

A Debate on The Pros and Cons of a Name Change from OAHI to CAHPI-Ontario

PROPOSAL: That the Ontario Association of Home Inspectors change its operating name to the Canadian Association of Home and Property Inspectors - Ontario (CAHPI-ON)

PREAMBLE:

Most of the provincial or regional bodies that make up CAHPI have changed their legal identity or name to include CAHPI, as in CAHPI-Alberta, thereby providing uniformity in identification. The two holdouts are Ontario and Quebec; AIBQ has made a verbal commitment to proceed along this uniform name path. The OAHI Board Of Directors has made a commitment to a uniform name change should our members agree. To that end we want to engage you, our members, in a province-wide discussion through the mediums of the new Members Forum on the website and the Regional Meeting Groups.

This initiative of your Board of Directors was assigned to directors George Webb and Andrew Dixon; they were entrusted with the starting of the discussion. The BOD would like to encourage all members to participate fully in the discussion of this proposed name change in preparation for a vote on the issue at the AGM in early 2005.

As the term is normally "Pros and Cons" we will start with the Pros.

PROS

- Upon the advice of our legal counsel it is our understanding that the legal costs and ramifications of changing the name of OAHI to CAHPI-ON are minimal, certainly when compared to other legal challenges we have endured. OAHI would not go away, rather it would be "doing business as CAHPI-ON". Bill PR-158 is unaffected and still in force.
- The name change would provide a goodwill gesture to CAHPI national and the provincial & regional associations.
- CAHPI-ON would be in line with names of other provincial associations providing a more uniform credibility to CAHPI national.
- The name change promotes a more unified profession by strengthening the identity of profession
- CAHPI-ON provides opportunities for more effective CAHPI planned marketing/advertisement initiatives on a national and provincial level.
- The name change increases lobbying effectiveness both at the national and provincial levels.
- CAHPI-ON provides a more seamless approach when dealing as a national group with national stakeholders, allowing for better coordination with national stakeholders on national issues.
- A name change to CAHPI-ON allows for better brand recognition with the public and all stakeholders whether nationally or provincially.
- A name change to CAHPI-ON should coincide with planned OAHI marketing initiatives, thereby promoting the association, the profession and all members.

CONS

- A name change will involve legal costs in the \$2,500 to \$3,500 range
- The introduction of CAHPI-ON will lead to confusion within the province as to the name of the only credible source of qualified home inspectors.
- The name change will require the advertising of CAHPI-ON to the public and provincial stakeholders; in short, advertising requires money, our money.
- While marketing CAHPI-ON has costs, there are also marketing opportunities, the concern lies in coordinating an effective marketing campaign with limited resources.
- A name change requires the costs of re-design of our official logo, letterhead, website etc.
- CAHPI-ON may lead to a loss of association identity in the public eyes and a lag-time to regain momentum.
- A name change could lead to a loss of goodwill that the name OAHPI has accrued. While on the pro side of this con the loss will likely be minimal and temporary when people understand this is an evolution. Nevertheless there could be confusion in the marketplace.
- CAHPI-ON will probably experience increased administration costs to handle inquiries from the public and stakeholders.
- A name change will require costs to the individual members to change advertising, business cards, promotional items, etc.
- CAHPI-ON will require a large number of volunteer hours devoted to the change in all of its seen and unforeseen aspects including the NEED to have a PLAN to promote the profession.

That's about it for George and Andrew. Please remember that the above items are not exclusive, and that while some pros and cons are straightforward there may be additional points of discussion within some of the particulars. The BOD looks forward to your input, welcomes your involvement in the discussion both on the members forum and the Regional Meeting Groups and your vote on the issue at the 2005 AGM: ; and if you wish you can send your views to the BOD via mail, fax or email.

Please contribute your ideas and your solutions.

Respectfully submitted



George Webb, RHI



Andrew Dixon, RHI