



Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation

THE APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT CENTRAL TENTH COUNCIL MEETING

28 April 2023 at The Grand Hyatt Erawan Bangkok Hotel

Hybrid Meeting, In-person and Online

Draft Minutes

OPENING OF THE APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETING

1. The APEC Architect Project Central Council Meeting began with **the Chair**, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pongsak Vadhanasindhu, greeting the attendees and introducing the traditional Thai blessing dance to welcome the distinguished guests.
2. **The Chair** expressed gratitude to **the Republic of the Philippines** for their virtual hosting of the 9th meeting, acknowledging their valuable provision of information, and informed the members of the forthcoming distribution of said information to all participating economies.
3. **The Chair** emphasised the potential for expanding cross-border practices and forging new opportunities with each APEC economy, while also mentioning the possibility of establishing a professional network in the near future.
4. **The Chair** underscored the core objective of APEC Architect, which is to foster international cooperation, emphasising the significance of effective decision-making and implementation in order to uphold a balanced consideration of the interests of all members, while expressing a steadfast commitment to perpetuating this collaborative momentum in future meetings.
5. **The Chair** extended gratitude to the attendees present both in-person and online, acknowledging the participation of three countries via online means, and proceeded to introduce **the Vice Chairman** of Thailand Monitoring Committee who would assume the role of presiding over the meeting.
6. **The Vice Chairman**, Michael Paripol Tangtrongchit, conveyed his appreciation for the convenience of a hybrid meeting and highlighted that the current meeting will build upon the amendments made to the manual during the 9th meeting.
7. **The Vice Chairman** commented on the increasing number of participating economies in the current meeting and mentioned the potential for **the Republic of Indonesia's** official inclusion, while expressing regret that **Viet Nam** and **New Zealand** were unable to attend. He expressed hope that more economies would be able to participate in the 11th meeting in Korea.
8. **The Chair** introduced Mr. Salyawate Prasertwitayakarn, Member of Architect Council of Thailand and Secretary General of Thailand APEC Architect Monitoring Committees, to the attendees.

AGENDA ITEM 1: WELCOMING PARTICIPATING ECONOMIES

1. **The Secretary General** introduced himself and extended an invitation to participating economies to introduce themselves, beginning with those present in-person and then those joining online, attached as Annex 1.
2. **The Vice Chairman** expressed his gratitude to the participating economies.

AGENDA ITEM 2: SPEAKER NOTE TOPIC ON ARCHITECTURE OF THAILAND "WORKING TOGETHER"

1. **The Vice Chairman** proceeded to the next agenda, which was the speaker note topic on the architecture of Thailand by Mr. Amata Luphaiboon.
2. **The Secretary General** introduced **Mr. Amata Luphaiboon** to the participating economies and invited him to share his insights on three projects undertaken outside Thailand, which will aid in developing architect policy for professionals working internationally.
3. **Mr. Amata Luphaiboon** introduced his company Department of Architecture Co., Ltd, and its three highlighted projects.
 - a. The Mist Hotspring Hotel, a project undertaken in collaboration with KKS International in China, is situated in close proximity to the first hot spring of the People's Republic of China. The hotel is designed to emphasise the mystical quality of the hot spring's mist.
 - b. The Corner House in Manila was developed in collaboration with BAAD Studio in Manila in the Republic of the Philippines, taking inspiration from The Commons, F&B community spaces in Bangkok.
 - c. Taste 18: In collaboration with Wong & Tung, Taste 18 is located in the People's Republic of China amidst a shopping museum, shopping centre, and streets, with a focus on the pedestrian experience of F&B, inspired by open spaces like walking streets and weekends.
4. **The Secretary General** asked follow-up questions which include Mr. Luphaiboon's discovery and commission by foreign clients, cultural challenges while working on the projects, and his perspective on the future for architects working on cross-border projects.
5. **Mr. Amata Luphaiboon** discussed how he obtained commissioned projects through online exposure, emphasised the significance of trust between architects and clients, and mentioned the convenience of video calling for communication. He also highlighted the importance of local teams in delivering high-quality projects.
 - a. Importance of Trust: Mr. Luphaiboon emphasised the significance of trust between architects and clients in securing commissioned projects. Building trust is a crucial factor in establishing long-term working relationships and delivering successful outcomes.
 - b. Convenience of Video Calling: He mentioned the convenience of using video calling for communication. This technology allows architects and clients to effectively discuss project details, share ideas, and address any concerns or queries, irrespective of physical distances.

- c. Role of Local Teams: Mr. Lupaiboon highlighted the importance of local teams in delivering high-quality projects. Their knowledge of the local context, including factors such as cultural nuances, environmental conditions, and local regulations, greatly contributes to the successful execution of architectural projects.
6. **The Secretary General** inquired whether, due to the perceived risks associated with the projects, the Professional Indemnity charge would be higher for Mr. Lupaiboon's firm.
7. **Mr. Lupaiboon** highlighted that their firm has maintained Professional Indemnity (PI) coverage since its establishment, even prior to their involvement in cross-border projects. Although the PI policy has not been actively utilised, its presence serves as insurance protection for both the firm and its clients.
8. **The Secretary General** expressed gratitude to **Mr. Lupaiboon** for his insightful presentation.
9. **The Vice Chairman** thanked **Mr. Lupaiboon** for sharing his experiences and addressed potential doubts among participating economies regarding the relevance of his presentation.
10. **The Vice Chairman** highlighted the significance of cross-border architectural practice, emphasising the need for collaborative efforts to mobilise architects in the APEC region, while also noting that regulatory issues should not hinder collaboration and knowledge transfer among members.
11. **The Vice Chairman** acknowledged the platform's potential, with 16 participating countries, to achieve the objective of cross-border mobilisation of architecture practice, while recognizing **Mr. Lupaiboon's** experience working with international teams as an exemplification of the APEC Architect project's goals.
12. The meeting took a 15-minute coffee break

AGENDA ITEM 3: THE ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS

1. **The Vice Chairman** called the meeting to order.
2. **The Chair** distributed gifts to each representative of the participating economies.
3. **The Republic of Philippines** presented the coffee table book to delegates of the participating economies.
4. **Mexico** introduced their additional representatives, Honorato Carrasco Mahr and Marco Antonio Vergara, who had recently joined the meeting virtually.
5. **The Vice Chairman** proposed a motion for the adoption of the agenda and related matters and inquired if there were any additional items or amendments to be included.
6. The meeting proposed no additional items or amendments, and the agenda was adopted without any modifications. The motion was initiated by **Australia** and seconded by **the Republic of the Philippines**.

AGENDA ITEM 4: CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES/REPORTS

1. **The Vice Chairman** initiated the confirmation of the minutes and the summary of the virtual meeting hosted by the Philippines on October 28th, 2021, as provided in the distributed documents.

2. **The Vice Chairman** inquired if there were any further changes to be made.
3. The minutes and the summary from the ninth meeting were presented and adopted without any amendments. The motion was proposed by **the Republic of the Philippines** and seconded by **Canada**.

AGENDA ITEM 5: MATTERS ARISING FROM THE 9TH APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETING

1. **The Vice Chairman** inquired if there were any issues arising from the previous meeting to be discussed, such as **the Republic of Indonesia's** full membership, as per the manual that allows approval in the second meeting for those who have attended previously.
2. **The Vice Chairman** asked if any economy would like to discuss the presentation.
3. **Singapore** proposed the full membership of **Indonesia, Viet Nam, and Brunei**, which received prompt support from more than the minimum three members required.
4. The meeting formally recognized **the Republic of Indonesia, Viet Nam, and Brunei Darussalam** as new members.
5. **The Vice Chairman** noted for **the Secretariat** to inform **Viet Nam** of their approved membership.
6. **The Republic of the Philippines** informed the meeting that they have fulfilled the commitment for the coffee table book, which has been distributed to all participating economies.
7. **The Vice Chairman** expressed his gratitude to **the Republic of the Philippines** for their diligent efforts.
9. **The Chair** explained to the meeting the protocol of the provision of the coffee table book which has now been fulfilled by **the Republic of the Philippines**.
10. **The Vice Chairman** proposed the possibility of discussing a second version of the coffee table book at the next meeting in Korea.
11. There are no other outstanding issues from the ninth meeting.
12. **The Vice Chairman** proposed the possibility of organising a small project among council members, such as an exchange program for practitioners or architectural students, to foster collaboration within the framework of APEC Architect.
13. **The Republic of the Philippines** referred to the committee for the faculty exchange established during the ninth meeting and highlighted the possibility of a virtual and expense-free exchange.
14. **The Vice Chairman** suggested taking a vote to record the economies that are in favour of the idea and suggested that either **Thailand** or **the Republic of Korea** could be responsible for coordinating the collaborative project.
15. **The Chair** suggested a discussion between **Thailand** and **the Republic of Korea**.
16. **The Republic of Korea** expressed their full support of **Thailand's** coordination.
17. **Malaysia** welcomed the proposed initiative and emphasised the significance of mobility between economies, where a borderless future is expected to encompass services between them, and thus, the meeting should primarily concentrate on urging the respective governments to progress in their regulations to enable architects to move between economies.

18. **The Republic of the Philippines** explained how the Republic Act 9266, also known as the Architect Act of 2004, addressed the APEC Architect project and ASEAN in anticipation of reciprocity, in preparation for potential future mobility.
19. **Canada** emphasised the importance of sharing legislative changes to enable mutual recognition agreements, citing **Chinese Taipei** and **the Republic of the Philippines** as examples, and recommended that this area of discussion be the focus of the meeting to facilitate the creation of new mutual recognition agreements.
20. **The Chair** stated that the economy has made a report on its legislative issue.
21. **The Vice Chairman** addressed challenges related to making legislative amendments and remarked that Thailand will share its progress in the afternoon session.
22. **The Republic of the Philippines** stressed the ultimate goal of the meetings, which is cross-border practices with minimal restrictions, and proposed that bilateral agreements could be the way forward.
23. **The Vice Chairman** emphasised the significance of practical and viable practices, taking into account the challenges and relevant issues discussed in the morning's presentation, while acknowledging full support for the concept of APEC Architect.
24. **The Republic of the Philippines** emphasised the reciprocity provision in their law and the issuance of a special temporary permit for foreign architects to practise in their economy under specific circumstances, while acknowledging challenges in multilateral collaboration and proposing the exploration of bilateral collaborations as a practical solution.
25. **Singapore** supported **Canada's** suggestion to share progress made and cited their own amendment to the Architect Act on October 6, 2017, enabling the Board of Architects to sign mutual recognition agreements with APEC and non-APEC economies, and cited their early involvement in a trilateral collaboration with Australia and New Zealand.
26. **Singapore** highlighted the current simplification of collaboration for foreign architects recognized in their home economies to work with local architects on specific projects in Singapore, requiring only an approval from the Board of Architects.
27. **Singapore** advocated collaborative practices and encouraged other economies to amend their legislation to enable such collaborations.
28. **Singapore** commended **Thailand** for being in the process of amending their legislation to facilitate collaborations.
29. **The Republic of Korea** requested clarification from **Singapore** regarding the scope of project-based collaborative practices, specifically whether it is limited to economies with which **Singapore** has bilateral and trilateral agreements or open to other economies as well.
30. **Singapore** clarified that foreign architects from economies with bilateral and trilateral agreements can practise independently, while foreign architects from all economies can request approval on a project basis to work as consultants with local architects.
31. **The Republic of Indonesia** supported **Singapore's** suggestion of starting with collaborative practices between foreign and local architects, as the construction of structures in a foreign country can be complicated, and suggested that if successful, a roadmap for foreign architects to work independently could be established in the future.

32. **The Republic of the Philippines** shared that their economy provides two types of permits: one is a temporary permit intended for foreign architects governed by reciprocity, and the other is a special permit that allows formerly Filipino architects who have acquired citizenship elsewhere to continue practising their profession in the Philippines.
33. **The Vice Chairman** acknowledged the innovative quality of the permits
34. **Chinese Taipei** highlighted that since 2018, it has been possible to sign mutual recognition agreements with other economies, enabling foreign architects to work independently in its economy. **Chinese Taipei** stressed the importance of collaborating with a local team before proceeding with independent work. **Chinese Taipei** proposed clarifying the legislative progress of each participating economy.
35. **Hong Kong China** informed participating economies that foreign architects can practise in the economy as long as they avoid using the title "architect" and architecture-related terms, and their firms can hire an authorised person to submit their projects to the government.
36. **Hong Kong China** suggested that becoming a member of the Hong Kong Institute of Architects is a feasible alternative to the challenging regulation amendment process for becoming a registered architect in Hong Kong, subject to a minimum work experience requirement, as the economy explores options to establish mutual recognition agreements, which is a lengthy and arduous process.
37. **Hong Kong China** emphasised that becoming an authorised person, which is necessary for ensuring public health and safety, requires passing another examination separate from obtaining registration as an architect.
38. **Hong Kong China** reported that it has established a mutual recognition of professional qualifications with certain APEC economies, including **Australia** and New **Zealand**, which permits foreign graduates to take the necessary examinations in Hong Kong to become architects in the economy.
39. **The People's Republic of China** reported conducting pilot trials in Hainan in 2020, allowing foreign architects to practise and have their qualifications recognized. However, to practise, they must be employed by a Chinese company, have relevant education, and pass an interview or document review. The agreement includes economies such as **Hong Kong China**, **Japan**, and **Australia**, and **the Republic of China** welcomes other economies to discuss required practice and professional competency with Hainan province's authority to expand the list.
40. **The Vice Chairman** asked why Hainan was selected as the testing ground.
41. **The People's Republic of China** stated that building a free trade port was their objective, and the mutual recognition agreement was one of the methods to achieve it.
42. **Mexico** emphasised the need for concrete efforts to establish new agreements and proposed matching economies to settle agreements similar to the Trans-Pacific Partnership.
43. **Malaysia** supported **Mexico's** view on the importance of initiatives and proposed more frequent meetings between smaller groups of economies instead of bi-annual meetings.
44. **The Republic of the Philippines** proposed an email directory for local information and an experimental APEC architect exchange program to promote knowledge-sharing and collaboration for practising in foreign economies.

45. **The Vice Chairman** proposed the establishment of a subcommittee and an open-source website accessible to participating members based on recommendations from Malaysia and the Philippines.
46. The participating economies agreed.
47. **The Vice Chairman** adjourned the discussion to the subsequent session and invited the representatives to take a group photograph.

AGENDA ITEM 6: REPORTING

1. **The Secretary General** commenced the afternoon session by extending a warm welcome to all participating members and highlighted that the afternoon session would focus on reporting from different economies to the Central Council, covering the following agenda items:
 - a. an application to form a new monitoring committee;
 - b. the monitoring committee's report to the Central Council;
 - c. the promotion of the APEC Architect Register;
 - d. updates on any new agreements cited by economies; and
 - e. an update on the status of the APEC Architect Reciprocal Recognition Framework.
2. **Australia** reported 15,645 registered Architects as of March 2023, with a total of 30 APEC architects at the end of the period, and 5 APEC architects from other economies, and received 1 application for registration licensing from an APEC Architect of another economy. There are 5 members on the monitoring committee. The scope of architecture practice for APEC Architects has no limitations; it encompasses all aspects. There has been one change to the procedure for APEC architect registration during this period, which involved updating the domain-specific requirements to align with the changed standard of Competency in 2021. There have been no changes to the registration or licensing process. Non-resident non-citizens are not mandated to complete the full registration process. The documentation changes during the period included updating the guide form to reflect the revised competencies issued in 2021. Communications and promotions efforts have primarily focused on the website and stakeholder meetings. Three existing reciprocal arrangements for APEC Architects include: the bilateral arrangement between **Australia** and **Japan**, a trilateral arrangement involving **Australia**, **Singapore**, and **New Zealand**, and another trilateral arrangement comprising **Australia**, **Canada**, and **New Zealand**. The reciprocal recognition framework pertains to the domain-specific assessment area. The fee structure for applying to become an APEC architect includes a \$1500 application fee, no processing fee, and an annual fee of \$360.
3. **Canada** reported an existing trilateral agreement with **Australia** and **New Zealand** and ongoing efforts towards a bilateral agreement with **Chinese Taipei** expected to be completed by the 11th meeting. **Canada** expressed delight in learning about **the Republic of the Philippines'** legislative change, anticipating a discussion on establishing an agreement on reciprocity. **Canada** acknowledged the impact of the pandemic on the limited numbers of outgoing and ongoing APEC architects, expressing optimism for a rise in numbers as the situation normalises.

4. **The People's Republic of China** reported that there are 41,065 registered architects and 126 APEC architects in the economy. Present today in the monitoring committee of the People's Republic of China are Director Cui Kai, Deputy Directors Zhuang Weimin, Zhao Qi, Yu Yang, and Li Cundong, Deputy Secretary General Chen Shenghui, and Secretary Liu Yuting. The Monitoring Committee of the People's Republic of China has made new appointments, adding a total of 30 members, which include representatives from the Registration Authority and Architectural Society of AIC, as well as Academic Institutions and Architecture Design Centers. China reported that there are no major changes. The number of APEC architects remain 126 which is the same. In the context of the reciprocal recognition framework for APEC architects, the economy is currently in the stage of local collaboration. **The People's Republic of China** has compiled and issued the standard for continuing education of registered Architects and established their code of ethics and contacts. These serve as the basis for discussions towards mutual recognition agreements for Architects' professional competence and qualifications. **The People's Republic of China** stated that to become an architect in the economy, one must first obtain professional qualifications, such as passing the national examination, followed by obtaining a licence to practise. Foreign architects can freely engage in conceptual design and practise their profession without permanent residency in the economy and can take the architecture registration examination in specific areas. The economy stated that Beijing, in addition to Hainan, is also a pilot free trade zone.
5. **Hong Kong China** reported to participating economies that it had a total of 4,128 registered architects and 66 APEC architects at the end of the period. There were no new APEC architects from other economies during this period, and no applications for registration or licensing by APEC architects from APEC economies were received. The list of the members of Hong Kong China's Monitoring Committee is available for reference on the second page. The Monitoring Committee of Hong Kong China's APEC Architect Project includes Chairman Chan Chak Bun Benny, Vice Chairman Ho Kin Wai Stephen, and members Chueng Kong Yeung Thomas, Lee Siu Wing Ivy, Tam Kwok Chi, Choi Wu Hing Donald, and Ho Ying Kit Tony. There were also no changes made to the scope of architecture practice, and the registration procedures remained unchanged. It was further noted that, under the Architects Registration Ordinance (ARO), registered architects in Hong Kong must be ordinarily resident in Hong Kong. To encourage registration for becoming APEC architects, Hong Kong China has set up a specific website for this purpose. However, there is currently no reciprocal agreement for APEC architects in place. The fee for applying to be an APEC architect is 200 HK dollars, and the annual fee for maintaining APEC architect registration is 200 HK dollars per year. There were no issues encountered during the registration of APEC architects from other jurisdictions.
6. **Japan** reported a total of 270 APEC architects at the end of the period, with only 1 APEC architect from other economies. One application for registration by APEC architects from other economies was received during the period. The domain-specific assessment for APEC architects is scheduled for June. **Japan** has mutual recognition agreements with **Australia** and **New Zealand** for APEC architects. There were no changes made to the procedure for APEC architect registration during the period.

7. **The Republic of Korea** has a total of 18,983 registered architects and 113 APEC architects, with 452 in the initial registration. There were no APEC architects at the end of the period. The monitoring committee comprises seven members and their tenure spans from May 2023 until the subsequent year. There were no changes made to the scope of architecture practice, nor the procedure for APEC architect registration during the period. The Republic of Korea is currently at the stage of local collaboration for the reciprocal recognition framework and preparing to upgrade to the next stage. The fee for applying to become an APEC architect is 300,000 Korean won, and the fee for review is 240,000 Korean won, with no annual fee. There were no issues encountered during the registration of APEC architects from other jurisdictions.
8. **Malaysia** presented a report on the status and activities in their economy. The following key points were highlighted:
 - a. **Number of Registered Architects and APEC Architects:** Malaysia reported that, at the end of the period, they had a total of 2,312 registered architects and 35 APEC architects. It was noted that no new APEC architects from other economies were registered during this period.
 - b. **Monitoring Committee:** The monitoring committee in Malaysia consists of ten members, as listed in the report. These committee members play a crucial role in overseeing the registration and regulatory processes for architects in the country.
 - c. **Registration Applications and Scope Changes:** Malaysia reported that they received no application for registration or changes to the scope of architecture practice from APEC architects from other economies during the reporting period. The registration procedure for APEC architects remains unchanged.
 - d. **Registration for Non-Residents:** It was noted that non-residents in Malaysia do not require full registration. However, temporary registration is available under the Act of Foreign Architects, enabling non-resident architects to practise in specific capacities for a limited duration.
 - e. **Documentation and Website Promotion:** Malaysia reported no changes to the required documentation for APEC architect registration during the reporting period. The country continues to promote APEC architect registration through its dedicated website, providing information and resources to interested architects and stakeholders.
 - f. **Reciprocal Arrangements and Local Collaboration:** Malaysia informed the meeting that they have not established any APEC architect reciprocal arrangements with other economies. However, they are actively exploring domain-specific assessments and legalising local collaboration, which will be presented to the parliament in the near future.
 - g. **Fees:** The fee structure for applying to become an APEC architect in Malaysia was provided. The application fee is \$50, with an additional processing fee of \$200 and a registration fee of \$250. The renewal fee for registered APEC architects is 200 Malaysian Ringgit.
9. **Mexico** reported registering 54 APEC architects during the period, with a monitoring committee consisting of five members. The architectural practice scope remains in general design and there were no changes to the registration procedures.

10. **The Secretary General** requested an explanation from **Mexico** regarding the total number of registered architects, which was reported as 14 in the written document.
11. **Mexico** explained that the 14 additional registrations were due to the coronavirus pandemic. The total number of APEC architects is 54, with 14 being additional registrations. Mexico made two announcements for promotion and communication during the period. The economy utilises domain-specific assessments as a reciprocal recognition framework and there were no changes to the registration procedures.
12. **The United States of America** assisted in clarifying the question from **the Secretary General** to **Mexico** in Spanish.
13. **Mexico** provided clarification stating that the number 14 pertains to additional registrations, while the total count of architects in the economy amounts to 100,000, with an estimated 500 of them holding certifications.
14. **Mexico** requested whether the document displayed on the screen could be enhanced for improved visibility.
15. **The Secretary General** made a request to Mexico for assistance in clarifying the total number of registered architects.
16. **The United States of America**, while requesting **Mexico** to correct any inaccuracies, provides an explanation on behalf of Mexico stating that the total number of architects in Mexico is approximately 100,000, with 500 holding the CONARC certificate and 54 being APEC Architects.
17. **The Vice Chairman** requested confirmation from Mexico regarding the discussion from the previous meeting, which recalled that the economy's representative is only responsible for one association and local architects are not obligated to be members of the association.
18. **Mexico** confirmed that architect registration in their economy is voluntary due to differing regulations, but reported being in the process of implementing the registration process, having completed approximately 30% of it.
19. On behalf of **Mexico**, **the United States of America** requested if the screen share could be further zoomed in to enhance visibility.
20. **Mexico** continued to report that the application fee amounts to 50 USD, the processing fee is 200 USD, and the registration fee is 250 USD, as seen on the screen.
21. **The Secretary General** stated that Thailand, as the host, will contact Mexico and request precise figures at a later time.
22. **The Republic of the Philippines** provided an update on the implementation of the APEC Architect Registry project in their economy. The following key points were brought to the forefront:
 - a. Updated Monitoring Committees: The Philippines reported that they have updated their list of monitoring committees, with appointments made since September 2022. The Monitoring Committee of the Philippines is composed of Chairperson Charito A. Zamora, and members including Hon. Robert S. Sac and Hon. Robert Mirafuente from the Professional Regulatory Board of Architecture, Chairman J. Prospero E. De Vera III from the Commission on Higher Education, and National President Architect Richard Garcia from the United Architects of the Philippines.

- b. Number of Registered APEC Architects: It was noted that the Republic of the Philippines currently has a total of 71 registered APEC architects in their economy. They reported no issues or concerns in implementing the APEC architect registry locally.
 - c. Promoting Registration: To encourage the registration of APEC architects, a meeting was held between the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) and the United Architects of the Philippines (UAP) Singapore. This collaborative effort aimed to facilitate the registration process and promote awareness of the APEC Architect Register project.
 - d. Application Processing: The APEC Architect Monitoring Committee of the Philippines, in cooperation with the PRC and UAP, continued to accept, process, and conduct interviews for APEC architect applications. These efforts ensure the thorough evaluation and consideration of applicants for registration.
 - e. Dissemination of Information: The United Architects of the Philippines (UAP) played an active role in disseminating information on the APEC Architect Register project to its members. They shared project updates and details during national conventions, conferences, and chapter activities. The UAP also facilitated the process for prospective members to become APEC Architects in coordination with the Professional Regulation Commission and the Commission on Higher Education.
 - f. Website Enhancements: The UAP further enhanced and developed the existing APEC Architect Central Council website, which will soon be transferred to Thailand. This website has been active since 2010 and serves as a dynamic and interactive platform to promote the overall programs of the APEC Architect Registry project. Additionally, the Philippines has its own APEC Architect website, the Philippines section, which is linked to the Central Council website.
 - g. Coffee Table Book: During the 9th APEC Architect Central Council meeting, a coffee table book was created to promote and highlight the works of APEC architects from various economies. This book was distributed to all member economies, serving as a means of showcasing the talent and accomplishments of APEC architects.
 - h. Agreements and Status: No new agreements were signed during the reporting period, and there were no changes in the status of the APEC architect reciprocal recognition framework.
23. **Singapore** reported 1,811 registered licensed architects, 51 APEC architects, and 3 APEC architects from other economies at the end of the period. The monitoring committee of Singapore comprises 10 members, including Tracey Hwang and Larry Ng who are present in the room, as well as Chan Kok Way, the President of the Board of Architects, and Melvin Tan, the President of the Singapore Institute of Architect. There were no applications for registration licensing by APEC architects from other economies. The scope of architect practice for foreign architects is the same as for local registered architects. The procedure for APEC architect registration remains unchanged, but there are changes to registration licensing procedures for APEC architects from other economies. There is no requirement for full registration of non-Western non-citizens and

no changes to documentation. The APEC architect project information is published on the board of Architects website, and updates are presented during the annual presentation ceremony and seminar. Singapore signed a trilateral agreement with Australia New Zealand in 2010 for the APEC architecture architect reciprocal arrangement. The country is currently in domain-specific assessment for reciprocal recognition frameworks status. The application fee for an APEC architect in Singapore is SGD 200 for Singapore-registered architects and SGD 2,500 for foreign-registered architects, with annual fees of SGD 100 and SGD 250, respectively, for Singapore foreign architects. There were no issues encountered during the period.

24. **Chinese Taipei** reported that the number of APEC architects totals 4,700, with 135 architects at the end of the current period, representing an increase of 14 from the previous period. The monitoring committee consists of 38 members. Architectural practice covers pre-design/schematic design, design development/detail design, construction documents/bidding, and construction administration. **Chinese Taipei** is currently in the process of establishing reciprocal recognition of registered architects with **the United States of America, Canada, and Australia**. During the period, **Chinese Taipei** promoted and communicated the APEC architect project by visiting universities and social functions. **Chinese Taipei** is in the phase of domain-specific assessments with **the United States of America, Canada, and Australia**. There are no application or processing fees; only a registration fee of 2,500 Taiwanese dollars is required once registration is approved.
25. **Thailand** reported that, as of March 2023, the number of registered architects amounted to 3,700 registered architects with no APEC architects. There were also no APEC architects from other economies during this period. Thailand underwent a change in the Board of Architects last year, leading to the establishment of a new monitoring committee consisting of six members, as introduced during the morning session. No applications for APEC architect registration were submitted. The scope of architecture practice is governed by the Architect Act 2000 and Architect Act 2023. While the procedure for APEC architect registration has not changed, Thailand is currently undertaking revisions to the Architect Act. In 2007, Thailand signed a mutual recognition service with ASEAN economies, but regulatory issues hindered the mobility of architects. Eight years ago, the Board of Architects recognized the necessity of amending the Architect Act, specifically to include the definition of foreign architects. Thailand is currently in a phase of local collaboration, during which the participation of locals in domestic architectural work is encouraged, with the aim of promoting effective teamwork and enhancing the quality of the architectural outputs. Six years ago, Thailand engaged in a collaborative effort with the People's Republic of China on an ad hoc project concerning the development of a high-speed railway network linking the two countries. Thailand issued certificates and pertinent documents for the initiative and has since embarked on the process of revising domestic regulations to align them with the project's objectives. The process of establishing a mutual recognition agreement necessitates the approval of parliament, which can be a lengthy and complex undertaking. In March 2023, the new Architect Act was announced. The following step entails establishing regulations that will facilitate international mobility of architects. In light of this development, the fee for applying to become an APEC architect is presently under scrutiny and has not been finalised.

26. **The United States of America** expressed its apology for the belated submission of a written report and committed to delivering it within the next few weeks. The US reported approximately 120,000 registered architects in total, with only 14 APEC architects by the end of the reporting period, a number affected by the implementation of a renewal process that led to a decline in registered numbers. The monitoring committee comprises three members, namely Patricia Ramallo, Harry Falcon, and CEO Michael Armstrong. At present, there is no mutual recognition agreement for APEC architects, but the US is engaged in talks with Chinese Taipei to forge a bilateral agreement. Fees are waived for individuals certified through the NCARB certificate program.
27. **The United States of America** expressed a willingness to discuss bilateral or trilateral agreements with any interested economy.
28. **The Secretary General** concluded the reporting session.

AGENDA ITEM 7: CENTRAL COUNCIL ADMINISTRATION

AGENDA ITEM 7.1: REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT

The Secretary General commenced the agenda by announcing that the report by Thailand the Secretariat is next on the agenda. The following points were highlighted in the report:

1. **Thailand's Responsibilities:** It was noted that Thailand fulfilled its responsibilities from 2022 onwards, following the transfer of duties from the Philippines. These responsibilities included providing administrative services, promoting project awareness, and organising the 10th APEC Architect Project Central Council meeting. The Architect Council of Thailand successfully fulfilled these tasks in addition to their regular responsibilities.
2. **Accomplished Tasks:** Between 2022 and 2023, after assuming the APEC Architect Central Council Chairmanship and Secretary from the Philippines on 5th August 2022, the Thailand Secretariat accomplished the following tasks:
 - a. Compilation of the annual report from 2022.
 - b. Proper accounting of remittances and receipt of annual fees from 12 participating economies.
 - c. Maintenance of the active status of the website, awaiting the transfer from the public or the Philippines to Thailand.
 - d. Completion of all other necessary administrative and financial tasks.
3. **Support for the 10th APEC Architect Project Central Council Meeting:** The Architect Council of Thailand expressed full support for the 10th APEC Architect Project Central Council Meeting until the end of the calendar year 2023.
4. **Meeting Format:** It was highlighted that during the 9th APEC Architect Projects Central Council Meeting, member economies had requested an in-person meeting. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the meeting was held in both physical and virtual modes, ensuring the safety and well-being of all participants.
5. **Financial Status:** It was reported that payments were duly received from all 12 participating economies for the years 2022 and 2023, as per the funding formula. The total

contribution fee of 82,972 USD was received, and as of 26th April 2023, payment for the contribution fees for both 2022 and 2023 had been received from all 12 economies.

AGENDA ITEM 7.2: TRANSFER OF THE APEC ARCHITECTS WEBSITE FROM THE PHILIPPINES TO THAILAND

1. **The Vice Chairman** proposed a motion for the transfer of the APEC Architect Website from the **Philippines** to **Thailand**, acknowledging the Philippines for their successful management of the website, and requesting the Secretary General to display the website on the screen.
2. **The Republic of the Philippines** expressed their pleasure in sharing the APEC Architect Website, which has been regularly updated and accessible. One can find recent events under the gallery section, including the most recent event, the 8th APEC Architect Conferment Ceremony of the Philippines, and the handover of the chairmanship and secretariat of AAMMCC from the Philippines to Thailand. The Republic of the Philippines requested that the United Architects of the Philippines (UAP) be given the opportunity to provide an update on the turnover to Thailand.
3. The delegate of **the United Architects of the Philippines (UAP)** stated that the Republic of the Philippines has been entrusted with the task of maintaining the APEC Architect Website since 2010. The website underwent development in 2018, with the aim of making it more interactive. Going forward, the delegate made an appeal for the cooperation and support of other member economies, such as Indonesia, to link their APEC Architect Indonesia Section to the Central Council. Other issues were discussed with Thailand's Vice Chairman, which included the technical transfer of the website from the Philippines to Thailand by the web host within the following week. The delegate expressed gratitude for having the honour and prestige of making a successful contribution to the APEC architect Central Council Website. The delegate then requested the chairman to formally receive the documents as a token of the Philippines' work on the APEC architect Central Council Website.
4. **The Vice Chairman** remarked on the availability of the Coffee Table Book PDF version on the APEC Architect Website and stressed the need for further research and information gathering under a subcommittee for the Database section. Furthermore, the Vice Chairman thanked the Republic of the Philippines for their contribution to the website.

AGENDA ITEM 7.3: AMENDMENT TO THE OPERATIONS MANUAL

1. **The Vice Chairman** presented a report summarising the discussions held during the previous meeting. The following changes were deliberated upon and implemented due to evolving circumstances:
 - a. Meeting Format: The possibility of hosting meetings in a hybrid (combining online and in-person), online-only, or in-person format was discussed.
 - b. Attendance Limit: The number of economies permitted to participate in the meeting was a subject of consideration.

- c. **Seat Allocation:** Previously, only three seats were available for three representatives from each economy. However, with larger committees, a discussion took place to determine the appropriate number of seats that should be provided. The aim was to accommodate the evolving committee size effectively.
 - d. **Flexibility in Accommodation:** It was concluded in the previous meeting that the flexibility regarding accommodation would be subject to the decision of the host.
 - i. **Minimum Seat Requirement:** A minimum of three seats must be made available for each economy in the monitoring committees.
 - ii. **Additional Seats:** The host possesses the authority to decide on any additional seats beyond the minimum requirement, considering the specific circumstances and needs.
2. **The Vice Chairman** requested if there were any further changes to be brought up in addition to the changes already discussed in the previous meeting
 3. Several economies had amendments in mind.
 4. **The Vice Chairman** suggested using the remaining time to discuss the establishment of a subcommittee proposed earlier in the morning. Each economy was encouraged to contribute to the subcommittee, which aimed to gather information on each economy and make it available on the website. The goal was to increase traffic to the website and allow individuals to conduct research using the collected information, as proposed by the Philippines.
 5. **The economies** responded by indicating that they had no amendments in mind.

AGENDA ITEM 7.4: ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBCOMMITTEES FOR DIRECTORY INFORMATION

1. **The Vice Chairman** subsequently proposed that the remaining time be dedicated to deliberating on the establishment of a subcommittee, as suggested earlier in the meeting. The subcommittee would be composed of representatives from each economy who would conduct research on their respective economies and provide relevant information for the website. The proposal is consistent with the Philippines' suggestion to increase traffic to the website and facilitate independent research by interested parties, using the compiled information.
2. **The Vice Chairman** inquired whether **the Republic of Korea** would be willing to assist in organising the efforts.
3. **The Republic of Korea** explained that, as it is currently occupied with preparations for the 11th meeting, it would be pleased to provide support to any economy that would lead the efforts.
4. **The Republic of Malaysia** requested further clarification regarding the subcommittee under discussion.
5. **The Vice Chairman** clarified that the subcommittee being discussed would be responsible for coordinating with selected representatives from member economies to collect information on the regulations and procedures of architectural work in each economy. The information, which has previously been discussed verbally, as well as relevant documents, possibly with formal translations, would be gathered. The representatives present in the meeting are already those with the best knowledge on related regulations.

6. **The Republic of Korea** proposed the idea of creating three regional subcommittees for the coordination of the architectural work regulations and procedures, covering the regions of America, Northern Asia, and Southern Asia. Each regional subcommittee would be responsible for their respective zones, and other member economies would be invited to participate as members.
7. **The Republic of the Philippines** has concurred with **Malaysia's** previous proposal to organise periodic meetings, whether in a virtual or face-to-face format, with a higher frequency than the current biennial schedule. These periodic meetings aim to strengthen the initiatives of the APEC Architect Registry Project, which will soon be hosted by the Republic of Korea. Moving towards the establishment of a subcommittee, the Republic of the Philippines suggests focusing on enabling comprehensive mobility of APEC architects, with particular emphasis on developing the seven necessary frameworks. Key areas of discussion should include education, understanding regulatory frameworks, and exploring the latest technologies available in specific economies that may potentially engage in agreements such as Memoranda of Agreement, Memoranda of Understanding, Mutual Recognition Agreements, or bilateral or trilateral agreements involving two or more economies.
8. **Malaysia** emphasised the importance of maintaining a strong focus on the tasks at hand for all members. In reference to the earlier discussions by the Philippines, there exist specific requirements and regulations that an APEC architect must fulfil before practising in another jurisdiction. Malaysia proposes that obtaining the metrics outlining these requirements and regulations would be a constructive starting point. Malaysia suggests that member economies aim to convene within a few months. One possibility is for representatives from each monitoring committee in every economy to convene via Zoom or a webinar to discuss pertinent issues and establish a framework that aligns with the collective objectives. For instance, while metrics for ASEAN architects exist, their clarity remains uncertain. Although each registration board or regulatory authority already possesses a website, the information available can be overwhelming, making it challenging to determine which aspects should be prioritised. Holding a productive meeting within the next 2-3 months would be highly beneficial. By the subsequent meeting in the Republic of Korea, the council would be equipped with more definitive and concrete information to share.
9. **The Vice Chairman** supported **Malaysia's** proposal and inquired about the member economies capable of assuming the role of coordinator or point of contact. **The Vice Chairman** suggested **Thailand** as a potential host for the first meeting, which could be conducted online for cost-effectiveness and convenience. This initial meeting would establish the foundation for subsequent collective small-step endeavours. Acknowledging **Malaysia's** statement, **the Vice Chairman** expressed confidence in the existence of relevant information, albeit possibly in different languages. Each economy was encouraged to provide English versions of the information to ensure the ability to gather and make it openly accessible.
10. **The Chairman** expressed support for **Thailand** in its hosting role for the first meeting and encouraged each economy to provide one or two names of individuals who would be

actively responsible. This would ensure the presence of a group of representatives who can be directly contacted via email.

11. **The Vice Chairman** requested all participating members to send their names to **Thailand**, who will organise the first meeting. **The Vice Chairman** mentioned that representatives from different economies may express interest in being champions for future activities.
12. **The Vice Chairman** urged the economies to provide two representative names, taking into account the possibility that one representative may be preoccupied with other responsibilities, allowing the other representative to attend the meeting in their place.
13. **Malaysia** expressed its willingness to provide assistance.
14. **The Republic of the Philippines** stated its commitment to providing the name of its representative, as well as the name of their alternate.
15. **The Vice Chairman** proposed that in the absence of any additional discussion on the current issue, the meeting should proceed to the next agenda, which entails the turnover of the Secretariat and the Chairmanship.

AGENDA ITEM 7.5: HANDOVER OF THE SECRETARIAT AND CHAIRMANSHIP

1. **The Vice Chairman** informed the participating economies that there had been an informal change in the hosting rotation. Instead of the anticipated host, **the United States of America**, **the Republic of Korea** has engaged in discussions with **the United States of America** and will now assume the responsibility of hosting the APEC Architect Central Council Meeting in 2024.
2. **The United States of America** confirmed that discussions have taken place between **the United States of America** and **the Republic of Korea**, resulting in an agreed switch of hosting responsibilities. As a result, **the Republic of Korea** will host the next meeting in 2024, and **the United States of America** will follow suit in 2026.
3. **The United States of America** confirmed the occurrence of discussions with **the Republic of Korea**, leading to a mutually agreed switch in hosting responsibilities. Consequently, **the Republic of Korea** will host the upcoming meeting in 2024, with **the United States of America** assuming the role in 2026. Moreover, **the United States of America** declared the existence of official letters that confirm the hosting switch.
4. **The Vice Chairman** requested confirmation from Singapore regarding informal information suggesting their interest in hosting after **the Republic of Korea**.
5. **Singapore** clarified that it was originally slated to host the 9th meeting, but its slot was taken by **the Republic of the Philippines**, resulting in a delay for **Singapore**. To commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Board of Architects of Singapore in 2027, Singapore is proposing to host the meeting during that year. This would enable a simultaneous celebration of the anniversary and the APEC Architects event, offering an opportunity for the economy to benefit.
6. **Singapore** inquired about the list of countries scheduled to host.
7. **The Vice Chairman** declared that the staff is presently engaged in the process of searching for the list.

8. **The Vice Chairman** presented the report provided by **the Republic of the Philippines**, which displayed a table indicating the scheduled rotation of responsibilities for future meetings as follows:

YEAR	SECRETARIAT	HOST
2019 – 2021	Singapore The Republic of the Philippines	Singapore The Republic of the Philippines
2022 – 2023	Thailand	Thailand
2024 – 2025	United States of America	United States of America
2026 – 2027	The Republic of Korea	The Republic of Korea
2028 – 2029	Japan	Japan
2030 – 2031	Hong Kong China	Hong Kong China
2032 – 2033	Australia	Australia
2034 – 2035	Chinese Taipei	Chinese Taipei
2036 – 2037	Mexico	Mexico
2038 – 2039	The Republic of the Philippines Singapore	The Republic of the Philippines Singapore
2040 – 2041	New Zealand	New Zealand

9. **The Vice Chairman** stated that the decision regarding Singapore assuming the responsibilities in 2026 rested with **the United States of America**.
10. **The United States of America** expressed its intention to assume the responsibilities in 2026.
11. **Singapore** inquired whether **the United States of America** was amenable to Singapore hosting in 2026 and **the United States of America** hosting in 2028.
12. **The United States of America** responded by stating that their economy operates on a specific timeline and emphasised that the trade agreement with **the Republic of Korea** was established due to an APEC-related discussion held with the US approximately a year ago.
13. **The United States of America** clarified that they adhere to a specific timeline and would not have exchanged slots with **the Republic of Korea** if it were not for their conversation approximately a year ago.
14. **The Republic of Korea** requested an opportunity to provide further details regarding the slot exchange that occurred between **the Republic of Korea** and **the United States of America** during the NCARB meeting in Chicago. **The Republic of Korea** put forward the proposal of trading slots with **the United States of America** due to the scheduled APEC summit meeting in Korea in 2025, which was planned a long time ago. Consequently, **the Republic of Korea** suggested the possibility of hosting both the APEC summit and the APEC Architect Project meeting, which falls under the umbrella of APEC meetings. Following extensive deliberations between **the Republic of Korea** and **the United States of America**, both economies exchanged letters to officially confirm the trade.
15. **Singapore** expressed its position, stating that it could only make a request, considering that Singapore had not previously hosted the APEC Architect meeting due to the slot being taken by **the Philippines** in 2019. Singapore highlighted that the year 2027 marks the 100th anniversary of the Board of Architects in Singapore, making it desirable for Singapore to host the meeting. Singapore clarified that it would be acceptable if **the United**

States of America chose to adhere to the original schedule, as Singapore's intention was only to propose hosting.

16. **The Vice Chairman** announced the separate arrangement of the handover of responsibilities from **Thailand** to **the Republic of Korea**, adhering to the established procedure, and expressed regret over the inability to conduct the previous handover in person from **the Republic of the Philippines** to **Thailand**.
17. **Chinese Taipei** proposed the organisation of an additional meeting to commemorate the unique occasion of **Singapore's** 100th-year anniversary of the Board of Architects.
18. **The United States of America** suggested bringing the matter to the council for deliberation, considering the option of hosting the meeting in Singapore. While emphasising that no promises were being made, **the United States of America** acknowledged the desire to ensure everyone's satisfaction and recognized **Singapore's** interest in hosting in 2027. However, **the United States of America** emphasised the importance of adhering to its own schedule.
19. **Singapore** recommended that **the United States of America** prioritise completing domestic discussions and consultations before making a decision. **Singapore** clarified that it was merely proposing to host the meeting due to the significance of the 100th anniversary as a special occasion.
20. **The United States of America** acknowledged the importance of the 100th anniversary, noting that the economy had recently celebrated its own centennial four years ago when the economy was supposed to serve as the secretariat. **The United States of America** remarked that they had already traded their slot twice and expressed their eagerness to proceed with the arrangement. **The United States of America** has expressed its commitment to ensuring that **Singapore** is able to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Board of Architects, regardless of the circumstances.
21. **Singapore** conveyed its flexibility in relation to the subject matter and respectfully requested that **the United States of America** furnish timely updates. Citing the suggestion put forth by **Chinese Taipei**, Singapore emphasised that **the United States of America** had been designated as the host for the meeting in 2026, while also noting the significance of 2027 as Singapore's Board of Architects would be commemorating its centennial anniversary. Consequently, **Singapore** proposed the notion of transitioning from a biennial meeting schedule to an annual one, taking into account the participation of the council's 17 member countries and the considerable timespan of 34 years required for each nation to host the event.
22. **Malaysia** noted that the implementation of a more frequent meeting schedule would necessitate an increase in the collection of fees by the council.
23. **Singapore** inquired whether, considering the current fee structure is designed for once-a-year meetings, a shift to an annual meeting frequency would warrant a reduction in fees by half.
24. **Malaysia** stated that the proposed reduction of half the fees may not be adequate.
25. **The Vice Chairman** proposed deferring the discussion to the 11th meeting in Korea.
26. **The Republic of Korea** consented to address the matter during the upcoming meeting in Korea.

27. **The Vice Chairman** suggested that if there were no other matters to be addressed, the council could take a coffee break while the secretary finalises the draft of the meeting summary report.

AGENDA ITEM 7.6: REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF THE MEETING SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

1. **The Vice Chairman** moved to the review and adoption of the Summary Conclusions
2. **The Vice Chairman** requested a modification of the topic for Agenda item 2, specifically the Speaker Note Topic on the architecture of Thailand, from "past/present/future" to "working together."
3. **The Vice Chairman** made a correction to number 16 in the Meeting Summary Conclusions, specifically changing the requirement from "at least one contact person" to "at least two contact persons." As a result, the revised statement reads as follows: "The proposal to establish subcommittees for directory information was presented, with Thailand volunteering to host the initial virtual meeting. Each economy is required to provide a minimum of two contact persons."
4. **The Vice Chairman**, referring to the previous deliberation concerning the usage of the terms "handover" and "turnover," inquired about the council's prior decision. It was confirmed that the term "handover" had been established as the preferred choice. Consequently, the phrase "Turnover of the Secretariat and Chairmanship" was modified to "Handover of the Secretariat and Chairmanship" in accordance with this preference.
5. **The Vice Chairman** inquired of the council whether any amendments were required for Agenda Item 5: Matters Arising from the 9th APEC Architect Project Central Council Meeting.
6. A query emerged regarding the spelling of "Viet Nam" versus "Vietnam."
7. **Singapore** provided assurance to the participating economies by affirming that "Viet Nam" was the accurate spelling, as previously communicated by the economy of **Viet Nam** itself.
8. **The Vice Chairman** inquired whether the phrase "directory information" aligned with the shared understanding of the participating economies.
9. **The participating economies** responded affirmatively.
10. **The Vice Chairman** requested the council to thoroughly verify the absence of any new bilateral agreements.
11. It was confirmed that there were no new bilateral agreements during the most recent period.
12. **The Republic of the Philippines** proposes the inclusion of an additional item, namely number 8, in which it is stated that "the meeting agreed on a collaborative project to consolidate directory information," with the specification that the first meeting will be initiated by Thailand.
13. **The Vice Chairman** stated that the specification outlining Thailand's organisation of the first meeting is encompassed within number 16.
14. **The Vice Chairman** rectified the plural form of "subcommittees" to a singular form, "subcommittee," for number 16, resulting in the revised wording: "The proposal to establish a subcommittee for directory information was presented, with Thailand

volunteering to host the initial virtual meeting. Each economy is required to designate a minimum of two contact persons."

15. **The Vice Chairman** revised number 15 of the Meeting Summary Conclusions, which had initially indicated that "The Council reviewed the adoption of amendments to the APEC Architect Operations Manual in order to integrate decisions made by the Central Council during the meeting," to reflect the fact that no changes were made to the APEC Architect Operations Manual. The revised statement now reads as follows: "There were no amendments to the APEC Architect Operations Manual."
16. The Summary of Conclusion of the APEC Architect Project Tenth Central Council Meeting was adopted, as discussed and modified, attached as **Annex 2.**

AGENDA ITEM 7.7: REVIEW OF THE SCHEDULE ROTATION

1. **The Vice Chairman** initiated a discussion on the Schedule of Rotation of Responsibilities, acknowledging the absence of the three newly added member economies from the current schedule.
2. **The Vice Chairman** proceeded to introduce **The Republic of Indonesia**, who expressed their interest in serving as the secretariat and host for the year 2042, succeeding **New Zealand**.
3. To ensure consensus, **the Vice Chairman** sought confirmation from **Brunei Darussalam**, the other new member economy present in the meeting, regarding their acceptance of this proposal.
4. **Brunei Darussalam** expressed their intention to conduct domestic consultations before being included in the Schedule of Rotation of Responsibilities as the secretariat and host.
5. **The Vice Chairman** requested the meeting to document **Indonesia's** intention to undertake the responsibilities of Secretariat and Host after **New Zealand**.
6. **The Vice Chairman** advised **Indonesia** to officially present their candidacy during the upcoming 11th meeting, which is scheduled to occur in two years' time.
7. **Australia** requested the inclusion of an appendix detailing the historical sequence of economies that have served as secretariats and hosts from the beginning, as well as upcoming ones, in order to provide a comprehensive overview of the chronological order for future meetings.
8. **The Vice Chairman** requested **Thailand** to forward the comprehensive chronological list, as proposed by **Australia**, to **the Republic of Korea**, the host of the 11th APEC Architect Council Meeting.
9. **The Vice Chairman** inquired if there were any additional matters to be discussed.
10. **The Republic of the Philippines** extends congratulations to Thailand, on behalf of all delegates present at the meeting, for successfully hosting in both 2022 and 2023.
11. **The Chair** expressed gratitude to **the Republic of the Philippines** for acknowledging **Thailand's** role as Host and Secretariat, and extended thanks to all other members, emphasising the importance of continued collaboration and friendship to facilitate border mobility.
12. **The Chair** noted the Council's significant progress in knowledge exchange and the establishment of a new working group.

13. **The Chair** expressed the expectation of reconvening with all members in Korea.
14. **The Republic of Korea** extended a warm welcome to all economies and expressed their anticipation for an increased participation of economies, initially as advisors, and potentially as members in the future.
15. **The Vice Chairman** conveyed gratitude to **the Republic of Korea**.
16. **The Republic of Korea** indicated its intention to initiate communication with **the Republic of the Philippines** in order to acquire the compiled Coffee Table Book.

The Vice Chairman concluded the meeting, instructing participating economies to assemble at 8:30 AM in the lobby, expressing optimistic anticipation for the enjoyable excursion scheduled for the following day, and adjourned the Central Council Meeting.

DRAFT

**THE APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT RECIPROCAL RECOGNITION FRAMEWORK-
SUPPORT MATRIX (ALL ECONOMIES LOCAL COLLABORATION (LC) UNLESSNOTED)**

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

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

- Agreements under APEC
- Agreements outside APEC