

**APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT
SECOND MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL**



**Asia Pacific
Economic Cooperation**

**23 – 24 May 2006
Colegio de Arquitectos
Mexico City, Republic of Mexico**

MEETING SUMMARY

Participating Delegations

Republic of Mexico (Chair), Australia, Canada, People's Republic of China, Hong Kong China, Japan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, New Zealand, Republic of the Philippines, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, United States of America.

A list of delegates is attached at APPENDIX 6.

ITEM 1 - Welcome to Delegates

The Chair declared the meeting open and introduced Lic. Rolando Paniagua of the Secretaria Economica of the Mexican government, who greeted all delegates and welcomed them to the second Meeting of the APEC Architect Central Council. He spoke of the Mexican government's firm commitment to APEC and its support of the APEC Architect project. He offered any help that his department might be able to give the Central Council and wished it well in its endeavours.

ITEM 2 - APEC Meeting Procedures

The Chair drew Council members' attention to the APEC meeting procedures and APEC Architect Central Council proceedings set out in the Briefing Notes for the meeting.

ITEM 3 - In Memoriam

It was with regret that the Chair advised the meeting that former Council members, Dr Albakri of Malaysia and Mr Low of Singapore had passed away since the last meeting.

They had been valued participants in APEC Architect negotiations and had made significant contributions to the development of the project. He asked all delegates to stand and observe one minute of silence in their memory.

ITEM 4 - Adoption of the Agenda

No matters were raised under this Item and the Agenda was adopted without variation.

ITEM 5 - Confirmation of the Summary Conclusions of the Second Provisional Council / First Central Council Meeting

In accordance with the resolution taken at the previous meeting, each delegation formally confirmed the agreement of the appropriate authority in its economy to the Summary Conclusions of the Second Provisional Council / First Central Council Meeting held in Tokyo on 31 May – 1 June 2005.

ITEM 6 - Constitution of the APEC Architect Central Council

6.1 Matters Arising from the First Meeting of the Central Council

(Item 13 of the first Central Council Meeting Summary refers)

Because Korea and Singapore had not established their Monitoring Committees at the time of the Tokyo meeting, but hoped to do so shortly thereafter, the Council had agreed to delegate the assessment of their applications for authorisation to the Secretariat in the interim period, so that they might be able to participate as full members at the following Council meeting. Both economies had finally submitted applications but because of delays and, in some areas, insufficient information, the Secretariat had referred the matter to the Central Council for its advice and determination.

Both Korea and Singapore were well advanced in their preparations to establish a section of the APEC Architect Register and anxious to receive the Council's authorisation at this meeting for them to do so. As the apparent deficiencies in the information provided were of a relatively minor nature, all present agreed with the Chair's suggestion that both economies should discuss the outstanding requirements with the Secretariat during the meeting breaks and that the Council's decision on the matter be deferred until later in the meeting when, if possible, any shortcomings had been rectified.

This proved an effective strategy and the Secretariat was able to advise the Council after the morning coffee break that Singapore had satisfied Central Council requirements. The Council duly authorised the Singapore Monitoring Committee to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register and admitted it to membership of the Central Council.

Similarly, following further discussions with the Korean delegation at the lunch recess, the Secretariat advised the meeting that Korea had also provided the required additional information on its accreditation systems and, in the Secretariat's opinion, now satisfied the requirements for authorisation of its Monitoring Committee. The Central Council accepted this recommendation and the Monitoring Committee of Korea was authorised by

the Central Council to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register and accepted as a full member of the Council.

6.2 Authorisation of Newly Formed Monitoring Committees

The Chair noted that, with the inclusion of Singapore and Korea, 14 of the 21 APEC member economies were now part of the APEC Architect project. The question therefore arose as to what process the Council should adopt for evaluating any future applications for authorisation from newly formed Monitoring Committees of other APEC economies. Did the Central Council wish to continue to delegate this function to future Secretariats, as it had for Korea and Singapore, or should it be determined by the Central Council in accordance with the rules set out in the Operations Manual?

There was general consensus that the rules should be adhered to and that the Central Council should determine any future applications for authorisation. Because of their participation as observers over the course of several Council meetings, Korea and Singapore were seen as a special case that would be unlikely to apply to other economies in the future. It was agreed that the Secretariat should receive all future applications and obtain all necessary supporting information, for circulation to Central Council members and formal determination at the following meeting of the Council.

The Central Council adopted the following resolution:

“Future applications for the authorisation of newly formed Monitoring Committees would be assessed by the Secretariat, subject to completion of the Survey Application for Authorisation, and the submission of required additional information on education and accreditation systems, for subsequent determination by the Central Council”.

6.3 Central Council Membership

The names of Monitoring Committee nominees for membership of the Central Council were distributed to all participants and formally received as members by the Central Council as a whole.

A list of Central Council members is attached at APPENDIX 1

ITEM 7 - Establishment of the APEC Architect Register - Review of Progress

7.1 Inauguration of the APEC Architect Register

The Chair introduced this item by pointing out that it was now eight months since the APEC Architect Register had become operational and eight of the twelve participating economies had established their websites and linked Register databases. He reminded the Council that, as a means of ensuring uniformity in the decentralised sections of the APEC Architect Register, all delegations had agreed at the Tokyo meeting that each Monitoring Committee website should contain four basic components:

- A brief introductory statement
- Access to the list of APEC Architects in the economy
- Information for registration as an APEC Architect and document download
- A statement of home economy recognition requirements for APEC Architects from other economies.

Because of the importance of maintaining consistent and accurate information on each section of the APEC Architect Register, the Council's confirmation of these guidelines was now sought. To open discussion on the subject, each delegation was asked to advise the Council on the stage it had reached in complying with the four components set out in the guidelines and to explain any difficulties that may have been encountered in doing so.

Australia, Canada, Hong Kong China, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Chinese Taipei and the United States all confirmed that their websites were established and complied with the agreed guidelines. Four other economies had not yet established their websites but all were in the process of doing so. The Philippines website was now ready and waiting to be linked with the Central Council domain, Mexico expected to have its website set up by June and the Peoples Republic of China by September. Thailand advised the Council that the organisational structure of the profession in its economy was undergoing some major changes. This would delay the creation of its database and website, possibly for a couple of years, but it would be in a position to establish them as soon as the structural changes were complete. These responses were noted and accepted by the Central Council.

Because of the particular significance of the Statement of Home Economy Recognition Requirements for APEC Architects from other economies, for the achievement of APEC Architect objectives, each delegation was invited to comment on its response to this particular issue. It became apparent that despite the general confirmation of compliance with overall guidelines given previously, only two economies had specifically included a statement to this effect on their websites. Several economies advised that the matter was still under review and others were awaiting the outcome of the proposed reciprocal recognition framework before reaching a final conclusion.

The Chair reminded all participating economies that completion of their websites in accordance with the agreed guidelines, particularly with regard to the statement on home economy recognition requirements, was essential for effective implementation of the project. He asked the views of the Council on the proposal that those Monitoring Committees that had established websites should complete them in accordance with the guidelines within three months of the meeting. The Chinese Taipei delegation noted that there were still several issues to be discussed before all details could be resolved and the Canadian delegation suggested it would be helpful if the Secretariat could notify economies of apparent deficiencies in individual websites.

The discussion concluded with general agreement that the Council should confirm the previously agreed Monitoring Committee websites and database guidelines, to be updated at maximum intervals of six months, and that where possible established websites should be completed by next September. The Secretariat was asked to advise each economy of any deficiency in its website.

Delegates also agreed to the particular request of the United States delegation to include the term “certification” in addition to “registration” where it occurred in the documents, to accommodate the situation in that economy which had multiple licensing authorities.

The Council noted that no participating economy had as yet received an application for registration / certification in its economy from an APEC Architect from another economy.

7.2 Documentation

Record of 7 Year Period of Professional Experience as a Registered/Licensed Architect; Application for Registration as an APEC Architect

Again there appeared to be considerable variation in the documentation available for download on established websites. Delegations were asked to comment on the situation and to confirm or amend the guidelines previously adopted for the Record of the 7 Year Period of Professional Experience as a Registered/Licensed Architect and the Application for Registration as an APEC Architect. Various views were expressed.

The Australian delegation informed the meeting that it had amended the Seven Year Experience Report form to require greater clarity in the role played by applicants in terms of the categories of architectural practice listed in Table 3 and it also requested additional information on the professional references of applicants. The Canadian delegation advised that it required letters of certification from independent licensing authorities in the Canadian provinces. The Philippine delegation advised that it had modified the form to suit its own particular requirements. It believed that the report should be uniform in approach but agreed with Singapore that more detail should be required from applicants.

Other economies had not yet received a sufficient number of registration applications to be in a position to comment on the suitability of the form. The United States delegation explained that at present it was continuing to use the certification form used by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, but planned to develop an appropriate form for APEC Architects. The Chinese Taipei delegation expressed some concern that too many additional requirements could have the negative effect of increasing barriers to professional recognition, rather than facilitating it.

However it was the general view of the meeting that the structure of the form for the Record of 7-Year Period of Professional Experience as a Registered / Licensed Architect was acceptable as a minimum requirement, subject to its modification to include the four nominated categories of architectural practice in Table 3. Similarly the structure of the Application for Registration as an APEC Architect form was confirmed as meeting the Council’s minimum requirements. The Council also confirmed its earlier decision that Monitoring Committees must include the minimum information previously agreed by the Central Council in these base documents.

The revised Record of 7 Year Period of Professional Experience as a Registered / Licensed Architect is attached at APPENDIX 2

APEC Architect Certificate and Identification Card

The meeting turned next to consideration of the layout of the APEC Architect Certificate of Registration and ID Card and the opinion of the Council on the designs for these documents was sought.

The Australian delegation opened discussion by suggesting that each economy, if it wished, might develop its own design for the Certificate, incorporating the previously agreed content. It also believed that only the signature of the Monitoring Committee should appear on the document. The Chair sought Council's opinion on these suggestions.

In response to the first question of whether there should be a standard design or could each economy develop its own format, the majority view expressed by Council members supported maintaining a standard design. This would present a unified international image for the project and emphasise the status of the APEC Architect Register as a single entity. It was agreed however that the design could perhaps be improved.

Opinion was divided on the suggestion that the Secretary General's signature be deleted from the Certificate. The United States delegation felt it should be retained to indicate Central Council authority. This view was countered by the New Zealand delegation because the Council had not established a position of Secretary General and, in any event, Monitoring Committees acted with the delegated authority of the Central Council. The Peoples Republic of China was also opposed to the inclusion of the Secretary General's signature. Other economies however preferred to retain the two signatures. The Chinese Taipei delegation thought it gave the document greater authority and the Thai and United States delegations both believed that it indicated cooperation between economies. At a practical level the Japanese delegation reminded the meeting that it had already issued over 300 certificates bearing both signatures.

When the question was put to the vote, most economies were persuaded by these comments that two signatures would be acceptable, with the exception of the Peoples Republic of China which believed that the signature of Secretary General should be deleted. It proposed instead that, as an alternative to having two signatures, the Council's authority could be represented by a Central Council seal. This solution was accepted by all present as a sensible alternative.

The discussion concluded with Central Council agreement that the APEC Architect Certificate of Registration should be of uniform design and the proposed layout should be modified to require the signature of the Chair of the member economy Monitoring Committee only, together with the seal of the APEC Architect Central Council.

In view of Australia's earlier suggestions concerning the design of the Certificate, the Australian delegation was asked to submit a revised design for the document, and suggestions for the Council seal, to the Central Council for its approval.

The Council then considered the ID Card design. A suggestion by the Korean delegation that space should be provided on the card for a photograph of the bearer was discussed at some length but in the end the general view was to keep the card as simple as possible. It was agreed however that the expiration date should be shown on the face of the card and the wording on the reverse side of the card should be amended to delete the words "in good standing".

7.3 Monitoring Committee Reports to Council

Central Council policy requires Monitoring Committees to report to the Secretariat at six month intervals on their APEC Architect registration activities and any other significant developments for the period. To ensure consistency in the information provided, it had been proposed that the Council adopt a standard format for these reports and the Secretariat had drawn the attention of the Council to the Individual Action Plans (AIPs) adopted by the APEC organisation as a possible model.

The APEC AIP had been circulated to delegates with the Briefing Notes and two further draft documents, tailored more closely to the needs of APEC Architect, were tabled at the meeting for the consideration of members. One of the latter followed the layout of the original AIP and the other was set out as a simple questionnaire addressing APEC Architect registration activities in each economy.

The Council supported the proposal to adopt a standard format for the six month Monitoring Committee Reports to Council and agreed that the simple questionnaire format would be most suitable for this purpose.

The agreed 6 month Monitoring Committee Report to Council is attached at APPENDIX 3

ITEM 8 - CENTRAL COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION

As resolved at the previous meeting, the Secretariat presented a report on the work it had undertaken in its first term of office, with particular reference to the budgetary and resource implications of administering the APEC Architect framework. It had previously circulated a detailed outline of its activities since the last Council meeting in Tokyo and now described to Council members its experiences in carrying out its functions and some of the difficulties it had encountered in doing so.

One of the major responsibilities of the Secretariat had been to establish the Central Council's website and to coordinate Monitoring Committees in the launch of the APEC Architect Register. Preparation of the Briefing Notes, Chair Brief, Meeting Reports and other documentation for the APEC Architect meetings in Tokyo and Mexico City was another important function. As administrator of an HRDWG project, the Secretariat also maintained contact with APEC headquarters in Singapore.

As much of the Secretariat's work was directed at setting up a new administrative system, it was not entirely typical of the services that Secretariats would normally expect to perform. There had also been some communication problems and delays in obtaining essential information, which had hampered the work and would need to be addressed by the incoming Secretariat. In consequence, the financial outlay for this first term of office would not necessarily apply to future administrative arrangements. But many other aspects of the functions it had carried out would have continued relevance for future Secretariats. The report voiced concern at the difficulty of handing over management of APEC Architect to successive economies and expressed the view that ideally the work should be undertaken at a fixed location and for a longer period of time.

The Council received the report with interest and the Chair thanked the Secretariat, on behalf of all delegates, for the work it had done and its valuable contribution to the APEC Architect project. He emphasised the importance of each economy accepting that it must at some stage participate in providing these services, and the need now for the Council to decide how this obligation could be shared.

The United States delegation opened discussion on this subject by voicing its support of the proposal under Agenda Item 11, that a structured system of rotation of the Secretariat function should be introduced, so that economies would know in advance when they would be due to act in that capacity. It also stressed the need to develop a system by which other participating economies could contribute to the funding of the acting Secretariat. This suggestion received general support, although the delegation from Hong Kong China reminded the meeting of the difficulty of a small economy such as theirs carrying out the work and there was general acknowledgment that options must be provided for variation if the particular circumstances of any economy required it. The Canadian delegation thought it would be helpful to have a more detailed indication of the workload and resources needed to undertake the work; the Philippines reminded the meeting of the funding solution adopted by APEC Engineer, which could have relevance for APEC Architect.

With agreement reached on the need for structured rotation, commencing in two year's time at the end of the next term of office of the Central Council, discussion turned to consideration of how this might be done. One obvious option would be to assign the Secretariat role to economies alphabetically. But first it would be helpful to obtain some understanding of the ability of participating economies to undertake this role and when they might be in a position to do so. Whilst recognising that some Monitoring Committees might not have the resources to carry out the Secretariat's functions, in most cases failure to make such a commitment would suggest that participating economies were not convinced that the APEC Architect project was worthwhile,

As a means of sounding out the views of economies, a notional timeframe was drawn up covering the next 13 terms of office of the Central Council and, as a purely hypothetical exercise, all delegations were asked to indicate when their Monitoring Committees might be in a position to act as the APEC Architect Secretariat. Hong Kong China advised members that it did not have authority to comment on such proposals at this stage.

To give economies time to consider these matters further, discussion on this item was deferred until the following day, for resolution under Agenda Item 11.

ITEM 9 - APEC ARCHITECT RECIPROCAL RECOGNITION FRAMEWORK

9.2 Proposed Reciprocal Recognition Framework

The Chair introduced the proposals for a Reciprocal Recognition Framework as the central item of the meeting and indeed of the whole APEC Architect project. As a matter of policy, the Central Council had previously resolved to support the future development of formalised agreements for the mutual recognition of architects with other APEC member economies in appropriate circumstances. The most recent information on the recognition requirements that host economies intended to place on APEC Architects from

other economies had been provided by the Survey Applications for Authorisation completed by Monitoring Committees for the last Council meeting. The survey identified the following three broad categories of recognition requirements that would be imposed by various economies on APEC Architects from elsewhere, in order of increasing levels of restriction:

1. Domain specific assessment
2. Comprehensive registration examination
3. Period of host economy residence/experience

The Chair pointed out that reciprocal recognition between economies would be based on substantial equivalence of their respective requirements, not on total uniformity. The proposal before the Council required each economy to nominate which of the three categories of recognition requirements it was prepared to offer APEC Architects from other economies, with the option of varying them for the assessment of applicants from economies committed to a more restrictive category of recognition requirements.

To open the discussion, each delegation briefly outlined its current registration requirements for foreign architects and advised the Council of the most liberal of the three stated categories it would require APEC Architects from other economies to undergo, as follows:

- 1) **Australia: *Domain Specific Assessment*** – to test knowledge of local legal and industry requirements, not architectural design and technical abilities.
- 2) **Canada** – with eleven independent licensing authorities, it was not yet in a position to make a single unified commitment, but plans for developing national policy on these matters were under way.
- 3) **Peoples Republic of China** – it would have different requirements for different economies and would therefore only be in a position to undertake bilateral agreements, not to make an overall commitment to all APEC Architects.
- 4) **Hong Kong China: *Period of Host Economy Residence/Experience*** – all foreign professionals were required to undertake a professional practice examination and to complete one year residency before obtaining professional recognition. The delegation advised the Council that it hoped in future to adopt the domain specific assessment requirement, and that it will discuss the current residency requirement with its government with a view to changing it.
- 5) **Japan: *Domain Specific Assessment*** – Japan would also apply a reciprocal basis for the assessment of APEC Architects from economies that are committed to a more restrictive category of recognition requirements.
- 6) **Korea** – foreign architects providing professional services in Korea must do so in collaboration with local architects.
- 7) **Malaysia** – requires foreign architects to enter into collaboration with local architects, although this is not bound by law. These provisions may be varied in the case of foreign architects undertaking specific projects in certain circumstances. However, although collaboration with local architects was the current situation, in future it might be in a position to revise this requirement in favour of the third category of a period of host economy residence/experience prior to professional recognition.
- 8) **Mexico: *Domain Specific Assessment*** – the Mexican government supported APEC policies and philosophy and the Mexican delegation urged all present to approach these proposals in a positive way.

- 9) **New Zealand: *Domain Specific Assessment*** – it would also apply reciprocal conditions to economies committed to a more restrictive category of recognition requirements. New Zealand advised that it had recently introduced a new Architects Act which specifically incorporated recognition of APEC Architects. It also believed that it was important that the APEC Architect project adhere to its stated multilateral objectives rather than degenerating into a series of bilateral negotiations.
- 10) **Philippines** – collaboration with local architects is required by law in the Philippines. If the law is to be amended it must be on an equitable basis and this is now under consideration, although it may take some time to complete.
- 11) **Singapore: *Domain Specific Assessment*** – Singapore still needs to develop procedures for applying the process, but agreed with the concept.
- 12) **Chinese Taipei: *Domain Specific Assessment*** – Chinese Taipei noted that this option would only be available to APEC Architects who established a commercial presence in the economy.
- 13) **Thailand** – as previously explained, the architectural profession in Thailand was undergoing a process of development and it was not yet able to make any specific commitments. Collaboration with local architects was currently required, but it hoped in the long-term to remove barriers to the recognition of APEC Architects.
- 14) **U.S.A.: *Domain Specific Assessment*** – the United States has an Experienced Foreign Architect policy, similar in its requirements to those of APEC Architect. It noted that certification by the National Association of Registration Boards was accepted by most jurisdictions in the United States but a few required knowledge of additional domain specific issues.

General discussion on various aspects of reciprocal recognition followed.

The New Zealand delegation voiced some concern that although APEC Architect had so far proved useful as a forum for discussion there was a danger that there might be insufficient collective vision for it to move forward and address its goals of enhancing the mobility of architects within the region. The moment had now come to decide whether these goals would be achieved or not. New Zealand believed that it is possible to persuade governments to change relevant policies, as it had been able to do in developing its new Architects Act.

The Chair also pointed out to delegates that they were discussing the future of the profession and of the region. The proposed framework would serve a new generation of architects who would not expect to encounter barriers in the practice of their profession. He reminded members that many of these barriers were essentially administrative and, although it was accepted that not all delegations were in a position to take immediate decisions on these matters, it was important to find a way in which the agreed APEC Architect objectives could be achieved.

The delegations from the Peoples Republic of China, Korea and Thailand each referred to the significance of cultural diversity and heritage which might be addressed by collaboration with local architects. In answer to a Korean request for more information on current bilateral agreements, the United States delegation briefly outlined the main provisions of the trilateral agreement between the United States, Canada and Mexico.

The Canadian and Malaysian delegations both suggested that a more comprehensive definition of the three proposed categories of registration requirements would help economies to determine the most liberal category they would be in a position to offer.

The Council then turned its attention to the specific proposal before it that “*the Central Council introduce a Reciprocal Recognition Framework to provide a structured basis for the reciprocal recognition of APEC Architects from all participating economies.*” Discussion focused first on the exclusion of the fourth category of “mandatory collaboration with local architect”, identified in the original Survey Applications for Authorisation of Monitoring Committees.

The economies in which this provision is currently in force were concerned that its omission would exclude them from the proposed Reciprocal Recognition Framework. They were reminded that to include it would constitute a fundamental change to APEC Architect policy, which was committed to the facilitation of the access of APEC Architects from other economies to “independent practice” in the host economy. Mandatory collaboration denied such access and, in any event, it was already an option available to architects without the need for the APEC Architect framework to facilitate it.

However, as the delegation from the Peoples Republic of China explained, a decision to completely omit reference to the collaboration obligation of several economies could create problems for them. The Council agreed that this situation should be addressed by the addition of a statement to clarify the position of APEC Architect participating economies whose current recognition requirements precluded their participation in the proposed Reciprocal Recognition Framework. As proposed by Chinese Taipei, this should be expressed in positive terms and various forms of wording were discussed. At the suggestion of the New Zealand delegation, the term ‘registration’ was substituted for ‘professional recognition’ wherever it occurred, to clarify its purpose of establishing registration requirements that would lead to the mutual recognition of APEC Architects.

It was finally agreed to add the following to the proposal

“The Central Council notes that some participating economies do not yet provide for the independent practice of architects from other economies. It is understood that they will work towards liberalising their current restrictions in the near future.”

The Peoples Republic of China suggested that the phrase be strengthened by substituting the word ‘recognises’ for ‘notes’ but the majority of Council members did not agree to formalising the situation to that extent.

The proposals to establish an APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework, based on commitment to three nominated categories of registration requirements for APEC Architects from other economies, were adopted by the Central Council with a two-third majority in favour, in accordance with Council rules.

The proposals made provision for economies to adopt a reciprocal basis for the assessment of APEC Architects from economies committed to a more restrictive category of registration requirements. All commitments to reciprocal recognition were to be recorded on Monitoring Committee websites and on the Central Council website.

Provisions for the establishment of the Reciprocal Recognition Framework adopted by the Central Council are attached as APPENDIX 4.

The commitment of participating economies to the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework is attached as APPENDIX 5.

9.3 The UIA Accord and Practice in a Host Nation

In accordance with the decision taken at the Tokyo meeting (Tokyo Meeting Summary, Item 13) that discussion on the possible application of UIA Accord policy to APEC Architect be deferred until this second meeting of the Central Council, a note on this subject was included in the Briefing Notes for the information of delegates. The matter however was not discussed.

ITEM 10 - PROMOTION OF THE APEC ARCHITECT REGISTER

At the time of the meeting, with the exception of one economy, only a handful of architects had so far been admitted to the APEC Architect Register. The Chair pointed out that these numbers would need to increase quickly if the project were to succeed. He asked Council members to consider the strategies set out in the Briefing Notes for promotion of the APEC Architect Register and the benefits that admission to it could bring. Council members generally agreed with the proposals, which called for regular dissemination of information on the APEC Architect Register to architect members of various organisations, both domestic and international, and continued communication with the APEC organisation itself.

The Council adopted the following resolution.

The Central Council agrees that:

- professional associations of architects be requested by Monitoring Committees to regularly circulate information on APEC Architect to their members;
- an information note on the function and operation of the APEC Architect Register be disseminated to all registered/licensed architects in each economy and to regulatory authority members to inform them of its existence and purpose;
- the Secretariat inform the UIA and other regional associations of architects of APEC Architect Register and its benefits;
- the Secretariat inform the HRDWG of the APEC Architect Register and its benefits;
- advice be sought by the Secretariat from the APEC organisation on any APEC initiatives that might serve APEC Architect purposes.

ITEM 11 - APPOINTMENT OF THE SECRETARIAT

Before resuming the former discussion on the introduction of a structured process for rotation of the Secretariat function, it was necessary to appoint a participating economy to take over the Secretariat role from Chinese Taipei when its term of office concluded on 31 December 2006. The Chair invited offers from any participating economy to act as Secretariat for the following two years, but none were forthcoming.

Returning to the earlier debate on how a more structured approach to the rotation of this function might be developed, the United States delegation observed that the overriding factors would appear to be time and money. It suggested that the Council give

consideration to the concept that a fee be paid by each participating economy to the acting Secretariat to partially, or completely, offset the cost of providing the service. There would clearly be a variety of matters to be taken into consideration before a final decision could be reached, such as fee collection, avoidance of taxation, equitable distribution of charges and other administrative difficulties. But it might prove to be the best way to ensure that responsibility for the management of the APEC framework was shared by all economies.

Whilst there was some hesitation about the scale of the contribution that might be needed, there was general consensus that this approach, in principle, should be pursued. Various ideas were briefly discussed. Although a fixed amount would be easier to administer, the United States delegation thought it might be possible to develop a graduated scale for small, medium sized and large economies. The Canadian delegation suggested that a flat fee might be charged at each meeting.

In the end it was agreed that a detailed proposal for financial contributions by each economy to the Secretariat to partially offset the costs of providing administrative services, possibly based on an equitable allocation related to the size of economies, should be developed for discussion at the next meeting. The United States delegation volunteered to work on these proposals, with the help of two or three other economies, and to put forward recommendations by the end of the year. Delegations from New Zealand, the Philippines and Japan all offered to join the United States to form a committee to undertake this work. The United States delegation asked all economies to share their thoughts on this subject with the committee and submit any suggestions they might have to the following email address - mbourdrez@ncarb.org.

The Chair then returned to the immediate question before the Central Council of the appointment of a participating economy to succeed Chinese Taipei in the capacity of Secretariat at the end of the year. The Council gratefully accepted the offer of the Mexican delegation to undertake the job on the basis of receiving financial support from the other economies as proposed. Their offer was greeted with applause and endorsed by all economies.

However it was clear that the proposed arrangements for financial contributions by participating economies would need to be resolved quite quickly for this to be possible. It was agreed that the committee should start work immediately on developing detailed proposals for submission to each Monitoring Committee by October and final confirmation by the Central Council by the end of December. The Central Council would ratify the proposals at its next meeting. As the incoming Secretariat, the Mexican delegation also offered to help the USA delegation with its deliberations and was accepted as a member of the US led finance committee.

Discussion on Item 11 concluded with completion of the notional schedule, started under Agenda Item 8, for participating economies to undertake the role of Secretariat for future terms of office of the Central Council. The Chair suggested that economies might consult with appropriate bodies and if possible confirm the offers by the end of the year. However the schedule was generally accepted by the Council as a notional timeframe only, and it was acknowledged that the commitments made by delegations were not binding on any economy. Nevertheless it was an interesting exercise.

The results were as follows:

SECRETARIAT SCHEDULE

YEAR	ECONOMY
2007	MEXICO
2009	USA
2011	NEW ZEALAND
2013	CANADA
2015	MALAYSIA
2017	PR CHINA
2019	PHILIPPINES
2021	THAILAND
2023	SINGAPORE
2025	KOREA
2027	JAPAN
2029	AUSTRALIA
2031	CH. TAIPEI

ITEM 12 - ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chair introduced a short paper that had been tabled earlier in the day, addressing an oversight in the Operations Manual which neglected to indicate what course of action the Central Council should take if any participating economy failed to comply with Council rules or requirements over an extended period. He apologised for the late inclusion of this item on the Agenda but said he believed that ensuring compliance with Council policy was a serious matter that should be addressed. The Canadian delegation added that the introduction of a financial commitment by each economy increased the need for establishing Council policy in this regard

There was a degree of concern that such an important issue had been introduced at such a late stage. The Malaysian delegation pointed out that there were several aspects of the proposals that would need careful consideration before any conclusions could be reached. It was generally accepted that each participating economy should be able to set its own timetable for compliance and provision would need to be made for varying circumstances.

But all present agreed that the Central Council must adopt policies to ensure the compliance of participating economies with Central Council rules and procedures within a defined timeframe, and that the matter should be included in the Agenda for the next Central Council meeting.

ITEM 13 - SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

13.1 Adoption of the Summary Conclusions

The following decisions reached on each item of the Agenda were put to each delegation for final consideration and were adopted as the Summary Conclusions of the second meeting of the Central Council. Each delegation was asked to confirm to the Secretariat the endorsement of the Summary Conclusions by the Monitoring Committee in its economy within three months of receipt of the Meeting Summary.

- **Item 6.1: Matters arising from the first Meeting of the Central Council**

On the recommendation of the Secretariat, the Central Council accorded authorisation to the newly formed Monitoring Committees of Korea and Singapore and received their representatives as members of the Central Council.

- **Item 6.2: Authorisation of Newly Formed Monitoring Committees**

The Central Council agrees that future applications for the authorisation of newly-formed Monitoring Committees be assessed by the Secretariat, subject to completion of the Survey Application for Authorisation and submission of required additional information on education and accreditation systems, for subsequent determination by the Central Council.

- **Item 6.3: Central Council Membership**

The Central Council received the nominated representatives of Monitoring Committees to its membership. (Appendix 1)

- **Item 7.1: Inauguration of the APEC Architect Register**

The Central Council confirms the previously agreed Monitoring Committee website and database guidelines, modified in accordance with any decisions taken at the meeting;

The Central Council agrees that:

- *information on Central Council and Monitoring Committee websites to be updated at maximum intervals of six months;*
- *where possible, economies that have not yet done so to complete their websites in accordance with Council decisions within the three months following the meeting.*
- *the Secretariat will advise each economy of any deficiency of its website.*

- **Item 7.2: Documentation**

The Central Council confirms adoption of the structure of the form for the 'Record of Seven Year Period of Professional Experience' as a Registered /Licensed Architect, modified to include the four nominated categories of architectural practice, and the structure of the form for the 'Application for Registration as an APEC Architect', as minimum requirements. The Central Council agrees that Monitoring Committees must ensure that the variations they introduce to these base documents include the required minimum information.

The Central Council also agrees that:

- *The APEC Architect Certificate of Registration should be of uniform design and that the proposed layout should be modified to require the signature of the Chair of the member economy Monitoring Committee only, together with the seal of the APEC Architect Central Council.*
- *Australia to submit a revised design of the document to the Central Council for agreement together with a proposal for the design of the seal.*
- *The proposed ID card design should be adopted by all economies, modified to include the expiration date on the face of the card, and with the wording on the reverse of the card to read: "The bearer of this card is an architect enrolled on the APEC Architect Register which is maintained jointly by the member economies".*

The revised Record of 7 Year Professional Experience is attached (**Appendix 2**)

- **Item 7.3: Monitoring Committee Reports to the Central Council**

The Central Council agrees, as a quality assurance measure, to adopt a standard format for the six-month Monitoring Committee reports to the Central Council.

The agreed draft report form is attached (**Appendix 3**)

- **Item 8: Central Council Administration**

The Central Council received the report of the Secretariat on its experience in administering the business of the Central Council in its first term of office.

- **Item 9.2: APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework**

The APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework is attached (**Appendix 4**)

- **Item 10: Promotion**

The Central Council agrees that:

- *professional associations of architects be requested by Monitoring Committees to regularly circulate information on APEC Architect to their members;*
- *an information note on the function and operation of the APEC Architect Register be disseminated to all registered/licensed architects in each economy and to regulatory authority members to inform them of its existence and purpose;*
- *the Secretariat inform the UIA and other regional associations of architects of the APEC Architect Register and its benefits;*
- *the Secretariat inform the HRDWG of the APEC Architect Register and its benefits;*
- *advice be sought by the Secretariat from the APEC organisation on any APEC initiatives that might serve APEC Architect purposes.*

- **Item 11 - Appointment of The Secretariat**

The Central Council agrees that a fee be paid by each participating economy to the Secretariat to contribute to the cost of providing this service. The Council accepts the offer of the US delegation supported by Japan, New Zealand and the Philippines to develop detailed proposals for this purpose. It also agrees that the US led committee send its proposals for financial contributions to each Monitoring Committee by October 2006, each Monitoring Committee will confirm by 31 December 2006.

The Central Council welcomes the offer of Mexico to act as the next Secretariat from the first day of January 2007 to December 31 2008, in accordance with receiving financial support of all economies as previously agreed.

- **Item 12: Any Other Business**

The Central Council agrees that it must adopt policies to ensure compliance of participating economies with Central Council rules and procedures within an agreed timeframe and that the matter be included in the Agenda for the next Council meeting.

- **Item 13.1: Adoption of the Summary Conclusions**

In view of the two yearly intervals between Central Council meetings, endorsement by the authorised Monitoring Committees of the Summary Conclusions of this meeting to be notified to the Secretariat within three months of receipt so that decisions taken by the Central Council at its meeting in Mexico City may be acted upon.

- **Item 14: Next Meeting of the Central Council**

The Central Council has determined that the next APEC Architect meeting will be held in Vancouver, Canada in early August, 2008, with the exact date to be determined by Canada.

13.2 Operations Manual

The Council also agreed that the Operations Manual be amended to incorporate the decisions taken by the Central Council at the meeting, and circulated to delegates in draft form for endorsement by participating economies.

ITEM 14 - NEXT MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL

The offer of the Canadian delegation to host the next Central Council meeting in Vancouver in early August 2008, on a date to be determined by Canada, was warmly welcomed and accepted by the other members of Council.

This concluded the business of the Second Meeting of the Central Council. The Chair personally thanked all present for their participation and contribution to the successful outcome of the meeting. The United States delegation responded on behalf of all delegates to thank Mexico for hosting an excellent meeting and the Australian delegation expressed the gratitude of the Central Council to the Chinese Taipei Secretariat for the great work it done for the past two years.

ITEM 6.3 - CENTRAL COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

The Central Council received the following Monitoring Committee nominees as its members.

Economy	Title	First Name	Last Name
Australia	Mr	Brian	Wright
	Mrs	Christine	Harding
	Mr	Edward	Haysom
Canada	Mr	Kiyoshi	Matsuzaki
	Mr	Jon F.	Hobbs
People's Republic of China	Mr	Lu	Xiu
	Mr	Kai	Cui
	Mr	Baiping	Zhang
	Mr	Zoasheng	Wang
	Ms	Chen	Cai
	Mr	Weimin	Zhuang
Hong Kong China	Prof.	Bernard V	Lim
	Mr	Bernard	Hui
	Prof.	Edwin	Chan
	Mr	Thomas	Ling
	Ms	Rita	Cheung
	Mr	Edward	Shen
	Dr	Roland	Lu
	Ms	Anna	Kwong
Japan	Mr	Kyran	Sze
	Prof	Sadao	Watanabe
	Mr	Toshihiko	Hayakawa
	Mr	Yasunori	Yamanaka
	Mr	Hiroki	Sunohara
	Ms	Michiko	Yamauchi
Republic of Korea	Mr	Junichi	Gohda
	Mr	Kun Chang	Yi
	Mr	Chun Gya	Shin
	Mr	Pil Hoon	Lee
	Mr	Sang Leem	Lee
	Mr	Chi Tok	Kim
Malaysia	Mr	Seok Jun	Moon
	Mr	Esa	Mohamed
Republic of Mexico	Ar.	Nur Haizi	Abdul Hai
	Arq.	Hector	Garcia Escorza
	Arq.	Jose M.	Reachi
	Arq.	Fernando	Mora
	Arq.	Aaron	Bernal
	Arq.	Cuauhtemoc	Vega
	Arq.	Bernardo	Gomez-Pimienta
	Arq.	Luis Enrique	Lopez Cardiel
	Arq.	Mauricio	Rivero Borrel
	Arq.	M. Rosario	Dominguez
Lic.	Rolando	Paniagua	

New Zealand	Ms	Jane	Aimer
	Mr	Richard	Harris
	Ms	Jennifer	Pelvin
	Mr	Ron	Pynenburg
Republic of the Philippines	Archt.	Prosperidad	Luis
	Archt.	Enrique	Olonan
	Archt.	Eugene	Gan
	Archt.	Edric Marco	Florentino
Singapore	Mr	Sui Him	Chan
	Mr	Kok Bin Patrick	Chia
	Mr	Lye Hock Larry	Ng
Chinese Taipei	Mr	Yuan-Liang	Cheng
	Mr	Joshua Jih	Pan
	Mr	Chikung	Wang
	Mr	Fu-Hsin	Lien
	Mr	Chin-Ling	Chen
	Mr	Ming-Wen	Tsai
	Mr	Hwa Song	Lee
	Mr	Ching-Liang	Lee
	Mr	Ching-Chang	Huang
	Mr	Chien-Mei	Hsu
	Thailand	Mr	Mati
Dr		Pongsak	Vadhansindhu
Mr		Sukit	Suppermpool
Mr		Smith	Obayawat
Mr		Michael Paripol	Tangtronchit
United States of America	Ms	Katherine	Schwennsen
	Mr	Stewart	RK
	Ms	Ellen	Delage
	Mr	H. Carleton	Godsey
	Mr	Robert	Luke
	Mr	Douglas	Engebretson
	Mr	Michiel	Bourdrez

**RECORD OF SEVEN YEAR PERIOD OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AS
A REGISTERED / LICENSED ARCHITECT**

APPLICANT DETAILS

Name:

Business Address:

Home Economy / Jurisdiction of Registration:

Registration Number:

Date of Initial Registration:

Current Registration in other Jurisdictions:

Applicants for APEC Architect registration are requested to complete the following record of relevant experience, starting with a report of the minimum 3-year period of practice as an architect with professional responsibility for projects undertaken. This experience may be acquired either as the architect with sole professional responsibility for a building of moderate complexity (Table 1), or as the architect in charge of a significant aspect of a complex building (Table 2), or a combination of these. Please list projects in reverse date order, starting with most recent period first.

3 YEAR PERIOD OF PRACTICE AS AN ARCHITECT WITH PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROJECTS UNDERTAKEN.

Table 1

Architect: with sole professional responsibility for the design, documentation and contract administration of buildings of moderate complexity.

Project Date From (m/y) To (m/y)	Name of organisation, architectural practice	Name and brief description of relevant project (s) with reference to level of complexity (Eg: size, concept, occupancy, technologies, site)	Role of applicant (Principal, sole practitioner, other)

Table 2

Working in collaboration with other architects, architect in charge of and professionally responsible for a significant aspect of the design, documentation and/or contract administration of complex buildings.

Project date From: (m / y) To: (m / y)	Name of organisation, architectural practice	Name and brief description of relevant project (s) with reference to level of complexity (Eg: size, concept, occupancy, technologies, site)	Area of professional responsibility

EXPERIENCE GAINED IN ADDITIONAL 4 YEAR PERIOD OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AS AN ARCHITECT

Applicants are asked to record a minimum period of four years additional professional experience that they have gained in all of the following **categories of architectural practice**:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| A. Preliminary Studies and Preparation of Brief | C. Contract Documentation |
| B. Design | D. Administration |

Table 3

Project date From: (m / y) To: (m / y)	Name of organisation, architectural practice	Name and brief description of relevant project (s)	Categories of experience gained (A, B, C, or D)	Role of applicant (Principal, assistant, other)

VERIFICATION OF RECORD

Signature of Applicant.

I hereby declare that the above information is correct.

Signed by:

Date:

References

Each period of professional experience recorded above must be supported by a statement confirming the information provided and signed by an appropriate referee.

Please list the names and positions held by professional associates familiar with the projects undertaken, who have provided the required references attached to this submission. The Monitoring Committee may request further information from nominated referees.

Name, position held, and contact details of each referee:

MONITORING COMMITTEE SURVEY REPORT TO CENTRAL COUNCIL
Report Period: 1 July xxxx – 1 January xxxx

Name of Economy:

Please provide the following information and appropriate comments as requested.

A. APEC ARCHITECT REGISTER DATABASE

1. Please state the total number of architects on your economy's section of the APEC Architect Register?

Number of APEC Architects:

2. How many APEC architects have been admitted to, and removed from your economy's section of the APEC Architect Register during the six month report period?

Admissions:

Removals:

3. Did any applications for registration as an APEC Architect in the report period require more than 3 months to process?

Yes / No

4. If the answer to 3 is 'Yes', please briefly describe the reasons for the extended assessment period

Comment:

5. Were any applications for registration as an APEC Architect rejected, or any significant problems encountered, in the report period?

Yes / No

6. If the answer to 5 is 'Yes', please briefly describe the circumstances.

Comment:

B. APEC ARCHITECT MOBILITY

1. At the start of the 6 month report period, which of the following reciprocal requirements for the professional recognition of APEC Architects from other economies had been made by your economy:

- a) Domain specific tests
- b) Comprehensive examination
- c) Host economy experience/residency
- d) Other

a) b) c) d) Please state:

2. During the report period, have any changes been made to the recognition requirements for APEC Architects from other participating economies stated above?

Yes / No

- 3 If the answer to 2 is 'Yes', please briefly describe the circumstances.

Comment:

3. How many APEC Architects from other economies are currently registered / \licensed to practise as architects in your economy?

Number of APEC Architects:

4. Please state the number, and home economy, of APEC Architects admitted to registration / licensure in your economy during the 6 month report period.

Number:

Home economies::

5. In those economies that require APEC Architects from elsewhere only to undergo domain specific tests, please describe briefly what aspects of architectural practice are reviewed for this purpose.

Comment:

6. Are tests on domain specific issues conducted by interview, written examination or a combination of both?

Comment:

C. NOTIFICATION OF RELEVANT CHANGES TO HOME ECONOMY PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION REQUIREMENTS

1. During the 6 month report period, have any changes been made to the professional recognition systems in your economy that may conflict with agreed APEC Architect criteria and policy?

Yes / No

2. If the answer to 1 is 'Yes', please briefly describe any relevant changes to:

- a) architectural education
- b) accreditation/recognition systems
- c) registration/licensure requirements

Comment:

D. ADDITIONAL MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE CENTRAL COUNCIL

1. Please advise the Central Council of any significant developments, new policy directions, forthcoming legislation or other activities in your economy that may facilitate the mobility of architects within the APEC region.

Comment:

2. You are invited to raise any matters of concern relating to APEC Architect provisions and policy, or to put forward any suggestion for their improvement for the consideration of the Central Council.

Comment:

ITEM 9 - APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework

The Central Council agrees to introduce a Reciprocal Recognition Framework to provide a structured basis for the reciprocal recognition of home economies' registration / certification requirements for APEC Architects from foreign economies.

The Central Council agrees that:

1. the Framework to be based on the following three categories of registration/certification requirements:
 - a) Domain specific assessment
 - b) Comprehensive registration examination
 - c) Period of host economy residence/experience

The Central Council notes that some participating economies do not yet provide for the independent practice of architects from other economies. It is understood that they will work towards liberalising their current restrictions in the near future.

The Central Council agrees that:

2. each economy nominate the most liberal of the three categories of registration/certification requirements it is prepared to offer APEC Architects from other economies;
3. in order to maintain a reciprocal basis for the assessment of applicants from economies that have committed to a more restrictive category of registration /certification requirements, an economy may choose to impose a similar level of requirements to that of the applicant's economy;
4. the commitments made by each economy to categories of professional registration /certification to be recorded in standard format on each Monitoring Committee website and summarised as the Reciprocal Recognition Framework on the APEC Architect Central Council website;
5. any changes to an economy's professional registration / certification requirements to be notified immediately to the Central Council;
6. participating economies with similar reciprocal recognition commitments consider negotiation of mutual recognition agreements in the near future.

**THE APEC ARCHITECT
RECIPROCAL RECOGNITION FRAMEWORK
2006**

The Reciprocal Recognition Framework identifies participating economies that have adopted the same registration / certification requirements for APEC Architects from foreign economies, thus establishing a reciprocal basis for the recognition of APEC Architects from those economies. In assessing APEC Architects from economies with more restrictive categories of requirements, host economies may impose similar requirements to those of the applicant's economy.

<p style="text-align: center;">Domain Specific Assessment</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Understanding of legal and technical issues unique to the host economy.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comprehensive Registration Examination</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Examination of all skills and knowledge required for the practice of architecture</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Host Economy Residence / Experience</p> <p style="text-align: center;">At least one year of professional experience in host economy prior to registration examination</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">AUSTRALIA</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CHINESE TAIPEI</p> <p style="text-align: center;">JAPAN</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MEXICO</p> <p style="text-align: center;">NEW ZEALAND</p> <p style="text-align: center;">SINGAPORE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">UNITED STATES</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">HONG KONG CHINA</p>

OTHER PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION ARRANGEMENTS

Other APEC Architect participating economies do not yet provide for the independent practice of architects from other economies. It is understood that they are working towards liberalising their current restrictions in the near future.