



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY
of
FIFTH APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETING

4-5 October 2012
Hotel Intercontinental, Wellington, New Zealand

Item 1: Powhiri / Welcome to Attendees

The Fifth APEC Architect Project Central Council meeting (the meeting) began with a Maori welcome or powhiri conducted by architect Henare Walmsley.

Conference attendees then took their seats and **the Chair**, Mr Warwick Bell, declared the meeting open. The Chair introduced the other persons who were assisting with the running of the meeting. The Chair confirmed that all attendees had received their agenda papers.

Item 2: APEC Central Council Meeting Procedures

The Chair outlined a set of protocols for the meeting, these being as follows:

- 1. APEC is a grouping of economies and not countries. As such, economies participating in the APEC Architect project shall be referred to as "participating economies".*
- 2. participating economies attending the 5th Central Council Meeting are each assigned up to three front row seats, and only attendees occupying those seats may speak.*
- 3. all contributions are entirely voluntary.*
- 4. the business of the Central Council Meeting shall be conducted in English.*
- 5. attendees wishing to speak shall indicate their wish to speak by raising their economy's name plate.*
- 6. the Chair of the meeting shall recognise each attendee's desire to speak by acknowledging his or her economy (ie not the attendee's name).*
- 7. in general, the leader of each economy's delegation speaks, though he/she may ask another member of his/her economy's delegation to speak.*
- 8. all contributions shall be to the Chair.*
- 9. in general decisions shall be by consensus, but if a vote is required a simple majority will suffice for a resolution to be adopted.*

The protocols were agreed to without dissent.

Item 3: Central Council Membership

Participating economies advised the Central Council of the names of their representatives at the meeting, these being as follows:

Nino BELLANTONIO	AUSTRALIA	Alfredo PO	PHILIPPINES
Christine HARDING	AUSTRALIA	Edric Marco FLORENTINO	PHILIPPINES
Pierre GALLANT	CANADA	Yolanda REYES	PHILIPPINES
Michael ERNEST	CANADA	Medeliano ROLDAN	PHILIPPINES
BAIPANG, Zhang	CHINA	NG, Lye Hock Larry	SINGAPORE
SHENGHUI, Chen	CHINA	SOH, Siow Lan Rita	SINGAPORE
XIU, Lu	CHINA	CHEN, Yin-Ho	CHINESE TAIPEI
ZHUANG, Weimin	CHINA	HUANG, Ching-Chang	CHINESE TAIPEI
FUNG, Yin Suen	HONG KONG	LUAN, Chung-Pi	CHINESE TAIPEI
LAM, Kwong Ki	HONG KONG	LIEN, Fu-Hsin	CHINESE TAIPEI
Hiroshi ASANO	JAPAN	HSU, Chien-Mei	CHINESE TAIPEI
Hiroki SUNOHARA	JAPAN	LIU, Kuo-Lung	CHINESE TAIPEI
Michiko YAMAUCHI	JAPAN	CHEN, Shau-Tsyh	CHINESE TAIPEI
CHO, In-Souk	KOREA	CHENG, I-Ping	CHINESE TAIPEI
KIM, Chi Tok	KOREA	CHAO, Yicheng	CHINESE TAIPEI
Saifuddin AHMAD	MALAYSIA	Teeraboon	THAILAND
Zuraina Leily AWALLUDIN	MALAYSIA	CHALONGMANEERAT	THAILAND
Esa bin MOHAMED	MALAYSIA	Michael Paripol	THAILAND
Amer Hamzah MOHD YUNUS	MALAYSIA	TANGTRONGCHIT	THAILAND
TAN, Pei Ing	MALAYSIA	Stephen NUTT	USA
David Cabrera-Ruiz	MEXICO	Warwick BELL	CHAIR
Callum MCKENZIE	NEW ZEALAND	Paul JACKMAN	SECRETARY
Tony van RAAT	NEW ZEALAND		
Christina van BOHEMEN	NEW ZEALAND		
Rozanno ROSAL	PHILIPPINES		

Item 4: Adoption of the Agenda

The Chair asked the participating economies if there was anything that anyone wished to add to the agenda, there being none.

The late report from Canada was distributed to attendees.

The Chair said that he sought the meeting's approval for the meeting summary to record the signing on the evening of 3 October 2012 of:

- an APEC Architect bilateral between Chinese Taipei and New Zealand
- a memorandum of understanding between Hong Kong and New Zealand in regard to degree recognition for initial registration purposes
- a memorandum of understanding between Australia, Canada and New Zealand in regard to their intention to negotiate an APEC Architect trilateral.

The meeting concurred.

Item 5: Confirmation of the Meeting Summary of the Fourth APEC Architect Central Council Meeting (Manila)

The meeting reviewed and adopted the Meeting Summary of the Fourth APEC Architect Central Council meeting in Manila 10 and 11 October 2010. Moved Canada, seconded Malaysia.

Distribution of Photo-DVDs, Manila Meeting, 2010

The Philippines distributed a DVD of photographs of the Fourth APEC Architect Central Council Meeting in 2010 in Manila.

Item 6: Reporting

Item 6.1: Applications to Form New Monitoring Committees

The Secretary, Mr Paul Jackman, advised that so far during 2011 and 2012 no inquiries had been received regarding any other economies participating in the APEC Architect Project.

The Chair noted that he had invited the other seven APEC economies not participating in the project to send observers to the meeting. The Chair said once he explained that any observers would have to meet their own travel and accommodation costs no further communication occurred.

Item 6.2: Monitoring Committee Reports to the Central Council

Participating economies spoke to their written reports as circulated.

New Zealand reported that currently New Zealand has seven APEC Architects. New Zealand continued to use interviews to determine who may be admitted to the register, this having recently resulted in an application being declined for the first time. New Zealand remained at “domain specific” in terms of the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework.

Australia reported that during 2011 and 2012 so far, 7 Australian architects had been added to the Register, resulting in a total of 17 Australian APEC Architects. Australia had entered into bilateral and other arrangements and was continuing to promote the project to Australian architects.

Malaysia reported that during 2011 and 2012 so far, 3 Malaysian architects had been added to the Register, resulting in a total of 11 Malaysian APEC Architects. Malaysia remained at “local collaboration” in terms of the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework, but the intention was to move to a more liberal regime in the coming years. Malaysia’s legislation had been amended to allow foreign persons to become registered in Malaysia.

Japan reported that during 2011 and 2012 so far, 49 Japanese architects had been added to the Register, resulting in a total of 352 Japanese APEC Architects. Japan had adopted the revised APEC Architect certificate and ID card provided by the Secretariat. Japan had reciprocal arrangements with Australia and New Zealand and remained at “domain specific” in terms of the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework.

Japan had published an English translation of the revised Kenchikushi law, and copies would be distributed to attendees.

Philippines reported that to date the Philippines had 40 APEC Architects. The Philippines was using the revised APEC Architect certificate and ID card provided by the Secretariat. The hosting of the Fourth Central Council Meeting in 2010 had been used in the Philippines to promote the APEC Architect project. At that event the Philippines and Chinese Taipei had signed a memorandum of understanding in regard to their intention to negotiate an APEC Architect bilateral in the future.

Korea asked the Philippines why, according to the Philippines report, there had been no additions to the Register in the Philippines during 2011 and 2012. **The Philippines** replied that organising the 2010 Central Council meeting and writing the Meeting Summary had been all consuming, but further applications were expected.

China reported that recently the Architectural Society of China had identified and listed 100 architects who were available for foreign architects seeking local architects to collaborate with. These 100 architects were being encouraged to become Chinese APEC Architects, the current total being 77 Chinese APEC Architects. China had signed a registration agreement with Hong Kong and was starting talks with USA, Canada, Japan, Korea and Singapore, there being a visit to Canada and the USA in late October 2012. Singapore would be sending a delegation to China in December 2012.

Chinese Taipei reported that currently they have 90 APEC Architects, with no additions having taken place during the review period. Chinese Taipei was promoting to APEC Architect Project to the central government and universities, and on 3 October 2012 has signed an APEC Architect bilateral with New Zealand.

The United States of America (USA) reported that during 2011 and 2012 so far, 11 USA architects had been added to the Register, resulting in a total of 47 USA APEC Architects. The USA remained at “domain specific” in terms of the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework. The USA noted that in the absence of any APEC Architect bilaterals so far, foreign architects could access the “Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect” procedure which allowed foreign architects with seven years’ experience to be assessed and, if successful, granted a NCARB certificate that was accepted for initial registration in 45 of the 54 US jurisdictions.

Singapore asked to be provided with the names of those jurisdictions and the USA undertook to provide that information.

The **USA** asked that in future the APEC Participating Economy Report Form could include the total number of architects in each economy.

Thailand reported that to date they have no APEC Architects on the Register. Thailand said this was because of the very strict regulations of the Architect Council of Thailand. Thailand said the APEC Architect Project would be promoted at upcoming exhibitions. Thailand remained at “local collaboration” in terms of the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework.

The Chair asked for further details in terms of those regulatory inhibitions. **Thailand** responded that Thailand's Architect Act would have to be amended to have a new definition of an APEC Architect and this was very difficult. Otherwise being an APEC Architect would be just a casual thing, Thailand said. **The Chair** suggested that perhaps this was too restrictive as Thai architects might benefit from using the title when working in other places. It was agreed this would be worth exploring outside the main meeting.

Singapore reported that they now have six APEC Architects. Singapore said the next step would be to have a cross-border registration based on her arrangements with Australia and New Zealand. Singapore had adopted the revised APEC Architect certificate and ID card provided by the Secretariat. The APEC Architect Project would be promoted at a seminar in November 2012.

Singapore noted that they had asked for the Fifth Central Council Meeting to be moved, given that it clashed with the World Architecture Festival in Singapore. Singapore said they were exploring the possibility of an APEC Architect bilateral with Japan. Singapore remained at "domain specific" in terms of the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework.

Singapore said copies of a magazine describing Singapore's work in terms of being a "vertical green" city would be distributed to attendees.

The Chair responded that it had been impossible to move the dates of the meeting because of commitments already entered into.

The Chair briefed attendees on the arrangements for that evening's dinner and entertainment.

The meeting adjourned for morning tea.

The meeting resumed at 11.18 am

Hong Kong reported that during 2011 and 2012 so far, 11 architects had been added to the Register, resulting in a total of 47 Hong Kong APEC Architects. Hong Kong reported that changes had been made to the way the Hong Kong Monitoring Committee was organised with better integration with the Hong Kong Institute of Architects and the Registering Board for architects in Hong Kong.

Hong Kong had adopted the revised APEC Architect certificate and ID card provided by the Secretariat. Hong Kong architects were being encouraged to become APEC Architects.

Hong Kong said it has been wrongly reported on the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework and Hong Kong should be recorded as being at the "local collaboration" stage. Hong Kong added that they intended in the next two years to examine whether Hong Kong could advance on the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework.

Canada reported that they intended to promote the APEC Architect Project across Canada more actively in the future. The principles of the APEC Architect Project were

in accord with Canada's public policy. In the meantime, foreign architects could obtain project-specific temporary licences in Canada and new procedures were now in place for foreign architects seeking registration in Canada which were available on line. Canada was proud to have signed a memorandum of understanding with Australia and New Zealand in regard to negotiating an APEC Architect trilateral.

Korea reported a marked drop off in the number of architects in Korea becoming APEC Architects. Promotional activities were being organised. Korea remained at "local collaboration" in terms of the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework.

However, Korea was going to discuss moving to domain specific with Japan and China at upcoming discussions in November in China. Korea was interested in better matching the appointment period of its APEC Architect Monitoring Committee to domestic appointment patterns.

Korea said it had been asked by its government to find out whether government officials were on monitoring committees in other economies. The Chair said this question would be answered shortly.

The Chair advised that Mexico had been unable to prepare a report and would provide its report to the Secretariat shortly.

The meeting was then opened to general discussion.

New Zealand commented that no APEC Architect had ever used the APEC Architect framework to seek a cross-border fast-track registration, despite all the efforts of participating economies. New Zealand said this was a concern and New Zealand would like to hear the views of participating economies.

Malaysia commented that the playing fields were not level for different economies. In many economies there were issues with immigration laws and other domestic regulations and rules. Malaysia had taken a pragmatic route so that within ASEAN local collaboration was required. However, Malaysia was changing its legislation to dispense with residency requirements for local registration.

Hong Kong said they intended to move to domain specific in terms of the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework. However, Hong Kong suggested perhaps the Secretariat could explore with all participating economies the proposal that all participating economies could recognise all APEC Architects from all participating economies as a whole, given that all APEC Architects have had seven years' experience to a very high standard and only small numbers of architects were involved.

Korea asked why a number of APEC economies were not participating in the APEC Architects Project.

USA said the best way the APEC Architect Project could be advanced was for economies to eliminate residency and citizenship requirements from registration. The USA said the BEFA programme in the US had no citizenship or residency requirement and yet only 12 foreign architects had used it successfully since 2004, so maybe international practice was a collaborative effort and would remain so.

Singapore said it would be useful to ascertain what the benefits were of being an APEC Architect as a guide to encouraging architects to participate in the APEC Architect Project. Singapore added that in Singapore out of 172 foreign architects there were 22 Australians and 4 New Zealanders registered as architects, so Singapore would like to promote to them the notion of becoming Singapore APEC Architects and then being more easily able to be registered in their country of origin.

New Zealand commented that clearly cross-border work happens and thrives around the world regardless of the APEC Architect Project. The potential in the APEC Architect Project lay in combination with migration. More typically, the easiest way to undertake offshore work was via local collaboration with locals who had local knowledge. After 10 years and a huge investment of effort to produce small results of relevance only to migration, the APEC Architect project needed to be considered in a bigger space than that alone.

Korea asked Singapore to explain what Singapore meant when earlier they had said they had 172 foreign architects.

Singapore responded that the architects referred to were registered in Singapore so they could submit plans to the building authorities in Singapore. Singapore said in one case a New Zealander registered in Singapore had said he wanted to be registered in New Zealand, as a positive thing. Singapore was also looking at developing new procedures for allowing for a form of registration for foreign architects who were collaborating with local architects.

Korea asked whether the foreign architects practising in Singapore were registered in Singapore or elsewhere.

Singapore replied that these architects were registered in Singapore.

USA asked whether the Australians and New Zealanders registered in Singapore were first registered in Singapore or were registered in Australia or New Zealand first and then registered in Singapore.

Singapore replied that it was a mix.

USA said a lot of people from the USA studied architecture overseas and became registered overseas and then struggled to become registered in the USA.

The Chair said this had revealed a potential benefit of the APEC Architect Project which was to provide a way for architects who had studied, worked and then become registered overseas to be able to practice in their places of origin. Another benefit was where actual migration was taking place.

Malaysia said the aim of the APEC Architect Project was to allow for full registration in a host economy and that should remain the goal.

New Zealand commented that the purpose of the APEC Architect Project was to eliminate local experience requirements for cross border registrations.

Australia said in the past not enough effort had gone into identifying the benefits of the APEC Architect Project and promoting them.

Singapore said the Board of Architects, Singapore treated Singaporeans and foreigners equally in terms of registration. There used to be a residency requirement for registration, but that had been removed some years ago.

The Chair asked participating economies to respond to Korea's question of whether there were government appointees on their APEC Architect monitoring committees.

In response:

- Australia answered no
- Canada answered no
- China answered that their monitoring committee comprised representatives from the government sector, the registration board, the Architecture Institute, the academic circle and practising architects
- Hong Kong said 10 committee members were nominated by the Institute of Architects and 1 was a government appointee
- Japan said no, though their Monitoring Committee was established by the related ministries
- Korea said it had one government official on its monitoring committee
- Malaysia said the Board of Architects established the APEC Architect Monitoring Committee and the Board of Architects was under the Ministry of Works
- Mexico answered no
- New Zealand answered no, though the New Zealand Registered Architects Board, which appoints the monitoring committee, is government appointed
- Philippines answered that the government appointed a representative on the monitoring committee
- Singapore answered that the Registrar was a public servant and on the monitoring committee
- Chinese Taipei said seven members of the monitoring committee were appointed by the Government
- Thailand answered no
- USA said there was no federal input but some committee members served on state registration boards, and thus may be governor appointed.

Korea thanked participating economies for this information.

Singapore commented that what mattered was whether the persons serving on monitoring committees were the right people to drive the project forward.

The Chair asked the USA to respond to an earlier question regarding how they deal with registration applications from foreign Architects.

USA said NCARB's Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect Programme was now accepted by 45 or the USA's 54 jurisdictions. Of the nine US jurisdictions still not accepting the programme, another four or five would probably come to accept it. Also

some of the USA jurisdictions not accepting the programme were developing their own procedures for registration applications from foreign architects.

The meeting adjourned for lunch.

The meeting resumed at 1.52 pm.

Item 6.3: Promotion of the APEC Architect Register

Participating economies were invited to report on their activities to promote the APEC Architect Project and in particular, their architects becoming APEC Architects.

In response:

- Australia said the APEC Architect Project was promoted on the Architects Accreditation Council of Australia website.
- Canada said that recent changes meant the APEC Architect Project was now clearly the responsibility of the regulator and this should lead to much better results in the future.
- Hong Kong said effective promotion had resulted in 11 more Hong Kong APEC Architects in the last two years.
- Japan said information about the APEC Architect Project had been distributed through the various architects' organisations in Japan.
- Korea reported that its intended upcoming trilateral should allow for better marketing.
- Malaysia said it promoted the APEC Architect Project through regular seminars, though architects at these seminars had asked what were the benefits.
- Mexico said it had nothing to report at this stage.
- New Zealand reported that a professional development opportunity had been organised alongside the Central Council meeting discussing possibilities for exporting architectural services. The New Zealand registered Architects Board used its newsletters to architects to promote the APEC Architect Project. Looking to the future, New Zealand said promoting the APEC Architect Project to architectural students through the architectural schools would be worthwhile.
- The Philippines advised that the APEC Architect Project would be promoted at an upcoming meeting of the United Architects of the Philippines. Another idea mooted was that those Architects who were members of the College of Fellows could become APEC Architects.
- Singapore said it would promote the APEC Architect Project at a yearly ceremony for young architects and at an upcoming Architects Regional Council of Asia conference.
- Chinese Taipei said it wanted to promote the APEC Architect Project by encouraging government support, marketing to architects and students and the negotiation of APEC Architect bilaterals.
- Thailand said it would promote the APEC Architect Project through its newsletters to architects and at an exhibition next year.
- USA said the NCARB website had a specific section on the APEC Architect Project.

- China said it had provided a briefing on the APEC Architect Project to architects from eight major design firms and others from the sector. A handbook being prepared for architects practising in China would include information about the APEC Architect Project.

The Chair summed up the discussion as suggesting that the following were ways that the APEC Architect Project could be promoted:

- promoting the project to senior architecture students
- using the negotiation of MRAs as marketing opportunities
- participating economy websites
- using professional development activities as a promotional vehicle
- newsletters to architects
- linkages to other bilaterals
- presence at conferences, seminars and exhibitions
- good government relations
- promoting communications between APEC Architects.

Malaysia said it was clear that among participating economies many architects were doing cross-border work and they should be encouraged to become APEC Architects.

The Chair asked participating economies to give their views on whether it was worthwhile to promote the project to architecture students.

New Zealand said that this was a very worthwhile suggestion and architecture students should be shown the international aspects of the work they were going to do.

Hong Kong concurred, saying this would be done.

USA said economies should accept time spent working offshore in terms of work experience requirements for initial registration.

New Zealand said the USA's idea had merit, but probably it would work better if regionally specific.

Australia said student exchange programmes between APEC economies should be encouraged.

New Zealand said from experience they needed a lot of organising between economies, but were good if they worked.

Malaysia said within the ASEAN framework there was a successful internship programme for students from other countries.

Hong Kong said their rules required two year's work experience for initial registration and one year of this could be served overseas. Hong Kong added that a APEC Architect student design competition was worth considering.

The Philippines said to promote the APEC Architect project to students the benefits needed to be identified in terms of preparing students for global competition.

New Zealand responded that competitions were good in principle but difficult to organise.

Malaysia said the competition idea was premature and the focus should be on getting APEC Architects registered.

The Philippines said the focus should be on architects.

The Chair said the suggestion of an APEC Architect Student competition seemed to have lapsed. The Chair asked participating economies if they had any further thoughts to share on the benefits of the APEC Architect Project.

Canada said the main benefit of being an APEC Architect was time saved when seeking registration in another economy.

Singapore said the APEC framework needed to go beyond just commercial issues and have a high agenda about issues such as global warming, green architecture and sustainability.

The Chair asked if carrying the APEC Architect title conferred a benefit in terms of the status of the title.

Korea responded that it had heard reports of the title had been useful for a Korean architect pitching for work in Africa.

The Secretary said that the APEC Engineers Project was seen by the organisation that represents engineers in New Zealand as being about a title for very senior engineers that provided them with international status and nothing more.

Australia said it was too soon to tell whether the same benefit applied for holders of the APEC Architect title.

Malaysia said it was working towards getting the APEC Architect ID card recognised for transiting Malaysian airports via the APEC entry lane.

Philippines, China and Korea said the APEC Architect ID card worked sometimes in their airports and sometimes not.

Kong Kong and Malaysia said in their economies APEC Business Cards from their immigration departments were required in airports.

Malaysia suggested the APEC Architect Secretariat should keep a data base of available projects that APEC Architects could tender for.

The Chair said it would be worthwhile drawing together the various benefits of the APEC Architects Project. The Chair noted that the benefits that had been identified were:

- purposes of migration
- recognising transfer of experience from one economy to another
- purpose of allowing architects who have studied and practiced overseas to return home to practice
- savings in time and cost in registering in another economy
- stature in home economy
- stature out of region
- branding value internationally.

Item 6.4: Update on Agreements Signed by Economies

The Chair noted that the participating economies' reports had identified all the mutual recognition arrangements or relevant memorandums of understandings currently in place, in addition to the three arrangements and MOUs signed on 3 October 2012.

Item 6.5: Update on the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework

Status

The APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status as agreed to in 2010 was placed on the meeting's monitors. **The Chair** noted that:

- the United States of America, Singapore, New Zealand, Republic of Mexico, Japan, Australia and Chinese Taipei were recorded under "Domain Specific Assessment"
- Malaysia was recorded under "Host Economy Residence/Experience"
- Philippines, Korea, Hong Kong China, China, Canada, Thailand and Malaysia were recorded as "Local Collaboration".

Malaysia responded that they should be recorded at "Local Collaboration"

Canada said they should be recorded under "Domain Specific".

The revised 2012 APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status is recorded in annex 1.

Malaysia asked if a definition was available as to what "Domain Specific" meant.

The Secretary said it was up to each economy to determine what its domain specific assessment procedure should be. He said in New Zealand's case the procedure was described in detail on the New Zealand Registered Architects Board's website.

Australia said that the application form that it uses provides all the required information.

The Chair said the Secretariat would draw together the relevant information from the "domain specific" economies.

Canada said they had identified as "domain specific" because they had a mutual recognition agreement with the United States and Mexico.

Hong Kong asked Singapore, Australia and New Zealand what had happened since their APEC Architect trilateral was signed two years ago.

The Secretary commented that New Zealand had in place a procedure for assessing an APEC Architect from another economy seeking registration in New Zealand, including applications forms.

Australia said they too had the required documentation in place.

The Chair asked the domain specific economies to indicate whether their domain specific assessment would be oral or written, the responses being:

- USA – oral
- Singapore – oral
- New Zealand – oral
- Mexico – oral
- Japan – written
- Australia – oral
- Chinese Taipei – oral
- Canada – written.

The Chair noted that he had been advised that the APEC Architect Manual was silent on the matter.

Japan said the APEC Architect Manual in section 4 said each monitoring committee must publish on its website the rules that apply in its economy.

Singapore said her initial intention has been a written assessment but then Singapore had realised that this would be inappropriate for senior architects.

Australia said that the APEC Architect Manual on page 90 said that “Domain specific competencies or knowledge related to conditions of professional practice specific to an economy.”

The meeting adjourned for afternoon tea

The Meeting resumed at 4.00 pm.

Item 7: Procedures

Item 7.1: Templates and Documents

The Secretary reported on a set of templates prepared for economies to use if they wished. The Secretary said there had been earlier templates, but these had proved unsatisfactory.

Australia said when the project was first set up a set of procedural template had been prepared, but the templates prepared by New Zealand were an improvement and therefore Australia supported their adoption.

The Chair asked participating economies whether they favoured adopting the proposed templates.

Singapore said the proposed forms were clearer and also pointed out some typos.

Chinese Taipei said the application form should have a title that did not create the impression that APEC Architects were limited to a particular economy. After discussion the meeting determined that the application form should be titled *Application for Registration as an APEC Architect to the [Economy] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee*.

The Secretary said the templates included options for calling the undertakings being entered into as “agreements” or “arrangements”, laid out in “articles” or “paragraphs”, and with the parties “agreeing” or “mutually deciding”. The Secretary said this had been included as the governments of some economies, including New Zealand, were opposed to any language that might create an impression that these agreements or arrangements were government-to-government.

Chinese Taipei said to solve that problem all the documents should be described as “arrangements”.

The Chair said the proposed templates would be a resource and not binding on any economy.

Canada moved that the recommended templates be accepted, seconded by **Singapore**.

USA asked why the templates included a memorandum of understanding in regard to degree recognition when degree recognition was not part of the APEC Architect Project, and whether it conflicted with or superseded the Canberra Accord.

The Chair said the Canberra Accord was signed by different entities. The Chair also said it was correct that degree recognition was not part of the APEC Architect Project, but the template in regard to degree recognition was a template reference to facilitate best practice in terms of agreements between economies in terms of the wider ideals of the APEC Architect Project.

Singapore said that at some time in the future the APEC Architect Project should set up its own accreditation committee to accredit universities. Degree recognition had taken place alongside the signing of the trilateral between Australia, Singapore and New Zealand.

New Zealand said accreditation of degrees was complex and expensive and it would be better for the APEC Architect Project to acknowledge entities that were doing it already.

The Chair asked if participating economies supported Chinese Taipei’s suggestion that the templates be referred to as “arrangements” and not “agreements”.

Singapore said it supported “arrangement” only.

Hong Kong said the term “agreement” was used in all its “agreements”, so not using the word in this context would be odd.

Canada said they favoured keeping both options.

Chinese Taipei said if both terms were used it created the impression that the various bilaterals being entered into were of different status from each other when this was not correct.

The Chair said agreement on using a single terminology had not been reached and so the various options would be retained. The Chair then put Canada's motion that the proposed templates be adopted as reference materials for participating economies to use if they wished. The resolution was agreed to with three abstentions.

The Chair also asked participating economies if they would support the Economy Reporting Form used for the meeting to be added to the templates, and this was agreed to, with economies being welcome to forward any suggestions for improvements to the Secretariat.

The Secretary asked if it would be appropriate for the templates to be placed on the APEC Architects website, participating economies indicating that it would.

Item 7.2: Proposal on the Definition of the Term "Home Economy"

Singapore spoke to its paper *Proposal on the Definition of the Term "Home Economy"* making the following points:

During the negotiation of the Australia, Singapore, New Zealand trilateral, an issue emerged concerning the need to define what "primary economy" as used in the operating manual meant.

This came in the context of what would happen if an APEC Architect was registered with a host economy via an APEC Architect bilateral and then allowed his or her home economy registration to lapse.

The operating manual in clause 2.2.2 says "The registration of an APEC Architect will be cancelled if the architect ceases to be registered /licensed in the designated home economy."

Singapore said this could be interpreted as meaning that:

- an APEC architect would lose his or her registration in a host economy if his or her home economy registration ended; or
- an APEC Architect's host economy could become his or her home economy.

Singapore said it was neither for nor against either of these propositions, but if an architect was able to change his or her home economy then there needed to be some rules about how it could be done.

USA said one option was to delete clause 2.2.2 from the operating manual.

Malaysia said there was also an issue of what would happen if the architect's home economy exited the APEC Architect Project.

Canada said the requirement that an APEC Architect had seven year's relevant experience needed to be retained.

The meeting then adjourned for the evening.

The meeting recommenced at 9.00 am, Friday 5 October 2012.

Australia began proceedings by asking for a round of applause for New Zealand for organising the preceding evening's entertainment.

The Chair said the meeting would next consider item 7.3 and return to item 7.2 later.

Item 7.3: Procedures for Non-Complying Economy

Malaysia introduced its paper by saying that at the 2010 Central Council meeting in Manila the issue had been raised of how the project should respond to with an errant economy that had failed to adhere to the conventions in the operating manual.

Malaysia said at the Manila Central Council meeting participating economies had been asked to provide Malaysia with their views. This was in the context of Malaysia having suggested a process in response to an errant economy that entailed:

- the Secretariat seeking clarification from the alleged errant economy
- a peer evaluation being done by a neighbouring economy to verify if there was a prima facie case
- a Work Group being set up to look into the matter and report to the next meeting of the Central Council.

Malaysia said New Zealand had raised a concern that peer evaluation by a neighbouring economy might not be practical given political sensitivities. New Zealand had also suggested that the makeup of the Working Group be based on the immediate past, present and future providers of the Secretariat. Malaysia said New Zealand had said suspension of an errant economy rather than expulsion should be considered as a final sanction and other economies might wish to join the current working group of Malaysia, Singapore and Mexico in taking the issue further.

Malaysia said the issue was sensitive, especially at a time when the APEC Architect Project wanted more APEC economies to get involved. Malaysia said an economy might have a good reason for not attending one or two Central Council meetings.

Malaysia also said another issue that had been raised was how a participating economy should exercise some control over one of its APEC Architects that was behaving in an errant manner in his or her host economy. Malaysia said in that situation the host economy would take disciplinary action under its own laws and then advise the home economy.

The Chair asked the meeting to focus on the issue of errant economies.

New Zealand said APEC architects were bound by the rules that applied in the places where they were registered, just like any other architect.

USA said this came up often in the USA between jurisdictions, the rule being that the host jurisdiction took action and advised the home jurisdiction.

Singapore said the responsibility lay with the host economy, though the home economy should be advised. Singapore then raised the question of whether in that situation the home economy should take any additional action.

The Chair directed that the discussion should focus on errant economies.

Canada said the APEC Architect Project was forward looking and positive, and it would be better to focus on encouraging economies to do the right thing.

Philippines said a technical working group should be formed to look at the issue and report to the next Central Council meeting.

The Chair asked if the working group of Malaysia, Singapore and Mexico was already a technical working group.

Malaysia said the Working Group did not really function, reflecting a lack of responses from other participating economies, possibly due to ambivalence about the subject. Malaysia said the Working Group could still exist and receive ideas from other participating economies and produce a more focussed document.

Singapore suggested it would be worthwhile for the economies that had already provided the Secretariat to report on what errant things had occurred.

The Chair asked the current Secretary to comment

The Secretary said the only issues he had observed was economies failing to provide reports as required by the manual and difficulties in contacting some economies to invite them to the Central Council meeting.

USA asked about difficulties collecting fees.

The Secretary said two economies still had fees to pay, but he expected these payments to be made.

The Chair suggested that the errant economy issue lie on the table and that Malaysia be permitted to co-opt other economies to join discussions on the issue if required. Economies then voted 12 in favour and two abstentions.

The Chair asked the meeting if it favoured the New Zealand suggestion that errant economy issues be investigated by an Investigating Group comprising the three economies that were the immediate past, present and future providers of the Secretariat. Malaysia so moved and New Zealand seconded.

A vote then took place the vote being six in favour, two against and 6 abstentions. The Chair declared the motion lost and said further work was needed on the issue of who would constitute the Investigating Committee.

The meeting then returned to item 7.2: Proposal on the Definition of the Term "Home Economy

Singapore summarised the issue in terms of what would happen if an APEC Architect became registered in a host economy and then cancelled his or her registration in his or her home economy.

USA said the issue was common in the USA when architects moved between jurisdictions. The USA said if clause 2.2.2 in the operations manual meant that an

APEC architect's registration in a host economy was lost if the architect's registration in the home economy was cancelled, that did not seem to accord with the intent of the APEC Architect Project which was mobility for architects.

New Zealand said clause 2.2.2 could also be interpreted as meaning that if an APEC Architect let his or her registration as an architect lapse in his or her home economy then his or her status as an APEC Architect of his or her home economy also ended.

Singapore responded that the issue was what happened if an APEC Architect became registered in a host economy and then in the following year cancelled his or her registration in his or her home economy. Singapore said that didn't make sense. That was why in Singapore there would be a separate register for Singapore architects who had gained their registration by being APEC Architects in another economy. Singapore's view was that if an APEC architect for example from New Zealand gained registration in Singapore, for that registration to continue he or she would have to continue to be a New Zealand APEC Architect.

The Chair said wearing his hat as Chair of the New Zealand Registered Architects Board, he had a concern about that, as it did not seem to encourage transportability of architects from one economy to another.

Malaysia said once an APEC Architect was registered in a host economy registration in the home economy was a separate issue. There was a risk of abuse however and the issue needed to be looked at carefully and if need be clause 2.2.2 should be reviewed.

Canada said if a USA architect became registered in Canada and then cancelled his or her registration in the USA, the architect's registration in Canada continued.

Malaysia said the spirit of clause 2.2.2 was that if an architect was deregistered in his or her home economy he or she should lose his or her APEC Architect status in a host economy.

USA asked if a Singapore APEC Architect was registered in Australia would he or she go onto the Australian section of the APEC Architect Register.

Australia responded that if a Singapore APEC architect became registered in Australia and then went off the Singapore section of the APEC architect register his or her registration in Australia would continue. However, Australia said the discussion had raised the issue of what would happen if an APEC Architect had taken up residency in a host economy and did not want to be registered in his or her original home economy but wanted to retain his or her status as an APEC Architect. A mechanism was needed for that, options including validation by the monitoring committee in the architect's new home or an automatic transfer.

Singapore said that if an APEC Architect violates the basis of his registration in his or her home economy then the host economy should have the right to decide whether or not he or she remained registered in the host economy. Why, Singapore asked, should a person be granted a special right and then that right continue a year later if the basis of that right being granted is gone. The issue needed more work, Singapore said.

The Chair asked if Singapore was prepared to lead that work, **Singapore** responding that they were but would need help from other economies.

Hong Kong said they would like to hear more from economies with multiple international jurisdictions as to how they handled the issue internally.

Canada responded that if an APEC Architect became registered in Canada as the architect's host economy then he or she was a registered architect in Canada and if the architect's registration in his or her host economy lapsed Canada wouldn't care. However, since it was accepted that there was only one APEC Register there ought to be a way for an APEC Architect to continue to be an APEC Architect if his or her home economy registration lapsed.

Australia said if a task force was going to work on the issue Australia would like to be a member.

The Chair said it was agreed that Singapore would lead work going forward on the issue, assisted by economies that already had APEC Architect mutual recognition arrangements, and Hong Kong and Canada.

Item 8: The Future of the APEC Architect Project

Item 8.1: Other Aspects of an APEC Architect's Practice in a host economy

The Philippines gave a presentation to its paper saying that while economies had indicated their levels of commitment to openness, further questions arose as to whether these commitments adequately defined the arrangements that applied between economies in regards to the mobility of professionals and the context of their practice in host economies.

USA commented that it was the responsibility of architects seeking registration in another country to resolve work or visa requirements.

Australia said this was a government issue that it could not comment on.

New Zealand concurred with Australia.

Malaysia said the issue could not be avoided and if it were avoided all the other work done on the APEC Architect Project would end in futility.

Canada said the entity that registers architects in Canada could not get involved with immigration issues. It was up to architects to work out regulatory and insurance requirements where they were working.

The Chair said it might assist the project if monitoring committee websites provided links to their government's immigration services.

The Philippines said they would like the Central Council to look into whether the APEC membership card could help architects fast-track getting through international airports.

Canada said the Philippines had raised an important issue in good faith.

The meeting adjourned for morning tea.

The meeting recommenced at 11.03 am.

The Philippines said the issues that it raised were important to some economies.

Malaysia said the issue of architect's liabilities in host economies was very important as in Malaysia, for example, it was unlimited.

Canada said the requirement to have liability insurance varied between economies, and local requirements were the sort of thing an APEC Architect needed to know when seeking registration in a host economy.

The Chair asked how participating economies would view a recommendation that monitoring committees provide this information on their websites.

USA said these requirements were so complex in the USA that putting it on a single website would be very difficult.

The Chair said it would be just a recommendation which participating economies could follow if they thought it was appropriate. The Chair then asked the Philippines if they were comfortable with the way these issues had been canvassed and the actions recorded. **The Philippines** indicated they were.

Item 8.2: The Future of the APEC Architect Project

New Zealand began discussion by saying that the APEC Architect Project had achieved considerable progress highlighted by the mutual recognition agreements that had been signed. However, if the expectation had been that by now cross border registrations would have occurred then the APEC Architect Project had failed. Nonetheless it might well be that the mutual recognition agreements being signed with increasing rapidity might mean a self-fulfilling prophecy was happening.

Malaysia asked the Chair to summarise the discussion that had taken place on the same topic the day before.

The Chair said he thought there was benefit in considering the needs of younger architects in addition to senior architects with the seven years' experience required to be an APEC Architect.

Malaysia said the benefits talked about the previous day related to being able to register across borders quickly without tedious delays, and the branding value in the prestige of the title APEC Architect.

Canada said the APEC Architect Project had made progress, as those attending the Central Council meeting could see.

USA said there was merit in recognising overseas experience for applications for initial registration.

Hong Kong said they required two year's work experience for initial registration and one of these could be in another country.

Malaysia said they supported the ASEAN Internship Exchange Programme.

Australia said they required two year's internship one of which could be overseas.

Singapore said they required two year's internship one of which had to be in Singapore.

USA said their pre-registration internship could all be served outside the USA if it was under the supervision of an architect registered in the USA. It was encouraging that international internships were accepted among APEC economies.

The Chair then asked for comment on the idea mooted earlier that APEC Architects seeking work in other economies where local collaboration was required should seek to collaborate with local APEC Architects.

The USA said that its APEC Architect Register was available on line for anyone to access.

Malaysia said architects providing architectural services in other economies should be reminded that they need to follow local laws and regulatory requirements.

Australia said the Australian section of the APEC Architect Register indicated whether or not each Australian APEC Architect was prepared to work in collaboration with overseas architects seeking projects in Australia.

The Chair asked participating economies if they did the same. They responded as follows:

- Canada – not sure
- China – local cooperation
- Hong Kong – that information not on the online register
- Japan – register has a specific column identifying those APEC Architects willing to collaborate with APEC Architects from other economies
- Korea – local collaboration
- Malaysia – that information not on the online register
- New Zealand – that information not on the online register
- Philippines – local collaboration
- Singapore - – that information not on the online register and also not sure it should be, as an APEC Architect could collaborate with any Singapore architect, that being the practice already.
- Chinese Taipei – this information would be added to their section of the APEC Register
- Thailand – this information would be added to their section of the APEC Register when Thailand has any APEC Architects
- USA – this could be done but all architects would always be yes.

The Chair said the aim was to encourage collaboration among APEC Architects and to further the ideals of the project. The Chair said other issues that had emerged were promoting the benefits of the APEC Architect Project to architects, APEC Architects, governments and graduates at schools of architecture, and internships.

Item 9: Central Council Administration

Item 9.1: Report by the Secretariat

The Secretary reported on the work of the Secretariat during 2011 and 2012 noting that during the period:

- the APEC Architect Project website was enhanced
- the APEC Architect Certificate and ID card were updated
- the Fifth Central Council meeting was organised.

The Secretary reported on Secretariat finances, noting that the NZRAB had donated his time to the project which was why the administration costs were so low.

The Secretary thanked all the economies that had contributed to the Secretariat's finances for 2011 2012 and expressed his confidence that the funds outstanding would be forthcoming. Broadly, it was expected that the Secretariat's funding and costs for 2011 2012, including funding the Fifth Central Council Meeting, would break even. In that sense, he thought the current funding formulae was satisfactory, at least at this stage.

Korea asked if its payment for 2012 had been received as the Secretariat report indicated that it had not. The Secretary said he would check on that.

Canada thanked New Zealand for a well-run event. Canada then asked if it would be sensible to get up-to-date numbers of architects for each economy, given their relevance to the funding formulae. **The Secretary** concurred.

Malaysia also thanked New Zealand for a well-run event. Malaysia then asked how New Zealand would fund a deficit if full payments were not received.

The Secretary said he did not expect that to happen. The Secretary added that during his time the most difficult thing had been making contact with some economies, which had been so challenging in some cases that he had had to seek the assistance of New Zealand's embassies to find people.

The Philippines also thanked New Zealand for a job well done and wonderful hospitality.

Singapore paid tribute to New Zealand's "awesome performance". Singapore suggested that to keep in touch with monitoring committees perhaps the relevant registration organisations should be CCd into correspondence.

The Secretary said he had done that, but it had failed in some cases.

Item 9.2: Review of the Schedule of Rotation of Responsibilities

Canada confirmed that it would provide secretariat services to the project in 2013-2014 and host the Sixth APEC Architect Central Council Meeting in 2014.

Malaysia and **China** confirmed they both expected to be able to provide secretariat services in 2015-2016 and 2017-2018 respectively.

The Chair asked if any other economy wanted to change its ranking in the schedule of secretariat responsibilities, no economy indicating such a wish.

Item 9.3: Adoption of Summary Conclusions

The meeting considered and adopted a set of summary conclusions (annex 2).

Item 9.4: Amendments to the Operations Manual

The meeting reviewed the *APEC Architect Operating Manual 2010* and resolved that:

- the manual should reflect the decision made at the Fourth APEC Architect Central Council Meeting that economies should report their activities to the Secretariat annually, as opposed to every six months
- the section describing the hand-over of secretariat functions should be amended to be suggestions, as opposed to being directions.

Item 10: Next Meeting of the Central Council

Canada said they intended that the Sixth Meeting of the APEC Architect Central Council would take place in Vancouver in the final quarter of 2014.

Singapore asked if the date not clash with the World Architecture Festival.

The USA asked that the date not clash with the UIA triennial meeting in early August 2014

The Chair declared the meeting closed.

The Philippines asked for a round of applause for the Chair.

Annex 1

THE APEC ARCHITECT RECIPROCAL RECOGNITION FRAMEWORK 2012

The following identifies the basis on which participating economies are currently able to enter into bilateral or multilateral arrangements with other participating economies to allow for the registration of APEC Architects. The scenarios noted below are the current requirements of participating economies in terms of the registration of an APEC Architect from another participating economy when the host economy and the APEC Architect's home economy have a mutual recognition agreement.

<p style="text-align: center;">Complete Mobility</p> <p>No requirement other than APEC Architect status</p> <p>None</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Domain Specific Assessment</p> <p>Understanding of legal and technical issues unique to the host economy</p> <p>United States of America, Singapore, New Zealand, Republic of Mexico, Japan, Australia, Chinese Taipei, Canada</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Comprehensive Registration Examination</p> <p>Examination of all skills and knowledge required for the practice of architecture</p> <p>None</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Host Economy Residence / Experience</p> <p>At least one year of professional experience in host economy prior to registration examination</p> <p>None</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Local Collaboration</p> <p>Association required with an Architect from the host economy</p> <p>Republic of the Philippines, Republic of Korea, Hong Kong China, People's Republic of China, Thailand, Malaysia</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">No Recognition</p> <p>No recognition of APEC Architect status</p> <p>None</p>

Annex 2

Fifth APEC Architect Central Council Meeting Summary Conclusions

- 1 Attendees were welcomed with a powhiri
- 2 The protocols for the Central Council meeting were confirmed.
- 3 Economies introduced their attendees, all participating economies being in attendance.
- 4 The Agenda was confirmed without amendment.

The meeting agreed that the meeting summary would include references to the bilateral arrangements and MOUs entered into at the parliamentary reception of the previous evening.

- 5 The Meeting Summary of the Fourth APEC Architect Central Council meeting in Manila in 2010 was confirmed without amendment.

A DVD of photographs from the Fourth APEC Architect Central Council meeting in Manila in 2010 was submitted and provided to attendees by the Philippines delegation.

- 6.1 The Secretariat reported that no inquiries had been received regarding the establishment of any new monitoring committees.
- 6.2 Economies provided reports on their APEC Architect activities.
- 6.3 Economies discussed their various ways of promoting architects becoming APEC Architects. Ideas noted included:
 - promoting the project to senior architecture students
 - using the negotiation of MRAs as marketing opportunities
 - participating economy websites
 - using professional development activities as a promotional vehicle
 - newsletters to architects
 - linkages to other bilaterals
 - presence at conferences, seminars and exhibitions
 - good government relations
 - promoting communications between APEC Architects.
- 6.4 Aside from the three arrangements signed in Wellington on 3 October 2012 no other bilateral or multi-lateral arrangements during the last two years were reported.
- 6.5 The project's Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status was reviewed and several changes made. Specifically:
 - Malaysia and Hong Kong asked to be correctly recorded as Local Collaboration
 - Canada asked to be recorded as Domain Specific.

Economies reported on the form of their domain specific assessment.

- 7.1 A set of templates for various APEC Architect processes were adopted as reference resources, to be available on the project's website. Also, the Reporting Form used for this meeting was adopted as amended for future reporting to the Council.
- 7.2 Singapore provided a briefing on the home/host economy issue. The meeting agreed to establish a task force, led by Singapore, to take the matter further, with Australia, Japan, Chinese Taipei, New Zealand, Philippines and Hong Kong.
- 7.3 Malaysia provided a briefing on the errant economy issue. The meeting agreed that this issue was not urgent and the current working group, comprising Malaysia, Singapore and Mexico, should continue its deliberations. Economies were encouraged to contribute idea to the working group.
- 8.1 The Philippines provided a briefing on aspects of an APEC Architect's practise in a host economy, especially in relation to issues of immigration, and liabilities and insurance. Economies were encouraged to provide links on their websites to relevant information.
- 8.2 New Zealand lead a discussion about the future of the APEC Architect Project. The meeting agreed that for enhancing the project it would be helpful to encourage APEC Architects from different economies to seek each other out and collaborate when working on cross-border projects. Economies were encouraged to highlight on their sections of the APEC register those architects interesting in collaborating with other APEC Architects from other economies. The benefits of being an APEC Architect were also identified and economies were encouraged to promote these to the profession and students of architecture.
- 9.1 The meeting noted the report of the Secretariat.
- 9.2 The Schedule of Rotation of Responsibilities was confirmed.
- 9.3 The Summary Conclusions for the Fifth Central Council Meeting were adopted.
- 9.4 The APEC Architect Operations Manual was amended to provide for the hand over procedure to be a guideline to the outgoing and incoming secretariats and for economy reporting period agreed at the Manila meeting to be corrected to be every 12 months.
- 10.1 Canada invited participating economies to the Sixth APEC Architect Central Council Meeting to be held in Vancouver in the fourth quarter of 2014.

The Philippines moved to express the Central Council's thanks to the host economy New Zealand for hosting the 5th Central Council meeting and providing secretariat services during 2011 2012.