disproportionate but risks excluding talented individuals from entering the profession, particularly those from less affluent backgrounds. The architectural field should be accessible to diverse, emerging talent, not limited to those who can afford these sky-high costs.

---

New rates for registration are prohibitive - will further discourage registration.

---

I am strongly against this proposed option. The proposed initial registration fees create a larger barrier through financial strain for applicants who want to apply. Furthermore by increasing the repeat attempt cost to match the proposed increased amount for the first attempt, I believe this is further going to discourage potential applicants for fear of the costs and risks associated. For those who may need to apply multiple times, the financial burden of doing so could be crippling. I think the increased proposed fee also creates an imbalance (or at least increases this imbalance) for those applicant who may not be able to afford the fee and therefore are barred from becoming a registered architect not necessarily from lack of experience, but instead due to lack of funds (which shouldn't determine if someone can practice or not). Please consider the affect increasing fees may have on the pool of applicants coming through.

---

Very Prohibitive to new architects becoming registered. No longer a realistic prospect for many graduates.

---

The cost seems to be prohibitive and will result in less graduates applying to become registered architects

---

This model would create significant barriers to initial registration, discouraging practices from supporting their graduates through the registration process. It would also make it much more challenging for individuals from less privileged backgrounds to succeed. Additionally, there's a risk that it could reinforce the perception of the NZRAB as being exclusive.

---

I agree with paying for what you receive, however for those graduates who do not work for larger companies/ will have to fund the full cost of registration themselves \$6,520 is a big ask and potentially a barrier

---

The current application costs and processes are already seen a high barrier for graduates. Passing the real costs of registration onto graduates will likely mean the process is cost prohibitive for almost all graduates. It is a 540% increase in costs and the application fee would make up 8-11% of their yearly salary of grads (based on the 2023 Emerge survey results). Furthermore having to pay the full cost application for repeat applications is likely to discourage graduates from re-applying.

---

---

Absolutely disagree that initial registration shouldn't be cross-subsidised. As someone who has just gone through the registration process, it is an incredibly stressful time and the fees already seem high (especially for applicants who don't get any assistance from employers). I know for certain that if there hadn't been the subsidy then I wouldn't have been able to afford to go for registration and would have stayed a graduate. Most people I know also preparing for initial registration wouldn't be able to afford the full cost and would likely not get registered. Removing the subsidy would be counter to the NZRAB's aim to see more people become registered.

---

This is a significant barrier for becoming registered

---

The balance between initial and repeat attempt fee is wrong - repeat should be half that of the initial attempt (and all attempts after that). The fees themselves really are quite a jump too from their current rates - perhaps too much of a raise in one go.

---

The cost that grads would face under this proposal is excessively high - which would very likely reduce the number being able to apply. Without any reduction in Fee's for the second attempt further exacerbates the problem with this. In talking with Grads in the studio many noted that this costs would delay any attempts at applying. There is no good reason for NZRAB to roadblock new architects in this manner.

---

Quick survey in our office of recent grads confirms that \$6K is a major disincentive esp with the possibility of another \$6K if 1st application fails. We do need to keep NZRAB membership attractive.

---

Diminishing profession - making it harder for graduates to apply for registration is counter intuitive. \$6520 is an enormous amount to expect a graduate to pay. You wont have a professional body to oversee in 10 years if you do this.

---

This amount of money would discourage me from perusing registration at all. Full cost recovery places a significant cost disadvantage on the group that is arguably the most financially vulnerable. It also puts an extreme amount of pressure for someone to pass on the first go. Given companies absorb annual fees but individuals tend to pay for their initial tests, it is a lot of financial stress for one person.

---

Too expensive for an applicant to attempt registration, I would be worried it would be too much of a barrier to registration. It would compete with all other life aspirations in a young adult's life - which all have high-cost implications.

---

Cost far to prohibitive

---

IT'S TOUGH OUT THERE FOE SAMALL PRACTICES

---

This high increase in cost is unfair for registration candidates and will depress the number who apply.

---

I share the NZRAB's concern that that a \$6,520 outlay is far too much for a young graduate to fork out to attempt gaining registration - and that again if you failed the first attempt? No way!  
This would just exacerbate the cross-Tasman brain-drain!

---

As some applicants will self fund their registration fees this option restricts access to registration. This risks the profession being monolithic and lacking the diversity to respond to the needs of the communities that we serve.

---

I do not think the ACR should drop when it results in such a big increase for those seeking registration

---

It is self explanatory. By the way did any of "you" asked me for my "expenses" when I was "pushed" to complete after being 10 years Registered Architect in Europe to go through "process" of completing semester at Uni for Professional practice and law.....and all hassle to once again "complete projects from A-Z", to pass registration exam (of course pay everything as required) and "confirm" that I have capacity, and knowledge to do same thinks what I already have been doing before in Europe. Yes in meantime I had to work for "pinuts" for nearly 5 years being "graduate", prior even come to position to complete registration, bla, bla, bla.

Highly disagree - as this would discourage graduates from registration and reduce the number of registered architects. The fee would be introduced at the time in their careers where their income is relatively low. If/when graduates become registered architects, they will repay the costs of their own registration, over time, by paying their annual registration fee.

I didn't appreciate how much the costs to NZRAB were and the current system subsidised registration, especially for Initial and repeat attempts. Looking at the numbers, I would appear that a big chunk of my registration fees are currently subsidising the registration process - just didn't think about that until now. It should be up to the applicant to cover the costs of their registration process and understand this in their journey to becoming a registered architect. It would be less than the course costs for 1 year of Uni study to put it in context. If fully paid for upfront, they would then have their future registration costs reduced as a result, not pay what amounts to a tax all their career. If you are expecting an increasing amount of applicants, then I don't want to further subsidise the 'pool' of applicants, assuming an increasing % of repeat attempts of registration. My understanding is the registration process/interviews are online these days, so why is the costs increasing so much?

Alternative

I believe some form of subsidy should occur

Between Neutral to Disagree, as this would raise the bar so high that we will have fewer applicants applying.

This is reasonable given the costs involved - give that to get to this point the Unis would have charged \$50k - this seems a small amount albeit its still quite a lot of cost upfront.

It is too expensive compared to graduate income, and would likely be a barrier to applicants. If there are practices that cover this cost for their graduates, then it might lead to a situation where only those from large practices are likely to become registered.

With the initial registration application fee being quite expensive and not affordable, there would be a significant reduction in the number of applications which would impact the profession long term as there would be less registered architects in the future and architectural graduates seeking alternative professional accreditation routes such as LBP. Good option for the registered architects as annual fees go down for us.

The current cost is already a barrier to registration. I believe this will drastically reduce the numbers seeking registration.

Far too expensive to register. Especially after 5 years of university and the current recession!

the initial fee and repeat pathway for the applicant could be higher without being a deterrent.  
the full cost to the applicant is significant and could be a significant deterrent

Fees are excessively expensive that prohibits graduates from attempting registration, regardless of ability to practice responsibly as an architect.

These annual fees are more comparable to other countries, although still higher (UK/AUS).

I'm a working professional so I'm happy to pay for full cost and maybe a bit more to cover some additional NZRAB activities

The initial registration cost seems excessive for those that are near the bottom of their earning potential.

Prefer to keep costs down as being an Australia based Architect don't feel as much of the impact and benefit of fees. But don't want to impact on Grads that significantly. Feels excessive especially compared to the funding model here.

This will prove to costly for people attempting registration, or practices supporting registration of employees.

This would be a major barrier in completing registration

This is a sure-fire way to kill off any prospect of registration and continuation of the Architecture industry in New Zealand. Increasing the barriers to registration, which are already high for graduates, would send more individuals such as myself to places like Australia, and continue the slow death of the NZ architecture industry.

The cost is unreachable - to the level that my colleagues and I will likely never go for registration at all.

This will create a large financial barrier for graduates to become registered. (unsure if this is a typo but first and second attempt are the same fee)

Price increase is significantly higher!! It is already not a straightforward path to registration. Increasing to this price will result in even more of a barrier to registration. Will see even less newly registered architects from this.

Architects are on much higher salaries than graduates, \$200 a year is negligible, and will not be noticed considerably by Architects, yet spending \$6k+ would be huge at the start of your career.

Becoming registered is hard enough without having to stump up \$6.5k, this will kill the inbound new architects to the industry

This is incredibly unfeasible and puts huge financial barriers in place for registration.

There is a drastic cost difference, which makes registration inaccessible to some graduates. This discriminates those who are in tougher circumstances.

Applicants should pay costs of registration Fees for ACR are too high at present and would decrease

Proposed cost of initial registration is prohibitive.

I believe the cost to graduates trying to register is too high and will become a barrier. We should be encouraging people to register.

The high cost of initial registration is off-putting, and subsequent attempts equally as prohibitive. After failing a first time, I doubt a second attempt would be made. Graduates would likely spend the \$6,000 on airfares and gain experience overseas, possibly never to return.

Unbearably expensive registration! 5-7 weeks of a graduate's income + annual fee. If the registration is covered by the company, usually the new architect will be required to stay for a couple of years. High risk of exploitations as in case of better offer elsewhere, the payoff is required. High risk of Graduates rather applying for LBP.

this option will discourage registration with high cost of entry

Presents a barrier to registration, which I don't support.

It is not ideal to create a barrier to initial registration.

This will greatly discourage firms from investing in graduates and deter individuals from pursuing the registration process. Paying the same fees for second application for registration will add even more pressure to the already high-pressure process.

This is far too expensive and will reduce the number of people striving for registration significantly. Graduates that have no support from their employer/companies will be set back and most likely never go for registration as it is simply too expensive. Companies that provide registration fees in their employment contracts will also be financially hurt by this.

To save \$200 and send all new registration traffic down the ADNZ route seems short sighted.

The cost to become registered is off-putting for potential architects, who are typically earlier in their career and therefore less capable of meeting those costs.

---

A 500% uptick in costs for new registrants is tantamount to killing the profession. We are already besieged by untrained LBPs as design 'professionals' and making registration as an architect more elitist and expensive will further destroy the growth of the profession and support that that growth brings.

---

The cost for registration will be prohibitive for many graduates.

---

too expensive for graduates to go for registration, less applicants.

---

Although as a small practice this appeals, the cost for initial registration becomes prohibitive

---

Barrier of initial registration will be too high.

---

This would make the barrier for initial registration huge, and discriminate against some graduates who are not able to raise the fees. There should be equal opportunities for graduates regardless of your background.

---

This is prohibitive to graduates and makes no sense.

---

Disagree with full removal of subsidy, as initial registrants are typically tightly budget controlled and we don't want to discourage registration in favour of LBP regime. Agree with introduction of charges for other services.

---

Allocate the costs where they are required. The cost for the initial registration should be what it is and not subsidised.

---

I believe we have a duty to support new architects entering the profession and support a subsidy for registration

---

It makes the registration process too expensive for people to want to get registered.

---

This option is simply not affordable. For myself personally, I have recently taken on a mortgage with buying a house and was planning to go for registration next year. This cost increase would set me back a year in a half of all my life savings to apply for registration alone which I currently do not have. This proposed fee would stop people like myself considering registration altogether unless the practice I work for would heavily subsidise the fee, which they currently cannot afford to do and I imagine would not do. This option only allows for people born into wealth to become registered Architects after University, no one else I personally know would likely bother with registration if the fee is this high and would leave the industry for good. I would hope for a figure closer to \$1500 for the initial registration application under pathway 1.

---

We need to support as many graduates as possible and others to become registered or many will decide instead to become LBPs.

---

I would not want to make it harder for graduates to attempt registration

---

For many years the applicants for registration have been subsidized. This has caused a tremendous burden for the annual registration fee for registered Architects. The cause of inflation has risen over the years and not to mention post covid situation. It is unfair for the registered Architects' to subsidise as this has been going on for many years. I am a sole practice and we are facing unprecedented situation, global recession (NZ has double recession) and situations are not getting better with the global economy/recession, wars in Ukraine, Middle East contributing to the global recession and directly affecting the NZ economy. We also need to understand that for the initial registration under "no crosssubsidisation", when the applicant is finally registered they will enjoy the privileges having the license carrying the entity name of "Architect" subjected to the governing code of practice and Ethics.

---

If the costs go to that limit we may as well pack up our bags as a group as there will not be enough new architects to replace. The cost would also need to be notified to any young person entering the industry so it is not a surprise later on and they can make that decision earlier. I would be right P off if I had the rug pulled from under me as it happened to me with student loans in 1991 . The risk to reward ratio of our industry is dismal compared with other professions and this would make it worse. You would see a lot of move permanently to ADNZ membership if implemented and the public are not valuing architects any differently. Some of those are arguably earning more than us with less risk under the RAA as the public don't understand the difference in training and skill. That is an issue for all of us including RZRAB and NZIA. There has been some abysmal marketing and lobbying from our professional representation. NZIA are not even in the

game in Wellington having coffees with ministers! If our graduates find it less and less attractive to be registered then this will muddy the waters further and there will be no difference. It should be those that benefit that pay. It is not necessarily the applicant that will immediately gain remuneration. The market is paying the same now for 2 years technical study and the same experience and less risk. On a pure financial basis it may not make any sense to a graduate. It is hard to get graduates interested in the first place -increasing the cost is another barrier. A practice with architects has access to client funds and those need to be channeled collectively to support new architects that we need in NZ. It is the clients that benefit the most for what they pay which is often not enough for the risk we absorb on their behalf also.

it would help if you explained the acronyms throughout the survey. I am for reducing costs wherever possible. more cost will lead to less registrations from young and senior practitioners.

No one will pay for this. The barrier of entry is high enough as it is, the level of difficulty to achieve registration combined with the high cost is already enough to deter most people.

This cost increase on registration would be a huge barrier to registration for applicants who are at the start of their careers, and would have the effect of reinforcing those who are privileged, and likely making it harder for marginalised groups to become part of the profession, reducing diversity.

This option creates an overly onerous financial barrier to those seeking registration

Cost prohibitive for new/repeat applicants for initial registration.

I feel the initial costs are too prohibitive to expect the graduates to pay, or small practice owners (like ourselves) to pay for our staff.

The pay for graduates in the industry is substantially lower than other professions. Increasing the cost for initial registration would provide a significant barrier for many graduates. The current rate of \$1200 is a lot for many people especially in the current economic climate, and I personally would have not been able to afford this fee at all.

In my opinion 6520 dollars for initial registration is very costly. In my case, that would rule out registration.

I completely disagree with this

High registration fees would have been prohibitive for me, I appreciate that others are in a similar or more difficult situation.

I believe this would be a large barrier to initial registration. The pay in the industry for graduates is already not very high. I went for initial registration this October and the existing fee was already a bit of a barrier as my organization does not pay for initial registration. I would not have been able to apply when ready if it was at the full cost recovery rate. I also can't see many practices being willing to foot that bill.

Too expensive for graduates to become registered. This will turn a lot of people away from becoming architects. Becoming an architect should also be accessible to everyone, not just the rich. Graduates don't always get paid much, and with the cost of everything going up these days, it can be difficult to save that much money just to register.

I believe that there should be some subsidy of initial registration, but this should be less than the current rate.

Initial costs for registration would be prohibitive for many. ACR's are typically paid by the practice and do not need to decrease.

Too high barrier for entry for new registrations

\$6500 seems prohibitively expensive to become registered. I think the more registered architects the better for our profession - so disagree with this option.

With no cross subsidisation it will be a huge disincentive for graduates to bother to register

It looks like too big a leap in initial registration for most and would discourage people entering the profession

---

Cost too high for registration

---

Significant initial registration costs would be a barrier for many people to get registered, over \$6k is unaffordable for many graduates.

---

Not sure where NZRAB imagines graduate architects would be able to find that kind of money, especially if they are turned down the first time. This would be substantial financial barrier to entry

---

Fees are a cost currently. However cost for registration will be a massive barrier to what is already a challenge.

---

Currently the professionals experiencing severe financial hardship so reducing membership please for all basis would make sense all members will be subsidising the one of cost of registration and potentially not sufficiently encouraging applicants to be successful on the first attempt.

---

subsidy should remain for graduates, who are the lower paid part of our woefully underpaid profession with limited funds. It should also remain for returning NZ architects. Subsidy for overseas architect should match the level of subsidy we receive in those countries (ie reciprocal. It was going to cost me \$27000 to register in the UK) there should be no subsidy for LBP/technician route - they have chosen to skip the expense of the proper education and from experience need a much higher level of interrogation of knowledge - and in particular ethics.

---

Often, it is challenging for Architecture Graduates to make a living. Increasing the fees to this level will preclude career starts to become registered.

---

## Please explain your answer for your rating of option 2 – same level of cross subsidy

Answered: 349 Skipped: 54

### RESPONSES

This is a more realistic option, still a raise in initial registration cost but not significant. When I become a registered architect, I wouldn't mind paying this level of annual cost.

I consider it important to minimize the financial barriers of initial entry into the profession so that it is accessible for a broad range of individuals.

I understand there are probably better solutions than maintaining the status quo.

This is the most reasonable option, however is still a 40% increase in cost for initial registration. Again, the industry pay does not incline this sharply, and the cost would be a deterrent to future applicants. It would be good to see options for scaled fees explored, for example a lower fee for online conversations vs in person. Another option is to increase the level of cross subsidy through ACR. Talking with my peers (registered and unregistered) architectural firms often cover the ACR fee as part of the employment benefits but do not pay for the initial registration fee. If the idea is to make registration more accessible and encourage people to register, an increased subsidy should be surveyed as an option.

This is ok, but I would like the board to look into less expensive registration processes.

As per comments above. I think the fee for initial registration could be increased from \$1200 to \$2000 with a resultant slight reduction for ACRs.

If anything, we should be cross-subsidising more, given the level of inflationary pressure, particularly on younger members in our industry.

A small cost increase to reflect inflation would be fair.

This seems a more fair fee for everyone. In addition, additional fees could potentially be gained from ACRs full year by staggering fees paid as per my comments at the end. Why is the cost for pathways 5-8 for international architects not that much more than initial registration?

We are concerned about the financial impact on our practice as we currently cover both our team members initial registration fees and their ongoing fee. Despite this though, our primary concern is accessibility of initial registration to a diverse base of graduates. We actively work to encourage and support a more diverse industry than has been traditional. We struggle to see how anyone on a graduate salary would have the financial means to pay a respective initial registration fee under Option 1 \$6,520 or Option 3 \$3,150, in the instance that they work for a practice that does not cover this. Based on the NZIA Salary survey results in 2023, there are only 28 practices that cover the cost of registration and 11 that cover professional membership ongoing. In particular, the costs proposed in Option 1 are extremely prohibitive to a graduate that does not have family or independent support. We are concerned that each of the three options have a cost proposed for voluntary suspension. We see this as disproportionately impacting women and at a time where their finances are often most pressed. In our experience, it is primarily women who use this option when going on parental leave. Despite the impact on our firm and the estimated net cost increase to us per annum, we consider that option 2 is the least prohibitive to graduates seeking to obtain registration.

Out of the three proposed options, this one seems the most balanced, considering that costs are rising and need to be recovered through fees. However, as someone following Pathway 2, a nearly fivefold increase in the QUEAP fee is particularly discouraging and unaffordable.

---

The current fee structure is an acceptable cost for registration

---

This option is easier support. The status quo (with cross subsidisation) is an acknowledgement that to undergo a course of study in Architecture (particularly Pathway 1), is very expensive investment of which can take many years to pay off, which not all architects across generations have had to bear. The proposed increase however exceeds that of inflation of the relative lifetime of the current fees, so some justification of these numbers is required.

---

A price increase to this level is more acceptable and less ridiculous.

---

Still an expensive option for architectural graduates if they are paying for their own registration. Inflation is not reflected on graduates salary.

---

I think the price point delivered in option 2 is more accessible for most practicing graduates who are limited by their salary band as it is. I certainly disagree with the cost of repeat attempts being sustained as per option 1 which makes failure to demonstrate competency a barrier for attempting it in the future, especially if an applicant is close to demonstrating competency

---

This will be a reasonable fee.

---

I understand costs are increasing across all realms of professional services, but believe the profession should continue to subsidise new registrations via ACR Fees. This is a profession which heavily relies on the support of mentorship, and support from senior peers in growing and learning. Once registered to a professional body members should actively encourage growth in its membership, not create an elite pool out of touch with the needs of a larger cohort of design professionals in this industry.

---

While not ideal, this option makes the most sense to me because it appears to take into account inflation, but also the cross-subsidy allows for those with a higher income to subsidise those at the beginning of their career.

---

too much cross subsidisation

---

As Board Chair of NZRAB when the fee levels were last set for Initial Registration, I strongly support the concept of cross subsidisation. Prior to 2012 the cost was seen by applicants as a significant barrier to seeking registration, not just the initial fee but also the re-sit fee which was a repeat at the same cost. A check across other professions revealed that the Board's then fees were substantially more than other professions. Many graduates were unnecessarily delaying registration until they could be absolutely sure they might get through. Research showed that under the earlier AERB fee regime from 1993 to 2004 the average number of applicants per year was 41. When the previous NZRAB initial registration fee came in, from 2006 to 2012, the average per annum had dropped to 34. It was also identified that by getting graduates to register earlier, that the NZRAB would benefit by receiving their annual registration fees earlier. Once the new fees were enacted there was a significant uptake of graduates seeking registration with numbers per annum increasing. I recall anecdotal evidence that graduates were registering earlier yet the pass fail was not varying. I strongly believe the rational back in 2012 still applies. Here is an extract for the consultation document at that time: "NZRAB Fee Change Consultation 2012 This consultation document relates to proposed changes to some of the fees that the New Zealand Registered Architects Board (NZRAB) charges architects and registration applicants for its services. The proposed fee changes are intended to: • make initial registration less onerous financially • better reflect changes to the NZRAB's procedures • ensure the NZRAB's financial viability. Architects and the NZRAB's other stakeholders are asked to read the document and respond to the survey at the end. We suggest that respondents save the document in Microsoft Word, type in their responses, and then email it back to paul@nzrab.org.nz. Proposed Fee Changes The proposed changes are as follows, after which an explanation for each proposed change is provided, all GST-included at 15 per cent. 1. Reduce the fee for initial registration from \$2,081.50 to \$1200.60 for a first attempt. 2. Reduce the fee for initial registration from \$2,081.50 to \$600.30 for each subsequent attempt. 3. Abolish the \$1,725 fee for an interactive equivalency assessment for initial registration. 4. Abolish the \$115 fee for a competence review desk-top assessment. 5. Increase the fee for a competence review interactive assessment from \$517.50 to \$632.50. 6. Increase the fee for an annual certificate of registration from \$563.50 to \$664.00 and the fee for a six-month certificate of registration from \$281.75 to \$322.00. Subject to consultation and ministerial approval, it is intended that changes 1 to 5 would come into effect once gazetted and changes 6 would come into effect on 1 July 2013. Explanation 1) Reduce the fee for initial registration from \$2,081.50 to \$1200.60 for a first attempt The NZRAB is concerned that too many people are delaying their applications for registration unnecessarily and are spending too much time preparing applications (especially case studies) that are excessive and unnecessarily costly to produce. This may mean some competent people are not applying at all. The NZRAB believes that in part this is caused by the current fee being too high. This was one of the themes that emerged from the NZRAB's survey of graduates who after five years

had not sought registration. The NZRAB is also concerned that the cost of initial registration as an architect is excessive compared to other New Zealand professions with similar entry prerequisites, while remuneration levels for recently-registered architects are relatively low. New Zealand would benefit if more of the built environment was designed by people with an architect's professional support, ethical obligations and accountability. 2) Reduce the fee for initial registration from \$2,081.50 to \$600.30 for each subsequent attempt The proposal to markedly reduce the fee for each subsequent attempt reflects the same thinking as applies to the fee reduction for first-time applicants. The NZRAB wishes to encourage applicants to see registration as less intimidating. A reduced fee for each subsequent attempt would encourage more first-time applicants who would know that if they miss out a second attempt is less financially onerous. The NZRAB budgets for five repeat applications a year, so the financial implications are modest. "

---

It's more appropriate / in line with previous payments. Given the cost of living and salary's within NZ I think this is more realistic to what those who choose to seek registration can reasonably afford without seeking additional loans etc.

---

Option two is more sensible. We all expect costs to rise over time, and this option is more palatable. I still don't support the fee for voluntary suspension, however, I think the issue is more that when taking maternity leave, voluntary suspension is the only option for pausing CPD requirements. The word "suspension" has very negative connotations. Could an additional service be created for maternity leave, with the first 12months incurring no fee, and then any longer than 12months, the \$250 fee would apply? If this was possible, then maintaining the proposed \$250 fee for voluntary suspension might be more acceptable, as would not include mothers/fathers. We want our mothers to feel good about leaving on maternity leave, and also re-entering the profession again.

---

Since there will already be a jump if fees across the board, and the percentage affects the initial registration with a big \$ value lift.

---

This is a more fair approach to align with wages and cost of living currently

---

This encourages and continues to be accessible for graduates to apply, particular those that their companies are not willing or able to pay for their registration process. Thus allowing them the opportunity to grow and ideally be a better architect and increase the standard of design in NZ overall. Maintaining a higher yearly fee is more in line with registered architects income.

---

I think it is right that the profession encourages people to register to ensure that the profession has a strong standing and representation and that there are not financial barriers to registering

---

The only possible option of the 3 listed. Even this is high enough.

---

I think we should attempt to keep the fees as low as possible while making them enough to discourage people from applying for registration before they are ready and have experience across most competencies.

---

You want to encourage people to get registered as it is overall better for the organisation to have more people who understand the rules and the seriousness of the industry

---

See the above answer - this provides (out of all the options) the best opportunity and ultimately best supports those starting out in their careers.

---

As those who have come before have benefited from, those who come through the ranks shall too. By keeping the fees lowered, arguably you'll have more people registered who can then help to subsidise in future. If you don't continue to have freshly registered architects, the effects will be two fold.

---

This feels the most approachable for someone entering the workforce

---

To continue providing support for the profession

---

More is needed

---

---

Option 2 provides a reasonable balance, preserving accessibility while increasing fees moderately. However, further clarification on how these increases will improve services or processes within NZRAB would be helpful for applicants to understand the value added by the fee increase.

---

This is the only way for graduates to continue to become registered and have the power in their hands to decide when, without it being tied to the company you work for.

This is the most fair option out of the three.

The cost of living is high. Everything has increased in cost. I disagree with the fee going up this much. As a sole practitioner I already pay for my NZRAB ACR plus my NZIA individual and practice memberships. This ends up being quite a large chunk of money. I do not feel like we need to subsidise people getting registered by this much. What additional services are we actually paying more for anyway?! I don't feel like we get that much from the NZRAB anyway. I feel organisations like this tend to waste money, and not be efficient with costs... Can we see a break-down of these additional services?

As per above, as a sole practitioner, I would prefer not to have an increase in fees

There is only a small uplift in annual registration vs not providing that cross fee support.

However, while I'd prefer to pay 1200, I'd still pay 1750, but it's more of a closer call.

Similar comments to above.

I support keeping the same level of cross-subsidy across the services. However, a \$550 increase to the cost of applying is still a significant cost to Graduates. It may be best reconsider how the application process itself is run and organised if the current system is unavoidably costly.

As above

This is the only reasonable financial option for supporting graduates.

We need to encourage appropriately qualified and experienced people to gain registration and the costs in this option are reasonable.

The current level is justifiable and achievable, albeit hard.

This would be more attractive than removing the subsidies. Do need to be mindful of the amount the annual continuing registration fee is set as this increases periodically, and along with insurances and institute fees can add up quickly .

Bringing architects into the profession is as important an aim as any use of funds the NZIA could aspire to. If the registration process could be 100% paid by membership fees (it can), that would be the better option for the profession of architecture in New Zealand. No architects are cancelling their registration due to membership fees. Registration fees are real barrier to new entrants already, a higher level would only serve to reduce registrations, which is an awful outcome for architecture.

I recognise rising work costs & this seems like a fairer increase in line with other industry registration programmes.

The most workable solution. No issue for registered architects helping subsidise this cost companies should be doing this anyway.

A more balanced approach whereby an Architect's registration is used in part to support the progression of architectural graduates to registered architects.

With clearer framework and some refinement this is the best option forward.

---

---

Everything is becoming more expensive, I don't see why we should favour one group over another.

---

Probably sustainable for a registered architect and maybe? workable for a graduate?

---

As above

---

This option reflects a manageable and fair incentive to candidates

---

I believe this is necessary to continue to get graduates seeking registration. Particularly when raising the cost will only mean that people who can afford to get registered will do so. We will lose diversity of our architects and likely diversity of the services they can afford to provide less low end / low paid jobs.

---

Keeping the same level makes sense if we are to retain a high number of registered architects.

---

As per explanation above

---

Similar comment, but to a lesser extent. I am not ecstatic about these changes, but this option is somewhat more digestible.

---

This option is best among the given options, the best of course it to keep to the current fee of \$1200. Already a big pressure for people who do not receive any support from the practices.

---

I think that this is the fairest option, given the general salary range of architectural graduates.

---

The collective of registered architects have a vested interest in maintaining a clearly understood, experience achievable, and financially viable pathway to registration. This maintains the title 'architect' (and all the responsibilities and benefits that come with it) as the 'normal' stepping stone for graduates and others in the architectural sector. If its too hard then other options (ie ADNZ, LPB) will increase in popularity and gain a momentum/scale relative to NZRAB.

---

The cross subsidy allows for architectural graduates to progress their career and encourage them to become registered architects. The requirement to remain a member of NZRAB allows a level of certainty that the cross subsidy will be repaid during the career of an architect. The revised level of increase is in line with an inflation uplift and should be accepted.

---

As a profession, I think we need to help remove as many barriers for applicants as possible.

---

The initial registration fee is achievable, but still at a level that requires a commitment from applicants. An increase in fees across the board is to be expected given the time since the last adjustment and inflation.

---

Helps share the burden

---

This seems the most balanced approach by applying costs across the community, rather than on the individual.

---

Think this is the best option

---

I support full cross subsidisation - to reduce disincentives to registration. It's a business expense that practices can claim.

---

An increase matching inflation is acceptable.

---

The option is the most sensible of the three. The fees are still steep in comparison to \$1200. A few weeks ago, the NZRAB released some important statistics, highlighting 51% of registered architects are aged 50 or older, 17% being over the age of 65. While these are significant milestones for the individuals bringing a wealth of knowledge to the profession, young emerging professionals are going to be the future of this industry and the decisions made now will have a significant impact to graduates, and students considering architecture as a profession.

---

This option is much more feasible to me, and something I would be willing to pay. I acknowledge rising costs of the NZRAB and think this option is more of a compromise that doesn't put the applicant out completely.

To encourage more ppl to get registered

While I could accept this option as is close to the status quo, but it is still not an adequate enough increase for the initial registrations.

For graduates that are not well off, it could become a hurdle for them to getting registered. The socioeconomic and demographic factors are a consideration here to support diversity in the profession. I would support incentivising the companies that are employing the graduate to make a contribution in some way, then that allows the annual fees to be a bit lower?

Would like to see cross subsidization level reduced

Agree with this entirely. it's a small increase in cost for all but still manageable.

(Refer above). Less financial obstacles will mean that 'sponsorships' for those still unable to site registrations is also more likely to be available. Sponsorships like your firm paying your fees, or scholarships.

A good balance. The cost of ACR cost is following inflation. Registered architects have a higher salary than graduates. They can afford it more.

As a registered architect now, I was able to rely on the support of other registered architects to subsidize my fees in order to get registered so I think it is fair to continue to pay this forward.

In this context, 'Option 1' is relevant. The proposed 160% increase will create the same barriers for graduates pursuing Pathway 1 in their quest for Initial Registration. While it's reasonable to expect costs to rise over time and that services should be funded accordingly—especially by those with international experience—the proposed fee increases for those on Pathways 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 (excluding 4-NZ Architects) should move forward. These fees could be adjusted further to align with those in other countries, which would help maintain current subsidies for NZ Registered Architects and graduates on Pathway 1. For reference: - ARCH: \$724.50 < \$850 (+\$125.50) - GRAD: \$1,200.60 < \$3,150 (+\$1,949.40) The same concerns expressed regarding 'Option 1' apply here; the 160% increase will similarly hinder graduates on Pathway 1 in achieving Initial Registration.

The ongoing cost of registration is too high.

1) I do understand that fee increases are required. I believe that Option 2 proposed fee increases for the initial registration first and subsequent attempts are fair and reasonable. Having a lesser fee for a reassessment is justified, as applicants would have already demonstrated competencies in some of the assessment areas in the first interview. 2) I have grave concerns about a 400% rise in proposed QEAP assessment fees. I believe this will give inequitable advantage to graduates whose families could afford to subsidise their Master's study, and who were not required to start full-time employment immediately following Bachelor's study. I believe that this policy will further disadvantage both minority groups (eg. Maori / Pasifika) and groups which are significantly underrepresented in the professional design industry (eg. females, LGBT+).

I think this option is more reasonable however it has some nuances, the increase of QEAP assessment increasing 5 times the cost and not subsidized at all effectively punishes someone for not going through Pathway one. There are many people who entered the profession through other avenues (myself included) this assumes that my level of knowledge is a lesser value, of difficult to assess. It would add another barrier and be discouraging to many potential great Architects.

As my answer above, my company pays for the annual NZIA fee, not the initial registration cost. This would mean that my company pays for 70% of my registration.

This option is most in keeping the ethos of the architectural profession in NZ.

---

This continues to subsidise the initial registration fee which will encourage applicants to keep applying

---

This appears to be an appropriate level of cross-subsidisation.

---

Prefer to option 1 But see 10 below for my preferred option

---

These costs are already on the expensive side for some who are juggling a mortgage or young family, but understandably you have to charge some money to cover your costs, so this seems like the best option.

---

Registered architects generally earn more and can therefore subsidize initial registration. Many practices also bare the cost of NZRAB and NZIA fees for their employees, so a higher fee will be paid by a practice, not an individual in many cases.

---

As above, all practising registered architects benefit from the continual growth of our profession, whether indirectly or directly. Leaving it to a few to pay like a "user pay" system is unfair. Please leave it as status quo or lift the levy for all registered architects to ensure the NZRABs costs are covered. FYI our practise pays for all the fees registered architects incur annually. This includes successful registration of graduates. I believe this is similar with most practises. We do this to incentivise graduates to become and remain registered but to also invest in our people.

---

Not sustainable unless something else changes

---

This seems the fairest way to support Graduates and has worked well in the past.

---

(As above). The increase in fees for registered architects is not much more than a streaming

---

service subscription. To sustain the profession, we need to see another, younger generation being encouraged into it. Those already in can and should subsidize that future rather than punish them financially for their career choice.

---

A reasonable amount of increase that doesn't prevent people from applying.

---

Costs have increased over the last five years since the fees were last reviewed and hence it seems understandable that the fees go up.

---

We maintain the cross subsidy to support graduates into the profession. Already they are burdened usually with an unbelievable student loan and a greater application fee will put registration out of reach. WE MUST CONTINUE TO MAKE REGISTRATION FINANCIALLY EASIER FOR OUR GRADUATES

---

I do not agree that we pay more for the registration of graduate architects - it is unfair on the profession, especially when we are in a recession. True cost needs to be factored in.

---

1. Technicians seem to 'rule' most architectural firms that I have seen. This is a fundamental betrayal of the public trust. 2. Architects are on side-by-side contracts with the client, losing their agency. This is a fundamental betrayal of the public trust.

---

Fair and reasonable.

---

As a practice owner, we'd probably pay anyway. If the practice owner can't/won't pay, at least it is vaguely affordable for a graduate.

---

This is still too expensive

---

This is probably the most fair option.

---

Option 2 is a lot more reasonable to the applicant. Applicants would understand a fee increase, considering it hasn't been increased in 5 years and this would be more in line with inflation. The fees could still be covered by the applicants firm if desired; and if not, is a lot more of a reasonable price to pay fully from the applicant. I do not believe there would be a large decrease in numbers of applicants with this increase.

---

I feel the increase to ACR is not significant and still represents good value for money. This also keeps the fees for entry at the lower level encouraging the next generation of architects to be registered.

Minimising the financial barrier of entry for initial registration allows more people to become registered and therefore help with subsidising registration for others. Having accessible career progression in the form of accessible registration will encourage people to stay in NZ and keep their skills in the NZ market.

To be honest, I don't consider that the current registration fee provides much in the way of service so I am reluctant to see this rise, noting that this is just one of a number of annual subscriptions required to maintain currency in practice.

While Option 2, which suggests maintaining the current level of cross-subsidy for services, is preferable to Option 1, I still remain firm in my decision to abandon my attempt to register next year. My reasoning is as follows: Lack of Salary Growth: Without salary increases in the industry to keep pace with inflation, I do not see how the rising fees for registration can be justified or covered. I had initially planned to pursue registration here, having gained most of my experience in New Zealand, with the intention of continuing my career here after spending a few years in my home country. However, the addition of a voluntary suspension fee has forced me to reconsider my goals and long-term plans. Unjustifiable Fee Hikes: Another major factor is the significant increase in the recognition fee for overseas degrees. This fee is now completely unachievable for me, further disqualifying this option. I find this particularly damaging to the architectural profession in New Zealand, as diverse perspectives and overseas education can provide valuable contributions to the industry. Unfortunately, with such prohibitive costs, it is likely that fewer individuals with international qualifications will seek registration here, which could diminish the richness and innovation in New Zealand architecture.

expense to registered architects becoming too high

I support option 1, please see option 1 for my explanation. I also support changing of the form and organisation of the exam to substantially reduce its cost.

We want to encourage people to register and reducing the initial registration fee is the best way to do this.

I would prefer to pay more to allow others to get registered and gain the opportunities I have now as a registered architect. Accessibility to and future proofing of the industry is extremely important

Spreading the cost helps avoid someone's financial situation being a barrier to them getting registered. Once registered they will be able to subsidize others entering the profession each year and from a stronger financial position later in their career.

More affordable first registration

Understandable to raise costs slightly due to inflation etc.

This seems like the best option to me, initial registration is already expensive enough. It's fair that we play higher ACR fees to subsidise initial registrations.

This option is my preference. Generally, with ACRs fees being raised, this cost could be split between company / architect, to 'soften the blow'. I understand this isn't possible with sole architects but it's the most accessible option for fee increases.

Option 2 keeps the status-quo per se with a small increase to adjust to inflation which is the most fair outcome to keep registration fees accessible to all.

This seems to be the least prohibitive to all parties.

Cost accessibility for applicants.

Highly support the same level of cross subsidy. For architects and architecture to remain relevant into the future we need to support a diverse and talented profession and ensure equitable access to accreditation.

As above.

This option looks like the best balanced.

in comparison to the increased fees for all other pathways, the initial registration fee change is only minor and probably reflects only inflation. I do not agree the financial burden to be transferred solely to international architects and those without NZ education that seek registration. I think NZ depends on skilled workforce to the country and this model will discourage such talents to get registered in NZ.

This would seem to balance the necessary increases across those already registered and those looking to go through the process. The ACR increase is not ideal, but costs have gone up at the end of the day...!

as above

I think putting all the cost increases on Registered Architects is also not fair

While I agree the cost on the initial applicants is reduced, the extent of increase to annual fees can be mitigated.

However i absolutely disagree that those wanting to go on voluntary suspension should have to pay any fee at all. Why are you further penalising those who effectively need to pause their membership usually because of caregiving reasons - this will SIGNIFICANTLY affect mothers overwhelmingly. Again, you are actively effectively locking out huge swaths of the profession.

As this is the current level, and the fees are increasing equally, this affects everyone equally

While this makes it easier for initial registration it does increase costs to Architects and practices on top of other rising costs

I support this option as I believe that the profession should support graduates in becoming registered. \$1750 is still a lot of money to commit.

I think the profession should help as much as possible reduce the barrier for new entrants to registration.

The most attainable option for a broader audience is that companies can write off the increased ARC costs, allowing graduates to afford the registration process and facilitating their participation.

This option is fair, however may be considered too little of a financial investment for new applicants increasing the number of people applying who are simply not ready.

This seems more equitable - with one exception. The QEAP cost seems significant - is this based upon a lower occurrence - or is there an onerously complex procedure involved? Again, I raise concerns about barriers to diversity through a significant registration fee for someone who has come through a non-traditional/non NZ tertiary route. I myself went through this, having gone to a major overseas university, however did my Master's degree in Architecture in New Zealand, though I still had to pay to get my accredited university's undergraduate degree assessed, which seemed excessive after a New Zealand university accepted it as a basis to proceed with Masters Studies. I am concerned that after all that expense and experience, further levying those applicants with a quintupled application cost will reduce the insight that overseas architects can bring to New Zealand practice. Perhaps make it clear to initial registration applicants that ACR fees are subsidising some of the costs so they

Fair for waged architect to share cost and lower the final barrier for people who wish to get registered or re-sit.

This is the least bad option

I think keeping the same model is the most fair approach. Why should future applicants get treated different? Honesty and Fairness is part of the ethical conduct, to me it seems very unfair for previous registered architects to have had their application subsidised whilst new ones bearing the total cost.

Young Architects are increasingly choosing the LBP route. As above we want to remove impediments to register and keeping fees as low as practical will support students to register.

My feeling is the current approach is unsustainable

This seems to keep things in line with keeping registrations coming in for the graduates

Its fine as is.

I support this option as there if there is an increase in costs then the industry and those applying for registration need to pay to a certain extent. Practices benefit from having their staff get registered as it helps to build the next generation and to grow the expertise within the practice.

The increased fees, which are high, are probably still achievable for graduates.

This seems to be the most sustainable option across the board. However, I question what the effects of having a fee for voluntary suspension might be. Some people, like myself, are currently on voluntary suspension because I am working overseas and therefore still have income to afford the fee, but where does it put practitioners who may be on VS because they are currently unable to work? Again, does this fee structure have the potential to exacerbate existing inequities within the profession? Seemingly small inequities can have massive impacts on the future pipeline of architects, and I would encourage the NZRAB to really consider what kind of future you are allowing or disallowing by introducing financial barriers that didn't previously exist. How much more would it cost a registered architect/initial registrant if the VS fee is subsidised by those fees?

Not sure we need to increase the fees at this economic moment, as New Zealand is facing challenges.

This option seems like a good compromise between all parties.

As point 5 above.

It'll keep people holding onto their registration as the increase isn't as significant. Still a high fee for initial registration though.

Similar response as per 'Option 1' applies here. We acknowledge the years have passed since fees were last reviewed; however the increases will likely not be welcomed where they are placed on both: Registered Architects and Graduates following Pathway 1 to seek Initial Registration. Understandably costs will rise, and the associated services should be paid for appropriately. Especially, by those with international experience. The proposed increase for those on Pathways 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8 (4-NZ Architects excluded) should proceed. This could be

raised further to align with fee's paid in other countries and would assist to keep current subsidies in place for NZ Registered Architects and Graduates on Pathway 1.

I think this makes sense for the most part. An annual increase of \$200 (approx) for the ACR is minimal in comparison to the increase of initial registration costs. It still retains a good incentive to graduates to work towards registration.

I believe that this option is reasonable and could be a one step towards the third option.

Best option of the three, but why increase fees at all?

More realistic figure for most to pay / manage. Shares the load and encourages graduates to continue their professional development in the pursuit of registration.

I don't want cost to be a barrier to graduates wishing to gain the professional recognition of becoming an architect.

Registered Architects shouldn't have to subsidise this as much as proposed.

Obviously the costs are rising so to be financially viable an increase needs to be reviewed, but it shouldn't be so big as to discourage this registration pathway.

Architects are required to pay the NZRAB fees - I'm not sure that compulsory fees should be used to subsidise people who are not legally required.

This seems to be a fair option with all prices increasing with the same level of cross-subsidy.

This seems a reasonable approach but I would like to know how the proposed registration fee compares with other professions, such as accountants and lawyers.

The money required to upgrade NZRAB systems should come from membership and other means. It seems already over the top the amount we pay. Myself I applied for Stage 1 pathway 2 in June/2024, I am still waiting the results due to lack of communication with one of my referees. You would think that the \$517 fee covers the NZRAB office chasing the referees, but apparently not.

Solo practitioners and those stepping away from larger firms to work flexible/reduced hours around children would be hit with this proposal for increased ACR fees. Not fair for all registered architects to subsidise the cost for other areas. Not all registered architects are working full time and / or might be working in other areas of the industry and might want to keep their registration.

Yes it encourages more people to register.

While I understand the pressures of inflation and expenditure escalation control might be factors, a 45% increase is still quite a jump in costs for anyone to absorb, let alone a graduate seeking Initial Registration. I would potentially support a "more cross-subsidation" option, if there was one. Hence, only 75% support for similar balance of it.

This is more fair to all.

It's understandable that fees need to increase to reflect market inflation, but still, it's almost x1.5 current fees.

seems fair

This is the best option in my opinion.

This is the preferred option. Is there a breakdown of the registration cost?

Disagree with cross-subsidization. Option 1 provides better and more related balance. Refer Option 1 explanation.

Registered architects are more senior with higher incomes. Firms such as my own pay annual registration fees and this is treated as an expense with negligible financial impact.

Subsidies is in part the best way to encourage more graduates embark on registration

status quo may be okay, but I think option 3 is better.

existing practices can help subsidise new registrants initial applications

Best to keep fees lower to encourage more to become registered.

This is the lowest cost to register and not a big increase in annual registration

would support the option that initial registration retain same amount of cross subsidization. fee shouldn't increase at all

things need to be changed

This is a bit better than option1, but still a huge increase in cost of any attempt.

This maintains the current level of subsidy, and assuming the increased fee adjusted to inflation. Supporting additional charge for cost associated with other Pathways. Support charges to maintain voluntary suspensions to motivate people to stay registered when practicing in or outside NZ. This will help protect the title of 'Architect'. Prevent misrepresentation - Some may be on voluntary suspension and practicing overseas without disclosing the status. General public or others outside the industry don't know the difference and may incorrectly represent the individuals as "architect" where they shouldn't.

This option represents +30% in ACR costs and +45% in Initial Reg costs, which is not unreasonable over a 5 year period. But it will hit smaller practitioners harder than others

as far as I understand no additional services are being provided so the price should stay the roughly the same. All registered architects were grads going for rego once, it benefits everyone to get more grads registered so I think they would be happy to help cover the costs, I would be if I get registered.

\$1,750 is reasonable.

This option would make it possible for me to go for registration as a working parent. I think this is a good balance as it is a small additional cost to ACR compared to option 3.

This option makes more sense. Keeping the registration fee more reasonable and accessible would encourage more graduates to pursue registration.

Our small creative industry already struggles to be encouraged and supported through registration by a large portion of architectural firms. It will also disproportionately affect graduates wanting to get registered but can't afford to

This is the more feasible option out of the three

Keeping the status quo wont help to change the gravity of the role and the work required to get registered.

The increase to ACR's to cover the the registration programme is far more feasible.

Provide support to younger professionals who do not have the means to pay such large fee and keeps the process accessible

ACR fees are usually covered by the practice, and should subsidise the cost of initial registration for new graduates.

This option is better, the initial registration fee is more financially achievable.

Makes it more attractive especially with all other NZIA yearly fees added on, this amount is most manageable.

I support subsidise initial registration to encourage graduates (and others) to become registered

In consideration of my explanation for options 1 and 3, consider that there needs to be some form of change, but not as options 1 and 2, but rather the middle ground as per option 3.

This seems fair in regard to cost to pay for registration for graduates. The slightly increased fee cost reflects the additional cost required for all services provided to members and applicants.

While this is still a steep amount to increase it is the only one of the 3 options that seem somewhat reasonable. Again, the cost at \$1200 is already steep when most grads pay for this out of pocket rather than have their firms pay.

It seems more fair for registered architects who would be on a higher salary to subsidise the cost rather than preventing graduates from becoming registered in the first place.

Those who are already registered are generally on higher salary than graduates looking to register, and so supporting those looking to register should be highest priority.

see above

The significant cost increase to existing registered members is too high

These service fees described in Option 2 feel commensurate with the administrative cost of each service.

Option 2 seems far more reasonable with a lower initial cost and a lower cost for repeat attempts. For many, the registration is already a stressful endeavour on top of work hours (full time) which is a paid expense and a risk in itself to undertake. Compared to Option 1, Option 2 seems like the best path forward for young architects looking to register.

Option 2 provides a good balance, resulting in a modest increase for the ACR (compared to option 3) and offering a healthy subsidy towards initial registration costs thereby maintaining affordability for graduates.

This makes a cost barrier to registration prohibitive, particularly to those from minorities, or from less privileged backgrounds & support. It is also hugely out of step with LBP Design class 3 fees. This makes a cost barrier to registration prohibitive, particularly to those from minorities, or from less privileged backgrounds & support. It is also hugely out of step with LBP Design class 3 fees. Has an assessment been done to the effect on diversity within the profession of proceeding with this option?

Registration can already feel like a huge and stressful undertaking and this takes the additional anxiety and stress of large costs / money out of the journey. It is still a significant enough cost that it rules out those who are underprepared but doesn't discourage or add even more stress.

Why is there a need for change? Nothing else had changed, we will still be going through the same process and it is a fair cost already.

This option seems to be the most fair.

I believe current subsidisation levels are fair and do not hold a large barrier for entry

The best and fairest option presented.

Helps to be able to become registered. Because registered architects tend to earn higher, it feels more equitable to be able to charge \$100 more for ACRs.

Similar to answer opposing option 2. Option 1 would make registration unachievable for me, I would consider pursuing a different career path if option 1 is chosen.

To encourage people to apply registration.

A smaller increase would be suitable if needed

This would be less of a financial barrier to applicants, but if it doesn't alleviate operating costs then it likely won't be better in the long term.

The only way Architecture graduates could afford the fee compared to their salaries

This is the preferred option out of the proposed options.

As an architectural graduate seeking registration in the next year or two, I wholly support this option more so than the others for obvious financial reasons. In addition, I believe to sustain the architectural industry going forward, this is the most fitting approach.

We should provide some cross subsidy to encourage new registrations.

It's good for the industry to have more qualified architects. Without the subsidies, it discourages graduates to sit their registration. There are already enough hurdles to overcome this without the added financial pressure. The NZRAB also needs to consider that people passing their registration equates to more people paying the annual certificate fee.

Similar comment as option one but a slightly better balance for graduates.

Too large an increase for Architects to maintain yearly.

I believe this is the best option, you expect a small price increase every year. This allows everyone the opportunity to become registered

Option two there is a 147% increase.

Increases naturally following inflation is an acceptable stance to take. I still strongly disagree with the ridiculously high fee for QEAP combined with registration and the higher costs for alternative candidates which I will be in and if it's that much money I won't bother getting registered and remain an LBP. There is no reason for QEAP to be so high compared to the other items on the list. If it costs less to administer it should cost less to apply.

This is not ideal as a graduate hoping to go for registration in the next few years, but more favourable than option 1.

Better options and a less bugger jump in cost for those who want to get registered.

Registered architects typically further along in their career can afford a smaller price increase compared to younger graduates having to raise 6000 dollars to get registered. This is a huge barrier and unfair on the lower wage earning part of our industry. For the future of architecture the registration process needs to remain as accessible as possible.

The cost is already relatively high for a service which doesn't provide any actual learning. UK models are delivered as a post graduate course by universities ending in registration. A rough calculation of the proposed massive increase in registration fee vs the relatively small reduction in ACRs means it would take more than a decade to see a return.

Given that the industry/ firms often pay employees annual fee, it makes sense that industry give back and help young people early in their careers.

This structure seems on balance to provide the greatest opportunity for those who would undertake registration, and is a more realistic / feasible cost to personally bare.

As far as I know, it is currently working somewhat well, and changing it significantly feels like it would make registration very difficult and out of reach for many individuals.

as above but this would be a better option than removing the subsidy

As above. This is the only viable option and the only one that is right or fair. But please, at least give us something for \$1000 a year...Right now we have got nothing, and the NZRAB have done very very little to progress our profession. All this study and work to still be paid like an engineering graduate. We are racing ourselves to the bottom. Workloads have increased, compliance demonstration has increased, costs have increased, personal costs have increased, and all we've got is the one-time salary boost because the borders were shut. I would like to see the NZRAB, NZIA, NZACS, and masterspec etc come out with a sole practitioner's package too. Role the contracts, the CPD, your insurance and masterspec standard all into one at a good price for those of us who work on smaller projects alone. Please do remember that BIM software is also now upwards of \$5000 a year per seat/license... Add in rego, nzia cpd, nzia practice contracts, insurance, spec, etc and it's becoming too expensive to even begin practicing by yourself; it will kill this profession if it keeps going this way.

I consider the practising profession has an obligation to support the next generation of professionals to the industry.

User pays. Stick to your core service of protecting the profession.

Per above I have been declined registration twice and am now an 'architecture graduate' (your choice of title) of 13 years. My salary is capped and I cannot progress in my career because I am not registered. Increasing re-application fees is completely unaffordable & would deter me from associating with this professional body.

More of a balance but still expensive for initial and repeat registrations

I think option 3 is a more fair and equitable option

This keeps the playing field level and accessible for those of different means and in different employment scenarios and support. It will encourage diversity in the industry (as women and people of colour are usually disadvantaged in most financial statistics) and ensure more graduates become NZRAB registered rather than LBPs. This aligns with the goals of both the NZRAB and the NZIA.

It should be a user pays system. Costs to be paid by the person creating the work for the NZRAB.

This option reflects an appropriate increase to the cost of delivering services in line with the rest of the economy.

Too expensive

Support for graduates wanting to become registered is important

There are already enough barriers in place that prevent graduates from launching into the registration journey - Increased costs for that initial registration will likely turn many away to follow other paths, like the increasingly more appealing LBP pathway.

This option seems a lot fairer to me, and aligns with the rising costs of living and operating. I can appreciate the NZRABs position of needing to increase funds somehow, and appreciate the cross-subsidization model. I would support this option.

The increase feels more balanced. Not as prohibitive for new architects to take on registration

The cost of the subsidy when spread across a large number of registered architects seems fair rather than the actual cost suggested for graduates who already probably have student loans.

This option introduces a reasonable cost to the ACR while providing more graduates with the opportunity to move towards registration. It stands out as the most inclusive option.

some cross subsidy is desirable

The cost increase per ACR is minimal compared to the increase for initial registration in the other options. It is worth considering that those that are registered are more likely to have a higher salary and are likely to be able to afford a \$200 increase compared to registration increases for graduates.

I largely support keeping the current level of cross-subsidy, but would suggest increasing it slightly to keep the initial registration costs as low as possible.

Least barrier for registration

The increase for ACR is too much - the increase in initial and repeat not enough.

I believe this keeps the balance that is needed to retain application rates. The small increase to ACR Fee's should be able to be covered by most practising architects.

I hadnt realised the extent of cross subsidy for applicants paid for by Reg Architects

Better option - see note above. Make it affordable so people actually get registered.

If fees have to increase, this seems to be the most fair distribution compared to relative incomes.

I think the current option works well, it spreads the load well, the mass of the profession supporting those who wish to become a registered architect.

Cost increase is a lot for registration per year

ITS TOUGH FOR SMALLER PRACTICES

This is the most fair and balanced option.

Fairer than Option 1 for new graduates seeking registration, but too steep a hike (on-going) for registered architects moving forward.

This maintains a fee level comparable to current first entry

This one makes sense when you consider that it is 5 years since the last increase

Explained earlier.

This seems like a fair approach, and a newly registered architect would repay their subsidised initial registration in about 8 to 10 years. The repeat attempt at initial registration fee could be increased - as this is the most subsidised of all of the registration fees. A suggestion is that it is raised so that it is 75% of the fee for the first attempt.

Simply because I want to protect my future overhead costs as much as possible to be honest.

I don't want to have that burden over 30 years. You are proposing to increase these by over 30%! There is 'increased costs', and there is 'inefficiencies'. I want to see more efficiencies in the system, or organisations being taken to task to force the efficiencies. Of if there is less efficiencies, then other people can pay for it to be honest. I'm over it. The time for just accepting increasing costs, especially in this digital age, is over. My opinion only.

Alternative

I believe some form of subsidy should occur

Closer to Highly agree as this would still be an increase to reflect current economic conditions, as well as encouraging applicants from applying to become a registered architect.

Its a significant cost to all architects to help pay for others to get registered - this cost should be borne by the individuals wanting registration

It keeps the costs affordable for applicants, and reapplicants, however it may not be at a sufficient level to encourage applicants to really be ready to apply, and it imposes quite a significant cost increase on every other architect.

Good balance between the initial registration fee vs. annual fee. Although personally as registered architects, forking out nearly 1 grand a year is still quite a bit (cost of living...)

The current fees are relatively low if you compare with other countries such as Australia or the UK.

Most balanced option across the board.

the significant cost of repeat attempts should be minimised by finding ways to reduce the likelihood of repeat attempts

With the current amount of registered architects, and application rounds, this is the most sustainable model for the ability to practice & keep the registration of existing members that are currently practicing.

Time has moved on and fees should be raised to 2025 - 2030 price levels

The increase seems a significant increase but keeps the initial registration affordable for new registrants.

Prefer to keep costs down in current difficult economic times so am ok with the status quo in terms of subsidy.

A good model, although the ongoing cost for registered architects may become prohibitive year on year.

Keeps the initial cost far more reasonable, however understand this is offset by more expensive fees once registered.

You should be working to reduce barriers and enable graduates to become architects, not exclusive to those that have money. Firms may refuse to support registration, putting the cost on the individual if you pursue option 1.

The increase for both graduates and registered architects seems a bit more manageable on both ends.

Understand there may need to be changes

Price is acceptable

Can see both the pros and cons of this option, however my registration cost must have been subsidised and now I am passing that on, so would like to continue to this.

Becoming registered is hard enough without having to stump up \$6.5k, this will kill the inbound new architects to the industry

This option makes registration truly accessible for all, however may not be best for business.

From the graduate's perspective we appreciate the current subsidy very much - especially during this tough nation-wide economic situation.

Don't see why registered architects should pay for new applicants.

Increase to annual fees is too great. Ever- increasing fees will deter practitioners from maintaining registration and encourage them to look for more cost sustainable options for their practices.

This is the option that will most encourage graduates to register and I support this.

It's a big jump for employers to have pay (25%), and if more than one or two architects are employed in a single business, it could have an impact of viability, especially given the current economic climate. The increase in costs for registration and second attempts in this option is palatable.

Not the best time to increase the fees so significantly as per other two options. Better wait until all the graduates who lost their job or got hours reduced to recover financially, in a year or two.

this puts too much cost on ACRs

Maintains access to registration and fee increase is not significant.

Good to continue to support registration

This will encourage individual progression and firms wanting to invest in their graduates.

This is a reasonable increase to the registration fees. It is what is currently in affect which I consider being a fair approach to all involved in the profession.

Comparing NZRAB + NZIA and LBP level 3 + ADNZ membership, this option tracks very similar annually. Given the benefits are equal either way i.e. awards, peer support, AON insurance, this keeps option 2 cost competitive.

---

Happy with either this or option 3

---

A modest increase in general professional fees is acceptable.

---

Keeping the status quo and spreading the increased costs across all seems fair. Although does it put too much extra cost on the individual member to benefit the registration applicant, or the practices that are paying for their registration applicant?

---

this makes the most sense i think. Architects get an increase we can live with. Registration attempt costs remain reasonable for a graduate.

---

As a small practice I feel this fee is too high. I find it increasingly hard to see the value in it. Especially at the moment.

---

Reduce barrier to initial registration

---

I strongly agree with option 2. I think the adjustment to other fees would have much less impact on Registered Architects than the dramatic increase in fees would have on those going for registration.

---

Of the three options this is the only practical option. The other options are both too prohibitive and will shut out grads from registering, and will also have a negative impact on students considering beginning a degree in architecture.

---

Agree, need to encourage Grads committing to registration. Cost of repeat attempt maybe could be pushed up a bit. The \$100 differential in ACR isnt worth the 100% differential inthe initial registrauon cost between Option 2 and 3.

---

Allocate the costs where they are required. The cost for the initial registration should be what it is and not subsidised.

---

I believe we have a duty to support new architects entering the profession and support a subsidy for registration

---

I don't like the increase in our annual fee. A cost of \$6520 per applicant seems way too much for registration.

---

This option is understandable with general cost increases over the last 5 years and is a cost that can be saved up for as an architectural graduate.

---

See above

---

Graduates will not be able to afford \$6K on top of a student loan especially if from a low decile household.

---

Continuing the same level of subsidy seem appropriate

---

I would not be registered today possibly if it was not for what I assume was subsidised exam and assessments. It may be called generational theft to turn that around.

---

see answer 1

---

More acceptable, but same issue as before. It increases the barrier of entry because its more expensive to even try.

---

This seems like the best of the options presented.

---

Whilst the increases in fee overall are concerning, the status quo remains largely unchanged

---

I think it important to continue the encouragement of new applicants for registration (by way of subsidised registration fees) - relatively low cost barrier and only a slight increase in ACR fees.

---

I agree that costs for everyone have gone up for everything and therefore a smaller increase to keep the level of support for registration available is good!

---

While increasing the cost of fees will still provide a barrier for some, keeping the fees at the current rate is the best option for seeing the number of graduates applying for registration at least stay the same.

That is the only option that I can see myself being able to do.

I think it is essential for the profession that we reduce barriers for graduates to become registered.

Access to registration is important. Quality should be the determining factor not ability to pay. This is also a diversity issue.

I believe that the similar cross-subsidisation will remove the barrier to initial registration. Keeping the fees at the current rate will make it a lot more accessible to graduates.

Much more accessible for graduates to become architects. Only a small amount extra for ACRs to pay to cover this.

Option 2 has repeat attempt registration fees half that for initial assessments. This encourages applicants to come less prepared and give it a try knowing that next time they don't have to pay as much. I don't believe the profession should be subsidising such behaviour. The repeat fee should be higher even if it is less.

I have no issue with the current model and would support leaving it as it is. ACR's are typically paid by the practice and such would be such a small increase in terms of a business expense.

fairer cost for initial registration applicants.

ACRs increasing in current economic environment is unpalatable for us.

Although no cost increase is welcomed this seems to be a balanced means of sharing cost increases

It's the easiest to understand but I support Option 3 more

Too subsidized by ACR

Current arrangement better than Option 2 and 3

This seems fair and proportionate in relation to what graduate architects are paid.

Think fees could be reduced.

See above

subsidy should remain for graduates, who are the lower paid part of our woefully underpaid profession with limited funds. It should also remain for returning NZ architects. Subsidy for overseas architect should match the level of subsidy we receive in those countries (ie

reciprocal. It was going to cost me \$27000 to register in the UK) there should be no subsidy for LBP/technician route - they have chosen to skip the expense of the proper education and from experience need a much higher level of interrogation of knowledge - and in particular ethics.

While the fee increase is substantial, the spirit of supporting young professionals is retained.

## Please explain your answer for your rating of option 3 – reduced cross subsidy

Answered: 330 Skipped: 73

### RESPONSES

Although the raise is understandable, it more than doubled and will put a strain on graduates. I am very hopeful that if this option is preferred at the end, the number of failed initial registration attempts should be less.

For initial registration I consider there would be potential to raise this fee up to \$2000

It sounds like this is unrealistic.

As per comments on option 1.

As per comments above. I think the increase from \$1200 to \$3150 would be a disincentive. \$2000 would be a reasonable compromise.

For similar reasons to 7.

A small cost increase to reflect inflation would be fair. Perhaps other cost cutting measures from NZRABs side could be considered, ie less expensive venues for the professional conversations.

I think this is too much to ask for initial architects to get registered.

We are concerned about the financial impact on our practice as we currently cover both our team members initial registration fees and their ongoing fee. Despite this though, our primary concern is accessibility of initial registration to a diverse base of graduates. We actively work to encourage and support a more diverse industry than has been traditional. We struggle to see how anyone on a graduate salary would have the financial means to pay a respective initial registration fee under Option 1 \$6,520 or Option 3 \$3,150, in the instance that they work for a practice that do not cover this. Based on the NZIA Salary survey results in 2023, there are only 28 practices that cover the cost of registration and 11 that cover professional membership ongoing. In particular, the costs proposed in Option 1 are extremely prohibitive to a graduate that does not have family or independent support. We are concerned that each of the three options have a cost proposed for voluntary suspension. We see this as disproportionately impacting women and at a time where their finances are often most pressed. In our experience, it is primarily women who use this option when going on parental leave. Despite the impact on our firm and the estimated net cost increase to us per annum, we consider that option 2 is the least prohibitive to graduates seeking to obtain registration.

I strongly disagree with the proposed increase in fees for initial registration.

Increasing the fees in line with general increasing costs makes sense to reduce strain on the fees paid by architects, however, I feel that a compromised amount between Option 2 and the proposed Option 3 would be ideal.

While presented as best of both worlds, the significant hike to Initial Registration relative to the cost of the ACR's going up is quite distorted, and would likely have similar effects to Option 1, just perhaps not as pronounced. Again, significant efficiencies would need to be found in the Initial Registration programme.

The increase is quite substantial. Probably this should be option 1 and the actual option 1 should be deleted as it is excessive and unjustified.

Same as Option 1

Don't think the services should reduce.

As above, I believe NZRAB fees should continue to be cross-subsidised, and encouraging as many graduates to become registered is a better outcome for Aotearoa's built environment. I

see this option again too prohibitive for graduates to willingly attempt registration.

This is slightly more manageable than option 1, however it is still a massive hike in pricing that at the very least would mean delaying going for registration to save money for the fees.

moving towards reasonable

See answer to Option 2. I do not support a change to the cross subsidy level. Evidence post the establishment of the reduced application fees in 2012, showing an increase in applicants for registration and increase in Registered Architects strongly supports retention of a similar level of subsidy.

Again, too expensive

Option 3 is better than option 1, but still not ideal. I feel this fee would still push graduates toward the LBP option, in turn lowering the number of registered architects. This is a risk to the future of the profession.

a fee in the order of up to \$ 2,500 I think would be reasonable to ensure there aren't applications that aren't duly prepared and eases some of the cost particularly for sole practitioners or architects who pay their own fees.

Still a very significant increase for those young graduates that are already earning a low income to put down to become registered.

I think this option will also deter people from taking the registration exam.

My response is the same as for option 1 above. I would not recommend architectural graduates apply at this level of cost.

Same as above. Our graduates are the future of the profession. Registration coincides with mortgages and sometimes children. The ability to pay is limited. We need to pay our staff more by at least as much as the cost of registration, or have employers pay, or pay with conditions around staying at the firm for say a year after registration. We need more creative thinking on this .

Not the preferred option that but better than option 1.

Maintaining some subsidisation is a minimum, but reducing is the least preferred option.

If cross-subsidy services have to be cut, then reducing them like this would be okay

Reducing the subsidy, even partially, still risks deterring entry to the profession, especially among students and early-career applicants facing high costs of living. This option also raises the question of how accessible and supportive the registration process remains for those at the beginning of their careers.

See my answer for question 5. This increase is still too high for initial registration.

Cost so prohibitive for new architects

I suppose this option will keep people going through registration process and the majority happy...

A balance, a middle ground for everyone

See previous answers

Not sure what this would achieve.

Similar comments to above.

For the same reasons as Option 1. Although an application fee of \$3,150 is significantly better than a \$6520 fee, it is still unaffordable for the vast majority of graduates. A cost increase of this scale is likely to massively decrease the number of applications.

As above

This option would severely dissuade young graduates from obtaining registration without significant financial support.

We need to encourage appropriately qualified and experienced people to gain registration and the costs in this option are high.

Subsidies should occur and be available to all who need and require it.

Still too high for initial registration.

Bringing architects into the profession is as important an aim as any use of funds the NZIA could aspire to. If the registration process could be 100% paid by membership fees (it can), that would be the better option for the profession of architecture in New Zealand. No architects are cancelling their registration due to membership fees. Registration fees are real barrier to new entrants already, a higher level would only serve to reduce registrations, which is an awful outcome for architecture.

Several thousand dollars for initial registration is prohibitive. Is this what you want for in industry that is already viewed as elitist with underrepresentation from minorities?

Not much better than option 1.

Could still be cost prohibitive for some seeking to get registered.

A better option, although it needs refinement. Supporting the profession through fees is key, however the numbers need to be revised.

See above.

mean and selfish!!

This option is probably more palatable for newly registered architects, sole practitioners and the like especially in the current economic climate.

This option creates a significant barrier to the growth and development of our profession.

I still believe this cost is too expensive in the current age. Even at present, the cost is high and raising this any further risk becoming prohibitively expensive for many. As it stands, I am in no rush to get registered and I think there are already significant barriers for too many competent, practicing graduates.

If it is partially subsidised, then I suggest going halfway between option 2 and 3 again. Grads may just about be able to stomach that.

Similar comment to 5).

Option 3 seems like the best balance of registered architect fees to initial registration fees.

This option is also more than doubling the fee overnight. Does not seem fair.

\$3150 for the first attempt, and \$1575 for any subsequent attempt is too high of a fee, given the general salary range of architectural graduates.

---

If the cross subsidy had to change \$3100 would be better than the full payment of \$6300.

---

While this is a reduction in the full cost to 50%, the reduction from Option 2 ACRs full year fee is only \$100. The financial impact between the two changes is insignificant for RAs but significant for graduates.

---

The cost is too high for applicants to bear. Especially for those resitting. As a profession, I think we need to help remove as many barriers for applicants as possible.

---

The initial registration fee is probably still too high, and the small reduction in the ACR is not material.

---

This is less optimal than option2, but better than option1

---

It will take a graduate more time to apply.

---

The reduction in the ACR less significant than the benefit of full subsidisation and minimising barriers to registration.

---

If there was an increase in the fee, I would also expect an increase in the amount of intake dates and a reduction in the time spent waiting between application, conversation and results.

---

I believe that the NZRAB needs to make it achievable for younger emerging practitioners to become registered. It can be argued that registered architects can bear the high costs as they are earning more than a graduate seeking registration. Architectural graduates like me, especially in the regions do not get paid what graduates in bigger cities get paid.

---

My preference would still be option 2, as this \$3k figure is still too high in my opinion and would probably delay my decision to get registered (I'm aiming for the March 2025 intake at this stage, but this price hike would probably delay my registration to later in the year, or 2026 and beyond).

---

This is definitely my preference of the 3 options, as it is a good compromise between the status quo and the more extreme option 1.

---

For graduates that are not well off, it could become a hurdle for them to getting registered. The socioeconomic and demographic factors are a consideration here to support diversity in the profession. I would support incentivising the companies that are employing the graduate to make a contribution in some way, then that allows the annual fees to be a bit lower?

---

Not preferable but still a far better option than option 1, still a big blow for graduates going towards registration.

---

(Refer above). I also find the QEAP fee is quite high and therefore less accessible, for applicants. I do note that it only has to be competed once.

---

\$3150 is still too much for initial registration. This is still a significant amount for someone on an architectural graduate salary.

---

This is better than Option 1 but the numbers are still pretty cost prohibitive for people applying.

---

It will still provide a huge barrier to entry and there will be no reason to become registered. Charges for all services beyond those tabled should be considered. e.g. Subsidies could be maintained if minor administrative tasks were charged for, as they are by other Professional bodies.

---

This option offers balance although the ongoing cost of registration should reduce further.

---

Same as for Option 2

---

I somewhat agree with the status quo, however I'm not ignorant to the increase of costs over the last 5 years. It is worth noting, the statement of expecting numbers seeking registration to continue to rise will in fact increase NZRAB fees in the long run. Registration for most is a one off cost.

---

from the perspective of a senior graduate trying to register: the difference between 850 (option 3) and 950 (option 2) for a business is nothing. While the difference to register is 1,400. It would take 14 years to make up the same amount between option 2 and 3. If successful next year, I will work and pay an annual fee for the next 20 years.

Option 3, similarly to option 1, will discourage architectural graduates (pre-registration) from attempting to become registered in NZ either to leave the country or the industry entirely. A consequence of this will be seen in future years, where young innovative architectural graduates will be afraid of going to rego, resulting in no new young architectural firms being formed.

If Option 2 is not favourable/selected then this Option would be next best

not as bad

For first attempt - see next

Same as option 1

It's no better than option 1.

Reducing the subsidy or levy on all registered architects will only mean graduates will have to pay more. Ultimately discouraging registration due to cost.

The cost of registration is small compared to the potential earnings, status and protection Registration provides to all

We need to support graduates financially, in the application process, as much as we can.

All as above. For a graduate with a loan, with a career which is poorly paid (if they can even get a job in it!), with an architectural environment that is increasingly complex, with graduates getting better pay selling clothes (it's true!) the profession faces a bleak future unless those that are in the career give a helping hand to those entering. Our daughter would not get registered under Option 1 - no way. Option 3 would still be a barrier. NZRAB risks losing its relevancy if it financially impedes registration. Face it. What's your point of being a club if no one can afford to become a member?

This is a huge jump and will prevent people from applying

Option 3 seems the fairest option in order to still receive new applications whilst adjusting fees to the current market

Still too high. I submit an architect applying through a different pathway ie: an architect from overseas can pay a higher subsidy but not NZ trained graduates.

This is my preference...even with a little tweak that just raises our fees to \$800.00 to help cover the costs. We should not be effected at this time.

Again, as per the previous, the lack of agency of architects in NZ means that it is difficult to truly substantiate the registration cost. You must enforce the institution and work to the public's trust, but right now, the profession is watered-down, and at the behest of technicians and software cults. I'm not even being hyperbolic.

Similar to option 1. Still unlikely to have grads apply with such a high fee.

See question 5

this will heavily disadvantage young graduates and people with families who have low discretionary income. The only new architects will be nepo babies or people who spend a long time saving up for it

None of these are good options

Whilst the proposal is not as tough on graduates as Option 1, it is still disproportionate with earning capacity.

An increase in fees is not unreasonable, however nearly tripling the fee price does not match inflation. Younger graduates are already faced with lower salaries and higher cost of living and this cost would deter many people from ever getting registered. There will be a larger number of people going through the LBP route, or taking their talents overseas (for example, Australia, where fees are approximately \$1,200 and salaries are higher).

Again, the higher cost for initial registration are daunting for young architects and the saving to the ACR is minimal. I now cost of living is affecting everyone but keeping the profession alive and protected is more important for the long term

While still the initial registration fee is still a significant amount, this could be worked towards say over a 2 year period. Given applicants need to consider their preparation for initial registration years out, this would be another element in their plan.

As per answers above

I think this strikes a fair balance for all parties

seems like some sort of compromise

I support option 1, please see option 1 for my explanation. I also support changing of the form and organisation of the exam to substantially reduce its cost.

If necessary, but again the higher level of fees is very discouraging. Similar arguments to Option 1.

While it's not as bad as option one I still believe reducing the initial registration fees as much as possible is in the best interest of the industry

While I understand the desire to assign fees on a user pays basis I feel this could have an adverse effect with pushing people towards the LBP route

Better than option 1, but still same reason as given for Option 1

Cross-subsidy is required, however this amount still seems too expensive.

will not support new registrations

Unfortunately I would still reconsider registration at this price, and consider other options or going overseas. Or I would push registration out 5-10 years.

Option 3 still adjusts the cost of registration past the rate of inflation posing a barrier to many graduates.

\$3K is still a significant amount, especially as some graduates have to pay this themselves.

Less cost accessibility but better than Option 1

As above, I would rather not see any reduction in cross subsidization but if it is done it should be minimal

As above.

A bit better than option one, but the same for the starters in the industry.

As mentioned above, do not agree that the increased costs are transferred mostly to professionals seeking registrations under other pathways than Pathway 1. Hence, I do believe that increasing the fee for initial registration for all to around \$3000 could provide an opportunity to not increase the fees for other pathways that significantly (which is however not reflected in the proposed option 3).

I still feel this would put up barriers to those from lower incomes looking to register, however additional comment below.

This may be a good compromise

This feels like a good middle ground and gets my support

It is a better option, however the initial registration fee could be lowered slightly.

Fuller subsidy makes more sense, obviously

Better than full cost recovery, but still shifting the financial burden more than what currently happens

While this increases the cost of initial registration I don't think it will be too prohibitive to application numbers. Increase in cost may also force applicants to be better prepared, reducing the number of repeat attempts

Agree that the % could marginally change however probably not as much as proposed

same as question 1 response.

If the NZRAB has to stretch if this far this would be the most grad would be able to afford.

This option finds the goldilocks zone in application fees. Its not too high to apply for registration, however it remains a worthwhile consideration for new applications to instil a level of importance on the professional body they are trying to join.

I appreciate your efforts in this scenario to reduce ACR costs for registered architects, particularly given the current economic climate, but I still see the initial registration cost as too high in this scenario and prohibitive to initial applicants.

This still represents a significant increase in initial registration costs

Somewhat ok. Again not as "fair" as maintaining Opt 2 but not as extreme as Opt 1.

Its better than removing subsidy completely but is a compromise.

If not Option, I consider this a fair alternative option

The cost of initial registration is way too high

Similar to option 3, it is still a high amount

Would be great

I understand there is a need to cover costs for services however \$3,000 is still a significant amount of money which many your graduates as per Option 1 will not be able to afford. I do not support this option.

This is still too high.

It is more reasonable than option 1, but \$3,150 is still a steep price to pay. It's a cost that may only be afforded by practitioners in a practice that can help subsidise fees.

Ditto

As ponit 5 above. Ideally, no subsidy is better in my opinion.

Better for people retaining their registration. Although still a high cost for those initially registering.

Similar response as per 'Option 1' applies here. The 160% increase will result in the same barriers regarding Graduates following Pathway 1 to seek Initial Registration.

Not a bad compromise / back up option, but I still feel that the initial registration cost is getting up there. I personally think the cost to sit initial registration and the cost to repeat could be the same, as the process (ie; professional discussion) is essentially the same.

This still a big step from the original fee. However, it is much better than the first option, specially that the difference between the first attempt and the second attempt is reasonable. So, anyone applying will feel that if they have to repeat then it is still reasonable to repeat. I still feel that this option should be a second step after having Option2 for a while before stepping to option 3

See answer for point 5. We are supposed to support the profession, not pick on younger members.

Marginally better than Option 1 but will still limit the number of graduates who can fund the registration process when we should be encouraging it.

Seems fair. Still promotes registration. The slightly higher one-off Registration price will commit people to being prepared and competent before attempting registration.

There may need to be a small reduction in cross subsidy to recover costs. That being said the newly registered architect will then be paying more due to the high cost/ increase to remain a registered architect.

I think it would be preferable to test the effect of applicants paying a much greater share of the registration/application costs on number attempting registration. This could be reviewed in say 3-5 years

I disagree with the level of cross-subsidy for services in option 3. The cost is still a major barrier and will deter people from the registration process.

suggest that a reasonable fee to apply for registration is \$2500. seems quite a bit less than \$3150 but similar outcome

This seems a reasonable approach but I would like to know how the proposed registration fee compares with other professions, such as accountants and lawyers.

Ditto number 7.

The second attempt should not be subsidised. If it costs the same to re-submit and have another conversation, it should be charged accordingly.

I can see the logic in this but overall i think its probably short sighted. The more architects you can encourage to register the better.

See 5. above. A little credit for a reduced fee on repeat attempts but not that much better than Option 1.

This is only better than Option 2 if you're registered for more than 30 years. Again it creates a barrier to entry, but better than Option 3.

For a graduate, \$3k is quite a hefty sum to pay.

Not as severe as option 1 but still has the same risks

Consider that this is an appropriate middle ground solution, that addresses the issue, but not to the extent that options 1 and 2 suggest. Careful consideration will need to be made as to the new level of cross-subsidy so that it doesn't result as a deterrent to becoming a registered architect but does contribute to recovering the costs from the initial application.

This would be reasonable if there were additional benefits that include NZIA membership fees or additional services that help new and current members.

This again creates a HUGE financial cost for those seeking registration. Along with the large amount of time taken to write a case study and study for the conversation this seems completely unsustainable. This will very negatively impact the profession and could see many grads moving to Australia or other overseas countries to obtain registration creating a drain on the profession.

This is still a very large fee given my organisation does not cover registration fees.

Priority should be to support those who need it the most, and I do not believe any subsidy to registered architects is reasonable at the detriment to those wanting to gain registration.

see above

Neutral to this option, agree a bit increase for the fees but not drastically that could prevent future people to join the party.

I think the proposed new level of cross-subsidy benefits existing registered members without creating a burden on initial registrations

Fees as described in Option 3 do not promote or encourage initial registration as an architect.

Option 3 sits somewhere between the two previous - if a rise in cost is inevitable, Option 3 would provide a compromise that would still be a hike in costs for registration, but would be much more preferable to Option 1.

This option is very similar to option 2 but the \$100 saving for the ACR is hardly worth it when initial registration costs would be so much higher. This is likely to be a barrier to many graduates and detrimental to the profession in the medium to long term.

Cross subsidisation can be seen as spreading the cost of initial registration for an individual across their years of registration, once successful, rather than simply covering costs where & when they fall.

I think this is a better compromise but cost still feels high and scary.

Definitely just a happy medium option isn't it really, to be frank. However I still think it's unreasonable.

Those registered have benefited from the existing subsidies already

I am not against this provided the extra money was utilised well elsewhere

Still much too high and unfair a cost for new registration.

Still a lot of money for initial registration which is one of the major difficulties. Because the mental and time demands for creating a case study and study for registration is so intensive, adding such an increase in monetary pressure is upsetting.

Option 3 is still a fairly high barrier to entry & would not create an equitable system for graduates.

The board is supporting by government. It should not reduce the level of cross-subsidy for the services if there is enough supporting, but if not, can it apply for more for supporting young designer for registration?

A fair medium between option 1 & 2

Better than the first option still too expensive

As per the point above

Refer to section 5. Increasing the cost seems irresponsible and dangerous to encouraging people to get registered.

We should provide some cross subsidy to encourage new registrations but not subsidise too much so we emphasise its importance, self commitment and financial responsibility of the applicant.

Even the reduced level of subsidy is unaffordable for graduates would are often on very modest or low salaries.

Similar comment as option one.

This is the better increase across all, however 2nd attempt should not be discounted, instead the cost relief should be for the 1st attempt and 2nd attempt should be higher. This will promote quality applications for 1st attempt without greatly hindering graduates from affording it.

This option is alright Still a significant increase for initial registration this would put registration out of reach for some individuals

Option 3 there is an 228% increase.

As above. I'd be more on board with something between opt 2/3 if the QEAP fees weren't so unreasonably high

Best option for graduates looking to go for registration which is my position.

Financial barriers reduce diversity. By increasing the fees this will only impact those who cannot afford to sit it. Further, this shift will push more graduates overseas, Australia for example, where pay is better and the registration pathway is more straightforward.

Better options and a less bugger jump in cost for those who want to get registered.

Prefer option 2 as above

Again, a hefty increase in cost for the user with no additional benefit.

I don't think it's great, but I understand why it would be considered. There still may be people who can't afford to go for initial registration, especially as architecture is not a particularly highly-paid profession, and not in the early years of work.

We need to support the young grads coming through the system to get registered

As above

Based on my experience, which may be uncommon, I believe any increase in cost should be justified with improvements to the application process. I do not feel that is occurring currently and that the process is highly subjective. The re-application process & associated fee should not deter applicants further. The whole process is humiliating to put it bluntly and I have questioned leaving the profession altogether numerous times. I do not think increasing fees is justified based on the service delivery

Too expensive again

Fair and equitable. Reduces large cost creep for registered architects while also not making the barrier to entry for graduates too high.

Reducing of the cross-subsidy for services disadvantages those not already registered, many of whom work for lower pay. In disadvantaging and disincentivizing graduates (many who will not receive pay increases if they pass and many who do not have employers subsidize registration), you push them towards LBP registration with is out of line with the stated goals of NZRAB and the NZIA which actively seek more people to register. The financial repercussions of failure in particular are severe and will put many people off.

It should be a user pays system. Costs to be paid by the person creating the work for the NZRAB.

I would support this if the initial registration regime was overhauled and the criteria/process 10/14/2024 6:25 PM was clearer and the outcome less reliant on the character of the assessors. I think \$3k is

appropriate to charge for initial registration, but not in its current form.

Quite expensive

Same answer as Option 1

This increase seems too steep a change for those wanting to apply for registration,

This is doubling the cost of registration. Even this increase is too prohibitive in my opinion. For very little savings to those already registered, it's not worth sacrificing new architects

Not my preferred option

Similar to my answer to question 5.

some cross subsidy is desirable

I honestly believe that \$3150 is still incredibly cost prohibitive for most architectural graduates looking to apply for registration.

Initial registration needs to be fully cross-subsidised. As someone who has just gone through the registration process, it is an incredibly stressful time and the fees already seem high (especially for applicants who don't get any assistance from employers). I know for certain that if there hadn't been the subsidy to the level it was then I wouldn't have been able to afford to go for registration and would have stayed a graduate. Most people I know also preparing for initial registration wouldn't be able to afford the cost without the full subsidy to the current fee level and would likely not get registered. Removing/minimising the subsidy would be counter to the NZRAB's aim to see more people become registered.

The increase in ACR feels about right although I wouldn't want to see ACR fees get much past this point in the near future. Although the initial and repeat costs are higher, I feel they have been historically relatively low so this increase brings them up to a level more commiserate with the level of Registered Architect which can be obtained.

There is better balance in this proposal than in option 01. However, do we as a profession and the NZRAB want to retain current application numbers or reduce them? Whilst not as financially painful as opt.01 it is still a significant cost to those on limited incomes.

A balance between full user pays and full subsidy probably best. Reducing the burden on existing Reg Architects is one popular outcome. Part of the justification for increasing applicant fees and annual practising certificate fees should be to allow the Board to fulfil its promotional functions under the Act as below:

Middle of the road option - still a lot of money for a grad

The lesser of two evils. Refer answer 5/7.

Increasing everyone's fees a little while still subsidising could be seen to be highlighting the value of becoming a registered architect to potential applicants, something to strive for without it being too out of reach financially.

Seems a more balanced approach to sharing costs

ITS TOUGH FOR SMALLER PRACTICES

This is a 'less bad' version of Option 1.

Option 3 is my preference - fairer for the majority (ie re-registering architects), and not so much of a deterrent for new grads to commit to the registration process.

As above

Again, I consider this option to be a disincentive to graduates getting registered. They will just become PBP's

You must find a way to operate with budget /earning you have from our present Fee we are paying. (Do not forget we are paying you to be what actually we are - registered architects

The cost would be a barrier to registration for graduates, while only resulting in \$100 saving for registered architects (when compared with option 2). No one would benefit.

I could see some 'dollar each way' thinking here. But I still think the applicants should pay up front, not pay it back over 30 years. Again, my opinion only.

Alternative

I believe some form of subsidy should occur

Agree to this model, but little bit concerned that initial registration and repeat attempt are more than the double of existing cost which may throw out some applicants with discouragement.

Its better than option 2 but my preference would be Option 1 still

The proposed fee seems to strike a good balance between the cost to applicants and the costs to registered architects. The cost increase seems as if it would be more than covered by the annual salary increase a graduate is likely to receive when they become registered.

Architects' annual registration fee goes up slightly but initial registration fee will still put off many who wants to get registered.

This is a good middle ground. Cost of registration should be commensurate with the level of service provided and the ability of those seeking registration to pay.

Cost barrier to get registered still too high. It would delay or deter from doing registration.

option 3 is balanced

This would make a balance of the amount to pay as a registering architect & maintaining registration. Though I believe as a registered architect, the higher fee (option 2) should not be a (significant) barrier of maintaining registration if you are a practicing architect.

I'm a working professional so I'm happy to pay for full cost and maybe a bit more to cover some additional NZRAB activities

The initial registration cost still seems excessive in relation to the cost of living and earning potential of an intern-Architect.

Prefer to keep costs down as being an Australia based Architect so would tend to lean more to this option if fee increase necessary. don't feel as much of the impact and benefit of fees. I don't want to impact on Grads significantly but the decision to get registered shouldn't be taken lightly.

A one-off increased fee for registering is balanced with the ongoing increase for registered architects.

Seems like a good balance between reducing annual costs and not extending registration costs so far that people will be restricted.

Something of a middle ground.

Still feels like a reasonably large barrier to registration. The cost for a repeat attempt at registration is also enough that failing the initial attempt would be devastating enough not to attempt again

Not as much of a barrier

Price is still significant.

More neutral about this option, I still think that \$3k for graduates to pay may be prohibitive for some people, which is what the board is seeking to remove. However, I do think that the cost of trying again should be higher, I think that if it cost the same to go again, that people would make sure that they are very confident and ready before going for it.

Not increasing fees is the preferred option - however this option is preferred above Option 1.

Registration costs should lie where they fall.

Seems like a modest and manageable annual cost increase for most practitioners and while the initial cost of registration is high, grads who are committed to the profession may not be entirely put off.

This option would be my 2nd choice.

The best option. A small and reasonable fee increase for current employers, and an increase for registration that's not onerous. Especially appealing is the near half-price for second attempts, which would seem attractive to grads, or at least not onerous. Having failed myself on the first attempt, I can live with this. The \$3,000 cost to attempt registration isn't impossibly high, and reflects a sound investment, plus it incentivises grads to be (well and truly) prepared.

Still feels very expensive. There will be much more complains if the first registration attempt is failed as our "verbal" form of exam results might be seen as subjective. Potential costs to NZRAB to process these claims.

this is a good compromise option

Neutral, as it does not represent a significant fee reduction over option 2, while increasing registrations fees significantly, in comparison.

Good to continue to support registration

This option is more reasonable than option 1, but the price is still high enough that it could discourage individuals and firms from investing in graduates.

Middle ground but still feel this is too expensive and will reduce the number of applicants

Comparing NZRAB + NZIA and LBP level 3 + ADNZ membership, this option is more expensive by \$1,200 initially, creeping closer to \$1,500 by year 5. Given the general public perception that an Architectural designer and a Registered Architect offer equivalent services, there is no incentive for new applicants to follow this route. There is a fundamental problem there that means the NZRAB and NZIA has to compete on price (rather than quality) with the alternative that the Govt imposed upon the industry.

Seems like a good balance but initial cost still looks high - I'd prefer to see this at the Option 2 level with the - repeat attempt cost matching (i.e. \$1,750 for both)

Better than nothing, but the increase in fees severley risks growth of the profession. It is short sighted to make it too expensive to achieve registration, compared with a modest increase in a preofessional lifetime of subscriptions for those who become registered!

I prefer this option, as it is a lesser and more reflective increase for individual members. The cost for registration applicants is increased more towards a real cost, but still subsidised. The registration cost is at such a level where it will sharpen the focus and commitment of the applications, and the practices supporting them and may encourage well researched applicants.

\$3k is still a substantial amount for a graduate to apply for registration.

Seems like the best compromise.

Option 3 also involves fees which are very high and would prevent graduates sitting registration. I am strongly in support of option 2.

As per above, this Option 3 is still probative for graduates.

Personally always good to pay less, but not to this extent. I would rather pay the additional \$100 in ACR to subsidise registration cost

Allocate the costs where they are required. The cost for the initial registration should be what it is and not subsidised.

I do not support this proposal as the reduced ARC fee is not significantly reduced but the cost for new registration is significantly increased.

The cost of \$100 less per year is far less substantial than the additional cost difference to a person trying to register.

Option 3 is still very expensive for someone like myself as a graduate and puts me off registration by the cost required. I would need to delay going for registration and would consider not reapplying if unsuccessful in the first attempt as the total sum for two applications is a considerable sum.

see above

As above in 4, slightly less objection

for the same reasons as 5. above

see answer 1

Again, no one will pay for this. Registration itself is hard enough.

As above for Question 5.

I think some level of increase would create more of an incentive for applicants to be ready. Would be interesting to know if this option would reduce the number of second round applications. This option puts an increased value on the notion of registration which is positive.

Similar to answer 7. Although the cost barrier to initial registration is higher for this option so less appealing.

It's better for us as registered architects but getting up there for grads to pay at a time of their lives when family and mortgages are kicking in...

The pay for graduates in the industry is substantially lower than other professions. Increasing the cost for initial registration would provide a significant barrier for many graduates. The current rate of \$1200 is a lot for many people especially in the current economic climate, and I personally would have not been able to afford this fee at all.

In my opinion, 3150 dollars for initial registration is still very expensive.

I appreciate that some practitioners are struggling however their costs are tax deductible whereas graduates costs are likely not tax deductible.

Pathway assumes 5 years of study and engagement with the profession usually with a financial burden attached. Other pathways, do not carry this same financial burden... maybe this is where fees should go up?

Again, this cost for initial registration would have meant that I would not have been able to afford to go.

Again, it becomes too expensive for graduates to register.

The concern here is similar to that for Option 2. Repeat initial registration attempts at 75% cost of first attempt fee could be considered.

I support option 2.

---

Option 2 is better

---

This seems to be the most balanced, and fairest option.

---

\$3,150 is a considerable sum for a graduate unlikely to be earning a high salary and is likely to discourage registration

---

It helps with annual costs and should encourage practices to support or at least subsidise those going for registration

---

Increased fees shared more equally. Not too onerous for registration

---

Initial registration costs would be a barrier for many people to get registered, double the current amount.

---

As above, this is a substantial cost in relation to wages, not clear where NZRAB imagines graduate architects would find that kind of money.

---

The cost of the registration process needs to come down. Either by reviewing the way the whole process is carried out i.e reducing case study requirement.

---

See above

---

subsidy should remain for graduates, who are the lower paid part of our woefully underpaid profession with limited funds. It should also remain for returning NZ architects - they have already paid once and it is the new NZRAB policy that takes them off the register. Subsidy for overseas architect should match the level of subsidy we receive in those countries (ie reciprocal. It was going to cost me \$27000 to register in the UK) there should be no subsidy for LBP/technician route - they have chosen to skip the expense of the proper education and from experience need a much higher level of interrogation of knowledge - and in particular ethics.

---

This would be a compromise that might have negative consequences, but might be a suitable option for smaller practices.

---

## Do you have other suggestions or comments on how the Board's fees are structured?

Answered: 229 Skipped: 174

### RESPONSES

The second initial registration attempt should be half the price of the first try.

Potential to investigate a tiered annual reregistration fee. Say for first 5 years after initial reregistration the annual registration fee is discounted from that paid by longer registered architects, who will have time to establish their career

I think it would be better if they were asking us to brainstorm ideas about this. It's hard to provide quality comment to the proposal. If the fees covered a quality professional studies course that prepared candidates and provided credit for registration, it could find more success as a proposal. I think this is something we need to be talking about.

Across all 3 options I don't agree with a \$250 fee for voluntary suspension. I think if warranted, further clarity is needed regarding the administration cost required for this.

Having registered a long time ago, i don't know how feasible it is to reduce the cost to register, but that is a huge amount. I can't see it being successful to land that on new registrations, but also \$950/year i think is too much for yearly registration and i think that also puts off people registering.

I did not receive the initial invitation to this survey. It would have been helpful to have more information on trends regarding numbers of applicants for registration, success rates, pathways, repeat applications etc, vs numbers of ACRs.

We need to wake up and recognise that our profession is slowly dying. Thus we need to actively take every opportunity to arrest this slide and reinforce the value that Registered Architects offer to society. The best way to do this is to encourage as many people to be positive, energetic advocates for Registered Architects by apply to become Registered. Young, fresh, enthusiastic people; people who join us from overseas; and those who have been in the industry for sometime and are seeking to bring their technical skills into our group, are the best people to do this. Anything that discourages this cohort or creates imbalances in the cohort generally, needs to be avoided. Things that need to be considered are: - Larger practices tend to cover registration costs. As the costs to get registered increase, this pushes those wanting to get registered into those large practices. This reduces the diversity of skills in our group, limits the pathways to get registered and ultimately reduce the quality of residential construction over the medium to long term. - This should be obvious to anyone who opens their eyes, but... Younger people have less disposable income than Registered Architects. Full stop. Raising the fee for initial registration will increase the rate of decay to our ranks and rob us of energy and enthusiasm that we desperately need. - The level of the charge to those wanting to sit registration should be high enough to convey the seriousness of the proposition, but not too high to prevent people being financially able to submit. Thank you for your time.

I would be interested to see the financial breakdown, where the money NZRAB earns is spent and what the current costs are for NZRAB. Has there not been a cost reduction in services since some initial registration interviews have been conducted online? Has there been any consideration to staggering the fees paid by current registered architects? In the UK, fees are staggered, with less experienced registered architects paying a lesser amount than more experienced architects. This would enable greater fees to be captured to enable subsidies for initial registration and ideally allow for fees proportional to income earned. There is clearly a problem with the industry as a whole, for the costs required to gain the qualifications (both university and registration) to be so high in comparison with the average income of those working in the profession.

no

I am curious about the level of subsidy from the institute. Why are the costs so high for an interview/review of the work? The document submitted by the Emerge committee raised a range of good questions that I agree with

Probably you did have lots of entries last few hand-ins, but it was because of covid and restrictions in the past years, the number of entries over the next years will return to normal levels. Increasing the cost as per option 1 sounds desperate.

While Option 2 is ideal, I would like the board to consider accessibility with the fee structure in relation to the salary of graduates, and encouraging applicants to re-attempt without punishing them with a consistent cost to do so. I understand there's an increasing cost to provide the service and respect a fee increase to support the continuation of supporting up-and-coming architects.

Yes, initial rego should be \$2500 at most for new grads

If the Board does not have access to the various documents which addressed this matter in 2012 then I can provide them. There is still relevant commentary and evidence from 2012 which would assist with deliberations on this matter.

As mentioned above, there should definitely be an alternative option for maternity leave perhaps named "parental break", rather than voluntary suspension. The first 12 months of "parental break" should be free. Any longer than 12 months, I believe a \$250 fee per year would be acceptable.

Has there been a review of the registration requirement to ensure that critical elements are covered but are kept streamlined to make both submissions and assessment efficient?

I think a gradual increase per year is a better structure than a large jump every 5 years. This will allow people to plan and save, ensuring they are focusing on studying rather than the financial burden and stress this puts the young graduates under. Thank you for your consideration.

I am concerned about charging for voluntary suspension. Architects go into voluntary suspension for a number of reasons, common ones include after being made redundant or when they are on maternity leave. Other times it could be due to their health or family members health. In all those situations they can be quite financially stretched. I think there should continue to be no charge for this service and the cost spread into other areas to subsidize this service.

Architectural graduates are not generally well paid. While they will get some benefits from registration, if the use of the title Architect continues to be protected, so do the practices they work for. It is a relatively small cost for each practice but a significant one for the graduate. I think that the level of subsidisation should remain high.

Ask the Government to invest in the architects of the future. Gather a tithe from firms based on some agreed metric . Create a trust architects can contribute to to support graduates....

If you compared the cost of living with the average wage of a graduate (say 5 years experience) and how long it would take to save \$6k in this environment (assuming that graduates are required to pay for registration themselves), this ask is extremely inequitable, and arguably more experienced architects on higher salaries can afford give back to the profession in the same way they have received support. Perhaps there is a further conversation around the registration process, and if that process needs to be streamlined to reduce running costs whilst maintaining high standards (tall ask..?).

As a fifth-year architecture student who took a three-year break between my undergraduate and postgraduate studies to gain industry experience, I returned to pursue my Master of Architecture to qualify for Pathway 1 of registration. I have been able to support myself with savings and part-time work throughout my studies. However, the proposed increase in initial registration fees presents a significant financial burden, especially with the already high costs of a student loan. If Option 1 or 3 were implemented, I would seriously consider offering my skills to overseas firms where the financial barriers to registration may be more manageable. It is crucial that NZRAB fosters an accessible pathway for students and recent graduates who are committed to the future of New Zealand architecture, without pricing us out of the profession.

In my experience, practices are more likely to pay for ACR than initial registration. Practices are more capable of absorbing the NZRAB price increases than graduates.

no

How about proposed fee for ARC around the \$800 mark? Registration will go up - at that cost hopefully most candidates are serious about passing.

I would question the introduction of a fee for requesting to go into temporary pause. Some typical scenarios for that requirement are being made redundant or having children, both of those significantly reduce a person's income availability. I'm sure there are other similar scenarios so I would prefer to see that left at the current zero cost.

Those that vote to pull up the ladder after themselves deserve to belong to a institution whose influence will continue to dwindle until they are truly just lap-dogs to the rich. This would be a shame because there is very real and deep knowledge (and perhaps will?) in the profession on how to make the built form more humane and sustainable. LBP Design Level 3 just doesn't have the same ring to it as "architect."

The administration of NZRAB needs work. During my registration process (Pathway 1), the delays, lack of communications, limited responses makes me wonder what the cost of the registration covers. The total months from the submission deadline of the case study to receiving results was 5 months. From the receiving end, the increase in the cost is not justifiable. Provide a better breakdown why it costs the stated figure in the consultation document. Invest in technology to streamline and reduce running ad overhead costs. Look at ARBV (Australia) portal as precedent. The application and the registration process is so much simpler and cheaper....

Can you please provide more information on how the estimated cost of each Registration Application was calculated? -Can you please provide a response to the questions that the NZIA Emerge Committee have raised in their letter dated 30 October 2024? -Can you please provide a comparison to how other professions address the issue of balancing application fees against membership fees? Similarly, can you please provide a comparison to how registered architects boards overseas address this issue?

N/A

Reduce the costs of all NZRAB activities and consider using Zoom to reduce travel time and costs for all the people involved with the NZRAB activities and the applicants or candidates for the different categories.

Maybe there should be an option for those who can afford to pay more to do so, but for those who can't, the current structure should remain.

It is unclear in all of these options what the fee for voluntary suspension is for. Is this an annual fee for each year of voluntary suspension or a fee to reinstate the registration after returning to the profession. If it is the former that does feel unfair as this is usually a time where time is being taken off working (parental leave, illness) and income will be limited. If this is for coming back into the profession, is this another hindrance to encouraging people back in? Might be better to pay a fee to go into suspension which is in effect a sum to cover the admin for coming out of that again, this may also encourage people to come back as they have already paid that fee.

The process around voluntary suspension also needs serious review.

I think the repeat attempt cost could be increased in all options to match the initial registration, which would decrease the subsidy to be covered by registered architects.

The voluntary suspension of registration fee seems to be a penalty which will disproportionately be applied to women?

Not sure if this would work or in practical terms (variation of Option 3): Initial registration application fee at say \$2300, and if successful then first year's registration is \$1,700, then \$850/year after that so that it defers some of that initial application cost. Might need to increase the cost of repeat attempt to cover the \$850 missed out from the applicants that weren't accepted at first attempt.

No

Reconsider how the registration process works!!! It's already so unnecessarily convoluted and frustratingly academic, if its also expensive then its probably time this was changed. Why not at least streamline the process so that graduates are filling in a template, reducing time for assessors to read through each case study. If the goal is to assess the competency of applicants, then consider whether writing a huge document is the best way to achieve this. Bullet points, outlines, templates could all make it much easier to both apply and assess.

Appreciate it's not easy to meet all financial demand of the board.

What is the day rate for examiners? Is there a more efficient way of doing this? Zoom interviews for example?

Is there an option where graduates are not copping the brunt of it all? Has the industry actively pursued other means for funding? E.g. government funding or overseas investors?

More evidence needs to be presented regarding 'financial model' mentioned in consultation document.

Here's an improved response: "Implementing a higher fee for cross-licensing from other countries, similar to the UK's £3000 charge for NZ-to-UK registration, could offer several benefits: \* Discouraging 'quick and easy' registrations: This could deter young architects from seeking easier registration paths in other countries, ensuring they meet rigorous NZ standards. \* Preserving the integrity of the NZ architectural profession: By preventing a surge in overseas registered architects, this measure could help maintain the quality and reputation of NZ architecture. \* Recognizing the value of the NZ registration process: The higher fee could acknowledge the time, effort, and expertise invested in the NZ registration process, making it a more valued qualification. However, it's important to balance these potential benefits with the need to attract skilled international architects and maintain global professional relationships. A careful assessment is necessary to determine the optimal approach." Key improvements: \* Clearer and more concise language: The response is more direct and easier to understand. \*

Focus on the benefits: The key advantages of the proposed measure are highlighted. \* Acknowledges potential drawbacks: The response recognizes the need for balance and further consideration. \* Stronger conclusion: The final sentence provides a balanced and thoughtful conclusion. By incorporating these improvements, the response becomes more persuasive and informative.

Has there been any review into how the costs associated with the registration process could be reduced?

I believe that the fee for voluntary suspension should be \$0. Those going into voluntary suspension are often on leave from practicing architecture and not earning. A fee would likely unfairly affect more women on maternity leave. I would support the cost for these applicants to be added to the ACR fee.

No

Think something between option 2 and 3, maybe around 2500

No.

Please reconsider these options as these prices are quite steep, as this is what will stand at for the next few years until the next review. I could see graduates shift to other certification pathways like becoming LBPs. I hope you also reconsider QEAP fees and it would be good to know whether zoom conversations can help reduce fees for initial registration in any way. Thank you

The fees for initial registration was increased several years ago to in excess of \$2000, but after some push back discussion was reduced significantly and cost of funding the NZRAB fell largely to the annual subscriptions. The current cost of fees for initial registration has been far to low since then and needs to be increased by at least 100%, so option 3 appears to do this in the most balanced and fairest way.

Whilst I appreciate the financial burden for individuals, and self-employed for payment of annual registration fees, I counter this with the qualifications of the industry as a whole. I would encourage Architects to become registered and would like to see a high bar, without the financial obstructions, so that Architects are the pre-eminent design professionals in the Construction space. Architects may not remain relevant if we don't continually lift others into the industry.

Higher costs for initial registration are not a good idea. Architectural graduates already struggle with low wages, high rents and high cost of living in NZ. This is even harder for females as they struggle even more with the same issues as put above put the added cost of raising children and working part time for even lower wages. Raising prices will encourage more Architectural graduates to move to Australia.

Explore a different registration format that doesn't cost so much to complete? Maybe a CV and exam over a conversation?

The costs involved with processes around 'Initial Registration' may be significantly reduced in holding the 'Conversations' over Zoom by default. All involved with Registration today are famili with online meetings. Hosting these events in person is not necessary and obviously requires gr expenditure. The application forms could be revised to state this and provide an option for thos seeking to 'meet in person', where they could pay a surcharge to do so. Further information about the costs and calculations should be provided as this Fee topic evolve

1) The NZRAB needs to consider the future of architectural registration, especially in light of accreditation systems like LBP. 2) I believe that the moderate increase to ACRs across the three options is fair, and will be able to be easily recouped by most registered architects through their project fees. 3) I am confused why the Pathway 3 fee would be half that of Pathway 2. I personally have a BArch from a New Zealand university. My own knowledge has benefitted substantially more through employment than through study, as I was advised by my lecturers. I have worked with colleagues who hold 5-year overseas MArch degrees. They have less understanding of New Zealand building codes, legal systems and regulations than I did at time of BArch graduation. If the QEAP process assesses all applicants equally, overseas applicants should go through a more stringent process than New Zealanders, to ensure their competencies in these areas.

As previously noted, I think it is important to reduce the cost of the QEAP assessment. I do not agree that it is fair to not offer some subsidy.

The ACRs fees should be considered as a fixed expense for architectural business owners or solo practitioners, an increase will not have a major effect on the profession. ACRs fees should continue to subsidy the rego fees. Whereas the large financial commitment for young professionals to become registered will have a larger impact on the profession with many individuals leaving the country to get registered elsewhere.

---

I would support a moderate increase in the fee for first attempt. This would discourage candidates from applying before they are ready. Some of the candidates I have mentored were not ready but went ahead anyway. A proportionately lower fee for a second attempt would create a neutral outcome overall for successful candidates, and encourage trying again.

---

N/A

---

Have you run this proposed jump in initial registration fees past aspiring architects in the graduate development program? I would suggest they would be very shocked with the proposed figure of >\$6K.

---

They should be structured to maintain the integrity of the Profession. Greater visibility for applicants on where their costs go

---

No.

---

Review the fees associated with registration. Why is it so much??

---

see above (maybe this already happens). WE MUST MAINTAIN Option 2

---

Keep costs to a minimum. Thanks for your work

---

I understand the dilemma, but I just renewed my registration and there is little to no work, and architects are being sidelined in the practice by highly-undereducated technicians and/or unregistered PCBU's so the institution is being undermined. NZRAB needs to fix it before the public becomes aware of what is going on.

---

A limit on applications each intake, first in basis. - A cheaper application fee for online conversations, likely to reduce costs.

---

Maybe Registered Architect process and LBP process should be combined into a single series of graduated levels. This could lead to less confusion in the marketplace and less fees for Reg Arch?

---

Please consider other options such as reducing the number of staff, reducing the size of the board. The interview could be shortened to one hour with a written test. There is too much discrepancy between interviews at present.

---

---

Young, talented, architectural graduates are already faced with large student loans, a cost of living crisis, and low salaries. They were already set back for 2 years due to Covid so may not have gained the relevant experience necessary due to working from home and not having the relevant mentoring. To set them back even further, after five hard and strenuous years of university to gain a Master's, by a 540% in fees, is incredibly unfair. Graduates work long and hard to get their experience and are already faced with a huge task of compiling their case studies, to then face further challenges of obtaining over \$6,500 of fees, not guaranteeing them a successful examination (potentially over \$13,000 of fees for a repeat attempt). It is the applicant that puts in a large amount of effort for their case study; financial struggles should not be something that they also have to be faced with. This number absolutely doesn't feel like it has been really considered to how expensive this actually would be for a young person who hasn't even made their way in the industry yet. There will be a huge reduction in applicants which will overall, hinder architectural practices and talent in New Zealand. A huge amount of people will not get registered, or take their talents and degrees (earned in NZ) to either Australia or the UK where fees are significantly lower. In Australia, salaries are also higher and a lower cost of living - fee increases will drive talented graduates out of New Zealand. (In Western Australia, the average experienced graduate salary is \$90,000, compared to that of \$70,000 in NZ. Fees in WA are approximately \$1,200, compared to that of \$6,520 in NZ. The figures alone will drive graduates to Australia no doubt, there is \$25,000 disparity between Australia and NZ). An increase in fees is not unreasonable to cover inflation and any potential digital advancements. A 540% increase in fees, however, is not okay. I feel incredibly strongly about this as someone who wants to do their registration in the next couple of years but I absolutely will not be doing it with this increase in fees when I want to afford to afford my bills and paying off my student loan (to get a Master's degree in the first place). One year of study at Victoria University is approximately \$10,000; the Option 1 fee increase to \$6,520 is comparable to 65% of a year of study. I have 3 years experience in NZ and then 3 years of experience in the UK. As a young graduate, I have talents that are desirable in NZ, yet this does not make me want to get registered in NZ. If I can earn more in Australia, and have a more affordable pathway to registration, for me, it is absolutely a no-brainer to move to Australia. The NZRAB have also noted that the increase in fees is to ensure future stability and investment in digital systems, yet have not outlined what these are. An applicant would not even understand or know where their money is going to. The NZRAB's broad statement has not helped people to understand what they are paying for, when afterwards, they have to pay annual fees anyway. From an applicants perspective, they are preparing the case study after years of experience, and months of preparation, to then have an interview after a review of the work from an examiner. To expect that the examiner and then panel review, is worth \$6,520, when it is the applicant that does the work, feels absurd and imbalanced. Perhaps the NZRAB can work more closely with architectural university's (Auckland, Unitec, Victoria) to gain more subsidies and sponsorship without hurting the applicant when they have already had to pay \$50k+ of fees for their Master's degree. Or perhaps the examiners (who are already registered) pay should be subsidised. Additionally, if the workload for examiners is too much, capping the amount of applicants per year could be an option so there isn't an influx in applications. Additionally, once a year for applications rather than twice. A graduate would still apply the following year if they missed out that current year. But would they be willing to pay \$6,520? Absolutely not.

---

Not at this point in time

---

While I understand that the initial registration fee is a one-time investment, it's important to consider that this fee is being imposed at the early stages of an architect's career, when salaries for graduates in New Zealand are relatively low. The proposed changes seem out of touch with current realities, especially when the industry is experiencing a downturn, with many professionals losing jobs and businesses closing. I also acknowledge that already registered architects may not be eager to subsidize fees for graduates. However, I believe this is a generational responsibility. Those who were registered in earlier times faced less financial strain when entering the profession, and to ensure the continuous growth and sustainability of the industry, they should support future generations in entering the market. These new architects will be crucial in carrying forward the vision and development of the profession in the years to come. Otherwise we cut old trees with no young ones planted to grow.

The \$6k actual cost for registration is a joke and should not be anywhere near that figure. Reduce your overheads. It should be top priority to reduce the barriers stopping a diverse range of people becoming registered as architects. The Board has been screwing this up for decades and it now, if not sorted promptly, may mean the end of Registered Architects as a whole through the occupancy regulation review.

Why NZ registration fees are so expensive when comparing to other countries, which registration/architects skills are recognised in NZ? Looking at cost of registration, NZ registration is the most expensive when comparing to AUS(e.g.NSW) and USA(e.g. Oregon), despite lower median earnings potential of NZ graduates and architects. Base of information from relevant organisation websites: NZ registration exam real cost: NZ\$ 6,530 New South Wales registration and exam costs: NZ\$1,806 APE1+2+3 + initial fee +1st year reg. USA (Oregon) registration cost NZ\$3,785 ; includes NCARB pre licence record for 5 years, NCARB exam (transmittal fee waived for first registration), Oregon registration. NCARB exam total 6 divisions costs NZ\$2470 each exam division can be retaken for NZ\$412 In my opinion, the exam form and organisation need to be changed to reduce the cost of exam. NZ yearly registration fee real cost: NZ\$530 NSW yearly registration fee is NZ\$387 USA Oregon yearly license fee in Oregon is NZ\$329.16 or NZ\$197.50 if paid for 2 year period NZ voluntary suspension: NZ\$250. I disagree with creating voluntary suspension fee, especially at that level. NSW No voluntary suspension fees, automatic reinstatement within 3 years, subject to CPD USA Oregon No voluntary suspension fees, automatic reinstatement within 5 years, subject to CPD, reinstatement additional fee application + 1 year registration: NZ\$824 Additionally in NZ, LBP can do the same work as architects. Their fees are: Exam application \$250 Exam LBP1 \$777 Exam LBP2 \$894 Exam LBP3 \$1,012 Yearly licence fee \$239

A slightly larger fee for initial registration is ok but I wouldn't recommend this much. In my opinion, charging more on yearly registration fees is a better approach to recovering costs where the practicing architect or practice can build this into their fees.

N/A

i would advocate for a repeat attempt at initial registration to be per section, in lieu of a complete re-submission. It would save time for assessors and cost for everyone. I would suggest the fee would be proportionate for the number of sections to resubmit but less than initial registration.

No.

Over the last four years every supplier necessary to practice architecture has significantly increased the cost of their services and fees into a declining post-pandemic economy. As a result of the significant increase in the core costs of practicing architecture and the downturn in income brought about by covid and escalating compliance requirements I have, this year, come to terms with the fact that it is no longer a profitable proposition to practice architecture and have closed my practice. I have weathered 18 years of sole practice including the great financial crisis of 2008. I predict the departure of many small architects from practice to safer, resilient and more comfortable and better paid roles, leaving an industry with only a handful of major architect firms upon which to levy increasing fees and a swathe of designers that are not required to meet the same expectations or overheads demanded of architects. Im sure your fees are justified to meet your increasing costs; just that there will not be be any small architects left in practice to pay them.

Increasing the initial QEAP by such significant amount, especially given that the NZQA provides a qualification assessment to \$445, seems extremely exaggerated. As well as such significant increase to other pathways fees. As mentioned above I think that the increased fees will likely discourage many NZ graduates to get registered or even try to build their careers elsewhere, given that the NZ salaries are not the highest. At the same time, those fees are strongly discouraging to international architects, even the already registered elsewhere, to establish their professional lives here. If NZRAB increases fees for those alternative pathways, it would have to be transparent in what the fees are allocated to. I honestly don't think it brings a good light to NZRAB for transferring the financial burden mostly to internation professionals in times when there is increased "brain drain" overseas.

If the registration fees increased as per option 3, could you put in place a subsidy for those with lower incomes to help those who need it, while those who could afford it would absorb the increases? Have you looked at what is charged by other professional bodies for those registered, and new registrants? It would be good to know how each options sits in context to other similar pathways and memberships.

Bring the initial registration fee down to between 2000-3000, and annual fee to between 800-900.

I am extremely concerned that anyone would consider the intensity with with registration fees could need to go up without subsidisation. In effect, you're prepared to marginalise Māori, Pasifika and Women overwhelmingly, and continuing to make the profession dominated by white men of privilege and affluence. You've assumed "more graduates are looking to register" based on what evidence? You'll likely have the opposite effect and any good gains we've made with brown people entering the profession will track backwards.

What additional services are being provided that warrant the significant increase in costs? Encouraging more people to become members will increase revenue some of the proposed increased costs of registration will be counter to the. Unless additional services are being provided focus should be on how to increase numbers to increase income rather than increase fees. What focus has been done to reduce expenditure?

possibly not subsidise the 4th attempt (if people are trying more than 3 times). or kick out applicants sooner if multiple attempts? (this might be a tad harsh, so potentially on a case by case basis). Reduce the process somewhat to a different level than which is required now? reduce the interview duration / create an examination similar to australia.

When considering the costs associated with different pathways, it's important to recognize that individuals on Pathway 1 incur not only the expenses of an additional two years of study but also the ongoing living costs of not working during this period. The fee for a Master's Professional program can be approximately \$20,000. Therefore, the additional fees for alternative pathways should be further evaluated and potentially increased to help offset the initial registration costs.

Option 3 does not undersell the profession, and it maintains the level importance and gravitas for registration.

Are there any procedural efficiency options, reducing the manual assessment involved in overseas architect applications, for example? As the price increase in those seems to suggest they are very time consuming?

I've just sat my professional conversation last month, maybe the location for these conversations doesn't need to be as central where I would expect would come at a high hiring cost. There might be practices that would offer their meeting rooms to perform these? Maybe provide some incentive for firms to help in providing venues to perform these conversations to reduce costs for NZRAB. Or these could be run on Zoom at a lower application fee since no venue is needed? Alternatively they could be done in more cost effective venues.

There is an incentive for employed architects NOT to maintain registration currently because Non registered architects can rely on registered architects to sign off their work. Its the larger practices with larger unregistered staff numbers that gain most from this. They should fund their share of member subscriptions. The separate practice subscription has always favoured large practices at the expense of smaller ones and individual architect members. All member and practice services should be available to all NZIA architects based on a simple subscription and be funded by employers on a practice staff numbers basis not just registered architects. This or a similar mechanism would remove the incentive for employed architects NOT to register or maintain registration.

N/A

Is there a middle ground between 2 and 3 where ACR is higher (as this is generally paid for by the practice) to assist in covering costs and the initial registration is kept lower to encourage grads to attempt and afford registration.

We risk further entrenching class divisions and shutting off access to the profession to those who are already least represented withing it. The architectural profession should not be a small, closed group of (largely) wealthy Pākehā who can afford the hefty fee of admission.

For transparency, can you please provide a breakdown of where the fees are going? The notice issued on 14 Oct 2024 mentions an increase in operating costs and investing in digital systems - what exactly are the operating costs?

With all the challenges facing the building industry and the broader New Zealand economy, I don't see a reasonable argument for increasing our fees. The institute should be more in touch with our reality.

No

Option 4: Simplify the registration pathway so there are less expenses spent on getting people registered. This way the initial registration fee and the annual fee can remain as low as possible. I'm currently living in Canada and have been paying annual fees for the last 7 years. Paying to remain registered each year is already expensive and voluntary suspension is not an option I'd like to pursue due to the negative association with the word suspension. It's unfair that the system in many ways forces people overseas to pay high fees for zero service as we are out of country and the only option we are given is an option that frankly no-one wants on their record.

Firstly, the proposed \$250 fee for 'Voluntary Suspension' is not appropriate for a minor administrative task of applying a hold. This item should remain at no cost. Further suggestions on the Fee Structure, some as previously described include: 1) Maintain support for the younger cohort by continuing the cross-subsidy to keep fees reduced, 2) Proceed with increasing the fees for those on Pathways 3-8. 3) Charges for all services beyond those tabled should be considered. e.g. Subsidies could be maintained if minor administrative tasks were charged for, as they are by other Professional Bodies. 4) The costs involved with processes around 'Initial Registration' may be significantly reduced in holding the 'Conversations' over Zoom by default. All involved with Registration today are familiar with online meetings. Hosting these events in person is not necessary and obviously requires greater expenditure. The application forms could be revised to state this and provide an option for those seeking to 'meet in person', where they could pay a surcharge to do so. Further information about the costs and calculations should be provided as this Fee topic evolves.

I'm interested to see that the subsidy for alternative pathways have been removed in all options and would be curious to understand the reasoning....

Charge less fees by making it way easier to get registered. We defend the sanctity of registration when it actually give us no more power than an LBP Design 3, which is far cheaper and easier to achieve. We need to start supporting out profession, and its future!

If anything, Maybe QEAP could be higher?? Maybe re-attempts could be a bit higher?? Keep in mind, ACR is usually part of our salary package, so it is an item that gets negotiated, hence it can't be too high (and my reason for increasing the initial one-off registration cost rather than us subsidising and missing out on a fair pay).

Have other options been considered like an increase to the second attempt for initial registration as the costs appear to be the same within the NZRAB. Im not saying pay the full 100% but even slight increases can be made as this is a large loss to the NZRAB. Along with the Voluntary suspension costs and other pathways to be reviewed. Also options for a review of the initial registration process and why the costs are so large for pathway 1/2 in the first place needs to be considered. Subsidising 75% of this initial process may not be a viable option moving forward but it should still stay in place in some way or form - especially for small practices who do not contribute to the registration process financially- it is a large some of money for graduates to pay for the registration process and the membership once passed. There are already large costs to be a registered architect with the NZRAB and NZIA memberships

Comparison to the LBP scheme costs makes sobering reading. Seems that the NZRAB cost structure is hugely inflated compared to design class 3 costs via the LBP scheme (\$1262 application, \$239 p/a ongoing). Perhaps the board could resolve to transfer registration of architects to the LBP scheme?

Is there some other way of reducing the cost of initial registrations? Meet online instead paying for travel for assessors and board members?

It would be good to know the breakdown of costs for the true cost of services provided.

I am comfortable with either Option 2 or 3 but as noted would be interested to see how these amounts and approaches compare with other professions.

Subsidize initial registration to encourage Graduates, which is what the board is currently doing.

I don't believe ACR fees should be used to subsidise other areas at all. Other areas should be

balancing costs that require administration. This affects solo practitioners and those who are not working full time but want to maintain their registration.

Sorry team but this is not your best work. There is not enough information provided to make a suitably informed response to these questions. If you are consulting I'd expect you to at least encourage us to have some empathy with the issues you are trying to address I would have expected that you would have made it clear that you can only adjust your fees with statutory approval. Is this the reason that this hasn't been addressed in 5 years? Why isn't a review on the Boards programme annually or bi annually. Please provide the context for the 5 year timeframe. And then provide the context of your financial challenge. What are the costs that have been putting your budget under pressure? is it Disciplinary Hearings? if so tell us what proportion of the Boards costs are these? and what proportion registration? What percentage movement in your costs have you encountered in the last 5 years? What efforts have been made to attempt to reduce your expenditure in order to limit the necessity to increase costs.

CMcK

Clarity around how the money is spent would be appreciated. The proposed costs seem quite high. As someone currently studying and trying to get enough experience to register (feels like hitting head against brick wall for last 5 years but moving the wall forward slowly, started this process super motivated and determined and the industry is slowly wearing away the enthusiasm) there does feel like there is very little clarity and support around the process, and the current fee is making me question/ pause from just giving it a crack and question if I'm ready as I can't afford to retry to many times. If there was an option 4, of having an online portal of study material and quizzes that you work through at your own pace, and possibly the 6.5k was broken down into the sections then people could go as fast or slow as they are able or can afford. The lack of clarity between industry and the board around what level you are required to be at (industry saying 10year experience min in my experience) or what you need to know makes the process so much harder and so many of my peers have given up trying or going the LBP route as its clearer and more affordable purely so they can see some career progression, this seems like it will make more people go for the LBP. Option 5 that may work would be a course that we work through, similar to that of the online institutes ideally all online to make it easier for the regions to access, also allowing the board to have more control over what we learn, possibly reducing the risk of giving someone their registration. Either of the options above, or others that prove the worth behind the cost both in time and money to walk this path would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your time in reading this minor essay, have a wonderful evening.

-

Is there any streamlining of the process for initial registration. Can this process be simplified. I understand that an architect is a protected title, but becoming a Licensed Building Practitioner is much cheaper at around \$1000.

Cross-subsidizing muddies real cost attribution, and places pressure on those who can least afford it. Larger practices carrying this cost is their investment in the new registrant.

I would be happy to pay more for my annual registration to subsidise initial registration more. I think a nominal fee for initial registration is important so that it gets taken seriously (\$1000 is about right) but there are so many hurdles for graduates to cross as it is without pricing them out of the profession

With the cost of living, and average salary for Architectural graduates I would suggest dropping the registration fees even further

Not particularly, but perhaps look at the amount of documentation that is being asked of grads to submit for rego which seems to be a lot! If the examiners are to do justice to every application, the time taken to read thru and consider the entire submitted info is a huge task. Perhaps this can be streamlined for all concerned which would reduce the time/cost for the examiners(?) The crux of whether a grad is suitable for rego is more accurately explored, critiqued and understood within the professional conversation than in the screeds of submitted material in the case studies (in my opinion).

make sure the board is acting in a professional manner and carrying out it's necessary obligations, but with no unnecessary costs. All NZRAB cost centres should be challenged in terms of the effectiveness of any monies spent. The required portfolios for applicants are too onerous and hence the examiner's processing time is extended unnecessarily.

Perhaps its time to wrap the NZRAB into the LBP system? A registered architect is also a LBP3 anyway

revisit and review all the expending, structure the cost wisely. this fee shouldn't increase at all. our industry is not a high profit industry that grads get look after.

could restructure the subsidy according to need skill level and roles of NZARB

The board should not increase the fee at all.

There is a difference between larger and smaller practices, with the former more likely to contribute to initial registration costs, as well as ACRs. We should take care not to disadvantage smaller practices or discourage new architects. Maybe the sweet spot is between options 2 & 3? Also, reviews more regularly than 5 years would be better.

There are enough barriers to registration already with frankly little benefit to being registered, increasing the costs will drive grads further away. Increasing costs to graduates themselves who earn far less than established, senior architects seems unfair. A better idea would be to make the registration process simpler to reduce costs.

Specifically for initial registration Pathway 1: \$2,000 for the first attempt, and \$1,000 for the next, still feels reasonable.

It would be great to see more support provided to working parents.

It would be helpful to receive a more granular breakdown of the costs so that members can better understand why the registration fees are so high. Additionally, I'm unclear as to why pathways 5, 6, 7, and 8 are currently exempt from paying any fees for registration.

Look for ways to to decrease cost of registration. Such as asking practices to host conversations in there meeting rooms rather than paying for facilities

Perhaps a midway point between options 2 and 3 would be an alternative, if option 2 is not selected.

If the fees are raised, it might be a thought for these fees to include some more member benefits such as NZIA fees for a period of time (eg 3 years).

Yes. I am struggling to understand how the cost to NZRAB of processing initial registration applications can be so high. The letter of 14 October only talks about how the costs can be recovered, rather than addressing the costs themselves, therefore appearing to suggest that NZRAB accepts the costs as reasonable. There is no information included to inform how the costs of initial registration arrive and/or where the money is distributed. It appears to me that NZRAB needs to review their processes such that the administration of the registration process becomes more efficient and therefore less costly. As such the solution of Option 3 may become more palatable for applicants. Like elsewhere in NZ/Aotearoa at present, the discussion shouldn't just be about revenue, but also about efficiency and reduction of costs.

The continued contributions from current and future members should be a driver to keep costs down and encourage more graduates to become registered rather than putting members off.

Remove barriers to registration don't increase them!

NZRAB fees are already high for what minimal intervention the average member requires, and one would expect once new digital systems are in place this should decrease the amount of administration and therefore costs to members.

If you remove the cross subsidisation, I guess you could send out an invoice to cover the difference between what an individual has paid so far (in their annual fees being higher) and the actual cost of their registration?

Could slightly increase the fees to cover as much shortfall as you can.

I think the key thing is reducing the cost of assessing graduates. Perhaps the current model costs too much to deliver? I think it's really important to have a robust process and a very high standard, but I wonder if the length and breadth of both case study and interview could be reduced. Perhaps some of the content could be assessed in a written exam to make marking a bit easier?

I think that a new level between options 02 and 03 would be a better fit.

Many firms already refuse to cover or subsidise registration costs for their young graduates/intermediates, and I highly doubt that \$6k+ for initial registration is considered affordable for those on a graduate/intermediate salary. To increase costs to enter/stay in the profession is to dissuade a generation of architects from emerging into practice in the future.

No

The fees for initial registration should be moderated to support the profession, including ensuring the diversity of the profession continues to improve.

Even if the fees are raised, I think the repeat attempt for registration needs to remain at \$600 or at least below \$1000. Registration is a daunting and stressful undertaking grads should have the option to easily re-sit. if the re-sit fee is too high, grads will feel discouraged to attempt it in the first place. This is making architecture feel even more unattainable and reserved for the wealthy and privileged which is something that needs to be corrected in New Zealand.

Block course option for registration? Maybe an adjustment to the registration process would allow for an introduction of a new fee guide to the registration process.

I feel, some level of cross-subsidy is valuable, but also believe the registration process is a career investment, so should have a reasonable level of fee attached. I think the \$3-4k for Option 3 seems okay, but perhaps repeat stays at \$600, but QEAP is a higher fee than that initial registration fee.

For graduates, it seems there are more and more reasons why one would not want pursue registration. If the NZRAB wants to continue as a strong organisation, a fair and equitable path to registration needs to be seriously considered. It should be the responsibility of existing NZRAB to support the registration of new members, and their annual fees going towards subsidising new registration is a direct way of supporting the next generation of members.

I suggest that the Board can have more training classes for supporting the fees that it needs to support its services.

	<p>You should be making it simpler to register, not adding further road blocks for it.</p>	
	<p>Given the limited guidance and direction of the registration process compared with countries, such as the UK and USA, it seems irresponsible to raise the costs. There should be a more robust system in place for supporting graduates registered.</p>	
	<p>No</p>	
	<p>I would suggest the board tries to reduce the cost of the initial registration process as much as possible before considering increasing the cost for those sitting it. Someways of doing this could be through the venue. I.e. the venue for the conversation doesn't need to be a hotel conference room, it could just be a community meeting room (at a library). Food doesn't need to be provided.</p>	
	<p>2nd attempt should not be discounted, instead the cost relief should be for the 1st attempt and 2nd attempt should be higher. This will promote quality applications for 1st attempt without greatly hindering graduates from affording it.</p>	
	<p>1. What are you doing to lower your operational costs? 2. How do you rationalise the disproportionate cost increase for pathway two? Keeping in mind that pathway two is the QEAP and then the pathway 1 registration.</p>	
	<p>I strongly disagree with the high fees, I especially oppose the higher fees for alternative pathways and QEAP. That is a ridiculous stance to take you are essentially saying that architects and grads using that pathway are less than. It's insulting. if you can't provide the services in an affordable way then ask central government to contribute. Do that when you're doing the review of the architects act they are doing. If there is a govt requirement for administrative cost for architects role in NZ they should provide assistance to uphold a functioning regulatory system. They will want to retain architects and could subsidise by encouraging and ensuring financial barriers aren't put up for young people like they have for trades training, nurses retention recently for example. Graduates or those wanting to register via alt pathways don't have a spare \$9000 to throw at registration. That is an unbelievable sum I'm shocked it was even written or considered at all.</p>	
	<p>Graduates are financially more vulnerable. For the architectural industry to thrive, the future architects have to be better supported and encouraged. These are the future members of the NZRAB.</p>	
	<p>Fees are very high compared to other jurisdictions I have / are registered in.</p>	
	<p>If the purpose for the board is to protect the public, then maximising the number of professionals who meet the requirements for registration should surely be a goal. Massively increasing the barrier to entry is a huge disincentive, especially at a time when the industry is already under enormous financial pressures.</p>	
	<p>Not sure why the QEAP has such a large increase in all opinions</p>	
	<p>As above. At \$730 x 2361 + rego fees, I struggle to see how the NZRAB is unable to make 1.8 million per year work. If the registration method is costing too much, adjust the method. Don't force younger grads to pay for the NZRAB's choices. Feel free to contact me as per my personal details on the register.</p>	
	<p>You need to keep ACR fees as low as possible by sticking to your core responsibilities. New entrants need to pay their own way. Those facing disciplinary proceedings similarly need to pay their won way. I suggest you look at what other countries charge to register architects and adopt a lower cost model without frills.</p>	
	<p>Take the fees from those that have the money to pay them otherwise you're looking at a dying profession in Nz</p>	
	<p>Fees should be be lowered for registration and there should be different registered architect fees and initial registration for different companies depending on their size because the small companies are struggling and the larger ones seem to be the ones doing the best right now and have more of a money pool to play with.</p>	

No.
If the costs of initial registration as so prohibitive, perhaps looking at more cost-effective means of administering initial registration could be examined? This could include hosting conversations via zoom rather than in person.
No
No
N/A
N/A
no
nil
I would like to suggest that the focus should be on the wider goals of the NZRAB in our industry. Given the ongoing conversations to change the registered architects act, consideration should be given to how we see envisage architects' roles within our industry in the future. We have to keep the process accessible to graduates if want architects to be a more diverse group of professionals. In comparison, LBP applications cost \$1000-1200. I understand NZRAB have a different process but it is something to consider if the goal is for more people to undertake registration. I have recently sat my initial registration conversation within the last week and I can say that if the cost was \$3150-\$6500 I would not choose to do so. Is there any way these cost increases can be lowered and the timeframe for the NZRAB investments to be elongated. While cost increases are to be expected, the fees were reviewed 5 years ago and now even the option with the lowest % increase for initial registration is a 45% increase. Are the NZRAB investments ongoing costs or a one-off upgrade? How will the substantial increase in revenue for NZRAB be used in ongoing years? I also note that in the 2022/2023 report, the fees generated from initial registration formed 40% of the cost to run. Could we get more updated data on where the associated increases are coming from?
I'd suggest increasing the level of cross-subsidy slightly to keep the initial registration fee roughly at the same level it is now. Why does voluntary registration need a fee at all?
I think there is room for a middle ground between option 02 and 03 that should have been tabled in place of opt.01.
"Protection of the public" which is the fundamental purpose of the Act must include the Board proactively advertising the difference between Registered Architects and others. Publicising this differentiation is within its functions: ie. Clause 7 (2) No person who designs buildings, prepares plans and specifications for buildings, or supervises the construction of buildings may use the title "architect" unless he or she is a registered architect Clause 50. The Board's functions ... include (e) to provide information to the public about the registration system for registered architects. This promotional work can be seen as solely for the protection of the public but Registered Architects will be happy to pay slightly higher fees along with applicants as there will be better quality architectural engagements and betterdesign outcomes with an informed public.
NOT AT THIS TIME
When reviewing fees, the NZRAB should be mindful of the equivalent fees in Australia.

Would the new Pathway costs include a year or registration, or are these standalone processing fees? Having come over from Melbourne (with wife and 2 kids) in 2020, as a young and fairly poorly paid registered architect the proposed Pathway 5 fees would have certainly been a prohibitive cost barrier for me, when factored alongside the thousands spent on relocating to NZ, securing housing, a car etc. These costs may deter overseas architects from coming over. It could impact their employability if they do come, but don't or decide to postpone transferring their foreign registration. It may lead to a culture of foreign architects arriving and working in the country in offices, but never actually getting their NZ registration, with or without any material impact on their salaries, or roles / responsibilities in their workplaces. Like graduates who go years without or never seek registration because of the costs, or hassles of applying.. I know plenty of people in this boat! And then there's the NZIA's annual fees which need to be paid as well.. for what we're paid, getting and maintaining registration is a significant cost and time commitment. The juice has to be worth the squeeze..

-I would suggest the board explores what cost efficiencies can be made by addressing backend systems and processes that might provide financial gains. -This I think needs to explore the registration process itself, for instance I understand there are travel and accommodation costs covered for assessors. Could virtual assessment be explored as an option to save costs. Likewise, assessor training days -What activity can be deprioritized that does not contribute towards NZRAB's strategic objectives -What other levers are available to NZRAB to enhance financial sustainability and have all of these avenues been explored. -What long term planning is in place to ensure that NZRAB continues to review fees on an ongoing basis to ensure that fee changes occur incrementally and are projected such that engagement and decisions can be made proactively rather than reactively.

Given I am considering voluntary suspension very soon I am curious to understand how on a cost recovery basis that might cost \$250.00. If voluntary suspension is for architects to take time out for family reasons and for overseas travel etc, I think a lot will just let registration lapse and revert to being an LBP when that want to get back into practice. ... and I know they will not be able to use the term "Architect" but to be honest, I am not sure that this matters as it should. Our client too often don't care.

Yes, I am suggesting NZ RAB management to minimize/reduce non critical expenses (like we all do when situation is challenging and shortage of work come) to ..... I am sure you are adults and you very well know what that mean (try for moment be small practice or self employee and imagine you have to "budget" somehow to pay all ..... (and bureaucrats and Government asking non stop for more and more money you have to earn to pay them prior you will eventually "earn anything" . For start think about reduce salaries (or not increase them), no fancy offices, no fancy meeting rooms and top technologies, no paid benefits as is no money, no fancy paid company phones, no bonuses, no..... Be real part of industry and not just Government body asking for more money.

It would be useful to have more information on the full costs for registration on the NZRAB website. For example, does the initial registration attempt currently cost \$1,200.60 registration + \$724.50 ACR? The ARB UK website is much clearer on this point. In comparison with NZ CPEng registration and annual practicing fees, and other overseas architecture registration and annual practicing certificate fees, the NZRAB fees are relatively high. It would be good to know why, and if there are any efficiencies that could be made within the NZRAB registration system.

Registration is primarily a public interest matter covered by the Architects Act. As such, serious consideration should be given as to why these costs should not be funded by the state.

Perhaps a middle ground option between 2&3 being around \$2k or just above \$2k for initial registration 1st attempt and around \$1k for repeat attempt be better? Food for thought.

no

I am interested in how the fees and level of cross-subsidy compare to other similar countries. Our fees should not create a 'back door' for NZ graduates to register overseas and qualify in NZ via other pathways. I am also interested in how the impact of the fee increase to around \$2000 from around 2008-2013 and subsequent decrease played out, and what factors were considered. Lastly, I think that Pathway 3 proposed fees for all options are out of step with Pathways 5-8, as Pathway 3 requires an interview. I think the fee should be the same as for 58, with only 4 being at the reduced level.

maybe get more government funding? or looking at reducing the level of service and trim the unnecessary costs.

Please look at ways to reduce the costs of the registration process. Such as all interviews done online, shorter written thesis (10,000 words for example), a limit on attachments, etc.

To maintain a balanced, diverse and ethical register, option 2 should be the first option, with option 3 second and option 1 as the last resort. As option 1 does not enable a diverse mix of newly registered and existing registered architects, it weakens the reputation in the event an architect that has not been interviewed/tested in a long time does not act ethically and has not kept up with registration standards, as CPD is not a error-proof method of ensuring continued education/practice.

Discounting second attempts seems like an odd choice if the cost is the same, I would rather see discount of the first attempt, or keeping them the same. Costing that has been calculated across the pathways seems off given the difference in requirements, why are pathways 3 and 4 so much cheaper than other pathways? I believe in the UK much of these costs are passed onto institutions providing a post graduate certificate therefore removing cost burden from the Board and allowing the cost to be passed into a student loan. Has this been considered?

Good job overall and appreciate the newsletters and advisory notes

The discounted fee for a second attempt should be equal, or even increased, compared to the initial attempt. That would incentivise individuals to not apply until they were fully prepared.

Maybe it should be scaled based on tenure, i.e. if a director of a practice vs first time registered. An architect in their late 20s, early 30s not earning a huge amount comparatively, maybe looking to save for a house or starting a family (esp at the moment) could be better subsidised where the fees are a comparatively small amount from the wallet by those who are better off.

It would be good to understand what services the NZRAB provide to registered architects for the yearly fee, besides a certificate.

Don't put the cost on underpaid graduates trying to succeed in an industry that throws up every imaginable barrier

No, I believe that the NZRAB is very fair about the way that fees are structured.

This seems the most feasible option as a business. This still ensures that small practices can support graduates to register.

Boards Fees should be minimised with maximum efficiency of its service, but continuing professional development is important

It does feel like the perception of value associated with being a registered architect is everdiminishing and the traditional role and of what we do is constantly being eroded. When when this is combined with increasing costs of being in practice, many smaller architect business owners will be thinking carefully about the ongoing viability of what they do. The club will get smaller.

If option 3 turns out to be the most preferred in this survey, I would like to see the 'Initial registration 1st attempt' be closer to \$2,500 rather than over \$3k.

Nope.

Voluntary suspension should be free. Just thinking of who might request that, a mother on

maternity leave? someone with health issues?

No

I think that occasional architects should be charged a lesser fee. I am an architect as my night job and I might only do 3 jobs a year and still pay \$700 or now more per year and I can't cancel so feel disadvantaged. Can we have a stratified approach and cross subsidy from full time architects. Also can we have quarterly payment options. When I called up for a payment plan it was not an option

No other comments

How could the initial registration cost be reduced without affecting the quality of applicant? How can one sit an LBP test and become qualified for \$1,102 and have the same authority to lodge building consents as a registered Architect that had to spend up to \$6,520 to become registered? Is the government subsidising LBP registration to keep the standard of construction high in NZ? If so, why aren't the NZRAB accessing this funding?

We need architects as professionals or we will lose the profession completely to the creep of LBPs and other untrained organisations as a lesser pathway. Perhaps tiered architectural registration not unlike the LBP pathways is a sensible option, to encourage house design done by professionals, leaving the complex structures to higher tiers is worth considering?

2nd attempts should reflect actual costs to re sit and not be heavily subsidised. This encourages people to pass on first try.

Explanation of the Qualifications and Experience Assessment Panel (QEAP) costs

No - I'm happy with Option 2

The cost of registration seems really, really high. Way too high. It seems like the process is broken and needs to be rethought. I didn't register in NZ, I did in Victoria, Australia. The process there was thorough, but really streamlined and efficient. Although it (currently) appears to be a similar overall cost, it is split into 3x stages of payment, so you only pay to resit the bit you failed. Further, its far more transparent with a PARCs course being an additional cost that most people undertake to prepare for the exam - of all the study I've ever done, PARCs was by far the best money I ever spent and the principles and approach still resonate in my practice. Having read case studies for applicants here and the feedback of people undertaking them, the NZRAB process is convoluted and complicated. Beyond outlining that \$420 of our proposed registration fees go towards subsidising registration, it would be great to get more clarity as to where the other \$530 is going. All I personally use the NZRAB for is to monitor my CPD (which I'd happily have integrated into an NZIA portal). So knowing more clearly the scope of your services - and giving options on what services don't seem value for money / worthwhile would be additionally helpful.

Anything outside of option 2 would likely prevent anyone not born into wealth entering the industry. For an industry also encouraging diversity, minority groups or people generally less well off, or needing support other family/friends are not going to necessarily be in a position to get registered with the fees proposed in options 1 and 3.

Find a more efficient way to run the registration process

The NZRAB should have a tiered fee structure for annual registered. Example for sole practitioner the annual registration fee should be the lowest and followed by a practice having the number of registered Architect under their employment.

Yes. 1. Reduce the cost of the assessments. \$6K seems excessive per applicant. Budget needs a belt around it please. 2. There are other ways to obtain money from those that will benefit. For instance could NZRAB approach companies like Resene and Winstones Wallboards, APL etc, who benefit from creating leaders in the industry like Registered Architects? It would be good to get the entities that benefits the most from quality buildings to help out perhaps, and support. Graduates need sponsorship and support. The trajectory of user pays in my experience is that the user pays and others benefit beyond what you sacrifice. Student Loans is a good example. The generations before me that are working are still benefiting from my student loan in that they were subsidised for tertiary study and were older than me to vote not to pay and pass on

costs to me. My significantly reduced wealth meant that they then knocked out a future competitor. In the years of work I waited for my hourly

rates to increase to cover my loans and risk. It never came. I am happy to support new graduates, but I need NZRAB to look at their cost structure and reduce that cost.

what attempts have you made to reduce costs? I believe additional costs, especially at this time, will lead to reduced registrations across all practitioners.

No

Maybe add an option to pay over 3 instalments (no extra costs) - similar to how our NZACS premiums are paid.

Ensuring the maximum level of cross subsidy is key for increasing the level graduates applying for registration. As mentioned, pay for graduates is relatively poor in relation to other professions of equal academic standing. Any increase to initial registration fees would impact the number of people applying for registration detrimentally.

If option 1 or 3 comes into place, a payment plan option would be helpful.

as above. Access to registration is important. High standards are important.

Not at this stage

-

n/a

Consider a practice levy (varied by practice size perhaps, like the NZIA Practice charge) that encourages practices to support offsetting the initial and subsequent fee increase

This survey avoids mentioning how much registered architect ACR fees might be going up, nor what the board's other costs are, nor whether cost savings within the board's operations have been considered. The table in the email only looks at registration costs going forward and doesn't include this year's costs for reference - and can barely be read on screen. I understand not confusing the initial issue at hand, but as this affects everyone in the profession this is a matter for full disclosure and all information to be provided.

Registration process needs a serious review as to time heavy.

subsidy should remain for graduates, who are the lower paid part of our woefully underpaid profession with limited funds. It should also remain for returning NZ architects - they have already paid once and it is the new NZRAB policy that takes them off the register. Subsidy for overseas architect should match the level of subsidy we receive in those countries (ie reciprocal. It was going to cost me \$27000 to register in the UK) there should be no subsidy for LBP/technician route - they have chosen to skip the expense of the proper education and from experience need a much higher level of interrogation of knowledge - and in particular ethics.

If the barriers for career starters are too stringent, it will prevent individuals to become registered. Resulting loss of income in years to come will provide an even more challenging future.