

Union International des Architectes - International Union of Architects
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE COMMISSION

MINUTES

Meeting Dates: November 11-12, 2005

Meeting Location: Board Room, The American Institute of Architects,
Washington, DC, USA

Attendees: See Appendix 1 for a list of those who attended the meeting.

CONTENTS	PAGE
1. Call to Order and Welcome	2
2. Adoption of the Minutes of the March 12-13, 2004 Meeting	2
3. Adoption of the Provisional Agenda	2
4. Report of the Professional Practice Commission Secretariat	3
5. Remarks by the UIA Secretary-General	3
6. Report on the UIA-Col-legi d'Arquitectes de Catalunya (COAC) Standard Format for Reporting the Practice Standards of Each UIA Member Section	6
7. Report on the UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education and the UNESCO-UIA Validation System	8
8. Report of the Invitational Accreditation/Validation Roundtable Conference	9
9. Report of the Drafting Panel for the study of different contractual systems utilized by architects in UIA member sections	10
10. Report of the Drafting Panel for the study of recommended standardized forms of mutual recognition agreements	12
11. Report of the Drafting Panel for the study of increasing the portability and recognition of required professional internship experience	15
12. Report of the Drafting Panel for the study of resource bases within UIA member sections for members interested in working internationally	17
13. Report of the Drafting Panel for the development of a glossary of terminology as used in the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines	20
14. Review and discussion of suggested changes to the contents of the existing UIA Accord	20
15. Review and discussion of proposed new subjects to be addressed by the Commission	27
16. Proposal for the Publication of the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines	38
17. Summation of the status of the Commission's work program	38

18. 2006 and 2007 Commission meeting sites	39
19. Recognition of the service of Prof. Xu Anzhi as the Commission Co-Director	39
20. Acknowledgement of the American Institute of Architects	40
21. Adjournment	40
22. Appendices	40

Friday, November 11

1. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

The Chair opened the meeting at 9:00 am.

Douglas Steidl, FAIA, President of the The American Institute of Architects had extended a welcome to the Commission at the opening reception on Thursday evening.

The Chair extended a special welcome and introduction to Professor Zhuang Weimin from Beijing, China who was attending his first Commission meeting as newly designated Co-Director representing the Architectural Society of China. He is succeeding Prof. Xu Anzhi.

Each of the meeting participants then introduced themselves.

The Chair took special note of having first time participants from two UIA member sections - Latvia and Nigeria. He took special note that all but one of the newly elected members of the UIA Bureau had served as active members of this Commission.

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 11-14, 2004 MEETING

The Minutes of the March 11-14 2004 meeting of the Professional Practice Commission were distributed via e-mail to all attendees at the Kuala Lumpur meeting. An Executive Summary of this meeting was prepared and e-mailed to the Commission members not present in Kuala Lumpur the UIA Council and all UIA member sections. The Minutes were posted on the PPC's web site, www.aia.org/international/uia.

MOTION: Mr. Wright moved the acceptance of the minutes. Mr. Silcher seconded the motion. The motion was accepted by acclamation.

3. ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

The Chair reported that the provisional agenda had been circulated with the initial August meeting announcement. It was revised and circulated again to those registered for the meeting on October 31, 2005. Hearing no further requested revisions to the agenda, the Chair stated that the Agenda would be accepted as presented.

4. REPORT OF THE PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE COMMISSION SECRETARIAT

4.1. Accomplishments during the UIA Triennium: The Chair presented a power point presentation summarizing the accomplishments of the Commission over the period of the last UIA triennium. This included as Appendix 2.

4.2. Set of Commission Documents: A complete printed set of the UIA Accord and all of the Recommended Guidelines were provided to each participant.

4.3. UIA Council Meetings, UIA Congress and UIA Committees: As the Co-Director he is invited to all of the UIA Council meetings and attended all of them. The Commission organized and presented a program at the UIA Congress on the work of the Commission. The Chair served on the UIA Bylaws Committee.

4.4. Commission Membership: The Commission currently has representation from 59 UIA member sections. The announcement for this meeting was sent to all UIA member sections currently not having any representation on the Commission and inviting them to do so.

4.5. Advisory Committee: The Chair noted that the Advisory Committee consists of the Co-Directors and the Chairs of the currently active Drafting Panels. They met yesterday afternoon to review the major new items to be addressed for the first time at this meeting.

4.6. Acknowledgement to the AIA: The Chair acknowledged and thanked the AIA for its support of the Commission Secretariat through the provision of office space, computer services, telephone and fax services and all related office services.

4.7. Commission Process: Before moving on to the rest of the meeting agenda, the Chair recalled that the Commission operates as a democratic body. All UIA member sections are invited to have representation on the Commission. Once the Commission has established their work program, the major portion of the work is conducted through Drafting Panels addressing a specific subject and chaired by a volunteer chair. These chairs make the major presentations at this meeting. Since this meeting represents the first meeting of a new UIA triennium, nearly all of the subjects included on this agenda have not been previously addressed by the Commission. The active participation of every individual present at this meeting is encouraged. The Commission generally attempts to reach agreement by consensus. However, if that appears not to be possible, the Commission will hold a formal vote in order to move a document forward.

5. REMARKS BY THE UIA SECRETARY-GENERAL

Mr. Farrando reported on several developments taking place that merit the attention of the Commission.

5.1. Continuing Professional Development: This has been a major concern of the UIA

Council for a number of years. The UIA General Assembly in Istanbul took three positions: a) to approve the scheme presently jointly by The American Institute of Architects and Spanish Superior Council of Architects; b) to enlarge the planned representation on the Joint Oversight Committee to include representatives from each of the UIA regions; and c) to convene a roundtable in Paris, France on October 11, 2005.

The Joint Oversight Committee was originally conceived to include UIA officers, one representative from both the Education and Professional Practice Commission and the program operators. It has now been expanded to include representatives from the UIA regions. The role of this committee is to serve as a go-between body between the general program operators and the decision making body, the UIA Council. It is intended to ensure that the program operator is operating the program in accordance with the understandings of the UIA Council. It is to serve both technical and political functions. It is intended that this committee will be appointed at the next UIA Council meeting on January 29-30, 2006.

Some participants in the October 11 Paris CPD Roundtable suggested that this Commission should have a panel dealing specifically with CPD. The purpose of this panel would be to: a) assist and help those UIA member sections not having CPD programs to establish their own systems; and b) serve as a resource to the UIA Council in providing advice.

The UIA Education Commission has decided to become an open membership Commission, as is this Commission, and to also establish a series of panel working on specific subjects and issues. One of them is on CPD.

UIA Region I had their most recent meeting in October. It was also attended by the UIA Vice President from Region II. They decided to create a regional panel on CPD.

These various developments will allow for an organized structure and system for allowing the Joint Oversight Committee to have the benefit of the input of a series of existing UIA constituencies. Even though the UIA CPD program has now been in development for a period of time there remains an ongoing sense that there remain important elements that require further consideration.

5.2. Regional Organizations and their Relation to the UIA: The UIA Region I and II CPD Panel are also going to include participation by the Architects' Council of Europe.

As the UIA Secretary-General he has been meeting the ACE Secretary General to identify other areas of mutual cooperation. He has been in correspondence with all of the other existing regional architectural organizations to encourage them to define what they see as the areas of possible collaboration between their organizations and the UIA. He is interested in avoiding duplication of work and making better joint use of existing resources.

5.3. Resolution 13 of the UIA General Assembly: He recounted the resolution as brought forth by the Nordic Section as a proposed amendment to the UIA Code of

Conduct. By action of the UIA General Assembly it was upgraded to a UIA Policy. Since the UIA policies related to professional practice are represented in the UIA Accord he wanted to bring to the attention of this Commission as to whether it would be relevant to place it in the UIA Accord or into some other document.

5.4. UIA Communications: This Commission passed a resolution at their 2004 meeting requesting that the UIA Council establish a Public Relations and Communications Committee. This resolution was put forward to the newly elected UIA Council members at their first meeting in Istanbul. The recommendation was accepted and the committee has been placed under his direction as the Secretary-General. The UIA regions have each been asked to identify an individual to serve on this committee. It also has to deal with the needs of the Commissions and Working Groups.

This Commission should be prepared to direct to this new committee its recommendations as to those related entities that the UIA should be communicating with on an external basis. Specifically he is requesting the Commission to: a) define your communication needs; b) to spend some time at the end of each meeting to identify those particular subjects need to be put forward both to internet and external audiences; c) who are the target groups; and d) the recommended form of the communication. He requests the Commission to identify the contact person for this particular responsibility.

The new UIA Bureau had a discussion of communication needs at their first held in Rome in early October. There was quickly a focus on the financial requirements of such a program. He is preparing a communications plan which be presented at the next UIA Council meeting.

5.5. New Commission Co-Director: He noted that the UIA Bureau at their last meeting did receive and approve the designation of the Architectural Society of China for this role and he extend the best wishes of the UIA Bureau to Prof. Zhuang in this service.

Discussion:

Mr. Peck noted that this commission brings together the experience and intellect of practicing architects from around the world. It produces a product of high professional standard. However, we are architects and not experts in communication. He suggested that the issue of sorting out communications for all of the UIA really needs to be addressed by professionals in that area. He questioned the effectiveness of such a committee being made up of architect members of the UIA.

Mr. Farrando agreed with Mr. Peck's comments and observations. This new committee is not be made exclusively of just architects. He would welcome the suggestions of any UIA member section that may be able to identify skilled public communication persons who have an experience in working with architects. He noted that there are currently no allocated funds in the UIA budget to retain outside individuals to deal with this need.

Mrs. Siola inquired as the status of the UNESCO-UIA Validation System, specifically

what is the status of the relations with UNESCO.

Mr. Farrando acknowledged that it remains a major issue. There have been ongoing contacts with UNESCO with regard to their no longer wishing to include the subject of architecture within their programs. He is anticipating however that a tentative draft agreement will be forthcoming that will address the UIA's concerns.

Mr. Wright raised the subject of the UIA being able to publish and distribute what are seen as very important political documents. He views this as especially critical for the UIA to effectively present themselves to government officials throughout the world. He noted that the UIA has no budgeted funds to support such a professional publication program and suggests that this needs to be changed in the next UIA triennium budget.

Mr. Farrando shares Mr. Wright's point of view. He agrees that there are a number of existing key UIA documents that urgently need publication.

6. REPORT ON THE UIA-COL-LEGI d'ARQUITECTES de CATALUNYA (COAC) STANDARD FORMAT FOR REPORTING THE PRACTICE STANDARDS OF EACH UIA MEMBER SECTION

Introduction: The Chair recognized Mr. Farrando to make this presentation.

Presentation: Mr. Farrando noted that this project has been ongoing since 1998. The first survey was conducted from 1998 to 2002. It was distributed to all the UIA member sections and based on the responses received a first presentation was made at the 2002 Berlin UIA Congress. A few months later the results were then made available in a publication sponsored by COAC. The Commission received copies at their 2003 meeting in Tokyo, Japan. The process then commenced to refine and expand the survey questionnaire and the work continued between 2003 and 2005. An update on the new survey results was presented at the 2005 Istanbul UIA Congress.

He indicated the directions the survey will be going in the coming years. The current data base is presented on the web site on a country by country basis or on a vertical reading basis. There is now a new possible reading available for the information, i.e. a horizontal reading, wherein one can look at the data on a subject by subject basis. It will also permit the comparison of the 2002 and 2005 data. It will be possible to see the changing dynamics in how architectural practice is evolving around the world. By January 2006 it is planned that COAC will have available an updated published edition as well. The published version provides a current static view of the survey. The internet allows for a dynamic interaction and use of the data.

He provided a live on-line demonstration of this new expanded capability using the survey results for France as an example an individual UIA member section. He proceeded to then illustrate how the system allowed for a UIA wide examination of the status of CPD within UIA member sections within a specific region, i.e. the Americas.

The current survey includes updated information on 63 countries. There is no updated information on 24 other countries. There are 23 countries who have never responded to any survey questionnaire. There are eight new UIA member sections for which they do not yet have new information. He is recommending that the concentration of survey work be on those countries who have never responded and to the new UIA member sections without having to again modify the survey questionnaire in this process.

He concluded by thanking all the COAC staff who have contributed so much to this project.

Discussion:

Mr. Wright extended his congratulations to the COAC for this masterful body of work. As the project has been developed it is ever increasing sophisticated and useful resource. He noted his interest in having the data base eventually be able to report what use UIA member sections have made of the UIA Accord, i.e. adoption, case specific applications, etc.

Mr. Bourdrez extended his congratulations and noted his regular use of the site in the work with the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards in the United States. The NCARB web site is also links to this web site.

Mr. Peck added his congratulations to the project but noted that Tasmania has been omitted in the map graphics.

Mr. Sagne adding his congratulations inquired as to the evaluation of the cost of the more recent work involved in putting this all on an online web site.

Mr. Aduku expressed his interest as well in understanding how much it cost to achieve this level of sophisticated communication for such an important international resource base.

Mr. Farrando acknowledged the responses and suggestions made and will give consideration to them. With regard to the project cost, he indicated that it represented a major contribution to the UIA from one member section.

Mr. Prinz urged every UIA member section to provide a link on their own web site to this site. The experience in Germany is that many architects practicing internationally use this resource.

Mr. Farrando responded indicating that is available to anyone but if one is establishing a link to the site that it would be appreciated if that process could be shared with him.

Mr. Silcher suggested it would be useful to others to have some idea of the cost to bring this final stage into existence as an internet site.

Mr. Sagne inquired as to the number of hits received by the site.

Mr. Farrando indicated that they have not yet regularly monitored the use of the site. He acknowledged that this is something that needs to be done.

Mr. Scheeler noted that this international data base is probably unique among the professions and it gives us a research tool to use this data in a creative way. He suggested that it would be useful to let all of the colleges of architecture in world know that this resource exists and accessible.

Mr. Sagne suggested that in considering how to improve the UIA newsletters that it would be useful to include some regular generalized reporting on some aspect of these statistics. He believes that this would contribute to a wider understanding that the profession of architecture has a wider economic significance than may commonly understood.

7. REPORT ON THE UNESCO-UIA CHARTER ON ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION AND THE UNESCO-UIA VALIDATION SYSTEM

Introduction: The Chair introduced Mrs. Cox to make these reports.

Presentation: Mrs. Cox presented her report which is included as Appendix 3. In addition to her prepared text she noted that the Charter has been translated into eight languages – English, French, Spanish, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic and Turkish. She encouraged the UIA member sections to have the same representatives at both of the Paris roundtable sessions in May in order that they might have a full understanding of what is taking place in both subject areas.

Discussion:

Mr. Wachi inquired as to whether UNESCO was changing its position with regard to education and what impact this was having on both the Charter and the Validation program.

Mrs. Cox responded indicating that the UIA continues to work with UNESCO in an effort to retain their active participation. She noted a workshop in Paris between UNESCO and UIA officers and staff that was intended to help UNESCO gain a better understanding of what UIA is going.

Mr. Peck recalled that the UIA Architecture and Children Work Group developed a Memorandum of Understanding between UNESCO and UIA. It seemed to die away and asked if it was referenced in the recent UIA discussions with UNESCO.

Mrs. Cox responded that she was aware of it when meeting with UNESCO.

8. REPORT ON THE INVITATIONAL ACCREDITATION/VALIDATION ROUNDTABLE CONFERENCE

Introduction: The Chair introduced Mr. Scheeler to make this report.

Presentation: Mr. Scheeler utilized a power-point presentation which is included as Appendix 4.

Discussion:

Mrs. Mora asked for a clarification as to who was being invited to participate to the Washington roundtable.

Mr. Scheeler responded that participation in the Washington May conference is limited to those UIA member sections who already had established national accreditation/validation systems. The March Paris roundtable will be open to all UIA member sections.

Mr. Bourdrez asked for clarification on the connection between the March and May meetings.

Mr. Scheeler reiterated that the March Paris roundtable is a meeting being sponsored by the UIA for UIA member sections to discuss the whole issue of the mutual recognition of accreditation/validation systems. He assumes that the UIA will be using the results of those discussions to advise the UIA representatives to the May meeting.

Mr. Wachi inquired as to the relationship between the UNESCO-UIA Accreditation/Validation system and the May conference.

Mr. Scheeler indicated the UNESCO-UIA Accreditation/Validation system is one of the invitees.

Mr. Shim inquired if the invited participants to the May conference will be receiving instructions as to how they should prepare for the conference.

Mr. Scheeler indicated that this information will be forthcoming to all of the participants once they have been designated. There are general suggestions in the initial letters of invitation.

Mr. Sagne suggested making a reference to the new Qualifications Directive that now exists in Europe. He noted that ACE has started a Joint Working Party with the European Association for Architectural Education and validation is one of the topics on their agenda.

9. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE STUDY OF DIFFERENT CONTRACTUAL SYSTEMS UTILIZED BY ARCHITECTS IN UIA MEMBER SECTIONS

Introduction: The Chair introduced Mr. Prinz to make the presentation.

Presentation: Mr. Prinz utilized a power-point presentation which is included as Appendix 5. He noted that one of the issues hindering international practice is the subject of the differing contractual legal systems an architect encounters when working abroad. The objective of this effort is to develop a guideline for creating a contract between an architect and their client. While he has collected examples from a number of UIA member sections, he requested all those present to provide him with examples from their country.

Discussion:

Mr. Peck suggested that rather than continuing to use the term “contract” it would be better to use the term “agreements” between architects and their clients. We are not referencing building contracts.

Mr. Prinz agreed with this suggestion. He observed that in his experience he has been interested to note how many instances there are where an architect enters into a relationship with a client without any formal agreement.

Mr. Prinz noted the useful information he had received from Costa Rica regarding their experience with mediation and arbitration in the work of their Conflict Resolution Center. There is also a great deal of experience in Europe on this subject.

Mr. Wright recommended that the model be developed in a manner that did not absolutely require collaboration with a local architect. It needs a flexible option.

Mr. Sagne supported Mr. Wright’s position especially within the framework of Mode Four as it exists within Europe, i.e. that you have the right to establish a practice in another country.

Mr. Wright observed that this work needs to recognize the two distinct forms of legal systems in the world, i.e. common law and the Napoleonic code.

Mr. Wright suggested using the terminology “intellectual property rights” rather than just “copyright”. It should be consistent with the UIA Accord Policy and the Recommended Guideline. He suggested that how the wording related to the “copyright” is worded is very important. He cautioned the use of the terminology concerning “copyright” that it “should not unreasonably with held”.

Mr. Zhuang noted that in China there are four distinct phases in the agreements between architects and clients – conceptual design, design, design development and working drawings.

Mr. Peck thought the situation in China could be incorporated into point two in the draft.

Mr. Wachi noted that in Japan there are increasing examples of where the client, especially in commissions dealing with high technology facilities, has the legal right to buy out the rights to the design. Thus, the issue of the copyright is getting more complicated.

Mr. Peck indicated his belief that this document should begin with a default position and taking an aspirational position with the issue of copyright.

Mr. Peck suggests that Article Six be called “Dispute Resolution”.

Mr. Wright suggests that there should a separate article addressing “Duty of Care” and another one dealing with “Limits of Liability”.

Mr. Prinz noted that in Germany the law requires that if the client terminates the agreement with the architect with no fault being that of the architect, the architect is entitled to the full amount of the fee for the work he did provide as well as that for the services he had not yet provided at the time of the termination of the agreement by the client.

Mr. Wright observed that this was an interesting point because it goes to the heart of the question as to how architects develop their fees.

Mr. Prinz emphasized that the ten articles he has included in this first draft are those he views as being the basic articles. Architect-client agreements may need to have others.

Mr. Wachi inquired if he had considered indemnification and non-disclosure/confidentiality agreement as part of this document. He noted that these two points are common requests of clients in Japan.

Mr. Silcher observed that it is very important in this document to state very clearly what the architect does and what he does not do. It is important for the client to understand what it is expected of the client and what services may be required of other consultants, structure, mechanical, etc.

Mr. Scheeler suggested that there are a number of UIA member sections who maintain and operate a professional documents program for the benefit of their members. As an example he cited that AIA’s Documents Program as being a useful resource for this UIA effort.

Mr. Prinz invited other Commission members to join the Drafting Panel.

Mr. Peck indicated that the RAIA would like to nominate Rick Barton who is their legal counsel and also an architect to serve on the drafting panel

10. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE STUDY OF RECOMMENDED STANDARDIZED FORMS OF MUTUAL RECOGNITION AGREEMENTS.

Introduction: The Chair introduced Mr. Bourdrez to make this presentation.

Presentation: Mr. Bourdrez utilized a power-point presentation which is included as Appendix 6.

As background to his presentation, he invited Mr. Farrando to make a brief presentation on the prior work of the Commission in producing the UIA Policy on Mutual Recognition Agreements that was approved by the UIA Council. He highlighted the major points of this document – Preamble, Definitions, Recommendations (Negotiation of Agreements, Form and Content of the Agreement and Further Information Related to the Provisions of the Mutual Recognition Agreement). This new effort will be focused on the subject of the Form and Content of the Agreement.

He noted that this was presented as a first working draft of a model agreement. It is based on two agreements that the American Institute of Architects and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards have negotiated – one with the Architects' Council of Europe and the NAFTA Agreement between Canada, Mexico and the United States. Both examples incorporate elements of the UIA Accord. Canada and the United States have in effect since 1994 a full mutual recognition agreement under the provisions of the Canada-USA Free Trade Agreement.

He took note that there is a provision in the draft for not only the official participants, the registration bodies, who will sign and implement the agreement but also for the parties, i.e. the professional bodies that also endorse the agreement.

He took particular note of the inclusion of a defined period of professional practice. This evolved from the long but unsuccessful efforts in these past negotiations to define and measure equivalencies in education, internship and practice.

He invited other interested Commission members to join the Drafting Panel. Presently Mr. Wright, Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Prinz and Mr. Sagne have volunteered to serve on the Drafting Panel.

Discussion:

Mr. Wright noted that there is still some NAFTA language remaining in Point 4 and in the Appendix that needs to be removed or edited.

Mr. Peck noted that this draft represents a very specific type of an MRA designed to facilitate the free movement of architectural service providers from one economy to another. He noted that there are other types of MRAs that are designed to allow for the free movement of professionally qualified individuals from one economy to another. He suggested that this Commission should be prepared to address these two types of MRAs. He further noted that MRAs can exist between professional bodies and also between statutory bodies and we need to recognize that situation. In order to be effective he indicated that MRAs have to address the subjects of visas and work permits. Any MRA will not be effective unless the government immigration arrangements are supportive of the purpose of the MRA.

Mr. Bourdrez responded by questioning if some of Mr. Peck's observations would be better addressed in the UIA Policy on MRAs rather than in a model MRA. He concurred that such agreements will go no where unless they enjoy government support.

Mr. Wright observed that there is a difference in the provisions found in a Free Trade Agreement and a Mutual Recognition Agreement.

Mr. Sagne suggested that this discussion highlights the importance of providing in the MRA document a clear definition of the terminology that is applied to and that is found in the document. He suggested that an annex covering terminology might be a necessary and useful resource.

Mr. Farrando made reference to the Preamble of the UIA Accord Policy on MRAs which already provides important definitions.

Mr. Wright suggested that this current work be developed with the idea that the final product would be an appendix to the existing UIA Accord Policy on MRAs. Such a combination would serve as a complete transition between the policy and the model document.

Mr. Bourdrez noted the unique situation in the United States wherein the US Constitution delegates to the states the right to regulate the professions. This makes for a situation where each state has the right to accept or reject any MRA.

Mr. Verma inquired as to how in 2.1.5. one defines an unqualified person.

Mr. Peck suggested revising the language to "unqualified foreign persons."

Mr. Bourdrez noted that this document is not intended to serve as a reference or source for changing a country's internal regulatory system.

Mr. Peck suggested that the last line before the signatures be amended to read "by mutual agreement by all parties".

Mr. Bourdrez invited Mr. Peck to make a presentation on the paper entitled “Proposed MRA to Achieve a Balance of Architectural and Land Surveying Services in ASEAN”.

Mr. Peck noted that the paper is relevant to this subject because it deals with the reach of MRAs. The ASEAN member states proposed in 2001 the development of an MRA to facilitate the free movement of professional services within the ASEAN region. In 2003 they recommended the development of MRAs in qualifications in major professional services for the free movement of professional labor within the region. He has been engaged by ASEAN under the provisions of a donor nation funding for the preparation of a design document for an MRA. His remarks addressed only the design document that is prepared and which is now awaiting funding from a donor nation for the actual process to take place.

There is an imbalance of a supply and demand of architects and land surveyors within the ASEAN region. All of the member states wanted an MRA that they could accept to overcome this problem. The approach taken has been to develop an MRA to facilitate the free movement of individuals with qualifications to enter those demand markets and work for existing service providers. It is seen as a quicker way of addressing the problem. There is always a resistance on the domestic scene to receive external service providers, i.e. issues with language, understanding of culture, knowledge of regulations, etc.

There are some desirable features about such an approach to an MRA. First, is that when individuals graduate from a course of architecture or land surveying they are at the most mobile point in their career. If there is a demand market where they can achieve experience through employment, they are likely to go there. Secondly, if you do attract young graduates into a demand market and are working for an existing service provider they do have the opportunity of improving their language skills, becoming familiar with the culture and the law of the land, and they have made a major commitment in their own career development which may limit their opportunities in their home economy. This MRA would cover the qualification issues but also the issues of work permit, visa, and residency. Further this experience in a foreign market would be credited for their domestic requirements for internship and towards requirements for legal registration. It attempts to eliminate the downsides of their having to leave their home market to further their professional development.

The Chair inquired as to what the likely schedule was to be for the implementation of this form of an MRA within ASEAN.

Mr. Peck responded that it is dependent on a donor nation providing the necessary funds.

The Chair took note of what a landmark year it has been for mutual recognition agreements related to architects– 1) Canada, Mexico and the United States have signed a mutual recognition agreement under the provisions of the North American Free Trade Agreement; 2) the Architects’ Council of Europe and the United States represented by NCARB and the AIA will sign next week in Luxembourg an initial document related to

mutual recognition; and 3) the APEC Architect Agreement is now signed and operative for all of the APEC member states.

11. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE STUDY OF INCREASING THE PORTABILITY AND RECOGNITION OF REQUIRED PROFESSIONAL INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCE

Introduction: The Chair reported that Mr. Scheeler had initially volunteered to chair this drafting panel but due to his increased responsibilities in writing a history of the major issues faced by The American Institute of Architects during their 150 year history, he was unable to continue in this UIA role. In announcing this meeting and in subsequent communications the Chair has sought a replacement volunteer. As of today no one has been identified to accept this role. Mr. Scheeler did agree to introduce the subject at this meeting.

Presentation: Mr. Scheeler noted his written statement which is included as Appendix 7. He emphasized the significance of the UIA having now developed a set of coordinated policies and procedures intended to enhance the portability of academic and professional credentials. The specific issue of internship was raised by the former UIA Secretary-General. He noted that the UIA Accord has both a specific policy on this subject and it is supported by a Recommended Guideline. The UIA does not have a system or service to help interns in seeking employment outside their own countries. A gap exists because there is nothing that addresses the issue of the international portability of this internship experience. Many UIA member sections have well established internship programs but they do not provide for unlimited portability of records or acceptance of unlimited foreign experience. For example in the United States, the intern development program only allows for official recognition of one-third of an intern's required experience to be acquired outside the United States. He suggested that the issue needs to be addressed from several directions: a) what UIA member sections might do regarding a program of employment assistance to interns; and b) the development of a limited mutual recognition agreement among registration agencies to cover specific requirements for internship experience.

Discussion:

Mr. Peck volunteered to assume the role of the drafting panel chair. He agreed with the suggestion of a limited MRA and suggested that the best overall way to approach it was to have the UIA facilitate it but not organize it. This project would be very much appreciated by all of those young architects seeking to gain practical qualifying experience outside of their own country.

Mr. Bourdrez noted that the Intern Development Program (IDP) program in the United States limits foreign experience to just one year. This rule has been in effect since the program was initiated in the late 1970s. He suggested Robert Rosenfelt at NCARB who is their expert in the IDP program as being a useful resource for this drafting panel. He suggested that this is a timely subject because in his work there is an enormous amount of

frustration among young graduate architects who want to get experience outside the US in a globalizing work environment and then find that such a limited amount of such experience is eligible for official recognition.

Mr. Wachi inquired as to why this is being addressed just as internship when the UIA Accord policy also speaks of experience/training/internship.

Mr. Scheeler responded that it would include all of those elements.

Mr. Pritchard noted that the RIBA allows their students to spend their first year abroad.

Mr. Silcher noted that Germany while not having a highly organized national internship program the applicant has no restriction as to where he can acquire this internship experience.

Mr. Aduku indicated that experience outside of Nigeria may be credited but only where it is coming from a country with which they have a relationship. He sees this as a valuable program for young architects.

Mr. Boon stated that Malaysia has a system based on the RIBA system.

Mr. Sagne inquired whether there might be any consideration in the longer term of establishing a data base to facilitate internship exchange.

Mr. Farrando noted that within the Europe there are programs for the exchange of young professionals, including architects.

Mr. Verma noted that within ARCASIA they are working to expand the eligibility of student architects to have portability of their third year one semester out training program among the member states.

Mr. Wright reminded the Commission that this effort should remain aspirational rather than just looking at what each of us are doing within our own countries. We should state what we think would be the best system.

Mr. Zerubavel noted three points: a) the young architect after completing his studies; b) most of the university architectural faculty in his country are from the theoretical background rather than the practice background; and c) most practicing architects are not wishing to recognize the need for continuing education. In the past, architects were knowledgeable in a broad range of architectural design experience but today that has shifted to the use of a broad array of specialized consultants. Utilizing the work of this Commission, he has been participating in an effort to strengthen the professional examination process in Israel.

Mrs. Cox noted that in Australia they do credit one year of practical experience.

Mr. Peck, in closing, noted that Mr. Bourdrez, Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Boon and Mr. Aduku have indicated their willingness to serve on this drafting panel. He invited any member section present to share with him copies of any documentation they might have regarding their established internship systems.

12. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE STUDY OF RESOURCE BASES WITHIN UIA MEMBER SECTIONS FOR MEMBERS INTERESTED IN WORKING INTERNATIONALLY

Introduction: The Chair introduced Mr. Prinz to make the presentation.

Presentation: Mr. Prinz used a power point presentation to make a presentation on the effort by Germany to create a Network on Architectural Export (NAX) targeted for those members interested in working internationally. A copy of his presentation is included as Appendix 8 Each participant was also presented with a boxed brochure describing the program. He noted that it has been translated into English; an equivalent brochure together with engineers has been translated into Chinese and Arabic. His primary objective in presenting this to the Commission is to encourage other UIA member sections to create similar networks and then to enable them to be connected to one another.

Discussion:

Mr. Peck inquired if this target membership within the BAK, i.e. those interested in working internationally, pays an additional subscription to fund the program. He was also interested in how the BAK members who did not work internationally viewed supporting such a program.

Mr. Prinz responded indicating that the firms included in the boxed program brochure did pay an additional fee. The project was also sponsored by a number of international firms who employ the services of BAK members in the international marketplace. With regard to the members who have no present interest in international practice, they did recognize the educational value of the program in helping them gain a better understanding of the issues associated with international practice.

Mr. Sagne inquired as to their having any assessment of the use of the related web site.

Mr. Prinz responded by indicating that the number of BAK members exporting architectural services has risen from 2% to 6%. While they are not in a position to give specific credit to NAX for this increase they do view it as having a positive impact on this increase.

Mr. Silcher observed that this increase is also due to the fact that building in Germany is at such a current level that it forces architects to look outside Germany for commissions. He views NAX as being especially helpful for medium to small firms who had not previously seen opportunities outside of Germany.

Mr. Zerubavel inquired if there was a limit on the number of firms that could be included in the NAX program.

Mr. Prinz indicated that the initial limit was set at 50 firms which are recognized as being "Guardians". They presently have about 44 firms. They are aware of some 400 member firms who are working internationally.

Mrs. Siola inquired whether the systems were designed to allow firms outside of Germany to use it to identify potential partner firms in Germany for work in or outside of Germany.

Mr. Prinz indicated that it was designed for such use. He acknowledged that the word "export" in the title conveys the opposite situation.

Mr. Prinz closed his presentation by emphasizing that when he joined the BAK it set about to bring about a closer relationship between what the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines were about and what BAK members were doing in their practices outside of Germany.

Getting the Deal Through: Public Procurement in 30 Jurisdictions Worldwide

Mr. Prinz introduced the subject by noting that the project was initiated by a lawyer in Germany who works in public procurement. When he became aware of the publication, he saw a connection to what this Commission was doing in regard to establishing a data base related to architectural practice. It includes information on 30 countries and there are plans for a second edition. He introduced Lisa Miller, an attorney with Ardent Fox in Washington, DC who was a contributor to the section on the USA.

The Chair thanked Mr. Prinz for securing complementary copies of the publication for each of the Commission attendees.

Ms. Miller stated that Global Competition Review (GCR) is very involved in publications of this type. This is the first public procurement publication they have produced. They invited authors who practice in this field to contribute a chapter. GCR puts forth a list of topics to which they ask the authors to address. She noted the headings used in the individual chapters. The purpose of the publication is to be a one stop resource for practitioners such as the legal departments in multi-national corporations. She has a long experience with the America Bar Association in their Construction Committee, Public Procurement Sub-Committee.

A related activity concerns her work with the United Nations. The United Nations Trade Law Commission (UNTKC) drafted a model procurement code a number of years ago. It was intended to assist UN member states in developing their own public procurement systems. It sets forth both a model law and guidelines as to how to apply the law. Two years ago the Working Group reformed to address needed changes such as those related

to electronic procurement which was not known when the first model was issued.

Discussion:

Mr. Sagne inquired about electronic procurement and electronic auctions. It is his understanding that these are developing quickly and include the procurement of architectural services. He noted that the EU Directives indicate that these are not appropriate to the procurement of architectural services. He suggested that it would be useful to have the public procurement of architectural services through design competitions added to the entries in this publication. He also noted that he did not see any cross reference to the ongoing work in the World Trade Organization on transparency and public procurement.

Ms. Miller responded noting that the reverse auctions are being addressed in the UNTLC. She could not comment on his other suggestions because at the time she became involved the subject headings had already been developed and accepted. It is her understanding that the basic structure was modeled on the EU Directives because many of the planning group came from the EU. She anticipates that subsequent editions will have a broader focus.

Mr. Prinz inquired as to the status of the procurement of design services in the USA through design competitions.

Ms. Miller indicated that there are provisions in US federal procurement laws that do address those forms on procurement. It is done but not regularly.

Mr. Peck inquired as to the inclusion of public-private procurement by governments. He observed that the Australian experience places a minimal emphasis on design quality and places maximum emphasis on economic outcomes.

Ms. Miller responded that public-private procurement is not active in the USA as compared to the rest of the world. Where it is being used in the USA is at the state and local level and primarily in the transportation arena.

The Chair inquired as to whether it would be appropriate for this Commission of the UIA to write to the publisher to make suggestions as to additional subject headings related to the public procurement of architectural services that might be included in a future edition.

Ms. Miller agreed that it would be a useful undertaking, especially coming from an international organization.

The meeting adjourned for the day.

Saturday, November 12

The meeting reconvened at 9:00 am.

13. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A GLOSSARY OF TERMINOLOGY AS USED IN THE UIA ACCORD AND RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES

The Chair noted that this was a suggestion made at the 2004 Kuala Lumpur meeting. The Advisory Group meeting during the UIA Istanbul Congress discussed potential ways of actually undertaking such a project. It was suggested that the Chair contact each of the drafting panel chairs and ask them to review the recommended guidelines their panels developed to identify terms that might be included in such a glossary. This was done between July and October. The lists that were provided varied greatly in character and length. A compendium of all the submissions was reviewed by the Advisory Group. It was the recommendation of the Advisory Group that rather than preparing a separate glossary it would be preferable to have terms meriting definition included with the individual recommended guidelines. He suggested that if this was acceptable to the Commission that it be the manner in which this effort would proceed. Hearing no comments, it was agreed this is the approach to be followed.

14. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF SUGGESTED CHANGES TO THE CONTENTS OF THE EXISTING UIA ACCORD

The Chair noted that a survey form developed in cooperation with the Advisory Committee had been circulated in March 2005 to the UIA Council, the Commission and all UIA member sections inviting them to offer recommendations for revisions to the UIA Accord. In the spirit of viewing the Accord as a living document, it was believed that after six years since its adoption, it was appropriate to revisit the contents. A second circulation of the survey form was made by the UIA Paris Secretariat prior to the UIA Istanbul Congress. The deadline for submissions was September 30, 2005. By this date four submissions had been received. New Zealand responded indicating that the Accord in its present form required no changes. The Netherlands submitted two recommended changes. Mrs. Cox in her capacity with the Education Commission submitted one recommended change.

There was one other set of comments that had been submitted by the Hong Kong Institute of Architects that was submitted in May 2004 following the Commission meeting in Kuala Lumpur. This comment deals with the Preamble to the Accord.

14.1. The Preamble: The Chair noted that this was described in Agenda Attachment 14.1. He noted that this Preamble was prepared by this Commission and that it was approved by the UIA Council. There is no known record of anyone from Hong Kong or UIA Region IV objecting to the Preamble at the Council. It was submitted to the UIA 2002 Berlin General Assembly where it was approved. It was at the Commission's 2004 Kuala Lumpur meeting that the representative of the Hong Kong Institute of Architects first raised a concern regarding the Preamble.

Mr. Peck, the prime author of the Preamble, viewed this as a critical issue for this

Commission. It turns to the very issue of whether this profession views itself as a profession or as a group of qualified people who provide commercial services. We have long held ourselves out to be professionals. A mark of the professional person is that she or he believes that their duty of care to community they serve transcends self interest and the interests of their clients. That is why we proposed that this Preamble be introduced into the UIA Accord. He acknowledged that it is not reflective of how many architects operate today in the global market, i.e. they see themselves as commercial service providers as a business. The notion that they would put the interests of the community ahead of the interests of their client is totally unacceptable to them. The form of the words is perhaps not as important as the basic idea.

Mr. Prinz supports Mr. Peck's statement. He noted further that they indicate that they have concerns advocating the UIA Accord to their members because their own rules are different. He noted that there are many instances where elements of the UIA Accord go far beyond what the current situation in a given UIA member section might be at the present time. In responding to the Hong Kong position we should reiterate that the UIA Accord is an aspirational document proposing the highest of standards. It is up to the individual UIA member sections to do with the UIA Accord what they wish. It is important to remember that we could never produce a UIA Accord that would be consistent with the individual policies and rules of every UIA member section. He recommended retaining the Preamble as it is.

Mr. Wright reminded the Commission that we have to be aspirational in everything we do. We should be looking forward not backward. In a world with increasing deregulation the issue of ethics is becoming more important. As architects we have an obligation to society at large, environment, etc. He would not be prepared to see any fundamental change in the ethical values reflected in the document we already have.

Mr. Verma indicated his support for the views that have been expressed. He recommended considering adding the words "or if effected by the product of his work" to what had been submitted by Hong Kong.

Mr. Wachi expressed his concern with their viewpoint. He is concerned with the possible perception. His concern is with the structure of their proposal change. There should be a more positive manner in which to indicate personal motivation.

Mr. Silcher noted that in reality the first issue for the practicing architect is the project and the client for which we do the project. The architect has a primary duty to their client. As presently formulated, the Preamble could be seen by a client as indicating that he/she never comes first with their architect. As the best case, the client comes second. If the interest of the client and the interest of the public collide too much then the architect may need to give up the project.

Mr. Dubler reported that in France they are trying to revise their code of ethics especially with regard to the environment. The most effective way they have found to date is to have a charter with the client that describes the client's responsibility towards

sustainability, etc.

Mr. Scheeler supports Mr. Peck's position. If we are to see ourselves as professionals then we must look to our professional roots. The title of the UIA Accord reflects this condition. i.e. UIA Accord on Recommended Standards of Professionalism in Architectural Practice.

Mr. Prinz observed that perhaps the language of the second sentence of the existing Preamble could be altered to read "When in conflict this duty prevails of the personal interests and the interests of the client."

Mr. Peck acknowledging the points raised by Mr. Wachi and Mr. Prinz views their comments as being a bit over sensitive. Any change in this wording would have to back to the UIA General Assembly.

Mr. Pritchard suggested that the sentence could read "As professional architects have a primary duty of care to the community they serve and the interests of their client. These duties prevail over their personal interests."

Mr. Aduku indicated that he did not see the need to revise the Preamble at this time. It had been carefully considered by all of the necessary UIA official bodies and approved by all of them.

Mr. Bourdrez reminded the Commission on of what has happened in the United States with regard to another profession, accountants. Some of the largest accounting firms in the country took the interest of the client way ahead of the public's interests. They are now out of business.

Mr. Silcher observed that the current language could also be seen by some readers as indicating that the architect is the person knowing what is best for the community. This is already a conflict between his personal interest and the interest of the public.

Mr. Zerubavel does not see this as being limited only to the client. As architects we must have a responsibility to the community. He supports leaving it as it is.

Mr. Zhuang supported the concept of retaining the public interest.

MOTION: Mr. Scheeler moved that the Commission not accept the recommended change submitted by the Hong Kong Institute of Architects and notify the author of the request that the prevailing opinion of the Commission that the current Preamble properly reflects the professional position of the architectural profession.

Mr. Wright seconded the motion.

There was no further discussion on the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

14.2. - The UIA Accord Policy on Ethics and Conduct

The Chair noted that this was a submission by the Royal Institute of Dutch Architects and recommended that the UIA Policy on Ethics should include a statement regarding how architects should respectfully conduct their relationships with one another.

Mr. Wright noted the standard for respecting your colleagues is already in the UIA Code of Standards, Principle Five, Obligations to Colleagues which is found in our Recommended Guideline. It already adequately deals with their issue. He suggested that if we wished to add this reference in the UIA Accord Policy, it be done in conformance with the language used in the Recommended Guideline.

MOTION: Mr. Peck moved that the recommendation of the Royal Institute of Dutch Architects be accepted and be reflected in a revision to the UIA Accord Policy which conforms to the language found in the existing Recommended Guideline. Mr. Silcher seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously.

14.3. – Procurement

The Chair noted that this was a submission by the Royal Institute of Dutch Architects and deals with the subject of mandatory and recommended fee schedules has having long been forbidden by Dutch law and European Union established policy. They proposed the addition of specific language to the UIA Accord Policy on Procurement.

Mr. Peck observed that their proposed language is reflective of what is happening rather than being an aspirational statement. He has prepared proposed language that would be aspirational rather than just reflecting current practice but would wait for the Commission's discussion as to whether the UIA Accord Policy should be changed or whether it was more properly dealt with in the Recommended Guideline. His proposed language was "1. Fees for architectural service should be negotiated and agreed between architects and their clients. 2. Fee negotiations should take into account the requirement of each particular project in respect to and amongst other things – design research required, experience, qualification and competency of architects and other professionals required. 3. Complexity of the project. 4. Economic and legislative constraints on the project. 5. Project schedule requirements."

Mr. Silcher noted that in Germany by law they have a mandatory fee scale for architectural services.

Mr. Wright suggested that we might consider not referring to the method of payment at all in the existing UIA Accord Policy. In the first paragraph under "Background" we could remove the last sentence and it would not affect the document at all. He sees it as primarily as a detail that could be dealt with under the Recommended Guidelines.

Mr. Verma noted that the Recommended Guideline represents another existing document that we have incorporated as a Recommended Guideline. This document already contains reference to the Dutch proposal.

Mr. Prinz supports Mr. Wright's proposal regarding the potential change in the "Background Statement". He sees a relationship between this proposal we are considering and the work being initiated with regard to the architect-client model agreement. If we were to change the "Background Statement" we would be removing the only reference in the UIA Accord to fees which is a very fundamental issue for any architect. He suggested that perhaps we should consider the development of a separate policy on the subject of fees for the UIA Accord.

Mr. Wright agreed with Mr. Prinz's suggestion. He noted that the Code of Ethics document does include some references to the subject of fees. There is an ethical issue related to fees. The client should be expected to provide appropriate resources to the architect to carry out the project properly. There are ranges of ways in which architects can develop their fees. It would be useful for the UIA to have a guidance document on how you properly resource a project. It would be a very useful document. He noted that some UIA member sections have such resource documents to assist their members, i.e. the AIA and the RIBA. The subject has been discussed with the regulatory representatives within the European Union.

Mr. Wachi indicated his view that the subject of architectural fees does not belong in the Accord. It is appropriate for a guideline.

Mr. Peck noted that under the existing UIA Accord Policy on Procurement, we do not have a Recommended Guideline to deal with the whole issue of procurement. We do refer to two existing guidelines - the UIA Design Competition Guidelines and the Quality Based Selection document. He suggested developing a recommended guideline for the UIA Accord Policy on Procurement in which we can reference all of these issues.

Mr. Prinz agreed with Mr. Peck's suggestion. He noted that in Europe the procurement of architectural services is usually in the context of public procurement. Such a new guideline for the UIA would necessarily have to include a broader definition of procurement. Following the development of such a guideline, it may be necessary to revisit the existing UIA Accord Policy on Procurement.

Mr. Wright observed that this would be very helpful for architects when negotiating a fee with a client. In the United Kingdom they have a statutory code under the Architects Act says that the client has to provide adequate resources. The Construction Sites Directive which is a health and safety law throughout Europe says exactly the same thing, i.e. that the client has to provide adequate resources. Having these legal references makes it easier for architects negotiating fees with their clients. It is important in avoiding later litigation due to a lack of resources. Thus a UIA recommended guideline would be helpful document for the architects of the world.

Mr. Sagne noted that within the member states of the European Union there is a recurrent view that the consumer is able to assess the adequacy of the resources. In the case of architects we need to put the case convincingly towards any interlocker that this has been thoroughly reviewed and this guideline for this view would be seen by ACE as a very helpful step. We have to find a way to draw a line between the notion of the client and the notion of the end user. Architectural services in that respect are so different that any other business professional services.

Mr. Prinz referenced the wording of the existing procurement policy and believes it is very appropriate to develop such a guideline within the framework of the existing language.

The Chair stated that he was hearing a sense of the meeting that the recommendation of The Royal Institute of Dutch Architects with regard to fees is acknowledged and accepted and will be dealt with by the development of new recommended guideline under the existing procurement policy. Based on the Commission's discussion, the guideline will be broader than just this specific recommendation.

Mr. Silcher volunteered to serve as the Chair of this new drafting panel.

The Chair accepted his offer. Mr. Wright and Mr. Peck expressed their willingness to serve on this drafting panel.

The Chair noted that The American Institute of Architects is legally very sensitive to the subject of developing and applying any form of recommended fee schedules. In the development of this guideline the AIA will need to pay particular attention to the inclusion of any recommendations to the development and application of mandatory fee schedules.

Mr. Peck observed that in Australia the Australia Consumer and Competition Commission considered the RAI A document relating to architectural competitions, fees schedules, conditions of engagement, etc., and has determined to prohibit the continued the future production of the fee guide. They also prohibit the RAI A producing information for the use of architects on how to calculate fees. This is all done in the public interest in precluding any conditions for price fixing.

Mr. Sagne volunteered that the ACE would be interested in participating in the drafting of this guideline.

The Chair looks forward to the Drafting Panel coming to the next meeting with a first working draft of this new recommended guideline on the UIA Accord Policy on Procurement.

Survey Response by the RIBA

Presentation:

Mr. Pritchard noted that the RIBA had some comments that were not submitted by the September 30th deadline. They relate to the UIA Accord Policy on Continuing Professional Development. Much of the discussion on CPD relates to maintaining competence and this term is not found in the current UIA Accord Policy.

Discussion:

The Chair suggested that since the Commission members did not have these in writing it would be best if they were considered at the next meeting. Since any changes in the UIA Accord have to await the next UIA General Assembly in 2008, we have adequate time to adjust them.

14.4. Survey Response by Louise Cox, UIA First Vice President.

Presentation:

Mrs. Cox stated this recommendation is founded on the need to coordinate all of the existing UIA documents represented by the UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education, the Education Policy Paper and the UNESCO-UIA Validation System. These have all been approved by the UIA Council and UIA General Assemblies since the adoption of the UIA Accord in 1999. She recommended that the UIA Accord be revised to include the additional language that defines an architect. These are represented by five additional points describing what professional capabilities should be represented in defining an architect under the headings of design, knowledge and skills. She is also proposing to amend the existing Background Statement be revised to reflect that changes approved by the UIA General Assembly in Istanbul in July 2005.

MOTION: Mr. Scheeler moved the approval of this recommendation. Mr. Wright seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

The Chair noted that these represent the responses that were received from the March 2005 survey process. As was agreed in the 2004 Kuala Lumpur meeting we would first revisit the UIA Accord with the UIA member sections and then we would move on to do the same thing with the recommended guidelines. He will proceed to revise the questionnaire within the next year and send it to all of the UIA member sections for their consideration. All of the recommended guidelines are available on the web site for reference.

Discussion:

Mr. Wright noted that within Europe there has been an effort underway to develop a code of ethics. This new code is a child of the UIA Accord Policy on Codes of Ethics. It will be appropriate for this Commission to revisit the UIA document in light of this more recent European experience.

The Chair noted that this was the kind of incremental use and application of the UIA Accord that needs to be better shared with all of the UIA member sections. It represents a good example of a case study.

15. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED NEW SUBJECTS TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE COMMISSION

Presentation:

The Chair noted that in the circulation of the Meeting Announcement and Meeting Registration Form, there is an opportunity for members to suggest other subjects they believe to be worthy of the Commission's attention. There were two sets of responses for this meeting which are documented on Attachment 15.1. The first set is from Vassilis Sgoutas, the UIA Past-President and the second set from Louise Cox, UIA First Vice President.

Discussion:

15.1. From Mr. Sgoutas:

1. International Architectural Competitions with three sub-headings. It was the consensus of the Commission's Advisory Group that these really deal with the UIA Competitions Commission and were not the purview or responsibility of this Commission.

Mr. Peck while acknowledging that the description of the Advisory Group's suggestion was correct, upon reflection he sees these as addressing practice issues once an architectural competition has been decided.

Mr. Wright indicated that he did not agree with Mr. Peck. He views these as very technical issues that relate to subjects that should be covered as part of the UIA rules for architectural competitions and thus should be addressed by the Commission on Architectural Competitions.

Mr. Peck acknowledged Mr. Wright's view and agreed that they should be referred to that Commission.

The Chair hearing no other comments indicated that he would refer these to the Commission on Architectural Competitions and copy Mr. Sgoutas.

2. Accountability and Liability

Mr. Prinz recommended that it should be included within the responsibility of the Drafting Panel on the Model Architect-Client Agreement. The Commission concurred.

3. Collaboration with a Architect in A Host Nation.

The Chair noted that this was also included in the subjects suggested by Mrs. Cox.

Mr. Prinz stated that it could eventually be incorporated within the work of the Drafting Panel on the Model Architect-Client Agreement but he saw it has having to be addressed following the basic work on the first model document.

4. Interior Architects versus Interior Designers.

The Chair observed that this has been an ongoing issue within the United States, especially as legislation is proposed at the state level to give legal professional recognition to interior designers as a licensed profession.

Mr. Prinz stated that a similar situation exists in Germany. He sees the UIA as representing only architects and not other related professions.

Mr. Silcher understands the point as making a clear distinction between interior architects and interior designers.

Mr. Peck referenced the UIA Accord Policy on the Practice Architecture, Definition and observed that it makes no reference to interior architecture. He interprets his suggestion as indicating that the UIA Accord Policy clearly recognizes that architects provide interior architectural services.

Mr. Wright observed that architects are every kind of designers and as such many design everything from furniture, spoons, interiors, exteriors, etc. It is his view that architects are about design and that is what we should be saying.

Mr. Peck agreed with Mr. Wright's comments and suggested the language should be reviewed to make sure we are addressing the key point of architects being seen as designers.

Mr. Verma stated that we should not have a definition or category of architects called interior architects.

Mr. Silcher noted that in Germany there are four categories of architects within the Chambers and they have separate registers and licenses - architects, interior architect, landscape architects and city planners. It may be necessary to review the UIA Statutes in this matter.

Mr. Sagne reported that the ACE has a number of contacts with sister organizations at the European level, including interior design architects. It has become very clear that this category is striving to get more recognized as a profession. Thus he sees the issue as perhaps being presented in this context.

The Chair indicated that he was hearing that the Commission agreed that this was an area

of concern as it relates to the both the UIA Accord Policy on the Definition of an Architect and as an issue of concern to UIA member sections in countries where interior designers are seeking to become legal recognized as a licensed profession. It should be given further consideration by the Commission.

15.2 From Mrs. Cox:

She noted that the UIA President, Gaetan Siew had asked her to present these two issues.

1. Practice in A Host Nation

Mrs. Cox reported that this is a continuing problem in Africa because many foreign architects are not entering into meaningful agreements with local architects. Many African architects see this as a growing problem and are looking to their governments to do more to address the problem.

Discussion:

The Chair responded indicating that this Commission has produced since 1994 a basic set of documents that address this issue in its largest context and that they have all been approved by the UIA Council and the UIA General Assembly. Thus the UIA member sections, regional architectural organizations and architects have a resource base to help them address this situation. He sees it as the primary responsibility of UIA member sections and their regional organizations to utilize these documents in working with their governments to take corrective steps to address the matter. He does not see it as the charge of this Commission to directly engage in such national situations.

Mr. Wright agreed with the Chair's comments. Further he referenced the specific language in the UIA Code of Ethics that addresses the responsibilities of architects working in another country. The UIA has dealt with the concern in both the UIA Code of Ethics and in the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines. It is therefore the responsibility of the UIA member sections to recognize and adopt these UIA documents and deal with it in their own context.

Mrs. Cox questioned how many UIA member sections have adopted or given recognition to the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines. She questioned how effective the UIA has been in promoting the application of these resources by UIA member sections.

Mr. Peck recalled that the Advisory Committee had a discussion of having every UIA member section go through a formal process of adopting within their own policies the documents produced by this Commission. This would focus the attention of the UIA member sections on what we are aiming to achieve and puts them in a position of their then being able to policy their own policies.

Mr. Scheeler's understanding of Mr. Siew's concern is that it is not a fault of the documents that exist but rather it is the fault of the lack of use in his region. He sees

nothing in the UIA Accord or Recommended Guidelines that is out of line to address this situation. If the UIA member section adopted the UIA Accord and Recommended Guideline they would have an internationally recognized source to deal with the problem.

Mr. Silcher indicated that the UIA has to recognize its legal authority to attempt to enforce its rules and aspirations. The UIA can be of assistance to a member section wishing to more effectively apply the body of existing documents.

The Chair further noted that following the adoption of the UIA Accord by the UIA General Assembly in Beijing, China in 1999 that the Commission had proceeded to prepare and recommend to the UIA Council a document recommending how to use it. That was then further supplemented by a resolution from this Commission addressed to the UIA Council in 2003 recommending the creation of a Public Relations Committee within the UIA which could advance the use of the UIA Accord. Under the leadership of Esa Mohammed of Malaysia this Commission prepared a recommendation to the UIA Council on how the UIA could be used within their own country.

Mr. Wright recalled that yesterday we recommended that a question be added to the next update on the international practice standards survey that how many UIA member sections had adopted the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines. We could then see how successful we have been in securing commitments from individual UIA member sections. This information could then provide a further strategy to advance the use of the UIA Accord.

Mr. Silcher expressed a question as to what is meant by “adoption”. He questioned what practical actions UIA member sections would be prepared to enforce, i.e. the withdrawal of a professional license from a member who was working at variance with the provisions of the UIA Accord.

Mrs. Siola recalled that this has been discussed by the Commission in previous meetings. She noted that as official representatives of the UIA member sections participating in a UIA General Assembly, they had officially voted to approve the UIA Accord and as officially designated delegates of their UIA member section had adopted the UIA Accord.

Mr. Verma noted that this subject of implementation is of importance to many UIA member sections. He agrees that the responsibility for applying the UIA Accord within any UIA member section rests with that member section.

Mr. Peck acknowledged Mrs. Siola’s view but indicated that UIA member sections are sovereign bodies and the only way that you bind them is to have their own jurisdiction adopt the UIA Accord. He then made a motion as follows: “That the UIA write to all member sections requesting: a) that they formally adopt as policy a recognition of the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines and b) since these are living documents that they regularly advise the Commission of their recommendations for modifications from time to time.”

Mr. Prinz suggested that the resolution be amended to indicate that the UIA member sections look for means to make their practicing architects use the UIA Accord. He believes based on the experience in Germany, that the UIA member section speak directly to their members who are actively engaged in international practice about their use and application of the UIA Accord.

Mr. Peck responded that by attempting to have UIA member sections do both things, the UIA would likely encounter greater resistance. He thinks it is important for the member section to first adopt the UIA Accord as policy and then follow-up by informing their members as to how they might individually go about implementing them. He views it as a two-stage process.

Mr. Scheeler suggested that since the Commission that originated these documents we first need an inventory of the UIA member sections as to how much on an issue by issue basis their own policies align with the policies of the UIA. He would be much more comfortable with this approach of going first to each UIA member section to determine whether their internal policies align with the policies set forth in the UIA Accord. It is as important for us to know whether they do as to whether they don't. For example, the AIA could not adopt every policy in the UIA Accord because it is not in accordance with our national laws. He would wish to further amend the motion to indicate that the communication to the UIA member sections be on the individual 13 UIA Accord policies and not on the entire UIA Accord.

Mr. Peck does not fully agree with Mr. Scheeler's suggestion because he would like to see the UIA being more proactive in advancing the UIA Accord. He believes it will take a long time to get the kind of responses that Mr. Scheeler is suggesting. Under his proposed approach UIA member sections can be asked to adopt the UIA Accord policies and if they cannot they can be invited to inform the UIA as to the reasons they cannot.

Mrs. Siola suggested that this process can take place through the ongoing practice survey.

Mr. Dubler noted an example of a member of the French Order of Architects being brought before their disciplinary board for a matter that took place in another country and the bodies' final decision was that the member could not be judged for a matter that took place outside of France.

The Chair requested a second to Mr. Peck's motion.

Mr. Scheeler proposed an amendment to Mr. Peck's motion that if we go out to the UIA member sections with that scale of an approach, we have 13 policies in the UIA Accord and the response has to be on basis of the 13 policies and not the whole UIA Accord.

Mr. Peck as the mover of the motion accepted the spirit of Mr. Scheeler's amendment. He restated his motion.

MOTION: “The UIA write to member sections requesting that: a) they formally adopt each of the policies of the UIA Accord and each of the Recommended Guideline documents; and b) since these documents are living documents that the member sections regularly review and advise this Commission of their recommendations for modification.”

The Chair requested a second to the revised motion by Mr. Peck. It was seconded by Mr. Silcher.

Mr. Farrando recalled that the UIA was already requested some time ago to undertake the effort represented in this motion. He suggested that this needs to be confirmed before proceeding. The second part is already being addressed by what this Commission has just done at this meeting in reviewing proposals for revisions to the UIA Accord. He views Mr. Scheeler’s suggestion as a substantial one for systematically proceeding. He further noted that in so far as the international survey results, there are already clues as to what individual UIA member sections are doing with the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines. Based on his experience with the practice survey, he has doubts as to how many responses might be provided by UIA member sections.

Mr. Prinz noted that only the UIA Accord was formally adopted by the UIA General Assembly. The Recommended Guidelines are adopted by the UIA Council. He believes there may be confusion in then going to the UIA member sections to ask them to formally adopt the Recommended Guidelines when they have not been adopted by the UIA General Assembly.

Mr. Wright noted that at the time of the UIA General Assembly in Beijing, the UIA Accord as presented to the Assembly included three Recommended Guideline documents. The process was changed and the UIA Council acted on the Recommended Guidelines.

Mr. Peck agreed with Mr. Farrando’s comments concerning what communications have previously taken place with the UIA member sections. However, he sees it as being important to still follow-up with each member section. It is his view that no matter whether the Recommended Guidelines are adopted within the UIA by the Council or the General Assembly, it is still important for UIA member sections to take recognition of them in order to give some standing within their country.

Mr. Sagne reported the Architects’ Council of Europe has formally put forward to their members that they adopt the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines. Indeed ACE itself has adopted several elements of the UIA Accord. He sees this as an example of where a regional organization has the capacity to check whether their members accept the policies of the UIA.

Mr. Ahmed observed that the spirit of the UIA Accord is already in place from the UIA adoption in 1999. He sees it more of a matter of encouraging UIA member sections to use those elements of the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines to improve and

enhance professional practice within their country. He sees it as important the UIA member sections in the more highly developed parts of the world, use the UIA Accord to educate their members so that when they go to work in less developed parts of the world they adhere to and apply the policies of the UIA Accord.

Mr. Scheeler acknowledges Mr. Peck's impatience however he recalled that we have always spoken about the UIA Accord as both inspirational and advisory. The UIA has absolutely no regulatory authority. He believes that we are making progress. The UIA member sections who stand in most need of these documents could mis-understand a push like that being proposed as being somewhat heavy handed.

Mr. Prinz recalled: a) that the German UIA member section adopted the UIA Accord; b) as a member of ACE they also participated in its adoption by that regional organization; c) they have it posted on their web site; and d) they inform members through their newsletter that it exists. The only thing they have not yet done is to send it to any member working internationally and recommend that they adhere to it. They will be doing this in the future.

Mr. Peck expressed his view that as representatives of UIA member sections serving on this Commission, we should have the authority to bind our organizations. Based on this discussion he sees the Commission members rather as nominees. He sees this as having the objective of giving some effect to the work that we are doing.

The Chair stated his disagreement with Mr. Peck second point. It is his view that we are only a recommending authority. We develop documents which we then recommend to either the UIA Council and/or the UIA General Assembly.

The Chair called the question and requested a show of hands. There were nine votes in favor. There were seven votes opposed. There were eight abstentions. The motion carried.

2. Legal Recognition of the Profession

Mrs. Cox suggested that this Commission might be able to give some direction regarding as to how to get national governments to give legal recognition to architects in their jurisdiction.

The Chair responded indicated again that the Commission has produced documents to enable UIA member sections to do as they wish to advance the practice of architecture within their own country. This Commission does have the capability of a legal advisory team that is available on a world wide basis to directly assist member sections in their individual use and application of the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines. Further he suggested that if the UIA President believes this be an issue of over-riding significance that it might be appropriately addressed at a forum held in conjunction with a UIA Council meeting or placed on the program for the next UIA Congress.

15.3 New Subjects to be Addressed by the Commission: Suggestions by the UIA Secretary General

1. Designation of a Commission Representative to the UIA Joint Oversight Committee on the UIA Continuing Professional Development.

The Chair noted that this committee is to include one representative from each of the UIA five regions and they have not yet been identified. It will also have a representative from the UIA Education Commission. He indicated his preference to have Commission members who represent a UIA member section having some experience in the operation of a national CBD program express their interest in serving in this capacity. A slate from this Commission would then be forwarded to the UIA Secretary General to select one representative from that group who does not duplicate the service of another UIA member section represented on the committee. It is not appropriate for The American Institute of Architects to be considered for this representative role since it will already be represented on the committee as the program operator. Recognizing that these were his personal suggestions, he invited the Commission to make any other suggested alternatives.

Mr. Farrando indicated that it would be the responsibility of the UIA Council to make a selection from any slate of nominees presented by this Commission. In order for the UIA Council do this at their next meeting, the slate of nominees needs to be made by November 25. Not all of the UIA regions have submitted their candidates as of this time.

The Chair noted that since this Commission has no budget to support it, the representative would have to be prepared to support themselves or secure the support of their UIA member section. He inquired if there was anyone present who was interested in serving in this role. There were no such indications from those present.

Mrs. Cox noted that she would be representing Region 3 on the Commission. She urged the Commission to make a decision on this matter at this meeting.

The Chair asked those UIA member sections present to indicate which had established CPD programs. It was indicated that the USA, Germany, United Kingdom, Malaysia and France had such programs. He would follow-up with these individuals to determine if once they consulted with their member section if it might be possible for them to represent the Commission.

Mr. Wright questioned whether it would be possible for Mrs. Cox to also represent this Commission.

Mr. Farrando responded indicating that he did believe this was appropriate. It was important that this committee represent a diverse number of UIA member sections.

Mr. Scheeler noted that at some time in the future, since this Committee will be a function of the operating system, it may be that revenue from the system may be able to

support the work of the committee.

2. A Panel Within the UIA Professional Practice Commission to Assist UIA Member Sections in Developing a Continuing Professional Development Program

The Chair noted that he had been invited to represent the Commission at a special forum convened in Istanbul, Turkey in June 2004 by the Turkish Chamber of Architects to consider their establishment of a CPD program. This forum was held in conjunction with the UIA Council meeting. Since The American Institute of Architects had been invited by the UIA Secretary-General to make a presentation to the UIA Council on their CPD program, several AIA staff members were also available to participate in this forum. He could participate in the forum as: a) the Co-Director of the Commission and speak to what the Commission had done in regard to CPD; and b) as an AIA member who had to meet the annual AIA CPD requirements. However, when it came to providing both descriptions of and answering questions related to all of the policy, programmatic, financial and technical aspects of the AIA's program, it was necessary to have the AIA experience staff at hand.

By the time of the 2005 UIA Congress and General Assembly, the Turkish Chamber had established their own CPD program and expressed their gratitude to the Commission.

Based on this experience, he questioned whether any Commission representative had the requisite experience to serve as an advisor representing this Commission to a UIA member section.

He questioned how the work of such a panel would be supported, i.e. would the UIA member section requesting the service bear all of the expense?

Mr. Prinz noted that this suggestion was brought forth by him at the Paris UIA Roundtable on CPD. Based on the discussion at this roundtable he suggested that it might be useful for this Commission to develop further recommended guidelines to on the UIA Accord Policy on Continuing Professional Development to assist member sections who have no CPD program.

The Chair with this description by Mr. Prinz, acknowledged that he then perhaps had a misunderstanding of what was the basic intent of such a proposed panel. He now understood that the suggestion was for the Commission to have a drafting panel revisit the existing Recommended Guidelines on Continuing Professional Development in order that it might be expanded.

Mr. Farrando also suggested that such a drafting panel could serve as a resource person to the Commission's representative on the Joint Oversight Committee.

Mr. Prinz made the observation based on his experience that the standards employed by each UIA member section having an established CPD program are very different. He suggests that this Commission could play an important role through an expanded

recommended guideline to help UIA member sections establish a more harmonized national foundation to support the proposed UIA international system.

3. Resolution 13 from the UIA General Assembly

The Chair noted that it has been referred to this Commission to place it in the context of UIA policy documents.

Mr. Scheeler noted that the Commission has agreed to now proceed to revisit the Recommended Guidelines. It would be his suggestion that the issue of inserting this into the Recommended Guideline on Ethics be assigned to that panel.

Mr. Wright while being sensitive to the Nordic Section's position reflected in this resolution he takes issue with the potential result of such a UIA policy resulting in the sterilization of a site, city or country where international criminal acts have taken place. If this Commission is to consider this UIA policy in the context of the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines then he suggests that it may need to be considered in other contexts.

Mr. Scheeler noted that it already exists as UIA policy by virtue of the action of the UIA General Assembly in Istanbul and that the Commission would be acting in a responsible manner to consider it as it reviews the existing UIA Accord and Recommended Guideline on Ethics.

The Chair summarized the discussion by indicating that Resolution 13 will be referred to the drafting panel created to revisit the Commission's existing policy and recommended guidelines related to ethics.

4. Communications from this Commission and A Commission Newsletter

The Chair noted that there had been a Commission newsletter but it later was replaced by the preparation of a summary report of each Commission meeting that was shared with the UIA Council, Commission members who were not present at the meeting and all UIA member sections. The meeting participants receive the complete meeting minutes which are also placed on the website. He personally does not see the need to prepare another newsletter but rather to see expanded coverage of the work of the Commission in the UIA Newsletter.

Mr. Bourdrez asked that the members attending the meeting also receive the summary report of each meeting.

Mr. Farrando indicated his view of the importance of such Commission summaries not only in terms of the format but also how it is used to reach related constituencies beyond the UIA members. He believes that the UIA has to be more external in communicating what it is doing. The active participants in this Commission know far better than the UIA Secretariat who many of these relevant audiences. The UIA needs to develop and

maintain a data base of these external institutions and then use it to make known what we are doing.

15.4. World Trade Organization, Council on Services, Working Party on Domestic Regulation

The Chair noted that prior to this meeting he had communicated with Dale Honeck in Geneva, Switzerland requesting an update on what the status of issues related to domestic regulation. He responded with a summary update and copies of several relevant documents. The most interesting being a proposal advanced by the Australian WTO delegation in September 2005 related to the Regulation of Engineering Services. In reviewing this document he saw it as a prototype document for the Regulation of Architectural Services. It was shared with the Advisory Group and they recommended that as a Commission we take that model paper and edit/revise to represent a document on the Regulation of Architectural Services that reflects to the UIA Accord and relevant Recommended Guidelines. With the concurrence of the Commission on such a document and the approval of the UIA Council, it would then be proposed to enlist individual UIA member sections who are WTO members to officially submit it to the WTO Working Party on Domestic Regulation.

Mr. Sagne observed that to his knowledge the WTO Working Party on Domestic Regulation would be attempting to develop both a horizontal treatment of all domestic regulation of services while also addressing individual sectors.

Mr. Wright stated that he believes this is an essential effort by the Commission. He suggested that the Architects' Council of Europe can also have a very significant role in this because it can deliver through the 113 Committee twenty-five nations.

15.5. Costa Rica Conflict Resolution Example

Mrs. Mora brought this example to the attention of the Commission in order that it might initially be considered in the context of the Commission's new work on contract documents. In their experience it is an example of a model working system to deal with alternative conflict resolution between architects and their clients. It has been in place for five years. The Center handles about 150 cases each year involving both architects and engineers. The document provided to the Commission is an English translation of the brochure they use in Costa Rica to explain the purpose and work of the Center. They have a national law that gives authority to this Center. It is named the "Alternative Conflict Resolution and Social Peace Promotion Law". She cited language from the law that relate to the work of architects. Their College of Architects founded this Center based on that law. It is accredited before the Ministry of Justice. She provided copies of the law to Mr. Prinz. She is requesting that the proposed client-architect agreement include a clause that references the alternative conflict resolution procedure and process.

Mr. Zerubavel inquired as to whether the Center operates with its own staff or whether it uses outside experts.

Mrs. Mora stated that the Center operates with five operating teams and is looking to creating five more.

Mr. Wachi inquired as to what the advantage was compared to the arbitration process.

Mrs. Mora responded that it was to be found in time and cost. Their experience has shown that most of the issues are solved in two or three sessions.

Mr. Peck noted that they have a similar system in Australia.

Mr. Sauveur noted that they have a similar system in Belgium which has established a very good record.

16. PROPOSAL FOR THE PUBLICATION OF THE UIA ACCORD AND RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES

The Chair referenced Attachment 16.1, a draft proposal for this effort. The only published form of the UIA Accord is that prepared by the UIA Secretariat in both English and French. It is nearing the point of being out of print. This proposal was reviewed in the Advisory Group meeting. Mr. Farrando made clear that there is no funding in the current UIA budget to support such a publishing project. The draft references the potential of seeking corporate support. It was the unanimous view of the Advisory Group that this was not a proper course of action for such a UIA official document. However, it was considered potentially appropriate for a UIA member section to seek outside foundation grant support to the UIA for such a publication project.

Mr. Wright noted the analogy to the Architects' Council of Europe effort with regard to their "White Book". There was a levy for members who wished to use the book to cover the cost of the publication. Member had to pay for any additional copies beyond the basic number they were provided. There is a need for the UIA to have available for public marketing use a set of creditable appearing professional documents.

The Chair indicated that he would edit the proposal to reflect this discussion.

17. SUMMATION OF THE COMMISSION'S WORK PROGRAM

The Chair summarized the meeting as follows:

The Commission will continue to support the continued development and refinement of the COAC data base.

The Drafting Panel on the Architect-Client Agreement has produced a well developed first presentation. The Drafting Panel chair is seeking additional volunteers.

The Drafting Panel for a Model Mutual Recognition Agreement has produced a well developed first presentation.

The Drafting Panel on Internship Experience now has a Drafting Panel Chair represented by Mr. Peck.

The Drafting Panel on National Resource Bases represented a case study on the German experience. It was suggested that this form a UIA member section presentation be continued at the subsequent Commission meetings.

The Drafting Panel on the Glossary Project will no longer exist in view of the decision reached to include glossaries with each of the future revised Recommended Guidelines.

We reviewed and reached closure on each of the recommendations received for revisions to the existing UIA Accord.

Mr. Silcher volunteered to chair a new drafting panel related to the subject of the development of architectural fees.

We addressed the proposed new subjects for the consideration of the Commission. The two priorities are the WTO paper on architectural services and the designation by this Commission of a representative to the UIA Joint Oversight Committee on Continuing Professional Development.

18. 2006 AND 2007 COMMISSION MEETING SITES

The Chair reported that two member sections extended invitations for these two annual meetings. Australia has indicated its willingness to host the meeting in early November 2006 in Melbourne, Australia. Korea has indicated its willingness to host the 2007 meeting.

The Commission accepted both of these kind offers.

19. RECOGNITION OF THE SERVICE OF XU ANZHI AS THE COMMISSION CO-DIRECTOR

The Chair paid recognition to his service as the Co-Director representing the Architectural Society of China.

Mr. Zhuang as the new Co-Director representing the ASC stated his pleasure at assuming this role. He indicated his appreciation of the high caliber of the work of the Commission and the many significant contributions by individual members. He thanked Prof. Xu for his personal encouragement and support. He looks forward to continuing the spirit and traditions of this important UIA Commission.

20. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

The Chair recognized and thanked Ellen Delage, Assoc. AIA, Director, International Relations, The American Institute of Architects for all of her support in the conduct of this meeting.

21. ADJOURNMENT

The Chair thanked the members for coming to Washington and participating in the meeting. He adjourned the meeting at 2 pm.

22. APPENDICES

Appendix 1: List of Meeting Participants

Appendix 2: Summary of PPC Accomplishments during UIA Triennium

Appendix 3: Report on the UNESCO-UIA Charter on Architectural Education and the UNESCO-UIA Validation System

Appendix 4: Report on the Invitational Accreditation/Validation Roundtable Conference

Appendix 5: Report of the Drafting Panel for the study of different contractual systems utilized by architects in UIA member sections

Appendix 6: Report of the Drafting Panel for the study of recommended standardized forms of mutual recognition agreements

Appendix 7: Report of the Drafting Panel for the study of increasing the portability and recognition of required professional internship experience

Appendix 8: Report of the Drafting Panel for the study of resource bases within UIA member sections for members interested in working internationally