**THE APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT EIGHTH CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETING**

**ZHENGZHOU, CHINA**

**SEPTEMBER 19 & 20, 2018**

**Draft Minutes**

**A formal welcome to Zhengzhou, China**

The APEC Architect Project Central Council Meeting began with **the Chair**, Mr. Cui Kai, greeting each delegate of participating economies attending the meeting and giving away his book *Chinese Architecture: A Selection 2013- 2017* to each delegate as a gift.

Conference attendees then took their seats and the Chair called the meeting to order.

**Item1 - Welcome to Attendees**

On behalf of the Architectural Society of China (ASC) and APEC Architects Project Monitoring Committee P. R. China, **ASC Secretary General** Mr. Zhong Jishou delivered his opening speech and thanked all participating economies attending the meeting.

**Item 2 - 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 8th 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/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 provided the names of each member of their delegation, these being as follows:

| **ECONOMY** | **NAME**  |
| --- | --- |
| AUSTRALIA | CATHERINE TOWNSEND |
| KATE DOYLE |
| CANADA | MARK VERNON |
| PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA | ZHUANG WEIMIN |
| YU YANG |
| ZHONG JISHOU |
| WANG XIAOJING |
| HONG KONG CHINA | CHEN MARVIN  |
| LAM KWONG-KI DOMINIC  |
| CHI WUH-CHERNG DANIEL |
| CHAN LOK FAI EMILY |
| WAI CHUI-CHUI ROSMAN |
| JAPAN | KATSUNORI INOUE |
| HIROSHI NAKANISHI |
| MICHIKO YAMAUCHI |
| REPUBLIC OF KOREA | JAEHO SHIM |
| CHITOK KIM |
| MALAYSIA | ZAIRUL AZIDIN |
| DATUK TAN PEI ING |
| ESA BIN MOHAMED |
| NEW ZEALAND | PAUL JACKMAN |
| REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES | YOLANDA D. REYES  |
| EDRIC MARCO C. FLORENTINO |
| BENJAMIN K. PANGANIBAN, JR. |
| MEDELIANO ROLDAN |
| PROSPERIDAD C. LUIS |
| SINGAPORE | TAN SHAO YEN |
| NG LYE HOCK, LARRY |
| CHINESE TAIPEI | CHAO YI-CHENG  |
| CHEN YIN-HO |
| CHENG I-PING |
| HUANG HSIOU-CHUANG |
| LIU KUO-LUNG |
| LUAN CHUNG-PI |
| WU CHIEN-CHUNG |
| TSAI JEN-CHIEH |
| HSIAO CHANG-CHENG |
| THAILAND | VADHANASINDHU PONGSAK |
| TANGTRONGCHIT MICHAEL PARIPOL  |

**Item 4 - Adoption of the agenda**

The agenda was accepted without any additions or amendments.

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

**Item 5 - Confirmation of the Meeting Summary of the APEC Architect Project Seventh Central Council Meeting in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia**

**Malaysia** asked if the Secretariat had received the updated report from Mexico.

**The Chair** informed Malaysia that the Mexico’s updated report had been received.

**Hong Kong China** asked if the meeting was going to adopt the Summary Conclusions or the Summary Conclusions and the Draft Meeting Minutes.

**The Chair** clarified that only the Summary Conclusions were to be adopted.

The Summary Conclusions of the APEC Architect Project Seventh Central Council Meeting, held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia on 10 and 11 October 2016, were adopted without any additions or amendments. Moved **Republic of Korea**, seconded **the People’s Republic of China.**

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

**Republic of Philippines** reminded the Council that in previous minutes of meeting, there was a request by **Malaysia** for **Republic of the Philippines** to email the questionnaire as to how becoming APEC Architect will benefit architects. **Republic of the Philippines** presented to the meeting a copy of the questionnaire enquires and asked the Secretariat to distribute it among the member economies.

**The Chair** mentioned that **Republic of Korea** proposed at last Central Council Meeting that the Central Council shall take into consideration coordinating APEC Architect towards higher official effort.Korea had passed to the Secretariat related documents that shall be discussed at this meeting.

**Republic of Korea** delivered a report summarizing the APEC Service Competitive Roadmap 28th APEC Ministerial Meeting held in Lima, Peru in November 2016. **Korea** mentioned that during the meeting, a Services Competitiveness Roadmap (2016-2025) together with its implementation plan was submitted with a view to increasing APEC competitiveness in the service sector by 2025, ensuring an open and predictable environment for access to services markets by progressively reducing restrictions to services trade and investment. According to the Roadmap, individual action plan from each economy should be concluded until 2020 and by 2021, there will be a Midterm Review. All the objectives of the Roadmap shall be achieved by the year 2025. **Korea** highlighted that APEC Architect Project was closely related to such target and timeline and each economy shall speak with their own authorities to implement this objective and target.

**Republic of the Philippines** expressed full support for Korea’s proposal and believed that if we had a target and a roadmap to look forward to in achieving a certain objective in every step then we would know the progress we made.

**Malaysia** – Thanked Korea forthe presentation. **Malaysia** stated that to date we have very few MRAs, yet MRA is actually the crutch of the whole advancement of mobility and liberalization for architectural services, thus proposed that having MRAs among all participating economies should be our target by 2020.

**Canada** requested an electronic copy of Korea’s presentation being circulated to all participating economies.

**Hong Kong China** highlighted that according to the agenda, there will be a session tomorrow discussing the Future of the APEC Architect Project and asked how far we should go in the current session.

**New Zealand** went on to state that at the presentation tomorrow, **New Zealand** will be challenging some of the assumptions that seem to be met at the moment.

**Singapore** concurred that there will be more time tomorrow to deliberate on whether we should twist the APEC Architect Project or disband it.

**China** formally moved that the Council shall discuss this issue in tomorrow’s session.

**The Chair** concluded that the Secretariat will distribute the documents presented by Korea to all economies and the Council will continue with the discussion on Future of the APEC Architect Project tomorrow.

**The Chair** also raised the following matters arising from last Central Council Meeting:

1. Basis of mobility of ASEAN economies and whether it is similar with APEC
2. From previous meeting minutes, there was a request to insert a row on the existing economy report that indicates “Number of APEC Architects from Other Economies”. The Chinese Secretariat has made relevant amendment and invited participating economies to fill in the report in June. So far, all the 14 economies have handed in their respective report in a timely manner.
3. In the last Central Council Meeting, the economies had a discussion on the definition of architects in relation to the founding and asked for a re- evaluation on APEC Architect funding and an update to it. The definition of architect is yet to be confirmed.

**Item 7 - Reporting**

**Item 7.1 - Applications to form new Monitoring Committees**

**The Chair** stated that as a multilateral organization, APEC Architect Project is inclusive and welcomes new applications with arms wide open but unfortunately up to date, the Secretariat has not received any application to form new monitoring committees.

**Canada** requested an update from the Secretariat with regard to the earlier email discussion on Vietnam and Indonesia’s joining.

**The Chair** explained that the Secretariat has invited Vietnam and Indonesia to attend the 8th Central Council Meeting as observers but didn’t receive any reply.

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

**Australia** reported on three initiatives relevant to the APEC Architect Project. Firstly, they have completed a comprehensive review of the accreditation procedures. Secondly they have commenced an in-depth research into the profession of architecture. They are looking at the business of the architecture, the characteristics of the profession and the numbers of students and practitioners. Thirdly, they have introduced another pathway for the registration of experienced practitioners. They won’t provide details now but economies are welcome to approach for details at any time.

**Canada** expressed their continuous support for the APEC Architect Project and reported that they have existing agreements with Australia, New Zealand and during this discussion with Japan. Something they are moving forward is changing the Domain Specific Assessment process. They have recently signed in principle an agreement with the Architects’ Council of Europe (ACE) for full reciprocity with the EU and as part of that the government has provided funding for a 10- hour online course and assessment.

**China** reported that there are no major changes to the China’s “APEC Architect Project Participating Economy Report”. The total number of registered architects from October 2016 to June 2018 is 30660, among which 25816 architects’ certificates are within the validity period. The total number of APEC Architects up to date remains the same at 126. The status of China’s “reciprocal recognition framework” is still at local collaboration. **China** mentioned that APEC Architect Project Monitoring Committee of China announced new appointments on 16 October 2017 during the 4th Monitoring Committee Meeting held in Beijing. Currently China has 12 Committee members including those from Chinese government, architectural society (ASC), academic institutions, architectural design institutes, engineering corporations, etc. **China** highlighted that a symposium on cooperative design was also held along with the 4th Monitoring Committee Meeting. Against the backdrop of internationalization of architectural practice and mobility of talent, APEC Architects were invited to attend the symposium to identify approaches in facilitating the provision of cross- border professional architectural services and discuss on possibilities of pushing for reciprocal recognition of standards. **China** also mentioned that in response to the requirements arising from the 4th Meeting and the symposium, the APEC Architect Project Monitoring Committee of China created a list of survey questionnaire for APEC Architects in China enquiring as to how architectural institutes or engineering corporations apply architectural standards in other countries. Besides, **China** proactively undertakes the research work from the Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development (MOHURD) entitled “Compilation of Successful ‘Going Global’ Cases of China's Engineering Standards”. The research work is now underway.

**Hong Kong China** reported that the total number ofAPEC Architects remained unchanged despite some members resigned and some new members admitted. A further review of the composition and structure of APEC Architect Project Monitoring Committee, Hong Kong China (HK APEC) is going to be carried out. Currently HK APEC is composed of members nominated by the Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA) and also members nominated by the Architects Registration Board in Hong Kong (ARB). The tenure of Monitoring Committee members is 4 years; however, it does not tie in with the change of the HKIA Council or ARB. They are trying to work out a better composition which will enhance the bonding or connection between these two bodies and HK APEC. **Hong Kong China** also mentioned that as of today, there is a total of 3952 registered architects in Hong Kong of which 3900 are registered under ARB. **Hong Kong China** highlighted a number of key issues facing the Architects/Architectural Profession/Institute in HK over the last two years. For example, HKIA was accepted as a full signatory of the Canberra Accord (CA) and also carried out some related promotions for HK through the Belt and Road & Great Bay Area Initiatives.

**Japan** reported that to date they have about 140,000 1st-class *Kenchikushi* among them 290 architects are registered as APEC Architects and 18 were first registered during the last two years, but as the registration renewal rate is about 80%, they see a reduction of 30 APEC Architects compared to the last report.

**Republic of Korea** reported that the number of APEC Architects in Korea has decreased to 148 from the previous report of 228 in part due to the skepticism among APEC Architects towards the future of APEC Architect Project and what’s the benefits of being APEC Architects.

**Malaysia** has a total of 2106 Registered/ Licensed Architects and the number of APEC Architects increased by 7 to 31 over the last two years. They have tried to encourage and promote the membership by reducing subscription fees from RM300 to RM250 and renewal at RM200 per annum. Again, architects are questioning the benefits of being an APEC Architect thus they look forward to the discussion tomorrow on the Future of APEC Architect Project. As for the framework, Malaysia remains ‘local collaboration’.

**New Zealand** currently has 1960 Registered Architects. The number of APEC Architects dropped from 10 to 9. The reason for the decrease is because they have decided to impose an administrative fee of NZ$250. **New Zealand** mentioned that they’ve changed their procedure for determining whether somebody meets the APEC Architect requirements.

**Republic of Philippines** currently has 71 APEC Architects on its register, an increase of 17 from the previous. They are continuously and actively looking for tangible benefits that can be attached to the title of APEC Architects. **Philippines** indicated that the number of registered architects is around 42,000 and members of APEC Architect Project Monitoring Committee are composed of three groups: The Professional Regulatory Commission (PRC), Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and United Architects of the Philippines (UAP). They have continuously informed the membership of the APEC Architects registry and during the first three months of the new administration, the President normally goes around the country to inform different chapters of the APEC Architects registry and encourage them to join. **Philippines** has entered into MOUs with Chinese Taipei and has a MOU in principle agreed with the People’s Republic of China. As to the Reciprocal Recognition Framework, Philippines operates at local collaboration.

**Singapore** reported that out of the 1650 Registered Architects with practicing certificates, 71 of them have registered as APEC Architects. Singapore has signed the trilateral agreement with Australia and New Zealand and to date they have 4 Singaporean architects registered in Australia and 1 registered in New Zealand. 2 from Australia are already registered in Singapore and 1 is to be interviewed, besides they have 5 New Zealand citizens registered in Singapore yet not in New Zealand. Singapore looks forward to speaking with more economies- They are going to have talks with HK after this meeting.

**Chinese Taipei** reported that up to date the total number of Registered Architects in practice is 4182 and there are 94 APEC Architects registered in Chinese Taipei. The number of Monitoring Committee members remain at 31 despite new appointments. There isn’t any change to the documentation or registration/ licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies. In terms of Communications and Promotion, during the period, the Monitoring Committee always paid visits to local architects’ associations to promote the value and benefit of being APEC Architects. Due to the delay in amendments to the *Architects Act*, they have not entered into any APEC Architect reciprocal agreement. Chinese Taipei remains at the “domain specific assessment” level in regard to the Recognition Framework.

**Thailand** has a total of 2530 registered architects and has no APEC Architects on its register yet.

**China** moved that the meeting proceeds to item 7.3, 7.4 or even 7.5 since there is plenty of time today and tomorrow there will be serious issues to be discussed. **New Zealand** and **Republic of the Philippines** secondedthe motionand it received unanimous support.

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

**Australia** reported that the APEC Architect Register is promoted on the website and through the international chapter of the institute of architects but they are not saying an increase in the number of APEC Architects. They are very active outside the APEC Architect Project in terms of mutual recognition agreements because there are a huge number of overseas architects coming into their jurisdiction. **Australia** also runs a number of alternative pathways for experienced practitioners and the impetus for most pathways is actually increasing much more than through the APEC Architect so the issue is that promoting the APEC Architect is not a great emphasis in Australia at the moment.

**Canada** reported that promotion of the APEC Architect is limited at this stage to members and architects in Canada who wish to go to Australia or New Zealand.They do receive enquiries. It is prominently placed on the website and within each provinces’ regulator so it is well known but again it is only utilized for individuals who wish to access existing mutual recognition.

**China** mentioned that the Chinese Secretariat was tasked to invite **Russia** and **Papua New Guinea** for the 8th Central Council Meeting as observers - The Secretariat reached out to them but didn’t receive any reply. Besides, the Secretariat also reached out to HRDWG but didn’t receive any response neither. China also mentioned that the US pointed out at last meeting that China’s link on the official website of APEC Architect Project didn’t work- the link is now valid. In terms of promotion of the APEC Architect Register, **China** reported that it is a platform for young architects to communicate with other economies. They have organized symposiums on cooperative design where APEC architects are invited to identify approaches in facilitating the provision of cross-border professional architectural services. Besides, applications for APEC Architects from fellow members of the Architectural Society of China is free of charge.

**Hong Kong China** promoted APEC Architect Register in the following three different ways: 1) they have their own website for APEC which is linked to the websites of HKIA and ARB; 2) they invite newly elected members of HKIA and ARB to join the APEC Architects; 3) news articles regarding APEC Architects is published on HKIA’s e-newsletters from time to time.

**Japan** reported on three initiatives for promoting APEC Architect Register: 1) inform individual architects of the characteristics and merits of the APEC Architect Project through website, agency papers and press releases of respective organizations. Japan Federation of Architects & Building Engineers Association has introduced the APEC Architect by providing press books for members; 2) introduced the APEC Architect at the symposium of the Architectural Society in November this year; 3) the Monitoring Committee continues to enter into bilateral agreements with participating economies.

**Republic of Korea** held a special lecture last month and invited speakers from Italy to promote the APEC Architect. As they find it hard to facilitate the mobility and still operates at local collaboration, they plan to upgrade the reciprocal recognition framework status to ‘domain specific assessment’ and try to reach out to the authorities for support.

**Malaysia** continued to promote the APEC Architect through annual conventions and other local congresses to explain to architects about the APEC Architect Register.

**New Zealand** reported that their promotion of the Project is primarily through the website whether it is a specific area within the section for architects which explains what the APEC Architect Project is to New Zealand registered architects.

**Republic of the Philippines** promoted the APEC Architect Register through UAP publications and newsletters as well as PRC website. The President of UAP has a weekly column in one of the major newspapers in the Philippines so he will be able to come up with issues about architectural practice and one of which will be the APEC and ASEAN Architects Projects. They also have radio programs and a TV program (a talk show about architectural practice). They look forward to holding an APEC Architects Congress.

**Singapore** promoted the APEC Architect Register through two primary channels: 1) they highlight the APEC and ASEAN Architect Projects on the website of the Board of Architects Singapore (BOA) to bring awareness to the architects; 2) they hold BOA conferences; one is jointly with other stakeholders and the other is purely for registered architects.

**Chinese Taipei** expressed their strong support for the APEC Architect Project and reported that the Monitoring Committee is working closely with the government to draft the articles of the *Architects Act* on the mutual recognition of architects from other APEC Architect Project participating economies. Besides, the Monitoring Committee held seminars, dialogues with local architects’ associations and lectures in college to help younger generations to have a better understanding of international trends. With promotions, they are in hope to spread the value and meaning of being an APEC Architect.

**Thailand** reported that they promote the APEC Architect Register via website and in public events, and also provide newsletters for members. **Thailand** mentioned that because of the language barrier and technical differences, many Thailand architects have difficulties practicing abroad and this is the practical issue that the APEC Architect Project should look into when we talk about promotion of the APEC Architect Project.

**The Chair** thanked delegates for providing their reports and announced that the floor is open for comments.

**Malaysia** commented that over the past 16 years, the Project has not seen any advancement nor reception of membership. It behooves us to reflect on the intention of the Project and that of each economy. It is our responsibility for now and for tomorrow to consider where we are going at this point in time as far as the APEC Architect regime is concerned and to come up with a conclusion so that we can really move forward.

**Australia** followed on from Malaysia’s comments that we need to look at the intention of what we are trying to do with the APEC Architect Project and what it actually means when we talk about mobility and the way we practice (for example, to practice as an architect in Australia, a person is required to be able to practice in English. In Australia, they have practitioners with over 100 languages and they still expect every architect to be able to practice to the professional standard of English language). **Australia** suggested that it would be useful if we could share information on 1) how does each economy deal with overseas architects or practitioners coming into their economies and how do they test and assess whether your economy will accept them as professional architects in your own economy? 2) Post registration/ recognition impediments to practicing as an architect in each of our economies; What are the legal impediments to acting as an architect in terms of citizenship, residency, visa requirements etc.? 3) Material commonalities of architectural education and practice in each economy; how does each economy define in terms of the context? The context is often varied. For example, in Australia they place a very high importance on architectural design whereas other economies have more emphasis on technology, structure engineering, etc. **Australia** pointed out that we’ve shared a lot of information but we need to share more information on what is useful when we get down to an individual practitioner coming into othering economies.

**The Chair** stated that China has a very open market and many foreign architects practice in China. A very efficient and standard method for the provision of cross- border architectural services is to collaborate with local architects. The only problem is that sometimes the qualification or standard of local architects cannot be guaranteed. In this sense, we can find local APEC Architects to partner with as they have proven experiences, high standards of professionalism in architectural practice

and proficient English. This might be one of the benefits of being an APEC Architect.

**Republic of the Philippines** shared the observation that there seems to be no movement and the question to ask is how do we measure ‘no movement’? Maybe because we did not give ourselves measures. There are at least two that we can mention: two trilateral reciprocal arrangements have been entered into and progress has been made in Reciprocal Recognition Framework. If we consider these as measures, then maybe we can say that there is movement but not as fast as we have hoped.

**New Zealand** added that the number of APEC Architects who, via MRA, actually engage in the fast-track cross-border registration should be the key performance indicator and the pivotal measure of success or failure.

***Second Day***

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

**China and Republic of the Philippines** reported a bilateral MOU to be signed between the two economies.

Other economies did not report newly signed agreements.

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

**New Zealand** – An existing CM trilateral agreement between New Zealand, Australia and the US should be included in the Support Matrix.

**Hong Kong** **China** asked for clarification on the definition and scope of CRE, whether it is applicable to students.

Economies agreed that students should be a separate matter for discussion.

**Item 8 - The Future of the APEC Architect Project**

**Item 8.1 - Keynote speeches on the future of the APEC Architect Project**

Three economies gave keynote speeches:

− Keynote speech by **Canada** titled APEC Architect Project Intern Exchanges. The presentation is a follow-up to the previous meeting in Kuala Lumpur, providing background information on Canada’s self-regulation, the three pillars of professional regulation and an overview of Canada’s Intern Architect Program as well as some challenges associated. The presentation was followed by a brief Q&A session for further explanation.

− Keynote speech by **New Zealand** on the future of the APEC Architect Project.

New Zealand reviewed its participation in the project, and noted there had been substantial investment of time and money, which seemed disproportionate with the benefits. Recalling the mission of the Project, it is observed that the handful of registered APEC architects have not advanced the purpose of the project. New Zealand gave an introduction to the different pathways to registration in the economy, especially in relation to the Project and said it now had other procedures that were proving more effective in encouraging architects from other economies to be registered in New Zealand. New Zealand said in almost all cases the architects involved were migrants, which was not the intended market for the APEC Architect Project, its focus being on global entrepreneurs trading internationally in architectural services. According to a survey results, it is believed that there is a personal branding benefit being an APEC Architect, but marginal. New Zealand raised questions concerning the future direction and methods for the Project’s advancement. Possible measures going forward include, reducing costs, simplifying Central Council meetings, or replacing with a less formal association focused on facilitating information exchanges and discussion between participating economies regarding all aspects of the regulation of architecture, or adapting Central Council meetings to that end.

− Keynote speech by **China** on the Future of APEC Registered Architects. The presentation contains three parts: China’s mutual recognition and cooperative design achievements; favorable policies on opening market for global architects, including examples of representative international collaboration architecture projects in China; China’s national codes and standards, and China’s application of international standards.

***Mr. Cui Kai had to leave the meeting, Mr. Zhuang Weimin took the Chair from Item 8.2 on the agenda.***

**Item 8.2 - Discussion on the future of the APEC Architect Project based on the speeches delivered**

**Canada** -Suggested the Meeting cover economies’ regulatory procedures and processes. Reiterates Canada’s support for APEC Architect Project to continue. The APEC Council can work towards removing barriers of registration.

**New Zealand** – China’s presentation is good evidence that architects are already working internationally, are we trying to solve a problem that doesn’t exist.

**Canada** – China’s presentation proves “starchitects” can work anywhere, but our system aims to help architects not known internationally and need our assistance in order to be able to work in other economies.

**Hong Kong** **China** – The initial purpose of the project is to promote trade and cooperation; therefore, should the Council review our focus on individual registration or should we look at the bigger picture and include the business side too. Can students work cross-border as interns and what provisions we can put in place to facilitate that.

**Republic of Korea** – Would like to continue the APEC framework. Believed when talking about mobility of services, one should also consider consumers and not just architects.

**Malaysia** – There are many kinds of barriers, registration barriers, language barriers, etc. Members should deal with these fundamental problems first. Mentions that Australia is willing to do a study on improving professional licensure, and it is very necessary. Besides, although some architects are working internationally, but when malpractice happens, for example, in Malaysia’s case, penalties can only be imposed on local practitioners, which is inequitable and needs to be addressed.

**Republic of the Philippines** – As a developing economy, the Philippines supports the APEC Architect Project and looks forward to more mobility. The Philippines is also developing a safety net, including an insurance system for foreign companies to cover losses if incurred. The Philippines is revising the laws and is undergoing political changes, which takes time before the economy can be fully prepared for CM, but is happy to help other economies progress.

**Chinese Taipei** – Agreed with Canada in that the meeting can put forward a statement on pushing governments to make adjustments favorable for mutual cooperation. Fully supports the advancement of the Project.

**Australia** – The lack in data and information of economies’ procedures and policies should be addressed so as to move towards shared objectives.

**China** – In response to New Zealand’s comment, for LC in China, foreign practitioners can only do scheme designs, not construction drawings. China believes total mobility is the ultimate goal of the Project, despite difficulties.

**Singapore** – The original goal of complete mobility seems to be no longer aligned with the current reality. Can the forum shift its focus to local collaboration instead, e.g. lowering barriers? Should we think about licensing firms instead? Can we leaner the structure of this organization?

**Chair** asked about the regulations regarding the disbandment of the Project.

**Singapore** – Has been fully supportive of APEC and now has an open regime. The forum has not made major progress in the last eight years, the forum should think hard what delegates can take away from the meeting.

**Japan** – The Project has value, but agrees with New Zealand in reducing cost. The reporting can be done online.

**Hong Kong** **China** – With the Project’s mandate in mind, the Project should broaden its focus from individual architects to businesses, to facilitating trade of architectural services. For individuals, the focus should be more than solely registration.

**Thailand** – Due to legislative restrictions, it’s difficult for Thailand to achieve MRAs, so focus should be placed more on mobility. Economies can talk with their respective governments on giving some special treatment to APEC architects.

**Republic of the Philippines** – Should be more aggressive in promoting the Project to their architects. Offered suggestions such as could we build a handbook of historical data of current achievements and registered architects; come up with out-of-the-box programs, e.g. to spread awareness, or intern exchange; or consider a corporate approach.

**Malaysia** – Registered APEC architects should be able to work internationally and have favorable treatment, but data of different economies’ qualification requirement needs to be compiled. Proposed an idea that architects who wish to work in other APEC economies must be registered within the framework.

**New Zealand** – Pointed out that Malaysia’s idea is impossible.

**Australia** – Explained that in Australia’s existing arrangements, for all architects, DSA is required and that the DSA normally entails an interview.

**Republic of the Philippines** – Pointed out a problem that in local collaboration, the Philippines can only hold local practitioners accountable, and there are no regulations to specify the liabilities of foreign architects.

**Thailand** – Focusing on mobility, economies need to think hard on how to let APEC architects practice in other economies. The Project’s ultimate goal is individual mobility, we need to think about the initial steps that can lead us there other than legislative barriers, e.g. internship, exchange, regional competitions, training, etc.

**Republic of Korea** –Agreed that it’s unfair that responsibilities are only borne by local architects. Suggests to focus on practical issues at the level of LC.

**Singapore** – Shared Singapore’s measures in preventing irresponsible foreign consultants or collaborators.

**Chair** summarized the discussion and notes that there exists an imbalance among developed and developing economies. The Chair indicated that it is not a good time to come to the decision on whether to sustain or terminate the program as we have the responsibility to push it forward.

**New Zealand** - Acknowledged the consensus is no doubt to retain the program.

**Singapore** - Reviewed Singapore’s commitment to the program in the past years, and suggested to discuss what can be done to achieve the shared goal.

**Hong Kong** **China** - Despite current difficulties, if nothing is done then no progress can be made, thus the meeting should explore benefits and significance of being an APEC architect.

**Republic of the Philippines** - Acknowledged New Zealand’s presentation is a wakeup call. Economies at different status should think about what they can offer and how they can move forward.

The Meeting took a lunch break.

**Chair** began afternoon session, and invited delegates to forward ideas and motions.

**New Zealand** – It would be valuable if this entity becomes a forum for discussing all the work we do as regulatory agencies.

**Republic of the Philippines** – Need to come up areas where information is needed from different economies.

**Hong Kong China** – The decision has been made to retain the APEC Project, and suggested delegates to brainstorm ideas on how to move forward.

**Republic of Korea** – Proposed the following motion: the 8th APEC Central Council adopts a resolution that mobility of APEC architects shall be more facilitated in such a manner where economies consider establishing MRA at the LC level regardless of reciprocal recognition status, except in the case of no recognition.

**Canada** – Moved for the Chair to also speak for China if he wishes to. Canada already has free ability of any architect to have LC. Agreed.

**Singapore** – Revisited the aim stated in APEC framework manual. Singapore cannot agree with Korea’s statement if it means just to promote LC.

**Chinese Taipei** – Asked about a suggestion Canada mentioned in the morning session.

**Canada** – Suggested that the Council put forward a statement for all governments to try to remove barriers post-registration.

**New Zealand** – Cautioned that it would be very difficult to change political situations.

**Chair** thanked Korea, and directs delegates to focus on Korea’s motion first.

**Australia** – Korea’s motion is more like an aspirational statement and it is a good place to start.

**Republic of Korea** – Explained the background and amended the motion.

**Republic of the Philippines** – Amended Korea’s motion statement to starting MRA even at the LC level.

Delegates had more discussion on Korea’s motion. **Chair** suggests to treat Korea’s proposition as a statement rather than a motion. **Korea** agreed.

**Malaysia** – The Meeting needs to first decide whether to disband or retain this Project before talking about details.

**New Zealand** – Proposed a resolution that was discussed and amended by economies and adopted by the Meeting with no objection: “That Central Council extends its role to facilitating discussion in regard to the regulation of the practice of architecture in the participating economies.”

**Thailand** – Suggested each economy should submit documents to the Council and present at the next meeting.

**Chair** agreed with Canada in that Thailand’s suggestion should be a separate topic.

**Republic of the Philippines** - New Zealand’s motion would require all economies to submit relevant information.

**New Zealand** – Writing reports are not necessary.

**Republic of the Philippines** – Economies can benefit a lot from informative presentations like today.

**Australia** – Some information is necessary. Australia is willing to share a spreadsheet for information gathering.

Consensus has been reached and **Chair** moved discussion to **Thailand’s** suggestion that each economy should submit regulatory documents to the Council and present at the next meeting.

**Australia** – Suggested a modification that the information be submitted in electronic templates. Offered to distribute a template sample to participating economies.

**Malaysia** – Report submission and website updating is already required of economies, so no need to collect information again.

**Singapore –** Supported Australia’s suggestion of the use of a template for its convenience and ease to use.

After discussion and modification, the resolution suggested by **Thailand** was adopted by the Meeting with no objection: “That each economy submits information in electronic templates in relation to the regulation of the practice of architecture in their respective economies. Australia will submit the template for the meeting’s use.”

**Chinese Taipei** – The purpose for New Zealand’s motion is not clear, suggests to add “for the professional regulation of APEC architects” in the end.

**New Zealand** – The vision is to go beyond the APEC Project.

**Chair** thanked the delegates for the contribution to the two resolutions adopted, and continued the meeting.

**New Zealand** – Proposed to discuss the validity of the APEC Architect Project.

**Hong Kong China** – Moved to adopt a resolution “That the APEC Architect Project shall be strengthened. That the Central Council should explore more benefits for the APEC architects.”

**Malaysia** – The Council first needs to decide whether to continue.

**Canada** – In response to Malaysia’s comment, a consensus has been reached to continue the Project.

**Chair** suggested to combine the two sentences into one motion.

Economies discussed and amended **Hong Kong China**’s motion and the meeting adopts the following resolution “That APEC Architect Project shall be strengthened further to explore more benefits for the APEC architects and the scope of the APEC Architect project.”.

**Thailand** – Proposed the Central Council to expand its role to actively study non-regulatory barriers that will lead to substantial regulatory alteration in each economy, considering stakeholders such as governments, architects and people.

**Chair** believed Thailand’s statement is a suggestion for the program, rather than a motion.

**Republic of Korea** – Asked if there should be some form of recognition of the roadmap Korea presented.

**Republic of the Philippines** – Proposed to take Korea’s proposal, and that Korea to establish the roadmap.

**Republic of Korea** – Should establish a draft roadmap by 2020 and distribute to economies for comments and consolidation.

Delegates had more discussion on the roadmap, Chair thanks and acknowledges Korea’s contribution in presenting the roadmap.

**Item 9 - Central Council Administration**

**Item 9.1 - Report by the Secretariat**

**The Secretariat** reported that during 2017 and 2018, the duty has been met by the People’s Republic of China, completing their task including: administrative services, raising awareness of the Project and providing information via websites, and organizing the 8th Central Council Meeting.

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

1. requested and collated annual reports,
2. issued invoices to and received fees from all 14 participating economies,
3. was successful in collecting annual fees from the period 2017 – 2018,
4. ensure that the website was kept ‘live’ and
5. completed all other administrative and financial task as necessary.

**The Secretariat** reported the Eighth Central Council Meeting held in Zhengzhou, China has been organized by Architectural Society of China who have completed the work without sponsorship or external funding.

In terms of Finance, in November 2017, invoices were issued to all 14 participating economies for both the 2017 and 2018 annual fees as per the funding formula. So far all 14 participating economies have paid the contribution fee for 2017 and 2018, totalling USD $91,798, roughly RMB ¥629,523.15.

**The Secretariat** reported there has been an amendment to the Operation Manual Item 4.2, as a follow up of the Seventh Central Council Meeting decision.

**New Zealand** – Asks the Secretariat if the funding is adequate.

**The Secretariat** answered yes.

**Chair** thanks all of the past Rotating Secretariats for the contributions they’ve made.

**Canada** – Appreciates China’s work as the Secretariat for the past two years.

**Republic of the Philippines** suggested to add a resolution of thanks to the Chinese Secretariat

**Item 9.2 – Review of the Schedule of Rotation of Responsibilities**

**Chair** invited **Singapore**, the next economy on the rotation list to give comments.

**Singapore** – Apologized to all economies and explained Singapore would not be able to host 2020, but willing to host later Meetings. Asked if any economy can volunteer to take over the 2020 Secretariat role.

**Chair** asked if any economy would like to volunteer to host the 9th Central Council Meeting. Chair explained that the Secretariat has sent emails to economies but didn't receive positive feedbacks and strongly suggested economies to step up and volunteer.

**New Zealand** – Asked if Singapore could take over the next Meeting as scheduled.

**Singapore** – Explained that Singapore preferred to host 2026 for a big celebration.

Each economy on the rotation list was asked whether they can act as Secretariat for the next Central Council Meeting, and all gave negative replies.

**The Philippines** volunteered to take over the role of Secretariat for the Central Council Meeting.

**Singapore** – Makes a motion to give special thanks for the Philippines’ helping hand.

**Item 9.4 - Amendments to the Operations Manual**

**Chair** brings to economies attention to an amendment to Item 4.2 of the Operations Manual, as decided in the 7th Central Council Meeting: All economies shall submit the economy report in June of the second year. Twelve-month intervals should be changed to twenty-four-month intervals.

**Item 9.3 - Adoption of the Summary Conclusions**

The Meeting considered, amended and adopted the summary conclusions.

Chair concludes the meeting has been successful, and thanked the Philippines.

**Item 10 - The Next Meeting of the Central Council**

**Republic of the Philippines** took over Secretariat duties for the Ninth Central Council Meeting; economies will be informed of the date and venue after confirmation.

**The Chair** declared the meeting closed.

***Annex 1* THE APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT RECIPROCAL RECOGNITION FRAMEWORK-**

**SUPPORT MATRIX (ALL ECONOMIES LOCAL COLLABORATION (LC) UNLESSNOTED)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AUSTRALIA** | **CANADA** | **CHINA** | **HONGKONG** | **JAPAN** | **KOREA** | **MALAYSIA** | **MEXICO** | **NEWZEALAND** | **PHILIPPINES** | **SINGAPORE** | **CHINESETAIPEI** | **THAILAND** | **USA** |
| **AUSTRALIA** |  | **DSA**  |  |  | **DSA** |  |  |  | **CM** |  | **DSA** | **DSA** |  | **CM** |
| **CANADA** | **DSA**  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **DSA** | **DSA**  |  |  |  |  | **CM** |
| **CHINA** |  |  |  | **DSA** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **HONGKONG** |  |  | **DSA** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **JAPAN** | **DSA** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **DSA** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **KOREA** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MALAYSIA** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MEXICO** |  | **DSA** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **DSA** |
| **NEWZEALAND** | **CM** | **DSA** |  |  | **DSA** |  |  |  |  |  | **DSA** | **DSA** |  | **CM** |
| **PHILIPPINES** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SINGAPORE** | **DSA** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **DSA** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **CHINESETAIPEI** | **DSA** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **DSA** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **THAILAND** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **USA** | **CM** | **CM** |  |  |  |  |  | **DSA** | **CM** |  |  |  |  |  |

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

**THE APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT EIGHTH CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETING**

 **Meeting Summary Conclusions**

* + - 1. Attendees were welcomed by the Chair Mr. Cui Kai, the Secretary General of the Architectural Society of China Mr. Zhong Jishou and the APEC Architect Monitoring Committee P.R. China.
			2. The protocols for the Central Council Meeting were confirmed.
			3. Economies introduced their attendees; all participating economies were present except Mexico and the United States of America. No observers attended the meeting.
			4. The agenda was confirmed without amendment.
			5. The meeting summary of the APEC Architect Project Seventh Central Council Meeting held in Kuala Lumpur in 2016 was confirmed without amendment.
			6. The Secretariat reported that no inquiries had been received regarding the establishment of any new monitoring committees.
			7. The Philippines provided questionnaire enquiries as to how becoming APEC Architects will benefit members.
			8. The Republic of Korea distributed copies of their presentation via the Secretariat.
			9. Monitoring Committees of each economy reported to the Central Council.
			10. All economies provided reports on the strategies adopted to promote the APEC Architect Register.
			11. The Secretariat informed each economy of the results of tasks confirmed by last Central Council Meeting.
	1. Chinese Secretariat is tasked to invite Papua New Guinea and Russia for the 8th Central Council meeting as an Observer. The Secretariat has reached out to Papua New Guinea and Russia for the 8th Central Council meeting as observers but they declined.
	2. The Chinese Secretariat was requested to provide a link with the APEC Architect Project under the HRDWG website as well as the main APEC website: The Chinese Secretariat has reached out to HRDWG but didn’t receive any reply.
	3. The US pointed out at last meeting that China’s link on the official website of APEC Architect Project didn’t work. The link is now valid.
		+ 1. China and the Philippines agreed to sign a MOU and the Secretariat was requested to update the Support Matrix.
			2. New Zealand reported that a CM trilateral agreement between New Zealand, Australia and USA should be included in the Support Matrix. The Secretariat updated the table accordingly.
			3. From Item 8.2, Mr. Zhuang Weimin took the Chair from Mr. Cui Kai.
			4. The meeting discussed on the future of APEC Architect Project where economies forwarded propositions to improve the mobility and value as APEC Architects. The Meeting adopted the following resolutions:
	4. That Central Council extends its role to facilitate discussion in regard to the regulation of the practice of architecture in the participating economies.
	5. That each economy submits information in electronic templates in relation to the regulation of the practice of architecture in their respective economies. Australia will submit the template for the meeting’s use.
	6. That APEC Architect Project shall be strengthened further to explore more benefits for the APEC architects and the expansion of the scope of the APEC Architect project.
		+ 1. The Meeting appreciated the Republic of Korea’s presentation on a roadmap for the APEC Architect Project, a template will be distributed by Korea to be accomplished by each economy. The Secretariat will collate and present in the next Central Council Meeting.
			2. The Meeting thanked Chinese Secretariat, the Monitoring Committee P.R. China and Chair for the hard work
			3. Singapore, scheduled to act as Secretariat to the Central Council for 2019-2020 and to host the Ninth APEC Architect Central Council Meeting in 2020, was not able to accept these responsibilities.
			4. Each economy on the rotation list after Singapore was asked whether they can act as Secretariat for the next Central Council Meeting. No economy agreed to take on the Secretariat. The Philippines volunteered to take over the role of Secretariat and host for the Ninth Central Council Meeting. Singapore thanked the Philippines profusely for offering a helping hand.
			5. The Meeting gave special thanks to the Philippines.