

**THE APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT SIXTH CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETING  
KUALA LUMPUR, MALAYSIA  
OCTOBER 10 & 11, 2016**

**Draft Minutes**

**A formal welcome to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, and opening performance.**

The Malaysian APEC Monitoring Committee gave a warm welcome to member economies and continued with a traditional cultural opening performance that portrays the diversity of race and culture in the country.

After the performance, highlights and the itinerary of the meeting were explained and continued with a prayer recital.

**Item1 - A welcome to delegates from the Chair, Ar. Datuk. Dr. Amer Hamzah Mohd Yunus.**

On behalf of the Board of Architects Malaysia and the Malaysia APEC Monitoring Committee, the **Chair** delivered his opening speech and thanked all participating economies attending the meeting. The **Chair** informed that only Mexico could not attend the meeting, nevertheless welcomed two (2) observer countries namely Vietnam and Indonesia that joined the meeting. The Chair then called the 7<sup>th</sup>APEC Architect Central Council Meeting to order.

**Item2 - APEC Architect Project 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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 recognize each attendee's desire to speak

- by acknowledging his or her economy (i.e. 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/here 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.

### Item3 – Central Council Membership

Participating economies provided the names of each member of their delegation;

ECONOMY	NAME
AUSTRALIA	RICHARD THORP
	KATE DOYLE
CANADA	VERNON MARK
	KEMP SCOTT
	PETER STREITH
HONG KONG CHINA	NG WING SHUN ANTHONY VINCENT
	CHI WUH CHERNG DANIEL
	LAM KWONG KI(DOMINIC) LAM
JAPAN	NISHIO SHINJI
	ANAMURA NORIO
	YAMAUCHI MICHIKO
MALAYSIA	AMER HAMZAH BIN MOHD YUNUS
	ESA BIN MOHAMED
	TAN PEI ING
	ZURAINA LEILY BINTI AWALLUDIN
	MUSTAPHA BIN MOHD SALLEH
	MOHD ZULHEMLEE BIN AN
	YONG RAZIDAH BINTI RASHID
NEW ZEALAND	WARWICK BELL
	PAUL JACKMAN
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA	YU YANG
	ZHUANG WEIMIN
	ZHANG YUEQUN
	WANG XIAOJING
REPUBLIC OF KOREA	KIM CHI TOK

ECONOMY	NAME
	SHIM JAE HO
REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES	EDRIC MARCO C. FLORENTINO
	GUILLERMO H. HISANCHA
	PROSPERIDAD LUIS
	YOLANDA D. REYES
SINGAPORE	TAN SHAO YEN
	NG LEE HOCK, LARRY NG
CHINESE TAIPEI	TSAI JEN CHIEH
	YI CHENG
	CHEN SHAU TSYH
	CHEN YIN-HO
	CHENG I PING
	CHIEN-MEI
	HUANG CHING CHANG
	HUANG HSIU CHUANG
KAO WEN TING	
THAILAND	VADHANASINDHU PONGSAK
	TANGTRONGCHIT MICHAEL PARIPOL
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	STEPHEN NUTT

On behalf of **Indonesia**, Tateng K Djajasudarma introduces himself and participate as an observer to the meeting.

On behalf of Republic of **Vietnam**, Pham Khanh Toan and Vu Anh Tu introduce themselves and participate as observers to the meeting.

The **Chair** explained that exhaustive efforts was undertaken to call Russia to participate as an observer for the 7<sup>th</sup> APEC Architect Central Council Meeting from the last meeting in Vancouver and had received a reply from them declining on their attendance.

#### **Item 4 - Adoption of the agenda**

The agenda was accepted without any additions or amendments.

**The Republic of Philippines** proposed adoption of the agenda & seconded by **Singapore**.

#### **Item 5 - Confirmation of the Meeting Summary of the APEC Architect Project Sixth Central Council Meeting in Vancouver, Canada**

The Summary Conclusions of the Sixth Central Council Meeting of the APEC Architect Central Council, held in Vancouver, Canada on October 6 and 7, 2014 were accepted without any additions or amendments. The motion was formally moved and seconded by The Republic of Philippines and received unanimous support.

#### **Item 6 - Matters Arising from the APEC Architect Project Sixth Central Council Meeting**

**United States of America** raised and requested an update from Singapore with regards to ASEAN moving towards ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) as well as a handbook on Architectural Practices in ASEAN since the last meeting in Vancouver.

**Singapore** acknowledged the request from United States of America and informed that they had worked with Malaysia to invite 2 observers from Indonesia and Vietnam to attend the 7th APEC Central Council Meeting. Singapore reported that majority of ASEAN member states are present in this meeting. The ASEAN Coordinating Committee on Services (CCS) had then established the Ad-Hoc Expert Group to work on the Mutual Recognition Arrangements for the identified professional services in ASEAN. For architectural services the various steps taken including the establishment of the ASEAN Architect Council (AAC), and the majority of respective economies had initiated the move via their own board and at the same time simultaneously running their own MRA regulation. The ASEAN member states are working together to contribute to what is called ASEAN Economic Community (AEC). The ability of architects to move beyond national borders within ASEAN will assist ASEAN to accelerate the objective of the AEC. Singapore mentioned it is still in the early stages and may anticipate mobility in next few years.

**New Zealand** requested explanation on the basis of mobility of ASEAN economies and whether it is similar with APEC.

**Singapore** reported that ASEAN is based on spirit of collaboration and taking into consideration each economies registration protocol. At the moment it is different and a little stringent for the registration of ASEAN Architect with two conditions:

1. 10 years after graduation from the University and
2. 5 years post-licensing in registration.

There are consideration to look of Vietnam economy's requirement of 5 years' experiences prior to registration. ASEAN Architect Council have also requested Vietnam if once they are ready and they could reduce the requirements for graduates to have 24 months' practical internship prior to requirement of professional exam as to make it more universal and adopt the UIA practice.

**Singapore** further explained that APEC is an independent practice which allows mobility and has been recognized as registered architect in the host economy. In the ASEAN context, the MRA on architecture services has been adopted which allows practices to be carried out in collaboration. The ASEAN Architect also taking into consideration of CLMV (Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Viet Nam) at the point where they are ready for independent practice and they already have architects from Malaysia, Singapore, and other ASEAN member states registered.

**Singapore** hopes that in future they will rise to the level of independent practice similar to the APEC economy. Meanwhile, they need to respect each of the 10 ASEAN economies; adopting practices in Collaboration.

**New Zealand** asked Singapore whether there are initiatives around qualification recognition across ASEAN.

**Singapore** highlighted that ASEAN Architect Council has just established the ASEAN Architect Education Committee and through Malaysia as Chair is looking into the possibility of mutual recognition of architectural education recognition and qualification within ASEAN. The work is still in progress as they need to take one step at the time. ASEAN member states are still in the various stages of development and believes strongly in the spirit of collaboration in moving forward.

**Malaysia** added to New Zealand's question, whether it is time to review the post-graduation and post-licensure period. The European Union direction is trying to harmonise the requirements of 5 years of education and 2 years of practise similar to UIA practice. Prior to that the directive was 4 years and now they have adjusted to some doing it 5 years plus 1 year or 4 years plus 2 years.

Malaysia continued and reiterated that qualification and standard of APEC Architect was discussed extensively at the APEC's Architect Steering Committee during the early years. It was deliberated that, one need to have more than just 2 years' experience as the 5 years' experience requirements is to ensure that the

architect has accumulate experiences of all aspects and types of buildings. Currently, the requirement for the application of an APEC Architect, requires the candidate to submit report on type of building that they have implemented and the experiences they have attained.

The **Chair** explained on the handbook on architecture services in ASEAN as requested by New Zealand. The **Chair** showed the photocopy of handbook and mentioned that it also can be viewed online at ASEAN Architect Council website. The handbook generally describes the practice of an architect in ASEAN member states and the handbook is published to provide guidance on the liberalisation of professional services in ASEAN.

**New Zealand** highlighted and proposed that the next secretariat to invite Papua New Guinea to the next central council meeting

The **Chair** agreed that next secretariat will be tasked to invite Papua New Guinea for the next 8<sup>th</sup> Central Council meeting as an Observer.

**The United States of America** highlighted item 7.5, on the updates of the APEC Architect Project Reciprocal Recognition Framework. The United States of America enquired the justification on the changes of six types classification to seven types as portrayed in the support matrix. The United States of America deliberates that there is comprehensive examination component and examination component and seek justification on these components if the form was agreed to be modified from previous meeting in Vancouver.

The **Chair** ask Canada for explanation on the updates of framework status from 6<sup>th</sup> Central Council Meeting minutes and the changes from six to seven numbers of classifications as Malaysia received the minutes handover from Canada.

**New Zealand** informed that they prepared the matrix and shall consult with Canada as they received the matrix from them.

**Singapore** thanked **United States of America** for bringing up the matter. Singapore recalled that in 2008, the economies propose this ladder in Vancouver. The reciprocal recognition framework which Singapore has the copy; shows the initial agreement was only six types of classification (i. CM-Complete Mobility, ii. DSA-Domain Specific Assessment, iii. CRE-Comprehensive Registration Examination, iv. HER-Host Economy Residence, v. LC- Local Collaboration, and vi.

NR-No Recognition).-**Singapore** suggested the adoption of initial of six original. All economies agreed to the suggestion.

**Canada** advice the current secretariat to eliminate the term Examination in the form and just to use the term Comprehensive Registration Examination, in order to avoid confusion.

**Malaysia** highlighted that from previous minutes of meeting, there was a request by the Chair for **Australia, New Zealand, Canada** and **The Republic of Philippines** to create a list of standardized survey questionnaire for APEC Architects in different countries. Malaysia wants to know if it has already been done.

**Australia** recalled back the previous minutes under item 10.3 and has not done the survey yet.

**The Republic of Philippines** shared with the meeting that they had done the survey with their APEC Architects and the questionnaire enquires as to how becoming APEC Architects will benefit architects. Malaysia requested Philippines to email the questionnaire so that the secretariat may distribute it to all economies in the meeting

**The United States of America** highlighted on the APEC Architect Funding Formula as discussed in Vancouver, there was supposed to be a re-evaluation on APEC Architect funding and an update to it. It was proposed that all economies calculation is based on the population or numbers of registered Architects in the economy as decided in the previous council meeting.

The **Chair** mentioned **The People's Republic of China** had some discussion on the vast membership in relation to the funding and asked them to clarify the issue.

**The People's Republic of China** informed that they have not decided yet on the definition of Architect.

**Malaysia** informed that the definition for Architect in Malaysia is in tandem with the definition used in APEC Architect.

**The Republic of Philippines** informed that upon checking with the Professional Regulation Commission, there are Thirty-nine thousand (39,000) Architects which are registered with their Board but currently only indicate eight thousand (8,000) is practising, thus this will give a new calculation fee if the definition is to be used.

The **Chair** highlighted that the definition will give an impact of number of architects, and as per decision of previous meeting in Vancouver, all economies should adopt to the definition of architect.

## **Item 7 - Reporting**

### **Item 7.1 - Application to form new Monitoring Committees**

The chair and members of economist concluded there are no new member applications to form new Monitoring Committees.

### **Item 7.2 - Monitoring Committee reports to the Central Council**

**Australia** report remains the same as per the documents submitted. They have now twenty-seven APEC Architects and informed that they had signed the Trilateral Mutual Arrangement Australia/Canada/New Zealand in 2015.

**Canada** reported that their first APEC Architect is from Australia and currently they have two APEC Architects.

**Hong Kong China** reported steady growth of fifty-three APEC architects. The composition of the monitoring committee are members nominated by the Hong Kong Institute Architects and the Architects Registration Board. They hope to have more dialogues and to progress in terms of mutual recognition or other agreements signed with other economies.

**Japan** reported there are no major changes to their report and informed that there are 320 APEC architects registered in Japan. There are also 3 Japanese APEC Architects registered in Australia through the APEC Architects bi-lateral Agreement between Japan and Australia. **Japan** informed the total number of registered Architects is one hundred thirty-six thousand and this include the registered 1<sup>st</sup>-class *kenchikushi* which includes the structural engineers and MEP engineers.

The **Chair** mentioned that the *kenchikushi* class of Architects was discussed during previous meeting in Vancouver. Japan has the number for both architects and engineers qualifications which needs to be distinguished in the registration of *kenchikushi*. Therefore, the accurate number of the registered Architects is

unknown.

**The United States of America** suggested that in the country that has tier licensure, to adopt the standard for unlimited practice of architecture for their architects registered. This should be applied not on their education, qualification or project but rather those that can practice fully. **Malaysia** reiterated that the same situations is in Europe especially in Switzerland whereby engineers and architects are together. As long as they practice and is providing the service, it can be consider as architectural services.

The **Chair** was made to understand that the three classes of *KenchiKushi*, they are all practicing architecture but with certain limitation. First class; they can do everything – double story structural. Second class; has limitation to smaller footage. Third class; a smaller in footage and non-structure. Similar to Malaysia, Board of Architect Malaysia also register the building draughtsmen who are practicing architecture, they can build houses or building which is two-story or any structure which does not exceed this guideline. However, Malaysia does not report the building draughtsmen. **The United States of America** highlighted that according to the framework of APEC, if an architect has a limited level of service competence, for an example, a level 3 of *KenchiKushi*, will not be eligible to register as APEC Architect. United States ask for agreement from others economies. **Australia** agreed with The United States of America. In Australia jurisdiction, an architect coming through APEC from another jurisdiction who is unable to perform architecture services on particular type of building make no sense. The Japan class 3 should not be included. **Philippines**. Agreed with United States. The APEC architect should have unlimited practice for going International practice.

The **Chair** concluded that only licensed practitioner in the home country with unlimited or without restriction can apply to become APEC architects. The one with limited practices will not be eligible. **Philippines** added to ask Japan if they agree with it. **Malaysia** informed that the operation manual has stated the eligibility requirement for the candidates. It stated that it should be unlimited. The **Chair** ask Japan if they agreed upon it. As informed by **Japan**, they have 136, 000 eligible candidate however only 320 are registered as APEC architects.

**Malaysia** reported the registered number of licensed Architects up to date is 1,986. The registration of APEC Architects is only 24. The monitoring committee have 10 members consist those from Professional Regulator Authority (PRA),

Architecture Institution (PAM), and Academic Institution. The tenures of the members are up to Sept 2017 and as for the framework, Malaysia operates at local collaboration.

**New Zealand** reported that to date there are 10 numbers of APEC Architects registered. The meeting was also informed that the appointment of Mr. Callum McKenzie, Deputy Chairman of NZARB has ended and the monitoring committee is still waiting for the new appointment. New Zealand also proposed to insert a row on the existing Economy Report that indicates the number of Registered Foreign Architect (RFA) under The APEC Architects. Currently there is one APEC Architect registered with New Zealand. **Singapore** agreed with New Zealand that to insert row that indicate the number of APEC Architect registered from other economies.

**The People's Republic of China** informed that they now have 126 APEC Architects registered during the period. This was due to the concentrated effort by the Monitoring Committee which had promoted the registration of APEC Architects in the economy.

**The Republic of Korea** reported the number of registered APEC Architects to date is 228 including 22 new registrations. The recognition framework status is still at local collaboration. **The Republic of Korea** highlighted that at a meeting held in Manila, a proposal to have the roadmap was deliberated and suggested that the central council to take into consideration coordinating APEC Architect towards higher official effort. **The Republic of Korea** had passed to the secretariat related documents and the secretariat will attach the document that shall be discussed at the next meeting, two years from now. (*Refer to attachment 1*). **Malaysia** agreed with **The Republic of Korea**. The input will be from respective economies and it is up to the monitoring committee of each economy to adopt and check with their respective ministry.

**The Republic of Philippines** reported to date they have a total of 54 APEC Architects and informed they have difficulties in getting Architects to register as APEC Architect.

**Singapore** reported to date there are 51 numbers of APEC Architects registered, an increase of seven from the previous. Three already registered with Australia and one in New Zealand. Singapore also received two applications from Australia and it will be processed within two or three months for approval.

**Chinese Taipei** reported currently has 3,500 registered Architects and 88 APEC Architects on their register.

**Thailand** reported that they have a new board of Architect Council of Thailand and they are fully aware of the participation in the APEC Architects. Currently Thailand has 2,324 registered licensed architects with unlimited practice. Thailand has 3 levels of Architect registration; first level is after graduate and passed the examination as well as a 3 years practice requirement. For the second level they need to sit for an exam to acquire full unlimited practicing license and third level is the honourable license. The 2,324 is for level two and three. Currently there are no registered APEC architects.

**United States of America** reported the number of registered architect in United States increased from 107,000 to 110,168 at the end of 2015 and 52 APEC Architects. United States of America informed the council that outside the APEC framework United States of America they have the tri-literal arrangement and MRA with Canada and Mexico. They are also in the process of finalizing with Australia and New Zealand for a tri-literal arrangement. United States remain under domain specific assessment. **United States of America** also clarified that the additional row in the report should specifically talk about foreign architects register through APEC registration process. **United States of America** also requested for the current secretariat to contact Mexico for their annual report. **United States of America** ask clarification whether the report should be submitted annually or every 2 years and suggested that economies to compile report in the form of spreadsheet for better viewing and comparison among economies.

**Australia** agreed with the United States of America that all the reports to be compile into one spreadsheet. Australia proposed that to submit only one report in every two years and the report must be submitted in the month of June to the secretariat.

The **Chair** seek for confirmation on Australia proposal and all economies agreed to Australia proposal.

**New Zealand** informed that item 4.2 under the operation manual need to be changed since the meeting has decided that all economies to submit the economy report in June. It should now be corrected "at 6 month" instead of "at 12 month".

The **Chair** proposed at the next meeting in China that each economy to explain and elaborate on the 6 reciprocal recognition framework status classifications.

**New Zealand** mentioned that the domain specific has been defined in glossary and proposed that each framework must be validated in each meeting.

**Malaysia** requested more information on format for level of competencies and the level of collaboration.

**New Zealand** requested the Chair to confirm with all economies on the information in the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition framework for 2016 (*Refer annex 1*).

The **Chair** requested all economies to confirm the Reciprocal Recognition framework for 2016;

1. Complete Mobility – *All economies agreed.*
2. Domain Specific Assessment – *All economies agreed.*
3. Comprehensive Registration Examination – *All economies agreed.*
4. Host Economy Residence/ Experience –*All economies agreed.*
5. Local Collaboration- *All economies agreed.*
6. No recognition of APEC status- *All economies agreed.*

**Singapore** highlights discrepancy of information under Hong Kong economy on the support matrix as it shows Hong Kong having Domain Specific Assessment with Australia and New Zealand. Hong Kong, Australia and New Zealand had not actually sign the agreement, therefore it is not under DSA. Singapore asked Hong Kong to confirm and needed to clarify.

**Hong Kong** confirmed that they are at Local Collaboration only and has an agreement outside APEC with China.

**New Zealand** mentioned that the matrix is missing the colour coding legend. There were supposedly three colours in the matrix. The green colour represents *agreement under APEC*, the yellow colour indicate *agreement under APEC potential pending negotiate* and the brown colour represent *agreement outside APEC*.

**Singapore** objects to the inclusion of information “*agreement under APEC potential pending negotiate*” as it will lead to confusion.

The **Chair** ask the other economies either agreed with Singapore.

**Australia** agreed it is confusing and also agreed with the Chair on the issues raised with colours used in the matrix.

**China** - mentioned DSA between China and Hong Kong and mutual recognition outside APEC which is beneficial for them.

**Singapore** suggested clarification on current DSA and Local Collaboration on other separate matrix for pending local collaboration.

**New Zealand** agreed with Singapore.

**China** mentioned it is just a chart to show the status thus no confusion can derive from that.

**Hong Kong** suggest to clear the confusion since the chart try to tell so many things.

The **Chair** proposed for two separate table. One is for APEC collaboration and collaboration outside APEC on status as well pending cooperation.

**New Zealand** proposed:-

A. Current Agreement in APEC

B. Current Agreement outside APEC as well pending agreement & potential.

**United States** giving a view that there is no confusion on the matrix. If two separate matrix be formed then confusion will happen.

**China** mentioned that the explanation for the colour coding is sufficient enough.

**Malaysia** moved to support New Zealand's proposal.

The **Chair** asked the economies to vote on two separate matrix to be formed.

**Malaysia** advice to focus only within APEC agreement.

**Singapore** agreed with Malaysia. It is still confused on the arrangement of Matrix with reference to Hong Kong in regards to DSA and Local Collaboration.

**New Zealand** – suggest to remove the agreement education between Hong Kong, Australia and New Zealand which will solved the issue.

**Hong Kong** have an intention to move forward however nothing was achieve for the last 3 years. Hong Kong suggested to adapt other colour coding legend since the colour may be different if printed on paper.

**China** –mention colour coding will clarify it.

**Philippines** wants reconfirmation from Hong Kong either they are DSA or Local Collaboration.

The **Chair** – ask Hong Kong either they are DSA or Local Collaboration.

**New Zealand** – clarify to Singapore that there is no need to focus on agreement outside the APEC. Since agreement outside APEC is different.

**Philippines** – suggest instead of using colour coding, using numbering to coding.

The **Chair** ask the economies to vote.

Conclusion one chart with colour coding legend.

### Item 7.3-Promotion of the APEC Architect Register

The Chair highlighted on the topic from the previous 6<sup>th</sup> council meeting regarding the seven economies of APEC who are currently not participating in the Project - Brunei, Chile, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Russia and Vietnam. The Chair had also informed that New Zealand had earlier described the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Agreement which includes Australia, Canada, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, USA and Vietnam, and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) which includes Brunei, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, Singapore and Vietnam. **The Chair** nominated Canada, the United States of America and Mexico to speak with Chile and Peru and he nominated **New Zealand** to speak with Papua New Guinea. **Malaysia** offered to speak with both Brunei and Vietnam through their ASEAN caucus. **Singapore** reminded everyone that they have already reached out to Indonesia and invited them to the Sixth Central Council Meeting but they failed to attend. **The Chair** suggested that **Canada** work together with **Malaysia** as current and future Secretariat to reach out to Russia. All new economies will be invited to observe the Seventh Central Council Meeting per project protocol.

The **Chair** mentioned that Malaysia have tried to invite various non-participating economies and manage contacted to Brunei & Vietnam. Malaysia also have tried to bring Russia in but failed. The Chair also mentioned that Mexico promised to attend however they did not.

**Philippines** – Clarified that Mexico is a member of economies.

**Malaysia** – Confirmed that Mexico is part of the economies member.

**Australia** – Reported that they have contacted the Architect through their respective Association industrial organization to promote APEC via registration and for the last 12 months using the personal approach includes writing an email and putting it up in the website. Australia can't find any momentum to find new members for APEC. Australia mentioned that the framework needs some adjustment to assist more registration of Australia architect and increasing mobility and moving towards full recognition. The Chair noted on the promoting approaches including initiatives and other matters as per previous minutes.

**Canada**- reported that Canada has bought this matter on the prerequisite program with regards to Australia-New Zealand and Canada agreement and with more development towards APEC.

**China**—a platform for young architects to communicate with other economies. Organized symposium about globalization practise and their works. Special enrolment for APEC which is free.

**Hong Kong** - We have our own website for APEC, in the past it uses direct invitation to seminars to increase the numbers. Hong Kong admits they not trying hard enough but will work on getting senior architects on board.

**Japan** –distribute APEC architect project through respective organization.

**Korea** - in maintaining average of 200 APEC members registered, Korean plan 2 strategies; move framework to Domain Specific Assessment and open dialogue with other economies with same categories of local collaboration in reaching of corporation for mutual recognition.

**Malaysia** – in promoting an APEC architect work closely with Board of Architects Malaysia during roadshow and stressed the important of collaboration with foreign architects and currently working on the guidelines to make it easier when they come to Malaysia to work and provide services. At the same time it will promote APEC architect project on the website and reduce fees to encourage more architects to register as APEC architects. This will entice them to have an APEC business card to travel. Using this will give them more mobility.

**New Zealand** – stated that contacts thru email and website. Also, concentration through MRA with economies and this has open doors.

**Philippines**- stated there is a specific agency for architect on international basis focus on APEC architect project. Also there is a website whereby new applicants can download the application form. In addition, Architects of Philippines will informed about what is APEC architects in their regional meeting.

**Singapore** - promote and working with Singapore Architect thru convention which is done in March every year. We have an active program with Canada and New Zealand for mobility. In October Certificates Presentation Ceremony are given to APEC architect for their recognition.

**Chinese Taipei** - in the past 2 years, we continued to acquire lecturers to

promote APEC architect project among colleagues and graduates from school of architectures including several speeches for mechanism and several training for English specific conventional English, a few colleges are involved. On the other hand, also set-up APEC architect website both in English and Chinese language.

**Thailand**—Firstly, we have already included APEC architect project in our agenda for major meetings at least once in a year. Secondly, we have put it up on our website. Thirdly, we are working together with Association of Siamese Architect to have a large exhibition and lecture on APEC architect project. In addition we will have a small Group Seminar especially for potential members to be APEC architects.

**United States** – NCARB website which have a direct link to International Practice that's connected to APEC website and using the web as a promotion of APEC architect project.

The **Chair** wants to discuss on others Universal methodologies that can be adopted to promote APEC registrations.

**United States** – would like the current secretariat or future secretariat to somehow reach out to Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation in general. US couldn't find the APEC architect project on website and suggested for the website to be more accessible.

**Philippines** - Proposed to get together with APEC members with one economy coming forward to organize it.

The **Chair** – proposing an APEC Convention and wants economies to second the proposal and all economies proposed to their respective government that the tender must be open to ASEAN Registered Architects as Malaysia have done that with Government project but came to no avail.

**New Zealand** – not interested to come for the convention as it will pose no interest to them.

The **Chair** mentioned that there was no directive from previous APEC to further pursue this up to respective ministry. In Malaysia, we are answerable to Ministry of Works.

**New Zealand** - mentioned that minutes has not been forwarded to HRWG and the same goes to Canada thus ask Malaysia not to follow the same and send the current minutes HRWG.

**New Zealand** - also asked whether the secretarial to revert back to APEC secretarial and also the website is not in order due to registration to the link.

The **Chair** assured **Malaysia** will do it.

**New Zealand** also suggested that what benefits for them must be put up in the website

**United States**—thank New Zealand for bring the registration link. **United States** suggested that the economies to provide a correct link and mentioned that China link has not been working for a year. The secretariat need to check the link periodically and to ensure its consistency. In reference to Philippines proposed convention, it is a good idea that will help promote the registration of Architects and asked whether this will be done by APEC Architects.

**Canada** – mention that what value will it bring to our current members of APEC as we have not yet set up MRA which allows Mobility between economies and the benefits are more important than promotion.

**Malaysia** - A UIA organising committee can be formed to propose an exhibition booth. With the exhibition booth we can showcase at the booth the goal of ASEAN Architects to have unlimited mobility. Further discussion is required for this.

**Korea** – Agreed the UIA congress in Seoul in September 2017 can assist the APEC Convention & Congress.

The **Chair** mentioned the first idea to have and APEC architect congress or meeting or getting to know can also be back to back with other meeting because more often or not you see the same group of people attending the meeting on behalf of the economies, the government or institutions. The ASEAN architects council meeting we always have back to back with the ASEAN committee of services, the main meeting will be the ASEAN CCS meeting and the rest of the other subcommittee having their own meeting a day or two before the main CCS meeting. It involves a lot of expenses incurred by

participating economies or member states that need to attend the meeting. If we agreed with the idea, then we may have the first APEC architects meeting or conference in Seoul, Korea on 3<sup>rd</sup> until 10<sup>th</sup> September 2017. Who will be tasked to organize it, probably the new secretariat?

The Chair mention as Malaysia said the whole idea of this meeting is to facilitate mobility and make it more feasible.

For ASEAN Architect it is the same issue with regards to mobility in respect to the qualification and education in the academic institution. The ASEAN Council have created ASEAN education council to look into how Architecture learning can be taught with emphasis of the practical and theory process of it. In addition it is also decided and agreed that an internship arrangement is brought forward to facilitate on exchange of students and lecturers. Recognizing the system of learning of a host country to the home country, it will bring harmonization once graduates venture into the system. However licensing process may be a deterrent and due to that reasons it has not move forward. In WTO and GETS it restricts the movements of professional as many countries protect local professional from the mass infiltration of foreigners. Politicians are adamant that this will be the case.

**New Zealand** – we are familiar with the Trans Pacific Partnership agreement that may not be passed nevertheless if the agreement is signed it will promote the Architecture mobility and adding to it a new agreement ASPA which includes economies from China, India, Australia, New Zealand, Japan and Korea. What will be the target from Local Collaboration to Doman Specific Assessment?

The **Chair** asked Head of ASEAN to explain but don't want to comment as the framework is based on collaboration and the roadmap is still in discussion.

**Malaysia** – enlighten that MRA in ASEAN states specifically the mobility of Architects is based on Mobility and for now it doesn't restrict any agreements between signatory and other economies. There is no timeframe but members of ASEAN ready to join a framework and at the same time there are bilateral agreement between ASEAN and economics for an example Malaysia which is talking Chile and Mexico for agreements.

HRWG may have forgotten and will consult APEC Desk in our ministry and in

reference to Ministry of Education.

The whole idea of APEC Framework is that one doesn't need to be concern of the training. Once you have registered as an APEC member a person is qualified to provide architectural consultancy.

The **Chair** mentioned that there will be another ASEAN Forum that promotes services including Architecture and also ASEAN Framework 2015 but unfortunately no progress has been made to ease the mobility of each professional.

The **Chair** added that the mode 3 has not materialize including G2G project. Mode 4 is also important as this is where an MRA and meeting like this can facilitate the promotion of APEC registration.

#### **Item 7.4-Update on the Agreements Signed by Economies**

**Australia** – Last meeting signed bilateral agreement with Canada and New Zealand

**Canada**- Trilateral agreement with New Zealand and Canada and also opening with other economies such as Japan and will continue with other economies.

**China**- None

**Hong Kong** - None but maintain MRA with Australia, New Zealand and China in respect to education.

**Japan**– Mutual agreement with Canada.

**Korea** - No signed agreement with other economies.

**Malaysia**- No agreement with other economies.

**New Zealand** - MRA with Canada and Australia and only working US which is outside the APEC framework.

**Philippines**- Dis not signed any MRA with other economies. Only signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Chinese Taipei towards MRA.

**Singapore**–Other than the existing agreements there are no new signed agreements, however they open to all APEC economies. Currently exploring with Japan and China as well USA.

**Chinese Taipei**—In the past two years no agreement signed.

**Thailand** - So far not enter into any agreement.

**United States** - no current or pending agreement with APEC Countries.

The **Chair** concluded no new agreement expect trilateral agreement between Australia, Canada and New Zealand.

#### **Item 7.4.2—Progress on the Australia, Canada and New Zealand MRA**

The **Chair** asked either the three economies would like to elaborate on the progress of this trilateral agreement. The chair would like to note that they should be in full compliance with APEC requirements.

**Australia, Canada and New Zealand**— Agreed

#### **Item 7.4.3 Other**

The **Chair** mention that ASEAN and ASEAN architect caucuses has already been deliberated. New Zealand at last meeting asked if someone could provide more information about ASEAN and the agreement regards to ASEAN architects and it was already deliberated earlier by Singapore.

**New Zealand** – all deliberated.

The **Chair** – all the information available in ASEAN Architects Council website.

#### **Item 7.5-Update on the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status**

The **Chair** mention it already been discussed earlier during item 7.1.

All economies agreed.

#### **Item 8—Procedures**

The **Chair** move the meeting to item 9.

## Item 9 -The future of the APEC Architect Project

The **Chair** - informed members of economies of New Zealand intention to have a discussion for tomorrow agendas, the chair wants every economy to brainstorm to shape the future of APEC Architect Project.

**New Zealand** - would like to discuss more on the first day as New Zealand have some reservation on the movement for APEC Architects Project.

The **Chair** appointed New Zealand, United States, Canada and Australia as group leader and the other economies rally upon them.

### Second Day

The **Chair** welcome everyone and proceed to continue proceedings with Item 9 (the future of the APEC Architect Project).

Yesterday delegates were grouped into 4 groups to discuss the future of APEC.

**Group 1:** Talks about the methods to improve mobility and looking at reality and the current arrangements. Looking at the backgrounds, there are architects which resides for a long period in the host economy with the proper education but originally they are from a different economy. On the other hand, there are architects registered with Australia but not residing in Australia.

The reality is that there are not much examples to highlight on. Foreign architects create unbalance in fees which may be disadvantage to the local architect. This issues are contributed by immigration and not businesses.

The main goal is to assist architects in home economy. How the issue of mobility relates to qualifications and recognition.

In summary, using APEC to promote. The Architect doesn't need to reside for a long period as in reality it is difficult. The main issue will be how does regulatory bodies achieved that.

**Group 2:** Reducing barriers to mobility and some economies mentioned about Local Collaboration. Discuss on the post to eliminate Local Collaboration, moving from Local Collaboration to recognition. To assist of mobility of intern and what's the purpose of this committee.

**Group 3:** Similar discussions with the two group. When the APEC started, it was an exciting time but as we move on what's the purpose of this APEC;

1. Discuss mobility

2. Discuss business traveller
3. Has the criteria of APEC architects becomes a burden?
4. Internship to home economies.
5. Sharing information on education qualification and recognition of education Institute
6. Sharing information on Trade agreements
7. Discuss on the meeting timeframe as it is good to only meet every 2 years

**Group 4:** We are the regulatory bodies and the problem is Regulatory bodies are confined. Thus, mobility and due diligence plays a major role in Local Collaboration. How to create mobility among economies as licensure may derived from long service using mobility.

APEC has to continue to strive and encourage mobility as APEC promotes global mobility.

The **Chair** sum up after listening, we are still in dire straits and still not sure of APEC architect project and as we go along, we encounter more restrictions rather than making pathways for mobility as easy as possible.

One need to relook if it is difficult to move for practise, it may be easier to relook at the purpose of mobility as to how it may assist younger architect to gain experience from other economies.

**Malaysia** - the issues we gathered are the difficulties to be an APEC Architects and the mobility is more towards the young and it is best for the young to be APEC Architects. We should start to change internship with other economies and to improve this is to amend our Architect Operations Manual.

**Australia** - There are no endorsement through APEC, observation on the LC is that it is unsure if the LC will be assisting the Architect as in every case one should look at business criteria with the home partners.

The real values are through education and it is a good view. It is difficult to ease mobility through APEC as many economies don't want mobility. We need to refocus on the objective of APEC as the reality of mobility is in the individual. The barrier will be immigration & nationality issue.

Each economy has certain level of protection for their professions. The strength of our profession is that we can communicate between economies.

One thing for sure is what are the conditions required are similar. To improve the APEC as we are regulatory bodies.

**Philippines** - what is the additional architect benefits when an APEC architect becomes mobile. Find the value-added benefits to be an APEC members. Identify what we can offer to be an APEC architect. Less restrictions or no restrictions for

APEC Architects. We can group common economies with common needs and see how this group can work with another group. Let us not be competitive and let's be working together.

**New Zealand** – no point in APEC and it is best to discuss on the regulations as this will add values. The mobility is happening.

**Philippines** – Should come out with a matrix what are the advantages of domain specific assessment and the success stories of local collaboration and from there an adjustment can be done. It is not easy to change in ASEAN Culture. We should continue a round table discussion with regulatory bodies as from there we can come up with ideas which will appreciate.

**Philippines** - Agree with US in regards to constant meeting.

**Malaysia** – Looking HRDWG as to how the Services and Trade will assist and how political and domestic rules and laws that needs to be viewed. There are many ways to improve mobility.

Adopting the law will slow down illegal practise and using APEC as a platform to provide mobility and seamless architect services.

There is no problem of Mobility but how we can make easier to work together as partnership.

**Hong Kong**- We have a role and APEC can be used as a platform to promote services and trade and to facilitate cross border trading. We can perform local collaboration with economies but with condition to follow certain regulations.

APEC framework can sell guidelines and standard. Promote education APEC to young architects. The APEC must facilitate clearer on the ground of mobility.

**Singapore** – It is good to review APEC and architect who are trapped in mobility but there are more towards it. The understanding of one economy is lacking. We should be facilitating.

The cross learning it is important as this will improve the chances of registration. Give areas which will enhance APEC. Example Bangkok, has strict regulations nonetheless it has enhanced.

**Thailand** - We are not focusing the real goal as mobility is still the main goal. We can change the platform to assist APEC and we are still lacking practise infrastructure and enhance technical skills and promoting internship and helping each economy to learn in about new economies.

The value proposal needs to consider the benefits for each economy. The question is who can the benefit from this exchange practices.

Reiterated the issue.

**Korea** - like to invite others to advise Korea in regards of APEC as to what are the benefits of being APEC Architects and Korea thinks the mobility will give more opportunity.

**United States**- In respond to Korea question, no value as no relationship with APEC Economies and framework. We have built MRA with APEC Economies but they are not coming as they are not interested in practising in the home economy.

1. Is it difficult to be an APEC Architect?
2. Is it expensive title?

The **Chair**- registration is only the first step and they should not expect to be spoon feed as APEC is a mere facilitation platform. We as a regulatory arm need to do more and negate with respective members and discuss with Government and how discussions will relate to HRDWG.

Thus, the regulatory body gives licensure to practise and once you have an APEC license, an individual can work mobility.

**Canada** – We focusing on Individual. We transfer knowledge understanding cultural issues, architectural issues and practice issues. In fact, we need to reduce the barriers of mobility. The discussion here is to provide value why we are here.

**New Zealand** - To discuss during tea

**Thailand** – Local Collaboration is going on nonetheless any agreement will take time and what are the value or benefits after applying for APEC Architect. Training and transfer of knowledge with younger architects for time being and mobility in the future.

The **Chair** – summed up that all may see the relevant of caucus and what was lacking is the colour coding it will assist this better. The essence of the discussion in relation of mobility that been formulated for this caucus APEC Architect Project started by Australia. We as the regulatory body become engross in regulating not by facilitating. We now should focus on facilitate the practice of mobility and make it legal, easier and recognized.

Same as in Bangkok, in Malaysia they have liability and responsibility to the stakeholder. Thus, we need to make the collaboration legal so that the stakeholder do not suffer.

## Item 10-Central Council Administration

### Item 10.1-Report by the Secretariat

**The Secretariat** reported that Malaysia being the Secretariat projects completing their task including; Administrative Services, Raising Awareness of the Project and Providing Information via Website, and Organizing the 7<sup>th</sup> Central Council Meeting. The task was completed by Board of Architect Malaysia alongside the normal duties at their place of work.

In terms of summarizing activities for **the secretariat;**

- i. request and collated annual reports,
- ii. issued invoices to and received fees from all 14 participating economies,
- iii. successful in collecting annual fees from the period 2015 – 2016,
- iv. ensure that the website was kept 'live' and
- v. completed all other administrative and financial task as necessary.

**The secretariat** reported The Seventh Central Council Meeting held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia has been organized by Board of Architects Malaysia who have completed the work without sponsorship or external funding.

**The secretariat** reported on the Finance matter, in October 2015, invoice was issued to all 14 participating economies for both the 2015 and 2016 annual fees as per funding formula.

The **Chair** - There was a delay in collecting fees, hope that the next secretariat can co-ordinate faster.

**Malaysia** – mention the number of registered architect for Malaysia is not correct.

The **Chair** explain the table will be updated for the final report.

**United States** – Commented on the secretariat responsible for the updates on number of registered architects and evaluate any changes on the funding formula. The number on the table is not same as the report that have been submitted.

The **Chair** asked Australia if the number of registered architect in the table is correct.

**Australia**—the figure includes the practicing and non-practicing architects. Australia request for more time to confirm on the correct number of architects.

**Canada**—requested the number needs to be revised.

**United States** – commented the number of architect on the table was not same as the report that United States provide. United States believe if all the economies received the report template and reply to the secretariat, the number should be correct and should reflected on the table.

**The Secretariat** – there are discrepancy on the number of architects on the table which has not been updated by secretariat. Mention some of the economies did not provide the information to the secretariat. The secretariat informed they will update the information accordingly.

The **Chair** ask the current secretariat to update the current number of architects based on the report sent by the participating economies and evaluate the funding formula.

**Philippines** – ask the number to be retain. However, the number included the deceased architects.

The **Chair** requested all economies to forward the annual report to the secretariat and as it is the table is accepted.

#### **Item 10.2-Review of the Schedule of Rotation of Responsibilities**

The **Chair** highlight the schedule of rotation of responsibilities and mention People Republic of China next in-line and by Jan 2017 current secretariat will pass the metal box to next secretariat.

**China**—Thanks Malaysia and a good job to Malaysia Secretariat. China confirms accepting the responsibility as the Secretariat for 2017-2018 for central council meeting. China would like to learn with Malaysia as well previous secretariat in regards to the secretariat duty and responsibilities.

**Singapore**—congrats and thanks China for gracefully accept the responsibility. Singapore suggest China to host the events and convention to improve the APEC.

**China**- Agreed.

Certificate ceremony – handing over the secretariat duty to China.

#### **Item 10.3-Adoption of the Summary Conclusions**

The meeting considered and adopted a set of summary conclusions (*see Annex*

2).

#### **Item 10.4-Amendments to the Operations Manual**

**Malaysia** – The future APEC Architects will determine with amendments to the Amendments to the Operations Manual. Depending on the group whether to review or not.

**New Zealand** - proposed drop the word Project and let it be APEC Architect Council Meeting.

APEC Architect Council – facilitating the mobility: -

1. APEC Architects Information
2. APEC Architect Project
3. APEC Architectural Intern/ Young Project Exchange
4. Collaboration Project.

**United States** – thank New Zealand for the proposal. United States suggest to remove the tagline of mobility and replace it with facilitating recognition. United States propose there are points for education, experience, examination, and practice.

**Australia** –express point of view on New Zealand’s proposal, what are the things that are difficult about operating currently. The great aspiration is there, how we put the aspiration into fact?

**Malaysia** –thank New Zealand for the proposal. We need to agree whether we are doing the same or adding any value to it. Malaysia proposed to adopt New Zealand proposal. Malaysia suggest more discussion through Skype.

The **Chair** –asked to accept in principal of New Zealand proposal. The **Chair** tasked New Zealand to create WhatsApp group where New Zealand as admin to facilitate the proposal.

**China** – mentioned that during past 10-20 years, many foreigner have come forward to penetrate the market. In China, there are more collaboration with foreign architect which is a burden.

**China-** suggested the Collaboration Project to be changed to APEC Architect Practise Project.

**Philippines-** Would like to include mobility in the chart.

The **Chair** proposed to task New Zealand with WhatsApps as it much better as more live. The discussion can go live and all the discussion recorded in WhatsApps group will be use during the meeting.

**New Zealand** – suggest each economy to named a representative for the WhatsApps group.

The **Chair** requested each economy to put forward their representative for the discussion on New Zealand Proposal to current secretariat. The discussion on the matter will be concluded before the next meeting in China and tabled before the delegates at the next meeting.

#### **Item 11 - The Next Meeting of the Central Council**

**China** confirm before March 2018 the date and venue for the Eight Central Council Meeting. It will be inform to all the economies.

**Philippines** – thank to the host country Malaysia, Board of Architects Malaysia for hosting the meeting and the hospitality.

**The Chair** declared the meeting closed.

Annex 1

THE APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT RECIPROCAL RECOGNITION FRAMEWORK-

SUPPORT MATRIX (ALL ECONOMIES LOCAL COLLABORATION (LC) UNLESS NOTED)

	AUSTRALIA	CANADA	CHINA	HONGKONG	JAPAN	KOREA	MALAYSIA	MEXICO	NEWZEALAN	PHILIPPINES	SINGAPORE	CHINESE TAIPEI	THAILAND	USA
AUSTRALIA		DSA			DSA				CM		DSA	DSA		
CANADA	DSA							DSA	DSA					CM
CHINA				DSA										
HONGKONG			DSA											
JAPAN	DSA								DSA					
KOREA														
MALAYSIA														
MEXICO		DSA												DSA
NEWZEALAND	CM	DSA			DSA						DSA	DSA		
PHILIPPINES														
SINGAPORE	DSA								DSA					
CHINESE TAIPEI	DSA								DSA					
THAILAND														
USA		CM						DSA						

CM–Complete Mobility, DSA–Domain Specific Assessment, CRE–Comprehensive Registration Examination, HER Host Economy Residence,  
LC–Local Collaboration, NR–No Recognition



Agreements under APEC



Agreements outside APEC

DRAFT

## **Annex 2**

### **THE APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT SEVENTH CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETING**

#### **Meeting Summary Conclusions**

1. Attendees were welcomed by the President of the Board of Architects Malaysia, Ar. Datuk Dr. Amer Hamzah Mohd Yunus and the Malaysia APEC Architect Monitoring Committee.
2. The protocols for the Central Council Meeting were confirmed.
3. Economies introduced their attendees, all participating economies were present except Mexico. The meeting was also attended by 2 observers namely from Indonesia and Vietnam.
4. The agenda was confirmed without amendment.
5. The meeting summary of the APEC Architect Project ~~Sixth~~ Central Council Meeting held in Vancouver, Canada in 2014 was confirmed without amendment.
6. Delegates discussed and confirmed the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status. The Support Matrix is to be improved with appropriate legend and the delegates voted for only one matrix to be adopted.
7. The delegates discussed and confirmed that the submission of participating Economy Reports shall be in June of the 2nd year interval to the Secretariat hence amendment has to be made under item 4.2 of the APEC Architect Operations Manual.
8. The Secretariat reported that no inquiries had been received regarding the establishment of any new monitoring committees.
9. All economies provided reports on their APEC Architect activities.
10. The Secretariat was requested to introduce a new row in the template of the Participating Economy Report, to indicate the number of APEC Architects from other economies at end of period accordingly.

11. No new bilateral or multilateral agreements were reported.
12. The Secretariat was requested to provide a link with the APEC Architect Project under the HRDWG website as well as the main APEC website.
13. The meeting discussed on the future of APEC Architect Project where economies brainstormed and forwarded propositions to improve the mobility and value as APEC Architect.
14. New Zealand agrees to lead the working group in collaboration with the new secretariat (People's Republic of China) and to utilise whatever suitable electronic digital media for discussion with nominated representatives of the participating economies.
15. All APEC Economies are required to submit number of registered architects in their jurisdiction and a direct website link to the APEC Architect portion of their website to their secretariat by October 31, 2016.
16. Current Secretariat will request an updated report form from Mexico.

DRAFT