



THE APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT CENTRAL NINTH COUNCIL MEETING
27-28 October 2021 through videoconference platform

Meeting Summary Conclusions

Welcome of Attendees

1. The attendees were welcomed by the Chair, Architect Yolanda D. Reyes, of the 9th APEC Architects Central Council Meeting and Commissioner of the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC). PRC Chairperson Teofilo S. Pilando, Jr. gave the welcome remarks.

Agenda Item 1: APEC Architect Project Central Council Meeting Procedure

2. The protocols for the Central Council Meeting were confirmed.

Agenda Item 2: Central Council Membership

3. Economies introduced their respective attendees. All participating economies were present.
4. The meeting was also attended by three (3) observers namely, Brunei Darussalam, Viet Nam (second attendance), and Papua New Guinea.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the Agenda

5. The agenda was confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 4: Confirmation of the Meeting Minutes/Report

6. The meeting summary of the APEC Architect Project Eighth Central Council Meeting held in Zhengzhou, People's Republic of China in 2018 was confirmed without amendments. Likewise, APEC Architect Project Central Council Special Meetings' Records of Discussions held on 25 November 2020, 28 May 2021 and 8 September 2021 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 5: Matters arising from the APEC Architect Project Meetings

7. Economies raised no issues/concerns in the previous meetings.

Agenda Item 6: Reporting

8. The Secretariat reported that no inquiries had been received regarding the establishment of any new monitoring committees.
9. Monitoring Committees of each economy provided report on their APEC Architect activities to the Central Council.
10. All fourteen (14) member economies reported on the strategies adopted to promote the APEC Architect Register such as linking of the APEC Central Council website to their

respective domestic websites, conduct of conferences/ workshops on the value of the APEC Register, submission of the APEC Architects' projects for the APEC Architect Coffee Table book.

11. No new bilateral or multilateral arrangements entered into by the participating economies since the last Central Council meeting. The meeting noted the ongoing negotiations for bilateral agreements between Chinese Taipei and Australia, and between the Republic of the Philippines and the People's Republic of China.
12. There was no change in the reciprocal recognition framework status.
13. People's Republic of China proposed that the reciprocal recognition of APEC Architect should be divided into two levels, the recognition of professional qualification of architect and the license to practice. The APEC Architects registration criteria could be taken as the standard and condition of professional qualification recognition but the license to practice should be discussed by bi-literal negotiation and solved under peer to peer conditions.
14. Economies reported on how they treat foreign APEC Architects practicing in their economies.
 - Singapore - amended Architects Act to give authority to Board of Architects to sign any agreement on Mutual Recognition Agreement (MRA) on Architectural Services after discussion with any country effective on 6 October 2017; Foreign architects will have to apply with the Board of Architects and on project basis they will approve the application; foreign architects work in collaboration with local architects;
 - Malaysia – removed their residency requirement for foreign practicing architects but they need to comply experience requirement and they have to sit in their examination;
 - Japan – architects should belong to any Kenchikushi (construction or architectural) firm as the first condition to work in Japan;
 - Mexico – License is granted by the government; agreement is between countries but internally, private association has an agreement with the government so they can assess professional practice of foreign architects, and issue a letter for the government to issue a license. There is no residency requirement;
 - Hong Kong China – They have an open economy; one has to go through a registration but there are overseas architects who are not registered architects but free to give architectural advice;
 - Thailand – considers liability and accountability of architects in this regard, foreign architects work in collaboration with local architects so that at least one party has liability to clients;
 - United States of America – For a foreign architect to obtain licensure in a US jurisdiction, they must hold a valid license in a foreign jurisdiction that has a means of documenting disciplinary action, hold a degree in architecture required for licensure in their country of licensure, document experience per NCARB's AXP, and pass NCARB's ARE, Now, they are trying to take a new look on how everyone does in the licensure. They are now focusing on competency, what is behind the competency and its requirement such as learning on the knowledge and skills and understand what the economies are doing;
 - Australia – A foreign architect already passed the requirements as APEC Architect in their economy and directs them where they can get the information (e.g. on legal

responsibility, standards, indigenous issue, and sustainability). They conduct interview which contains 3 areas: technical issue, proposed management plan, responsibility, and accountability/liability;

- Republic of the Philippines – requires establishment of reciprocity in the practice of architecture;
- People's Republic of China – Professional practice and professional registration are regulated by the government. Professional association assesses the professional qualification of architect and report to the government. The professional body and another professional body can sign an agreement and later, the government representing each economy sign the agreement for implementation; and so there are 2 levels: first about qualification of architects and the second is the practice of architects;
- Canada – foreign architects are free to apply for registration. If they are not part of country or economy with whom they have reciprocity agreement. They must go through experience architecture program average of two (2) years. For APEC economies with whom they have reciprocity agreement, it is a fast track agreement. They assess education and experience and identify the areas of difference and the domain specific assessment as part of the agreement developed. The challenge on APEC reciprocity is that there can be no licensure requirement such as residency or local collaboration in the other economy;
- Viet Nam – They have an open economy for foreign architects. They can easily practice by registering by showing the original copy of the Certificate of Registration in the home country, convert it in their local. If they practice for 6 months, they just present the original copy of the Certificate of Registration. If they practice more than 6 months, they have to undergo procedure of conversion of their home certification into Vietnamese certification;
- Brunei Darussalam – They have two (2) layers: first is registration and the second is practicing certificate. Currently, they do not have limitations. They treat all foreign and local architects the same for registration;

15. There were few movements done in the APEC Architect project due to COVID-19 pandemic.

16. Economies were requested to report in the next Central Council Meeting how they have moved forward in giving benefits to their APEC Architects in order to determine the value-add of one becoming an APEC Architect and how do we treat foreign APEC Architects in order to practice in another economy.

Agenda Item 7: Future of the APEC Architect Project

17. The Meeting appreciated the Republic of Korea's presentation entitled "Global Synergy", delivered by Ar. Lee, Sang Leem, Chairman of the SPACE Group and Member of Korea's APEC Architecture Monitoring Committee. Korea's presentation emphasized the important role of the Architects in post-pandemic era in several areas such as in law, cyber life, education, and sustainability, among others. Korea recommended for the Central Council to aim for a *focus a specific point* strategy through cooperation and mutual recognition of license/ education, inspired by the concept of synergy. Korea strongly believed that APEC Architect is our future.

18. In view of the current pandemic, Korea added that the goal is to protect the people and avoid contagion, to study the management of air conditioning system especially in negative pressure room.
19. Mexico agreed with ideas of Korea and shared that spaces should now be more flexible and furniture should be lighter and movable especially that apartments/ rooms become smaller nowadays and ventilation is priority.
20. Malaysia shared that business and trade are being handicapped during the pandemic and the different systems among the economies added to the issues raised. Malaysia steered the discussion on how to set up a level playing field in the Asia Pacific and suggested to look into the available data such on the number of architects versus GDP of the participating economies. Malaysia presented the analysis on the number of architects for each economy.
21. People's Republic of China, on the other hand, emphasized the challenge on realizing the mutual recognition in Asia Pacific. People's Republic of China recommended to start with identifying what makes an APEC Architect distinctive to other architects in other international organizations. Also, mutual recognition may be achieved through identifying common requirements, competencies, or standards in the architecture profession in Asia Pacific.
22. Australia shared their experience in mobility. Mobility kindles learning/ professional development through encountering people with different background. Australia shared that the actions to be made should include understanding the new global demand and the specific domestic demand.
23. The Chair thanked the participating economies for their comments/ insights. The Chair highlighted the importance of having an open communication to attain mutual recognition and freer mobility of professionals in Asia Pacific – looking forward to the future of APEC Project.

Agenda Item 8: Central Council Administration

Report of the Secretariat

24. The Republic of the Philippines reported the duties completed from 2019 to present particularly on administrative services, raising awareness of the project, organizing the APEC Architect Central Council Ninth Meeting and on the finance matter.

Amendments to the Operations Manual

25. APEC Architect Operations Manual was adopted as revised.
26. On Maintaining APEC Architect Registration, page 12, the Central Council agreed to modify the proposed statement to "APEC Architect registration is to be renewed on payment of an administration fee to a Monitoring Committee at intervals to be decided by the respective Monitoring Committee."

27. On Meeting Chair, page 19, the Central Council agreed to the removal of the proposed additional statement on turn-over of chairmanship since it duplicates the statement under the Schedule of Rotation to Act as Secretariat in page 20, which was adopted.
28. On Attendance, page 19, the Central Council agreed to revise the proposed additional statement to “The economies present during the council meetings are allowed to designate up to three (3) official representatives. Additional attendees will be considered as official guests.”
29. On Hosting of the Council Meeting, page 22, the Central Council agreed to modify the proposed additional statement to “In the event that the members of council cannot meet physically in person for the council meeting, the secretariat may host the meeting via hybrid or purely virtual platform.”

Review of the Schedule of Rotation

30. The meeting adopted the amended Schedule of Rotation of Responsibilities. Thailand confirmed to be the Secretariat to the Central Council for 2022-2023 and to host the APEC Architect Project Tenth Central Council Meeting in 2023.
31. The meeting confirmed that Viet Nam is eligible to be an official member economy of the APEC Architect Project. On the other hand, Brunei Darussalam and Papua New Guinea signified their intention to attend the next Central Council Meeting.
32. Singapore proposed to have an APEC Architect Alumni which can be further discussed in the next Central Council meeting to be hosted by Thailand.

Review and Adoption of the Summary Conclusions

33. The Summary of Conclusion of the APEC Architect Project Ninth Central Council Meeting was adopted.
34. APEC Architect economies recognized the excellent work carried out by the Philippines as host and great Chair and Secretariat.