

WONG Kin Ho, Anthony

RPHM, CIHCM, ACIS, ACS, MCI Arb,
Solicitor (Hong Kong SAR), Solicitor (England & Wales)

8 April, 2015

Honourable Members of the Bills Committee
on Property Management Services Bill

c/o Legislative Council Secretariat

Dear Honourable Members of the Bills Committee
on Property Management Services Bill,

**Academic and/or Professional Qualifications for Licensed PMP
as proposed under the Property Management Services Bill**

Thank you first for your efforts and contributions to the scrutiny of the Property Management Services Bill and the proposed licensing regime for the property management industry and practitioners.

In the period between January 2012 and November 2013, I was invited and appointed by the Director of Home Affairs as a Co-opted Member of the Sub-committee on Property Management Practitioners (PMP) of the Advisory Committee on the Regulation of the Property Management Industry.

May I further share with you my following humble views on the *necessity of formal education in property management at degree level* for securing the quality of the practitioners and their quality services to the stakeholders. Hopefully my views can be considered by the Bills Committee in its next meeting fixed for late April 2015.

Though I am affiliated with some professional and academic institutions, I must declare that my views and observations here are my personal ones and do not represent those of my affiliated entities in the professional and academic domains.

1. It is considered undisputedly that a licensing system per se will not warrant the high quality of the property management practitioners and their quality services to the stakeholders if the benchmarking in the system is not aptly made and the importance of university education in property management is overlooked.
2. Please allow me to indicate truly my surprise and puzzle upon reading the proposal on the academic and/or professional qualifications for Licensed PMP (Tier 1) as stated in the LC Paper No. CB(2)556/14-15(02), page 3 thereof.

The second bullet point there as an alternative qualification, "*Other* [italic emphasis added] degrees or equivalent qualification or above (plus at least 5 years of local working experience in property management)", should *not* be contemplated. In other words, the *other* degrees not in the discipline of property management should *not* be recommended as the alternative qualification for Licensed PMP (Tier 1). The reasons are detailed in the paragraphs below.

3. It is considered that formal education in property management at a degree level is an essential and indispensable tool to upkeep (if not to raise) the quality of the practitioners licensed at Tier 1 at a reasonable high standard which should not be replaced or substituted merely by some working experience of a longer period.

Working experience in the industry and formal education in property management at a degree level can supplement, but not substitute, one another.

For instance, a degree programme in property management can equip the practitioners with the prerequisite knowledge of building studies, building maintenance, laws relating to property management, professional ethics, property development process, other related contemporary practices as well as the useful intellectual and analytical skills. **Only with all these assets of academic knowledge and intellectual skills in property management, the property management practitioners can profess ethically and intelligently in their practices and provide quality services to meet all the stakeholders' needs.**

4. **The current training and development practices of the property management companies and organisations, in particular the sizeable ones such as the Housing Department and Hong Kong Housing Society etc., provided to their property management staff are to sponsor or encourage them to undergo the proper and formal education in property management at universities and to acquire their professional qualifications for career development. Such training and development practices have further echoed the importance of the formal education in property management at**

universities as perceived by the property management companies and organisations nowadays.

5. As deliberated in the meetings of the aforesaid Sub-committee on PMP, **the proposed licensing regime should be used to promote and benchmark the quality of property management practitioners on one hand without imposing any unfair trade barrier to the prospective entrants to the industry and the existing workers in the trade on the other hand.**

The above philosophy can be realised well by licensing those qualified practitioners, who are comparatively junior or short of the Tier 1 requirement, as **Licensed PMP (Tier 2)**. Such Licensed PMP (Tier 2) can then advance his/her academic and/or professional qualifications to meet **Tier 1 requirement through further education at a degree level, or equivalent qualification, in property management and some more related local working experience.**

6. Furthermore, the **Property Management Services Authority (PMSA)** can license those applicants as **Licensed PMP (Tier 1)** by exercising its decision on case-by-case basis to those candidates who possess *equivalent* standing as proposed in the first bullet point stated on page 3 of the aforesaid LC Paper, i.e. *“Degree or equivalent qualification [italic emphasis added] in property management to be specified by the PMSA (plus at least 3 years of local working experience in property management);...”*.

Pursuant to the above lines of reasoning, the **alternative second bullet point of the academic and/or professional qualifications, “Other degrees or equivalent qualification or above (plus at least 5 years of local working experience in property management)”**, will become unnecessary or superfluous.

In the premises, *I would support the proposal stated in the above first bullet point of academic and/or professional qualifications for Licensed PMP (Tier 1), namely “Degree or equivalent qualification in property management to be specified by the Property Management Services Authority (PMSA) (plus at least 3 years of local working experience in property management)”*.

On the other hand, *I, with due respect, cannot agree to the aforesaid alternative second bullet point of academic/or professional qualifications for Licensed PMP (Tier 1), namely “Other degrees or equivalent qualification or above (plus at least 5 years of local working experience in property management)”*. It is because **this initiative will derogate the importance and usefulness of formal education in property management at a degree level**

which can be taken as the only reliable means for warranting or enhancing the quality of the property management practitioners to serve the stakeholders in the best interests of the latter.

In summary, save and except the aforesaid alternative second bullet point of academic/or professional qualifications for Licensed PMP (Tier 1), the licensing requirements for both Licensed PMP (Tier 1) and Licensed PMP (Tier 2) are agreeable in principle.

The above submissions are for your consideration please. Should I be of further assistance, you are welcome to contact me at the above email addresses.

Yours faithfully,

Anthony Wong (sd)

WONG Kin Ho, Anthony

c.c.

Mr. Chan Jick Chi, Jack, JP – Director of Home Affairs (Acting)

(via email jjcchan@had.gov.hk)