

---

**From:** Peter Austin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 16 October 2018 1:22 PM  
**To:** DPTI:Planning Engagement  
**Subject:** Accredited Professionals Scheme submission

I wish first to answer the four questions raised on your website :

1. Should industry bodies be allowed to deal with complaints against Accredited Professionals on behalf of the Chief Executive of DPTI? ANSWER : NO. The sole accrediting body also should be the only one to resolve such complaints.

2. Should Accredited Professionals be penalised for failing to participate in audits in accordance with the Scheme? ANSWER : YES, as any proper professional should.

3. Should certificates of currency be submitted as proof of insurance, or is annual self-certification sufficient for this purpose? ANSWER :  
Certificates of currency should of course be provided. Any reluctance to do so should be viewed with great suspicion.

4. How important is design as a non-mandatory Continuing Professional Development topic compared with other non-mandatory topics? ANSWER :  
VERY important. Design is at the core of all development processes.

Having answered those questions, I submit that the entire concept of private certification should be questioned. It is difficult to monitor the genuine maintenance of standards, and bluntly it facilitates the path to corruption. Recent experiences in the Eastern States are clear examples of that kind of degradation. I do not believe that South Australia should be following this path.

Submission ends.