

From: [REDACTED]
To: [TPBreview](#)
Subject: Review of the Tax Practitioners Board
Date: Friday, 12 April 2019 2:33:04 PM

Dear Mr Nick Westerink

My submissions towards the review of this board are as follows:

Discrimination against those taking maternity leave and working part time.

I believe this issue has been brought to the attention of the TPB at several instances previously but to ensure that this matter does not fall through the gaps I am submitting it for consideration of your review. It is also disappointing that despite the TPB and TASA knowing this is an issue for some years, it has not been dealt with.

The TPB are under legislation that under the experience option a practitioner needs to have had experience in 6 of the last 8 years. I am sure there was intended to be flexibility in this legislation however the level of flexibility does not go far enough as those of us working part time are severely impacted. For example, I have been a practitioner for 12 years. However it has been in the last 8 that I have taken maternity leave (6 months x 2) and returned to work on a part time basis. Due to this I cannot renew my registration to give tax advice. A 12 year career now hanging on a thread. You should make room in the legislation that working 3 or 4 days per week and taking time out to have a baby is sufficient to meet the minimum requirement. Part time employees still have to maintain the same level of CPD points and working 4 days per week does not mean I know 80% less than the men next to me who haven't taken time out to give birth, breast feed and care for their family. It is discriminatory legislation as my long standing career is in jeopardy not for the immediate future but for the next 6 years as working part time means I will never meet the experience criteria. Also please note that I am not uneducated. I have a Masters in Taxation and Financial Planning, business degrees and several diplomas. The idea that junior advisors who have little education are now registered and I am not is insulting.

Discrepancies in approved subjects

The board should also review the subjects that they accept for the educational requirement. My subjects are all sufficient to be registered as a Tax Agent but not Financial (Tax) Advisor. There seems to be a significant gap in putting together the list of courses. If a course has been reviewed to be suitable to Tax Agent status it should also be reviewed towards the Financial (tax) advisor status.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

