

附錄：

三、東京會議紀錄稿[◆]

**APEC ARCHITECT PROJECT
SECOND PROVISIONAL COUNCIL MEETING/
FIRST CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETING**



**31 May - 1 June 2005
Mita Kaigisho, Tokyo, Japan**

[DRAFT] MEETING SUMMARY

SECOND MEETING OF THE PROVISIONAL COUNCIL

Participating Delegations

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

Note: The delegations from Korea and Singapore attended the meeting as observers.

A list of delegates is attached at APPENDIX 6.

ITEM 1 - Welcome to Delegates

The Chair introduced himself and his Co-Chair, and their colleagues at the head table. It was a great privilege for him to welcome delegates from fourteen participating economies to the second meeting of the APEC Architect Provisional Council. He declared the meeting open at 9.30 a.m.

[◆] 此為亞太建築師計畫秘書處 2005 年 7 月 22 日電子郵件之附件資料。

The Chair drew Council members' attention to the APEC meeting protocols outlined in the Briefing Notes.

ITEM 2 - Adoption of the Agenda

No matters were raised under this Item and the Agenda was adopted without variation.

ITEM 3 - Confirmation of the Summary Conclusions of the Fourth Steering Committee / First Provisional Council Meeting

In accordance with the resolution taken at the last meeting, each delegation formally confirmed the agreement of the appropriate authority in its economy to the Summary Conclusions of the Fourth APEC Architect Steering Committee / First APEC Architect Provisional Council meeting held in Honolulu on 22 / 23 September 2004.

ITEM 4 - Formation of New Provisional Monitoring Committees, Provisional Council Nominations

New Provisional Monitoring Committees

The Chair informed the meeting that Canada and the Peoples Republic of China had advised the Secretariat that their economies had formed Provisional Monitoring Committees following the last APEC Architect meeting. The Chair welcomed the nominees of these newly formed Committees as members of the Provisional Council.

Provisional Council Nominations

Delegations were asked to update the previous list of Provisional Monitoring Committee nominations to the Provisional Council and conclusion of this item was deferred until this task had been completed. The Chair returned to the matter later in the meeting and the list of current nominees to the Provisional Council was confirmed.

The Provisional Council received the nominated representatives of Provisional Monitoring Committees as its members.

The list of Provisional Council representatives is attached at APPENDIX 1

ITEM 5 - Authorisation of Provisional Monitoring Committees

As a transitional measure, it had been decided at an earlier APEC Architect meeting that initiating Provisional Monitoring Committees would be granted automatic authorisation to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register, subject to their submission of a Survey Application to record their compliance with established APEC Architect criteria. Economies that had joined the project more recently, and had not taken part in the previous surveys on education, accreditation and registration requirements for architects in participating economies, had been asked to provide this information with their Survey Applications, as evidence that they, too, complied with APEC Architect criteria.

Completed Survey Applications for Authorisation had been received from Australia, Canada, Peoples Republic of China, Hong Kong China, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, the Philippines, Chinese Taipei, Thailand and the United States. Mexico had also submitted the required additional information with its Survey Application.

The Survey was intended to serve as a general benchmark against which the continued authorisation of Monitoring Committees could be reviewed. It recorded current systems for professional recognition in participating economies, and their proposals for implementing the APEC Architect framework. The final section of the Survey asked each participating economy to state its requirements for an APEC Architect from another APEC economy seeking to practise independently as an architect in its economy.

A powerpoint presentation of the Survey Application responses was screened, and delegates were given an opportunity to make any necessary corrections to their entries. The Chair then invited comment on any aspect of the Survey.

The Mexican delegation opened discussion by asking what was the purpose of the Survey. It was explained that the Survey was intended to provide a record of the standards and procedures for the professional recognition of architects that were common to all participating economies, and also to make clear their differences. Mexico replied that it had assumed that reciprocity was the goal of APEC Architect, but the intentions of participating economies stated in the final section of the Survey varied widely and did not show the spirit of mutual recognition. It questioned why discussion on future application of the APEC Architect framework was not on the Agenda.

Mexico was supported by the New Zealand delegation, which agreed that application of the APEC Architect framework should be discussed at every meeting. APEC Architect was at the beginning of its journey and, no matter what rules and regulations currently existed in various economies to impede it, if the Council held to its vision it would be able to overcome them and achieve its goals. The Survey served to make the current situation transparent. Other delegations also voiced their agreement.

The Malaysian delegation referred to the difficulty of achieving a balance with other multilateral commitments such as ASEAN, the UIA and the World Trade Organisation. Malaysia had also to satisfy its government before it could commit itself on some issues.

Returning to the authorisation of the Provisional Monitoring Committees, on behalf of the Provisional Council, the Chair declared the Monitoring Committees of the following participating economies authorised to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register:

Australia, Canada, Peoples Republic of China, Hong Kong China, Japan, Malaysia, Republic of Mexico, New Zealand, Republic of the Philippines, Chinese Taipei, Thailand and the United States of America

The announcement was greeted with applause.

ITEM 6 - Constitution of the APEC Architect Central Council

With the authorisation of twelve Monitoring Committees, the Chair confirmed the nomination of their representatives as members of the Central Council and declared the APEC Architect Central Council constituted.

The Chair also welcomed the delegations from Korea and Singapore as observers.

The list of Provisional Council / Central Council members is attached at APPENDIX 1

FIRST MEETING OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL

ITEM 7 - APEC Architect Register Databases and Websites

7.1 APEC Architect Register Databases, Monitoring Committee Websites

The main purpose of the meeting was to inaugurate the APEC Architect Register and the Central Council had been asked to agree on the general layout and content of Monitoring Committee websites and to review preparations made so far by participating economies. To open discussion, the Chair requested each delegation to report on its progress in establishing an APEC Architect Register database and Monitoring Committee website. Eight delegations advised the meeting that they had constructed websites and three had also set up sections of the Register database.

The Chair turned next to the layout and content of websites. The Home page of the Chinese Taipei Monitoring Committee website model was screened and the menu options and linked items noted. The Chair reminded the meeting that, although the Chinese Taipei website contained a large amount of information, the Council's immediate task was to agree on the overall format and general content of Monitoring Committee websites. As an aid to discussion, each delegation was asked to comment on the following suggested website outline:

- Brief introductory statement of an APEC Architect framework
- Access to the list of APEC Architects in that economy
- Information for registration as an APEC Architect and document download
- A statement on home economy recognition requirements for APEC Architects from other economies.

All economies advised that they had either followed a similar format in constructing their websites, or that they intended to do so. The United States delegation however explained that, whilst it had followed the Secretariat model, it was not legally permissible for it to list the names of APEC Architects unless they had individually agreed to have their names published. They would however be encouraged to give this permission.

The Central Council also agreed to the proposal that the registration numbers assigned to APEC Architects on each section of the Register would be prefixed with an abbreviation of the name of the home economy.

The conclusions reached by the Central Council on the formation of APEC Architect Register databases and Monitoring Committee websites are attached at APPENDIX 2

7.2 Central Council Website

The meeting turned next to consideration of the proposed Central Council website that had been developed by the Secretariat. The domain Home page, with linked websites and menu options, was projected for discussion purposes.

The Canadian delegation congratulated the Secretariat on the website it had created. It suggested that, in addition to the information displayed, from time to time it could prove a useful instrument for the dissemination of information on special events and activities.

The Secretariat was asked whether the Central Council had permission from the APEC organisation to use its logo. The Australian delegation replied that permission had been granted at the start of the project and presumably use of the APEC logo was still valid. The delegate from Mexico stressed the importance of the title 'APEC Architect' and proposed that the Secretariat investigate the possibility of obtaining exclusive rights to incorporating it in the APEC logo. It was agreed that the Secretariat would follow up these matters.

Referring to the general content of the website, the Japanese delegation pointed out that the Central Council website, by its nature, had no single 'owner', and the information it contained should therefore not only be relevant, but kept to a minimum, especially as the Secretariat would change every two years. It proposed that an 'Archive' containing information on the project's history and records of previous meetings and events, be included as a special segment of the 'Reports' section of the menu. There was general support from delegates for this suggestion.

As the Australian delegation observed, the website was a living document that would continue to reflect the Council's work in progress. It would be for the Secretariat of the time to determine the relevance of the detailed information that it contained.

Discussion concluded with the Central Council's confirmation of the overall content and layout of the proposed Central Council website model.

ITEM 8 - Documentation

8.1 Record of Seven Year Period of Professional Experience as an Architect

For the APEC Architect Register to become operational it was necessary for the Central Council to agree on the documentation to be used for its implementation. Council members were first asked to consider the draft "Record of 7 Year Period of

Professional Experience as a Registered/Licensed Architect" which had been circulated prior to the meeting with the Briefing Notes.

The Chair drew the meeting's attention to a proposal in the draft document to extend the previous requirement that APEC Architects candidates must have practised within the preceding 2 years, to require them to have practised "in a position of professional responsibility" within the preceding 2 years, to ensure currency of appropriate experience. The proposal was agreed without dissent.

The delegation from the Peoples Republic of China sought the views of the meeting on the particular circumstance in its economy where formal registration of architects had been introduced quite recently. This meant that only a relatively small number of architects would currently be able to satisfy the seven-year professional experience requirement. The delegation was interested to know whether architects who had been granted professional recognition before registration was introduced and had obtained the required professional experience, might be eligible for APEC Architect registration. The Chair suggested that, if they wished, they could draft a motion to this effect for discussion later in the meeting.

Returning to consideration of the draft document, the Japanese delegation advised the Council that it had already drawn up an APEC Architect professional experience report form, incorporating specific questions relevant to Japanese professional recognition requirements. It therefore questioned whether the draft under consideration was intended as a mandatory document for use by all economies, or was it proposed as a guide for economies to modify for their own purposes as appropriate. Various views were expressed. The Mexican delegation believed that each economy should adopt the same document containing agreed minimum information, a view supported by the Malaysian and United States delegations. New Zealand also indicated its preference for a common form to ensure that the professional experience record did not lose coherence over time.

However, the Japanese delegation believed that the system it had prepared was simpler, would be easier to apply and less resource intensive. It proposed that the basic requirements for the Record of Professional Experience be agreed by the Central Council, with each economy given the option of adding additional requirements if they wished to do so. At the suggestion of the Chinese Taipei delegation, the Japanese professional experience report form was distributed to delegates. Various other details were discussed, including a suggestion by the Hong Kong China delegation to provide additional columns in the report tables, for authentication by an appropriate person.

Discussion on this matter continued under Agenda Item 8.2.

8.2 Application for Registration as an APEC Architect

A draft application form for registration as an APEC Architect had also been attached to the Briefing Notes for the Council's agreement. Again, the question arose as to whether the circulated draft should be regarded as a mandatory document, or whether it might be adopted as a base reference document that could contain additional information to satisfy home economy requirements.

To resolve the matter, the Chair suggested that the Council accept both the draft documents before them as a minimum, and that each economy might then add additional material to either of them if it wished to do so. Singapore supported the idea saying that the Central Council had agreed on APEC Architect criteria and empowered Monitoring Committees to apply them, and therefore each economy should have authority to decide any other specific requirements. The New Zealand delegation suggested that both of the proposals to adopt the draft documents under Items 8.1 and 8.2 be amended to include the words "adopt, as a minimum, the substance of the draft".

The proposal that Monitoring Committees "adopt, as a minimum, the substance of the draft" of both the Record of 7 Year Period of Professional Experience as a Registered /Licensed Architect, and the draft Application for Registration as an APEC Architect, was agreed by the Central Council.

The 'Record of 7 Year Period of Professional Experience as a Registered /Licensed Architect' is attached at APPENDIX 3

The 'Application for Registration as an APEC Architect' is attached at APPENDIX 4

8.3 APEC Architect Identification Card

It had been suggested that an APEC Architect Identification Card be issued to all architects admitted to the Register as a means of identifying the bearers as architects of known standing and professional status. It would take the form of a plastic ID card bearing the architect's name, name of the home economy and APEC Architect registration details. The opinion of Council on this proposal was sought.

The general response to the idea was positive. However, it was agreed that an Identification Card should not replace the formal registration certificate to be issued by Monitoring Committees to each APEC Architect and all delegations supported Hong Kong China's proposal that the card should be accompanied by an APEC Architect Certificate of Registration. The US delegation also cautioned the Council that the card should not convey more authority than it actually possessed and must be presented as an identification card only.

There followed discussion on various practical aspects of issuing such a card and the information that it should provide. All economies agreed that it should be of a uniform design, created by the Secretariat for Council approval. The Philippines delegation suggested incorporating a brief note on the reverse side of the card indicating its purpose. The Canadian delegation questioned the practical difficulty of ensuring currency of cards and the problems associated with renewal or replacement of expired ID Cards. The Thai delegation believed it should be made clear that both ID Cards and Registration Certificates would be issued by Monitoring Committees on behalf of the Central Council. The original proposal was amended to incorporate these suggestions.

The proposal was put to delegations and the Central Council agreed that an APEC Architect Identification Card and Certificate be issued by the home Monitoring Committee on behalf of the Central Council, in accordance with a standard design, to

all architects admitted to the APEC Architect Register. It would bear the architect's name, the name of the home economy, and date and currency of APEC Architect registration.

8.4 Operations Manual

The Central Council ratified the Operations Manual, amended to incorporate decisions taken by the Council during the course of the meeting, as the base reference document for APEC Architect policy and procedures.

8.5 Presentation / Language of Documents

The Briefing Notes for the meeting had referred to a recommendation that a consistent corporate style be adopted for APEC Architect documents. They also raised the question of the language to be used by APEC Architect for documentation and communication. The Chair asked the opinion of the Central Council on these matters.

There was a general consensus that an APEC Architect document style had developed by default over the years and that this might be retained and refined.

With regard to the language, whilst it was accepted that English should be the language of communication between APEC economies, all present shared the view that each economy should also be able to use its own language on websites and documents.

The Central Council adopted a proposal to this effect and agreed that each economy should be free to use the language of the home economy and any other language of choice. However, required information must also be provided in English.

ITEM 9 - Letter of Support from Governments

At its previous meeting, the Provisional Council agreed that each participating economy should seek to obtain a letter from its government formally supporting the APEC Architect framework, for submission to the governments of other participating economies as evidence of commitment to achieving mutually desired outcomes. As requested by the Provisional Council at that meeting, a draft outline of the proposed government letter had been circulated to Central Council members and this was now put to the Council for its consideration and endorsement.

The response to the proposal was cautious. The delegation from Hong Kong China questioned whether 'government' referred to the regulatory authority or to some other government authority and explained that it would not be in a position to ask its government to provide such a letter. Chinese Taipei suggested that the authority governing the economy's registration system would be the appropriate body.

The Mexican delegation advised the meeting that it could not compromise or engage in agreement with another economy unless it was on a reciprocal basis. The Chinese Taipei delegation agreed that the key word should be 'reciprocity'. The delegation

from Malaysia expressed its view that APEC Architect was not a mandatory undertaking, but a cooperative agreement between economies and this proposal must therefore be approached carefully.

Delegates were reminded by the Australian delegation that the proposal had arisen in response to a desire to encourage governments of non-participating economies to join the APEC Architect framework, but it agreed with the United States that perhaps the letter was no longer needed. It became clear from further discussion that this view was shared by most of those present.

The Central Council therefore decided that the earlier resolution by the Provisional Council at its first meeting, to seek a letter of support from governments for dissemination among all Monitoring Committees, was no longer an appropriate option, and the proposal was withdrawn.

ITEM 10 - Launch of the APEC Architect Register.

With discussion on the content and format of websites and databases concluded, and agreement reached on registration documentation, it remained for the Central Council to determine a date on which all preparations would be complete and the APEC Architect Register would become operational.

The Chair asked participating economies how much time they would need to be ready for this moment. The Japanese delegation first requested clarification as to whether, 'become operational' meant the date on which the database was 'electronically ready' to receive applications for registration? The United States understood it to refer to the date on which both database and website preparations were substantially complete and the website system as a whole was ready to receive applications, a view shared by the meeting. As expressed by the Chinese Taipei delegate, the store would be ready for business and would open its doors on the date selected by the Central Council.

As an opening suggestion the Australian delegation proposed that September 19, 2005, the fourth anniversary of the first APEC Architect held in Brisbane, might be an appropriate date on which to launch the APEC Architect Register. Various related matters were considered. In response to a question from the Canadian delegation, the Secretariat confirmed that APEC Architect Registration Certificates and Identification Cards would be available by the proposed 19 September date. As the Thai delegate pointed out, the Central Council website and relevant registration documents would also need to be completed by the proposed deadline.

Delegates discussed how the launch of the APEC Architect Register should be marked. The New Zealand delegation suggested that it might prove an effective strategy to promote the Register if the first architects admitted to it in each economy were prominent members of the profession. Malaysia proposed that the APEC Ministerial Meeting be informed of the launch. The Thai delegation sought the advice of Council members as to what specific benefits of registration as an APEC Architect might be promoted to local architects. In response, the United States suggested that each economy could submit a one-page summary of its acceptance of APEC Architects to the Secretariat to go on the Central Council website. It was also

suggested that the opening statement in the Operations Manual, on the purpose of APEC Architect, should be prominently displayed on all websites.

The Japanese delegation questioned whether it was necessary to select one particular day on which the Register would become operational that would be suitable for all economies. But the general view of the meeting was that, whilst economies could make their preparations according to their own schedules, a specific day should be selected for the launch so that public announcements could be made to this effect.

The Australian delegation recalled the APEC Architect meeting in Brisbane, when the first significant steps had been taken by participating economies to liberalise their regulatory arrangements for APEC Architects. The proposed date for commencement of the APEC Architect Register would mark the beginning of an on-going process that would continue to evolve and develop. The immediate task now was to get it started.

All delegations confirmed that they could complete their database and website preparations by the 19 September 2005, except for Malaysia, the People's Republic of China and Thailand, which could not be sure they would be ready in time. It was decided that the Register launch should go ahead on the proposed date and any economies not yet ready could follow as soon as possible.

The Central Council agreed that the APEC Architect Register would become operational on 19 September 2005. Economies would be free to begin accepting applications before that date, but actual registration of APEC Architects would not commence until the official launch of the Register on 19 September 2005. Monitoring Committee web sites would also become operational on this date.

ITEM 11 - Funding and Financial Management of the APEC Architect Framework

The question of funding and financial management of the APEC Architect framework, and its importance in maintaining the viability of the project, had been raised briefly in Honolulu and it was decided that the issue should be considered further at this meeting.

The Chair referred Council members to proposals for information gathering and cost sharing by participating economies outlined in the Briefing Notes, and opened the subject for discussion. As a general observation, the Japanese delegation voiced the opinion that, as Monitoring Committees operate independently of each other, sharing financial information and arrangements could be complicated. It thought that matters should perhaps be left as they were until such time as a particular problem arose that must be dealt with by other means. Australia, the Philippines and the United States supported this opinion.

Turning to the Briefing Notes recommendation that Central Council meeting expenses might be shared by Monitoring Committees, the United States delegation proposed amending it to clarify that such contributions would be by means of a per-delegate registration fee, if requested by the host economy. Thailand was concerned that a high registration fee might restrain participation, a view shared by Japan, which suggested that any such contribution should not necessarily be for the whole cost of a meeting. As New Zealand observed, an economy offering to host a meeting on this

basis would need to clarify the extent of the contribution expected before a decision could be reached.

On this understanding, the Central Council adopted the first proposal that Monitoring Committees would share Central Council meeting expenses, through a per-delegate registration fee, if requested to do so by the host economy.

The second proposal before the Council required Secretariats to record information on funding and expenditure during their terms in office, for consideration by the Central Council at subsequent meetings as a guide to establishing future financial strategies. Various ideas were put forward. The possibility of creating a central administrative body was touched upon, a solution that had been set aside at an earlier meeting. Also the option of sharing the expenses of the Secretariat was suggested. However, the Chair reminded the meeting that the proposal before it, at this stage, was that Secretariats gather information for future discussions on financial strategies.

All delegations agreed to adopt the proposal that Secretariats provide the Central Council at its following meeting, with budgetary and resource information on their terms of office administering the APEC Architect framework, for the guidance of participating economies in establishing future financial strategies. The Peoples Republic of China advised that it would need to obtain government support for any contribution to expenses it might be asked to make.

However the third proposal that Monitoring Committees also record information on their expenditure and funding, was greeted with caution. There was a general concern that it might not be appropriate for this information to be shared, and its relevance was questionable. At the suggestion of the United States and Philippine delegations, all present agreed that the proposal should be withdrawn.

ITEM 12 - Central Council Operations Program

The Chair introduced this item by pointing out the need to establish a process for effective management of the APEC Architect framework in the periods between Central Council meetings. Council members were asked to consider proposals contained in the Briefing Notes for a program of operations to govern the interim duties of the Secretariat and to coordinate the activities of Monitoring Committees.

The first proposal, which required Monitoring Committees to put into effect the promotional strategies adopted by the Provisional Council at the previous meeting, was agreed, as amended.

Provisional Council resolutions adopted at the last meeting are attached at APPENDIX 5 for ease of reference.

The Central Council also adopted a process for maintaining regular communication between all participating economies. These required Monitoring Committees to notify the Council of any relevant changes to professional recognition systems in their economies, and to submit survey reports of their activities to the Secretariat at six month intervals. The Secretariat, in turn, would circulate all relevant information

received from Monitoring Committees and update the Central Council website on a regular basis, as defined.

The final proposal that the APEC Architect Secretariat maintain regular dialogue with the APEC Secretariat was initially questioned by members. But both the Malaysian and Philippine delegations believed that the existence of the APEC Architect framework was justified by its relationship with the central organisation and it was important to retain it, a view subsequently endorsed by the Central Council.

The agreed program of operations for the Central Council is attached at APPENDIX 5.

ITEM 13 - Any Other Business

Authorisation of Korea and Singapore Monitoring Committees.

At the request of the Korean and Singapore delegations, the Chair asked the Council to consider a process by which their Monitoring Committees could receive Central Council authorisation, and their representatives admitted to Council membership, prior to the next meeting.

Under Agenda Item 5, automatic authorisation had been granted to the Provisional Monitoring Committees of economies that had previously satisfied the Steering Committee that the architectural education and accreditation systems in their economies complied with agreed APEC Architect criteria. Although Singapore had already formed a Provisional Monitoring Committee, Korea had not yet done so, although it hoped to form one shortly. Neither Korea nor Singapore had submitted a Survey Application for Authorisation, nor had they previously supplied the information on their professional education, accreditation and recognition systems that had been a condition for the automatic authorisation of the initiating economies.

The Chair outlined a process that would enable the Monitoring Committees of Korea and Singapore to obtain Central Council authorisation to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register. This would require each of them to submit a completed Survey Application for Authorisation to the Secretariat, together with the necessary additional information on professional recognition procedures, plus the names of their nominees to the Central Council. The documentation would then be circulated to Council members for confirmation of authorisation. This proposal had the general support of the meeting.

However, when the matter was reviewed again under Item 14, the question of who exactly should make the authorisation decision created considerable debate. Should Monitoring Committees or Central Council members review documentation submitted by Korea and Singapore? Should the voting procedure set out in the Operations Manual be observed? In the end, the matter was resolved by a New Zealand delegation proposal, supported by the Philippines, Hong Kong China and Australia, that Korea and Singapore should not be required to obtain Central Council agreement to their authorisation.

Instead, authority to assess the compliance of their education and accreditation systems with APEC Architect criteria would be delegated to the Secretariat. On review of the information submitted to it by Korea and Singapore, the Secretariat would advise the Central Council of its decision to authorise the Monitoring

Committees of Singapore and Korea to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register.

The Summary Conclusions were amended to incorporate this decision, as follows

The Central Council agrees that

1. When ready, Korea and Singapore notify the Secretariat that they have formed a Provisional Monitoring Committee.
2. Both Economies submit a completed Survey Application and additional information, as well as the names of nominees to the Central Council, to the Secretariat.
3. On receipt of the required documents completed correctly and in full, the Secretariat will advise the authorised Monitoring Committees of the Central Council of the acceptance of Korea and Singapore.
4. The Secretariat shall circulate all information to the authorised Monitoring Committees of the Central Council.

The Korean and Singapore delegations expressed their appreciation to the Council for the conclusion it had reached.

Future Considerations

Turning to the broader picture, United States delegation remarked that the meeting had been successful in concluding decisions on the rules and procedures that would govern the APEC Architect framework and lead to the reduction of current barriers to independent practice for architects in participating economies. It went on to remind the Council that these were a means to achieving the underlying purpose of APEC Architect, the exchange of knowledge and development of best practice for the good of the region. It referred to the acknowledgment of participating economies in the Operations Manual of the public benefit of the mobility of architects in the provision of architectural services, the positive value of cultural diversity and the mutual benefits of cooperation in developing a framework to facilitate these goals. These should not be forgotten in the course of negotiations.

Whilst supporting the statement made by the United States, the Malaysian delegation noted that the creation of bilateral arrangements between participating economies was an agreed objective of the APEC Architect framework and it asked what role the Central Council would play in facilitating such agreements. It suggested that the UIA Accord policy of Practice in a Host Nation could provide a starting point for negotiations. The Australian delegation cautioned that although UIA policy might act as a gateway in some circumstances, APEC Architect was intended to go beyond it in terms of access to the provision of professional services in other APEC economies.

Malaysia referred to the agreement reached at the last meeting that APEC Architects be given an opportunity to indicate their willingness to form a professional alliance with APEC Architects from other economies. Whilst the purpose of that statement had been to create opportunities for architects in home economies, the United States delegation believed that at this stage it was not possible to be specific about the actual form such an alliance might take and it would be premature to predict these matters.

The Council was reminded that it had been agreed from the outset that the purpose of APEC Architect was to facilitate access to independent practice of APEC Architects

in other economies so that they would be professionally responsible and accountable in the host economy for the work undertaken. In reality, the UIA policy 'Practice in a Host Nation' would actually introduce barriers in the majority of APEC Architect participating economies, which currently make provision for the professional recognition of foreign architects under certain circumstances.

At the request of the Chair it was agreed that discussion on the possible application of UIA Accord policy to APEC Architect should be deferred until the next meeting.

ITEM 14 - Summary Conclusions

The following decisions reached on each Item of the Agenda were put to each delegation for final consideration and agreement as the Summary Conclusions of the second meeting of the Provisional Council and the first meeting of the Central Council:

- **Item 4 - Formation of New Provisional Monitoring Committees, Provisional Council Nominations**

The Provisional Council received the nominated representatives of Provisional Monitoring Committees as its members. (Appendix 1)

- **Item 5 - Authorisation of Provisional Monitoring Committees**

The following Provisional Monitoring Committees have been accorded authorisation by the Provisional Council to maintain a section of the APEC Architect Register.

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

- **Item 6 - Constitution of the APEC Architect Central Council.**

The Central Council has been declared constituted. (Appendix 1)

- **Item 7.1 - APEC Architect Register Databases, Monitoring Committee Websites**
(Attached at Appendix 2)

- **Item 7.2 – Central Council Website**

The Central Council confirms the overall content and layout of the Central Council website model.

- **Item 8.1 - Record of 7 Year Period of professional Experience as an Architect**

The Central Council agrees that

1. The previous requirement that APEC Architects must have practised within the preceding two years be extended to require them to have practised 'in a

position of professional responsibility' within the preceding two years to ensure currency of adequate experience.

2. *The Central Council adopts as a minimum, the substance of the draft 'Record of Seven Year Period of Professional Experience as a Registered / Licensed Architect' (Appendix 3)*

- **Item 8.2 - Application for Registration as an APEC Architect**

The Central Council agrees to adopt, as a minimum, the substance of the draft 'Application for Registration as an APEC Architect' (Appendix 4)

- **Item 8.3 - APEC Architect Identification Card and Certificate.**

The Central Council agrees that an APEC Architect Identification Card and Certificate be issued by the home Monitoring Committee on behalf of the Central Council, in accordance with a standard design, to all architects admitted to the APEC Architect Register, bearing the architect's name, name of the home economy, and date and currency of APEC Architect registration.

- **Item 8.4 - Operations Manual**

The Central Council ratifies the Operations Manual, amended to incorporate decisions taken by the Council during the course of the meeting, as the base reference document for APEC Architect policy and procedures.

- **Item 8.5 - Presentation / Language of Documents**

The Central Council agrees that each economy is free to use the language of the home economy and any other language of choice, however, required information must also be provided in English.

- **Item 9 - Letter of Support from Governments**

The Central Council agrees that the earlier resolution by the Provisional Council at its first meeting to seek a letter of support from governments for dissemination among all Monitoring Committees is no longer an appropriate option, and that it be withdrawn.

- **Item 10 - Launch of the APEC Architect Register**

The Central Council declared the date on which the APEC Architect Register will become operational as 19 September 2005. Economies are free to begin accepting applications before, although actual registration as an APEC Architect will not begin until the official date of 19 September 2005. The Monitoring Committee web sites should be operational on this date as well.

- **Item 11 - Funding and Financial Management of the APEC Architect Framework**

The Central Council agrees that

1. *Monitoring Committees would share Central Council meeting expenses, through a per-delegate registration fee, if requested by the host economy;*
2. *Secretariats will provide budgetary and resource information, on their terms of office administering the established APEC Architect framework, to the Central Council at its following meeting, for the guidance of participating economies in establishing future financial strategies;*

- **Item 12 - Central Council Operations Program**

*Attached at **Appendix 5.** (Provisional Council resolutions adopted in Hawaii for promotion of the APEC Architect framework are also attached for ease of reference.)*

- **Item 13 - Any Other Business**

The Central Council agrees that

1. *When ready, Korea and Singapore notify the Secretariat that they have formed a Provisional Monitoring Committee.*
2. *Both Economies submit completed Survey Application and additional information, as well as the names of nominees to the Central Council, to the Secretariat.*
3. *On receipt of the required documents completed correctly and in full, the Secretariat will advise the authorised Monitoring Committees of the Central Council of the acceptance of Korea and Singapore.*
4. *The Secretariat shall circulate all information to the authorised Monitoring Committees of the Central Council.*

- **Item 14 - Summary Conclusions**

The Central Council agrees that

In view of the two yearly intervals between Central Council meetings, endorsement by the authorised monitoring committees of the Summary Conclusions of this meeting to be notified to the Secretariat within three months of receipt so that decisions taken by the Central Council in Tokyo may be acted upon.

- **Item 15 - Administrative Provisions – the Secretariat**

The Central Council agrees that the appointment of the next Secretariat is to be decided at the next meeting unless an offer is received in the interim.

- **Item 16 – Next Meeting of the Central Council**

The Central Council has determined the next APEC Architect meeting will be held in Mexico City in May or June of 2006 with the exact date to be determined by Mexico.

The Summary Conclusions of the second meeting of the Provisional Council / first meeting of the Central Council were adopted.

Each delegation was asked to obtain endorsement of the Summary Conclusions of this meeting by the authorised Monitoring Committee in its economy.

Note:

In view of the two-year intervals between Central Council meetings, endorsement of the Summary Conclusions is to be notified to the Secretariat within three months of receipt so that decisions taken by the Central Council in Tokyo may be acted upon.

ITEM 15 - Administrative Provisions – the Secretariat

With the confirmation of the Summary Conclusions, it remained for the Central Council to complete administrative arrangements for the continued management of the APEC Architect framework. The Chair drew the attention of the meeting to the Addendum previously circulated by Chinese Taipei that it would conclude its period acting as Secretariat on 31 December 2006. He invited offers from the Monitoring Committee of any participating economy to take over the Secretariat role from Chinese Taipei on that date. No offers were forthcoming.

In the discussion that followed it was thought that Monitoring Committees might be reluctant to undertake the job of Secretariat because they were not sure of the work that would be involved. The United States suggested, if cost were an issue, perhaps the work could be shared, a possibility that had previously been agreed by the Provisional Council. At the request of the Philippine delegation, the Secretariat briefly outlined the workload that might be expected of future Secretariats and agreed that a note on the subject could be circulated to help Monitoring Committees reach a decision on this matter. As the Japanese delegation observed, subsequent Central Council meetings would be quite different in character from those that had led up to the creation of the APEC Architect framework.

There was concern about the possible consequences for APEC Architect if no economy were to offer to undertake the work and various ideas were touched upon. In the end, on the understanding that Chinese Taipei would still be acting as Secretariat at the next meeting of the Central Council, decision on the matter was deferred.

It was suggested that information on the workload of the Secretariat should be circulated to all Monitoring Committees in the interim period to enable them to make an informed decision to offer to take on the Secretariat role at the next meeting, or before, for the following term.

The Central Council agreed that the appointment of the next Secretariat would be decided at the next meeting, unless an offer was received in the interim.

ITEM 16 - Next Meeting of the Central Council.

In response to the Chair's request for an offer to host the next meeting of the APEC Architect Central Council, both the Canadian and Mexican delegations expressed their willingness to do so. They each explained however that date restrictions applied to their offers – Canada would be able to host a meeting between September 2006 and April 2007, whereas Mexico could host it within the next 12 months. All delegates welcomed these offers. The choice to be made between them would depend on the suitability of the proposed dates for participating economies.

The Chair asked each delegation whether it would prefer the meeting to be held in one or two years' time. There was a general feeling that sooner would be better rather than later for the newly established framework and the majority view was that the next Central Council meeting should take place within 12 months.

Mexico's offer to host the next meeting in Mexico City between May and June 2006, was accepted by the Council. The exact date would be determined by Mexico, The Mexican delegation was warmly thanked for undertaking to host the meeting and the Canadian delegation was also sincerely thanked for offering to do so.

Finally, the Chair expressed his gratitude to all present for attending the meeting and to the Secretariat the work it had done in preparing for it. He looked forward to a successful meeting in Mexico. His words were greeted with applause.

The Malaysian delegation responded on behalf of those present, thanking Japan and the Chair and Co-Chair for hosting an effective and successful APEC Architect meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5.30 pm.

THE LIST OF CENTRAL COUNCIL NOMINATIONS

Economy	Title	First Name	Last Name
Australia	Mr.	Brian	Wright
	Mrs.	Christine	Harding
	Mr.	Edward	Haysom
Canada	Ms.	Bonnie	Maples
	Mr.	Jon F	Hobbs
People's Republic of China	Mr.	Zao Sheng	Wang
	Mr.	Lu	Xiu
	Mr.	Kai	Cui
Hong Kong, China	Mr.	Thomas	Ling
	Prof.	Bernard V.	Lim
	Ms.	Sum Yee Anna	Kwong
	Mr.	Helius Kai-ming	Ng
Malaysia	Ar. Dato	Esa	Mohamed
	Ar. Dato Dr.	Ikmal Hisham	Albakri
	Ar. Dr.	Amer Hamzah	Bin Mohd Yunus
	Ar.	Pei Ing	Tan
	Ar.	Che Wee	Boon
Mexico	Arq.	Héctor	García Escorza
	Arq.	Jose M.	Reachi Mora
	Arq.	Fernando	Mora Mora
New Zealand	Prof.	Gordon	Holden
	Ms.	Jane	Aimer
	Mr.	Richard	Harris
Republic of the Philippines	Ms.	Leonor	Rosero
	Mr.	Eugene	Gan
	Mr.	Carlito S.	Puno

Republic of the Philippines cont'd	Ms.	Yolanda	Reyes
	Mr.	Edric Marco	Florentino
	Ms.	Prosperidad	Luis
Chinese Taipei	Mr.	Yin-Ho	Chen
	Mr.	Kuang-Hsiung	Chen
	Mr.	Ching-Chang	Huang
	Mr.	Joshua Jih	Pan
	Mr.	Chikung	Wang
Thailand	Mr.	Mati	Tungpanich
	Dr.	Pongsak	Vadhanasindhu
	Mr.	Sukit	Suppermpool
	Mr.	Michael Paripol	Tangtrongchit
	Dr.	Singh	Intrachooto
United States of America	Mr.	Douglas L	Steidl
	Mr.	Frank M.	Guillot
	Mr.	H. Carleton	Godsey
Japan	Prof.	Sadao	Watanabe
	Mr.	Kazukiyo	Sato
	Mr.	Toshihiko	Hayakawa
	Mr.	Shinjiro	Wachi
	Mr.	Junichiro	Shibati
	Mr.	Atsuo	Okasaki
	Mr.	Soichiro	Yasukawi
	Mr.	Yasunori	Yamanaki
	Mr.	Hiroki	Sunohara
	Dr.	Izumi	Kuroishi

ITEM 7 - APEC ARCHITECT REGISTER DATABASES AND WEBSITES

7.1 APEC Architect Register Databases, Monitoring Committee Websites**The Central Council agrees that:**

Each Monitoring Committee website is to include

- Brief introductory statement
- Access to the list of APEC Architects in that economy
- Information for registration as an APEC Architect and document download
- A statement of home economy recognition requirements for APEC Architects from other economies.

The Central Council also agrees that:

Registration numbers assigned to APEC Architects by Monitoring Committees consist of a two-letter abbreviation of the name of the home economy, followed by a five digit number.

Australia	AU
Canada	CA
People's Republic of China	CN
Hong Kong, China	HK
Japan	JP
Republic of Korea	KR
Malaysia	MY
Republic of Mexico	MX
New Zealand	NZ
Republic of the Philippines	PH
Singapore	SG
Chinese Taipei	CT
Thailand	TH
United States of America	US

APEC ARCHITECT

**RECORD OF SEVEN YEAR PERIOD OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AS
A REGISTERED / LICENSED ARCHITECT**

Registration as an APEC Architect is reserved for practising architects who have gained experience in designated aspects of professional practice and who have acted in a position of professional responsibility for projects undertaken in the course of that practice. Applicants for APEC Architect registration are required to complete the attached record of a seven year period of professional experience they have gained as registered / licensed architects that satisfies the following requirements.

APEC Architect Requirements for Period of Professional Experience as an Architect

- A. *Applicants for registration as an APEC Architect must have completed a minimum period of professional practice of 7 years after initial registration / licensure as an architect in any participating economy. Experience must be gained in all of the following categories of architectural practice:*
- *Preliminary studies, preparation of brief*
 - *Design*
 - *Contract Documentation*
 - *Administration*
- B. *At least 3 years of the 7 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.*

When completing the Report of Professional Experience, applicants should select projects that best illustrate the experience required to satisfy APEC Architect criteria, outlining the categories of practice in which the experience was gained and the level of the applicant's involvement. Professional practice undertaken in any economy, that meets the above requirements, is acceptable.

To ensure continued competence, APEC Architect candidates who have not practised in a position of professional responsibility for the preceding two years, may be required to fulfil other prescribed conditions to be admitted to the APEC Architect Register.

Signed references and the names and contact details of appropriate referees, are required for each period of experience recorded, to confirm the information provided. Referees may be professional associates, clients or others in a position to verify the statements submitted.

**RECORD OF SEVEN YEAR PERIOD OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AS
A REGISTERED / LICENSED ARCHITECT**

APPLICANT DETAILS

Name:

Business Address:

Home Economy / Jurisdiction of Registration:

Registration Number:

Date of Initial Registration:

Current Registration in other Jurisdictions:

Applicants for APEC Architect registration are requested to complete the following record of relevant experience, starting with a report of the minimum 3-year period of practice as an architect with professional responsibility for projects undertaken. This experience may be acquired either as the architect with sole professional responsibility for a building of moderate complexity (Table 1), or as the architect in charge of a significant aspect of a complex building (Table 2), or a combination of these. Please list projects in reverse date order, starting with most recent period first.

**3 YEAR PERIOD OF PRACTICE AS AN ARCHITECT WITH PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR
PROJECTS UNDERTAKEN.**

Table 1

Architect: with sole professional responsibility for the design, documentation and contract administration of buildings of moderate complexity.

Project date From: (m / y) To: (m / y)	Name of organisation, architectural practice	Name and brief description of relevant project (s) with reference to level of complexity (Eg: size, concept, occupancy, technologies, site)	Role of applicant (Principal, sole practitioner, other)

Table 2

Working in collaboration with other architects, architect in charge of and professionally responsible for a significant aspect of the design, documentation and/or contract administration of complex buildings.

Project date From: (m / y) To: (m / y)	Name of organisation, architectural practice	Name and brief description of relevant project (s) with reference to level of complexity (Eg: size, concept, occupancy, technologies, site)	Area of professional responsibility

EXPERIENCE GAINED IN ADDITIONAL 4 YEAR PERIOD OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AS AN ARCHITECT

Applicants are asked to record a minimum period of four years additional professional experience that they have gained in all of the following **categories of architectural practice**:

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

Table 3

Project date From: (m / y) To: (m / y)	Name of organisation, architectural practice	Name and brief description of relevant project (s) and categories of experience gained in each situation	Role of applicant (Principal, assistant, other)

VERIFICATION OF RECORD

Signature of Applicant.

I hereby declare that the above information is correct.

Signed by:

Date:

References

Each period of professional experience recorded above must be supported by a statement confirming the information provided and signed by an appropriate referee.

Please list the names and positions held by professional associates familiar with the projects undertaken, who have provided the required references attached to this submission. The Monitoring Committee may request further information from nominated referees.

Name, position held, and contact details of each referee:

APEC ARCHITECT

APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION AS AN APEC ARCHITECT**APEC Architect Participating Economies**

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

APEC Architect Framework

Representatives of 12 member economies of Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) have joined together to create the APEC Architect framework to facilitate the mobility of architects in the provision of professional services throughout the region.

Information on the APEC Architect framework is available on the Central Council website at www.apecarchitect.org and the linked websites of participating economies. It may also be obtained on application to the APEC Architect Secretariat or the APEC Architect Monitoring Committees of participating economies.

APEC Architect Register

APEC Architect framework is managed by a Council composed of representatives of Monitoring Committees formed by each participating economy for this purpose. The central function of the Council is to maintain the APEC Architect Register. The 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 agreed criteria. Monitoring Committees are authorised by the Central Council to perform this function.

Registration as an APEC Architect provides evidence of the achievement of standards of professional competence that are common to all participating economies. Although economies may continue to test foreign architects on practice matters specific to the host economy, APEC Architects applying for professional recognition in another economy will largely be exempt from further assessment of their professional education and qualifications.

Eligibility for Registration

APEC Architect registration applies only to individual persons.

To be eligible for admission to the APEC Architect Register, candidates must demonstrate to the Monitoring Committee of their home economy that they:

- have completed an accredited/recognised program of architectural education;
- have fulfilled the necessary pre-registration experience requirements;
- are currently registered / licensed as architects in their home economy;
- have gained at least seven years of professional experience as an architect in specified categories of practice;
- comply with continuing professional development obligations prescribed by the home economy regulatory authority;
- are bound by a home economy code of professional conduct.

Applications for Registration

The Monitoring Committee of each economy is responsible for all matters connected with the registration of APEC Architects within that economy. It undertakes the assessment of applications for APEC Architect registration and the evaluation of individual records of professional experience.

Application for registration as an APEC Architect should be addressed to the Monitoring Committee of the economy in which the applicant resides permanently and has primary registration / licensure as an architect (the 'home economy'). It must be accompanied by a completed 'Record of Seven Year Period of Professional Experience as a Registered / Licensed Architect', supported by appropriate references. In some circumstances candidates for APEC Architect registration may be required to attend an interview.

(An assessment fee determined by the Monitoring Committee will be payable on application)

APEC Architects will be issued with Central Council Certificates of Registration and APEC Architect Identification Cards on admission to the APEC Architect Register, to verify the currency of their registration and to facilitate access to independent practice in other participating economies.

Continued Registration

Maintaining registration as an APEC Architect is subject to fulfilment of home economy requirements for continuing professional development. Registration may be renewed on payment of an administration fee to the appropriate Monitoring Committee at maximum intervals of two years. APEC Architects are bound by the codes of professional conduct and disciplinary provisions of both home and host economies.

APEC Architects must immediately advise the Monitoring Committee of any changes to the information recorded on the attached application form.

APEC Architect registration will be cancelled if an architect ceases to be registered / licensed in the home economy.

APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION AS AN APEC ARCHITECT

APPLICANT

Family Name:

Given Names:

Gender: M/F

CONTACT DETAILS

Business Name:

Business Address:

Telephone:

Fax:

Email:

HOME ECONOMY REGISTRATION DETAILS

Name of Home Economy:

Jurisdiction(s) of Registration (if applicable):

Home Economy Registration Number(s):

Date of Admission to Registration:

CURRENT REGISTRATION IN OTHER ECONOMIES

Name of Economy(s):

Date(s) of Admission to Registration:

QUALIFICATIONS

Qualification in Architecture:

Institution:

Date of award:

Other qualifications in Architecture:

7 YEARS PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Is the 'Record of 7 Year Period of Professional Experience' attached? Y/N

Are references for 7 Year Period of Professional Experience attached? Y/N

APPLICATION TO THE MONITORING COMMITTEE OF [NAME OF ECONOMY] FOR ADMISSION TO THE APEC ARCHITECT REGISTER

Signed:

Date:

ITEM 12 - CENTRAL COUNCIL OPERATIONS PROGRAM

The Central Council agrees that;

1. Except as modified by this meeting, participating economies put into effect the Summary Conclusions adopted at the previous meeting for Promotion of the APEC Architect framework, as soon as possible;
 2. all Monitoring Committees immediately notify the Council of any changes to professional recognition requirements in their economies that might conflict with APEC Architect criteria and policy, as recorded in Section 2 of the Operations Manual;
 3. the Secretariat circulate advice of such changes to all Monitoring Committees, and consult as necessary, for resolution by the Central Council at the following meeting;
 4. Monitoring Committees be required to submit a brief survey report to the Secretariat on a date to be determined by the Secretariat at six month intervals on their APEC Architect registration activities for the period, for circulation to all participating economies.
 5. at three month intervals, the Secretariat post an update of its activities and any relevant developments on the Central Council website and distribute it to Monitoring Committees;
 6. The APEC Architect Secretariat maintain regular dialogue with the APEC Secretariat.
-

**Extract from Summary Conclusions of Previous Meeting
'Promotion'**

The Provisional Council agrees that each participating economy:

- promote the benefits of the APEC Architect project to the architectural profession and regulatory authorities in its economy;
- inform relevant government authorities of its significance and encourage them to reduce other restrictions to access of APEC Architects to independent practice;
- publicise the launch of the APEC Architect Register and encourage architects to take advantage of the benefits it offers.
- promote the benefits of the APEC Architect as a protection of the public health, safety and welfare through emphasis on compliance with host economy codes of professional conduct.
- provide an opportunity for registrants on the APEC Architect Register to indicate a willingness to consider offers of professional alliance from other APEC Architects.

MEETING DELEGATES

Economy	Title	FName	LName	Organization	Position	Address1	Address2	City	State	ZipCode	E-mail
Australia	Mr.	Brian	Wright	Architects Accreditation Council of Australia	President	P.O. Box 236	Civic Square	ACT		2608	b.wright@ozemail.com.au
	Mrs.	Christine	Harding	Architects Accreditation Council of Australia	Registrar	P.O. Box 236	Civic Square	ACT		2608	registrar@aaca.org.au
	Mr.	Edward	Haysom	Royal Australian Institute of Architects	Past President	P.O. Box 2127	Fortitude Valley BC	Brisbane QLD		4006	edh@haysomarchitects.com.au
Canada	Ms.	Bonnie	Maples	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	Immediate Past President	4511 Marineview Crescent	North Vancouver	BC		V7R3 P1	bmaples@providencehealth.bc.ca
	Mr.	Jon F	Hobbs	Royal Architectural Institute of Canada	Executive Director	350-55 Murray Street	Ottawa	ON		K1N 5M3	Jonhobbs@raic.org
People's Republic of China	Mr.	Lu	Xiu	Practice Qualification Registration Center, Ministry of Construction, China PRC	Vice President	2nd Floor, Building 21 Ganjiakou	Haidian District	Beijing		100037	
	Mr.	Kai	Cui	The Architectural Society of China PRC	Vice President	No.9.Sawlihe Rd.	Haidian District	Beijing		100037	
	Mr.	Chang	Zhou	The Architectural Society of China PRC	Secretary General	No.9.Sawlihe Rd.	Haidian District	Beijing		100037	
	Ms.	Xiujuan	Wang	Department of Construction Market Administration, Ministry of Construction, China PRC	Deputy Division Head	No.9.Sawlihe Rd.	Haidian District	Beijing		100037	
	Ms.	Chen	Cai	Practice Qualification Registration Centre, Ministry of Construction, China PRC	Staff	2nd Floor, Building 21 Ganjiakou	Haidian District	Beijing		100037	
Hong Kong, China	Prof.	Bernard V.	Lim	The Hong Kong Institute of Architects	President	19/F One Hysan Avenue	Causeway Bay	Hong Kong			hkiasec@hkia.org.hk (HKIA) limwfbarnard@hkia.net
	Ms.	Sum Yee Anna	Kwong	The Hong Kong Institute of Architects	Vice President	19/F One Hysan Avenue	Causeway Bay	Hong Kong			hkiasec@hkia.org.hk asykwong@hkdbdc.org.hk
	Mr.	Helius Kai-ming	Ng	Environment, Transport and Works Bureau, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government	Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)	12th Floor, Murray Building	Garden Road	Central			hkmng@etwb.gov.hk
	Mr.	Bernard	Hui	Architects Registration Board	Chairman	19/F, One Hysan Avenue	Causeway Bay	Hong Kong			bh@roccodesign.com.hk arbsec@arb.org.hk

	Mr.	Thomas	Ling	Architects Registration Board	Vice Chairman	25/F, Guangdong Investment Tower	148 Connaught Road	Central			tckling@lckal.com
Republic of Korea	Mr.	Kun Chang	Yi	Korea Institute of Registered Architects	Vice President	1321-6, Seocho-Dong, Seocho-Gu		Seoul			kcyi@aumlee.co.kr
	Mr.	Chun G.	Shin	Korea Institute of Registered Architects	Vice-Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee of KIRA	1321-6, Seocho-Dong, Seocho-Gu		Seoul			cgsaa@kira.or.kr
	Mr.	Gil Soo	Song	Ministry of Construction & Transportation	Deputy Director, Architecture Division Urban Affairs Bureau	1321-6, Seocho-Dong, Seocho-Gu		Seoul			sogl@moct.go.kr
Malaysia	Mr.	Esa	Mohamed	AKITEK JURURANCANG (M) SDN BHD	Managing Director	No. 19, Jalan KG ATTAP		Kuala Lumpur		50460	esa@pc.iaring.my
	Ar. Dato Dr.	Ikmal Hisham	Albakri	Board of Architects, Malaysia	Member						kasb@tm.net.my
	Ar. Dr.	Amer Hamzah	Bin Mohd Yunus	Board of Architects, Malaysia	International Practice Committee	11th Floor, Menara Tun Ismail Mohd Ali	Jalan Raja Laut	Kuala Lumpur		50350	amer@jkr.gov.my
	Ar.	Pei Ing	Tan	Malaysian Institute of Architects	Immediate Past President	Suite B-6-1, Megan Avenue 1	Jalan Tun Razak	Kuala Lumpur		50450	peiing@pc.iaring.my
Mexico	Arq.	Hector	García Escorza	Mexican Committee for International Practica	Executive Coordinator	Zapata 37, Centro Historico	Deleg. Cuauhtemoc	D.F.		CP 06000	hegarza@arquired.com.mx
	Arq.	Jose M.	Reachi Mora	FCARM (Federation de Colegios de Arquitectos de la Republica Mexican, A.C.)	President	Yucatán 189-201	Tizapan San Angel	D.F.		01090	fmorafcarf@yahoo.com.mx
	Arq.	Fernando	Mora Mora	CONARC(Consejo Nacional de Registro y Certification de Arquitectos)	Director	Ave. México 3370-26D	Guadalajara, Jal.				fmorafcarf@yahoo.com.mx
New Zealand	Prof.	Gordon	Holden	Architects Education and Registration Board	Board Member	PO Box 11106		Wellington			gordon.holden@vuw.ac.nz
	Ms.	Jane	Aimer	Architects Education and Registration Board and NZIA	Chairman	PO Box 113-186		Auckland			jaimer@clear.net.nz
	Mr.	Richard	Harris	Architects Education and Registration Board	Chair, Provisional Monitoring Committee	P.O. Box 6646	Newton	Auckland			rvh@jasmax.co.nz
Republic of the Philippines	Arch.	Eugene	Gan	Professional Regulation Commission - Board of Architecture	Chair	P.Paredes St. Corner Morayta St., Sampaloe		Manila			arch_egan@yahoo.com

	Archt	Prosperidad	Luis	United Architects of the Philippines	Chair, APEC Architect Committee	6 Benito Soliven Avenue, Loyola Grand Villas	Quezon City				prosperidad_luis@yahoo.com
	Arch.	Enrique	Olonan	United Architects of the Philippines	National President	No.38 Xavierville Ave., Loyola HTS	Quezon City	Manila			enriqueolonan@skynet.net
	Archt	Yolanda	Reyes	Commission on Higher Education	Chairman, Committee on Architecture	61, Kalaw St. Miranila Tandang Sora	Quezon City	Manila			ydrevesarcasia@yahoo.com
	Dr.	Leonor	Rosero	Professional Regulation Commission	Chairperson	P.Paredes St. Corner Morayta St., Sampaloe		Manila			lerosero@yahoo.com
	Dr.	Carlito S.	Puno	Commission on Higher Education	Chairman	5th Flr. DAP Bldg. Ched, San Miguel Ave., Ortigas Center	Pasig City				cspuno@ched.gov.ph
	Dr.	Heracleo	Lagrada	Commission on Higher Education	Director III, Office of Programs and Standards	5th Flr. DAP Bldg. Ched, San Miguel Ave., Ortigas Center	Pasig City				hdlagrada@ched.gov.ph
Singapore	Mr.	Chin Min	Low	Board of Architects, Singapore	Registrar	5 Maxwell Road, #01-03 MND Complex Tower Block		Singapore	069110		boarch@singnet.com.sg
	Mr.	Kok Bin Patrik	Chia	Board of Architects Singapore	Board member	5 Maxwell Road, #01-03 MND Complex Tower Block		Singapore	069110		boarch@singnet.com.sg
Chinese Taipei											
(Secretariat)	Mr.	Yin-Ho	Chen	APEC Architect Project Secretariat	Secretary General	13F-1, No 51,Keelung Road, Sec. 2		Taipei	110		apecarchitect@naa.org.tw
				National Association of Architects, Taiwan	President						
(Secretariat)	Mr.	Shau-Tsyh	Chen	APEC Architect Project Secretariat	Deputy Secretary General	13F-1, No 51,Keelung Road, Sec. 2		Taipei	110		orig.design@msa.hinet.net
(Secretariat)	Mr.	I-Ping	Cheng	APEC Architect Project Secretariat	Chief Financial Officer	13F-1, No 51,Keelung Road, Sec. 2		Taipei	110		doitarch@naa.org.tw
(Secretariat)	Ms.	Yi-Cheng	Chao	APEC Architect Project Secretariat	Executive Secretary	13F-1, No 51,Keelung Road, Sec. 2		Taipei	110		amanda@naa.org.tw

(Secretariat)	Mrs.	Helen	Fisher	APEC Architect Project Secretariat	Consultant	28 Cammaray Road, Castle Cove		NSW (Australia)		2069	fisherhelenc@hotmail.com
	Mr.	Ching-Chang	Huang	Chinese Taipei Monitoring Committee	Committee Member	13F-1, No 51,Keelung Road, Sec. 2		Taipei		110	0033@mail.moex.gov.tw
	Mr.	Joshua Jih	Pan	Chinese Taipei Monitoring Committee	Committee Member	13F-1, No 51,Keelung Road, Sec. 2		Taipei		110	panjih@jipan.com
	Prof.	Tze-Hwan	Chung	Architectural Institute of ROC	President	13F-1, No 51,Keelung Road, Sec. 2		Taipei		110	ted0001@ms31.hinet.net
	Mr.	Kuang-Hsiung	Chen	Construction & Planning Agency, Ministry of Interior	Director General	No. 342, Sec. 2, Bade Road		Taipei		105	pierre@cpami.gov.tw
	Mr.	Chikung	Wang	International Affairs Committee, National Association of Architects Taiwan	President	13F-1, No 51,Keelung Road, Sec. 2		Taipei		110	chikungw@ms37.hinet.net
	Mr.	Hen-Chi	Chou	Chinese Taipei Monitoring Committee	CEO	13F-1, No 51,Keelung Road, Sec. 2		Taipei		110	aming005@naa.org.tw
Thailand	Mr.	Michael Paripol	Tangtrongchit	The Association of Siamese	Committee Foreign Affairs	248/1 Sol 17 Rama 9 Road		Bangkok		10320	office@asa.or.th
	Dr.	Pongsak	Vadhanasindhu	Council of Architects, Thailand	Council Member	The Information Technology and Communication BLDG. Wisutkasat Road	Pranakorn	Bangkok		10200	office@thaiarchitects.org
	Mr.	Sukit	Suppermpol	Council of Architects, Thailand	Sub-committee	The Information Technology and Communication BLDG. Wisutkasat Road	Pranakorn	Bangkok		10200	office@thaiarchitects.org
	Dr.	Singh	Intrachotoo	Council of Deans of Architecture Schools of Thailand	Member	Faculty of Architecture, Thammasat University Rangsit Campus Engineering Building 7th FL.	Pathumthani			12121	Hvimolsi@arch.tu.ac.th
United States of America	Mr.	Douglas L.	Steidl, FAIA	The American Institute of Architects	2005 President	1735 New York Avenue, NW		Washington	DC	20006	dsteidl@bsa-net.com
	Ms.	Ellen	Delage	The American Institute of Architects	Director, International Relations	1735 New York Avenue, NW		Washington	DC	20006	edelage@aia.org

	Mr.	Frank	Guillot	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards	President	1801 K Street, NW-Suite 1100K		Washington	DC	20006	fg@gvvarchitects.com
	Ms.	Katherine L.	Schwensen, FAIA	The American Institute of Architects	President-Elect	1735 New York Avenue, NW		Washington	DC	20006	kschwensen@iastate.edu
	Ms.	Lenore	Lucey	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards	Executive Vice President	1801 K Street NW, Suite 1100K		Washington	DC	20006	lmucey@ncarb.org
	Mr.	Michiel	Bourdrez	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards	Director, Education and International Services	1801 K Street NW, Suite 1100K		Washington	DC	20006	mbourdrez@ncarb.org
	Mr.	H. Carleton	Godsey	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards	First Vice President	1801 K Street, NW-Suite 1100K		Washington	DC	20006	cgodsey@godsevassociates.com
	Mr.	Robert	Luke	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards	Second Vice President	1801 K Street, NW-Suite 1100K		Washington	DC	20006	boblake@luke-kaye.com
Japan	Mr.	Kazukiyo	Sato	Japan Federation of Architects & Building Engineers Associations	Deputy-Chairman of International Committee	5-26-20, Shiba	Minato-ku	Tokyo		108-0014	intl@kenchikushikai.or.jp
	Mr.	Toshihiko	Hayakawa	Japan Federation of Architects & Building Engineers Associations	Chief of Information & International Section	5-26-20, Shiba	Minato-ku	Tokyo		108-0014	intl@kenchikushikai.or.jp
	Prof.	Sadao	Watanabe	Japan Federation of Architects & Building Engineers Associations	Director, Chairman of International Committee	5-26-20, Shiba	Minato-ku	Tokyo		108-0014	intl@kenchikushikai.or.jp
	Mr.	Shinjiro	Wachi	Japan Institute of Architects	Representative	2-3-18 Jingumae	Shibuya-ku	Tokyo		150-0001	wachi@nikken.co.jp
	Mr.	Junichiro	Shibata	Architectural Design Committee, Building Contractors Society (BCS)		Tokyo Kensetsu Kaikan 8th Floor, 2-5-1 Hacchobori	Chuo-ku	Tokyo		104-0032	shibata.junichiro@obayashi.co.jp
	Mr.	Atsuo	Okasaki	Housing Bureau, Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport	Director for International Codes and Standards	2-1-3 Kasumigaseki	Chiyoda-ku	Tokyo		100-8918	okasaki-a263@miit.go.jp
	Mr.	Soichiro	Yasukawa	National Institute for Land and Infrastructure Management	Senior Researcher, International Research Division	1 Asahi	Tsukuba	Ibaraki		305-0804	yasukawa-s2sa@nilim.go.jp

Mr.	Yasunori	Yamanaka	The Japan Architectural Education and Information Center	Executive Director	Kanematsu Bldg, 2-14-1, Kyobashi	Chuo-ku	Tokyo	104-0031	int@jaeic.or.jp
Mr.	Hiroki	Sunohara	The Japan Architectural Education and Information Center	General Manager, Planning Department	Kanematsu Bldg, 2-14-1, Kyobashi	Chuo-ku	Tokyo	104-0031	int@jaeic.or.jp
Dr.	Izumi	Kuroishi	The Japan Architectural Education and Information Center	Senior Researcher	Kanematsu Bldg, 2-14-1, Kyobashi	Chuo-ku	Tokyo	104-0031	int@jaeic.or.jp