

Disciplinary Panel Hearing

Case of

Ivan Moore [0098066]

On

Wednesday 22 April 2026

Held Remotely via Teams

Panel

Glenn Mathieson (Lay Chair)

Victoria Thornes (Lay Member)

Ben Davies FRICS (Surveyor Member)

Legal Advisor

Nick Hawkins

Representatives for the parties

Hearing Officer

Jae Berry

Charge Sheet

Allegations

1. On or about 21 June 2023, Ivan Moore acted dishonestly by representing to RICS that an EWS assessment he submitted was his own work, when he knew that the work was in part not his own, but that of another (Mr LM), as set out in Schedule A.

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

2. On or about 21 June 2023, Ivan Moore acted without integrity by representing to RICS that an EWS assessment he submitted was his own work, when he knew or ought to have known that the work was in part not his own, but that of another (Mr LM), as set out in Schedule A.

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

Schedule A

Sections of Mr Moore's case study in part copied from Mr Morland

1. Introduction and Scope
2. Building Details & Fire Strategy review
3. External Wall construction & As-Built Information Review
4. Intrusive Survey Findings
5. Risk Assessment & Methodology
6. Recommendations
7. EWS Outcome

Response

Mr Moore had indicated on the Listing Questionnaire, dated 25 March 2026, that he admitted both allegations and that he accepted that he was liable to disciplinary action. He confirmed that remained his position.

The Hearing

1. The Panel considered a bundle of 187 pages, including a Case Summary prepared by counsel on behalf of RICS.
2. Mr Moore admitted both allegations and that he was liable to disciplinary action. The Panel accepted his admissions and found that the allegations were proved and that Mr Moore was liable to disciplinary action.

Background

3. Mr Geering presented the case and referred the Panel to his Case Summary, which is set out in the following paragraphs.
4. RICS offers its members the chance to take part in the External Wall Systems Assessment Training Programme. This is an Ofqual qualification which relates to fire safety. RICS role is to design and deliver the training and the final assessment, with the eventual certificate issued by Awarding Body for the Built Environment.
5. This is an online programme comprising of various learning modules followed by two assessments – a multiple-choice assessment, and a case study. To complete the latter, the candidates receive certain instructions and information and used these to complete an EWS template report.

6. The front page of the EWS template includes the following “*important information about your submission*”:

“

- *Whilst it is acknowledged that in real life situations it is good practice to collaborate with colleagues on report findings, for the purposes of this assessment, you must complete your submission independently.*
- *By submitting this report, you declare that it reflects your own work. Please refer to Plagiarism policy provided with this course for further information.”*

This plagiarism policy states:

“Candidates that reproduce material from other sources during examinations without referencing the original source are committing plagiarism. Although instances of plagiarism are rare in assessment/examination conditions, any occurrences will be reported to RICS immediately.”

“Plagiarism can be defined in a number of ways including (list not exhaustive):

- *Using the work of others and submitting them as their own without acknowledging them intentionally or unintentionally*
- *Cutting and pasting information; taking or closely paraphrasing ideas, sections, sentences or paragraphs including drawings or other graphical representations (including internet sources)*

...

- *Deliberate plagiarism is where a candidate makes a conscious decision to steal another’s work and submit as their own.”*

“Individuals applying to obtain RICS qualifications will be required to:

- i) ii) understand what plagiarism is and be aware of the policy read the qualification guides, and declare that all submissions have been completed in line with the requirements*
- iii) iv) meet the requirements as set out in the course specification sign a declaration attesting that all submissions are their own work, representing their own learning, and was written by them in their own words*
- v) acknowledge all sources that have been used.”*

Mr Moore submitted his case study on 21 June 2023. On 27 June 2023 this was put through the Turnitin programme, which is used by RICS to identify potential plagiarism by assessing – inter alia – the degree of similarity between the various student studies submitted.

Turnitin identified similarities with a study submitted by Mr Morland. An investigation was opened.

RICS wrote to Mr Moore setting out its concerns. A table set out those aspects of the two reports which were substantially the same, and Mr Moore was invited to comment on these.

Mr Moore was unable to respond to this letter initially due to health issues. On 30 December 2024 he provided the following responses to RICS' questions:

- “1. An explanation as to why the submission share word for word likeness. The Introduction & Scope section, Building Details & Fire Strategy Review section follows the layout of a standard report template document that was used at Bellrock. The excel document and traffic light scoring system used for the Risk Assessment & Methodology section was based on a Bellrock template.*
- 2. Do you know Mr Morland, if so what is your relationship? Yes, we previously worked together at Bellrock in the TRE Team. Where we assisted in developing standard report templates.*
- 3. Did you see Mr Morland's work before making your submission? Yes, I peer reviewed a draft copy of Mr Morland's submission, which was submitted prior to my submission date.*
- 4. Did you copy any part of your submission from Mr Morland's submission? Yes.*
- 5. Did you and Mr Morland assist each other or each other's work to compile your assessment? No, I peer reviewed Mr Morland's submission but did not assist in compiling his submission. There was no involvement from Mr Morland in my compiling my submission....”*

7. Mr Moore provided some limited comments on the specific alleged similarities. He again attributed the similarities in part to the fact he had used the Bellrock report template, and so, presumably, had Mr Morland. He made this comment in respect of the Introduction and scope section, and the Building Details & Fire Strategy Review section. The “traffic light scoring” format of the Risk Assessment & Methodology section also came from the template.

8. In respect of the following sections he stated “*Agreed*” in the comments column: External Wall construction & As-Built Information Review, Intrusive Survey Findings, Recommendations, and EWS Outcome. It is understood by “*Agreed*”, he indicated his agreement that these sections were copied from Mr Morland.

Submissions by RICS on Sanction

9. Mr Geering referred the Panel to the Sanctions Guidance but did not invite the Panel to impose a particular sanction. He reminded the Panel of the principle of proportionality in sanction.
10. He submitted that it was an aggravating factor that this was a planned act by Mr Moore and could not be seen as a momentary error of judgement. Further, the plagiarism was extensive going to core aspects of the report submitted.
11. It was also an aggravating feature that the plagiarism was in order to obtain a fire safety qualification, and that this could have put the public at risk had Mr Moore not been found out.
12. Mr Geering acknowledged the mitigating factors including his previous good conduct, his partial admissions in writing and his full admissions in advance of the Hearing. He had cooperated with his regulator.
13. Mr Geering asked for costs as of £6,200 as set out in the costs’ schedule previously provided.
14. Mr Geering submitted that there should be publication of the Hearing in the normal manner as there was no reason to depart from the presumption in favour of publication.

Submissions by Mr Moore

15. Mr Moore said that he regretted his actions and wished to apologise for his behaviour. Shortly before submitting his work for assessment, he had received some bad news about the health of a family member, and this had affected him personally.
16. He asked the panel to take into account his 30 years membership of RICS with no disciplinary issues. He apologised to his colleague for using his work.
17. In answer to questions from the Panel, Mr Moore said that he understood the impact that cheating to obtain qualifications would have on public confidence, adding he would like to retake the course to rebuild trust.
18. Mr Moore stated that expulsion would have a devastating effect on him and his family.
19. Mr Moore stated that he felt the costs asked for were excessive.
20. Mr Moore asked the Panel not to order publication of the Hearing, to mark his 30 years membership of RICS without any previous findings against him.

Legal Advice on Sanction

21. The Panel received and accepted the advice of the Legal Advisor. The question of sanction is a matter for the Panel's judgment. The Panel was advised that having found liability to disciplinary action, it was required to consider what, if any, sanction to impose. It was advised that the purpose of sanctions is not to be punitive but to protect the public and the public interest in the wider sense, namely, to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold standards.

22. The Panel was reminded that in deciding upon sanction it should have regard to the Sanctions policy, and apply the principle of proportionality, weighing the interests of the public with those of the practitioner and taking the minimum action necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.

Determination on Sanction

23. The Panel bore in mind that the purpose of sanctions is not to be punitive, although they may have that effect. The purpose is to protect the public, to declare and uphold the standards of the profession, to safeguard the reputation of the profession and that of RICS as its regulator and to deter members from future non-compliance. Sanctions must be proportionate and considered in order of severity, starting with the least restrictive until a sanction, or range of sanctions, which meets the public interest has been reached.

24. The Panel began by identifying the aggravating and mitigating factors present. It found the following mitigating factors:
 - Some cooperation with the investigation, and partial admissions during the investigation.
 - Full admissions to the facts at the Hearing
 - No previous disciplinary findings in a 30-year career.
 - Some insight, although the Panel found the remorse and insight to be centered on the impact on himself rather than on public confidence.
 - Personal circumstances at the time of the plagiarism may have affected his judgement

25. The Panel found the following aggravating factors:

- The plagiarism was extensive and deliberate, and involved more than just “cutting and pasting” from a colleague’s report.
- There would have been a risk to the public if Mr Moore had been given a fire safety qualification as a result of his plagiarism.
- Public confidence in the profession would be severely damaged if RICS did not take instances of cheating to obtain fire safety qualifications seriously.

26. Notwithstanding the mitigating factors, the Panel determined that the aggravating factors marked the conduct out as towards the higher end of seriousness. It did, however, conclude that there was little risk of a repetition of Mr Moore’s wrongdoing.

27. The Panel next considered the possible sanctions available to it, in ascending order of seriousness. In light of the serious nature of the findings made, the Panel was in no doubt that the sanctions of caution and reprimand were both insufficient to properly protect the public and insufficient to safeguard the wider public interest.

28. The Panel next considered undertakings and conditions. It considered that no undertakings had been offered. The Panel concluded that in this case conditions were inappropriate – there could not be a condition to behave honestly and with integrity as that is something expected of all members of the profession.

29. The Panel next considered whether to fine Mr. Moore. It considered that whilst a fine at the appropriate level might go some way to marking the gravity of Mr. Moore’s conduct, it was insufficient to properly assure public confidence in the profession and the upholding and declaring of proper professional standards. A fine would do nothing to protect the public and the Panel considered that a well-informed member of the public would be concerned if a person who had behaved dishonestly in an attempt to obtain a fire safety qualification was allowed to remain as a member of RICS.

30. The Panel finally considered expulsion from the profession. Whilst the Panel gave very careful consideration to whether a lesser sanction could be imposed in circumstances of a first disciplinary offence in an otherwise unblemished career of 30 years, it did not find any

sufficiently extenuating circumstances in a case of dishonesty that could not properly be described as anything other than deliberate. It therefore concluded that expulsion was the only appropriate sanction available to it, to ensure the public was protected from a professional who had behaved dishonestly and without integrity.

31. The Panel therefore ordered that Mr. Moore should be expelled from membership.

Costs

32. The Panel noted the costs application from RICS in the sum of £6,200. The Panel had been provided with a statement of means by Mr. Moore. The Panel could see no reason not to award costs in full and therefore made an order for costs in the sum of £6,200

Publicity

33. The Panel noted there is a presumption in favour of publicity. In the absence of any factors indicating publicity was not appropriate, the Panel made an order for publicity in accordance with the publication policy.