



RICS Regulatory Tribunal Rules 2022

Part VI, Regulatory Tribunal Single Member Decision

Regulated Member: William Forster

RICS Membership No: 1211452

Case Reference: CON003961

Single Member Decision of: Jason Tucker

Date of Decision: 13 February 2026

CHARGE

The charge against the Regulated Member is:

"Between 1 January 2024 and 1 February 2025, you have failed to comply with RICS' requirements in respect of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) in that you have not completed and/or recorded, or caused to be recorded, at least 20 hours of CPD on the RICS CPD portal."

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (October 2021).

The Regulated Member is therefore liable to disciplinary action under Bye-law 5.2.2(c).

ALLEGED RULES BREACH

Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (October 2021) states:

Members and firms must be honest, act with integrity and comply with their professional obligations, including obligations to RICS.

Appendix A to the Rules of Conduct sets out 3 mandatory professional obligations for RICS Members, and professional obligation 1 states:

Members **must** comply with the CPD requirements set by RICS.

The specific CPD requirements and obligations are set out by RICS online (see [CPD requirements and obligations](#)).

MATERIALS CONSIDERED

In addition to the Bye-Laws, Rules and Policies referred to in this decision, I have also considered an evidence bundle that includes:

- RICS Investigation Report;
- Witness Statement of Rohima Akhtar (Regulatory Support & CPD Officer) dated 04/11/2025;
- Witness Statement of Damian McKeown (Regulation Support Team Manager) dated 04/11/2025;
- Record of telephone call from Rohima Akhtar to William Forster, and follow-up email.
- Copies of Mr Forster's 'CPD Annual Summary', 'Contact Details' and 'Concessions' held on the RICS computer system;
- Correspondence between RICS and Mr Forster relating to non-compliance with CPD requirements and these disciplinary proceedings;
- A Schedule of Costs;
- Head of Regulation Decision, by Claire Hoverd, to refer the matter for consideration by a Single Member of the Regulatory Tribunal dated 26/01/2026.

In addition, on 05/02/2026, Mr Forster telephoned the RICS Regulatory Tribunal Manager to discuss the proceedings, and subsequently submitted an email to RICS (on 10/02/2026) setting out his response to the charge. I have, therefore, also considered the content of the 'telenote' of the conversation and the email.

BACKGROUND

William Forster became a RICS Member on 13/11/2008, and so is subject to the RICS CPD requirements and obligations, which state that:

- 1. All Members must undertake a minimum of 20 hours CPD each calendar year (January to December).*
- 2. Of the 20 hours at least 10 hours must be formal CPD. The remainder can be informal CPD.*
- 3. All Members must maintain a relevant and current understanding of our professional and ethical standards during a rolling three-year period. Any learning undertaken in order to meet this requirement may count as formal CPD.*
- 4. Members must record their CPD activity online by 31 January.*

Mr Forster recorded appropriate CPD from 2013 to 2019. However, he failed to record any CPD in 2020, for which a caution was issued in 2021. Mr Forster also failed to record sufficient CPD for 2022, and due to a RICS data error a further caution was issued, rather than the usual sanction of a caution plus fine. In 2023, Mr Forster failed to record any CPD, for which a caution and fine were issued in 2024, notwithstanding that this was Mr Forster's third breach of the CPD requirements.

Rule 8(c)(i) of the RICS Regulatory Tribunal Rules 2022 (version 3), effective from 14/03/2024, provides that a Single Member of the Regulatory Tribunal can consider the matter *“where a Regulated Member has failed to meet the requirements in respect of the Rules of Conduct obligation to comply with CPD requirements for a third or subsequent time, in accordance with paragraph 23 of the Sanctions Policy”*.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The burden of proving the charge rests with RICS. The standard of proof is the civil standard (i.e. the balance of probabilities), and requires that the evidence establishes that it is more likely than not that a matter in issue occurred.

RICS relies upon the evidence provided by Rohima Akhtar and Damian McKeown. Although Mr Forster’s response of the 10/02/2026 notes that he is currently non-practising, and contends that he has undertaken relevant CPD, he does not challenge the evidence provided by Rohima Akhtar and Damian McKeown. I, therefore, accept the evidence of Rohima Akhtar and Damian McKeown as being true and accurate, and I make the following findings of fact:

- i. Mr Forster recorded 0 hours of CPD for the 2024 campaign.
- ii. No concessions are recorded for Mr Forster.
- iii. The fine imposed by RICS in 2024 remains unpaid.
- iv. Mr Forster paid his RICS membership fees for 2024/2025.
- v. For the 2024 CPD year, mailings were sent to RICS members via email.
- vi. Between 13/11/2024 and 12/03/2025, 6 email reminders were sent to RICS members who had not recorded 20 hours of CPD online (including 10 hours of formal CPD), and who were not recorded as being exempt from the requirement to complete CPD.
- vii. The reminders noted the risk of expulsion from RICS where a member had failed to comply with the CPD requirements on two or more subsequent occasions in the previous ten-year period.
- viii. The reminders were sent to each member’s email address, as registered with RICS.
- ix. Mr Forster received the emails sent to him by RICS, as none of the emails sent to Mr Forster’s address were ‘returned’ as undeliverable.
- x. On 9th October 2025, Rohima Akhtar spoke to Mr Forster by telephone and granted him an extension of time to complete his CPD record to 15th October 2025.
- xi. The extension of time and RICS CPD requirements were confirmed in a follow-up email sent on 9th October 2025.
- xii. Mr Forster failed to take any action to update his CPD record following the grant of the extension of time.

I have noted what Mr Forster has said in his response. Mr Forster does not challenge that he has failed to log his CPD via the RICS portal. Although he has noted that he has *“continued to maintain and update my professional knowledge”*, by regularly attending

“seminars hosted by lawyers and professional advisers” and that he keeps *“up to date with real estate publications”*, Mr Forster has not particularised which activities relate to the 2024 CPD year, nor has he provided information on the purpose and outcomes of any structured learning or professional development that these activities supported. Therefore, having considered Mr Forster’s response, I make the following additional findings of fact:

- xiii. Mr Forster was aware of the relevant CPD requirements and obligations.
- xiv. Mr Forster did not comply with the CPD requirements in the 2024 campaign, and this was his fourth failure to do so in a ten-year period.

LIABILITY FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION

It follows from my findings of fact that I am satisfied that, between 01/01/2024 and 01/02/2025, Mr Forster failed to comply with RICS CPD requirements, as he did not complete and record (or cause to be recorded), at least 20 hours of CPD on the RICS CPD portal. Therefore, I find that the charge is proved, as a result of which Mr Forster was in breach of Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct (October 2021).

RICS Bye-Law 5.2.2(c) states that:

A Member may be liable to disciplinary action under these Bye-Laws, whether or not he was a Member at the time of the occurrence giving rise to that liability, by reason of:

- (a) ...*
- (b) ...*
- (c) a failure to adhere to these Bye-Laws or to Regulations or Rules governing Members’ conduct;*
- (d) ...*

Therefore, as a result of breaching Rule 1, Mr Forster may be liable to disciplinary action, and I am satisfied that the breach is sufficiently serious to give rise to a liability for disciplinary action.

In reaching this conclusion, I note that all RICS Members agree to adhere to the relevant Bye-Laws, Regulations and Rules, and accept that they may be subject to disciplinary action if they fail to do so. I also note that the purpose of the CPD requirements is to ensure that there are consistent standards within the profession, that Members maintain up to date knowledge in their area of expertise, in the interests of protecting the public and the wider public interest, and that Members ensure this is evidenced by the completion of a record at RICS. The importance of the CPD requirements is reflected in the fact that the Rules of Conduct, which are approved by the Standards and Regulation Board, place an express professional obligation on Members to comply with the CPD requirements set by RICS. In addition, the ‘RICS Sanctions Policy: Guidance

to RICS Regulatory Tribunal Rules' (version 9) makes it clear that even a single breach of CPD requirements is sufficient to give rise to a liability for disciplinary action.

My findings of fact mean that I am satisfied that Mr Forster was aware of his professional obligations in relation to CPD, and that he received 6 reminder emails containing information about the risk of expulsion from RICS where a Member, with two or more sanctionable failures in the previous ten-year period, commits a further breach of the CPD requirements.

REGULATORY SANCTION

Having determined that Mr Forster is liable for disciplinary action, I must decide the appropriate sanction. RICS is a professional membership organisation and sets standards for its Members as a condition of membership. Undertaking CPD is an essential part of RICS membership, and is a commitment by RICS Members to continually update their skills and knowledge so as to remain professionally competent. The recording of CPD is the means by which RICS monitors to ensure compliance, and in turn protect the public. Compliance is not optional. It is not difficult to record CPD online, nor is it unreasonable for RICS to impose sanctions on members who do not do so. The CPD requirements are not dependent on RICS sending reminders to its Members.

In deciding what, if any, sanction, should be imposed, I have taken account of the RICS Sanctions Policy: Guidance to RICS Regulatory Tribunal Rules (version 9), which states at paragraph 22.1 that the policy for CPD breaches is as follows:

- a) first breach – Fixed Penalty (caution)*
- b) second breach within 10 years of receipt of a caution – Fixed Penalties (caution and fine)*
- c) third breach within 10 years of receipt of a caution – referral to Single Member or Disciplinary Tribunal with presumption of expulsion.*

The purpose of any sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have that effect. The purpose is to declare and uphold the standards of the profession, to safeguard the reputation of the profession and of RICS, and to protect the public. Sanctions must be proportionate to the breach and all the circumstances, and a decision should be reached having taken account of any mitigating and/or aggravating factors.

In terms of mitigating factors, I note that, in relation to his disciplinary record, Mr Forster has no sanctions, other than those relating to CPD requirements, recorded against him. Whilst Mr Forster's record evidences compliance with the CPD requirements in each of the years from 2013 to 2019, and in 2021, this does not mitigate the seriousness of this matter, as this is his fourth breach since the 2020 CPD year.

I consider that the following aggravating factors are present in this case:

- Mr Forster has been a Member of RICS since 2008, and understands the CPD requirements and process of recording, having successfully logged his hours from 2013 to 2019 and again in 2021, and partially in 2022, where 11 informal hours were recorded.
- Mr Forster failed to pay a fine issued in 2024, indicating a disregard for the RICS CPD requirements and regulatory sanctions.
- Mr Forster was sent 6 reminders to record his CPD and failed to respond.
- Mr Forster has not taken responsibility for his failings, characterising them in his telephone conversation with the RICS Regulatory Tribunal Manager (on 05/02/2026) as failures to log into the portal and miscommunications with RICS.
- Although he refers to his "*continued commitment to the standards expected of RICS members*", Mr Forster has taken no action to rectify the position, despite the fact that he must have been aware of the issues in relation to his CPD compliance given that he has received three previous sanctions. In addition, RICS granted Mr Forster an extension of time, to 15th October 2025, to complete his 2024 CPD record, which he failed to avail himself of.

In deciding on sanction, I have considered each available sanction, starting with the least serious, until the appropriate and proportionate sanction is reached. I have concluded that, given the seriousness of the breach, imposing *no sanction* would be neither proportionate nor appropriate.

As for the options of a *caution*, *reprimand* or *fine*, I have concluded that, similarly, these would not reflect the seriousness of Mr Forster's repeated failure to comply with the requirement to undertake and record CPD, particularly given that the previous cautions and a fine do not appear to have achieved Mr Forster's sustained compliance with the CPD requirements. Imposing such sanctions in these circumstances would also undermine public confidence and the deterrent effect on other members of the profession.

I have considered the options of *imposing undertakings* or *conditions on membership*, but have taken the view that imposing such in respect of obligations to which Mr Forster is already expected to adhere, and which have been breached three times, would be ineffective, as well as insufficient to satisfy the wider public interest.

I, therefore, determine that *expulsion* from membership of RICS is both the proportionate and appropriate sanction in this case. In reaching my decision, I note that the aggravating factors identified significantly outweigh the mitigating factors. I have also balanced Mr Forster's interests with the need to protect the public and to uphold professional standards. I have noted what Mr Forster has said about the fact that he is currently non-practising, and that a concession/CPD exemption may have been applicable to his circumstances. However, the RICS 'CPD FAQs', which are publicly available via the RICS website, make it clear that a Member "*will not be exempt from the*

CPD requirements until they have applied for and been granted an exemption”, and that “a Member may still be liable for disciplinary action for failure to complete CPD even when they are eligible for an exemption”. Therefore, the onus was on Mr Forster to apply for any concession/CPD exemption that he believed was applicable to his circumstances. The fact that he failed to do so again runs counter to Mr Forster’s assertion that he is committed to complying with the standards expected of RICS Members. Finally, I have also had regard to the impact expulsion may have on Mr Forster. However, in the absence of evidence of insight at a fundamental level and/or compelling mitigation from Mr Forster, I cannot be satisfied that he will not commit a further breach. Therefore, I conclude that the wider public interest outweighs Mr Forster’s interests. Accordingly, I can find no reason to depart from the presumption in the Sanctions Policy of expulsion for a third breach of the CPD requirements within 10 years of receipt of a caution.

ORDER MADE

In accordance with Part VI of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules, I make the following order:

Mr William Forster is expelled from membership of RICS.

TAKING EFFECT OF ORDER

In accordance with Part VI of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules, this order will take effect 14 days from the service of the Single Member’s decision upon Mr Forster, unless notification in writing is received from Mr Forster or RICS stating that they consider the findings and/or the Regulatory Sanction imposed by the Single Member to be wrong.

COSTS

I have taken into account the schedule of costs totalling £350, which is in accordance with the RICS Sanctions Policy: Supplement 2 (Fines, costs and administration fees). I am satisfied that the costs claimed are proportionate. In the absence of any statement of means and/or documentary evidence of Mr Forster’s financial or personal circumstances, I am also satisfied that it is reasonable that Mr Forster should pay the costs of these proceedings.

In accordance with Part VI of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules, I make the following order in respect of costs:

Mr William Forster must pay costs in the sum of £350.

PUBLICATION

I find no good reason to depart from the approach set out in the RICS Sanctions Policy: Supplement 3 (Publication of regulatory/disciplinary matters). Therefore, in accordance with Part VI of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules, this Record of Decision will be published

following the expiry of 14 days from service of the Single Member's decision upon Mr Forster.