

RICS response to consultation on proposed revised CPD Framework

April 2025

1 Introduction

1. RICS' Standards and Regulation Board (SRB) established a CPD Framework Steering Group in February 2023 to lead a review of RICS' existing continuing professional development framework. The Steering Group is comprised of three RICS members and two lay individuals – a chartered accountant and a university professor. The Group has representation in the UK, USA, Hong Kong and Australia.
2. The key objective of the Steering Group is to make recommendations in respect of any revisions to RICS' current CPD framework and, potentially, the creation of a post qualification recertification or reassessment programme (subject to consultation with the membership).
3. Throughout its period of operation, the Steering Group has:
 - reviewed the existing RICS CPD Framework and all responses to previous surveys that asked for member views;
 - reviewed other information and stakeholder views received through engagement activities;
 - heard feedback in respect of RICS' current CPD training provision;
 - engaged with World Regional Boards and UK Regional Boards to seek feedback;
 - engaged with the Knowledge and Practice Committee to seek feedback;
 - reviewed more than 60 other comparable CPD Frameworks globally for comparison;
 - reviewed research regarding the effectiveness of CPD and different CPD models
 - utilised the expertise of independent specialists, especially the chartered accountant and university professor group members;
 - considered the work of the Entry and Assessment Steering Group;
 - conducted a member survey on key aspects of the existing RICS CPD framework, and carefully analysed the responses received (November 2023 – January 2024);

- conducted a full 12-week consultation on draft recommendations and analysed all responses (April – July 2024).

4. This document:

- summarises the responses received to the 12-week consultation from April – July 2024;
- explains how those responses have shaped and changed the group's recommendations; and
- explains the next steps in respect of changes to the RICS CPD Framework.

2 Summary of responses

5. RICS received over 350 formal responses to the consultation from April - July 2024.

Additional responses were received by email, and further feedback has been obtained through member events and in discussions with the Knowledge and Practice Committee and Professional Group Panels.

6. This is a summary of the feedback received via formal consultation responses:

Should RICS change the CPD requirements?		
Yes: 201	No: 88	Not sure: 62
Do you agree that there should be one set of CPD requirements applicable to all members globally?		
Yes: 236	No: 54	Not sure: 61
1. Do you agree with the proposal to amend the headline CPD requirement for all RICS members to focus on the need to identify, plan, undertake and record CPD which is relevant, adequate and appropriate?		
Yes: 243	No: 78	Not sure: 30

2. Should RICS be considering increasing the minimum number of CPD hours per year?			
Yes: 87		No: 217	
		Not sure: 47	
3. What do you believe is an appropriate number of CPD hours per year?			
20 hours: 226		30 hours: 88	
		40 hours: 8	
		Other: 29	
4. Do you agree that RICS's minimum required hours should be similar to other built environment professional bodies?			
Yes: 101		No: 144	
		Not sure: 106	
5. Should CPD be split and categorised as structured or unstructured?			
Yes: 207		No: 93	
		Not sure: 51	
6. Should the minimum number of hours of structured CPD per year be increased?			
Yes: 81		No: 224	
		Not sure: 46	
7. Do you agree that mandatory topics should be introduced as part of the RICS CPD Framework?			
Yes: 164		No: 142	
		Not sure: 45	
8. Does the proposed list of 5 mandatory topics cover the right subject-matter? Please identify topics you think should / should not be covered.			
Yes: 116		No: 137	
		Not sure: 98	
9. Do you think that 5 years is an appropriate timeframe within which to review the list of mandatory topics?			
Yes: 176		No: 106	
		Not sure: 69	
10. Would you find a list of recommended topics by area of practice helpful?			
Yes: 277		No: 69	
		Not sure: 5	
11. Do you agree that retired members should be fully exempt from the CPD requirements unless they intend to act as APC assessors?			
Yes: 292		No: 42	
		Not sure: 17	

12. Do you agree that members with non-practising, unemployment, ill health or family raising concessions should receive a full exemption from CPD requirements for 12 months?		
Yes: 282	No: 40	Not sure: 29
13. Do you agree that after 12 months members with these concessions should be required to undertake some CPD?		
Yes: 200	No: 77	Not sure: 74
14. Is undertaking some CPD while on one of these concessions generally achievable?		
Yes: 120	No: 84	Not sure: 147
15. Are there any other circumstances which should give rise to a concession and therefore some form of CPD exemption? E.g. those working in business operations and/or in the C-suite?		
Yes: 63	No: 132	Not sure: 154
16. Do you agree that those returning to practice after a period of absence should be required to undertake additional CPD in their first year in practice?		
Yes: 186	No: 122	Not sure: 43
17. Is 5 years the right timeframe? (Additional requirements after this period of absence)		
Yes: 154	No: 70	Not sure: 127
18. Do you think the additional CPD required should be a minimum number of hours or a designated programme?		
Designated programme: 51	Additional minimum hours: 96	Not sure: 204
19. Do you agree that an additional 10 hours of CPD in that year is adequate and appropriate?		
Yes: 132	No: 134	Not sure: 85
20. Do you think an additional 10 hours or a designated programme is achievable?		
Yes: 151	No: 109	Not sure: 91

21. Should the additional requirements only be over the first 12 months, or should they be in place for longer e.g. 24 months?		
Longer than 12 months: 116	First 12 months: 191	Not sure: 44
22. Should this requirement be different depending on the number of years on a full or partial exemption? E.g. 3 years full exemption, 2 years partial exemption OR 5 years full exemption?		
Wide variety – see comments in spreadsheet		
23. Is there a need for a further additional requirement for those returning after e.g. 10 years out of practice?		
Yes: 227	No: 67	Not sure: 57
24. Does a 12 monthly cycle for CPD raise any issues?		
Yes: 37	No: 289	Not sure: 25
25. Should members be able to carry forward CPD hours if they undertake more intensive courses which are relevant to their practice, e.g. a 1 year relevant and appropriate masters programme? E.g. Masters programme involving 100 hours of structured learning in 2024 – could count towards required hours of CPD in 2024, 2025 and maybe also 2026?		
Yes: 225	No: 101	Not sure: 25
26. If yes, for how many years should hours be able to be carried forward?		
Wide variety		
27. Do you already complete an annual Professional Reflection Statement or something similar?		
Yes: 51	No: 294	Not sure: 6
28. How do you currently select the CPD you undertake?		
Wide variety		
29. Do you think an annual Professional Reflection Statement will help inform your approach to CPD?		
Yes: 67	No: 208	Not sure: 76

30. Do you already record learning outcomes for the CPD you undertake?		
Yes: 201	No: 138	Not sure: 12
31. Do you think that recording learning outcomes will help inform your approach to CPD?		
Yes: 104	No: 190	Not sure: 57
32. Would alignment of the CPD reporting and membership renewal cycles be helpful?		
Yes: 160	No: 107	Not sure: 84
33. Would you foresee any issues with being required to sign a declaration at the point of renewal of your membership in relation to having met the RICS CPD requirements?		
Yes: 68	No: 239	Not sure: 44
34. Would you support the review and assessment of CPD records for a percentage of members each year?		
Yes: 198	No: 79	Not sure: 74
35. Would it be valuable for professional reflection statements to be peer reviewed by other members, in order to provide a route for feedback or informal mentoring?		
Yes: 49	No: 232	Not sure: 70
36. Do you think the selection of records for review and assessment should be random or risk-based?		
Risk-based: 86	Random: 65	Not sure: 200
37. If the selection is risk-based, are the above criteria adequate and appropriate?		
Yes: 169	No: 40	Not sure: 142
38. Do you agree that failure to comply with Continuing Professional Development requirements has the capability of leading to regulatory sanction?		
Yes: 264	No: 38	Not sure: 49
39. Do you agree that any of the following failures would be appropriate reasons for possible disciplinary action?		

a) failing to record any CPD	261
b) refusing to provide CPD records for review	253
c) failing to provide an adequate Professional Reflection Statement	19
d) failing to record learning outcomes for CPD undertaken	25
e) failing to do CPD that was relevant to the member's area of practice	124
f) failing to complete the minimum number of hours of CPD	234
g) failing to complete CPD on any mandatory topics	131
h) otherwise not completing adequate and appropriate CPD	123
i) other (please specify)	15

1. Members must identify, plan, undertake and record CPD which is relevant, adequate and appropriate, in the context of their practice
Comments: Opinion ranged, with some members seeing value in the CPD Framework encouraging members to plan their CPD in more detail and take full responsibility for their professional development, while other members stated that the current system is simple and effective, and that some unplanned CPD can also be useful. Members also commented on the meaning of 'relevant' encouraging RICS to take a relatively expansive view, allowing members to undertake CPD which is very specific to their role, but also CPD which is of more general interest and relevance in the context of the profession.

2. Members to undertake a minimum of 30 hours of CPD in total per year, of which 20 hours must be structured learning

Comments:

Views on the minimum number of hours to be required varied quite widely. A few members suggested that this should not be a prescriptive requirement, but should be a guideline only. Most members acknowledged the need for a specific requirement, but gave varied suggestions ranging from 20 hours to 100 hours per year. Some members suggested alignment with RIBA and CABE, setting 35 hours as the minimum. There was also fairly strong commentary on the need to scrutinise quality as well as quantity.

3. A minimum of 20 hours of CPD must be structured learning (meaning up to 10 hours can comprise unstructured learning)

Comments:

While some members were supportive of this proposal, suggesting that it ensures very informal networking does not make up the majority of CPD undertaken, most members who responded to the consultation were in favour of not increasing the number of hours of formal / structured CPD required. Members noted that flexibility was required to accommodate different learning needs and methods, as well as to allow for varying availability of high quality CPD, particularly in different sectors and regions.

4. Members will be required to undertake structured CPD across stipulated mandatory topics each year

Proposed mandatory topics could include:

- Ethics
- Sustainability
- Data, AI & technology
- Diversity, equity and inclusion
- Law, regulation and markets

Comments:

Most members who responded to the consultation were in favour of mandatory topics in principle, including Ethics, and with one or two additions. Members noted the need for RICS to ensure that CPD is available across these topics if/when introduced. Some members suggested different or additional topics, including: health and life safety, climate change and business skills. There was broad support for ethics, sustainability, and AI & technology. Some comments highlighted the difficulty of mandating DEI as a topic, given regional socio-political differences as well as the lack of quality CPD on this topic in some regions.

5. Members who are retired from practice receive a full exemption from CPD requirements unless they intend to act as APC assessors

Comments:

There was fairly strong support for maintaining this automatic exemption from CPD for retired members, acknowledging the low likelihood of them returning to practice and therefore the low risk of not maintaining competence through CPD. Members noted that if retired members were still undertaking some work, including acting as an APC Assessor or providing mentoring, then they should not be exempt from CPD.

6. Members on other relevant membership concessions* receive a full exemption from CPD requirements for up to 12 months

They then receive a partial exemption (unless discretion applied to extend full exemption)

On partial exemption members must complete a minimum of the structured CPD required under the mandatory topics – i.e. 5 mandatory topics

Comments:

There was clear support for ensuring that members on ill-health concessions receive automatic exemptions from CPD for as long as they are unwell, rather than just for an initial 12 month period.

There was a range of comments in respect of other membership concessions, including parental leave, adoption leave, family raising, caring, non-practising and unemployed / seeking work. Most comments noted the relevance of the member's propensity to return to practice and the connected need to maintain competence. Several members noted that some flexibility is required to accommodate particular personal circumstances. Most members suggested that for those likely to return to practice, some baseline CPD requirement was appropriate and achievable.

7. Those on full or partial exemptions for more than 5 years must undertake additional CPD in their first year of returning to practice*

Either:

- an additional 10 hours of CPD (i.e. a total of 40 hours)

OR

- a specified suite of CPD designated as a "returners' programme"

Comments:

While some members were supportive of this proposal, many suggested that it was an unnecessary and disproportionate barrier to re-entering the profession after a period of absence. Many members also noted that employers already ensure members returning to practice undertake training to bring them back up to speed with changes and developments, and that no further requirement from RICS is needed.

8. CPD must be undertaken within a 12-month cycle (January – December)

Comments:

Some members suggested that a 2 or 3 year cycle would be better, perhaps even allowing for an average number of hours across 3 years. However, the majority of members were supportive of retaining the familiar 12-month CPD cycle from January-December, in alignment with annual membership subscriptions.

9. Members must prepare an annual Professional Reflection Statement covering their reasons for identifying and selecting the CPD they have undertaken, and identifying what CPD they require for the following year or years

Comments:

Members were relatively divided in their response to this proposal, with some clearly seeing the value of an annual learning and development plan, while others viewed it either as unnecessary and/or duplicating existing similar documents required by employers.

Many members commented positively on the idea of recording some sort of professional reflection in connection with CPD, but many were not supportive of a separate requirement for a formal document.

10. Members must record the learning outcomes of each CPD activity undertaken

Comments:

Some members suggested that this was not an essential requirement to set. Other members noted that they already do this on a voluntary basis. Those in favour of the requirement noted that it helps members to remember what they have learnt, it reminds members why the CPD was relevant to them, and it helps to identify future learning activities which could be beneficial.

11. Members will be required to sign an annual declaration that they have completed their Professional Reflection Statement and, in light of that reflection, have undertaken relevant, adequate and appropriate CPD which meets RICS requirements

Comments:

Members already familiar with an annual declaration e.g., as part of the Valuer Registration Scheme or for other organisations were generally supportive of this proposal. Some members also commented that it was a good

idea as it reinforces the importance of CPD and encourages accountability among members. Other members thought that this was unnecessary, particularly if CPD was being recorded with RICS anyway, and others noted the practical difficulties of potentially tying such a declaration to RICS membership when some membership renewals are completed by a firm on behalf of a member.

12. Percentage of members annually will have their CPD records reviewed in detail to assess whether they meet RICS' CPD requirements

Comments:

Many members supported the idea of a detailed CPD review annually, with some even suggesting that 100% of records could be reviewed each year with RICS using artificial intelligence to support the compliance process. Most respondents noted the need for this qualitative review, rather than just a quantitative focus on the number of hours of CPD undertaken. Some members queried how records would be selected, and some viewed the review process as potentially too costly and resource intensive.

13. CPD non-compliance is likely to lead to disciplinary action, up to and including expulsion from membership and may make someone ineligible for RICS membership

Comments:

The majority of respondents considered it necessary for there to be some connection between CPD non-compliance and the RICS disciplinary process to ensure that members take CPD seriously and to ensure that the public can have trust in the profession. Several members called for this process to be made more transparent and advocated for an approach which is not overly punitive.

3 Analysis and impact

7. RICS staff and the CPD Framework Steering Group have carefully considered the consultation responses received. They have also considered all other feedback received by other means, as well as the findings of their own research on different CPD models and the effectiveness of CPD.
8. The following matters in particular required further consideration by the Steering Group following consultation, in light of the feedback received:
 - amending the required minimum hours of CPD per year
 - increasing the number of hours of structured CPD required per year
 - the subject-matter of the mandatory topics to be covered
 - the ill-health concession and CPD exemption
 - other membership concessions and CPD exemptions, particularly parental leave, family raising and non-practising
 - additional CPD requirements for those returning to practice after a period of time
 - the submission of a Professional Reflection Statement document annually
 - simplifying and improving the approach to sanctions for non-compliance
9. The Steering Group considered the minimum number of hours of CPD required. It noted member feedback and concluded that the current requirement of 20 hours of CPD per year is relatively low and is not difficult to achieve; also many members report undertaking a much higher number of hours of CPD every year. Lots of activities count as CPD e.g. reading, preparing to deliver a lecture, research connected with a professional appointment, listening to a surveying-related podcast; when this range of activities is taken into account, 30 hours per year of CPD does not seem too onerous and does not need to be expensive for members. However, given member feedback to date, the Standards and Regulation Board has decided not to change this CPD requirement at this stage; the minimum number of

hours of CPD required annually will remain at 20 for now, though will be kept under review.

10. The Steering Group noted with interest members' concerns at potentially increasing the number of hours of *structured* CPD required per year. The Group understood concerns about possible cost implications of this as well as concerns about the availability of adequate, appropriate and relevant CPD in some sectors and some regions on an annual basis. The Steering Group has been working closely with RICS staff to understand RICS' approach to developing and delivering CPD content and has provided feedback on that. In light of member feedback the Group amended its recommendation to SRB regarding structured CPD, retaining the current 10 hour requirement for the time being, meaning that members will be required to undertake a minimum of 20 hours of CPD per year, including 10 structured hours.
11. The Steering Group heard and understood feedback from members regarding the proposed mandatory topics, particularly the possible lack of availability of quality CPD regarding Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. The Group has therefore amended its recommendations to propose that Ethics is retained as a mandatory topic and that Sustainability and AI & Data & Technology are introduced as new mandatory topics. Diversity, Equity & Inclusion and Law, Markets & Regulation will be included within an annual list of recommended topics instead.
12. The Steering Group considered a high volume of detailed feedback regarding membership concessions, CPD exemptions and additional CPD after a period away from practice. It understood the challenges of completing CPD while in certain circumstances, but also noted the need to ensure that CPD requirements support the maintenance of competence and uphold trust and confidence in the profession. It therefore concluded that retired members and those on ill-health concessions should be fully exempt from CPD, whereas those on other relevant membership concessions should be required to undertake a minimum level of CPD per year – 10 hours of structured or unstructured CPD, including coverage of the mandatory

topics – after an initial 12-month full exemption. A major consideration in reaching this conclusion was the propensity of a member in these different situations to return to practice; the ability of a member to undertake CPD while not practising was also taken into account. The Steering Group has been careful to ensure that its recommendations support the public interest and uphold trust and confidence in the profession while not placing an undue burden on the profession. Further detail on these recommendations is set out below.

13. The Steering Group has also amended its recommendations so that no additional CPD requirements will be imposed following a period of absence from practice. Instead it would encourage members to reflect on their own learning needs and undertake any additional learning they consider necessary.
14. The Steering Group also discussed feedback regarding the proposal to introduce a requirement to complete and submit an annual Professional Reflection Statement. While the Group is very keen to encourage professional reflection and a considered approach to CPD, it understands some of the concerns raised by members. It has therefore amended its recommendations to suggest that this professional reflection can be captured by means other than an annual statement document; instead, it is recommending that the CPD recording platform be amended to require a member to record professional reflections as well as learning outcomes for CPD undertaken. The aim is for this information to support RICS' approach to reviewing CPD records in detail every year, but also for it to be made available in summary format for members as a reminder of their learning and development each year.
15. Following consideration of the consultation responses, and other feedback received, the Standards and Regulation Board approved the following recommendations from the CPD Framework Steering Group:

Headline recommendations:

- Move to a framework which better encourages professional reflection and a considered approach to CPD; this includes providing an overview of how the activities undertaken benefit the member's professional work
- Ensure that compliance monitoring is both quantitative and qualitative
- Strengthen alignment between CPD compliance and RICS membership
- Do not, at this time, introduce full revalidation for all RICS members. Allow revalidation for particular sectors, as SRB sees fit, e.g. for Registered Valuers
- Embed this CPD Framework as a strong baseline across the full RICS membership globally. Allow additional CPD requirements to be introduced for particular sectors, as SRB sees fit, e.g. for Registered Valuers

Detailed recommendations:

1.	<i>Members must identify, plan, undertake, and record with RICS, CPD which is relevant, adequate and appropriate, in the context of their practice</i>
2.	<i>Members must undertake, and record with RICS, a minimum of 20 hours of CPD in total per year (this requirement is to be kept under review by SRB)</i>
3.	<i>A minimum of 10 hours of CPD must be structured learning (meaning up to 10 hours can comprise unstructured learning)</i> <i>'Structured' – e.g. webinars, seminars, conferences, lectures, workshops; not reading or listening to podcasts.</i>
4.	<i>Members must undertake CPD across stipulated mandatory topics each year on a rolling 3-year basis (i.e. 1 topic per year to be covered)</i> <i>Mandatory topics:</i> • <i>Professional and ethical standards</i> • <i>Sustainability</i> • <i>Data, AI & technology</i> <i>SRB should review this list of mandatory topics at least every 3 years to ensure the topics remain relevant and sufficient</i> <i>Other mandatory topics may also be required by the SRB from time to time should a particular or contemporary risk be identified</i>

5.	<i>SRB should publish recommended CPD topics on an annual basis, in consultation with the Knowledge and Practice Committee and the Professional Group Panels, to supplement the mandatory topics and to support members to find relevant, adequate and appropriate CPD that is regionally fitting</i>
6.	<i>Members who are retired from practice, on a retired membership concession, automatically receive a full exemption from CPD requirements unless they act as APC assessors, in which case they must comply with the full CPD requirements</i>
7.	<i>Members on an ill-health membership concession automatically receive a full exemption from CPD requirements for the duration of their ill-health</i>
8.	<i>Members on other relevant membership concessions receive a full exemption from CPD requirements for up to 12 months</i> - <i>Parental or adoption leave, family raising / caring = automatic exemption</i> - <i>Non-practising, unemployed / seeking work = manual exemption, considered on receipt of a request</i> <i>They then receive a partial exemption (unless discretion is applied by the Head of Regulation to extend the full exemption)</i> <i>On a partial exemption members must complete and record a minimum of 10 hours of CPD per year (this may be structured or unstructured) and must meet the requirements in respect of the mandatory topics</i> <i>Further detail on these proposed changes to CPD exemptions for those on membership concessions is set out below</i>
9.	<i>CPD must be undertaken within a 12-month cycle (currently January – December to align with membership subscriptions)</i> <i>If in any given 12 month cycle a member undertakes a longer period of training e.g. a Masters programme, up to 15 hours may carry forward to the following year and count towards that following year's CPD requirements. Such hours may be carried forward for a maximum of 24 months i.e. two future 12-month CPD cycles</i>
10.	<i>Members must record the learning outcomes of each CPD activity undertaken</i>
11.	<i>Members must record their reflections on their professional development and learning needs</i>

12.	<i>Members must complete an annual declaration stating that they have undertaken relevant, adequate and appropriate CPD which meets RICS requirements</i> <i>Members who are unable to complete such a declaration may be subject to a full CPD review and may receive a regulatory sanction</i>
13.	<i>A percentage of members annually will have their CPD records reviewed in detail to assess whether they meet RICS' CPD requirements</i>
14.	<i>CPD non-compliance may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including expulsion from membership and may make someone ineligible for RICS membership</i> <i>Failure to record CPD with RICS, either at all or a sufficient number of hours, and/or failure to complete CPD across the required mandatory topics will result in regulatory action. Across a 3 year period, a first instance of such non-compliance (a breach) will lead to the issuing of a caution, a second breach will lead to suspension from membership unless/until the non-compliance is rectified, a third breach will result in the member being liable to removal/expulsion from RICS membership</i> <i>Members whose CPD records are reviewed in detail may be liable to regulatory action if found to be non-compliant; this includes a finding that the CPD undertaken was not relevant, adequate and/or appropriate. Such matters will be handled on a case-by-case basis</i>

Detailed proposed changes to CPD exemptions for those on membership concessions:

16. Under the existing CPD requirements automatic exemptions from the CPD requirements are granted to qualified members on some concessions. The proposals to amend the CPD framework being made by the CPD Steering Group include changes to the automatic exemptions awarded for some concessions. This document examines the impact of those changes.

17. This table sets out the current and proposed position on concessions and CPD exemptions:

Concession type	Current position	Proposed position
-----------------	------------------	-------------------

Ill health or Disability (unable to work)	Manual exemptions considered on a case-by-case basis.	Automatic exemption
Exceptional Hardship	This concession is only granted based on a decision by Lionheart. Exemptions will be considered on a case-by-case basis.	No change
Parental or Adoption Leave / Family Raising/Caring	Where a concession has been given, an automatic CPD exemption will be added.	Automatic full exemption for one year, then partial exemption with reduced CPD requirement
Unemployed or seeking work	Where a concession has been given, an automatic CPD exemption will also be added. Where a concession is not in place, exemptions may be made on a case-by-case basis.	Where a concession has been given, automatic full exemption for one year then partial exemption with reduced CPD requirement
Non-practising	Where a concession has been given, an automatic CPD exemption will also be added. Where a concession is not in place, exemptions may be made on a case-by-	No automatic concession – concession considered on request on a case-by- case basis

	case basis. Note – if the member is non-practising but is providing professional advice (even if unpaid) then they will need to meet the CPD requirements.	
Retired	Automatic CPD exemption	No change
Part-time	Full CPD is required	No change
Academic	Full CPD is required	No change
Dual Membership	Full CPD is required but there are separate compliance arrangements for members of the Society of Chartered Surveyors Ireland (SCSI), the South African Council for Quantity Surveying Profession (SACQSP) and South African Council for the Property Valuers Profession (SACPVP):	No change

Data about concessions

18. RICS does not hold sufficient membership data for most of the protected characteristics to provide a reliable assessment of impact for those

characteristics, with members either choosing not to provide the data, or laws in some countries preventing its collection.

19. However, we hold information about the gender of the majority of members and we have used this to analyse whether the proposed changes will have a disproportionate impact on members of different genders. The position as at November 2024 is shown in the table below:

	Female (No)	%	Male (No)	%	Other* (No)	%	Total
All members	21049	19%	91630	81%	861	1%	113604
Ill health	94	22%	327	77%	4	1%	425
Parental leave/adoption	569	84%	104	15%	3	0%	676
Family raising	298	57%	229	43%	0	0%	527
Unemployed	484	23%	1615	76%	13	1%	2112
Non-practising	477	24%	1496	76%	7	0%	1980

**Other includes those who prefer not to say, use a different term or have left this field blank*

20. The data shows that, for the concessions where changes are proposed, there are a higher proportion of women using that concession than their proportion in qualified membership.

Impact assessment

21. For those concessions where automatic concessions have been removed or reduced, women will be disproportionately affected. This is particularly marked in relation to the changes to remove the full automatic exemption beyond the first year of the parental leave, adoption and family raising concession where the protected characteristic of maternity is also relevant.

22. RICS consulted members and the public on proposed changes including an option to require those returning to the profession to undertake additional CPD following an extended period on a concession. Concerns were raised that this may have a discriminatory effect and the proposed policy has therefore been changed to seek to meet the aims of the CPD framework in a more proportionate way.
23. The aim of RICS' CPD Framework is to support the maintenance of professional competence for qualified members and uphold trust and confidence in the profession, given the RICS' remit to maintain the usefulness of the profession for the public advantage.
24. For those on the non-practising concession, instead of being automatic, an exemption will need to be applied for and is likely to be refused where the member uses their designation in a way which would lead a reasonable person to believe they were maintaining their competence. Given the option to apply for a manual exemption where the facts indicate that public confidence would not be damaged by the member failing to maintain their professional competence, we believe this proposed change is a proportionate way to achieve the aim above.
25. For those on the other concessions where change is proposed, they would need to undertake 10 hours of CPD in all years except the first for which they held the concession. This reflects the likelihood that a member using parental leave/adoption/family raising or unemployment concessions will want to return to the profession when their personal circumstances change. It is a legitimate aim to seek to ensure that members who are likely to return to the profession maintain their competence.
26. The proposed approach is proportionate because it recognises the challenges of undertaking the full CPD requirement. RICS also provides free CPD resources

which would be available to meet the required hours so there is no additional cost to the member. Where personal circumstances make it impossible to undertake even the partial CPD required the member can apply for a manual exemption.

4. Conclusion and next steps

27. RICS, and the CPD Framework Steering Group in particular, is grateful for the invaluable contributions of our members, stakeholders and subject matter experts who took the time to provide comments through [iConsult](#) (our interactive platform), by email and in person. We are pleased with the level of engagement the consultation received.
28. Due to the volume of feedback received, it has not been possible to summarise every comment in this document, but we wish to emphasise that each individual comment was fully considered.
29. We recognise and understand both the positive comments received and the concerns raised in respect of the proposed changes to the CPD Framework.
30. The Steering Group is keen to ensure that its final recommendations support the overarching themes of the Bichard Review and embed them in a learning and professional development culture across the membership; the group believes that this will support the public interest and effective self-regulation of the profession.
31. These revisions to the CPD Framework have now been approved by the Standards and Regulation Board. Planning is underway to implement the changes. No changes will be implemented before January 2026, with 2025 being used to thoroughly and properly plan the implementation of the new framework.

Further detailed communications will follow to ensure that members are aware of the changes and the timeframes for implementation.