Agenda

4 – 5 October 2012

Lambton Room, Level 1
Hotel Intercontinental
2 Grey St, Wellington
New Zealand
Agenda

Day 1: 4 October 2012

8.45 am: Assemble for Powhiri, level 1 (at top of stairs)

9.00 am – 10.30 am

Item 1  Powhiri / Welcome to Attendees

Item 2  APEC Central Council Meeting Procedures
The Chair outlines the Central Council meeting procedures as described in the Central Council Meeting Protocol (attachment 1).

Item 3  Central Council Membership
Participating economies provide names of the members of their delegations.

Item 4  Adoption of the Agenda
Participating economies are invited to confirm/amend the agenda.

Item 5  Confirmation of the Meeting Summary of the Fourth APEC Architect Central Council Meeting (Manila)
Participating economies are invited to confirm the Summary Conclusions of the Fourth Meeting of the APEC Architect Central Council, held in Manila, Philippines 10 & 11 October 2010 (attachment 2).

Distribution of Photo-DVDs, Manila Meeting, 2010
DVDs of the 2010 Fourth Central Council meeting in Manila will be distributed.

10.30 am – 11.15 am  Photography followed by Refreshment Break
Please assemble on stairs for group photograph

11.15 am – 12.45 pm

Item 6  Reporting

6.1  Applications to Form New Monitoring Committees
Secretariat advises whether applications have been received to form new monitoring committees.

6.2  Monitoring Committee Reports to the Central Council
Monitoring Committees are invited to report and advise on any issues they have regarding local implementation, their administration of the APEC Architect Register etc.(attachment 3).

12.45 pm – 1.45 pm  Lunch
1.45 pm – 3.15 pm

6.3 **Promotion of the APEC Architect Register**
Participating economies are invited to report on the strategies they have adopted to promote their Architects becoming APEC Architects.

6.4 **Update on Agreements Signed by Economies**
Participating economies are invited to report on any mutual recognition arrangements or relevant memorandums of understandings that they have entered into since the last Central Council meeting.

6.5 **Update on the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status**
Participating economies are invited to advise if their status has changed regarding the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework (attachment 4).

3.15 pm – 3.45 pm **Refreshment Break**

3.45 pm – 5.00 pm

**Item 7 Procedures**

7.1 **Templates and Documents**
The Central Council considers a presentation by New Zealand on templates for key APEC Architect Project documents (attachment 5).

7.2 **Proposal on the Definition of the Term “Home Economy”**
The Central Council considers a presentation by Singapore in regard to the definition of the term “home economy” in MRAs (attachment 6).

7.3 **Procedures for Non-Complying Economy**
The Central Council considers a presentation by Malaysia on proposed procedures for responding to a non-complaint economy (attachment 7).

Day 1 concludes

6.00 pm – 10.30 pm **World of Wearable Arts Dinner and Awards Show**

*Please assemble in the hotel lobby at 5.45 pm. You will then be escorted to the venue which is nearby. Attendees must be seated at the venue by 6.15 pm. The event includes a meal.*
Day 2: 5 October 2012

9.00 am – 10.30 am

Item 8 The Future of the APEC Architect Project

8.1 Other Aspects of an APEC Architect’s Practice in a host economy
The Central Council considers a presentation by the Philippines on other aspects of an APEC Architect's practice in a host economy, including immigration and other entry requirements, liabilities and insurance, and other local nuances (attachment 8).

8.2 The Future of the APEC Architect Project
The Central Council considers a presentation by New Zealand on the relevance of host economy registration to the needs of architects who wish to undertake cross-border business (attachment 9).

10.30 am – 11.00 am Refreshment Break

11.00 am – 12.30 pm

Item 9 Central Council Administration

9.1 Report by the Secretariat
The New Zealand Secretariat reports on its activities to date (attachment 10).

9.2 Review of the Schedule of Rotation of Responsibilities
The schedule for the rotation of secretariat responsibilities and the hosting of Central Council meetings is confirmed/amended (attachment 11).

Canada, scheduled to act as Secretariat to the Central Council for 2013-2014 and to host the sixth APEC Architect Central Council Meeting in 2014 is asked to confirm its acceptance of these responsibilities.

9.3 Adoption of Summary Conclusions
The Central Council reviews for adoption the Summary Conclusions on agenda items 5 to 8.

9.4 Amendments to the Operations Manual
The Council reviews for adoption any amendments to the APEC Architect Operations Manual required to incorporate decisions taken by the Central Council during this meeting (attachment 12).

Item 10 Next Meeting of the Central Council
Subject to 9.2, the Central Council reviews for adoption the proposal from Canada in regard to the date and venue for the sixth meeting of the APEC Architect Central Council to be held within two years of this meeting.

Central Council Meeting ends

12.30 pm – 1.30 pm Lunch

1.30 pm – 4.30 pm Optional Architectural Tour of Wellington
(Departing 1.30 pm, Hotel Intercontinental forecourt)
1. APEC is a grouping of economies and not countries. As such, economies participating in the APEC Architect project shall be referred to as “participating economies”.
2. Participating economies attending the 5th Central Council Meeting are each assigned up to three front row seats, and only attendees occupying those seats may speak.
3. All contributions are entirely voluntary.
4. The business of the Central Council Meeting shall be conducted in English.
5. Attendees wishing to speak shall indicate their wish to speak by raising their economy’s name plate.
6. The Chair of the meeting shall recognise each attendee’s desire to speak by acknowledging his or her economy (ie not the attendee’s name).
7. In general, the leader of each economy’s delegation speaks, though he/she may ask another member of his/her economy’s delegation to speak.
8. All contributions shall be to the Chair.
9. In general decisions shall be by consensus, but if a vote is required a simple majority will suffice for a resolution to be adopted.
DAY 1: October 10, 2010

PRE-MEETING EVENT
Signing of the Tri-Lateral Cross-Border Registration Arrangement
(Australia, New Zealand and Singapore)

The Secretary General of the APEC Architect Central Council informed the delegation that in July 2010, the economies of Australia, New Zealand and Singapore had forged a tri-lateral, cross-border registration agreement which they would like to sign before the members of the Central Council during the Fourth Central Council Meeting.

Before the signing ceremony, there were remarks delivered:

The National President of the United Architects of the Philippines, Ramon S. Mendoza, delivered the Welcome Remarks. He noted the progress that the APEC Architect Project had undergone during the last decade and expressed his hope that the Project would continue to serve as a vehicle for free transmission of information and exchange of views among its members in many areas of cooperation. He expressed the hope that the meetings would turn diversities to strengths, and that they would bridge the gap that kept economies apart, and eventually unify everyone in prosperity.

The Chair of the Monitoring Committee of Australia, Andrew Hutson, noted the great development of the APEC Architect Project starting from its inauguration in Brisbane, Australia in 2000, as an effective vehicle in fostering international and inter-economic relationships. He mentioned the bilateral agreements Australia had forged with Chinese Taipei in 2007 and with Japan in 2008 and expressed Australia’s pride in being part of the first tripartite mutual recognition agreement. He expressed the hope that the agreement would serve as a trigger and support for other economies to seek similar agreements.

The Chair of the New Zealand Registered Architects Board, Warwick Bell, said that he was very pleased to sign the tri-lateral agreement and that he appreciated the benefits for all its signatories. He envisioned a scenario where the first adventurous New Zealand architect would become
registered in Singapore and would export architectural services in the Asian Region using Singapore as a launching pad. This would mean benefits for New Zealand in the form of foreign exchange earnings and new learning brought back by the architect to the home economy. On the other hand, he believed that the potential value of the APEC Architect Project would accrue to the host economy because it would get exposed to different perspectives and new ideas brought in by foreign architects.

The President of the Board of Architects, Rita Soh, thanked the Architects Accreditation Council of Australia, the New Zealand Registered Architects Board and the Board of Architects Singapore for bringing to fruition the tri-lateral agreement. Singapore, she said, is a strategic hub for business in the global economy, and as such, had attracted eminent international architects who had worked in collaboration with local architects in redefining Singapore’s city skyline. At the same time, locally registered architects had spread their wings beyond Singapore’s shores and produced projects of note in the international arena. Singapore intends to seek similar arrangements with other economies to promote wider mobility of architects, and to enrich the professional experience in the quest for a cleaner and greener living environment for the future generation.

The members of the Central Council of the economies of Australia, New Zealand and Singapore were then invited on stage to witness the signing of the Tri-lateral Agreement by the president/chair of their respective architect accreditation board/council.

A photo documentation of the event was held afterwards.

The Script and Seating Arrangement for this pre-meeting event is attached as: Pre-Meeting Annex A

MEETING PROPER

Participating Delegations:

Republic of the Philippines (Chair),
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, and Thailand.

Unable to Attend: United States of America

Item 1: Welcome to Delegates

The Chair, Armando Alli extended welcome to the delegates of all participating economies attending the meeting and called the meeting to order.

The Chair acknowledged the presence of the economies of 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, and Thailand.

The Secretary General informed the Council that the economy of the United States of America is unable to attend. Their attendance of the UIA Commission on Professional Practice Meeting in Paris is one, among other reasons, of their inability to attend.
Item 2: APEC Meeting Procedures

The Chair discussed briefly the APEC meeting procedures and reviewed some protocols to be observed:

APEC is a grouping of economies, not countries. As such, they shall be referred to as “member economies” or “economies”

At present, there are 14 participating economies in the APEC Architect Project. There are three (3) seats assigned to each participating APEC economy. Only delegates occupying such seats may speak or intervene during the meeting. Other delegates who wish to speak or intervene must occupy these assigned seats.

Interventions or contributions are totally voluntary. The Chair of the meeting shall recognize the delegates who raise their name plates or stand them on one end.

When acknowledging a delegation’s wish to speak or intervene, the Chair shall only call out the name of the economy and not the delegate’s name.

The delegation leader generally speaks. He/she may call on another member of their delegation to speak or intervene. Delegates are expected to comment constructively.

When speaking, delegates must address the Chair of the meeting.

Exchange of business cards is a common practice in APEC meetings. Business cards are usually exchanged using both hands.

Gift-giving is not customary practice in APEC meetings. As Asians, however, friendship and culture may be expressed through token gifts.

Item 3: Adoption of the Agenda

References:
Annex 1: Original Agenda
Annex 1a: Revised Agenda

Note:
10-10-10”, a fun run to raise funds for the rehabilitation of the Pasig River was held in the general vicinity of the SMX Convention Center, the venue of the 4th APEC Architect Central Council Meeting. Participated in by around 116,000 people, it clogged the roads leading to the venue. The organizers of events decided to delay the start of the meeting by two hours. A Revised Agenda was prepared for the two meeting days (October 10, 2010, from 11:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M., and October 11, 2010 from 9:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M.)

The Chair called attention to the Revised Agenda and reviewed the coverage of Day 1 and Day 2 of the meeting. He explained that the Council may have to meet up to as late as 8:00 P.M. on Day 1 because Day 2 must conclude at 1:00 P.M. because some delegations must leave immediately afterwards to catch their flight out of Manila.

The Chair called for suggestions and amendments to the Revised Agenda. Mexico requested to make a presentation on COP 16 Conference to be held in Cancun. The request for a presentation was accepted and would be Item 13 in the Revised Agenda for presentation on Day 2.
The Revised Agenda was adopted as amended.

**Item 4: Confirmation of the Meeting Summary of the Third APEC Architect Central Council Meeting.**

Reference:
Annex 2: Amended Page 24 of the Meeting Summary of the Third Central Council Meeting

Malaysia requested that the names of their delegates: Dato Esa Mohamed, Mr. Boon Che Wee, and Ms. Tan Pei-Ing be listed on page 24.

Singapore suggested that Appendix 1 (List of Central Council Delegates from each Economy) and Appendix 2 (Members of the Central Council from the Nominees to the Monitoring Committee of Economies) be updated.

The Meeting Summary of the Third Central Council Meeting held in Vancouver, Canada was approved as corrected and modified.

**Item 5: Constitution of the Central Council**

**5.1 Applications to form New Monitoring Committee**

The Secretary General reported that there are no new applications to form new Monitoring Committees from other APEC economies. However, the Secretariat, through the Submission Form in the APEC Architect Website had received numerous inquiries on how to become an APEC Architect coming from both participating and non-participating economies.

Singapore made the observation that there are 21 APEC economies and so, there are still 7 economies that are not participants in the APEC Architect Project. For the record, the Chair enumerated these 7 economies: Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Russia, and Viet Nam.

The Secretary General reported that Peru and Papua New Guinea had each attended a meeting of the APEC Architect Project in the past.

It was agreed that the next Secretariat will invite these non-members to the next Central Council meeting, especially Peru and Papua New Guinea to reawaken their interest to join the APEC Architect Project.

**5.2 Central Council Membership**

References:
Annex 3: Attendance of the Fourth Central Council Meeting
Annex 4: Membership of the Central Council
(As Updated in October, 2010)

Each economy was requested to read the names of the members of their delegation attending the Fourth Central Council Meeting for entry into the official record.

The Secretary General requested that each economy submit the updated list of the member representatives to the Central Council using a form designed to capture the information desired for the database of the Central Council Secretariat.
The Secretary General reported that although USA is unable to attend the meeting, they have sent the updated list of their representatives to the Central Council as follows:

- Kenneth J. Naylor, AIA (NCARB) – Head of Delegation
- Scott C. Veazey, AIA (NCARB)
- Lenore M. Lucey, FAIA (NCARB) – Contact Person
- Stephen Nutt, AIA (NCARB)
- George H. Miller, FAIA (AIA)
- Clark D. Manus, FAIA (AIA)
- Jeffrey Potter, FAIA (AIA)
- Suzanna Wight Kelley, AIA (AIA)

Item 6: Review of Progress of the APEC Architect Register

6.1: Update on the APEC Architect Register

Each economy was requested to report on the progress of the APEC Architect Register. The economies reported on the number of APEC Architects they have enrolled in the APEC Architect Register as follows:

- **Australia:**
  There were 9 applications received since last report. There are now a total of 16 currently in the registry.

- **Canada:**
  There were no applications received since last report. The number stands at 6.

- **China:**
  The total number is 77.

- **Hong Kong China:**
  There was 1 new application received since last report. The total is now 36.

- **Japan:**
  The total is 364 as of September, 2010

- **Korea:**
  From the last report of 259, the number dropped to 172 because many did not find the APEC Architect title beneficial to them. During the next round, 42 out of 55 applicants were registered; so in all, there are currently 214 in the registry.

- **Malaysia:**
  The total remains at 8 since last Central Council Meeting.

- **Mexico:**
  The total is 73, with 50 more in process.

- **New Zealand:**
  There was 1 new application; the total is now 3.

- **Philippines:**
  After 4 rounds of applications and evaluation, there are now 40 in the registry.

- **Singapore:**
  Singapore has not started to process any applications. It will first conduct an awareness campaign for architects to realize the importance of the Project. But since Singapore has recently signed the tri-lateral agreement with Australia and New Zealand, it will now start processing applications to the Registry.

- **Chinese Taipei:**
  The total is 90.

- **Thailand:**
  The number is 0. Foreign practice is a sensitive issue in Thailand. However, local collaboration may be an acceptable arrangement under the Reciprocal Recognition Framework and on this basis, it might be possible to launch the project successfully in Thailand.
It was agreed that each economy would continue to advocate and forward the concept of the APEC Architect as committed by each economy at the start of the Project.

### 6.2 Adoption of APEC Architect Formats

The Chair requested the economies to report on their adoption of the APEC Architect formats for the Registration Certificate and the Identification Card.

- **Australia** has adopted the formats.
- **Canada** has adopted the formats.
- **China** has recently adopted the designed formats and will issue them very soon to their 77 APEC Architects.
- **Hong Kong China** has adopted the formats of the Professional Experience Form and the Registration Certificate. They have yet to print and distribute the Identification Cards.
  - **Japan** has adopted the formats.
  - **Korea** has adopted the formats
  - **Malaysia** has adopted the formats.
- **Mexico** is making the change and will adopt the formats.
- **Philippines** has adopted the formats; in addition, they also give out medallions to their new APEC Architects.
- **Singapore** will adopt the formats when it starts implementing the Project.
- **Chinese Taipei** has issued Registration Certificates in the old format designed by them when they were the Secretariat of the Central Council. However, they have adopted the new format and have also issued them, though they have yet to print the Identification Cards. The economy reports a very strict procedure in evaluating applications. Chinese Taipei brought up the idea of working out the validity of the APEC Architect Identification Card, for use in the APEC Architect entry lanes at Immigration of the international airports of participating economies.
- **Thailand** will adopt the formats but they will use the Thai language for the Registration Certificates and the Identification Cards.

Malaysia noted the formal recognition rites for the new APEC Architects of the Philippines held the previous night and the medallions given to them. He expressed support for the idea of the medallion as an additional token or symbol of recognition and wondered if it can be adopted by other economies.

The Secretary General reported that like the Philippines, some economies do give additional tokens, but smaller ones like APEC Architect pins.

The Chair said that interested economies might wish to examine the design of the Philippines for its medallion. However, he said that it is really up to each economy to decide on the design or on whether or not to give these additional tokens at all.

On the matter of the APEC Architect Identification Card being valid for entry in the APEC entry lanes at Immigration, the Chair said that it is a matter worth pursuing and discussing in future meetings of the Council.

### 6.3 Monitoring Committee Reports to the Council

The Secretary General reported that to date no economy has submitted its Monitoring Committee Report which should have been submitted every six months following protocols and policies. Prior to the Fourth Central Council Meeting, Secretariat has written all economies to bring their Report for submission during the Meeting.
The Secretary General commented that the format asks the same question each time and so, at intervals of six months, economies might not have new matters to report. She commented that the Council might have to decide on a more realistic interval for submission of reports.

Malaysia made the observation that during the two intervening years between the Third and Fourth Central Council Meetings, there seemed to be little communication between the Secretariat and the member economies. Malaysia suggested increasing communication through some means or vehicles.

Canada suggested that a more proactive communication among member economies be established.

Hong Kong China suggested that economies should at least receive an email or some bulletins on a half-yearly basis so that they would be informed of what is going on.

The Secretary General noted that there is indeed a vehicle through which member economies may communicate. She reported that Memorandum No. 2009-01 sent by Secretariat to all economies informed them of the launch of a newly designed website with address: [www.apecarchitects.org](http://www.apecarchitects.org). The economies had been requested to send a picture of the skyline of a city which they would like to be featured in the website and were also requested to submit news items about the APEC Architect and related events within their economy to be featured in the website. The submission of New Zealand of a night scene of the city of Wellington and its submission of news articles was noted by Secretariat. The Secretary General also reported that as the upcoming host economy of the Secretariat of the Central Council, New Zealand has expressed the intention of not changing the design of the website and to communicate with the current webmaster for its transfer.

People’s Republic of China suggested that reports from economies be on yearly intervals and for Secretariat to summarize these reports for distribution to economies.

Hong Kong China supported China’s suggestion for a yearly interval despite the previous agreement in the Central Council Meeting in Vancouver for the reports to be every six months. Hong Kong China has had in fact only one new APEC Architect application in 12 months and thus supports an annual reporting.

Japan reported that their procedures are on annual basis and thus, an annual reporting would suit their system better.

After deliberations, the Council unanimously concurred with the resolution of China for reports to be submitted annually instead of every six months.

The Council also unanimously concurred with the resolution of Canada for reports to be submitted on the 30th of June of every year.

**Item 7: Update on Procedures for Non-Complying Economy**

Reference:

Annex 5: Draft Course of Action for Non-Compliance with Council Rules

In behalf of the economies of Singapore and Mexico that are also members of the committee designated for the task, Malaysia reported on the course of actions for non-compliance of economies with Council rules.

Malaysia presented the following thoughts on the matter of non-compliance to rules:
• There are different levels and types of non-compliance – some are administrative which are easily resolved, while some are fundamental which are more difficult to resolve.

• Some examples of non-compliance are:
  o Non-submission of reports and non-payment of annual contribution to the host economy serving as Secretariat are administrative and may be resolved easily by reminders.
  o More restrictive measures in the recognition of APEC Architects which are in contravention with agreed APEC criteria is a fundamental violation and is therefore more difficult to resolve.

• It is unlikely that APEC economies would deliberately deviate from APEC rules unless under unavoidable circumstances, knowing that such deviation would result in a breakaway from the group, which is not the spirit of APEC. However, persistent violations by economies are a great concern and must be dealt with accordingly.

• Depending on their seriousness, the Council may decide on such extreme actions as expulsion of the economy, or deregistration of an APEC Architect.

• A possible process for an errant economy might be:
  o Secretariat to seek clarification from alleged errant economy;
  o Peer evaluation to be done by another economy geographically close to the errant economy (example: Singapore-Malaysia, Mexico-United States of America). This consists of a visit of the errant economy by the peer evaluators to verify if there is a prima-facie case of deviations committed;
  o A Work Group in charge of disciplinary matters to be formally constituted within the Council to deliberate on the matter;
  o The Work Group to report to the Council during its regular meetings on all facets of the case;
  o The Council to take action.

• A possible process for an errant APEC Architect might be:
  o Complaint to be submitted to the host economy;
  o Local registration board to investigate and act on the complaint;
  o Local punitive actions against the foreign APEC Architect to be imposed;
  o Host economy to notify the Council of its actions.

Philippines made the observation that the matter is too serious to discuss and decide on immediately and moved that the issue be calendared for discussion in the 2012 meeting, thus giving the matter its due length of study time.

Australia suggested that since the Draft has been written, economies can bring them back home and submit their comments to the new Secretariat. This way, economies are able to provide feedback on the Draft as soon as possible.

Canada suggested that a mechanism be put in place in order for feedbacks to be circulated and shared. Canada for one would like to understand fully the meaning of paragraph 2.4 of the Draft. If the paragraph means that the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework (AARRF) is the only basis for admission in reciprocity, then Canada has a concern. Canada looks forward to an early discussion of this matter.

China commented that the Draft is well-done and prepared. However, it inquired about punitive action on unreasonable absences of an economy from Council meetings and how a first, a second, or a third absence will be dealt with and considered. China suggested that the Draft include more of such details.

New Zealand made 3 comments: 1) that with regards to paragraph 2.4, the bilateral and tri-lateral agreements would play key roles in the relationship of economies; 2) that the idea of “suspension” should be considered in order to bring in the possibility of negotiation for the return of an errant
economy or APEC Architect, rather than considering only permanent “good-byes”; and 3) that perhaps, other economies might wish to join the working group of Malaysia, Singapore and Mexico in drafting this document.

Mexico suggested that a group in charge of discipline be created within each economy and when a problem of discipline arises, each economy can send a representative to the overall Working Group in charge of discipline within the Council.

Malaysia expressed concurrence with the suggestion of Australia for the Draft to be studied by each economy and for comments to be made. Malaysia volunteered to be the repository of all comments on the matter.

Singapore nominated Malaysia to take the lead for the working group and also concurred with the suggestion of Australia. Singapore however cautioned that though it is good to have punitive actions in place, it should not serve to scare away economies that the Council is still enticing to join the Project. Singapore further pointed out that though economies have their registry of APEC Architects, the Project is not effective unless economies have entered into agreements with other economies within the AARRF which would make relationships more concrete and specific.

Malaysia proposed that the Draft paper be taken away by members of the Council to deliberate on and for each economy to provide feedback to Malaysia within the period of 6 months. Malaysia will compile these feedbacks and inputs to be submitted to Secretariat for distribution and dissemination to member economies.

The Council members unanimously accepted the proposal of Malaysia.

**Item 8: APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework**

**8.1 Update on Mutual Recognition Agreements Signed by Economies**

Australia has a MRA with Chinese Taipei and another with Japan, and a tri-lateral agreement with New Zealand and Singapore. The framework of their MRAs is robust, solid and rigorous which they are happy about. The elements within the framework differ according to reciprocal agreements that differ from one economy to the other.

Mexico requested for sample copies of MRAs which they can study in more depth.

New Zealand expressed willingness to share copies of the tri-lateral agreement just signed. From their experience, they gave the tip that economies should look at the details of the tests that would be given when the level of agreement is domain-specific, to determine if the questions are equally fair and reasonable.

Australia also expressed willingness to share copies of their agreements. However, they noted that it is important for all signatories to express their willingness to make these documents available to the public.

Chinese Taipei and Philippines also expressed willingness to share copies of the Memorandum of Agreement they signed on October 9, 2010.

**8.2 Discussion of Some Issues or Concerns Arising from these Signings**

New Zealand informed the Council about the concern of the three signing economies of the tri-lateral agreement about the definition of the term “Home Economy” which is defined as “...the
economy of permanent residence and primary registration/licensure as an architect.” The word “primary” needs to be defined.

Singapore explained by citing an example thus:

“An architect has primary registration in Economy A; obtains registration in Economy B as an APEC Architect; then later decides to have permanent residence in Economy B and allows primary registration in Economy A to lapse; thereafter, goes to Economy C to be registered as an APEC Architect.”

In the above example, Singapore asked what the definition of “primary” is.

The Chair inquired if the Council would like to deal with the matter the same way as the Draft on Non-Compliance with Rules.

Australia suggested that the matter be handled by Secretariat through a survey and for the result to be presented during the next meeting of the Council. “Leapfrogging” is not a likely scenario, but just the same, there must be an answer to the question if it occurs.

New Zealand asked the Council members if they regard the case cited of an architect moving from Economy A, then B, then C as a problem. Some commented as follows:

Canada had no concern about it.

Thailand commented that there is no problem as long as the architect registers in Economy B as an architect upon becoming a permanent resident.

Malaysia commented that there will be a problem if the architect has allowed primary registration to lapse in Economy A since the recognition as an APEC architect is dependent on registration in a member economy of the APEC Architect Project.

Singapore further pointed out that the situation may be a problem because not all economies have their MRAs with all other economies.

Canada commented that the issue is the definition of “primary registration”. “Primary” can mean the largest component of registration or it can simply mean the first registration.

Hong Kong said that in their economy, there is a 7-year rule which requires that an architect must reside continuously in Hong Kong for 7 years to become a permanent resident. Thus, the architect must retain primary registration in home Economy A up until permanent residence in Hong Kong had been obtained.

In the light of the above discussions, Singapore reiterated the importance of the definition of “primary” registration.

Canada forwarded two points. First: that primary registration may refer to the first jurisdiction in which a person became registered. Second, that any person should be able to move at free will to any jurisdiction. In Canada, any person who has obtained citizenship is not required to maintain any registration anywhere else, but is entitled to all rights and privileges of a citizen.

New Zealand pointed out that the over-riding attitude in the APEC Architect Project is that of trust between and among member economies. Citing an example, New Zealand says that it will accept Singapore’s word that a person is competent and would not anymore question the person’s origin because trust is the essence of any mutual recognition agreement.
Singapore moved that since MRAs are in their early stages of formulation, the issue is not an immediate concern and therefore can be discussed at a future time, such as during the next Council meeting.

8.3. Update on Other Multi-Lateral Mobility Agreements:

The Chair called for reports on other multi-lateral mobility agreements.

a. The NAFTA

Canada announced that Canada, USA and Mexico have signed a Tri-National Agreement which is now moving into the “pilot program” phase designed to test the system without opening it yet to everyone. Each economy will send to each of the other economies, three candidates through the system and if all goes well, the agreement will be formally launched for full implementation.

Mexico emphasized the importance of this pilot program in determining possible problems and negative effects of this Agreement before moving to full operational level.

b. The ASEAN Architect Project

Malaysia reported that the ASEAN Architects Council (AAC) was formally inaugurated in Myanmar, City of Bagan, a very well-known heritage city recognized by UNESCO, on June 30, 2009. At the current stage, there are 7 member states, 4 of which are APEC member economies, that have participated, namely Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam.

Malaysia further reported that, although the MRA had been signed by the ASEAN member states, the difference in the manner in which the architectural profession is regulated in each, has made it very difficult to have one open platform. The AAC also appreciates that there are existing constitutional provisions, laws, regulations and juridical considerations that are not easy to repeal or rectify, made even more difficult to change by the political and socio-economic situation.

Nonetheless, the practice of a foreign architect in a host country is made possible thru the widely accepted manner of collaboration with a local architect. It is intended however, that countries move progressively to the more open and liberalized levels.

In the case of Malaysia, the target is to attain 100% equity registration for foreign architects by 2012. There had been activities undertaken to promote collaboration and liberalization to promote both ASEAN and APEC Architect projects and to encourage enrolment in their registries.

The 1st ASEAN Architect Congress was held in 2010 in Kuala Lumpur.

New Zealand noted that documents of the NAFTA, ASEAN Architect Project, and the various multi-lateral agreements, are very strong advocacy instruments to inform economies about the APEC Architect Project and encourage their architects to participate. The example of an architect from a home economy, enjoying liberalized practice in a host economy, if made widely known, would have a positive impact on the work of the APEC Architect Central Council.

The Chair said that these documents should be in the respective websites of the APEC and ASEAN Architect Councils. He inquired if the ASEAN MRA is in the website of the AAC.

Malaysia answered in the affirmative and gave the Council the website address of the AAC: www.aseanarchitectcouncil.org
As a public document, Canada and Mexico expressed their willingness to make publicly accessible the NAFTA Tri-National Agreement. They did not expect any objection from the United States.

8.4 Update on the APEC Architect
Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status
References:
Annex 7: Survey Report on Bilateral/Trilateral Agreements within the APEC Architect Framework

The Chair called on Singapore to render a report.

Singapore recalled that in the Council Meeting in 2008 in Vancouver, the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework formulated in 2006 in Mexico was revised to include 6 levels. It was noted that while there were 6 levels, the economies were at that time open at only two levels:

“Domain Specific Assessment”
(Australia, Chinese Taipei, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore, United States) and

“Local Collaboration”
(Canada, China, Hong Kong China, Korea, Malaysia, and Philippines).

Thailand informed the Council that their intention is to open their borders at the “Local Collaboration” level.

Singapore requested that an update be made by all economies on Annex 7: The AAFFR, 2008.

The Chair called on the economies to make their updates:

**Australia**: “Domain Specific Assessment”
**Canada**: “Local Collaboration”
Anticipates change in the near future

**China**: “Local Collaboration”

**Hong Kong China**: “Local Collaboration”

**Japan**: “Domain Specific Assessment”

**Korea**: “Local Collaboration”
Is considering to move up to “Domain Specific Assessment”, if they are able to translate the examinations to other languages. Until such time that the examination can be taken in English at least, Korea remains in “Local Collaboration”

**Malaysia**: “Local Collaboration” but is moving up to “Host Economy Residence/Experience”

**Mexico**: “Domain Specific Assessment”

**New Zealand**: “Domain Specific Assessment”

**Philippines**: “Local Collaboration”
Anticipates no change until local issues concerning the signing and sealing of architectural plans by civil engineers are resolved.

**Singapore**: “Domain Specific Assessment”

**Chinese Taipei**: “Domain Specific Assessment”
The Chinese Taipei Monitoring Committee and the Ministry of Examination have joined together and have started preliminary procedures for amending existing laws to allow the economy to enter into MRAs at the highest level of openness.

**Thailand**: “Local Collaboration”
Singapore summarized the update reports as follows:

Under “Domain Specific Assessment”:
(Australia, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, United States)

Under “Host Economy Residence/Experience”
(Malaysia)

Under “Local Collaboration”
(Canada, China, Hong Kong China, Korea, Philippines, Thailand)

Malaysia sought clarification from the Philippines on the issue of civil engineers taking the role of architects and inquired about the possibility of an APEC Architect from another economy collaborating with a civil engineer in the Philippines, if the issue is not resolved in the near future.

Philippines recounted that the problem emanates from local governments allowing civil engineers to prepare and sign architectural plans in violation of the architectural law. Actions are being undertaken so that all government entities would abide by the law. There is no problem about APEC architects collaborating with civil engineers, if the civil engineers are practicing their profession and preparing engineering plans, and their role is within the domain of their profession. The problem occurs when they practice as architects and prepare and sign architectural plans.

Malaysia inquired about the process required for the collaboration of a foreign APEC Architect with a local civil engineer in a project. If such is the type of collaboration, would the Board of Architecture stop the entry of the foreign APEC Architect?

Philippines responded that in such a case, an application for a special temporary permit must be submitted to the Board of Architecture. When issued, the permit should show 3 components: the applicant foreign architect; the project that brought the foreign architect in; and the local counterpart who will be liable locally for the project.

Australia asked for clarification on whether or not an APEC Architect collaborating with a local architect would achieve registration as an architect in the host economy.

To clarify matters, Singapore called the Council’s attention to the matrix on the screen showing the APEC Architects Reciprocal Registration Framework 2008, and explained that it resembles a ladder where the bottom category reflects no recognition, the top category reflects completely open doors for independent practice, and the intervening categories reflect progressive upward openness of doors. If an economy is at “local collaboration” level, it means that the local law has not been changed for independent practice and this actually means, “no recognition”.

Korea expressed concern for the Philippines with regards to their problem of civil engineers jeopardizing the practice of architects in the country and proposed that the Council pass a resolution of support for the architects of the Philippines, which the United Architects of the Philippines may in turn bring to their government.

Philippines thanked Korea and the Council for any form of support, especially from an international group, that would drive the point and help reinforce the position of Philippine architects.
8.5 Matrix That Also Reflects Bilateral and Multilateral Agreements

Reference:
Annex 8: Matrix Reflecting Bilateral and Multilateral Agreements
Annex 8a: Revised Matrix Reflecting Bilateral and Multilateral Agreements

Singapore called the Council’s attention to the screen showing Annex 8: Matrix Reflecting Bilateral and Multilateral Agreements. Reactions and comments were sought:

Malaysia suggested that the Matrix also include the MRAs of APEC economies that are member states of ASEAN.

Mexico pointed out that the Tri-Nation Agreement between Canada, Mexico and the United States is under the umbrella of NAFTA, not APEC. The Matrix should show this differentiation.

Canada clarified that although the Tri-Nation Agreement is under a Pilot Program, the MRA is a signed agreement and is now in the stage of implementation. So, the Matrix should show it as a signed and on-going agreement.

Philippines suggested that the MOU between them and Chinese Taipei be considered as 50% complete, since the intent is for the MOU to lead to the MRA.

Hong Kong China recalled that they have a MRA with China and that they have reported about this in the Council Meeting in Vancouver.

Korea recommended that different color codes should be used to differentiate the umbrellas under which the MRAs had been signed – APEC, NAFTA, or ASEAN. Korea however expressed concern that the Matrix is not able to capture the many other nuances in MRAs between economies.

The Council requested Singapore to update and revise the Matrix in accordance with the reactions and comments.

The following is a summary of the Revised Matrix of Bilateral and Multilateral Agreements, as corrected and updated by the economies and as shown in Annex 8a.

**Australia:**
- AARRF tri-lateral MRA with New Zealand and Singapore;
- AARRF MRA with Chinese Taipei
- AARRF MRA with Japan

**Canada:**
- NAFTA Tri-National MRA with USA and Mexico (currently under a pilot program)

**China:**
- AARRF MRA with Hong Kong;
- in active discussion with Japan and Korea

**Hong Kong:**
- AARRF MRA with China

**Japan:**
- AARRF MRA with Australia
- AARRF MRA with New Zealand
- in active discussion with China, Korea and Singapore

**Korea:**
- in active discussion with China and Japan
Malaysia:
  o ASEAN Architect MRA (with 7 ASEAN countries, 4 of which are APEC economies)

Mexico:
  o NAFTA Tri-National MRA with Canada and USA (currently under a pilot program)

New Zealand:
  o AARRF tri-lateral MRA with Australia and Singapore
  o AARRF MRA with Japan

Philippines:
  o MOU leading to MRA with Chinese Taipei;
  o ASEAN Architect MRA (with 7 ASEAN countries, 4 of which are APEC economies)

Singapore:
  o AARRF tri-lateral MRA with Australia and New Zealand
  o ASEAN Architect MRA (with 7 ASEAN countries, 4 of which are APEC economies)

Thailand:
  o ASEAN Architect MRA (with 7 ASEAN countries, 4 of which are APEC economies)

Chinese Taipei:
  o AARRF MRA with Australia
  o MOU leading to MRA with Philippines

USA:
  o NAFTA Tri-National MRA with Canada and Mexico (currently under a pilot program)

Malaysia recalled that Korea had earlier proposed to support the position of architects of the Philippines in their conflict with civil engineers through a Council motion. The Chair requested Malaysia to formulate the motion in this connection. Malaysia moved that:

“…..the APEC Architect Council should only recognize collaborations of APEC Architects from another economy with registered and licensed architects in the host economy.”

On the question of Hong Kong on what the resolution is exactly about, Malaysia explained that the motion came about because of the issue brought up by the Philippines where civil engineers sign and seal architectural plans. The spirit of the motion is to discourage this practice and assist Philippine architects in convincing their government that only architects should be allowed to do architectural works. Thus, APEC architects from other economies should be discouraged from collaborating with civil engineers to do architectural works.

Canada expressed its willingness to indicate somehow some support for the Philippines in its struggle on the issue, but suggested that instead of including the matter of the Council’s recognition of collaborations, which is an entirely different matter and beyond the jurisdiction of the Council, the motion be made around the statement that:

“…..only architects should practice architecture.”

Canada further suggested that since the day is late, this matter should be taken up the next day after everyone had rested and possibly had had time to craft the proper words acceptable to everyone.

The Chair said that the matter will be calendared as the first item for discussion on Day 2 of the Council Meeting.
Philippines reminded the Council that Malaysia has a pending motion and suggested that Malaysia withdraw it so that there is no pending motion, and re-introduce it the next day. Malaysia posed no objection to the suggestion.

It was agreed that the Meeting will be temporarily adjourned, to resume at 9:00 A.M. the next day, October 11, 2001.

Before temporary adjournment, the Secretary General reported back to the Council about the total number of APEC Architects after confirmation from all economies. The total number of APEC Architects in the Central Council Registry as of October 10, 2010 is **932**.

**DAY 2: October 11, 2010**

**Item 8.4 (Continuation of Discussion)**

The Chair greeted the members of the Council and resumed the meeting.

Malaysia reported that they had received recommendations from other economies with regards to the proposed motion. While Malaysia had earlier recommended the following motion:

“**Member economies of the APEC Central Council shall only recognize collaborations of APEC architects from another economy with a registered and licensed architect from the host economy.**”

Canada also recommends the following:

“**Representatives of participating economies in the APEC Architect Project recognize the need and requirement that architecture must be practiced by architects.**”

and Philippines recommends the following:

“**In participating economies of the APEC Architect Project, the responsibility of preparing, signing and sealing of architectural documents are limited to registered and licensed architects; thus APEC architects must exert all efforts to work with local registered architects in the host economy where collaboration is required in the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework.**”

Malaysia proposed that the various proposals be circulated electronically to member economies for their comments and inputs for further deliberation in the next Council Meeting. The issue is a major one, considering that economies have their own particular ways of regulating practice and these differences may have a bearing on whether or not a resolution of this nature is acceptable to them.

Philippines emphasized the urgency of the matter, reporting that the issue has lingered for six years now, and that the Philippines can not even think globally when the efforts are focused on trying to protect what is by law, rightfully the domain of architects in the country.

Philippines further reported that as a member of the Architects Regional Council Asia (ARCASIA), the Philippines had received support from ARCASIA in the form of a resolution of support. A resolution of this nature would be beneficial to the Philippines and all other economies in the same situation. The support of ARCASIA comprising of 17 institutes of architects and the APEC Architect Central Council comprising of 14 economies, would strengthen the position of the architects.
Given the urgency of the matter, Malaysia suggested that the resolution be a combination of the proposals of Malaysia, Canada and the Philippines, with the exclusion of the component on collaboration. The resolution reads thus:

“The representatives of the participating economies in the APEC Architect Central Council recognize the need and requirement that architecture must be practiced by architects; hence, in participating economies, the responsibility of preparing, signing and sealing of architectural documents should be limited to registered/licensed architects.”

There were comments and reactions to the above resolution from the following economies:

China notes the resolution and has no objections to it.

Hong Kong accepts the first part of the resolution because it is a universally accepted truth, but can not accept the second part because it is not how it is done in Hong Kong.

New Zealand accepts the first part, but not the second part of the resolution. Licensed architects are not the only ones that prepare documents in New Zealand.

Australia accepts the first part, but not the second part of the resolution. In Australia, there is no such limitation and prohibition in their national and state legislations.

Korea accepts the resolution, but would like to introduce the following modifications:

on the first part:
“…..architectural design (instead of “architecture”) must be practiced by architects…..”

and on the second part:
“…..preparing, signing and sealing of architectural design documents” (instead of architectural documents) should be limited to registered/licensed architects.”

Canada pointed out that the definition by law of the practice of architecture differs in different economies and cited the case of Canada where legislation permits the practice of non-architects in less complex buildings, even while the practice of architecture is defined comprehensively as the full scope of services from pre-design and design, documentation, project management, all the way to hand-off to clients, and post warranty period.

Since the second part of the resolution is not acceptable to a number of economies, Malaysia proposed that the resolution be re-stated to include only the first part. The second part will have to be deferred for a future discussion to give time for economies to deliberate over them. The resolution is re-stated thus:

“The representatives of the participating economies in the APEC Architect Central Council recognize the need and requirement that architecture must be practiced by architects.”

The resolution was unanimously approved.

The Philippines thanked all economies in discussing its problem and passing a resolution of support acceptable to all member economies.
Item 9: Promotion of the APEC Architect Register

The Chair called on the economies to discuss their strategies in promoting the APEC Architect Register domestically and internationally. The economies with a large number of APEC Architects were requested to recount how they had achieved success in this area.

Australia:
- Australia promotes the APEC Architect Register through the websites of the Architects Accreditation Council of Australia and the Institute of Architects.
- Australia has signed bilateral and tri-lateral agreements with other economies and intends to pursue the project vigorously.

Canada:
- Canada advertises the possibilities for APEC Architects through the website hosted by the Royal Architects Institute of Canada.
- The responsibility for the APEC file had been assumed by the regulators, since it has registration and licensing consequences. The regulators intend to give high priority to labor mobility and access to the profession.
- Canada currently has registered only six APEC Architects out of the 8,300 architects, with only 1500 practicing in the Pacific coast but Canada is most keen to listen and learn from the accounts of the success of other economies.

China:
- China reported that there are many projects designed by foreign architects in China, but so far, foreign architects have had to always collaborate with local registered architects.
- China has entry and immigration requirements that are problems to surmount.

Hong Kong:
- Hong Kong surmised that among all economies, they are probably the most open in terms of global practice because it is easy for an architect registered in another economy to set up office and do work in design and urban planning in Hong Kong. Immigration is not a big problem in Hong Kong and there are no commercial restrictions for as long as the low profit tax of 16% is paid.
- Hong Kong had not been active in arranging MRAs with other economies but they plan to actively consider opening up their system and endeavor to reach reciprocal agreements with other economies.

Japan:
- Japan has approximately 400 APEC Architects registered and this number has not decreased nor increased.
- Japan plans to showcase the projects of APEC Architects in an exhibition planned for September, 2011 during the UIA Congress.

Korea:
- As had been previously reported by Korea, the number of APEC Architects had dropped because architects perceive no apparent benefit from being one. So, Korea had taken steps to enhance the importance of the APEC Architect.
- They had tried to forge an agreement with the government so that all government-procured projects would be limited to APEC Architects.
- They are planning to classify architects into two: 1) those who are qualified for “out-country” or foreign projects which include APEC Architects, and 2) those who are qualified for “in-country” or local projects. This classification, however, does not preclude “out-country” architects from doing “in-country” projects.
- They are planning to publish in their monthly magazine the overseas works of APEC Architects focusing on the added stature and recognition given to APEC Architects even in non-APEC regions.

Malaysia:
- Malaysia is entering what they call as the second wave of globalization which commenced at the end of 2008 and beginning of 2009. The government of
Malaysia has decided that globalization is the way to improve the economy and sustain growth. By 2012, foreign firms can have 100% equity. The amended Architects Act is currently with the legislative chamber about to be signed off.

- Globalization thrusts occur at various levels:
  - At the government level – organization and coordination of the professional services sector in exporting services.
  - At the professional and institute level – promotion of networking of architects with APEC and other foreign architects.
  - At the Board of Architects level – promotion of the APEC Architect and ASEAN Architect initiatives through road shows and outreach programs.

- However, even with this over-riding global thrust, Malaysia is cautious and is concerned that respect and recognition of domestic rules and regulations; and sensitivity to local needs, local environment and local public health and safety; should remain primary considerations. Malaysia has communicated the importance of this facet of globalization in international forums such as the WTO and the UIA.

- The idea of the APEC Architect Register dovetails with the other initiatives of Malaysia in globalization.

Mexico:

- Mexico reports that at the national level, there are 74 Colleges of Architects based in the principal cities of Mexico and to date, there are 73 APEC Architects that have been recognized and enrolled in the APEC Architect Registry. It can be said that on the average, there is one APEC Architect per College of Architects. It is the plan of Mexico to double this number in the near future.
- Mexico is attending the meeting of the Council of Pan-American Architects Federation to be held in Colombia and offered to take the initiative to invite Peru and Chile to join the APEC Architect Project.
- Mexico commented that the International Conference of Architects and the APEC Architects Exhibits integrated by the Philippines with the planning of the 4th Central Council Meeting, are events that indeed promote the APEC Architect Project and should therefore be considered as inclusions in the planning of the next Central Council meetings.

New Zealand:

- New Zealand reports that their website dedicates a section to the APEC Architect Project which communicates to the users the requirements and opportunities that can be derived from the Project. Another means of communication is their newsletter that reports activities to all New Zealand architects.
- The Tri-lateral Agreement of New Zealand with Australia and Singapore will catalyze change and focus interest on the benefits that can be derived from being an APEC Architect. New Zealand will now identify senior New Zealand architects who can qualify to be APEC Architects.

Philippines:

- Philippines reports that there are 40 APEC Architects in the Registry to date. Not many are applying because architects do not see the benefit of being one. Promotion of the APEC Architect Registry must be pursued with more vigor and strategies must be formulated.
- Like what Korea had tried to arrange with their government, it would be a boost to the prestige of Philippine APEC Architects if they were awarded government projects because of their qualification.
- It was also mentioned that if the APEC Architect I.D. Card is recognized in the APEC lane at the immigration gates of airports, such a privilege would promote the APEC Architect Register as beneficial to holders of the card and the title.

Singapore:

- Singapore notes that with the exception of Mexico and Chinese Taipei, their records show that there are architects from the other 12 economies that are
registered with the Singapore Board of Architects, an indication of their open-ness to global practice.

- APEC Architect and ASEAN Architect Projects are promoted in tandem in seminars, conventions such as the recently concluded Board of Architects Seminar for 300 architects and the Singapore Institute of Architects Practice Convention. The Projects are also promoted thru newsletters.
- With the signing of the Tri-lateral Agreement with Australia and New Zealand, Singapore is now ready to implement the APEC Architect Registry and invite Singaporean architects to apply to become APEC Architects.
- Singapore proposed an APEC Architect Convention, attended by APEC Architects only, held during the open year that the Central Council will not meet; which means that the Central Council Meeting and the APEC Architects Convention will alternate with one another, creating a yearly event in the calendar of the APEC Architect Project.

**Chinese Taipei:**

- Chinese Taipei reports that it had been active in the promotion of the APEC Architect Project:
  - For four years now, the Chinese Taipei Monitoring Committee had been going around the island to visit architects’ offices to promote and explain the benefits of being an APEC Architect.
  - The Monitoring Committee also visits universities and conducts forums with faculty members and students who are very interested to know about the APEC Architect Project.
  - Training modules (on such subjects as “Thirty Thousand Years of Arts”, “Contract Management”, “Land Management and Planning”, and “Arbitration Law”) to be delivered in English, are being prepared. The aim is to provide continuing professional education for Chinese Taipei architects, while improving their command of the English language in preparation for global practice.

**Thailand:**

- Thailand informs its architects through their website and through regular meetings of the Council.
- Foreign practice is still prohibited by law in Thailand and so local architects need to be slowly but progressively informed about international practice.
- However, there are many foreign architects’ offices operating in different areas in Thailand. The foreign architects have been given visas, although the use by them of the title “Architect” is prohibited.

Philippines thanked Mexico for their comments about the organization of the APEC-ICA. As a reaction to the Mexico proposal on the integration henceforth of conferences and exhibits with Central Council meetings, Philippines recommended that these conferences and exhibits should be optional, not mandatory, and in accordance with the discretion of the host economy for the Central Council Meeting. With regards to Singapore’s proposal for the holding of APEC Architects Convention, Philippines recommended that any economy who would initiate the hosting of such a Convention should be fully supported by the other economies in terms of attendance and information dissemination to APEC Architects in their respective economies.

New Zealand agreed with the Philippines that the organization of a conference in conjunction with the Central Council Meeting, how the events would be promoted and other things around it, should be left to the decision of the incumbent Secretariat.
Item 10: Central Council Administration

Item 10.1 Report by the Philippine Secretariat

References:
Annex 9: Functions of the APEC Architect Secretariat

The Chair called on the Philippine Secretariat to render its Report to the Council.

The Secretary General reviewed the eight functions and the pre- and post-activities of the Secretariat and reported how the Secretariat of 2009-2010 had fulfilled these functions and activities.

Pre-Activities: Preparation and Organization

The Philippine Secretariat received from the Mexico Secretariat the files of all the documents of the APEC Architect Project, electronically via the internet, and as hard-copies through a face-to-face transfer. Secretariat set up its office in the UAP National Headquarters.

1. APEC Architect Register:
The number of architects from member economies enrolled in the APEC Architect Register, are reported in the bi-annual survey report of the economies. Though not submitted by economies on a regular basis, a survey report from each economy was requested to be submitted during the Central Council Meeting. One survey had been undertaken to determine the bilateral and trilateral agreements that the member economies have forged with each other. The result of the survey was transmitted to Singapore for the preparation of their Report to the Council on the matter.

2. Central Council Website:
The Philippine Secretariat decided to design a new website for 2009-2010. Several documents of the APEC Architect Project had been uploaded, especially the most recent ones. The earlier documents have yet to be uploaded. Economies had been invited to submit a panoramic picture of their city to be part of the changing banner of the website showing pictures of 14 cities in succession. Likewise, they had been invited to submit news articles to share with other economies. New Zealand had responded to both requests. The Central Council Website has not been linked so far to the websites of the 14 economies and so notification about the deficiencies could not be done. New Zealand and the Philippine Web Master have communicated about the transfer of the management from Philippines to New Zealand. New Zealand does not intend to change the design of the website.

3. Reciprocal Recognition Framework:
Economies had directly communicated with one another in the development of their respective Mutual Recognition Agreements under the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework. Secretariat provided them with a copy of the Operations Manual and collected information on the agreements between economies that have come to fruition. The next Secretariat can upload copies of the bilateral and trilateral agreements on the website.

4. General Administration:
The operations of the Philippine Secretariat involved financial management, records keeping, and correspondence and were initially supported by the United Architects of the Philippines, since the shares of the economies for the funding of the Secretariat are usually remitted by the economies at the end of the two-year period. Annex 10 shows the general cost items and the equivalent expenses of the Secretariat for the years 2009 and 2010.

5. Constitution of the Central Council:
The economies were requested to submit an updated list of the members of their Monitoring Committee. There had not been any application from any prospective new member economy.
6. Central Council Meetings:
Secretariat had made the various arrangements for the Council Meeting and had prepared all necessary documents. It had also cooperated and coordinated with the Organizing Committee of the APEC-ICA in the conceptualization, formulation of the theme and selection of speakers for the conference.

7. Promotion:
Mexico and Philippines had written separate letters to UIA and APEC informing them that there is a new Secretariat for the APEC Architect Central Council. Philippine Secretariat prepared a report to APEC-HRDWG at the end of 2009 but could not get through the computer answering machine for an electronic transmittal of this report.

8. Information Center:
The APEC Architect Website contains a section which allows users to submit questions or suggestions by filling up a Submission Form. Questions from persons of various nationalities were mostly on how to become an APEC Architect. Questions were referred to the respective member economies of the APEC Architect Project. Others were informed that their country is not a member of the APEC and so are not eligible.

Handover to Next Secretariat:
Philippine Secretariat showed the Council the valise containing hard copies of APEC Architect Project documents that Mexico Secretariat brought to the Philippines in April, 2009. Philippine Secretariat intends to bring the valise to New Zealand in 2011, to continue the tradition started by Mexico. New Zealand, in turn, is expected to turn over the valise to Canada, and so on, in accordance with the schedule of the round-robin scheme for Secretariat work.

The Secretary General gave comments and suggestions with regards to the conduct of Secretariat work, derived from the experience of the Philippine Secretariat:

- Secretariats should build up on the work of previous Secretariats and not start from “zero” in matters such as the APEC Architect website.
- It would be of great help to the incumbent Secretariat if the support of other economies in the form of their contribution per the funding formula would be transmitted at the start of the assumption of the responsibility of the Secretariat.
- The next Secretariat should decipher how to submit its report to the HRDWG by breaking through the computer-programmed telephone voice.
- An effective way of promoting the APEC Architect Project and Registry is to answer all queries posed in the Submission Form in the website.
- Apart from the electronic transfer of documents, Mexico started the beautiful tradition of a Face-to-Face Hand-Over of a valise brought to the Philippines, that contained hard copies of all the documents of the APEC Architect Project from its inaugural meeting in Brisbane in 2001 to the present. The Philippine Secretariat recommends the continuance of this tradition and will travel to New Zealand to hand-over the valise.

10.2 Funding Formula for the Secretariat and Its Implementation
Reference:
Annex 11: Funding Formula for the Secretariat

The Chair reviewed the computation of the Funding Formula for the share of each economy as approved during the Third Central Council Meeting in Vancouver.

The Secretary General reported on the contributions so far received by the Philippine Secretariat as of October 11, 2010.
- Chinese Taipei – full payment for 2009 received April 2009


- Mexico – full payment for 2009 & 2010 received October 2010
- Hong Kong China – full payment for 2009 & 2010 received October 2010
- Philippines – full payment for 2009 & 2010 received October 2010

### 10.3 Review of the Schedule of Rotation of Responsibilities

**Reference:**
- Annex 12: Schedule of the Secretariat
  (as approved during the Third Central Council Meeting)
- Annex 12a: Schedule of the Secretariat
  (as approved during the Fourth Central Council Meeting)

During the Third Central Council Meeting, a Schedule for the rotation of Secretariat responsibilities and the hosting for the Central Council Meeting was approved by the Council.

This schedule was reviewed and economies were asked if there were any requests for change in the schedule. In general, the economies accepted their assignments per the schedule except for the following suggestions and offers:

Singapore requested the Secretariat to inquire from the United States of America if the latter is willing to exchange places with Singapore – that is, Singapore will host the Secretariat in 2019-2020; USA will take the current Singapore assignment to host in 2023-2024

Korea offered its time slot in 2025-2026 to Japan scheduled on 2027-2028, if it would like to precede Korea in hosting. Japan decided to adhere to its assigned time slot.

Hong Kong offered to swap time slots with Australia, the latter having hosted the Secretariat twice in 2001 and 2002. Australia agreed, thus the amended schedule would be for Hong Kong to be Secretariat in 2029-2030 while Australia would be Secretariat in 2033-2034.

Korea made the observation that should there be new economies that would join the Council, the schedule will have to be revised.

### Item 11 Summary Conclusions

#### 11.1 Adoption of the Summary Conclusions

**Reference:**
- Annex 13: Summary Conclusions (Draft)
- Annex 13A: Summary Conclusions (Final)

In view of the lack of time to prepare the Summary Conclusions for review of the Council before adjournment, the Secretariat requested that these be instead prepared at a later time and circulated via the internet for comments or reactions of the economies.

The recommended target dates were:
- October 15, 2010 – Secretariat circulates the Summary Conclusion to economies
- October 22, 2010 – Economies transmit their reactions and comments

#### 11.2 Amendment to the Operations Manual

The Council agreed to the amendment of the APEC Architect Operations Manual to incorporate decisions taken by the Central Council during the Fourth Central Council Meeting, to be released as Operations Manual 2010.
**Item 12  Next Meeting of the Central Council**

**Item 12.1  Venue**

New Zealand formally accepted the role of Secretariat for 2011 and 2012 and host of the 5th Central Council Meeting to be held in the last quarter of 2012. The specific date of the Council Meeting will be announced not later than September 30, 2011.

The tentative venue being considered is the Te Papa, the National Museum and Art Gallery in Wellington, New Zealand.

New Zealand briefly described Wellington as a place to look at great architecture, experience great café scenes, with hotels within 5 to 10 minutes walking distance to the proposed venue.

Singapore expressed its support for Wellington as the venue for the next Central Council Meeting.

**Item 12.2  Proposed Items in the Agenda**

Philippines suggested that the next Central Council Meeting in New Zealand include the following items in the Agenda with regards to Aspects of Practice in a Host Economy:

- Taxation (Tax requirements for an APEC Architect from another economy practicing in a host economy)
- Immigration (Visa requirements and issues)
- Civil liabilities (Liabilities which will be required by the host economy to be absorbed by a foreign registered architect)
- Professional indemnity insurance
- Laws, rules, or guidelines in the host economy with regards to the procurement of architectural services.

Chair made the observation that the first four items were in the original Agenda but were removed or deleted to adapt to the shorter time of the Council Meeting.

New Zealand accepted the suggested items and issues from the Philippines and further requested the members of the Council to send in items or issues which they would like to include in the Agenda.

**Item 13  Other Matters**

**Item 13.1  UIA COP 16**

Mexico presented UIA COP 16 to be held in Cancun-Quintana Roo, Mexico from November 29 to December 1, 2010, with the following features:

The 2nd Open Forum that features reflections, discussions and proposals on how to reduce the negative impact of human actions on the environment. Projects demonstrating good practice will be presented by representatives from different countries, including renowned architects.
An exhibition of sustainable architecture and urban planning projects that apply the concept of “Sustainable by Design” as advocated by the Union of International Architects.

A Student Forum of architecture students, identified as the link into the future, that will discuss and craft in a workshop, a student declaration about climate change.

Mexico requested the economies to send teams of students to participate in the Student Forum.

Mexico distributed information leaflets on the UIA COP 16 to the members of the Council.

**Item 13.2 Report of the Convenor**

The Convenor of Events gave a brief report.

The responsibility accepted by Philippines during the 3rd Central Council Meeting in Vancouver, Canada, to host the Secretariat in 2009 and 2010, and the 4th Central Council Meeting in Manila, Philippines in 2010, was validated by the Philippine Monitoring Committee and the National Board Directors of the United Architects of the Philippines, with the identification and approval of the designation of responsible persons as follows:

Secretary General – Prosperidad Luis
Chair of the 4th Central Council Meeting – Armando Alli
Convenor of Events – Medeliano Roldan

In the planning of the hosting of the 4th Central Council Meeting, the idea of an International Conference of Architects (ICA) and an APEC Architects Exhibit (AAE) as related events to promote the APEC Architect Project and Register, was hatched and subsequently implemented.

The Convenor expressed his wish that all the delegates had a nice stay in the Philippines.

The Convenor apologized to Korea for the loss of the USB used to transfer the file of the presentation of Ar. Kun Chang Yi in the ICA into the Conference Lap-Top.

The Convenor reminded everyone about the City Tour the following day and asked those who would join it to be at the hotel lobby at 7:30 A.M. for pick-up. He also announced that there are transfer vehicles from hotel to airport for members of economies leaving after lunch.

**Item 13.3 Resolution of Thanks**

Canada thanked the Philippines for the hard work and hospitality.

Malaysia proposed a motion of thanks to the Philippines to officially recognize the wonderful arrangements and hospitality of the Organizing Committee and noted the exhibition as something to emulate. Malaysia requested that its comments be officially recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

Mexico thanked the Philippines for the excellent direction of the meeting and recognized the work of the Chair and the Secretary General.

Singapore concurred with Malaysia and Mexico and specifically expressed its appreciation for the UAP Organizing Committee, the Chair, the Secretary General and the support staff of the Council Secretariat.

Chinese Taipei expressed its appreciation for the Secretariat’s hard work, understanding what the role entails, having been itself the Secretariat of the Central Council in the past.
The Chair acknowledged the expression of appreciation of the different economies and wished everyone a safe trip home.

The Secretary General shared the words of former Secretary General Fernando Mora Mora to the Council on the role of SG:

“You may feel tired at this point in time but when everything is finished, you will feel fulfilled because not many of us will be given the privilege of this unique experience.”

**Item 14 Adjournment**

Reference:

Annex 14: The Central Council Secretariat Meeting Through the Eyes of the Central Council Secretariat: A REPORT

The Secretary General acknowledged and introduced the members of the Central Council Secretariat that served the 4th Central Council Meeting. Their separate report and recommendations is attached as Appendix 14.

The Chair adjourned the 4th APEC Architect Central Council Meeting at 12:30 P.M., October 11, 2010
## APEC Architect Project Participating Economy Report

### New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects</td>
<td>7 1 deceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at end of period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first registered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of</td>
<td>Warwick Bell (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>David Sheppard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Callum McKenzie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon Moller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Jackman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications for</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>registration/lic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>licensing by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects</td>
<td>The panel that interviews applicants was changed from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from other</td>
<td>two members of the monitoring committee to one member and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economies</td>
<td>a NZRAB registration assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes made to bring in assessment expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedure for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to</td>
<td>New Zealand adopted the revised APEC Architect Certificate and ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>registration/</td>
<td>card provided by the Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>licensing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedure for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upcoming hosting of Central Council was used to promote project to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand architects via regular newsletters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noteworthy that rate of APEC Architect registration applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please indicate</td>
<td>Japan (July 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year signed)</td>
<td>Singapore/Australia (October 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework Status</td>
<td>Complete Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Place X in</td>
<td>Domain Specific Assessment X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant section)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Registration Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Host Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence / Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note also Australia TTMA Negotiations with Chinese Taipei underway 2012

Initial contact with Canada in conjunction with Australia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects at end of period</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects first registered during period</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Monitoring Committee</td>
<td>Nino Bellantonio (Chair)  Andrew Hutson Richard Thorp Denis Bergin Nicole Kerr Chris Harding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications for registration/licensing by APEC Architects from other economies</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to procedure for APEC Architect registration</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to registration/licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>AACA has adopted the revised Architect Certificate and ID card provided by the Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Promotion</td>
<td>The State/Territory Architect Boards have promoted the project in their newsletters to architects registered in their jurisdictions.</td>
<td>NB: The number of APEC Architect registrations has increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architect Reciprocal arrangements (Please indicate year signed)</td>
<td>Chinese Taipei (September 2007) Japan (June 2008) Singapore/NZ (October 2010) Hong Kong (Stage 1)(October 2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status (Place X in relevant section)</td>
<td>Complete Mobility</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain Specific Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Registration Examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Host Economy Residence / Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects at end of period</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects first registered during period</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Monitoring Committee</td>
<td>Ar. Dato’ Sri Haji Esa Mohamed Ar. Datuk Prof. Amer Hamzah Mohd Yunus Ar. Tan Pei Ing Ar. Zuraina Lelly Awalludin Ar. Saifudin Ahmad Ar Boon Che Wee Ar. Mohammad Hafiz Hashim Ar. Assoc. Prof. Mustapha Mohd Salieh Ar. Saari Omar Ar.Yong Razidah Rashid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications for registration/licensing by APEC Architects from other economies</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to procedure for APEC Architect registration</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to registration/licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Malaysia adopted the revised APEC Architect Certificate and ID Card provided by the Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Promotion</td>
<td>Through website <a href="http://www.lam.gov.my">www.lam.gov.my</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architect Reciprocal arrangements (Please indicate year signed)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status (Place X in relevant section)</td>
<td>Complete Mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain Specific Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Registration Examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Host Economy Residence / Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Collaboration X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APEC Architect Project Participating Economy Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects at end of period</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects first registered during period</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Members of Monitoring Committee | Sadao Watanabe (Chair)  
Kengo Kuma  
Kiyonori Miisho  
Kunihiro Misu  
Taro Ashihara  
Takashi Yamauchi  
Akira Wada  
Hiroshi Asano |
| Applications for registration/licensing by APEC Architects from other economies | None                                                 |
| Changes to procedure for APEC Architect registration | None                                                               |
| Changes to registration/licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies | None                                                      |
| Documentation | Japan are now using the revised APEC Architect Certificate and ID card provided by the Secretariat |
| Communications and Promotion | Presentation of the status of the APEC Architect Project in Japan was made over Japan Korea China Architects Organization Meeting in November 2011 |
| APEC Architect Reciprocal arrangements (Please indicate year signed) | Australia (Jul. 2008)  
NZ (Jul. 2009) |
| Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status (Place X in relevant section) | Complete Mobility  
Domain Specific Assessment  
Comprehensive Registration Examination  
Examimation  
Host Economy Residence / Experience  
Local Collaboration  
No Recognition |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects at end of period</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects first registered during period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Monitoring Committee</td>
<td>Rozanno Rosal, Prosperidad Luis, Medeliano Roldan, Armando Alli, Angeline Chua Chiaco, Yolanda Reyes, Edric Marco Florentino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications for registration/licensing by APEC Architects from other economies</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to procedure for APEC Architect registration</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to registration/licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies</td>
<td>When the membership of the Philippine Monitoring Committee changed, the membership of the Panel of Evaluators for application as APEC Architect also changed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>The Philippine Monitoring Committee will continue to use the APEC Architect Certificate and ID Card. It will also continue to give APEC Architect medals to new APEC Architects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Promotion</td>
<td>Promotion effort was at its height when Philippines hosted the 4th Central Council Meeting. Promotion is not as strong these past 2 years.</td>
<td>The Philippines and Chinese Taipei signed a Memorandum of Understanding leading to a possible reciprocal arrangement in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architect Reciprocal arrangements (Please indicate year signed)</td>
<td>None yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status (Place X in relevant section)</td>
<td>Complete Mobility, Domain Specific Assessment, Comprehensive Registration Examination, Host Economy Residence / Experience, Local Collaboration X, No Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APEC Architect Project Participating Economy Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>People’s Republic of China</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period</strong></td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APEC Architects at end of period</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APEC Architects first registered during period</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members of Monitoring Committee</strong></td>
<td>Chen Zhong (Chairman) Zhao Chunshan Zheng Guangda Zhao Qi Zhou Chang Xiu Lu Li Zhe He Zhifang Chen Bo Wan Bin Cui Kai Zhuang Weimin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications for registration/licensing by APEC Architects from other economies</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to procedure for APEC Architect registration</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to registration/licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation</strong></td>
<td>China adopted the revised APEC Architect Certificate and ID card provided by the Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications and Promotion</strong></td>
<td>Organized a seminar on APEC Architects. 8 major design institutes participated in the meeting. Upcoming hosting the China-Japan-Korea Architects Organization Seminar which will be held in December 2012 in Hainan, China.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APEC Architect Reciprocal arrangements (Please indicate year signed)</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status (Place X in relevant section)</strong></td>
<td>Complete Mobility  Domain Specific Assessment Comprehensive Registration Examination Host Economy Residence / Experience Local Collaboration No Recognition</td>
<td>1. The reciprocal recognition of APEC Architect should be divided into two levels, the recognition of professional qualification of architect and the practice licence. The APEC Architects registration criteria could be taken as the standard and condition of professional qualification recognition. But the practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
licensure should be discussed by bi-literal negotiation and solved under peer to peer conditions.

2. According to the realistic conditions in China, it is better for developing the mutual recognition and practice activities by domain specific assessment as well as local collaboration. After the overseas architects acquired the experience in a certain period in China, satisfying some conditions, then he or she could practice independently.
## APEC Architect Project Participating Economy Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Chinese Taipei</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects at end of period</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects first registered during period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Monitoring Committee</td>
<td>Chen, Yin-Ho (Chair) and 30 other members.</td>
<td>The Chinese Taipei Monitoring Committee is consisted of 31 members that are from government agencies, academic institutes, and professional organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications for registration/licensing by APEC Architects from other economies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to procedure for APEC Architect registration</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to registration/licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Chinese Taipei adopted the revised APEC Architect Certificate provided by the Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Promotion</td>
<td>Continue to work with government agencies on regulations and laws that will affect the practice of APEC Architect. Visit architecture schools/colleges to promote APEC Architect Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architect Reciprocal arrangements (Please indicate year signed)</td>
<td>Australia (September 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status (Place X in relevant section)</td>
<td>Complete Mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain Specific Assessment</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Registration Examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Host Economy Residence / Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APEC Architect Project Participating Economy Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>United States of America</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects at end of period (as of 8/31/2012)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects first registered during period</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

Unable to determine the number of individuals removed from the Roster.

**Members of Monitoring Committee**

Ronald Blich, President
Blake Dunn, 1st VP
Dale McKinney, 2nd VP
Mike Armstrong, Staff
Stephen Nutt, Staff

2 AIA officers and staff are also included in the monitoring committee at this time.

**Applications for registration/licensing by APEC Architects from other economies**

None

**Changes to procedure for APEC Architect registration**

None

Architect must hold a current NCARB Certificate. There is a one-time fee of $400 to be placed on the Roster.

**Changes to registration/licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies**

None

**Documentation**

Return email notice confirming the individual has been placed on the APEC Roster.

**Communications and Promotion**

Information on the APEC Architect Project and the APEC Roster is on the NCARB webpage.


**APEC Architect Reciprocal arrangements (Please indicate year signed)**

None

The U.S. and Canada are renegotiating the existing Interrecognition Agreement signed in 1994.

The U.S., Canada, and Mexico are in a pilot program of credential exchange through the Tri-National MRA signed in 2005.

**Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status (Place X in relevant section)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete Mobility</th>
<th>Domain Specific Assessment</th>
<th>Comprehensive Registration Examination</th>
<th>Host Economy Residence / Experience</th>
<th>Local Collaboration</th>
<th>No Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once an MRA is implemented, it will require documentation and demonstration of experience through a domain specific assessment.

Currently, local collaboration with an architect licensed/registered in a U.S. jurisdiction is required.

*Satisfaction of the Broadly Experienced Foreign Architect program (BEFA) and issuance of an NCARB Certificate is accepted for licensure in 45 of 54 U.S. jurisdictions.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects at end of period</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects first registered during period</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Members of Monitoring Committee | Jedkamchorn Phromyothi  
                             Duangrit Bunnag  
                             Tonkao Panin  
                             Michael Paripol Tangtronchit  
                             Nitis Sthapitanonda  
                             Attayanan Jitrojanaruk |       |
| Applications for registration/licensing by APEC Architects from other economies | None                                    |       |
| Changes to procedure for APEC Architect registration | None                                    |       |
| Changes to registration/licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies | None                                    |       |
| Documentation   | The revised APEC Architect Certificate and ID card are adopted |       |
| Communications and Promotion | Lectures to universities  
                             Planning to have an exhibit in ASA 2013 annual exhibition |       |
| APEC Architect Reciprocal arrangements (Please indicate year signed) | ASEAN (2007)                             |       |
| Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status (Place X in relevant section) | Complete Mobility  
                             Domain Specific Assessment  
                             Comprehensive Registration Examination  
                             Examination  
                             Host Economy Residence / Experience  
                             Local Collaboration X  
                             No Recognition |       |
**APEC Architect Project Participating Economy Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period</strong></td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APEC Architects at end of period</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APEC Architects first registered during period</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members of Monitoring Committee</strong></td>
<td>Rita Soh, Chan Sui Him, Koh-Lim Wen Gin, Wo Mei Lan, Ko Shiou Hee, Larry Ng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications for registration/licensing by APEC Architects from other economies</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to procedure for APEC Architect registration</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to registration/licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation</strong></td>
<td>Singapore adopted the revised APEC Architect Certificate and ID card provided by the Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications and Promotion</strong></td>
<td>Information publish on the Board's website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APEC Architect Reciprocal arrangements (Please indicate year signed)</strong></td>
<td>Australia/New Zealand (October 2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status (Place X in relevant section)</strong></td>
<td>Complete Mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain Specific Assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Registration Examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Host Economy Residence / Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APEC Architect Project Participating Economy Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Hong Kong, China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects at end of period</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects first registered during period</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members of Monitoring Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Members of Monitoring Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LING Chi Kong Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUNG Yin Suen Ada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TONG Sek Por David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KWAN Kwok Lok Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAI Chui Chi Rosman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHAN Hon Wan Edwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAM Kwong Ki Dominic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAM Ping Hong Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KWONG Sum Yee Anna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHI Wun Cherng Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TANG Wai Man Tony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LO Kwok Wah Kevin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applications for registration/licensing by APEC Architects from other economies**

None

**Changes to procedure for APEC Architect registration**

None

**Changes to registration/licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies**

None

**Documentation**

Hong Kong adopted the revised APEC architect Certificate and ID card provided by the Secretariat

**Communications and Promotion**

To encourage registered architects in Hong Kong to register as APEC architects and send 2 reps to attend the APEC Central Council Meeting in October 2012.

**APEC Architect Reciprocal arrangements (Please indicate year signed)**

None

**Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status (Place X in relevant section)**

| | 
|---|---|
| Complete Mobility |  |
| Domain Specific Assessment |  |
| Comprehensive Registration | X |
| Examination |  |
| Host Economy Residence / Experience |  |
| Local Collaboration |  |
| No Recognition |  |
### APEC Architect Project Participating Economy Report

**Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities (CALA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects at end of period</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>aware that this is in effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects first registered during period</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>a/e/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Monitoring Committee (MOC)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>CALA's AECB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications for registration/licensing by APEC Architects from other economies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to procedure for APEC Architect registration</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to registration/licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies</td>
<td>Broadly Experienced Foreign Architects (BEFA) program of assistant may add 21 September <em>BEFA links available</em></td>
<td>Conducted nationally via AECB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Promotion</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Opportunity of national meetings + 21 September <em>AECB links available</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architect Reciprocal arrangements (Please indicate year signed)</td>
<td>CALA has reciprocal agreement (under revision) with Mexico (US)</td>
<td>approx. 20 years ago (likely license + 1yr post-licensure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status**

- Domain Specific Assessment
- Comprehensive Registration
- Examination
- Host Economy
- Residence Experience
- Local Collaboration
- No Recognition

**Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CAB); accredits architectural programs; universities ; also certifies individuals education**

**- provisional today; final reply**

**- next CALA meeting: November 2012; APEC Council in October 2014 precedes APEC annual conference; opportunity for APEC representatives to attend and/or participate as panelist; APEC info & promotion**

**- some Canadian jurisdictions require registration of business and/or allow temporary (project-specific) licenses (see APEC Bulletin 22)**
APEC Architect Project Participating Economy Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Korea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>October 2010 to October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects at end of period</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architects first registered during period</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Monitoring Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIM, Chi Tok (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEONG, Young Kyoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH, Seom Hoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK, Je Yu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RYU, Choon Soo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER, Hai Chun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIM, Jae Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIN, Eon Hark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YI, Kun Chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIM, Dong Hyun (Ministry of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHO, In-Souk (Executive Coordinator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIN, Chun Gyu (Director of KIRA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Applications for registration/licensing by APEC Architects from other economies | None |
| Changes to procedure for APEC Architect registration | None |
| Changes to registration/licensing procedure for APEC Architects from other economies | None |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea APEC Architect Monitoring Committee revised its operations manual of the as of May 8, 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications and Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| APEC Architect Reciprocal arrangements (Please indicate year signed) | None |

| Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status (Place X in relevant section) |
| Complete Mobility |
| Domain Specific Assessment |
| Comprehensive Registration Examination |
| Host Economy Residence / Experience |
| Local Collaboration | X |
| No Recognition |
Attachment 4:
Update on the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework Status

THE APEC ARCHITECT RECIPROCAL RECOGNITION FRAMEWORK 2012

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Mobility</td>
<td>No requirement other than APEC Architect status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain Specific Assessment</td>
<td>Understanding of legal and technical issues unique to the host economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America, Singapore,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand, Republic of Mexico, Japan,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia, Chinese Taipei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Registration Examination</td>
<td>Examination of all skills and knowledge required for the practice of architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Economy Residence / Experience</td>
<td>At least one year of professional experience in host economy prior to registration examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Collaboration</td>
<td>Association required with an Architect from the host economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of the Philippines, Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Korea, Hong Kong China, People’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of China, Canada, Thailand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Recognition</td>
<td>No recognition of APEC Architect status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 5:

Templates and Documents

The following are a set of templates for APEC Architect documents, which if agreed to, should help the consistency of the way the project is administered.

The templates offered for consideration cover the following:

1. Application to be an APEC Architect – a template for this already exists, but, from New Zealand’s experience it is rather dated, and an alternative is offered that is more explicitly linked to the operating manual.

2. The APEC Architect Certificate and APEC Architect ID card – New Zealand updated these in 2011 and circulated them to participating economies.

3. A memorandum of understanding in regard to degree recognition – this is based on an arrangement entered into between Hong Kong and Australia.

4. A memorandum of understanding in regard to negotiating an APEC Architect bilateral Mutual Recognition Agreement.

5. An APEC Architect bilateral – this is based on the various agreements that currently exist, their format having originally been developed by Australia. This can also be adapted for trilateral arrangements.

Note that in items 3, 4 and 5 some terms are provided with an alternative. This is because in some economies governments are sensitive to these documents appearing to be government-to-government treaties or agreements when this is not the case. Hence for:

- “agreement” - “arrangement”
- “agreed” - “mutually decided”
- “article” - “paragraph”.
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Template 1: Application to be an APEC Architect

APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION AS A [ECONOMY] APEC ARCHITECT

[ECONOMY] is a participant in the APEC Architect Project which provides for fast-track across-border registration arrangements for senior architects. Within participating economies senior architects apply to be recognized as APEC Architects, as per this form. This entitles them to apply for fast-track registration in other economies with which their home economy has entered into reciprocal APEC Architect arrangements.

Applications for Registration as a [ECONOMY] APEC Architect

To be a [ECONOMY] APEC Architect, applicants must:

• be a [ECONOMY] Registered/Licensed Architect
• have at least seven years of professional experience as an registered/licensed architect in specified categories of practice.

APEC Architect Requirements for Period of Professional Experience as an Architect

Applicants must have completed a minimum period of professional practice of seven years after initial registration as an architect in any participating economy. Experience must be gained in all of the following categories of architectural practice:

• Preliminary studies and preparation of brief
• Design
• Contract Documentation
• Administration.

At least three years of the seven year period must have been undertaken as an architect:

• with sole professional responsibility for the design, documentation and contract administration of buildings of moderate complexity; OR
• in collaboration with other architects, as an architect in charge of and professionally responsible for a significant aspect of the design, documentation and/or contract administration of complex buildings.

Professional practice undertaken in an economy other than [ECONOMY] MAY be acceptable.

The names of referees are required who can confirm the information provided. Referees may be professional associates, clients or others in a position to verify the statements submitted.
Application for Registration as a

[ECONOMY] APEC Architect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family name</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Given names</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration number</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Year first registered/licensed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any current registrations in other economies

| Name(s) of other economies | - | Year(s) first registered | - |

Qualifications in architecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Year(s) awarded</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Record of seven years practising as an architect

Please complete the following records of relevant experience over the last seven years.

**Experience gained over three years as an architect with professional responsibility**
Start with reports totaling at least three years of practice as an architect with professional responsibility for projects undertaken. This can be either when you were the architect with sole professional responsibility for a building of moderate complexity or the architect in charge of a significant aspect of a complex building or a combination of these. Please list projects in reverse date order, ie starting with the most recent first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates (start/finish)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice name</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant was the architect with sole professional responsibility for a building at least of moderate complexity</td>
<td>Yes/No -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant was the architect in charge of a significant aspect of a complex building</td>
<td>Yes/No –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of applicant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief description of project with reference to its level of complexity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates (start/finish)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice name</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant was the architect with sole professional responsibility for a building at least of moderate complexity</td>
<td>Yes/No -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant was the architect in charge of a significant aspect of a complex building</td>
<td>Yes/No –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of applicant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief description of project with reference to its level of complexity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates (start/finish)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice name</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant was the architect with sole professional responsibility for a building at least of moderate complexity</td>
<td>Yes/No -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant was the architect in charge of a significant aspect of a complex building</td>
<td>Yes/No –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of applicant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief description of project with reference to its level of complexity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates (start/finish)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice name</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant was the architect with sole professional responsibility for a building at least of moderate complexity</td>
<td>Yes/No -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant was the architect in charge of a significant aspect of a complex building</td>
<td>Yes/No –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of applicant</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief description of project with reference to its level of complexity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates (start/finish)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice name</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant was the architect with sole professional responsibility for a building at least of moderate complexity</td>
<td>Yes/No -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant was the architect in charge of a significant aspect of a complex building</td>
<td>Yes/No –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of applicant</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief description of project with reference to its level of complexity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates (start/finish)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice name</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant was the architect with sole professional responsibility for a building at least of moderate complexity</td>
<td>Yes/No -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant was the architect in charge of a significant aspect of a complex building</td>
<td>Yes/No –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of applicant</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief description of project with reference to its level of complexity</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experience gained in an additional four year period of professional practise as an architect apart from the three years cited above

In the table below please record a minimum of an additional four years professional experience gained in the following categories of architectural practice:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Organisation/practice</th>
<th>Projects and experience</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Place an X in the relevant boxes on the right to indicate categories of architectural experience)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referees

Please list the names and positions held by professional associates familiar with your work. Referees should not be fellow directors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation/practice</th>
<th>Phone number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Signature of Applicant

I hereby declare that the above information is correct.

Signed by: ……………………………………………..

Date:

Please send this signed application form to:

[ECONOMY] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee

[Postal address]

or

convert to a PDF and email to [Email address]

Your application will be considered by the [ECONOMY] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee and you will be advised of the results of its deliberations
Template 2: The APEC Architect Certificate and APEC Architect ID card

[Image of the APEC Architect Certificate and ID card]
APEC ARCHITECT

ARCHITECT'S NAME

[Country] XX 0000X
Valid through to XX/XX/20XX

The bearer of this card is an architect enrolled on the APEC Register which is maintained jointly by the member economies

SIGNATURE OF THE BEARER
Template3: A memorandum of understanding in regard to degree recognition

**Agreement/Arrangement** for Mutual Recognition of Accreditation Systems of Architectural Programmes

between

[Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1]

and

[Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2]
THIS AGREEMENT/ARRANGEMENT FOR MUTUAL RECOGNITION OF ACCREDITATION SYSTEMS OF ARCHITECTURAL PROGRAMMES is made on this .......... day of ....................................

BETWEEN:

THE [REGISTRATION/LICENSING AUTHORITY OF PARTICIPATING ECONOMY 1] [PHYSICAL ADDRESS], in the first part

AND

THE [REGISTRATION/LICENSING AUTHORITY OF PARTICIPATING ECONOMY 2] [PHYSICAL ADDRESS], in the second part.

RECITALS

1. The [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1] is the [description of entity and the basis of its authority].

2. The [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2] is the [description of entity and the basis of its authority].

3. The parties acknowledge that the primary purpose of this Agreement/Arrangement is to facilitate the mutual recognition of professional academic qualifications in architecture obtained from schools of architecture in [participating economy 1] and [participating economy 2].
AFFIRMING their common interest in the accreditation of courses/programmes in architecture, THE PARTIES WISH TO RECORD THEIR COMMON UNDERSTANDING IN THE FOLLOWING TERMS:

1. Definitions

1.1. In this Agreement/Arrangement, unless the contrary intention appears:

"Accreditation" refers to the formal endorsement of a course or program of study, which has been tested to produce results of an acceptable standard against set criteria meeting the required education standard for the purposes of registration as an architect.

"[Initials]" refers to the [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1]

"[Initials]" refers to the [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2]

"Parties" refers to [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1] and [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2]

"Agreement/Arrangement" refers to the Mutual Recognition Agreement/Arrangement between the [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1] and the [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2]

"Architect" means a person:

a. who is registered/licensed as an architect in [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1] which entitles an architect to [description of what registration/licensing means in economy 1];

b. who is registered/licensed as an architect in [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2] which entitles an architect to [description of what registration/licensing means in economy 2];

2. Mutual Recognition

2.1. The parties agree/mutually decide that:

2.1.1. The [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1] shall recognise the [economy 2] Architecture Program Accreditation Procedure as being deemed equivalent to the [economy 1] Accreditation Procedure; and

2.2. The parties agree/mutually decide that as a result of their mutual recognition of the respective Procedures documents detailed at clause 2.1.1 and 2.1.2:

2.2.1. The courses or programmes of study in architecture accredited by the [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1] detailed at clause 2.1.1 may be accepted as meeting the professional academic qualification requirement for registration as an Architect by the [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2]; and

2.2.2. The courses or programmes of study in architecture accredited by the [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2] detailed at clause 2.1.2 may be accepted as meeting the professional academic qualification requirement for registration as an Architect by the [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1].

3. Implementation

3.1. The parties agree/mutually decide that the arrangements detailed in this Agreement/Arrangement will commence when both the [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1] and the [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2] have executed this Agreement/Arrangement.

3.2. Both parties resolve to regularly exchange information on:

3.2.1. any changes to the accreditation Procedures detailed in clauses 2.1.1 and 2.1.2; and

3.2.2. any changes to the accreditation status of courses or programmes of study in architecture within their jurisdiction.

3.3. Both parties acknowledge that the other party may enter into comparable agreements or arrangements with the competent authorities of other countries, provided that each party keeps the other informed in regard to any proposed agreements/arrangements.

3.4. Both parties agree/mutually decide that a comparable agreement or arrangement entered into with the competent authority of another country by either the [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1] or the [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2] will not lead to mutual recognition of the accreditation procedures or professional academic qualifications in architecture from that other country.
4. Exchange of Information

4.1. The Parties agree/mutually decide to notify each other and provide copies of any major changes in policy, criteria and procedures that might affect this agreement/arrangement.

5. Consultations

5.1. The parties will at all times seek to reach a common understanding in relation to matters concerning the interpretation and application of this Agreement/Arrangement, and will make every attempt through co-operation and consultation to arrive at a mutually satisfactory resolution of any matter that may affect its operation.

5.2. A party to this Agreement/Arrangement may request (in writing) consultations with the other party relating to any matter that it considers might affect the operation or interpretation of this Agreement. A party who has received a consultation request should endeavour to reply as soon as practicable.

5.3. The parties to the Agreement/Arrangement agree/mutually decide that they will, at least every five (5) years, review and update the status of implementation and report on the effectiveness of this Agreement, and recommend changes where appropriate. The Agreement/Arrangement will be subject to renewal by mutual consent every five years from the day of signing.

6. Termination

6.1. The parties agree/mutually decide that this Agreement may be terminated by any party by giving to the other party at least six (6) months prior written notice.
7. Signatories

SIGNED this ………………… day of …………………………….

[ECONOMY 1]

(signature) ……………………….
[Name], [Title], [Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1]

In the presence of

(signature) ……………………….
[Name], [Title], [Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1]

AND

[ECONOMY 2]

(signature) ……………………….
[Name], [Title], [Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2]

In the presence of

(signature) ……………………….
[Name], [Title], [Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2]
Template 4: Memorandum of understanding in regard to negotiating an APEC Architect bilateral MRA

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

IN REGARD TO THE NEGOTIATION OF A MUTUAL RECOGNITION AGREEMENT/ARRANGEMENT UNDER THE APEC ARCHITECT FRAMEWORK

between the

[ECONOMY 1] APEC ARCHITECT MONITORING COMMITTEE

and the

[ECONOMY 2] APEC ARCHITECT MONITORING COMMITTEE
The [Economy 1] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee and the [Economy 2] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee affirm and declare:

1. the purpose of the APEC Architect Project, being to facilitate the mobility of architects providing architectural services throughout the APEC region

2. their intention to negotiate a Mutual Recognition Agreement/Arrangement under the APEC Architect framework

3. that the purpose of the Mutual Recognition Agreement/Arrangement shall be to establish, agree to and implement specific shared procedures by which:

   3.1. APEC Architects from [Economy 1] can become registered/licensed in [Economy 2]; and
   3.2. APEC Architects from [Economy 2] can become registered/licensed in [Economy 1]

4. their intention to conclude the negotiation of a Mutual Recognition Agreement/Arrangement under the APEC Architect framework by [date].
5. Signatories

SIGNED this …………………… day of ……………………………

[ECONOMY 1]

(signature) ………………………..
[Name], [Title], [Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1]

In the presence of

ECONOMY 2

ECONOMY 2

ECONOMY 2
APEC Architect Project

Bilateral Agreement/Arrangement

On Reciprocal Recognition of Registered/Licensed Architects in [Economy 1] and [Economy 2] to

Facilitate Mobility of Architects in the Provision of Architectural Services
This agreement/arrangement is made on the [day] day of [month] [year]

between:

[Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1]

of [physical address], in the first part

and

The [Economy 1] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee

of [physical address], in the second part

and

[Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2]

of [physical address], in the third part

and

The [Economy 2] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee

of [physical address], in the fourth part.
PREAMBLE

A. [Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1] is the [description of entity and the basis of its authority].

B. The [Economy 1] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee is an independent committee established in [Economy 1] in accordance with the APEC Architect Operations Manual with delegated authority of the APEC Architect Project Central Council (Central Council) to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register in [Economy 1] and to act as a nominating body for the Central Council.

C. [Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2] is the [description of entity and the basis of its authority].

D. The [Economy 2] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee is an independent committee established in [Economy 2] in accordance with the APEC Architect Operations Manual with delegated authority of the Central Council to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register in [Economy 2] and to act as a nominating body for the Central Council.

E. The Parties acknowledge that the primary purpose of this Agreement/Arrangement is to facilitate APEC Architects to become registered to practise independently in a host economy as defined by reference to the APEC Architects Operations Manual [current year] (the Manual) annexed to this Agreement/Arrangement and marked with the letter A and as amended by the Central Council from time to time.

F. The Parties acknowledge that the [Economy 1] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee and the [Economy 2] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee have been authorised by the APEC Architect Central Council to operate a section of the APEC Architect Register in their respective economies.

G. The Parties acknowledge that each economy shares the recognition that APEC Architects who are on the APEC Architect Register in its economy meet all the requirements for registration/licensure as an Architect of the other economy in accordance with their mutual commitment to the provisions of the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework, subject to the conditions and exceptions set out in this Agreement/Arrangement.
Affirming their common interest in the implementation and ongoing administration of the APEC Architect Framework in their respective economies, the Parties have agreed/mutually decided as follows:

Article 1/Paragraph 1

Definitions

1.1 The definitions detailed in the Manual apply in this Agreement/Arrangement.

1.2 For the purposes of this Agreement/Arrangement, the term “Architect” means a person (excluding a body corporate or other entity that is not a person) whose name is on the register of Architects held by a Regulatory Authority.

1.3 In this Agreement/Arrangement, unless the contrary intention appears:

- “APEC Architect” refers to an Architect whose name appears on the APEC Architect Register in their Home Economy
- “[Economy 1] Participants” means [registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1] and the [Economy 1] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee
- “[Economy 2] Participants” means [Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2] and the [Economy 2] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee
- “The Parties” refers to the [Economy 1] Participants and the [Economy 2] Participants
- “Signatories” refers to the Parties.

Article 2/Paragraph 2

Application of the APEC Architect Framework

2.1 The Parties agree/mutually decide that the Operations Manual forms part of this Agreement/Arrangement.

2.2 The Parties agree/mutually decide that the Operations Manual forms the basis upon which the reciprocal recognition of Registered/Licensed Architects in [Economy 1] and [Economy 2] is to be effected and the manner in which the mobility of Architects in the provision of architectural services in [Economy 1] and [Economy 2] is to be facilitated.

2.3 The Parties agree/mutually decide that this Agreement/Arrangement shall not apply to Architects who have obtained registration/licensure in their home economy by means of a mutual recognition agreement involving a professional association in other economies or countries other than those from participating APEC economies.

2.4 The Parties agree/mutually decide that this Agreement/Arrangement applies to Registered/Licensed Architects who names appear on the APEC Architect Register of the home economy.
2.5 The Parties agree/mutually decide that nothing in this Agreement/Arrangement or the Manual is intended to discriminate against an APEC Architect on the basis of that Architect’s place of origin or place of education.

Article 3/Paragraph 3

Purpose of this Agreement/Arrangement

3.1 The Parties agree/mutually decide that the purpose of this Agreement/Arrangement is:

3.1.1 To facilitate the registration/licensure of an APEC Architect in [Economy 1] or [Economy 2] to enable that APEC Architect to provide services in either [Economy 1] or [Economy 2].

3.1.2 To set out standards, criteria, procedures and measures which:
- are assessed on objective and transparent criteria, including but not limited to professional competence and ability to satisfy any benchmark criteria
- are not more burdensome than necessary to ensure that the standards of architectural practice are maintained in the Host Economy
- do not constitute an unreasonable restriction on the cross-border provision of any architectural services between [Economy 1] and [Economy 2].

3.2 The Parties recognise that any differences between the standards and processes for registering/licensing Architects in [Economy 1] and [Economy 2] must be respected and appropriately addressed in order to allow qualified APEC Architects to offer professional services in the circumstances described above.

Article 4/Paragraph 4

Reciprocal Recognition Provisions

4.1 Current Registration/Licensure Procedures:

4.1.1 In [Economy 1], registration as an Architect is the responsibility of the [description of the registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1].

4.1.2 In [Economy 2], registration as an Architect is the responsibility of the [description of the registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2].

4.2 In [Economy 1], a person who is registered/licensed as an Architect may legally provide architectural services using the title “Architect”.

4.3 In [Economy 2], a person who is registered/licensed as an Architect may legally provide architectural services using the title “Architect”.
4.4 The Parties agree/mutually decide that the primary qualification for registration/licensure in the host economy pursuant to this Agreement is to be registered as an APEC Architect in the Home Economy.

4.5 The Parties agree/mutually decide that applicants must, in addition to demonstrating that their names are entered in the APEC Architect registered in the Home Economy, fulfil the following in order to qualify for registration/licensure in the Host Economy pursuant to this Agreement/Arrangement:

4.5.1 Successfully pass the domain-specific assessment imposed by the Host Economy

4.5.2 Agree to:
  • abide by the professional requirements, rules and regulations of the Host Economy
  • satisfy the requirements to assure continuing competency, as imposed by the Host Economy
  • observe any relevant code of professional conduct, and conform to ethical standards of truth, honesty and integrity as the basis for ethical practise, including, at a minimum, abiding by the ethical standards in the Host Economy.

4.5.3 Provide information on the history of any previous application for registration/licensure in the Host Economy.

4.5.4 Complete an application form for registration/licensure in the relevant jurisdiction and pay the required fee.

4.6 The Parties agree/mutually decide that each economy will make its own arrangements for domain-specific assessment and make publicly available information on the domain-specific assessment.

4.7 Nothing in this Agreement/Arrangement will preclude an applicant from pursuing registration/licensure in a Host Economy through the exercise of alternative procedures.

Article 5/Paragraph 5

Implementation

5.1 The Parties agree/mutually decide that this Agreement/Arrangement will commence when:

5.1.1 the Regulatory Authority(s) in [Economy 1] has consented to and endorsed the terms of this Agreement/Arrangement.

5.1.2 the Regulatory Authority(s) in [Economy 2] has consented to and endorsed the terms of this Agreement/Arrangement.
5.2 The Parties acknowledge that the consent of the each Regulatory Authority in [Economy 1] and [Economy 2] is a fundamental pre-requisite to the commencement of this Agreement/Arrangement. It is further acknowledged that after the commencement of this Agreement/Arrangement the Regulatory Authority(s) in [Economy 1] must agree to accept [Economy 2] APEC Architects who seek registration, subject to the requirements of article 4.5, and also the Regulatory Authority in [Economy 2] must agree to accept [Economy 1] APEC Architects who seek registration, subject to the requirements of article 4.5.

5.3 The Parties agree/mutually decide to provide to each other a regularly updated report on implementation.

Article 6/Paragraph 6

Professional Discipline and Enforcement

Co-operation between Parties to the Agreement/Arrangement

6.1 The Parties recognise that Regulatory Authorities are responsible for any appropriate disciplinary action where an Architect violates the requirements detailed in article 4.5.2 in this Agreement/Arrangement.

Disclosure by an Applicant for Registration

6.2 The Parties agree/mutually decide that any application for registration/licensure under this Agreement/Arrangement must include disclosure by the applicant of any sanctions imposed against the applicant related to the practise of the Architect in any other countries and any APEC economies. The Parties acknowledge that information relating to the nature of sanctions imposed may be considered by the Regulatory Authority in the Host Economy as part of the registration/licensure process.

6.3 The Parties agree/mutually decide that any applicant for registration/licensing in the Host Economy under this Agreement/Arrangement must include the applicant’s written permission to distribute and exchange information regarding sanction between both economies. The Parties acknowledge that any failure to fully disclose or provide any of the required information may be the basis of denial by a Regulatory Authority of the application for registration/licensure, or of the imposition of sanctions by a Regulatory Authority, including revocation of the registration/license.

Article 7/Paragraph 7

Immigration and Visa Issues

7.1 The Parties agree/mutually decide that registration/licensure in a Host Economy does not avoid the need to comply with any applicable immigration and visa requirements of the Host Economy.
**Article 8/Paragraph 8**

**Exchange of Information**

8.1 The Parties agree/mutually decide to notify each other and provide copies of any major changes in policy, criteria, procedures and programs that might affect this Agreement/Arrangement.

8.2 The Parties agree/mutually decide to provide each other annually a report providing details of all applications made pursuant to the terms of this Agreement/Arrangement.

**Article 9/Paragraph 9**

9.1 The Parties agree/mutually decide to at all times seek to apply a common approach to the interpretation and application of this Agreement/Arrangement, and to make every effort through co-operation and consultation to arrive at a mutually satisfactory resolution of any matter that might affect the operation of this Agreement/Arrangement.

9.2 A Party to this Agreement/Arrangement may request in writing that consultation with the other Parties occur in relation to any matter that it considers might affect the operation or interpretation of this Agreement/Arrangement.

**Article 10/Paragraph 10**

**Terms of this Agreement**

10.1 The Parties agree/mutually decide that they will, at least every five (5) years, review and update the status of this Agreement/Arrangement and report on its effectiveness, and where appropriate or necessary recommend any changes.

10.2 The Parties agree/mutually decide that this Agreement may be terminated by any Party by giving to the Parties at least six (6) months prior written notice. The Parties agree/mutually decide that the termination of this Agreement/Arrangement by a Party will no effect on the right to practise in a Host Economy obtained through the application of this Agreement/Arrangement.

10.3 The Parties agree/mutually decide that this Agreement/Arrangement will automatically terminate if the Monitoring Committee in either economy ceases to be authorised by the APEC Architect Central Council to operate an APEC Architect Register.
Signatories

SIGNED this ........................ day of ..............................................

[ECONOMY 1]

(signature) ...........................................
[Name], [Title], [Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 1]

In the presence of

(signature) ...........................................
[Name], [Title]

and

(signature) ...........................................
[Name], [Title], [Economy 1] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee

In the presence of

(signature) ...........................................
[Name], [Title]
AND

[ECONOMY 2]

(signature) ..............................
[Name], [Title], [Registration/licensing authority of participating economy 2]

In the presence of

(signature) ..............................
[Name], [Title]

And

(signature) ..............................
[Name], [Title], [Economy 2] APEC Architect Monitoring Committee

In the presence of

(signature) ..............................
[Name], [Title]
Operating Manual to be attached
Proposal on the Definition of the Term “Home Economy”
Singapore

1.0 Background

1.1 At the Fourth Council Meeting in Manila, New Zealand informed the Council about the concern of the three signing economies of the Tri-lateral Agreement (namely Australia, New Zealand and Singapore) about the definition of the term “Home Economy” which is defined as “…the economy of permanent residence and primacy registration/licensure as an architect”. The words “Primary” and “Home Economy” need to be defined or reviewed.

1.2 Singapore explained by citing an example “An architect has primary registration in Home Economy A; obtain registration in Host Economy B as an APEC Architect; then later decides to have permanent residence in Host Economy B and allows primary registration in Home Economy A to lapse; thereafter goes to Host Economy C to be registered as an APEC Architect”.

1.3 In the above example in Para 1.2, Singapore asked what is the definition of “Primary” and suggested that there is a need to clearly define “Primary” and “Home Economy” for further deliberation in the Fifth Council Meeting.

2.0 Current Situations

2.1 Under the Tri-lateral Agreement, the term “Home Economy” and “Host Economy” are defined as follows:

“Home Economy” means the economy of permanent residence and primary registration/licensure as an Architect"

“Host Economy” means economy of secondary registration/licensure as an Architect”

2.2 Going by the definition in Para 2.1, an architect who has primary registration in Home Economy A is deemed to have fulfilled all the requirements to become as APEC Architect (AA), including having completed a minimum period of professional practice of seven (7) years after initial registration in the Home Economy A. This AA from Home Economy A is then entitled to register in other participating Economies eg Economy B, Economy C, etc, as long as there are established Mutual Recognition Agreements with Home Economy A. Such other registrations in other Host Economies are termed as Secondary Registrations.

2.3 Based on the provision of the current Agreement, an architect whose primary registration is in Home Economy A and has obtained secondary registration in Host Economy B as an AA, will lose his secondary registration in Host Economy B if he allows
his primary registration in Home Economy A to lapse. Under Clause 2.2.2 of the Operation Manual, “the registration of an APEC Architect will be cancelled if the architect ceases to be registered/licensed in the designated Home Economy”

3.0 Draft Proposals

3.1 The current Agreement does not provide or allow for the APEC Architect to convert his Secondary Registration in a Host Economy B to a Primary Registration as a locally registered architect in Host Economy B.

3.2 One proposal is not to allow APEC Architect to change Home Economy regardless of any number of secondary registrations in different host economies, which means that the Primary Registration will be permanent in the original designated Home Economy. This will be less flexible for APEC Architects who want to seek permanent residency in other Host Economies.

3.3 If we truly want to encourage mobility among the architects, one solution is to allow the change of Primary Registration from the original Home Economy to the Host Economy (or new Home Economy). However, the same set of criteria adopted by the Central Council for admission to the APEC Architect Register will have to be similarly applicable to the APEC Architects applying to Economy B as new Home Economy. In addition to the same set of criteria for Primary Registration in the new Home Economy B, the APEC Architect must also be a resident (either as a citizen or permanent resident) in the new Home Economy B. This will give flexibility to APEC Architects who may want to choose to practice in any Economy within APEC.

3.4 In summary, the following criteria will have to be fulfilled before the APEC Architect can adopt Host Economy B as the new Home Economy and then allow the original primary registration in Home Economy A to lapse:

1. Minimum number of years of registration as an APEC Architect in Host Economy B which will become the new Home Economy. (It can be 5 or 7 years or any other number of years agreed by all Economies)

2. Complies with Residency Clause with minimum being a permanent resident in Host Economy B.

3. The Primary Registration in original Home Economy A will either be obsolete or will be considered as Host Economy

4.0 Recommendation

4.1 In the spirit of truly allowing architects a choice to practice within any Economy within APEC, it is recommended to adopt the proposal to allow APEC Architect to adopt any of the Host Economy as the new Home Economy if the various criteria set out in Para 3.4 are met. Though we do not see this as common occurrences in future, it would still be advisable to set out the criteria in the event that APEC Architect chooses to adopt a new Home Economy.
Attachment 7

Procedures for Non-Complying Economies

Malaysia

1.0 Introduction

1.1 At the Second Council meeting in Mexico City, it was agreed to add to the Agenda on what course of action the Central Council should take if any participating economy failed to comply with Council rules or requirements over an extended period considering the commitments being taken by all economies. There could be various scenarios and types of disciplinary actions that could be taken should an economy be deficient.

1.2 As suggested by Australia that there were different degrees of importance in the requirements where some are merely administrative and others are fundamental, such as changes to registration criteria, education, competence and registration experience, among others, and this should be considered. Therefore the courses of action have to commensurate with the types of deviations committed.

1.3 Another type of infringement concerns the conduct of the APEC Architect himself when practicing in foreign member economies.

2.0 Course of Action

2.1 The Council takes note that the punitive action shall not be a deterrent for APEC economies to participate in the APEC Architect initiatives. However, the Rules and conventions of Council have to be respected and adhered to. The deviation from the Rules is fundamentally unacceptable in the spirit of APEC. Economies that are members of the Central Council that commits such deviations signal the breakaway from the cooperation. The work group would think that it is highly unlikely for such deliberate occurrence unless under circumstances that are unavoidable.

2.2 The administrative oversight, such as failure to submit half-yearly report or changes to the survey contents to the secretariat may be rectified administratively with a reminder. However the persistent commitment of such oversight requires attention of the Council.

2.3 The failure of Member economies that fail to make payments of contribution to the host secretariat will require a serious attention of Council. The course of action may be determined by Council.

2.4 The more SERIOUS misdeed would be when a Member economy chooses to impose more restrictive measures to recognize an APEC Architect from another economy in contravention to the agreed APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework (AARRF). The Council may choose to expel the participating economy from Council for such action and in the extreme case deregistration of the APEC Architect from the economy. The Council is advised to deliberate on this issue seriously. This is in view that in most economies the regulation of architectural practices is under the jurisdiction of the various states/provinces. The Central authority does not have control over the conduct of the states, provinces and, in a lot of instances, local authority. (CANADA HAS A CONCERN ON THIS AND WOULD LIKE FURTHER DISCUSSIONS ON IT)
3 Procedure of actions by Council

3.1 The punitive actions that may be considered are;
   1. Secretariat seeks clarification from allegedly errant economy.
   2. Peer consultation to be conducted, the report of which to be presented to Council
   3. Caution to be issued by Council to errant economy
   4. Withdrawing of Council membership of the economy

3.2 Upon discovery by the Secretariat that there is a prima facie case of deviation/s committed by a member economy, the secretariat shall submit a notice to the Council’s Work Group on Discipline (WGD) as soon as possible. The WGD shall investigate such case and seek clarification from the allegedly errant economy and submit the report of the clarification to the subsequent Council meeting for deliberation.

3.3 The Council may choose to authorize a peer consultation to the allegedly errant economy. The Monitoring Committee of the nearest economy may be nominated to conduct such consultation and to establish whether a deviation has been committed. The report of the consultation shall be submitted to the Council for deliberation. The Council may decide the appropriate punitive actions to be taken.

3.4 Any complaints against individual APEC Architect (AA) shall be made to the host Monitoring Committee. The Disciplinary procedures and actions against the AA shall be conducted locally. Should the AA were found to be guilty the local punitive actions shall be imposed on the errant AA. The economy of origin shall be notified for punitive actions that may be imposed in accordance to the home economy.

COMMENTS FROM NEW ZEALAND
At the 2010 meeting of the APEC Architect Central Council in Manila, Malaysia presented a paper entitled Draft Course of Action for Non-Compliance with Council Rules.

The paper was in response to the question of what the Central Council would do if a participating economy failed to comply with Council rules or requirements over an extended period. Malaysia proposed the following, from the Manila minutes.

A possible process for an errant economy might be:

- Secretariat to seek clarification from alleged errant economy;
- Peer evaluation to be done by another economy geographically close to the errant economy (example: Singapore-Malaysia, Mexico-United States of America). This consists of a visit of the errant economy by the peer evaluators to verify if there is a prima-facie case of deviations committed;
- A Work Group in charge of disciplinary matters to be formally constituted within the Council to deliberate on the matter;
- The Work Group to report to the Council during its regular meetings on all facets of the case;
• *The Council to take action.*

New Zealand is concerned that in some situations it would not be practical for one economy to peer evaluate the conduct of its neighbour, given political sensibilities that might apply between neighbours. New Zealand suggests a simpler approach.

New Zealand suggests that if a concern is raised about the conduct of a participating economy it should be investigated forthwith by the Work Group which would report in writing to the next Central Council.

Regarding the membership of the Work Group, New Zealand suggests:

- the economy that at the time is providing the secretariat
- the economy that previously provided the secretariat
- the economy next scheduled to provide the secretariat.

New Zealand further suggests that if the alleged errant economy is one of the above three, or for some other reason one of these economies cannot do the work, then the Working Party comprises the other two plus the next economy that is scheduled to provide the secretariat after the economy that is scheduled to next provide the secretariat. Also, if the alleged errant economy is the economy currently providing the secretariat, then the matter should be referred to and managed by the economy that is next scheduled to provide the secretariat.

New Zealand made 3 comments during the last meeting in Manila: 1) that with regards to paragraph 2.4, the bilateral and tri-lateral agreements would play key roles in the relationship of economies; 2) that the idea of “suspension” should be considered in order to bring in the possibility of negotiation for the return of an errant economy or APEC Architect, rather than considering only permanent “good-byes”; and 3) that perhaps, other economies might wish to join the working group of Malaysia, Singapore and Mexico in drafting this document

**MALAYSIA’S RESPONSE TO NEW ZEALAND**

Malaysia agrees with New Zealand’s proposal on the composition of the Work Group on Discipline (WGD).

In cases where bilateral and tri-lateral agreement are in effect and where there exist an MRA on the movement of Architects between the relevant economies, such agreements may take precedent over the AARRF. It is imperative that economies considering MRA or services trade agreements in respect of architectural services to adopt the AARRF among participating economies. The Central Council may still consider actions against economies that choose to NOT adopt the AARRF. (THIS ITEM DESERVES FURTHER DISCUSSION AS SUGGESTED BY CANADA)

Malaysia is agreeable with the idea of “suspension” as the punitive action depending on the severity of the non-compliance.

Malaysia requests the contact details of the parties from economies that wish to be part of the initial WGD.
COMMENTS FROM CHINA
China suggested that the Draft include more of details, such as how a first, a second, or a third absence will be dealt with and considered?

MALAYSIA’S RESPONSE TO CHINA
It is important that the economies’ Monitoring Committee are empowered to exercise regulatory controls on the conduct of their respective APEC Architects (AAs) as well as those from other economies practicing in the host economy. Hence it is important for the economy to be present at the Central Council meeting occurs biannually. During the initial formative years, the number of AAs may not be many and their cross border activities may be limited. An absence from one Central Council meeting may be excused, provided sufficient notice is given to the secretariat with valid reasons. However an absence for two consecutive meetings means an absence of six years of contact with the Central Council. The Central Council at the relevant meeting may consider disciplinary proceedings or other cautionary measures on the errant economy.

COMMENTS FROM MEXICO
At the last meeting Mexico suggested that a group in charge of discipline be created within each economy and when a problem of discipline arises, each economy can send a representative to the overall WGD in charge of discipline within the Council.

MALAYSIA’S RESPONSE TO MEXICO
Malaysia agrees with New Zealand’s proposal on the composition of the WGD. It is also conceivable that each Monitoring Committee (MC) would have in its jurisdiction a disciplinary group to monitor the conduct of APEC Architect working in the host economy. Should there be any infringements on the conduct of the AA, the host MC shall take the necessary disciplinary actions in accordance to the host economy’s domestic rules against the errant AA. The home economy shall be notified of such disciplinary actions for further necessary actions by the home economy against the errant AA.

COMMENTS FROM SINGAPORE
At the last meeting in Manila Singapore cautioned that though it is good to have punitive actions in place, it should not serve to scare away economies that the Council is still enticing to join the Project. Singapore further pointed out that though economies have their registry of APEC Architects, the Project is not effective unless economies have entered into agreements with other economies within the AARRF, which would make relationships more concrete and specific.

MALAYSIA’ RESPONSE TO SINGAPORE
Malaysia is in agreement with Singapore that agreements among economies should be based on the AARRF.
The APEC Architect Central Council has identified six (6) categories of openness of economies to allow liberal practice of foreign architects, specifically APEC Architects, within the economies’ national boundaries. These categories appear as a ladder-type ascent of economies in what is now known or called Reciprocal Recognition Framework, from a level of complete closeness to the ultimate level of complete openness, as follows:

1. No Recognition – no recognition of APEC Architect status;
2. Local Collaboration – association required with an Architect from the host economy;
3. Host Economy Residence/Experience – at least one year of professional experience in the host economy prior to registration examination;
4. Comprehensive Registration Examination – examination of all skills and knowledge required for the practice of architecture;
5. Domain Specific Assessment – understanding of legal and technical issues unique to the host economy; and
6. Complete Mobility – no requirement other than APEC Architect status.

The participating economies have reported, during the 4th APEC Architect Central Council Meeting in Manila in October, 2010, about the level in which their respective economies are in.

1. Local Collaboration – for Canada, China, Hong Kong China, Korea, Malaysia, and Philippines; and
2. Domain Specific Assessment – for Australia, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, United States of America.
3. (For confirmation: Thailand)

Economies have committed to ascend the ladder of the framework progressively as each economy moves towards their commitment to full liberalization of architectural practice.
While the economies are on these levels of openness, questions arise as to whether or not these levels of commitment to openness would adequately define the arrangements between economies with regards to mobility of professionals and the context of their practice in a host economy. Are there other aspects that must be addressed in addition to these arrangements?

The Philippines recognizes that there are as yet many issues that have to be resolved but identifies at this time two (2) of them:

1. The aspect of immigration requirements per the laws within an economy; and
2. The aspect of responsibility and liability.

As of last reporting, the economies of Australia, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, and the United States of America, commit to a status that allows for APEC Architects to freely practice after taking a Domain Specific Assessment that would demonstrate their understanding of relevant technical, legal, cultural, and socio-political aspects within their national borders. Would there be no other legal impediments to the entry of an APEC Architect into the host economy? Can visa for the purpose of practising the profession of architecture in the host economy be easily obtained? For how long? Can a “commercial presence” be easily obtained by way of establishing and opening an architectural office in the host economy? What types of visa are available for APEC Architects who would like to operate in the host economy as non-immigrant persons.

(Note: It is assumed that APEC Architects would cross national borders as non-immigrants, preferring to maintain their status as citizens of their home economy. However, the mobility with which global practice has endowed on professionals, has given rise to the issue of the definition of the term “home economy”. As professionals move from economy to economy, the definition of “home economy” becomes more and more hazy – thus the issue raised by Singapore is valid and needs to be clarified.)

On the other hand, the economies of Canada, China, Hong Kong China, Korea, Malaysia, and Philippines, commit to a status that allows for APEC Architects to practice for as long as they associate and collaborate with a local architect. In this connection, the questions that arise have to do with the sharing of responsibilities and liabilities. What is the level of responsibility and liability of a foreign APEC Architect with regards to the design that had been introduced to the local inventory of buildings? How would the sharing of responsibilities and liabilities be between the foreign APEC Architect and the local architect?

The Philippines therefore recommends further discussions on the following topics during the 5th APEC Architect Central Council Meeting and further discussions during the subsequent Central Council Meetings:
1. Immigration and Other Entry Requirements:
Here, economies are requested to inform the Council about entry requirements (visa and type) and other laws on immigration in their own economy that an APEC Architect accepted to practice in a host economy will have to address.

2. Liabilities and Insurance:
Here, economies are requested to inform the Council about the liabilities of an Architect in their economy and how the aspect of responsibility of the professional for public safety is covered. Economies are also requested to inform the Council about the practice of coverage of liability by insurance in their economy.

In the following paragraphs, the Philippines submits and offers a discussion of the above issues in the context of architectural practice in the Philippines, as an example of what might be expected as equivalent discussions by other economies.

On Immigration:

The Bureau of Immigration of the Philippines identifies the following as aliens which may be admitted as non-immigrants (from the website of the Bureau of Immigration of the Philippines):

1. A temporary visitor coming for business or for pleasure or for reasons of health;
2. A person in transit to a destination outside the Philippines;
3. A seaman serving as such on a vessel arriving at a port of the Philippines;
4. A person entitled to enter the Philippines under and in pursuant of the provisions of a treaty of commerce and navigation (1) solely to carry on substantial trade principally between the Philippines and the foreign state of which he is a national or (2) solely to develop and direct the operations of an enterprise in which, in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the Philippines, he has invested or of an enterprise he is actively in the process of investing, a substantial amount of capital; (to include wife and children under 21 years of age), for as long as citizens of the Philippines are accorded the same recognition;
5. An accredited official of a foreign government recognized by the Government of the Philippines, his family, attendants, servants and employees;
6. A student, having means sufficient for his education and support in the Philippines, who is at least 15 years of age and who seeks to enter the Philippines temporarily and solely for the purpose of taking up a course of study higher than high school at a university, seminary, academy, college or school approved for such student by the Commission of Immigration; and
7. A person coming to pre-arranged employment.

In the above list, an APEC Architect may be admitted as:
#1 – a temporary visitor; or
#4 – a person entering under the provisions of a treaty of commerce and navigation. In the Philippines, GATS (General Agreement on Trade and Services) is a treaty signed by the Philippines with 100 or more participating countries. With the approval of Congress, the Philippines signed the treaty in 1994.

The above are the initial and immediate manners of entry. However, Philippines has to further fill in the information voids such as length of stay, manner of establishing presence, etc.

**On Professional Liability:**

Article 1723 of Republic Act No. 386 (The Civil Code of the Philippines) provides:

“The engineer or architect who drew up the plans and specifications for a building is liable for damages if within fifteen years from the completion of the structure, the same should collapse by reason of a defect in those plans and specifications, or due to the defects in the ground. The contractor is likewise responsible for damages if the edifice falls, within the same period, on account of defects in the construction or the use of materials of inferior quality furnished by him, or due to any violation of the terms of the contract. If the engineer or architect supervises the construction, he shall be solidarily liable with the contractor.

Acceptance of the building, after completion, does not imply waiver of any of the cause of action by reason of any defect mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

The action must be brought within ten years following the collapse of the building.”

In the Philippines, by law, responsibility and liability rests on the shoulders of the designer for a period of 15 + 10 years or 25 years.

Risk transfer by way of insurance coverage is currently not the practice and there are only one or two insurance companies known to provide insurance service to architectural practitioners in the country. However, more and more architects who cross borders and practice in such places as the Middle East and Southeast Asia, report that one of the requirements in the selection process for designers is professional liability insurance.

Those involved in selecting designers usually require proof that the designers have adequate and appropriate insurances. The basic insurance coverage are:

1. Professional Liability Insurance. also known as “Errors and Omissions (E&O) Insurance or Malpractice Insurance, provides coverage and indemnity for claims alleging negligent act, errors or omissions (wrongful acts) in the performance of professional services. Wrongful acts not only include defects in plans and specifications, but all services rendered by an architectural firm.
2. Commercial and General Liability Insurance covers damages caused by the occurrence of accidents to employees on the job site, to include operations away from the office premises.

3. Workers Compensation covers payment of employees’ compensation for lost income and all medical expenses related to bodily injury by accident or disease attributed to job-related activities.

For economies currently requiring collaboration of foreign APEC Architects with a local architect, it is logical to assume that the local architect will assume legal responsibility as the professional-on-record.

For economies on the upper level of the Framework, risk transfer insurances are necessary in order to assure that local citizenry are not left with no way to be indemnified for mistakes committed by foreign architects, which have possibilities to occur.

What is the situation in other economies?
Attachment 9: The future of the APEC Architect Project

New Zealand

The APEC Architect Project is now 10 years old. The first meeting of the steering committee for its establishment met in Sydney on 13 June 2002.

The original attendees at that meeting were Australia (Chair), the People’s Republic of China, Hong Kong China, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Chinese Taipei, and the United States of America.

Apologies were received from Papua New Guinea, Canada and Indonesia.

Since then a great deal has been achieved.

Canada, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, Singapore have joined the project.

Other achievements have included:

- the development of the operating manual
- regular meetings of the Central Council
- the creation of the APEC Architect Register, with architects from most participating economies being represented on it.

In addition, a number of bilateral and trilateral mutual recognition arrangements have been signed between participating economies, allowing for APEC Architects to access specific registration arrangements in host economies. Specifically arrangements have been agreed to between:

- Singapore, Australia and New Zealand in 2010
- Japan and New Zealand in 2009
- Japan and Australia in 2008
- Chinese Taipei and Australia in 2007.

The Philippines and Chinese Taipei have signed a memorandum of understanding to explore further the possibility of a bilateral arrangement, and Chinese Taipei and New Zealand are scheduled to sign a bilateral arrangements at the October 2012 Central Council Meeting.

Two significant issues stand out however.

1. For a significant number of participating economies, being able to enter into a bilateral or trilateral arrangement on the basis of domain specific assessments only is not possible, given statutory, regulatory or other requirements at home.
2. From within the economies that have negotiated domain-specific bilaterals, so far no APEC Architects have applied for registration in a host economy, despite their MRAs.

Both these issues suggest that it is worth asking whether in some way the APEC Architect Project needs to be rethought or extended.
One idea that the Central Council could consider is whether it ought to place an additional focus on finding new arrangements that encourage younger architects to get experience in other economies as a way of broadening their horizons early in their careers.

It may be that APEC Architects are not seeking cross border registrations because they are sufficiently advanced in their careers that they have well established businesses at home which they don’t wish to leave behind and from which they are able to transact business throughout the region without difficulty. In other words, it may be that the project is trying to provide a benefit for people who don’t need or want it.

Conversely, there may be younger architects for whom working in other jurisdictions would be highly sought after as something done temporarily before returning home richer for the experience.

Another possibility is that something new is needed for participating economies that cannot enter into bilateral or trilateral arrangements on the basis of domain-specific assessments only. For these economies, perhaps there could be some other way to allow APEC Architects from other participating economies to be recognised as have expertise that warrants recognition and respect, apart from actual registration in the host economy.

These are just initial thoughts, but it is suggested that the project needs to review itself and consider alternatives.
Attachment 10:  
Report by the Secretariat  
New Zealand  

Participating economies provide the project with secretariat services on rotation. During 2011 and 2012 that duty has been met by New Zealand.

During the period the secretariat has focussed on three main tasks, these being:

1. maintaining the APEC Architect Project Website  
2. providing other administrative services  
3. organising the two yearly Central Council meeting

Items 1 and 2 have been provided by the New Zealand Registered Architects Board’s Chief Executive, alongside his normal duties at his normal place of work.

Maintaining the APEC Architect Project Website  
Early in 2011 2012 the previous secretariat provided the New Zealand secretariat with access rights to the APEC Architect Project website. Since then the website has been significantly enhanced. All the agendas and reports from previous central council meetings have been added along with papers from project’s set up phase. The various bilaterals and multilaterals signed so far have also been added.

In addition all participating economies are now represented in the rotating photos at the top of each page.

Administrative Services  
During 2011 2012, the APEC Architect certificate and ID card were updated and sent to all participating economies for their use. A PDF format was created which allows the name of the APEC Architect and other details to be entered and then the certificate printed to a high quality.

A reference was added to the certificate saying that it could be authenticated by accessing the Register via the APEC Architect Project website.

Central Council Meeting  
The Wellington Central Council meeting has been organised by a working party of Wellington architects who have done the work gratis. Sponsorship has not been required.

APEC Architect Secretariat Costs 2011 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining website and administrative services</td>
<td>NZ$6,111.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEC Architect Central Council Meeting (budgeted)</td>
<td>NZ$101,617.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>NZ$107,728.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APEC Architect Secretariat Income 2011 2012

In November 2011, invoices were issued to participating economies as per the funding formulae in attachment 1 in US dollars covering 2011 and 2012.

Payments received as at 10 September 2012 as follows:
### Invoicing formulae

#### Basis of APEC Architect Secretariat Funding

#### Per annum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Architects</th>
<th>PPP</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong China</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>9,533</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1,6007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>7,590</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Taipei</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Architects**
Based on numbers provided by economies

**PPP**
Based on the three World Bank Purchasing Power Parity categories. The numbers were inverted for the formula

**Ranking**
The economies grouped into three categories by numbers of architects
16,000 and over = 3
3,201 – 15,999 = 2
3200 or less = 1

**Economy points**
PPP + ranking

**Adopted Funding**
$45,900 per annum (as per Manila) divided by total number of points multiplied by economy total points x 2 to cover two years.
### SECRETARIAT SCHEDULE
(As approved during the Fourth Council Meeting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SECRETARIAT</th>
<th>HOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Brisbane, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Sydney, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Chinese Taipei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Honolulu, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Chinese Taipei</td>
<td>Tokyo, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Chinese Taipei</td>
<td>Mexico City, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Vancouver, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>Metro Manila, Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Wellington, New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-24</td>
<td>The United States of America</td>
<td>The United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-26</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027-28</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029-30</td>
<td>Hong Kong China</td>
<td>Hong Kong China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031-32</td>
<td>Chinese Taipei</td>
<td>Chinese Taipei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033-34</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that Central Council Meetings shall be organised and hosted by the economies providing the secretariat in the second year of their time as the secretariat, unless arrangements have been made otherwise.
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GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Accreditation: Also validation - the granting of approval/recognition to a course or program of study, which has been tested to produce results of an acceptable standard against set criteria.

Authorisation: Approval granted by the Central Council to a Monitoring Committee to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register

Benchmark Criteria: Agreed standards by which other standards can be measured.

Central Council: The joint governing body of the APEC Architect project composed of nominees of Monitoring Committees of participating economies, with ultimate responsibility for a range of matters, including the approval of Monitoring Committees, strategic directions and administrative arrangements.

Consensus: Agreement without dissent.

Domain Specific Competencies or knowledge related to conditions of professional practice specific to an economy

Home Economy Economy of permanent residence and primary registration/licensure as an architect.

Host Economy: Economy of secondary registration/licensure as an architect.

Monitoring Committee: Independent committee formed by a participating economy, with delegated authority of the Central Council to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register in its economy and to act as nominating body for the Central Council

Participating Economy: An APEC economy with an authorised Monitoring Committee

Recognition: Also professional recognition - acceptance by a regulatory authority of compliance with requirements.

Registration: Also licensure, certification – legal admission to the right to practise as an architect.

Regulatory Authority: Authority responsible for the registration/licensure or recognition of persons permitted to offer professional services as an architect.

Note: In economies with multiple domestic jurisdictions, the ‘regulatory authority’ referred to in these Briefing Notes is taken to be the national organisation composed of representatives of regional jurisdictions to formulate national standards and procedures for the professional recognition of architects. It is understood that the ultimate legal decision for the application of these standards rests with the individual jurisdictions.
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FOREWORD

Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) is an international forum composed of twenty-one member economies that have undertaken to act collectively to promote economic and technical cooperation within the Asia-Pacific region. Its purpose is “to sustain the growth and development of the region for the common good of its peoples”. APEC builds on WTO General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) principles for the progressive liberalisation of trade in services through the reduction of regulatory restrictions, leading to reciprocal agreements between member economies where appropriate.

The APEC Architect project is an initiative of the APEC Human Resources Development Working Group (HRDWG), one of a number of sectoral groups established to implement APEC programs. The project was endorsed by the HRDWG at its year 2000 meeting in Brunei as a direct response to the Group’s strategic priority of facilitating mobility of qualified persons by developing a means for the mutual recognition of skills and qualifications.

A Steering Committee was formed by the APEC economies participating in the project to develop a mechanism by which current restrictions on the professional recognition of architects from other economies would be reduced or removed. Through the positive commitment of those involved, and fruitful negotiation in the intervening period, a set of principles and an operational framework for the creation of an APEC Architect Register has been agreed by all participants. Registration as an APEC Architect provides evidence of the achievement of professional standards that may satisfy some, or all, of the requirements for the recognition of architects by host APEC economies.

This Manual sets out the organisational structure of the APEC Architect framework and the rules and criteria that underpin its operation. The contents of the Manual are subject to continued scrutiny by the APEC Architect Central Council, which jointly manages the project, to ensure its currency and continued response to changes that develop in the practice of architecture. It is a document that will continue to evolve as it is tested, reviewed and amended as necessary.

The GATS identifies four modes of service provision, of which the third, ‘establishment of a commercial presence’, and the fourth, ‘the presence of natural persons’, are those that are essentially addressed by the APEC Architect framework. However the project will have relevance for all means by which architectural services are exported.

APEC is a cooperative association between regional economies; it is not bound by treaty. Although participating economies are guided by APEC objectives and the GATS principles that inform them, decisions taken by the Central Council are reached by consensus, they do not place a mandatory obligation on any economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Economies of the APEC Architect Central Council 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose

The aim of the APEC Architect framework is to establish a mechanism to facilitate the mobility of architects for the provision of architectural services throughout the APEC region by reducing current barriers to the export of professional services. Its central function is to maintain a Register of APEC Architects who have fulfilled common elements of the education and training requirements for professional recognition in participating economies and are currently registered/licensed as architects, and who have a proven record of professional experience as registered practitioners.

Through the identification of these common aspects of professional recognition, reinforced by a period of professional experience, registration as an APEC Architect defines a level of competence that will satisfy designated registration criteria in other participating economies without further assessment. A host economy may additionally adopt special requirements for the recognition of APEC Architects to address aspects of professional practice specific to that economy, such requirements however must be fully transparent.

Structure

Overall responsibility for operation of the APEC Architect Register rests with a Central Council composed of nominees of independent Monitoring Committees established for this purpose in each participating economy, and authorised by the Central Council to carry out its functions. Policies governing the operation of the APEC Architect Register and strategies adopted for its implementation are determined jointly by the representatives of participating economies appointed to the Central Council.

The APEC Architect Register is divided into sections, each administered by the Monitoring Committee of a participating economy, for the enrolment of architects registered/licensed in that economy who meet APEC Architect criteria. Monitoring Committees are responsible for the management of their respective sections of the Register on behalf of the Central Council.

APEC Architects

An APEC Architect is a person who is registered, licensed or otherwise professionally recognised as an architect in a participating economy, and whose name is enrolled on a section of the APEC Architect Register maintained by that economy. APEC Architects are bound by host economy codes of professional conduct to protect public health, safety and welfare.

The criteria adopted by the Central Council for admission to the APEC Architect Register, and use of the description ‘APEC Architect’, are based on identification of a common sequence and elements in the education, training and assessment of architects as qualified to provide professional architectural services in the home economy. These consist of:
• an accreditation or recognition procedure for education programs in architecture;
• a minimum period of post-graduate practical experience, with specified requisites;
• fulfillment of registration, licensing or other requirements for full professional recognition,
• a minimum period of professional practice as a registered or licensed architect, with specified requisites.

Architects deemed by the Central Council to fulfil these requirements are eligible for registration as an APEC Architect. To retain their registration, APEC Architects must comply with obligations imposed by their home economies for maintaining professional competence and observing codes of professional conduct. Host economies may choose to impose special requirements for the recognition of APEC Architects for practice in their economies, but any such requirements must be fully transparent. (See p. 9 for further details).

Monitoring Committees

Each participating economy is required to establish a Monitoring Committee to take responsibility for administration of the APEC Architect framework in that economy, after receiving authorisation by the Central Council to do so. Monitoring Committees act with delegated authority from the Central Council to implement its policies and carry out its duties.

The primary duty of a Monitoring Committee is to operate a section of the APEC Architect Register for the enrolment of APEC Architects registered/licensed in that economy. It must confirm that candidates for APEC Architect registration have complied with criteria adopted by the Central Council and assess the professional practice experience they have obtained as registered/licensed architects. Each Monitoring Committee is also responsible for ensuring the continued maintenance of required standards.

Monitoring Committees are the constituent bodies of the Central Council. They must nominate one or more representatives to the Council, with each Monitoring Committee entitled to one vote. They are called upon to contribute from time to time to the administrative and review functions of the Central Council and generally to act as centres of information on all APEC Architect matters, and to promote its purposes.

The decisions taken by the Central Council are reached by consensus and are not binding on the regulatory authority of any participating economy. (See p. 14 for further details).

Authorisation of Monitoring Committees

Newly formed Monitoring Committees wishing to establish a section of the APEC Architect Register must first be authorised by the Central Council to do so. Applications for authorisation must be accompanied by information on the professional recognition/ accreditation systems in place in the economy and details of its proposals for assessment of APEC Architect criteria, and any other information the Council deems necessary. Advice on the structure of the Monitoring Committee and its arrangements for administration of the section of the APEC Architect Register within its economy will also be required. Monitoring Committees that have been granted authorisation may establish a section of the APEC Architect Register. (See p. 16 for further details).

Central Council

The Central Council has ultimate responsibility for all matters relating to the APEC Architect framework. The Council comprises at least one representative appointed by the Monitoring Committee of each economy authorised to operate a section of the Register. Non-authorised economies may also be invited to attend Council meetings as non-voting observers. The Central
Council’s primary duty is to decide the standards and criteria required for registration as an APEC Architect and to establish operational procedures for management of the APEC Architect Register. These are reviewed periodically by the Council to ensure their continued relevance to the practice of architecture within the APEC region and the effectiveness of the systems employed to assess them. The Council is responsible for the authorisation of Monitoring Committees to maintain a section of the Register and for subsequent review of their continued conformance with APEC Architect registration criteria.

Effective communication with relevant authorities in participating economies, architects and consumers alike, is essential for successful operation of the APEC Architect Register. The provision of information on its objectives and achievements, and promotion of the role it plays in facilitating the mobility of architects within the region are also important functions of the Central Council. (See p.20 for further details).

**Administrative Provisions**

Responsibility for providing administrative services for the APEC Architect Central Council and acting as the project Secretariat is undertaken in rotation by participating economies. The economy performing this role at any time may share its duties with other economies or it may be exempted from them on request. During its term of office, the Secretariat is required to administer all Council business, manage its meetings and coordinate the activities of the independent Monitoring Committees. It acts as a centre of information for the project and maintains the APEC Architect website.

**Desired Outcomes – Facilitating the Mobility of Architects**

The introduction of the APEC Architect Register has created an effective mechanism for achieving the strategic priority of the APEC Human Resources Development Working Group ‘to facilitate the mobility of qualified persons by developing a means for the mutual recognition of their skills and qualifications’. By providing evidence that agreed standards of competence required for professional recognition have been satisfied, APEC Architects may be exempt from many current restrictions on access to independent practice, such as pre-registration examination and host economy experience, that are normally imposed on architects from other countries. Even though they may still be tested on practice issues specific to the host economy, the savings in time and costs for all involved, architects and regulatory authorities alike, are substantial.

The APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework, which records the registration / certification requirements of participating economies for the professional recognition of APEC Architects from other economies, may be viewed on the Central Council website at [www.apecarchitect.org](http://www.apecarchitect.org).

Through its identification of common standards of professional competence and the quality assurance systems applied to ensure that they are maintained, the APEC Architect framework provides a reliable and transparent basis for the further negotiation of reciprocal arrangements between APEC economies for the mutual recognition of architects. The APEC goals of progressive liberalisation of access to markets for the provision of professional services will become a reality as the benefits of the APEC Architect framework are recognised and endorsed throughout the Asia Pacific region.

**Termination**

The APEC Architect Central Council will operate for so long as it is acceptable and desirable to participating economies.
2. REGISTRATION AS AN APEC ARCHITECT

A candidate for registration as an APEC Architect must be currently registered / licensed or otherwise professionally recognised as an architect in the economy that maintains the section of the APEC Architect Register to which application for admission is made. Architects must demonstrate to the appropriate Monitoring Committee that they have completed an accredited /recognised program of architectural education, fulfilled pre-registration experience requirements, have practised for at least seven years as registered/licensed architects and satisfied any additional requirements, all in accordance with criteria determined by the Central Council. Architects may only be enrolled on the section of the APEC Architect Register in their home economy, unless otherwise provided by this Manual.

(Note: APEC Architect Registration applies only to individual persons, not to architectural practices or firms)

The statement on the ‘Competence of an APEC Architect’ at 2.3 describes the scope of practice and the skills and knowledge required of an APEC Architect.

2.1 APEC ARCHITECT REGISTRATION CRITERIA

The following set of principles satisfies Central Council criteria for admission to the APEC Architect Register and the right to use the description ‘APEC Architect’.

1. Architectural Education

*Educational Benchmark Statement*

Education as an architect shall comprise at least four years of full time study. The education must be of university level, with architecture the principal component. It must maintain a balance between theoretical and practical aspects of architectural training and lead to the acquisition of the skills and knowledge necessary to underpin the required competence of an APEC Architect. Structured experiential learning, determined by the regulatory authority economy to be the equivalent of full-time architectural study as described above, would also satisfy the APEC Architect education requirements.

*Common Elements of Architectural Education Programs*

The core subject areas in an accredited/recognised program of architectural education are:

- Design, as the predominant subject category
- Technology and Environmental Science
- Social, Cultural & Environmental Studies, and
- Professional Studies.

Other subject areas within architectural educational programs may include:

- Related Studies
- General Education.

*Accreditation / Recognition Procedure for Educational Programs in Architecture*

Processes incorporating the following principles of good governance will satisfy the accreditation/recognition criteria for educational programs for an APEC Architect. The accrediting/recognising body should:

- have authority and, where appropriate, legal status and be transparent, independent and publicly accountable.
• have a structured process for the approval of qualifications and compliance with agreed standards.

The Central Council agrees to respect the accreditation/recognition procedures of each participating economy.

2. Fulfillment of Period of Pre-registration or Pre-licensing Experience for Recognition as an Architect in a Home Economy

Applicants for registration as an APEC Architect must have completed a prescribed period of practical pre-licensure or pre-registration diversified experience, as defined by the home economy, for a minimum period equivalent to a total of 2 years.

3. Fulfillment of Registration / Licensing Requirements for Recognition as an Architect in a Home Economy

The purpose of this criterion is, in the first instance, to establish eligibility for registration as an APEC Architect, not for registration in another economy.

Fulfillment of registration/licensing requirements for recognition as an architect in a home economy is accepted as meeting this criterion for an APEC Architect.

4. Professional Practice as a Registered / Licensed Architect

Applicants for registration as an APEC Architect must satisfy the home economy Monitoring Committee that they have completed a minimum period of professional practice of 7 years; after initial registration/licensure as an architect in any participating economy. This experience must be gained in all of the following categories of architectural practice:

- Preliminary studies and preparation of brief
- Design
- Contract Documentation
- Administration

At least 3 years of that period must have been undertaken as an architect:

• with sole professional responsibility for the design, documentation and contract administration of buildings of moderate complexity;
• OR in collaboration with other architects, as an architect in charge of and professionally responsible for a significant aspect of the design, documentation and/or contract administration of complex buildings.

Practice Jurisdiction
Professional practice that satisfies the above requirements undertaken in any economy may be accepted by the relevant Monitoring Committee.

Currency of Practice
To ensure competence, APEC Architect candidates who have not practised in a position of professional responsibility within the preceding two years are subject to a requirement to undertake a program of professional development or fulfill other prescribed conditions to be admitted to the APEC Architect Register.
2.2 ENTITLEMENT TO REGISTRATION

1. Admission to the APEC Architect Register

Candidates for registration as an APEC Architect must apply to the Monitoring Committee of their home economy to determine their eligibility for enrolment on that economy’s section of the Register. In addition to details on education, training and professional recognition in any APEC jurisdiction, candidates will be required to submit a report on their post registration/licensure professional experience, outlining the categories of practice in which it was undertaken and the level of their involvement.

APEC Architects must also agree to be bound by the code of professional conduct of their home economy and of any jurisdiction in which they practice.

Particulars of APEC Architects to be recorded on the Register include:
• name and business address;
• home economy or jurisdiction in which the architect is registered/licensed; and
• any other economy in which the architect is registered/licensed.

The registration numbers assigned to APEC Architects by Monitoring Committees are preceded by the following abbreviations of the name of the home economy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>CN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong, China</td>
<td>HK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>KR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>MY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Mexico</td>
<td>MX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of the Philippines</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Taipei</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applications for admission to the APEC Architect Register are dealt with in a timely manner and will not normally exceed three months for completion. On admission to the Register, APEC Architects are issued with a Central Council Certificate of Registration by the home economy Monitoring Committee and an APEC Architect Identification Card bearing the architect’s name, name of home economy and date and currency of APEC Architect registration. On request, Monitoring Committees also provide relevant information to the regulatory authorities of other participating economies for registration purposes.

2. Maintaining APEC Architect Registration

APEC Architect registration is to be renewed on payment of an administration fee to a Monitoring Committee at intervals no greater than two years. Registration details are to be reviewed and renewed on application to practise in a host economy.

Renewal of registration is subject to compliance with home economy regulatory authority or Monitoring Committee requirements to undertake programs of continuing professional development, or fulfil other tests of current competence. The Monitoring Committee may impose conditions on architects who have not practised in a position of professional responsibility during the preceding two years.
The registration of an APEC Architect will be cancelled if the architect ceases to be registered/licensed in the designated home economy. The registration of APEC Architects found, subject to due process, to be in breach of the code of professional conduct of either their home economy, or a host economy, may be suspended by their home economy Monitoring Committee.

3. Acquired Rights

Should the authorisation of a Monitoring Committee be discontinued for any reason, APEC Architects enrolled in that economy may enroll on a database maintained by the Secretariat for this purpose, for a maximum period of two years. Alternatively they may apply for registration in a host economy and subsequent admission to the section of the APEC Architect Register in that economy.

2.3 THE COMPETENCE OF AN APEC ARCHITECT

The skills and knowledge required for admission to the APEC Architect Register

An APEC Architect must be competent to create architectural designs that:

- satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements;
- are informed by the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies and human sciences;
- demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale;
- respond to environmental concerns and address sustainability issues;
- show skill in land-use planning and the planning process;
- take account of cultural and social factors and demonstrate an understanding of the responsibility of an architect to society;

An APEC Architect must be competent to translate a design concept into built form and be able to:

- investigate and interpret design objectives and relevant issues and prepare the brief for a design project;
- advise on project evaluations, feasibility studies and programs;
- evaluate and determine structural, constructional and engineering elements of a building design and integrate the advice and design of specialist disciplines into a building project;
- assess the physical influences on buildings and the technologies associated with providing internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate, and coordinate and integrate services systems to control them;
- meet building users’ requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations
- provide advice on issues of construction, procurement and contract administration;
- generate the documentation and information needed to translate a design concept into a building;
- manage the procurement of buildings, administer contractual arrangements and monitor their construction.
An APEC Architect must be competent in the practice of architecture and:

- observe legal and regulatory obligations related to the planning and construction of buildings;
- have adequate knowledge of the industries, organisations and procedures involved in the management and realisation of a design project as a building;
- observe the standards of conduct expected of a professional by the community;
- maintain competence in relevant aspects of the practice of architecture.
3. THE APEC ARCHITECT REGISTER

3.1 APEC Architect Register

The APEC Architect Register is the means by which the names of architects who have achieved common standards of professional competence are made publicly available.

To ensure that the information it contains is accurate and current, the APEC Architect Register is divided into independent sections established in each participating economy for the enrolment of architects who are registered/licensed in that economy. It consists of a series of decentralised, linked electronic databases, constructed and operated by the Monitoring Committee of each economy. The Monitoring Committee is responsible for maintaining and regularly updating the section of the Register it administers.

The participating economy acting as Secretariat maintains the central APEC Architect domain with hyperlinks to the individual APEC Architect database websites. Each website contains an introductory statement on the APEC Architect framework, information on APEC Architect registration requirements, access to the list of APEC Architects registered in its economy, and relevant publications and forms for downloading. Monitoring Committees publish on their websites any special requirements that the home economy places on APEC Architects from other economies.

A standard website format has been adopted by all economies to preserve the uniformity of the APEC Architect Register and provide ready access to the registered particulars of APEC Architects, whilst ensuring the security of the independent Register sections. All information contained on the websites is updated at six month intervals An opportunity is also provided for APEC Architects to indicate their willingness to consider offers of professional alliance with APEC Architects from other economies.

In addition to the links with each economy’s APEC Architect database, the Central Council website contains information on the APEC Architect framework, contact details of participating economies, and other relevant matters. Application forms for assessment and registration are also available.

English has been adopted as the common language for exchanging information among APEC economies, although each economy is also free to use the language of the home economy and any other language of choice.

Advice on the registration of APEC Architects may be obtained electronically or from printed records of each section of the Register published annually by Monitoring Committees.

3.2 The Reciprocal Recognition Framework

The Central Council has established a Reciprocal Recognition Framework which identifies participating economies that have adopted the same registration / certification requirements for APEC Architects from foreign economies, thereby establishing a reciprocal basis for the professional recognition of APEC Architects from those economies. In assessing APEC Architects from economies with more restrictive categories of requirements, host economies may impose similar requirements to those of the applicant’s economy.
Some APEC Architect participating economies do not yet provide for the independent practice of APEC Architects from other economies but it is understood that they are working towards this objective.

The Reciprocal Recognition Framework may be viewed on the Central Council website at www.apecarchitect.org.
4. MONITORING COMMITTEES

The policies of the Central Council are put into effect by independent Monitoring Committees established in each participating economy for this purpose and authorised by the Central Council to act on its behalf. Their primary responsibility is to manage the section of the APEC Architect Register in that economy, in accordance with Central Council policy and rules of procedure.

4.1 Composition

Whilst the composition of Monitoring Committees is a matter for each economy to decide, the size and balance of its membership will be dictated by the functions it must perform, particularly with regard to evaluation of the qualifications and professional experience of candidates applying for admission to the section of the APEC Architect Register it maintains. Monitoring Committees should be recognised as competent by the authorities responsible for the professional recognition of architects within the economy. Their members are also required to speak authoritatively on the issues of concern to the Central Council and would normally represent appropriate bodies such as the regulatory authority, professional associations and educational institutions in the sponsoring economy.

4.2 Functions

Monitoring Committees, when authorised, carry out the following functions and manage the section of the APEC Architect Register, with delegated authority of the Central Council, for which they are responsible, in accordance with Central Council policy, guidelines and rules of procedure.

Constituent Bodies of the Central Council
Monitoring Committees that have been authorised to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register are the constituent bodies of the Central Council. Each Monitoring Committee must nominate at least one representative to the APEC Architect Central Council, although there is no restriction on the number of members they appoint. However, it is expected that representatives will be able to speak on behalf of the regulatory authority in their economy.

Each authorised Monitoring Committee is entitled to one vote on the Central Council.

APEC Architect Register
The central duty of an authorised Monitoring Committee is to establish and maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register for the enrolment of APEC Architects registered/licensed in that economy. It is responsible for the enrolment and periodic renewal of the names of architects on the Register who satisfy APEC Architect criteria, and the removal of the names of those who no longer comply. Each Monitoring Committee must establish, monitor and regularly update the database of the section of the Register for that economy and publish a list of APEC Architects enrolled on that section.

Monitoring Committees issue Certificates of APEC Architect Registration and APEC Architect Identification Cards, and provide advice on registered particulars of APEC Architects, on request.

Assessment of Candidates for Registration
Monitoring Committees must authenticate the architectural education and practical experience of each candidate and certify it as satisfying APEC Architect criteria. They are also required to evaluate the subsequent seven-year period of professional experience as a registered/licensed practitioner for compliance with APEC Architect requirements in accordance with Central Council
guidelines on the information required, to ensure uniformity between economies. Assessments are conducted at least annually and applications dealt with in a timely manner.

Opportunities are provided for individuals to request a review of an adverse judgment.

**Maintaining Standards**
Monitoring Committees must equally ensure that the required standards continue to be maintained by the architects enrolled on their sections of the APEC Architect Register. To provide assurance that the professional competence of APEC Architects remains at an acceptable level, the Central Council requires confirmation that renewal of registration in the home economy is subject to compliance with professional development requirements or similar tests of continued competence.

Similarly, Monitoring Committees have a duty to monitor the continued compliance of the systems employed for accreditation/recognition of architectural education and the professional recognition of architects in their economies with the standards originally authorised by the Central Council. The procedures adopted by Monitoring Committees for this purpose are subject to periodic review by the Central Council. Monitoring Committees must immediately notify the Council of any changes to professional recognition requirements that might conflict with APEC Architect criteria and policy.

**Information and Communication**
To ensure transparency of process in facilitating the mobility of architects throughout the APEC region, each Monitoring Committee publishes on its website any requirements that its economy places on APEC Architects from other economies.

At six month intervals Monitoring Committees are required to complete a Council Report on their APEC Architect registration activities and any other significant developments during the period, for circulation to all participating economies. The Secretariat also posts updates of its activities and other relevant information on the Central Council website every three months. Another important function of Monitoring Committees is to promote the benefits of registration as an APEC Architect to members of the profession, both nationally and internationally, and to regulatory authorities and other relevant organisations.

The APEC Architect Secretariat maintains regular dialogue with the APEC Secretariat.

**Central Council Obligations**
As the constituent bodies of the Central Council, Monitoring Committees act as the point of contact and centre of information for the APEC Architect project in each economy. They have responsibility for promotion of the project, and for the publication and distribution of relevant documents and the provision of advice on all APEC Architect matters to architects, government authorities and other external agencies. Monitoring Committees, or their representatives, also contribute to the administrative and review functions of the Central Council as required.

From time to time participating economies are called upon to act as Secretariat, on a rotating basis, and to provide administrative services for the Central Council for a limited period.

**4.4 Termination of Authorisation**
A Monitoring Committee may surrender its authorisation to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register after giving due notice to the Central Council.
AUTHORISATION OF MONITORING COMMITTEES

An APEC economy seeking to operate a section of the APEC Architect Register must first constitute a Monitoring Committee to submit an application to the APEC Architect Central Council, through the Secretariat, for authorisation to do so. (Note: In economies with multiple domestic jurisdictions, where applicable, the professional standards and criteria established by national organisations acting as councils of individual regulatory authorities are those to be evaluated for the authorisation of Monitoring Committees.)

4.5. Application for Authorisation

To promote consistency and transparency of process, the Central Council has prepared guidelines on the information to be provided by Monitoring Committees in support of their applications for authorisation to show conformance with APEC Architect criteria. It will require advice on:

- education and practical experience/training requirements for registration/licensure as an architect in that economy;
- the accreditation/ recognition procedures employed to assess them;
- procedures adopted to assess compliance with the required professional practice experience as a registered/licensed architect.

Additional information required by the Central Council will include the composition of Monitoring Committees, the procedures they will employ for management of the section of the APEC Architect Register for which they will be responsible, and the resources available for undertaking these responsibilities. In reaching its decision, the Council will assess the professional recognition criteria and assessment systems in place in the economy applying for authorisation to determine their compliance with APEC Architect criteria. It will also take into account quality assurance provisions adopted by the economy to monitor continued conformance with required standards of competence and of professional conduct.

Economies, authorised to do so, may establish a section of the APEC Architect Register. Economies not authorised to operate a section of the Register will receive guidance on rectifying deficiencies and have the right to reapply.
4.6 Continued Authorisation

Authorised Monitoring Committees, and the procedures they adopt, are subject to periodic review by the Central Council to ensure that they continue to comply with agreed standards. They must immediately notify the Central Council of any material changes in education provision, accreditation/recognition systems and registration/licensure requirements to those which were approved for initial authorisation, or of any other significant developments concerning the professional recognition of architects in their economies that might conflict with Council policy.

A Monitoring Committee whose authorisation has been suspended by the Central Council because it no longer conforms with APEC Architect criteria may, with reason, request an independent review of the decision.
5. THE APEC ARCHITECT CENTRAL COUNCIL

Overall authority for the control and management of the APEC Architect framework rests with the Central Council. It is the responsibility of the Central Council to determine policy and procedures for all matters relating to the APEC Architect Register and to promote its objectives. The Central Council may delegate authority to authorised Monitoring Committees in each participating economy to carry out its functions.

Architects wishing to export their professional services to other economies, and regulatory authorities requiring evidence that they are competent to do so, may turn to the APEC Architect Register to facilitate achievement of these objectives. It is important that the policy adopted by the APEC Architect Central Council and the procedures employed to implement them are readily accessible and equitable to all parties.

5.1 Constitution of the Central Council

The Central Council acts as the joint governing body for the APEC Architect framework and is composed of at least one representative from the Monitoring Committee of each economy authorised to operate a section of the Register. There is no limit to the number of members appointed to the Council by Monitoring Committees but each authorised economy is entitled to only one vote.

To promote the project and extend its benefits, economies that have not yet received authorisation to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register are also invited by the Council to appoint representatives to attend its meetings as non-voting observers. Although observers are not entitled to take part in the decision making process, this provides an opportunity for them to familiarise themselves with the APEC Architect framework with a view to establishing a Monitoring Committee in their own economy.

5.2 Duties of the Central Council

The Central Council has ultimate responsibility for the operation of each aspect of the APEC Architect framework. Its duties include the following:

**Maintenance of the APEC Architect Register:**
- determine standards and assessment procedures for admission, renewal and termination of the registration of an APEC Architect;
- oversee and coordinate all sections of the Register operated by independent Monitoring Committees, maintain the APEC Architect website;
- establish and apply governance systems and quality assurance strategies to review and maintain uniformity and compliance with agreed criteria.

**Establishment of Monitoring Committees:**
- determine policy concerning the composition, authorisation and responsibilities of Monitoring Committees;
- assess applications for authorisation of Monitoring Committees to operate a section of the APEC Architect Register, and to hear appeals;
- conduct reviews of registration systems and standards in authorised participating economies to ensure continued compliance;
Oversight of the Reciprocal Recognition Framework

- Regularly review the commitment of participating economies to the nominated categories of registration/certification requirements that they are prepared to offer APEC Architects from other economies;
- ensure that the reciprocal commitments recorded on all websites are accurate and current.

Administration of the APEC Architect Project

- make provision for a Secretariat to administer the business of Council, maintain records and coordinate with Monitoring Committees;
- act as a communications centre to provide information, documentation and advice on all aspects of the project.

5.3 Standards and Criteria for Registration as an APEC Architect

The purpose of the APEC Architect Register is to establish authoritative and reliable evidence of the achievement of common standards of professional competence by the architects enrolled on it. Registration is reserved for experienced practitioners to provide an additional level of assurance to consumers.

The criteria adopted for registration as an APEC Architect are based on a dynamic set of principles that identify common elements of professional recognition in APEC economies and reflect current practice norms. These standards and criteria are incorporated in Council guidelines periodically reviewed by the Central Council to ensure that they remain relevant to international best practice within the profession.

Equally the Council must assure itself that APEC Architect standards are rigorously upheld and uniformly applied by the Monitoring Committees authorised to assess them. Strategies employed by the Council to ensure continued compliance by participating economies with required standards rely on a system of regular reporting and notification of changes to agreed process by Monitoring Committees, supplemented by informal visits and discussions when necessary.

5.4 Information and Communication

An important role for the Central Council is to promote the APEC Architect Register throughout the region and to provide advice and support to governments and regulatory authorities to help streamline recognition procedures for APEC Architects. Understanding current restrictions to the mobility of architects and developing strategies to address them play a significant part in the effective operation of the APEC Architect framework. The Council maintains regular communication between participating economies, and advises architects on the significant benefits that registration as an APEC Architect provides in the export of professional services.

While much of the publication and dissemination of Council documents is handled by Monitoring Committees, information provision and promotion of the project remains the responsibility of the Central Council.

5.5 Council Proceedings

Council Meetings: The Central Council meets at least every two years, at a date and venue determined by the members, to review its procedures and criteria, consider applications for authorisation of Monitoring Committees, receive reports from participating economies, and deal with matters arising. Participating economies host the meetings on an alternating basis.
**Membership:** The selection of members to be appointed to the Council and their terms of office is a matter for decision by Monitoring Committees, within the guidelines established by the Central Council.

**Meeting Chair:** The Meeting Chair is normally appointed by the Monitoring Committee acting as host for the Central Council general meeting, although this may be varied as required.

**Meeting Agenda:** To provide an opportunity for all Monitoring Committees to have an input into the topics to be discussed at Council meetings, draft meeting agendas prepared by the Secretariat are circulated for comment to Central Council members, revised and recirculated in the meeting Brief for final adoption by consensus at the start of the Central Council meeting.

**Meeting Quorum:** The Central Council meeting quorum is two thirds of the Central Council Monitoring Committee membership.

**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 authorisation should they wish to continue as participants.

**Decision Making:** All Central Council decisions in connection with changes to APEC Architect criteria and registration policy, and the authorisation or conditional suspension of Monitoring Committees, require the two-third support of all Central Council member Monitoring Committees for adoption. Council decisions on other matters are arrived at by the consensus of members present. A Monitoring Committee must be represented in order to vote. All decisions requiring voting must be notified in advance of the meeting for pre-circulation with the agenda.
To provide an equitable system for sharing the provision of administrative services among economies, Central Council business is conducted by participating economies, which take on the role of Secretariat on a rotational basis. The minimum period for economies to act in this capacity is two years and they may reapply to continue for a subsequent term of office.

The economy acting as Secretariat may delegate any of its functions to another economy by mutual agreement, or participating economies may be exempted from the Secretariat obligation at their request. Alternatively two or more participating economies may undertake the Secretariat role jointly and Monitoring Committees may share Council meeting expenses at the request of the host economy. Budgetary and resource information recorded by Secretariats during their terms in office administering the APEC Architect framework, guide the Council in developing financial strategies.

The Central Council Secretariat is responsible for the conduct of Council meetings and the management of Council records, maintenance of the APEC Architect website and administration of its finances during its term of office. It is also required to arrange for the appointment of Council members, the authorisation of Monitoring Committees and the application of quality assurance provisions from time to time, and to act as a centre of information for all APEC Architect matters.

6.1 Mechanism, Procedures and Documents for Secretariat Service by Member Economies

**SCHEDULE OF ROTATION TO ACT AS SECRETARIAT**

A system for the rotation of the Secretariat services among member economies is generally accepted by the Council as a notional timeframe. Commitments made by economies to serve for a period of not less than two years are received by the Council although it is acknowledged that the commitments are not binding on any economy. The Schedule of rotation is updated every Council Meeting and before the scheduled time of service, Council confirms whether or not the economy accepts the role and responsibilities.

**HOSTING OF THE COUNCIL MEETING**

It is also generally accepted that for convenience and logistical advantage, the member economy acting as Secretariat will also act as host for the Central Council Meeting scheduled every two years. Thus, the Central Council Meeting is expected to occur towards the end of the second year of service of the member economy serving as Secretariat.

**FUNDING FORMULA FOR THE SECRETARIAT**

Secretariat service by any member economy is given assistance by other member economies in accordance with a funding formula formulated and approved by all member economies.
HAND OVER PROCEDURE

In order to have continuity on the administrative duties and responsibilities, the following are procedures to be followed whenever there is a change of economy to act as Secretariat for the Central Council.

**Mechanism and procedure**
- Establish a meeting date and venue between outgoing and incoming Secretariats, to take place where documents and information are handed over.
- Prepare a written document to be signed by both Secretariats stating information handed over and received, with official date of hand-over.
- Send official communication to organizations APEC Architect has contact with (UIA, ARCASIA, other professional international organizations, etc.):
  - By outgoing Secretariat announcing the handover of Secretariat and presenting the economy taking over to act as new Secretariat, as well as its officials.
  - By incoming Secretariat, with contact information
- Send official communication to APEC Secretariat and Lead Shepherd of HRDWG by both Secretariats as above

**Documents – in printed and/or digital format**
- Information package for Incoming Secretariat
  - Secretariat Responsibilities Timetable
  - Central Council Website information and control
  - Guidebook on APEC Publications, Websites and Meeting Documents
  - APEC Protocols (2001 Desi Document)
  - Contact information of participating economies
  - Contact information of principal international organizations APEC Architect must be in communication with.
  - Last Meeting Summary
  - Operations Manual in effect
  - Basic Financial information
- Documents passed on by past Secretariats
  - Meeting Summaries
  - Operations Manuals
  - Meeting Agendas and Briefing Notes of all past meetings
  - Surveys
  - Basic APEC information
- Others if requested
  - Communications sent
  - Communications received
  - Any other matter