

Review of prices for the Valuer General's land
valuation services to councils
Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal
PO Box K35
HAYMARKET POST SHOP NSW 1240

Dear Tribunal members,

**SUBMISSION TO THE INFORMATION PAPER, REVIEW OF PRICES FOR THE VALUER-GENERAL'S LAND
VALUATION SERVICES TO COUNCILS**

Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission on behalf of Tamworth Regional Council
(TRC) and we fully support the NSW Revenue Professionals Inc responses.

We have set out below our responses to each of the matters discussed in the information paper.

Submission

Efficient costs

1. Do you consider the Valuer General's pricing proposal represents good value? Why/why not?

No. There remain several unanswered questions regarding the uplift in the pricing proposal. We have concerns about the lack of any substantive evidence, the figures quoted do not appear to be independently quantified or supported by any external audit process. The Valuer General's pricing proposal seems to hinge on additional costs mainly associated staff increases due to the transition from contract work to internal staffing but shows little evidence of any contract savings.

There does not appear to be any efficiency savings included in the Valuer-Generals proposal, the proposal is prepared on continuity of current business practices. It is expected that efficiencies in technology for example would lead to reductions in pricing over the next 6-years.

The Valuer-General has been quoted as saving \$16 million over the next 7-years by halving the number of annual valuations performed by contractors and boosting in-house capabilities. In an article published in the [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] the journalist has quoted a [REDACTED] as saying, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Extract of Newspaper article not published due to copyright reasons [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] These savings should be directly reflected in the prices set and passed onto ratepayers rather than being absorbed by the state.

- 
2. Has there been any material change to the land valuation process that has impacted the cost of undertaking valuations (e.g. contract costs)?

We are not aware of material change in the land valuation process that has impacted the valuation costs.

3. How might the Valuer General's costs of providing land valuation services change over the next 6 years, considering the impact of digital technology, AI and innovation?

Integrating AI to increase efficiency enables reduced costs and an increase in uptime concurrently. Cost savings in reduced downtime and predictive process automation enable humans more time to focus on the how and why leading to increased efficiency. The use of Augmented and Assisted Intelligence has a place in quality control processes and outputs, we see these two forms of AI having a significant future in the mass valuation landscape.

Cost allocation between users

4. How should the Valuer General's costs be allocated between users of valuation services?

We do not believe the cost allocation is fairly allocated between councils, the NSW Government and other beneficiaries such as the general public. We agree that providing information and access to land valuation data is important and a healthy outcome, however we do not believe that ratepayers are aware that they are burdened with the costs in providing this information so broadly.

There are eight operating cost categories identified and we believe six should be split 20% to councils and 80% to the state and other users. The remaining two, postage and graphic design works need further discussion and information to allow better decisions to be made, we would like to see more information on where the money is spent and on what to be able to make an informed decision. It is important to reflect on councils receiving new valuations for only one year of a 3-year cycle and Revenue NSW receive new valuations annually. Each year valuations are made they are also made available to the public.

Labour (30.1%) Mass Valuation (25%) Other Valuation (30.4%) ICT (34.7%) Other direct (31.8%) Corporate support (29.8%)	We propose reducing these to 20% aligning with the valuation delivery.
Postage and graphic (100%)	We do not believe the local government sector should be burdened with the full costs in postage and graphic design works. These initiatives help to support quality valuation services and data across all users.

We have noted in the Valuer-General's submission item 10.2¹ that minor users have been considered immaterial, however this service to the community other agencies such as the Commonwealth Grants Commission, NSW Fire Brigade, other NSW Government agencies and the public should be costed to the state. It would be appreciated if the level of access could be substantiated for visibility into the materiality.

The previous price setting IPART draft report identified an undertaking to reduce *'the Valuer General's annual notional revenue requirement over the 2019 determination period by the average revenue received from all minor users over the 2014 determination period. This ensures that the (marginal) costs associated with delivering services to minor users are not recovered from Revenue NSW or councils.'*² Further, land valuation data made available to the general public on government websites should not be a burden on ratepayers, rather costs associated with this service should be isolated and funded by the respective state agencies.

The extent to which these minor users (including the general public) access land valuation data or how they are billed has not been expanded on and we believe it to be a revenue stream worth exploring to defray more of the costs allocated to councils.

The Valuer-General's submission³ is seeking to allocate costs for objections *'based on the 3-year historical average of general objections..'*⁴ at 50.2% to councils and 49.8% to Revenue NSW. However, the latest publicly available data for the years 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23 indicate a different result.

¹ Review of prices for land valuation services provided by the Valuer General to councils page 59

² IPART Review of prices for land valuation services provided by the Valuer General to councils – April 2019 page 41

³ Review of prices for land valuation services provided by the Valuer General to councils page 45

⁴ Review of prices for land valuation services provided by the Valuer General to councils – table 7-3 page 45

In this table we can see that the maximum percentage of objections in land valuations attributable to council rates is 47.9% and the 3-year average is just 35%.

Item	2020-21 count	2020-21 %	2021-22 count	2021-22 %	2022-23 count	2022-23 %	Average
Council rates	2,330	43%	345	14.9%	5,083	47.9%	35%
Land Tax	3,093	57%	1,981	85.1%	5,561	52.1%	65%
Total	5,423	100%	2,326	100%	10,644	100%	100%

Source: Valuer-Generals Annual Report 2020-21 table 4 page 29. Valuer-Generals Annual Report 2022-23 table 3 page 22.

We would be interested to learn more about the difference in the proposed allocation of costs and recommend that consideration be given to reflect the above table and reduce the allocated costs to councils from 50.2% to 35% based on the information provided.

Pricing framework

5. What is the impact on councils of the Valuer General's proposed price increases?

The impact on councils will be subject to whether the increased costs will be recognised separately in the future rate peg determination as a direct cost to ratepayers or as part of the Base Cost Change (BCC). If the former then councils will directly pass on the additional costs to ratepayers and therefore have little impact on councils' ability to fund other works, services, activities and facilities. If the cost remains included as a component of the BCC within the rate peg, the impact will be less predictable or identifiable as other costs in the BCC may distort the pass on effect.

6. Should the current four pricing zones be retained or is there a more appropriate pricing model for land valuation services such as a single price?

For the previous price setting period (1 July 2012 to 30 June 2025) the decision to adopt the Valuer-General's proposed zonal pricing structure, with a price per property within four geographical zones (Country, Coastal, Metro and City of Sydney) was logical. Particularly as this had been based on all areas being contracted out providing clear visibility on the cost of the valuations for the different council cohort groups. It was difficult to argue that a cohort group shouldn't contribute what it actually costs, or that other cohort groups should cross subsidise.

Under the emerging hybrid service delivery approach, eight areas are identified as having been, or will be brought inhouse. The Valuer-General's document claims this will *'Mitigate overall market capture and increasing contract prices and enhance flexibility in cost management.'* And *'Better enable service delivery, as overall market capacity constraints have caused delays for individuals interacting with Value NSW.'*⁵ This indicates the areas being brought in-house should be less costly over time. It is clearly at the VG's discretion which areas benefit from these lower costs, and those that remain contracted presumably at a higher cost. The document also gives

⁵ 4.3 Review of prices for land valuation services provided by the Valuer General to councils – page 20

no indication that the actual cost for those areas brought in-house can or will be tracked or isolated.

Accordingly, we propose a pricing model that differentiates between contract valuations and in-house valuations enabling full disclosure of the savings and full visibility of the price changes being passed through to councils.

7. If a price increase is necessary, should it be implemented in the first year, or gradually over a few years?

The proposed increases ranging from \$9.44 and \$18.09 per valuation annually and representing increases of between 21% and 38% in the first year, with subsequent years being subject to CPI is not considered the best pricing solution, we would support a gradual approach. In particular if the gradual approach could align with the transition from contract valuations to in-house valuations as discussed in item six (above).

Further, the Valuer-General's Financial Report for 2022-23⁶ indicates that the total revenue exceeds expenses by \$24.99million in 2021-22 and by \$21.29million in 2022-23. We have not been able to obtain a full set of financial statements and presume that the difference relates to capital and only an operating statement has been made available.

Government regulation

8. What potential impacts does the bringing in-house of mass valuations by the Valuer General have on the long-term viability of the valuation market participants and the level of competition in the valuation market?

We have concerns with fully outsourcing the mass valuation contracts due to potential impacts on the quality and consistency of land valuation data. Competitive tendering creates competition between contractors, which is a healthy outcome from the process, plus competitors are naturally impacted through accountability in the quality of their services.

Land valuation is a specialist skill and retention of staff with those skills would be considered an essential objective for the Valuer-General. It is useful to have some insight retained and an ongoing investment in improved technology and work practices.

We have referred to savings identified by Value NSW of \$16 million over the next 7-years through halving the number of annual valuations performed by contractors and boosting in-house capabilities. These savings should lead to cost savings for our communities, however reduced quality controls may also result in cost increases in objections under the current proposal.

⁶ Appendix 6 - Annual report on operations, achievements and performance with financial statements – page 45

It is difficult to conclude what the impacts of transitioning away from contract valuers will have based on the information available.

Service quality

9. Is the quality of service provided by the Valuer General meeting expectations?

The level of service provided by the Valuer-General has generally been timely and accurate. We have some concerns with the proposed own source valuation standards and with the cost of objections split 50/50 with Revenue NSW. Costs incurred in quality assurance and improvements in land valuations should not be simply passed down the line.

10. If you have been involved with the Valuer General's land valuation dispute process, what has been your experience?

TRC has not been involved in any land valuation disputes managed by the Valuer-General.

General

11. Are there any other matters you would like us to consider as part of our review of the Valuer General's monopoly services?

We would be interested in opening the dialogue on the following, initially to determine if they would represent better cost benefits and align with the objectives for local government in NSW.

- The opportunity for councils to engage the services of independent valuers to provide land valuation data.
- Valuation objections to be subsidised or fully funded by the NSW Government as a quality assurance accountability measure.
- Investigate the potential for CIV to better align equity in the rating/taxation model through a formal cost/benefit analysis and public consultation process.
- Allowing councils to choose between CIV and the current land value (unimproved), should the option be feasibly viable.
- Consideration of future impacts from the Emergency Services Funding (ESF) reforms that may lead to impacts on councils in the event that the NSW Government's model leads to councils collecting a levy. Conversely, the use of land values by Revenue NSW in the calculation of a new levy for the ESF, if this direction is chosen.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the information paper, if you have any questions regarding our submission, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Yours sincerely,



19 November 2024

