

**THE REPORT FOR THE APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT CENTRAL COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING**

25 November 2020, Video Conference

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The APEC Architect Central Council Special Meeting was held through an online platform on 25 November 2020. All participating economies (Australia, Canada, China, Hong Kong China, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, USA, Philippines) were present except Korea.
2. The meeting was presided by Yolanda Reyes, AACC Chairman, from the Philippines. The list of attendees from the participating economies is attached as Annex A.

II. QUORUM

3. Ar. Robert S. Sac, from the Philippines, declared the presence of quorum.

III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

4. The meeting agreed to include the following items in the Agenda (Annex B):
 - a. Hand-Over of APEC Architect Central Council Chairmanship and Secretariat from China to the Philippines
 - b. The validity of APEC Architect Registration

IV. AGENDA ITEMS

A. Updates on the Philippines' Hosting of the 9th APEC Architect Central Council (AACC) Meeting were presented to the participating economies

5. Philippines proposed that the conduct of the 9th AACC Meeting will be in on October 26 – 30, 2021, back-to-back with the International Conference of Architects (ICA)

6. The Chair informed the meeting that Philippines already made some preparations for the 9th AACC Meeting and ICA even before the Covid-19 pandemic hit the country. The meeting was supposed to be conducted on 26 to 30 October 2020. The chair further presented photos of the proposed venue for the meeting.
7. The meeting has informed the economies that Philippines, as the host, will hold the 9th AACC Meeting on the 28th, 29th and 30th of October 2021, while the ICA will be on 26 to 27 October 2021 in Metro Manila. The Philippines is considering the Conrad Hotel and SMX Convention Center as the venues for the said activities. The participating economies agreed on the dates of the 9th AACC meeting and ICA.

The Philippines presented the following additional activities:

- a. Conferment of new APEC Architects
 - b. Exhibits of APEC Architect works
 - c. Launching of the APEC Architect Coffee Table Book
 - d. Educational and Historical Tours
8. The meeting agreed on the additional items to be included in the Participating Economy Report Template (ANNEX C).
 - a. Submission of respective update reports by January 2021 to the secretariat.
 - b. Any additional update prior to the 9th AACC meeting will be submitted by the economies to the secretariat.
 - c. With respect to the additional information on “Requirements for Full Registration of Non-Resident/Non-Citizen”, the chair clarified that the participating economies need to indicate the requirements based on their domestic regulations.
 9. The meeting agreed on the proposed additional inclusions in the APEC Architect Operations manual.

- a. Actual Turnover of the Secretariat and Chairmanship of AACC

2nd sentence of the Council Proceedings particularly under the Meeting Chair in page 83: *A turn-over ceremony will be conducted for the acceptance of the economy’s chairmanship.*

2nd paragraph of the Schedule of Rotation to act as Secretariat in page 84: *A hand over ceremony will be conducted to turn-over the documents and information of the Council to the new*

Secretariat. The economy during the ceremony will formally accept the role and responsibilities as APEC Chairman & Secretariat.

b. AACC Meetings in virtual/online Platforms

2nd paragraph of the Hosting of the Council Meeting in page 84: In the event that the members of council cannot meet face-to-face for the council meeting, the secretariat will host the meeting through virtual or online platform.

10. The Chair shared the report on the Hand-Over of the AACC Chairmanship and Secretariat from China to the Philippines. The Chair further mentioned that the one of the highlights of the activity was the actual turn over of documents concerning 'issues & concerns' and which will be disseminated to the Economies

B. Matters arising to be discussed during the 9th AACCM

11. The meeting agreed to retain the number of official delegates to council meetings which is three (3). Additional attendees who will be joining the meeting will be considered as observers.
12. The meeting clarified however that only the official delegates will speak for the economy. The meeting further emphasized that in the registration, the names of official representatives shall be disclosed including the names of observers who will attend the meeting. The Secretariat will inform the economy whether additional cost will be incurred in the accommodation of the observers.
13. The participating economies were asked to identify issues and concerns that may arise following the acquisition of another citizenship with respect to the practice of the architecture profession in the economies.
 - a. Australia mentioned that no limitations on practice in relation to citizenship. One who is lawfully resident in Australia may practice under the supervision of an architect or subject to completing appropriate assessment in Australia.
 - b. Canada mentioned that there is no link between citizenship and practice in Canada. The requirement is that individuals are either registered with a regulator in Canada or collaborating jointly with a local firm.

- c. People's Republic of China mentioned that at present they do not have any problem.
- d. Hong Kong mentioned that anyone can do business but if one wants to be registered as an architect then he needs to be a permanent resident.
- e. Japan mentioned that they do not have a major problem about acquisition of citizenship.
- f. New Zealand mentioned that no citizenship requirement to be registered as an architect.
- g. Republic of the Philippines mentioned that practice of architecture profession is only for Filipino citizens under the law. Foreign architects can practice provided they collaborate with local architects who are registered with Professional Regulation Commission.
- h. Singapore mentioned that they do not have an issue on citizenship.
- i. Chinese Taipei mentioned that the practice of profession has no link with citizenship but if one wants to work one needs to incorporate with local architects.
- j. Thailand mentioned that they do not have problem.
- k. United States of America mentioned that if one is pursuing a US license, there is no issue as long as one meets their qualifications requirements. If one is pursuing a license with his foreign license or through a Mutual Recognition Agreement, then one has to be a lawful resident of their home country.
- l. Malaysia mentioned that they allow practice in collaboration with local architects registered with the Board of Architects. There is no provision for residency or citizenship. Foreign architects are allowed to be registered provided, they follow the local registration requirement.
- m. Republic of Mexico mentioned that they have similar condition as that of US. Mexico needs a signed accord of architectural practice.

14. The economies agreed to submit their issues encountered in their respective economy to the secretariat. The economies will discuss the issues during the 9th AACC meeting or in another special meeting, if necessary.

V. Presentation of the New *APEC Architect Central Council website*

15. The Philippines presented the new APEC Architect Central Council website. The Chair requested the economies to submit new activities' information and photos to the Philippines to be uploaded to the new website.
16. With respect to the map, Singapore proposed that a map should be link to the website of the Professional Regulatory Authority of the economy. Malaysia further made a suggestion to make the economies more visible in the map by shading it with another color.
17. The Chair requested all economies to check the website to verify their list of registered APEC Architects. Thailand confirmed that they do not have a registered APEC Architect.

VI. Presentation of the Proposed Coffee Table Book

18. The Philippines presented the concept for the APEC Architect Coffee Table Book. The Chair explained that the purpose of the Coffee Table Book is to promote APEC Architects.
19. The economies agreed to submit APEC Architects and their works which will be featured in the book. The economies agreed to submit a maximum of ten (10) APEC Architects. The Chair further mentioned that the featured APEC Architects will have equal exposure.
20. Australia mentioned that it is very helpful if soft copy will be available in the website. Australia likewise requested the Philippines to include in the template a summary of works of APEC architects and where their works will be represented because the same will be useful to encourage architects to put forward their works.
21. Singapore clarified if the projects of APEC Architects refer to the works done in their respective country or outside. The Chair responded that the project location has to be featured, whether inside or outside their country.

22. The Chair has requested the Coffee Table Book Committee in the Philippines to immediately provide to the economies the details and information required in the Coffee Table Book.
23. The meeting agreed that the monitoring committee of each economy will be the one to choose their 10 APEC Architects and submit the same to the Philippines. All economies agreed to submit APEC Architects' works to be featured in the Coffee Table Book.

VII. Report on Collection of annual fees

24. The Philippines reported on the collections of annual fees from 2019-2020 Annex D.
25. Canada, Australia and Mexico requested for a copy of their invoices. China claimed that they already paid the balance last April 2020 but they said that they will also check with their local transfer. China mentioned that they will send the receipt to the Philippines including the name of the bank where it was transferred. Malaysia mentioned that they already paid the fee and they indicated that they will validate if they have given the complete payment.
26. The Chair requested United Architects of the Philippine to acknowledge payments made by the economies.

VIII. Other Matters

27. Chinese Taipei proposed to review the validity period of the APEC Architect Registration. The validity in the APEC Architect manual has been changing from 3 to 2 years. To settle the issue, the economies were asked to comment on the validity.
 - a. Chinese Taipei and Mexico proposed 3 years.
 - b. Singapore mentioned that that the issue on whether 2 or 3 years have already been settled. In 2012, it was 2 years. In 2014, it is was 3 years but on the succeeding years, it was reverted back to 2 years. Singapore mentioned that their practice is 2 years. Singapore suggested to leave the flexibility to each economy.
 - c. Australia suggested 2 years. However, if another economy would like to move it to 3 years, Australia is amenable.
 - d. Canada mentioned that they are the same as Australia.

- e. Hong Kong proposed to stick with 3 years as decided by the Central Council.
- f. Japan mentioned 3 years because their practice is 3 years.
- g. Malaysia has no objection whether 2 or 3 years.
- h. Mexico has no problem with 2 or 3 years. Mexico's operation is 3 years.
- i. New Zealand mentioned that their renewal is annually but has no problem whether 2 or 3 years.
- j. The Philippines mentioned 3 years is their present renewal cycle.
- k. Thailand said that either 2 or 3 years it depends on each economy.
- l. United States mentioned that their practice is 2 years but suggested to leave it to each economy.

The meeting agreed that each economy will be given flexibility on the number of years on the validity of period of APEC Architects Registration.

- 28. The Chair requested the economies to email the Secretariat if they have further suggestions in the Operations Manual.
- 29. Singapore reiterated the provision in the Operations Manual regarding the attendance of economies during the APEC Architect Central Council Meetings, to wit:

Attendance: Monitoring Committees whose representatives fail to attend three consecutive meetings will be deemed to have withdrawn from the APEC Architect framework and may need to reapply for activation of their authorization should they wish to continue as participants.

- 30. The secretariat was requested to correct page 69 of the APEC Architect Operations Manual as to the date (8th AACC Meeting) and to include the following economies: Chinese Taipei, Thailand, United States of America

*Member Economies of the APEC
Architect Central Council 2018*

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

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned. The economies expressed gratitude to the Philippines for organizing the special virtual meeting.

Note: Participating Economies who gave their comments/inputs as of 14 January 2021:

1. Chinese Taipei:

“Chinese Taipei agree with the conference Records of Discussion, but please add all names of the members from Chinese Taipei. (Annex A)

The name list is attached.

Thank you for your assistance.”

from: Kuo Lung, Liu, Chair of Chinese Taipei Monitoring Committee

2. Canada

“Thank you for the draft report: I have no corrections and my only comment is that I still require an invoice in order to pay the 2019 & 2020 fees.” (This request was already communicated with UAP)

from: Mark Vernon, Chief Executive Officer, Architectural Institute of British Columbia

3. Australia

“Thank you for the record of meeting and attached documents. We have no further comment on the attached documents. We look forward to receiving an invoice for the outstanding fees so we can make the required payment. (This request was already communicated with UAP).

from: Kate Doyle, Chief Executive Officer, Architects Accreditation Council of Australia

4. New Zealand

“We had no comments on the Report. For the 9th APEC Architect Central Council meeting in October, New Zealand will need to participate via Zoom. Are you able to make arrangements for that? (Informed Ms. Bearsley that we will give them updates on the latest developments for the said meeting).

from: Margaret Bearsley, Chief Executive, New Zealand Registered Architects Board

5. Japan

Japan has comments on the Report and were incorporated in the text. (Please refer to the comments on the right side/portion.)

from: Michiko Yamauchi, Senior Researcher, Japan Architectural Education and Information Center