



ROYAL INSTITUTION OF CHARTERED SURVEYORS

Disciplinary Panel Hearing

Case of

Andrea Renaudo (6874829)

On

7 May 2026

At

Held remotely via Microsoft Teams

Panel

Ms Jane Bishop (Lay Chair)
Mr Peter Baker (Lay Member)
Dr Stephen Moore (Surveyor Member)

Legal Adviser

Mr Arran Dowling-Hussey

RICS Representative

Mr Ben Rich of Counsel

Member

Mr Andrea Renaudo (attended and was not represented)

Tribunal Executive

Ms Maria Choudhury-Rahman

Allegation 1

1. On or about 19 April 2024, Andrea Renaudo acted dishonestly by submitting a formal Assessment of Professional Competence (APC) to RICS, intending to present it as his own original work when he knew that he had copied parts of his submission from another source.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct with effect from 2 February 2022

Mr Renaudo is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-Law 5.2.2(c)

Allegation 2

2. On or about 19 April 2024, Andrea Renaudo acted without integrity by submitting a formal Assessment of Professional Competence (APC) to RICS, intending to present it as his own original work when he knew that he had copied parts of his submission from another source.

Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct with effect from 2 February 2022

Mr Renaudo is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-Law 5.2.2(c)

BACKGROUND

1. Mr Renaudo enrolled with RICS to become a Chartered Member on 11 January 2024. As an Assessment of Professional Competence (APC) Candidate, he was a member of the attached classes and required to abide by RICS' Regulations and Rules.
2. To become a Chartered Member of RICS, Mr Renaudo was required to complete and submit an APC to demonstrate he had met RICS' competencies. On 19 April 2024, Mr Renaudo made an APC submission (the Submission). The Submission was identified through Turnitin (a plagiarism software) as having a 36% similarity with another student's (Mr Artifoni's) 2022 APC submission.

3. Mr Artifoni is a work colleague of Mr Renaudo. His witness statement dated 2 April 2025 stated that he had *“never knowingly or intentionally”* provided a copy of his APC submission to another person, including Mr Renaudo, and he did not know how Mr Renaudo obtained it.
4. On 24 September 2024, RICS informed Mr Renaudo that his Submission contained similarities with Mr Artifoni’s APC submission and invited him to respond to a series of questions. Mr Renaudo responded in an email dated 27 September 2024. He said his Submission was due and he needed to add further details to his RICS’ competencies. He used the Red Book and a printed portion of an untitled RICS submission that he found in his office. He did not know who wrote the untitled RICS submission and it was clearly incomplete. He was under time pressures to meet RICS’ deadline and, to reach the required word count in the Summary of Experience section, he used some of the untitled RICS submission and material from the Red Book. He understands the seriousness of his conduct and expressed his deepest regret.
5. On 24 September 2025, RICS sent Mr Renaudo an Allegation Letter alleging his conduct was dishonest and lacked integrity. On 8 October 2025 Mr Renaudo responded via email. He denied Allegation 1 but acknowledge he made a serious error of judgement. However, he did not act with dishonest intent. He believed the untitled RICS submission was a general template or guidance material available for reference. He was under time pressures and personal stress that impaired his abilities to verify the status of the untitled RICS submission or seek clarification. He categorised his behaviour as negligence as opposed to deliberate dishonesty. He conceded part of Allegation 2. He acknowledged his conduct fell short of the expected standard of integrity, but he did not agree it amounted to an intentional breach. He maintained the untitled RICS submission appeared to be abandoned office material without a clear owner. He exercised poor judgement in not seeking proper authorisation and this was compounded by work pressures affecting his decision-making capabilities.
6. During the hearing, Mr Renaudo conceded the words he copied from the untitled RICS submission were not his own but did describe his own professional experience of over 10 years. He accepted that the second part of what he had described as a template that he found in the office (the unidentified RICS submission) was the work of another and identifiable as material that would have been used in a RICS submission. He repeated his written evidence that his conduct amounted to a serious lapse of judgement made when he was experiencing

personal and professional stresses. He did not believe his conduct amounted to dishonesty because it was not planned and done to deliberately mislead. However, during cross-examination, Mr Renaudo conceded that he did deliberately copy Mr Artifoni's submission and had mislead RICS.

RICS SUBMISSION

7. Mr Rich submitted that there was an expectation that all text in an APC submission should be the candidate's own words to enable RICS to assess how a candidate thinks and works and it should reflect what the candidate wants to convey about their knowledge and experience. The material Mr Renaudo copied fell into three categories, general statements, non-specific statements about how Mr Renaudo practised and specific examples. Mr Rich outlined a specific example appearing in Mr Artifoni's submission and the Submission.

Mr Artifoni wrote:

During a site visit to an industrial property in the province of Verona, I noticed the presence of asbestos both on the roof and stack on the ground, in the external areas. There were also residual materials from the previous activity, as well as metal drums of used oil, the removal of which can generate considerable costs, especially if leaks have occurred in the underlying ground.

Mr Renaudo wrote:

During an inspection of an industrial building, I happened to notice the presence of asbestos: in 2018 in Bologna there was asbestos both of the roof and stacked on the ground, internally and in the external areas of the building. However, it can often happen that you walk near residual materials from the previous activity, with the possibility of finding all kinds of tools and machinery, including remains and polluting materials whose removal can generate considerable costs, especially if leaks have occurred in the underlying ground.

8. Mr Rich acknowledged that taking more general statements from Mr Artifoni's submission about his practice habits and making slight changes to the words might represent Mr

Renaudo's actual experience. However, he submitted that as the specific details increased, so too did the unlikelihood that the words represent Mr Renaudo's actual experiences.

9. During the hearing, Mr Renaudo told the Tribunal that although he used Mr Artifoni's words, he had in fact visited many industrial buildings in Verona and Balogna and often found asbestos. Mr Rich then asked Mr Renaudo why he changed the location in the example and put to him that he did so to disguise he had used copied material.
10. Mr Rich submitted, citing the well-known case of *Ivey v Genting [2017] UKSC 67*, that to make a finding of dishonesty, the Tribunal must first make a finding about Mr Renaudo's actual knowledge or belief (a subjective test) and then determine whether his actions were dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people (an objective test).
11. Mr Rich submitted that Mr Renaudo knew, or believed his Submission was, in part, not his own work, that he was not entitled to use other people's material, that RICS would not have accepted the Submission if it knew parts of it were not Mr Renaudo's own work and that if RICS had not become aware of how the Submission was prepared, the Submission would or could have been accepted as Mr Renaudo's own work. Mr Rich submitted that if the Tribunal concluded Mr Renaudo's subjective state of mind was in whole or in part as set out above, his conduct would be dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

MR RENAUDO'S SUBMISSION

12. Mr Renaudo submitted that he made one error of judgement that did not reflect his education, attitude, and moral values. What he did was wrong and would never be repeated. He has had time to reflect on his conduct and taken remedial steps of completing time management and ethics training.

FINDING OF FACT

13. The Tribunal reminded itself that the burden of proving the allegations was on RICS alone. The Tribunal accepted the Legal Adviser's advice that the standard of proof to be applied was the ordinary civil standard of proof, namely the balance of probabilities. The Tribunal accepted

the Legal Adviser's advice that when dishonesty was alleged, the Tribunal must take the approach of first ascertaining Mr Renaudo's state of knowledge or belief as to the facts and then determine whether the conduct was honest or dishonest by applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people (following the test in *Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67.)

Allegation 1

On or about 19 April 2024, Andrea Renaudo acted dishonestly by submitting a formal Assessment of Professional Competence (APC) to RICS, intending to present it as his own original work when he knew that he had copied parts of his submission from another source.

**Contrary to Rule 1 of the Rules of Conduct with effect from 2 February 2022
Mr Renaudo is therefore liable to disciplinary action under RICS Bye-Law 5.2.2(c)**

14. The Tribunal carefully considered the written evidence before it and Mr Renaudo's oral evidence. Mr Renaudo accepted his Submission contained words that were not his own and he knew what he was doing was wrong. He conceded his actions were deliberate and intended to mislead RICS into thinking his Submission was his own. The Tribunal accepted Mr Rich's submission that the reason Mr Renaudo altered the location of the specific example set out in paragraph 7 was to disguise the words were not his own. The Tribunal is satisfied on the balance of probabilities Mr Renaudo's knew he was not entitled to use other people's material, that RICS would not have accepted the Submission if it knew parts of it were not Mr Renaudo's own work and that if RICS had not become aware of how the Submission was prepared, the Submission would or could have been accepted as Mr Renaudo's own work. The Tribunal is satisfied Mr Renaudo's conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.
15. Given the Tribunal's findings in relation to Allegation 1, it did not consider the alternative charge of Allegation 2.

LIABILITY FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION

16. The Tribunal considered whether Mr Renaudo was liable to disciplinary action under by-law 5.2.2(c). RICS submitted that a finding of dishonesty is serious and should be liable to disciplinary action and Mr Renaudo did not dispute that approach.
17. The Tribunal accepts Mr Renaudo's conduct was not at the high-end of the range of dishonest conduct. However, the conduct occurred in a process designed to ensure RICS Members have the requisite standard of skills and competencies to be a Regulated Member. Mr Renaudo's conduct had the potential to undermine the public's confidence in ensuring RICS Members are competent and trustworthy. His conduct brings the profession and Mr Renaudo into disrepute. The Tribunal is satisfied Mr Renaudo's conduct was well-below the standard expected of a Regulated Member and is serious. The Tribunal is satisfied Mr Renaudo is liable to disciplinary action.

DECISION AS TO SANCTION

18. Sanctions must not be primarily punitive but may have a punitive effect. They must be proportionate and start on the basis that each step on the 'sanctions ladder' is taken until there is a sanction that is proportionate to the charges found.
19. RICS did not invite the Tribunal to order a particular sanction but to have regard to the RICS' Sanctions Policy.
20. Mr Renaudo acknowledged the Tribunal's decision, was regretful of his conduct and invited the Tribunal to be proportionate in its decision allowing for a lapse of judgment. He submitted that his conduct has had significant consequences for him at work and his relationship with clients.
21. The Tribunal accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser and had regard to RICS' Sanctions Policy. The Tribunal noted that the overriding principles of acting in the public interest, to protect the public, the reputation of the profession and to declare and uphold proper standards and proportionality. The Tribunal had regard to Mr Renaudo's engagement with RICS, his acknowledgement that his conduct was wrong and his deep regret for it. Although Mr Renaudo recognised his conduct was wrong and lacked judgement, he found it difficult to categorise his conduct as dishonest as opposed to a single lapse of judgement in the context of an onerous

workload and imminent RICS's deadline. The Tribunal had regard to Mr Renaudo's previous good character and previous unblemished disciplinary record. The Tribunal considered all the sanctions of no sanction, caution, reprimand, undertakings as to future conduct, fines, and conditions. However, dishonest conduct in the process used to determine whether a person is competent to become a Regulated Member is serious. It must be deterred because it undermines the reputation, trust, public confidence in the profession and the rigour of RICS' Membership process. The Tribunal has found Mr Renaudo knew what he was doing was wrong and considered a sanction below expulsion was not proportionate. The Tribunal found the most appropriate sanction was to expel Mr Renaudo from RICS Membership.

22. Mr Renaudo, a member of the attached classes of RICS, as defined by RICS Regulation 2.1.2, is expelled from membership of RICS.

PUBLICATION

23. RICS submitted there is a presumption of publication in the normal way. Mr Renaudo invited the Tribunal to depart from that presumption citing the adverse impacts publications would have on him. The Tribunal considered the policy on publication of decisions, The Sanctions Policy Supplement 3 - Publication of Regulatory Disciplinary Matters and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that there was no identifiable reason to depart from the presumption of publication.

COSTS

24. RICS applied for its costs totalling £4,217 and provided a detailed schedule. The costs represented a contribution to RICS incurred costs and the Tribunal accepted the amount of costs sought was fair and reasonable.
25. Mr Renaudo provided a detailed statement of his fixed expenses and income indicating a modest surplus of funds per month. Given his financial position and the financial consequences that have flowed from his conduct, he invited the Tribunal not to award all or some of RICS's claimed costs.

26. The Tribunal considered Mr Renaudo's submission and his statement of means. However, if Mr Renaudo did not contribute towards the costs of bringing this case, those costs would fall on RICS' Membership. The Tribunal was not satisfied there was a reason to reduce the costs claimed.

27. The Tribunal finds Mr Renaudo must pay costs in the sum of £4,217 to RICS.

APPEAL PERIOD

28. Mr Renaudo may appeal to an Appeal Panel against this decision within 28 days of notification of this decision, in accordance with Rule 152 of the Regulatory Tribunal Rules.