MINUTES

2007 Annual Meeting of the Professional Practice Commission, International Union of Architects

Meeting Dates: October 3-5, 2007

Meeting Host: The Korean Institute of Registered Architects

Meeting Location: KIRA Headquarters
1321-6 Seocho-2dibg, Seocho-gu
Seoul, Korea

CONTENTS **PAGE**

1. Call to Order, Welcome and Introduction of Participants. 2
2. Adoption of the Minutes of the November 4-5, 2006 meeting, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia 2
3. Adoption of the Provisional Agenda. 3
4. Report of the Professional Practice Commission Secretariat. 4
5. Report on the UIA Col-legi d'Arquitectes de Catalunya (COAC) Standard Format for Reporting the Practice Standards of Each UIA Member Section. 6
6. Report UIA Education Commission and the UNESCO-UIA Validation Council. 6
7. Report on the May 2007 Invitational Accreditation/Validation Roundtable Conference, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. 7
8. Report on the June 2007 Meeting of the UIA Joint Oversight Committee on Continuing Professional Development, Paris, France. 10
9. Report of the Drafting Panel for Study of a Recommendation on Architect-Client Agreements. 14
10. Report of the Drafting Panel for the Study of Increasing the Portability and Recognition of Required Professional Internship Experience. 18
11. Report of the Drafting Panel for the Study of a Guideline for the Development of Architect Fees. 19
12. Report of the Drafting Panel on Revisiting the Existing Recommended Guideline on Procurement. 20
13. Report of the Drafting Panel on Revisiting the Existing Recommended Guideline on Scope of Practice. 21
14. Report on Integrated Practice. 24
15. Report of the Drafting Panel on Revisiting the Existing Recommended Guideline on the Roles of Professional Bodies 26
16. Report of the Drafting Panel on Revisiting the Existing Recommended Guideline on Codes and Ethics 28

17. Proposal by the UIA President for a "UIA Charter for a Fair Practice of Architecture. 29
18. Report and follow-up actions with the World Trade Organization on the UIA Council endorsed "Draft Disciplines on Domestic Regulation in the Architectural Sector. 35
19. Proposed Commission Work Program for the UIA Triennium, 2008-2011. 36
20. Establishment of an Editorial Panel. 39
21. Communication to UIA Member Sections on the endorsement and promotion of the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines. 40
22. Status of the ASEAN Mutual Recognition Agreement on Architecture. 41
23. Off Shoring and Outsourcing 42
24. Proposed Commission Program Submission for the 2008 UIA General Assembly. 43
25. Summation of the status of the Commission's Work Program. 44
26. 2008 Annual Meeting, Morocco. 46
27. Open Forum. 46
28. Appreciation to meeting host. 46
39. Adjournment. 47
30. Appendices. 47

Thursday, October 4

1. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

Prof. Zhuang, serving as the Chair, opened the meeting at 9:00 am. On behalf of the Commission he thanked the Korean Institute of Registered Architects for the hospitality extended to the Commission at the Wednesday evening reception and dinner.

Mr. Yi welcomed the Commission members on behalf of the KIRA.

The Chair briefly reviewed the recent work of the Commission and its accomplishments. Each of the participants was then invited introduced themselves. The List of Participants is included with these Minutes as Appendix 1.

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 4-5, 2006 MEETING

The Minutes of the November 4-5, 2006 annual meeting of the Professional Practice Commission were distributed via e-mail in January 2007 to all attendees at the Melbourne, Victoria, Australia meeting. An Executive Summary of the meeting was prepared and e-mailed to the Commission members not present and the UIA Council. The Minutes were posted on the PPC's web site at www.aia.org/about_uia.

Mr. Peck requested one correction in the Minutes. The Drafting Panel for the Portability of Internship secured the referenced survey data from the existing COAC Practice Standards Survey and not from a survey conducted on their own.

MOTION: ***Mr. Peck moved the adoption of Minutes with this one correction. Mr. Scheeler seconded the motion. The motion was adopted by acclamation.***

The approved Minutes of the 2006 Annual Meting are included with these Minutes as Appendix 2.

3. ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

The Chair noted that the provisional agenda had been circulated with the July meeting announcement. There were no additional agenda items suggested to the Co-Director and Secretary.

Mr. Peck requested that three additional subjects be added to the Agenda: a) the establishment of an Editorial Panel for the Professional Practice Commission; b) a discussion of the recent ASIAN Mutual Recognition Agreement on Architecture; and c) UIA member sections reporting on the formal adoption of the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines within their own member sections.

Mr. Verma requested that the subject of off-shoring and outsourcing be added to the agenda as a follow-up to the initial references at the 2006 Annual Meeting.

MOTION***: Hearing no further requested revisions to the agenda, the Chair stated that the agenda would be accepted as amended.***

4. REPORT OF THE PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE COMMISSION SECRETARIAT

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

Presentation: Mr., Keune utilized a power-point presentation summarizing the work of the Commission Secretariat since the 2006 annual meeting. This presentation is included with these Minutes as Appendix 3.

The key points in this presentation included: a) publication of the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines in both English and French editions;) b) preparation, distribution and posting of the 2006 Annual Meeting Minutes and Appendices; c) representation of the Commission at the February 2006 UIA Council meeting in Turin , Italy and the adoption by the UIA Council of the Commission's Model Mutual Recognition Agreement; d) promotion of the 2006-2007 Drafting Panels and announcement of the available publications in the UIA Newsletter; e) maintenance of the entries on the Commission's website; f) planning with KIRA for the 2007 Annual Meeting; and g) conclusion of his service as the Commission's Co-Director and Secretary at the time of the UIA Congress and General Assembly in July 2008.

Discussion:

Mr. Farrando noted that the French national section of the UIA collaborated in the preparation of the French edition of the UIA Accord.

Mr. Yi expressed appreciation to the AIA for supporting the publication of these two editions of the UIA Accord.

Mr. Peck expressed the appreciation of the Commission for the contributions Mr. Keune has made to the operation and work of the Commission over the past several years.

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

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

Presentation: Mr. Farrando utilized a power point presentation which is included with these Minutes as Appendix 4. His report emphasized the following points: a) the second published edition of the survey is ready for printing pending the available of funds to pay for it; b) updating the website; and c) launching survey work on the 2008 update.

The first published edition appeared in 2003. The second edition is ready for printing in both Catalan and English editions. The funds are not presently available to pay for printing.

The research engine to access and use the data has continued to be refined. The website has also been refined to make it easier to use. Additional information has been added to the site to make it more useful for any architect conducting an international practice. He demonstrated how the website can be used to access the information by the use of global maps and color-coding to indicate the status of national information.

They are now tracking the number of hits on the website and for 2007 it has averaged about 100,000 per month.

The survey form can be downloaded electronically from the website. The focus has been on maintaining up-to-date information rather than adding new information. The format has been modified to make it easier to both provide the information and then for it to collected. Currently there is information on 93 countries. There are 116 member sections of the UIA. The survey is conducted in English, French and Spanish. The English speaking countries have been contacted first, starting in July with a requested submission deadline of October 1, 2007. Among the 42 countries that do not belong to the UIA, there are a number where they are still seeking the appropriate national references to a professional national body within that country. Regional organizations, such as the Architects' Council of Europe, have been of assistance in making some of these new contacts.

He concluded by observing that the Commission should have a discussion regarding the future of this survey in the next UIA triennium.

Discussion:

Mr. Bourdrez observed that the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards had published a booklet which was a reference to national contacts for those interested in international practice. They ceased publishing it once the COAC survey was available since it was so much more comprehensive. He noted that the NCARB website has a link to the COAC survey website.

Mr. Scheeler, recognizing the number of hits on the site, inquired as to whether COAC had considered including paid advertising on the website in order that it might support the survey and the publication cost.

Mr. Farrando noted that the survey is hosted on the COAC website and that they have their own policy with regard to sponsorships on their website. Such a suggestion would have to be discussed with COAC.

Mr. Peck observed that this is very valuable information to some people and institutions. He speculated as to whether such information might be delivered on two levels – one which is available to all and the other level for agencies looking for information related to trade agreements at a cost for accessing the information.

Mr. Farrando responded that COAC already has an existence such a two-level access and delivery system, e.g. at no cost and for a fee. Thus it could be an appropriate approach.

Mrs. Cox suggested if a fee system was instituted a sponsor might be approached to pay for the survey publication.

Mr. Wachi suggested that one addition to the site might be an inventory and status report regarding ongoing mutual recognition agreements. In the case of Japan, it would be helpful to encourage their government to understand what is taking place between other countries.

Mr. Farrando responded that there is already an entry provision in the survey to record information concerning MRAs. He acknowledged that a separate entry for such information on an international basis might be very useful.

Ms. Soh inquired as to the basic organizational elements of the survey. She expressed the view that the existence of this extensive data on current practice standards needs to be better understood and utilized by the members of ARCASIA.

Mr. Farrando responded that the survey format is organized according to the Accord prefaced by some general statistics.

Follow-up Action: UIA member sections are reminded to respond to the ongoing survey update for the entry related to their country.

6. REPORT ON THE UIA EDUCATION COMMISSION AND THE UNESCO-UIA VALIDATION COUNCIL

Introduction: The Chair recognized Mrs. Cox to make this presentation.

Presentation: Her report is included as Appendix 5 to these Minutes. The highlighted subjects included: a) the translation of the documents into other languages and their availability on the website; b) the effects of the Bologna Agreement on architectural education in the European Union countries and on other countries outside the EU; c) the European Commission Directive of 2005 and its effects on restrictions on non-EU qualified individuals practicing as architects in any EU country; d) updating the UIA Inventory of Architectural Study Programs; e) the seven reflection groups continuing work on the application and implementation of the UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education; f) the most recent UNESCO-UIA Validation Council meeting held in Paris in April 2007; g) the panel visit taking place this month at a university in Kazakhstan; h) the UIA-ARCASIA Agreement signed last year allowing for more cooperative/collaboration on validation; i) conversations with the Royal Institute of British Architects to assist the UIA in administering the UNESCO-UIA Validation system; and j) the visit of panels to three schools of architecture in Korea.

Discussion:

Mr. Wachi inquired if: a) the UIA representatives visiting these schools of architecture have been validated in their roles; and b) have they actually validated any schools to date.

Mrs. Cox responded that the answers to both questions was no. Up to this point all of their visits have been trial visits.

Mr. Yi stated that the Korean Architectural Accrediting Board invited the UNESCO-UIA Validation program to come and visit these schools of architecture as a part of their initial accreditation procedure. He inquired if this type of visit was open to any UIA member section.

Mrs. Cox responded that they were open to consider such invitations from any UIA member section or UNESCO member.

Mr. Verma inquired if: a) any country with an established national validation system had approached UNESCO-UIA with the intent of having them validate their national system; and b) what was the established system for doing this.

Mrs. Cox replied that the UNESCO-UIA system can validate a separate study program or it can validate a national system. She noted that the existing national systems have not

indicated such an interest and that they are conducting their own round table meetings to explore if they are prepared to recognize one another's systems. The documents outlining the UNESCO-UIA system have been available on the website since their adoption by the UIA General Assembly in Berlin.

Mr. Keune inquired as to whether the discussions with the RIBA have reached the point of the RIBA developing an actual proposal. He was particularly interested in the cost of operating such a joint UIA-RIBA system.

Mrs. Cox indicated that the RIBA has given the UIA a proposition which will be discussed at the UIA Council meeting next week in Xian, China. It includes a suggested management fee and that the RIBA would contribute 12,000 pounds per year for the first two years. The RIBA has extensive experience in the financial aspects of operating such a system. She is pleased to see individual UIA member sections prepared to become so directly supportive of a UIA program with which they have extensive experience.

7. REPORT ON THE MAY 2007 INVITATIONAL ACCREDITATION/VALIDATION ROUNDTABLE CONFERENCE, OTTAWA, ONTARIO, CANADA

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

Presentation: Mr. Scheeler noted that the foundation for this work is based on the policy contained in the UIA Accord. In the subsequent development of the UNESCO-UIA system the established models represented by existing systems in the United Kingdom, the Commonwealth Association of Architects, the United States and Canada were used as references. The established systems took the position that it was not necessary for them to spend their financial resources to be validated by the new UNESCO-UIA system. In order to address this reality, it was suggested that new protocol for mutual recognition among the existing national and international systems should be initiated. The UNESCO-UIA Validation Council developed such a proposal for the consideration of the UIA Council. It was approved by the UIA Council.

The first roundtable was held in Washington, DC in 2006 with the objective of determining if there were enough similarities among these systems to see if it might be possible to establish a form of mutual recognition among them. It was determined that it was possible.

The second round table was conducted in Ottawa, Ontario, Canada in May 2007. The Memorandum of Intent and Understanding resulting from the meeting was circulated as an attachment to the provisional agenda for this meeting. It is included with these Minutes as Appendix 6. The key points in this document are: a) they share the goal of establishing an International Accord for the Recognition of Validation Systems; b) the recognition that such an Accord could enhance the quality of architectural education and contribute to the portability of academic credentials; c) agreement and acceptance of the standards developed by Canada for the evaluation of the similarities of national systems

and that they should be completed by the third round table; and d) the necessary internal national consultations should continue in order to proceed for the signing of such an Accord and the establishment of a timetable for the production and assemblage of the necessary products.

The third round table will take place in Canberra, Australia in April 2008. George Henderson of the CAA has been charged with drafting the proposed text of the Accord. Mr. Scheeler is optimistic that such an Accord will be signed. The round table participants have been Australia, Canada, China, Commonwealth Association of Architects, Korea, Mexico, UIA, United Kingdom and the United States.

Discussion:

Mr. Peck questioned if the national authorities responsible for the control of registration of architects had been present at these roundtables, e.g. in the case of Australia none of the state statutory boards were represented. Thus he wonders how such an Accord would have effect in being recognized by the registration authorities.

Mr. Scheeler responded by observing that the focus of the proposed Accord is on the substantial equivalency of academic credentials. This work is being done by the national accrediting agencies within the UIA member sections and not by the UIA member sections.

Mrs. Cox observed that the university accrediting teams in Australia consist of members of both the national professional body, the RAIA, and the state regulatory bodies. The state regulatory bodies have declined invitations to participate in these round tables. Thus Australia cannot presently be a signatory to the Accord. She considers it frustrating that they have not been willing to participate. The proposed Accord contains two categories of signatories; a) one for national systems that are focused only on their own national system; and b) one for systems that operate internationally.

Mr. Prinz observed that in Germany where the process of establishing a national system to accredit schools of architecture is relatively new, there is a need for such accrediting agencies to work with the registration bodies to reach an understanding and definition of what constitutes accreditation of academic credentials and how those credentials are then viewed by the independent registration body.

Mr. Scheeler responded by acknowledging that those participants in the round table with extensive experience are very sensitive to this issue. The focus is on the substantial equivalency of academic credentials.

Mr. Peck, referencing Australia's joint accrediting procedure, noted that they use the term "accreditation" in relation to the statutory regulatory body and the term "recognition" in relation to the professional association.

Mr. Scheeler responded that Australia is perhaps unique because the academic accrediting system is a shared responsibility of the professional and regulatory bodies. However, in the other round table participants the academic accreditation systems are discreet entities from the registration system.

Mr. Wachi as a point of clarification inquired if the signatory to the proposed Accord is the registration regulatory body.

Mr. Scheeler responded that the signatory is not the registration body but rather the academic accrediting body for each country.

Mr. Peck inquired as to who was representing Korea and China at the round table and did it include their registration authority.

Mr. Chough indicated that it was the Korean Architectural Accrediting Board. It did not include the registration body.

Prof. Zhuang indicated that it was the National Architectural Accrediting Board of China and not the registration body.

Mr. Bourdrez noted that NCARB in the United States is a member of the National Architectural Accrediting Board and thus is represented at the round tables.

Mr. Verma observed that most of the CAA countries have their own national validation systems for schools of architecture. For a university program in a CAA member country it is optional for them to be validated by the CAA. He noted that the regulatory bodies in the CAA member countries may not feel bound or obligated to recognize the provisions of this Accord when it comes to recognizing academic credentials. He indicated the importance of the UIA encouraging member sections to establish national academic validation systems for schools of architecture if they presently do not have such a system. Countries with new or less developed validation systems are going to be interested in knowing how they are to respond to such an Accord.

Mr. Scheeler responded that he believes that CAA representative understands the situation that exists where there is a CAA country with a national system. In terms of what happens next, he views the parallel experience of the engineering profession, as represented by their existing operating Washington Accord, as being instructive and that it will take a considerable amount of time.

Mr. Peck indicated that his prior comments should not be considered as negative. He views the developing document as sound and the role of the UIA in bringing these parties together as very important.

Mr. Prinz shared Mr. Peck's view. He views the process of accrediting schools of architecture as a process having regulatory implications because those decisions have such important subsequent implications. The accreditation process for schools of

architecture is separate from the legal registration of architects. He suggested that perhaps the national regulatory bodies will need to have another accord for mutual recognition. He questioned how these two systems might be linked in the future.

Mr. Scheeler observed that there is no international organization bringing together the national regulatory bodies. Some national regulatory bodies are represented in the UIA member sections. The last international gathering of regulatory bodies was held in Washington, DC in the mid-1990s. The national and global practice of architecture could be enhanced if there was more attention focused on registration bodies being in regular communication with one another.

Mr. Yi inquired as to: a) who is the legal entity to give the CAA and the UIA authority to conduct their validation systems; and b) how do other countries who have an established accreditation system get involved in the round tables.

Mr. Shim expressed his view with the previous point made by Mr. Wachi.

8. REPORT ON THE JUNE 2007 MEETING OF THE UIA JOINT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE ON CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Introduction: The Chair recognized Mr. Keune. He stated that Bonnie Maples of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada serves as the Commission's representative on this committee. She was not able to attend this meeting but did submit a report that was circulated to the attendees. Her report is appended to these Minutes as Appendix 7.

Presentation: Mr. Keune noted that Policy 11 of the UIA Accord addresses continuing professional development (CPD). The UIA Council subsequently sought to develop a UIA CPD program. As part of this initiative a Joint Oversight Committee was established and this Commission was named as a member. Representing a UIA member section that has an established CPD program, Ms. Maples was designated as the Commission's representative to the committee. She has attended two committee meetings. He called attention to the three main elements of the UIA CPD program articulated in her report. She has requested that this Commission adopt a resolution in support of the UIA entering into the contract with the general program operator that will be presented to the UIA Council for approval next week in Xian, China.

Discussion:

Mr. Prinz inquired as to the source of the funds to support the operation of the program by the general program operator (GPO).

Mr. Farrando responded that the Spanish CSCAE would be responsible for providing everything necessary to support the program including the financial resources.

Ms. Soh inquired as to what the procedure will be for those UIA member sections to become a participating entity. She does not believe that Singapore was represented at the roundtables held after the Istanbul General Assembly.

Mr. Keune observed that the CPD Round Tables that preceded the development of this contract were open to all UIA member sections.

Mr. Farrando indicated that he was not aware of another CPD Round Table being scheduled. The general program operator has expressed a willingness to meet with interested UIA member sections and had recently attempted to organize a meeting within UIA Region IV.

Mrs. Cox noted that there would be a CPD Roundtable in Madrid, Spain in December, 2007 where any UIA member section may attend.

Ms. Oussidhoum reported that there was a July 2007 meeting in Madrid to continue the development of the program guidelines. UIA member sections having established CPD programs were represented. A survey is to be undertaken among existing CPD programs to assist in the further definition of the elements to the mutual recognition element.

Mr. Peck stated his understanding that while the CSCAE is assuming all of the initial financial risk that the ultimate financial success of the program will require the UIA and its member sections to market and promote the program. In some countries where there is presently no CPD requirement it will represent a significant opportunity to provide CPD to their members. In other countries with CPD programs, they are operating them in many cases on a commercial basis and are producing product in established marketplaces. He inquired if this business aspect between the established and the new systems has been considered in the roundtables.

Ms. Oussidhoum noted that both the RIBA and the AIA, UIA member sections who both have established programs, have been participating in and supportive of the program guidelines.

Ms. Soh observed that the UIA program should be working in partnership with UIA member sections that have an established CPD program and not be developing a program that might be competing with them.

Mr. Verma inquired about the stated fee range for each course and as to why there was such a range in the amounts.

Ms. Oussidhoum responded that this fee is to be paid by the CPD provider and not the person taking the offered course for credit.

Mrs. Cox observed that participation by providers and participants in the proposed system is optional. If providers wish to have their course offering included they will be expected to pay for doing so.

Mr. Wachi, while viewing this development as positive, indicated his concern that there not be any conflict between the CPD program offered by the UIA member sections and the UIA international program. He inquired who was going to be responsible for evaluating the CPD programs offered by the UIA program.

Mr. Farrando stated that the UIA program is intended to enlarge the opportunities and not to compete with existing systems. There are guidelines that have been developed by the GPO which are intended to verify the quality of the programs proposed to the UIA.

Mr. Peck inquired as to whether the stated staff and administration budget line item included the costs associated with evaluating proposed course offerings.

Mr. Farrando indicated that to the best of his knowledge there were no other separate budget items to support such evaluations.

Mr. Peck, returning to the budget aspects of the program, questioned how it is anticipated that one can provide product into the market place where the consumer doesn't pay for it. He has reservations over the financial model being presented, e.g. the course providers pay and the consumers do not pay.

Mr. Farrando noted that the UIA Treasurer serves as a member of the Joint Oversight Committee and has been engaged in the review of the system. He also recalled that several UIA member sections presently offer CPD programs at no charge to their members and that they were not supportive of then having a new UIA program that required their members to pay for the UIA CPD courses.

Mr. Peck observed that if this Commission is being asked to endorse this proposal, it needs to have a very clear understanding of how is it going to work. From the discussion it is his understanding that the providers will pay the costs and not the consumer. Based on his experience with, and awareness of, other CPD programs, that while they may have commenced with a similar aspirational goal, that in reality they evolved to where the consumer does pay. His experience indicated that for a CPD program to be financially viable the consumer has to pay.

Mr. Farrando observed that this discussion is being based on a written report concerning the Joint Oversight Committee meeting and not on the availability of the full background on this proposed UIA system.

Mr. Obayawat sated that Thailand does not have a CPD system. The Council of Architects, a government body, has given the architects association a charge to propose the establishment of a CPD system. Thailand has been consulting with their neighboring countries that have such a system. He is not clear as to what Thailand would expect to receive from this new UIA program and what would be the outcome from within Thailand. For example, would there be a new CPD guideline and/or a detailed curriculum? Their association has had a number of voluntary member education

programs for a period of time for which they charge and it produces significant income to the association. This education program has been useful for architectural graduates preparing for their registration examination.

Mr. Verma recalled that a number of the important points being referenced in this discussion where also raised in the previously mentioned post-Istanbul CPD roundtables. He questioned if the proposed agreement between the CSCAE and the UIA has considered all of these points and if so, have they been addressed in the proposed contract. He would not wish to see the effort not be successful at the next UIA General Assembly.

Mr. Keune, in view of the points raised in this discussion, recommended that we not consider a resolution at this meeting. He noted that the proposed contract between the CSCAE and the UIA is on the UIA Council's meeting agenda for next week in Xian, China. Should commission members have specific concerns, they may wish to share them with their regional representatives on the UIA Council.

Mr. Farrando observed that this is the first time this Commission has discussed this subject in any detail. It is unfortunate that the Commission's representative to the JOC could not be present since it is likely that she could answer many of the questions raised by Commission members.

Ms. Soh noted that in many UIA member sections CPD is now tied to legal requirements for maintaining one's professional registration.

Mr. Prinz thought the CSCAE has produced a detailed description of the proposed UIA program and it could be reviewed to be sure that the points raised in this discussion are adequately addressed in that document.

Mr. Dubler based on his experience in France, urged caution in the process of evaluating the content and claims of commercial providers of CPD course offerings.

Mr. Wachi observed that the character perception of the UIA is that it is an international, voluntary, professional organization. He understands that the CSCAE is assuming all of the financial risk in launching this program. However the business model, if successful, has the potential to alter the UIA character, for example being seen as a voluntary organization in association with a business partner. It is his view that after a certain point in time all of the potential profit should go to the UIA.

Mr. Verma concurred with Mr. Keune's suggestion to not adopt a resolution.

Mr. Farrando observed that since the Commission is represented on the Joint Oversight Committee and since the Commission's Co-Directors attend the UIA Council meetings, he would recommend that these opportunities be utilized to share the stated concerns of the Commission members.

Follow-Up Action: This discussion will be shared with Ms. Maples for her use and reference in further Joint Oversight Committee meetings. The Co-Directors will share the views expressed with the GPO during the UIA Council meeting.

9. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR STUDY OF A RECOMMENDATION ON ARCHITECT-CLIENT AGREEMENTS

Introduction: The Chair recognized Mr. Prinz to make the second presentation to the Commission on this agenda item.

Presentation: Mr. Prinz noted that he did not circulate a document in advance of this meeting. His objective in this presentation is to update the Commission on what has transpired since the 2006 Annual Meeting and then benefit from the Commission's discussion. He has had continuing conversations and negotiations with the FIDIC representative. He highlighted the following key points:
a) It would be useful for the UIA to develop a recommended form of an architect-client agreement, especially to assist those architects working internationally.
b) A survey has been done of the UIA member sections that have established programs for their members concerning standard forms of contracts used by their members. A collection of example documents has been assembled.
c) There is one consultant-client contract that is already used by architects on an international basis. It has been produced by the International Federation of Consulting Engineers (FIDIC). It is used as a form of contract by international organizations such as the World Bank.
d) Within this FIDIC model contract there is a difference in the scope of services between that applicable to engineers and architects. The other elements are similar for the two professions.
e) The direction of the conversations with FIDIC in Geneva, Switzerland were with the intent of investigating sharing their experience and resources to produce a model UIA document for the use of architects. FIDIC has been receptive to such a collaborative project.
f) At the Commission's 2006 Annual Meeting he presented the first description of the proposed FIDIC-UIA document. The Commission's discussion identified issues that required further clarification. These issues were:

1) The copyright for architects. The existing recently revised FIDIC document has a good provision for the copyright protection for the architect as a designer. As a lawyer he recommends acceptance of this existing provision.

2) For the subject of alternative dispute settlement, mediation/negotiation/arbitration there is now a section in the existing document that addresses these subjects. He regards the existing language as being sufficient.

3) The scope of services must be developed by the UIA for inclusion in the document. It has to replace the existing element of the document since it addresses the scope of services for engineers.

4) The work "consultant" in the current document being replaced by "architect". This issue will decide where we go with these negotiations. He understands and appreciates the need of the architects to defend their position within the construction

sector. The word "consultant" was purposefully used by FIDIC rather than "engineer" because they wished to have the widest possible use of the document by all of the design professionals. They did not want to have to produce separate documents for the quantity surveyors, charter surveyors, project managers, etc. The scope of services in the existing document makes clear that it is for engineers. Using the word "architect" could be problematic since it is not a protected title in all countries, e.g. many countries in Europe.

5) Accepting the document as it is would also accommodate a new cover with the UIA logo. The proposed cover title would be "The Consultants Agreement Provided by FIDIC and the UIA: The Architects Edition". The body of the text would remain as is with the exception of the replacement of the scope of practice with that defined by the UIA.

6) FIDIC has offered to produce an electronic version of the document in which the word "consultant" could be replaced by the word "architect" for those who wished to use it.

7) The FIDIC document is designed in such a way that the users cannot just fill in the blanks and sign it. It is intended to be used as guideline to actually write a contract. The user is forced to read each provision and consider its application to the intent of the contract.

8) FIDIC would grant UIA a license for a fee of between 5,000 and 8,000 Euros to produce the publication and sell it through the UIA and sell it through the established FIDIC web site distribution system. FIDIC would be committed to promoting the document through their established international system.

He asked the Commission to discuss his report and make a recommendation on the points raised, especially on the matter of the document's title so that he may continue the conversations and negotiations with FIDIC.

Discussion:

Mr. Wachi asked for clarification on the license fee regarding what does it cover and what time period does it cover.

Mr. Prinz indicated that it would give the legal right to the UIA to produce the document and sell it. He would anticipate that this fee could be generated from the income resulting from the sale of the document. The term of the license is for ten years.

Mr. Peck spoke in favor of retaining the word "consultant" as suggested by Mr. Prinz. He observed that the use of the word "architect" throughout the document could leave the client with the impression that this is a self-serving document. Use of "consultant" would promote the recognition that this is a document used across a wide sector of the industry throughout the world.

Mrs. Cox questioned if the cover incorporated the UIA logo if it then needed to include "The Architects Edition".

Mr. Verma, referring to the 2006 Annual Meeting Minutes, once again expressed his view that the use of document without the use of "architect" throughout could diminish the role of the architect with the client.

Mr. Prinz replied that the electronic version would permit the use of the word "architect" throughout the agreement. The use of such a UIA document would be voluntary for any architect to use. However, he does see value in having architects being able to use an internationally validated model document with clients.

Mr. Verma expressed his reservations over the potential negative impact of the UIA having a document that does not use the word "architect" throughout. He noted the increasing tendency of governments in Asia to retain "consultants" who then retain the services of architects rather than the government retaining the architect directly. He asked for clarification on what the title of the document will be. He wished to know if the document could be titled "The FIDIC-UIA Architect-Client Agreement".

Mr. Prinz stated that based on his conversations with the FIDIC representative that this was as far as they were willing to go in such a potential agreement with the UIA. The printed edition would be a "The FIDIC-UIA Client-Consultant Agreement: The Architects Edition". The electronic version would have the possibility of being used as an "Architect-Client Agreement". Based on his conversations with FIDIC they would not accept the title proposed by Mr. Verma.

Mr. Wachi inquired if the electronic version, with the opportunity for the alternative use of "architect" is included in the provisions of the license agreement with FIDIC.

Mr. Prinz indicated that it would be included.

Ms. Soh stated her support of using "architect" in the printed format.

Mr. Prinz responded that such a condition would then require the UIA to conclude the discussions with FIDIC and for the UIA to produce their own document.

Mr. Scheeler stated that Mr. Prinz, having the benefit of the Commission's discussions at their 2006 Annual Meeting has continued his conversations and negotiations with FIDIC and has gone as far as FIDIC are prepared to go in such a possible collaboration with the UIA. Therefore he moved:

MOTION: ***The Professional Practice Commission supports Mr. Prinz's continued conversations and negotiations with FIDIC which would include the following elements:***
a) the document will be identified as the "FIDIC-UIA Consultant-Client Agreement: Architects Edition";
b) the FIDIC and UIA logos will be incorporated on the cover of the printed edition;
c) with the retention of the existing language in the FIDIC printed consultant agreement;

d) with the inclusion of the scope of services as developed by the UIA, the word "architect" will be included as appropriate;
e) the availability of an electronic version which at the option of the user may use "architect" throughout;
f) the development of a licensing fee; and
g) the language of a formal agreement between FIDIC and the UIA for this initiative.

Mr. Peck seconded the motion.

Discussion on the Motion:

Mr. Agari inquired if the proposed FIDIC format had been studied in comparison to the international contact documents developed by the American Institute of Architects.

Mr. Prinz stated that he had reviewed the AIA documents. He views the FIDIC document as being used more commonly in international practice.

Mr. Peck, as a point of clarification, asked if the scope of services used in the proposed FIDIC document would use the word "architect". It is his view that when it comes to the definition of the services being provided it is only at that point that the services are described as architectural services. Thus the consultant being engaged is being retained to provide the services defined and the services defined are those of an architect. He questioned if FIDIC would have an issue with that understanding.

Mr. Prinz responded that it would use the term "consultant" but that the text defines a scope of services provided only by an architect. He indicated that he would include this point in his ongoing conversations/negotiations with FIDIC.

Mr. Keune wished to clarify that the Commission is not being asked at this meeting to approve a fully developed document it has not yet seen. It is being asked to respond to Mr. Prinz's description of the current status of this conversations and negotiations with FIDIC, especially on the point of the use of "consultant" or "architect". Based on the Commission's action at this meeting, the conversations and negotiations with FIDIC will continue and Mr. Prinz will be able to return to the 2008 Annual Meeting with a fully developed document and recommendation for the Commission to consider and recommend to the UIA Council.

Mr. Verma expressed his being unable to support the motion. He believes that the UIA should focus on producing a document that is solely focused on an "architect-client agreement".

Mr. Peck observed that in most countries it would be illegal for anyone who wasn't a licensed architect to provide architectural services and to sign such a document as that being proposed.

Mr. Scheeler called the question on the motion. The motion was adopted by a majority of the Commission members in a voice vote.

Follow-Up Action: Mr. Prinz will continue his conversations and negotiations with FIDIC and will return to the Commission at their 2008 Annual Meeting with a fully developed recommended FIDIC-UIA Agreement and joint document.

10. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE STUDY OF INCREASING THE PORTABILITY AND RECOGNITION OF REQUIRED PROFESSIONAL INTERENSHIP EXPERIENCE

Introduction: The Chair recognized Mr. Peck to make the second presentation of this Drafting Panel.

Presentation: Mr. Peck utilized a power-point presentation which is appended to these Minutes as Appendix 8.

As background to this presentation he recalled that the basic objective was to develop a recommended means of allowing graduate architects to secure and have recognized by their home country, a portion of their required internship experience outside of their home country. The system being proposed by the Drafting Panel is a mutual recognition agreement focused on internship. The Drafting Panel documented those UIA member sections with regard to current internship requirements. 46 UIA member sections require internship experience. 37 reported that this requirement was compulsory. The bodies controlling/administering the internship experience vary with some using the professional body and some using the regulatory/registration body.

Since the last meeting the Drafting Panel has come to the view that the document should be in the form of a mutual recognition agreement (MRA). This recommendation is based on the position that in order to have an operating effect between statutory bodies, it must have the force of a signed MRA. He has received no negative comments on the wording of the proposed document. The Drafting Panel thus recommends that this be treated as an Appendix to the existing UIA Accord Policy on Practical Experience/Training/Internship and language to this effect is proposed for addition to the existing UIA Accord policy statement.

Discussion:

Mr. Keune stated that following the 2006 Annual Meeting, he prepared and sent an e-mail to the Director of the Education Commission, Fernando Ramos, concerning the ongoing work of the Commission on this subject and the potential relationship to the Education Commission's Reflection Group on Internship. He never received a response to this e-mail.

Mr. Wachi inquired as to the basis for the 50 % of internship experience being secured outside the graduate's country of proposed registration.

Mr. Peck responded that it was based on existing examples, for example between New Zealand and Australia. Further, recognizing that internship experience is intended in part on the individual gaining experience with applicable national law and regulations in the country in which they are to be registered, it is not practical to recognize all their internship experience being gained in a foreign country.

Mr. Bourdrez noted the use of the word "graduate" and that in the United States, architectural students may begin accumulating recognized internship experience after their third year of university studies.

Mr. Peck responded by noting that the word "graduate of architecture" is already used in the approved UIA Accord Policy on Practical Experience/Training/Internship and it is preferable to not change the existing policy. He suggested replacing the word "graduate" in the MRA by "candidates for registration".

Mrs. Cox noted one spelling correction in Appendix 1.2.D.

MOTION: ***Mr. Peck moved the approval of the proposed amendment to the UIA Accord Policy on Practical Experience/Training/Internship and the proposed Mutual Recognition Agreement Drafting Model as an Appendix to the UIA Accord Policy. Mr. Bourdrez seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion was adopted unanimously by a voice vote for recommendation to the UIA Council.***

Follow-Up Action: The documents will be forwarded by the Co-Director and Secretary to the French UIA Member Section for translation into French. The documents will be presented to the UIA Council at their February 2008 meeting for adoption.

12. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE STUDY OF A GUIDELINE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARCHITECT FEES

Introduction: The Chair noted that Mr. Silcher could not be present at this meeting. He did not submit a written report for the Drafting Panel. He inquired as to whether the Commission wished to discuss this subject in the absence of Mr. Silcher.

Discussion:

Mr. Obayawat stated that Thailand eagerly looks forward to the work of this Drafting Panel since their association has been invited to serve on a panel reviewing the existing architect fee structure used by the national government. The government has evidenced an interest in their collecting information on systems in existence in other countries.

Mr. Scheeler suggested that in the absence of Mr. Silcher this agenda item be deferred to the next Commission meeting.

Mr. Peck expressed his view that this is an important subject for the Commission to address, especially in view of the recent history and resulting developments regarding competition policy as they relate to fees for professional services in the developed economies. Architects are having to react to consumers who are aware of governments outlawing any form of fee guidance to clients. There are situations where government departments are now developing their own fee scales for architectural services they commission.

Mr. Farrando reminded the Commission that the COAC Practice Standards Survey includes information on this subject as it exists within individual countries.

Mr. Prinz noted that in his conversations with Mr. Silcher he evidenced a concern that it is difficult for him to decide on what to produce as the conditions within countries vary so greatly. Mr. Silcher is working with a similar group within the European Work Group and he has noted interesting work being done by Austria as a result of set fee schedules disappearing within the member states of the European Union. The Austrian work has focused on setting a process by which architects may calculate their fees without reference to a set fee schedule. Mr. Silcher is considering bring it to the Commission as a possible model for recommendation on a global level.

Mr. Dubler noted that in France there is now a precise model for the development of contracts which enables the calculation of the architect's fee. It is posted on the web site of the French Order of Architects in both French and English.

Mr. Keune recalled that the 2006 Annual Meeting Minutes record that there was a consensus that what this Commission produces should be aimed at UIA member sections and not individual practicing architects.

The Chair hearing no further comments recommended that this agenda item be deferred to the Commission's next meeting.

Follow-Up Action: The Commission will include this on the agenda for the 2008 Annual Meeting.

13. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL ON REVISITING THE EXISTING RECOMMENDED GUIDELINE ON PROCUREMENT

Introduction: The Chair introduced Mr. Peck to make this first presentation to the Commission. He referenced the document that was circulated in advance of the meeting. It is appended to these Minutes as Appendix 9.

Presentation: Mr. Peck referenced the existing UIA Accord Policy on Procurement. He noted that the existing Recommended Guideline on Qualification Based Selection is derived from that initially developed by the American Institute of Architects in the federal Brooks Bill. At the 2006 Annual Meeting a citation was made to the intervening

work done in the United Kingdom on project team partnering and the alliancing process. The document circulated with this agenda item describes this process.

The difference between this guide and the existing UIA Recommended Guideline is that the existing UIA document emphasizes qualifications whereas this document is more oriented to the project output. The risk in focusing only on qualifications is that it might be seen by clients as being self-serving to the profession. By changing the emphasis to this quality outcome, and offering procedures for client agencies to follow, it should lead them to appointing quality architects.

He supports Mr. Wright's suggestion that we should modify the existing guideline to embrace the idea of a process to achieve quality outcomes.

His recommendation is that a Drafting Panel be appointed to revise the UIA Recommended Guideline in light of current developments and in reference to the United Kingdom's document and other developments that have recently taken place. In the absence of any other Commission members volunteering to assemble such a Drafting Panel, Mr. Peck volunteered to serve as the Chair. He asked that the Commission agree in principle that he be authorized to recommend other individuals to serve on this Drafting Panel with the concurrence of the Co-Directors.

Hearing no other views, the Commission concurred with his proposal.

Follow-Up Action: Mr. Peck will recruit other members of the Drafting Panel, notify the Co-Directors for their concurrence, and then proceed.

15. REPORT ON THE DRAFTING PANEL ON REVISITING THE EXISTING RECOMMENDED GUIDELINE ON SCOPE OF PRACTICE

Introduction: The Chair introduced Mr. Wachi to make the first presentation to the Commission on revisiting the existing Recommended Guideline.

Presentation: Mr. Wachi recalled that this effort was undertaken based on the comments received from the Royal Institute of British Architects at the Commission's 2006 Annual Meeting. He utilized a power-point presentation which featured the document circulated with the Provisional Agenda. This document is appended to these Minutes as Appendix 10.

He has changed the structure of the existing Recommended Guideline by eliminating the existing "Project Flow" classification. The revised document places "Other Services" after the "Core Services". He reviewed in detail the other additions and editorial revisions in the text of the revised Recommended Guideline for the Accord Policy on the Scope of Practice.

Discussion:

Mr. Peck questioned whether "Post Occupancy Evaluation" should be included as a "Core Scope of Service" under A. Project Management. It is his experience that it is not always provided and thus should be in "Other Services". He also recommended deleting "Support To" from the first entry under "F. Contract Administration".

Mr. Yi recommended adding "Topographical Survey" to "Other Services".

Mr. Wachi responded that it was his experience that the architect usually depends on the independent survey performed by a surveyor retained by the client and that is why he did not include it.

Ms. Soh observed that in Singapore the services of a quantity surveyor are used to arrive at the estimated project cost. She noted that the citations to cost issues under A and C might need to be further clarified.

Mr. Wachi responded that this listing is not intended to be a mandatory list to be applied to all countries. He has included in the lists services that can be provided by the architect.

Mr. Peck observed that in some countries it is traditional for architects to step aside from project cost control by suggesting that the client appoint a separate consultant to undertake that task. Since the Commission documents are aspirational he believes it is important to include project cost control citations in the "Core Services". Clients expect architects to deliver projects on schedule and within a budget.

Mr. Dubler observed that under "A. Project Management" when dealing with project cost control the architect should be prepared to inform a client that he cannot design and build what he wants to have for the budget he has to support the project.

Mr. Yi suggested changing "Project Cost Control" in A to "Project Budget Control".

Mr. Dubler, in reflecting on Mr. Peck's previous comments concerning "Post Occupancy Evaluation", suggested that the architect has an obligation within overall project management to be thinking of what it will cost the client to operate and maintain the completed building. There is also an element of occupancy evaluation. This condition is especially important in the control of sustainable design.

Mr. Wachi in reviewing the text under "Project Flow" noted that this may be subject to change due to the many changes emerging in new systems being used in some countries.

Mrs. Cox stated that accessibility should be referenced in "Core Services" rather than in "Other Services".

Mr. Dubler suggested life cycle planning and building energy studies should be recognized in the revised Guideline.

Mr. Verma suggested that building code review should be a core service.

Mr. Wachi responded that the architect in executing the core service of design had to meet all applicable code requirements.

Mrs. Cox suggested a specific reference to as built drawings.

Mr. Farrando suggested that a statement might be added that qualifies that in some countries there might be several sub pre-design phases.

Mr. Peck suggested that the concept of project design being a continuum might be added to the description. It strengthens the need for the client to recognize that the architect should be engaged from the beginning to the completion of a project and not retained only for the initial design.

Mr. Obayawat observed that the language used in the pre-design phase needs to mindful of trans-nation practice where a foreign architect is retained by the client to only execute a conceptual design.

Mr. Peck observed that the text should be mindful of the possible separation in the services provided by an architect in schematic design phase and technical documentation phase. These two phases are presently jointly incorporated under B in Project Flow.

Mrs. Cox stated that it should be clear that the architect should have the committed sign-off from the client on the schematic design phase before proceeding to the following phases to produce the construction documents.

Mr. Dubler observed that under F. Post Construction Phase it is important for the architect to make an assessment of whether the completed project actually works as effectively as it was initially conceived.

Mr. Keune stressed the importance of moving forward with this document in a timely fashion so it can be referenced in the ongoing work being done with FIDIC.

Follow-Up Action: Any specific recommended editorial changes in the text should immediately be forwarded by e-mail to Mr. Wachi. He will produce a revised document based on the discussion at this meeting and share a copy with Mr. Prinz for his reference in his conversations and negotiations with FIDIC. Mr. Wachi will submit a revised document to the 2008 Annual Meeting.

The Chair temporarily adjourned the meeting for the day.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5

Mr. Keune assumed the Chair for the second day of the meeting. On behalf of the Commission he thanked the meeting hosts for the tour, dinner and program on Thursday evening.

Mr. Shim stated that he had distributed to the attendees a copy of the Architectural Society of Korea's Journal which includes articles by both of the Commission's Co-Directors.

16. REPORT ON INTEGRATED PRACTICE

Introduction: The Chair introduced Mr. Wachi to make this first presentation to the Commission following the general discussion on this subject held at the 2006 Annual Meeting in Melbourne.

Presentation: Mr. Wachi observed that in conducting his research on this topic that there is so much activity taking place on this subject that it is challenging to keep current with all of the developments. The range of engagement is from those countries where it is being embraced and applied to those countries where nothing is happening. In Japan it is just in the early stages of recognition and use. The intention of his presentation was not to focus on the technical aspects but rather to look at the impact of integrated practice on the design process.

It is necessary for this Commission and the UIA to focus on this issue due to the impact is having, and will have, on the profession. He made a power-point presentation which is included with these Minutes as Appendix 11. The four elements of the presentation were: a) introduction, b) definition, c) background, and d) issues. In addition to his text, he made the following observations. The subject is presently defined in different ways by different institutions. He included examples in his paper from Australia and the United States. Under "Issues" he has prepared an initial outline, based on his research, of the key subjects to be considered within integrated practice. Under "Education" he noted the rapid ongoing advances in computer programs to support integrated practice and their growing availability and use in schools of architecture. This situation is sometimes resulting in architectural graduates being better equipped to address the subject than their employers.

Discussion:

Mr. Dubler inquired if headings such as "remodeling" and "adaptive use" should be included under "Integration of Building Life Cycles". He also observed that in the preparation of documents it should not be implied that consensus represents compromise and to reach consensus often takes time.

Mr. Peck observed that this paper blends integrated practice and alliancing. He views this as being very difficult for industry to understand and accept at this early stage in their

development. He suggested perhaps preparing one paper on integrated practice with reference to the added benefits that derive from alliancing and another paper on alliancing that likewise refers back to the added benefits from integrated practice.

Mr. Wachi expressed his view that the UIA needs to become actively engaged with this activity in order to participate in setting a proper direction. He does not envision the UIA creating a detailed professional practice document related to integrated practice but rather that the UIA has an international educational role in informing UIA member sections what is happening and being a voice in setting the broad, ideal directions. It needs to be both defending and advocating the public understanding of the architectural profession's core competencies.

Mr. Yi stated that a major concern with integrated practice is the subject of the architect's liability when so many parties are involved. He noted the existence in Korea of other project construction delivery systems such as build to lease (BTL) and build to operate (BTO). The architect is not usually the lead in such systems.

Mr. Wachi responded that there are model documents in existence that address the architect's liability within integrated practice.

Mr. Dubler recommended the addition of examples of European definitions of integrated practice. He expressed his concern over the direction of this document in regards to the role the architect in the construction process.

Mr. Peck, based on the comments expressed, suggested that the contents of this draft are too elaborate. It is his experience that integrated practice does not create liability issues for architects or issues in the role of the architect in the construction process. The key dimension is that of creating a building in cyberspace with the input of all the professions so that all the accumulated electronic information can be used downstream by the contractor and sub-contractors. The process can be totally controlled by the architect. He again urged the consideration of the preparation of two companion documents.

Mr. Wachi observed that the International Alliance for Operability is already well advanced in the area of coordinating standards in the technical area of integrated practice.

Mr. Steidl observed that integrated practice came about in the United States because of the demands of major clients and not because of the initiative of the architectural profession. The clients expected: a) cooperation between the architects, engineers and contractors; and b) greater efficiency in the entire process of designing and constructing a building. There was too much duplication taking place in the building process with resulting high levels of change orders. He observed that integrated practice and building information modeling are two separate systems. In the United States integrated practice is being used by large firms and we will know more about it in another year.

Mr. Prinz supported the UIA becoming an international voice in shaping where this system is going. He stated that the copyright and liability issues can be addressed much

more efficiently within integrated practice since everything is so well documented at every step in the process by virtue of having on ongoing complete record of everyone's contributions. He supported separating the other systems from what we do in regard to integrated practice. Integrated practice is beginning to be used by some German architects. However it is his view that due to the hesitancy of the European architectural profession to be open to change, it will take time for them to accept the concept of working with an integrated practice system. It will take a major education initiative to change this situation.

Mr. Wachi noted that the current literature emphasizes the positive side of integrated practice. He is interested in citations to literature discussing the possible negative aspects.

Mrs. Cox inquired if there was still a system in existence in France where project liability was a shared responsibility of the project team.

Mr. Dubler responded that France does have a ten-year warranty system for buildings. He views this as contributing to a loss in the quality of building. He views it as an unfair system because the architect's insurance company pays 30 per cent of the settlements.

Mr. Nutt stated that in the United States the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards is currently looking at the regulatory aspects of integrated practice and building information management. With all of the different project access points, there are issues of who is actually in the position of responsible control of the project.

Follow-Up Action: Mr. Wachi will review his document based on this discussion and will continue to follow the issue. It will be included on the agenda for the 2008 Annual Meeting. It is a subject to be included in the next triennium work program. It should be considered as one of the program subjects for any Commission submission for the 2008 UIA Congress.

17. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL ON REVISITING THE EXISTING RECOMMENDED GUIDELINE ON THE ROLES OF PROFESSIONAL BODIES

Introduction: The Chair noted that Mr. Prichard could not attend this meeting. He recognized Mr. Dubler to make this presentation.

Presentation: Mr. Dubler read Mr. Pritchard's report which is included with these Minutes as Appendix 12.

Discussion:

Mr. Dubler added an observation concerning the need to recognize the changing role of national professional bodies in response to new regional governing organizations such as the European Commission.

Mr. Peck suggested that since Mr. Pritchard's statement indicates that so much more work needs to be done on the Guideline that it would be more appropriate to reconvene the drafting Panel rather than attempting to have the Commission address the entire document at this meeting.

Mr. Prinz expressed his concern over the suggestion to eliminate Section 2.2 which addresses the minimum roles of professional bodies. He views this entry as being important and it needs to be edited to reflect changing conditions. A focus on defining the consumer, public and professional interests and then describing how we respond to each of them would make for a stronger Guideline.

Mr. Verma supported a reconsideration of the Guideline in the context of the relationship between the national professional and regulatory bodies. Of particular interest is the difference in the voluntary membership role of many professional bodies in comparison to the legal requirement to be registered by a public body in order to practice. UIA member sections can benefit from guidance from the UIA as to how they should be interacting with their regulatory body.

Mr. Scheeler suggested that the Commission at this meeting should be looking at how it wishes to move forward with the review of the Guideline. He made a motion.

MOTION: ***That the Commission re-establish a Drafting Panel charged with undertaking a complete review of the existing Recommended Guideline on the Roles of Professional Bodies and report back to the next meeting with a revised text for the Guideline. Mrs. Cox seconded the motion.***

Discussion on the motion:

Mr. Nutt inquired as to when the next Commission meeting would take place.

The Chair responded that it would like be in the Fall of 2008.

The Chair inquired of Mr. Farrando if he knew if there were examples of where this Guideline may have been used by UIA member sections.

Mr. Farrando indicated there were examples where the UIA Secretariat had referred the Accord Policy and Recommended Guideline to UIA member sections in Eastern Europe where national societies and systems were undergoing many changes.

The Chair called the question on the motion. It was adopted unanimously by a voice vote.

The Chair inquired if there were any current examples of changes in UIA member sections professional bodies that should be shared with the Drafting Panel.

Mr. Prinz observed that a development in the United Kingdom is being viewed with concern by other European countries. It is being proposed to divide the tasks of the professional bodies according to licensing and representation of the profession and to create another body that would represent the consumer interests. The existing national bodies in France, Germany and Spain presently have both the regulatory and representation roles and responsibilities.

Mr. Lam expressed concern over the present Appendix D, Union or Trade Associations. Such trade associations can work contrary to that of the professional institution. He sees it as being important that the document reference both individuals and architectural practices as being included in the membership of professional bodies.

Mr. Verma reiterated the need for having the document recognize the role of professional bodies in the improvement of the role of regulatory bodies in licensing especially in the context of the WTO GATTS.

Mr. Agari noted that in Japan where the private professional and public regulatory bodies are separate, there is an ongoing debate about the defined responsibilities and obligations of each body. It would be helpful if such a Guideline could define what should be the shared common interests, responsibilities and obligations of both bodies.

Mr. Bourdrez noted that in the United States there are two distinct national bodies – the American Institute of Architects and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards. The AIA is the largest and represents the interests of the profession. NCARB's membership consists of only the 54 state registration boards that are legally responsible for the protection of public health, safety and welfare. He recommends that such a model be recognized in the Guideline.

Ms. Soh noted that the Architects Act for Singapore had been amended with the past two years to bring about a closer alliance between the professional and regulatory bodies.

Follow-Up Action: The Chair will share these comments with Mr. Pritchard for his consideration in reconstituting the Drafting Panel and in preparing a report to the Commission's 2008 Annual Meeting.

18. REPORT ON THE DRAFTING PANEL ON REVISITING THE EXISTING RECOMMENDED GUIDELINE ON CODES AND ETHICS

Presentation: The Chair reported that Mr. Wright was not able to attend this meeting. He had indicated to the Chair that upon further reflection of the Commission's discussion of this subject at the 2006 Annual Meeting in Melbourne, he would be recommending only minor proposed revisions to the existing Recommended Guideline. He proposed that this agenda item be held over to the 2008 Annual Meeting.

Follow-Up Action: This subject will be included on the agenda for the Commission's 2008 Annual Meeting.

19. CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSAL BY THE UIA PRESIDENT FOR A "UIA CHARTER FOR A FAIR PRACTICE OF ARCHITECTURE"

Introduction: The Chair stated that this proposal came to him as the Commission Co-Director from the UIA President in response to the circulation of the Provisional Meeting Agenda. He noted that in response to the initial circulation, Elizabeth Siola of Greece, a long-standing Commission member, submitted a statement that could be shared with the Commission since she could not be present at this meeting. These documents are included with these Minutes as Appendix 13A and 13B.

Discussion:

Mr. Prinz views this as a good and timely proposal in the context of globalization. In Germany there is currently a focus on social responsibility in procurement of products and services. He is not aware that the UIA has a policy on the practice of fair architecture. While it represents a good project for the next triennium, it could not be done by this Commission by the July 2008 UIA General Assembly. He views it as going beyond the focus of this Commission.

Mr. Peck took issue with the implication in the proposal that the UIA has not been concerned with fair practice in architecture. He views the work of this Commission over the past 14 years as being centered on the idea of architects working for community interests.

Ms. Soh stated her view that there were new elements in the proposal such as sustainability.

Ms. Oussidhoum viewed the proposal as being more focused on social and cultural responsibilities rather than on professional practices. Coming from Morocco, she can see the value in such a UIA statement for a country that is experiencing so much rapid change in the built environment.

Mr. Verma stated that in his view this proposal suggests that is it necessary to review the existing UIA Code of Ethics. He is concerned that the proposed title could be interpreted as depicting the architectural profession engaging on a regular and widespread basis in unfair practices. Other titles should be considered.

Mr. Dubler stated that the profession has to continuously re-define itself so as to meet the challenges of a changing world and society. He believes it is very important for the UIA to actively engage with other related international organizations.

Ms. Soh sees the issues identified in the proposal as being more concerned with the globalization of practice rather than on just fair practice.

Mr. Prinz observed that the existing UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines do not specifically address such issues as cultural diversity. He views the proposal as more of a broad UIA policy statement rather than a specific policy related to professional practice policies and guidelines.

Mr. Farrando observed that many of the issues in this document have been already addressed by not only by this Commission but also by other UIA Work Programs who deal with specific issues. He sees this proposal as being one that attempts to unify this work and assemble it in a simpler and clearer format for the UIA to use in an international context. He sees it as perhaps more of a Declaration rather than a Charter. He noted that the request is for the Commission to have one representative designated to contribute to this process.

The Chair noted his observations regarding the proposal as presented to this Commission: a) the use of the words "fair practice" invites a reader to inquire as to what have been the "unfair practices"; b) the English version of the proposed Charter is not clear in its present form and is likely to not be fully understood by non-architects; c) the five "commitments" in Point 2 are not fully crossed referenced to the points in the Charter; d) the process of how this UIA Charter is intended to work and evolve with other stakeholders is not described; e) there is no referenced role for UIA member sections; and f) both institutional and individual approaches are included. The individual approach describes a voluntary acceptance by individual architects but there is no description of how such a procedure would be implemented, administered and monitored.

Mr. Peck suggested that one way individual architects could enhance both the public's awareness of the UIA and evidence their adherence to the UIA Code of Ethics would be to use the UIA logo on their corporate letterhead and related client documents.

Mr. Wachi sees the proposal's benefit as having a clear message to the public beyond the UIA's own membership. It is especially timely in view of issues such as global warming, sustainability, heritage protection and human rights.

Ms. Ossuidhoum sees the proposal as being based on the need for an enhanced global communication tool by the UIA.

Mr. Prinz views the existing UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines as being documents primary intended to define and enhance the practice of architecture. Their primary audiences are the UIA member sections and related bodies. What is being proposed in the Charter he views as being as primarily an external document for the UIA. He views the present document as just a beginning draft.

Mr. Scheeler expressed the view that the Commission should positively respond to the invitation to have the Commission participate in the further development of such a document.

MOTION: ***Mr. Scheeler moved that the Commission accept the charge given to the Commission by the UIA President to participate in the development of this position paper and bring it back to the UIA Council for their consideration. The Commission shall designate a representative to work with the designees from the five UIA regions. Ms. Soh seconded the motion.***

Discussion on the Motion:

Mr. Yi stated that Mr. Siew's preliminary statement touched on the core of what the public view of the UIA should be. He expressed his views concerning the definition and application of "fair" as it applied to architectural practice. Different life styles, national cultural characteristics, national laws and regulations, and attitudes towards sustainability, all combine in his view to make it very challenging to create an international standard applying to the fair practice of architecture. He believes that this Commission should be focused on establishing minimum standards and not be delving so deeply into individual subjects. He views the proposed UIA Charter for a Fair Practice of Architecture as being something to be addressed by another level within the UIA structure and not solely by this Commission.

Mr. Obayawat views the concept of the proposed Charter as more related to a global public relations campaign as contrasted to the policy and standards represented in the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines. He expressed his caution over pronouncements and documents that are declaratory and proscriptive and how they are received in many cultures and countries.

Mr. Peck, responding to the two prior statements, stated that this Commission has never intended to produce products that are seen as laws or regulations. Rather what we are doing is not to reach the lowest common denominator in matters related to professional practice but rather to produce aspirational documents for the reference and use of UIA member sections. What they elect to do with them is then their decision.

Mr. Prinz observed that all national governments are not entirely fair when it comes to every aspect of the procurement of products and services. He views the proposed Declaration or Charter as a basis for promoting much needed discussion in order to contribute to a process for designing a better world. The UIA is a place where these global issues can be addressed.

Mr. Scheeler noted that from the beginning the work of this Commission recognized that the UIA has no regulatory authority and little, if any, authority over its member sections. The effect has always been to reach consensus on what was a reasonable advisory standard for the benefit of the use of the member sections. A number of the issues put forward relate to work already done by the Commission. There is a change in the issues the UIA is considering. The Commission has always considered their work as living documents that can and should be modified over time.

The Chair stated his understanding from both the document provided to the Commission and the discussions at the February 2007 UIA Council meeting, that the Commission is being invited to have a representative participate together with a representative from each UIA region to produce a document for the UIA Council and the next UIA General Assembly.

Mr. Peck observed that there are concepts in the document that are contrary to positions previously developed by the Commission and approved by the UIA Council. For example, the commitment to local partners as stated is contrary to the provisions of the existing UIA Accord Policy and Recommended Guideline on Practice in a Host Nation.

The Chair called the question on the motion. The motion was adopted by a voice vote.

Follow-Up Action: The Co-Directors will share this information with Mr. Siew at the UIA Council meeting next week in Xian, China. They will designate a member of Commission to serve on the Task Group.

Mr. Peck expressed concern over the Commission being able to fully participate in this process in view of the proposed timeline. He noted that the Commission will not meet again until after the 2008 UIA General Assembly.

Mr. Prinz suggested that the initial approach might be one similar to how the Commission initially approached the individual UIA Accord Policies, e.g. the preparation of a definition, background statement, and policy, and them move on later to a more complete development of the document over a longer period of time.

Mr. Scheeler stated his concern over a timeline which would expect a fully developed document to be produced between now and the July 2008 UIA General Assembly. To be successful, it is going to require the careful consideration by the UIA membership.

Mr. Obayawat suggested that we might try to telephone the UIA President to seek his clarification of his intent.

Mr. Farrando did not know how to reach him at this exact time.

MOTION: ***Ms. Oussidhoum moved the following resolution: Regarding the resolution by the Professional Practice Commission, supporting the recommendation of President Gaetan Siew on Fair Practice, that the commission participate in the preparation of a recommendation to the UIA Council, the Commission further recommends:***

1. ***That in order to accomplish the intent of the "Background Paper" on Fair Practice, the UIA Council develop a paper as a declaration for the 2007 Assembly consistent with existing UIA policies;***
2. ***That the urgent issues defined in the paper include:***
   - ***Sustainability***
   - ***Cultural diversity***

- ***Human rights***
- ***Transparency***
- ***Local issues***

Further that these issues by elaborated and commended to the UIA member sections for their consideration, review and recommendation to permit a grassroots development of substance to be contributed by the UIA member sections to the Union's efforts. The charge to the UIA member sections should include the request that they engage the public and appropriate stakeholders in their deliberations.

3. ***As this substance is gathered from the UIA member sections it will be referred to the appropriate Commissions and Work Groups to influence their work and programs.***
4. ***The results will be summarized and presented to the 2011 Assembly as a report of progress on these important issues.***

Ms. Soh seconded the motion.

Discussion on the motion:

Mr. Peck expressed his concern with the current wording over the words "declaration" and "commitment".

Ms. Oussidhoum responded that the emphasis is to find a more collaborative effort. The proposed Declaration by the UIA General Assembly would be a list of issues and then have the UIA member sections conduct further investigations and studies of those issues in following three year period.

Mr. Peck stated his view that the proposed Declaration should make clear that the UIA was calling on its member sections to respond to the stated issues, rather than just a Declaration of concepts which are not finalized.

Ms. Oussidhoum viewed it as being important that the UIA would be making a commitment to the findings of the process.

Mr. Dubler emphasized that the intent was to bring this from an internal question to a broader perspective. He doesn't see this as being just the responsibility of this Commission but rather that of the UIA General Assembly.

Mr. Farrando observed that there might be two concerns from the UIA President; a) that this would set an element of the UIA program for the next triennium when he will not be serving as the UIA President; and b) he is intending this to be his legacy to the UIA as the President.

Mr. Prinz concurred with Mr. Farrando's observations. However, he doesn't see this Commission as having the possibility of completing a declaration as proposed by Mr.

Siew. The Commission can certainly accommodate it in its next triennium work program.

The Chair reiterated that he does not see this as an exclusive Commission process. We are being asked to serve in the role of a contributor as a part of a UIA Council responsibility.

Mr. Scheeler believes that the legacy issues defined in the paper provided to the Commission need to be taken out to the UIA member sections to enable a grassroots movement to assemble, present, consider and evaluate ideas for the future benefit of the UIA. In his memory it has been a long time since the UIA member sections were presented with a set of issues with which they were all expected to respond to. It was done in the mid-1990s with the first draft of the UIA Accord.

Mr. Peck supported Mr. Scheeler's suggestion.

Mr. Dubler noted that the draft reduced the cited number of commitments from four to five. The commitment "architects are committed in markets" because it was difficult to reduce to an easily comprehensive term. He believes that the reference to consultations with the public is very important because it would encourage UIA member sections to gain other, non-architect perspectives.

Mr. Wachi observed that if this is really important that the Commission needs to focus on the content rather than the schedule.

Mr. Verma stated that the effort should be done in a considered way and not in a half-hearted manner.

The Chair observed that it would be possible for a UIA member section to propose such a Charter at the UIA General Assembly. He does not view this as the appropriate manner in which to have such a charter come to the Assembly. It should have first been vetted by the UIA Council.

Mr. Steidl in listening to the discussion observed that the Commission is attempting to do four things in one statement; a) attempting to change it from a Charter to a Declaration which would allow the UIA President to exit with a statement of what he stands for; b) a concern to have the Declaration or Charter in alignment with the existing UIA Accord; c) getting the UIA member sections engaged in the process over the next UIA triennium; and d) setting an agenda item for the next UIA President. He questions if these can be done in one motion.

There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously adopted.

Follow-Up Action: The Co-Directors will take these two resolutions to the UIA Council meeting next week in Xian, China.

20. REPORT AND FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS WITH THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION ON THE UIA COUNCIL ENDORSED "DRAFT DISCIPLINES ON DOEMESTIC REGULATION IN THE ARCHITECTURAL SECTOR REGISTRATION

Presentation: The Chair summarized the historical development of this document since the Commission's 2005 Annual Meeting in Washington, DC. At the 2006 Annual Meeting Commission members volunteered to attempt to secure a commitment from their World Trade Organization (WTO) representatives to refer the document to the WTO Working Party on Domestic Regulations (WPDR). The purpose of this agenda item is to review what these volunteers efforts have produced. He called on the Commission members for their reports.

Australia – Mr. Peck reported that it was forwarded to the Royal Architectural Institute of Australia's national office but he does not know what has happened subsequently.

Germany – Mr. Prinz reported that due to the position of Germany as the President of the European Union (EU), it was circulated to the EU members and the European Commission (EC). It has gone to the WTO from the EC and several EU member states.

Hong Kong – Mr. Lam reported the no action had been taken on this matter but that he would follow-up on his return to Hong Kong.

Malaysia – In the absence of Mr. Mohamed, the Chair reported that he had a communication from him indicating that he was following-up but that he does not know the current status.

Mauritius – The Chair reported that Mr. Siew had followed-up with both his national UIA member section and WTO representatives. It has been brought forward to the WTO-WPDR.

Thailand – Mr. Obayawat reported the document had been forwarded two months ago to the Ministry of Commerce who has a Department of International Trade Negotiation. The Council of Architects has also forwarded it to the Ministry. They have not yet had any response.

United Kingdom – The Chair has had no follow-up report and thus does not know the current status.

United States – The Chair accompanied the AIA delegation to a meeting with representatives of the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR). The USTR representatives declined to forward the document to the WTO-WPDR. This decision is based on the policy position of the USTR supporting the WPDR developing horizontal disciplines rather than sector specific disciplines. This means that the effort will be to develop one set of regulatory disciplines applicable to all regulated professions.

Architects' Council of Europe – The Chair reported that Mr. Sagne had distributed it to all the ACE members and requested them to forward it to their national WTO representatives. The ACE also submitted it to the EU's WTO representative. Mr. Prinz stated that he is aware that the document has been distributed within the WTO as it has been referred back to him for comment through the German WTO representative.

The Chair noted that based on his observations at the Paris OECD-World Bank seminar held in Paris this past February, the WPDR is being cautionary in addressing other sector specific disciplines in view of the experience in having put forward disciplines on the regulation of the accountancy sector and then having watched the global collapse of Arthur Anderson.

Mr. Scheeler expressed the appreciation by the Commission for those members who did follow-up with their national WTO representatives and succeeded in having them forward it to the WTO-WPDR.

Follow-up Action: The Chair indicated that he will continue to follow what transpires with the WTO-WPDR. Should other Commission members who did not previously volunteer to this, he would welcome their doing so.

21. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED NEW SUBJECTS TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE COMMISSION AND THE FORMULATION OF THE COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDED WORK PROGRAM FOR THE NEXT UIA TRIENIUM, 2008-2011

Introduction: The Chair noted that this subject needed to be addressed at this meeting since the Commission will not meet again prior to the 2008 UIA General Assembly. The proposed triennium program needs to be presented to the UIA Council and UIA General Assembly.

The subject was discussed at the Advisory Council meeting. There was a general consensus that the Commission stands at a turning point. It has successfully completed the primary objective of what it initially set out to do 13 years ago – develop the UIA Accord on Recommended International Standards of Professionalism in Architectural Practice and the accompanying Recommended Guidelines. As a living document, it needs to be monitored, revised and updated as changes take place in professional practice. The Commission now needs to take a long look into the future to understand, define and contribute to what the UIA member sections will need to do to keep pace with changes in professional practice that will impact architects throughout the world.

Discussion:

Mr. Scheeler noted that two large architectural design firms in the U.S. have recently been bought by constructors who are non-U.S. corporations. These are large international, full service, diversified construction firms who are buying design services to be incorporated into their corporate organizations. He views this as a trend occurring

around the world. Thus he recommends the Commission address this subject of how the architectural professional maintains their responsibility to society as independent practitioners dealing directly with clients and public responsibility. He sees this as a subject where the UIA should be seen as a resource to member sections that are, or will be, experiencing this type of corporate development.

Mr. Prinz, in addition to the matter of future programs, believes that the Commission would benefit from the participation of more UIA member sections. It has always been an open Commission and architects with the experience in newly emerging subjects should be encouraged to participate.

He views the Commission moving from what has been an international political agenda focused on aspirational policies and standards to one which in the future becomes more practice oriented. He recommends an increased focus on a series of UIA practice guides or notes on subjects such as: building information management, integrated practice, the role of architects in public-private partnerships, liability in the context of increased complexity in construction, negotiation/mediation/arbitration, improving and enhancing architect client relationships, continuing work on architect-client agreements, initiating work on a UIA model handbook on architectural practice with Part I being the existing UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines and Part II being the new practice guides.

Mr. Peck observed that the Commission's work to date has well defined the traditional role of the architect as an individual professional service provider. He views this as a 19th and 20th century view of the profession. This new century has seen an emerging different role for the architect as a result of new national and international market and corporate law conditions. The UIA should be actively engaged in defining this new role. His overall Commission theme would be "Redefining the Role of the Architect in the Future."

Mr. Verma observed that with the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines now being increasingly known and recognized by UIA member sections, it is important that the Commission not lose sight of the need to keep them current. While he acknowledges the previous statements regarding the future, he is also aware that many UIA member sections in developing countries have yet to implement UIA Accord policies and guidelines as they might relate to their own conditions. He recommended that the subject of the architect's intellectual rights to, and copyright for, their designs needs to be further addressed. The roles and responsibilities of national professional and regulatory bodies would also benefit from increase review and recommendations.

He suggested the production of a guide on the role of UIA member sections in dealing with their national trade representatives when it comes to them identifying those sectors for which national commitments are to be made to open sectors within the WTO framework. The UIA member sections need to have a better understanding of what it will mean to them when their government makes such offers and commitments under the GATTS and the four modes contained therein. He sees this as being important once the WTO is able to conclude the difficult negotiations presently related to agriculture. Other

services will then emerge as focal points with the WTO. The Commonwealth Association of Architects has started some work in this area.

The Chair shared a suggestion by Mr. Pritchard of the RIBA that the Commission address the relationships between national professional and regulatory bodies. The Chair observed that there is no international body where national architectural regulators come together. There are a number of UIA member sections that do have the responsibility for the regulation of architects in their country. The UIA might wish to give consideration at some point to including architectural registration bodies within their membership structure.

Mr. Prinz supported the concept of a closer working relationship between the national professional and regulatory bodies. In Germany he has worked for both organizations and has experienced the importance of their working closely together. He would not be supportive of creating a worldwide registration body.

Follow-Up Action: The Chair will develop these suggestions into a format that can be share with the UIA Council. He will circulate a draft copy to the Commission for their review and comment.

22. A PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A UIA PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE COMMISSION EDITORIAL PANEL

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

Presentation: Mr. Peck stated that this proposal is a result of discussions at the Advisory Committee meeting. The origin is in the problems encountered in translating documents prepared in English into French. The technical work of the Drafting Panels would be subject to an editorial review process to achieve clarity and consistency in proper English grammar.

Since the Commission's working language is English, the Commission's documents should be expressed in a proper form of that language. The object of this proposal is to ensure that existing and future Commission documents are written in clear, concise and consistent English capable of translation into member section languages without confusion or ambiguity.

The Chair of the five member Editorial Panel would be a Commission member who is a native English speaker. Two panel members would be native English speakers from UIA member sections and two panel members from UIA member sections in which the native language is not English. The panel members would have experience in editing and/or experience in editing practice documents. They may not necessarily be architects.

The proposed process would have all existing and future Commission documents being edited in English by the Editorial Panel. Once edited it would be returned to the Drafting Panel Chair for review and approval. The final document would them come to the

Commission for approval before referral to the UIA Council. This process is intended to assist the Commission Secretariat in getting consistency and clarity in all Commission documents.

Mr. Farrando suggested adding that this panel might also be available to those translating Commission documents. He observed that it is often the experience of these individuals that it is just not the translation of the words but it is often also the need to understand the intent of the phrasing of statements.

Mr. Peck concurred with Mr. Farrando's suggestion.

Mr. Wachi based on his experience with the Commission as a non-English native speaker welcomed the availability of such a panel.

Mr. Shim expressed the interest of the KIRA in serving as one of the non-native English speaking panel members.

Mr. Scheeler suggested that Mr. Peck, as the author of this proposal, be invited to serve as the Editorial Panel Chair.

Mr. Peck accepted the responsibility of serving as the Chair.

MOTION: ***Mr. Peck moved that the Commission accept the establishment of the Editorial Panel. Ms. Soh seconded the motion. The motion was adopted unanimously be a voice vote.***

Follow-Up Action: Those Commission members wishing to volunteer for service on this panel should notify Mr. Peck. Mr. Peck will subsequently inform the Commission of the membership of the Editorial Panel.

23. COMMUNICATION TO UIA MEMBER SECTIONS REPORTING ON THEIR ENDORSEMENT AND PROMOTION OF THE UIA ACCORD AND RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES

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

Presentation: Mr. Peck noted that the background for this proposal comes from his personal experience in Australia in dealing with having the national government recognize these UIA documents. Their response was to inquire what the RAIA had done in regard to these documents before giving consideration to what their position might be. It brought into focus that the RAIA's governing board had never formally adopted them. Now having circulated the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines in a published format to all the UIA member sections, he is suggesting that it would be appropriate for the UIA to write to all of the member sections inviting them to confirm in writing that: 1) they have formally endorse the documents; and 2) are committed to supporting the documents to their national government and other relevant authorities.

MOTION: ***Mr. Peck moved the adoption of this recommendation. Mr. Prinz seconded the motion.***

Discussion on the motion:

Mr. Prinz supported the recommendation since it would encourage all of the UIA member sections current leadership to both become familiar with these documents and to have them become more active in their promotion and use of these resources with their national governments. Eight years have now passed since the UIA Accord was approved by the UIA General Assembly in Beijing, China. At that time all of the then UIA members sections present formally voted to adopt the Accord. There have been many changes in the leadership of the UIA member sections since that time.

Mr. Peck emphasized that when presenting this document to UIA member sections governing bodies that we are not binding them to the documents. We are asking them to recognize them as aspirational documents that provide direction as to where the profession should be headed. In making this request it has to be made clear that we are not asking them to change their policies in order to giver recognition to the documents.

The Chair suggested that it might be useful and desirable for the Commission to develop model language for the UIA member sections to consider in their adoption in giving recognition to this document.

Mr. Farrando suggested that the UIA letter should also highlight what is in the interest of the UIA member sections in giving recognition to the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines.

The Chair stated that such a letter would be most effective being sent under the signature of the UIA President.

Mr. Verma noted the importance of the choice of words used in such a letter in terms of what was being asked of the member section, e.g. endorsement, recognition, adoption, etc.

Mr. Peck responded that he acknowledged we would not be asking UIA member sections to make a commitment to change their own policies by adopting the entire UIA Accord but rather it is to merely recognize and endorse that the UIA has taken these policies positions in the UIA Accord.

Mr. Wachi, noting the 1999 UIA General Assembly formal adoption of the UIA Accord, thought there might be some confusion in member sections if the UIA President is asking them to once again recognize it.

Mr. Peck responded that we would be asking them to recognize the most recently published version which includes all of the work done since 1999.

Mr. Verma recommended that the letter be clear in making this point that they are not being asked to adopt the UIA Accord since that has already been done in 1999. The emphasis should be on receiving a commitment from the UIA member sections to continue their support and promotion of the UIA Accord.

The Chair called the question on the motion. It was unanimously adopted by a voice vote.

Follow-Up Action: The Co-Directors, in collaboration with Mr. Peck, will draft such a letter for the consideration of the UIA President to be sent to all UIA member sections.

24. STATUS OF THE ASEAN MUTUAL RECOGNITION AGREEMENT FOR ARCHITECTURE

Introduction: The Chair recognized Mr. Peck to make the presentation.

Presentation: Mr. Peck stated that he has been advised by the ASEAN Secretariat they had prepared a MRA on Architecture for the ASEAN region. He had requested a copy be made available to this Commission but it has not been made available. He asked if any of the ASEAN member states at this meeting might know the current status of this MRA.

Discussion:

Ms. Soh reported that the Singapore Board of Architects Registrar serves as the Chair of the ASEAN MRA Preparation Committee. The template is ready but is awaiting endorsement. When this has been accomplished she would provide a copy to the Commission Secretariat.

Follow-Up Action: Ms. Soh will provide a copy to the Secretariat when it is available.

25. OFFSHORING AND OUTSOURCING

Presentation: The Chair will need to confirm if subsequent to the 2006 Annual Meeting, he provided a web site citation to the location of the AIA Report on the Offshore and Outsourcing Roundtable, September 25, 2006. He will include the citation with the Minutes of this meeting. The "Report on the Offshore and Outsourcing Roundtable, September 25, 2006" is available at www.aia.org/siteobjects/files/oor_final_report.pdf

Discussion:

Mr. Verma expressed the view that young architects in countries such as India, Bangladesh, the Philippines and Sri Lanka are being attracted to these off shoring and outsourcing service providers in their countries for financial reasons. The concern is not that they are securing financial benefits but rather: 1) the potential negative impacts by reducing internship opportunities in the exporting countries; and 2) the absence of diverse

internship experiences for those young graduate architects engaged in this work in the importing countries. He suggested that this is an area in which the UIA has a potential role and responsibility in calling this condition to the attention of the UIA member sections engaged in this activity. He is also concerned over the potential misuse of references to such work experience on individual resumes presented to future clients.

Mr. Wachi observed that in Japan there is a segmentation of the design process taking place in very large design projects. Large Japanese developers have preferred to hire non-Japanese architectural firms as the project designer and they in turn hire a Japanese architectural firm as the local architect of record. Outsourcing is often a part of the process when it comes to the production of the working drawings.

Mr. Prinz acknowledging Mr. Verma's points, observed that attention also has to be paid to the western architects who are the clients to these Asian based architects providing these services.

Mr. Bourdrez noted the existence of a NCARB Rule of Conduct within the United States that intern architects in training must be under the daily control of a registered architect. This raises questions of whether it is ethical for an architect to outsource work in situation where they have no responsible control. The issue of responsible control is important in that there is the potential to be in violation of the regulatory law.

Mr. Verma recommended that the Commission continue to address this subject.

The Chair noted that with so much of the outsourcing work being done in Asia, inquired as to whether the subject has been addressed by ARCASIA.

Ms. Soh indicated that it has been but only in a preliminary way. The ARCASIA members sections are in many varying stages of development as it applies to the development and management of internship experience.

The Chair recommended that in view of this discussion the subject should be included in the Commission's proposed work program for the next triennium. While the AIA report of the 2006 symposium can serve as one basis for the Commission, he suggested that it would perhaps be useful for the UIA member sections in which this activity is taking place to also have their own discussions and/or regional symposium to focus on this subject.

Follow-Up Action: The Chair will add the subject to the proposed work program for the next triennium.

24. PROPOSED COMMISSION SUBMISSION FOR THE 2008 UIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY PROGRAM, TURIN, ITALY

Presentation: The Chair stated that as of today he had not received any communication describing what the opportunities are going to be for the UIA Commissions to participate

in the 2008 UIA Congress. He has only received the document that invited the submission of proposed individual papers. He noted this Commission has organized programs for the past UIA Congresses.

Discussion:

Mr. Farrando noted that the advance planning by the Italian hosts is behind schedule. Yesterday he received a communication describing the opportunities for UIA Commissions and Work Groups and summarized to the Commission. Under the Congress theme of "Transmitting Architecture" there are three types of sessions; a) main; b) specialized; and c) talks. The theme is broken down into a different focus for each of three days: a) the first day is focused on "Culture"; b) the second day is focused on the "Present"; and c) the third day is focused on the "Future".

There are four potential ways for the Commission to participate: a) to have a member serve as a speaker on one of the main sessions; b) to organize a specialized session in cooperation with the Scientific Committee; c) to organize and present an exhibition; and d) to conduct an internal meeting in association with the Congress. He anticipated that the deadline for submission will be changed from the original date of October 19 to sometime in November. The rooms will be provided free of charge as will the interpretation for specialized session if it conforms to the Congress theme. Likewise the exhibit space allocation is without charge.

The Chair invited discussion on; a) what of the four available forms does the Commission wish to be present; and b) what specific suggestions for topics does the Commission wish to consider.

Mr. Peck proposed that the Commission under the themes of "The Present" and/or "The Future" develop a specialized half-day program and not seek any exhibition space. The content should include: a) a live presentation of the COAC Practice Survey; b) how the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines can be useful to emerging national professional associations in developing countries; and c) presentations focused on newly emerging forms of architectural practice, e.g. Building Information Management, Alliancing, etc. The presentations should not be made by just talking heads but rather involve panelists who can interact with the audience.

Mr. Prinz supported Mr. Peck's suggestions. He suggested adding overview presentations on negotiation/mediation, alternative dispute settlement resolution and other key issues that the Commission will be addressing in the future. He also thinks the Commission should invite comments and suggestions from those UIA members present as to issue they feel are important for the Commission to address.

The Chair asked for a show of hands of those present here in Seoul who thought it likely that they would be present in Turin in July. There were a goodly proportion of those indicating that would be in Turin.

Mr. Prinz suggested the formation of a Drafting Panel to be responsible for preparing the proposal and overseeing the implementation of an accepted proposal. He volunteered to serve as the Drafting Panel chair.

The Chair inquired and Mr. Farrando confirmed that there will be a supply of the English and French editions of the UIA Accord available for distribution at the UIA Congress.

Follow-up Action: The Chair will forward the UIA Congress documents to Mr. Prinz upon his receiving them. Mr. Prinz will coordinate the preparation of a submission by the stated November deadline.

25. SUMMATION OF THE STATUS OF THE COMMISSION'S WORK PROGRAM

The Chair summarized the actions taken at this meeting and the status of the agenda items.

- **a.** His role as Co-Director and Secretary to the Commission will conclude with the 2008 UIA Congress and General Assembly. A replacement will be selected by the next UIA President following an open call for UIA member sections to make nominations for a successor.
- **b.** It is timely to reconsider the contents of the COAC Practice Standards Survey in the next triennium.
- **c.** Due to a number of unanswered questions, we were not able to reach consensus on a resolution in support of the adoption by the UIA Council of the proposed contract agreement between the UIA CPD Program Operator and the UIA.
- **d.** A resolution was adopted to authorize Mr. Prinz to continue his negotiations with FIDIC and to report back at the next meeting.
- **e.** There was no report on the Development of Architect Fees and it will be on the agenda for the next meeting.
- **f.** A resolution was adopted to recommend to the UIA Council an amendment to the UIA Accord Policy on Internship/Training/Practical Experience together with an Appendix to that Policy setting forth a recommended form for a Mutual Recognition Agreement.
- **g.** An initial report was received concerning possible revisions to the existing Recommended Guideline on Procurement. It was discussed and suggestions made for further development and presentation at the next meeting.
- **h.** An initial report was received concerning possible revisions to the existing Recommended Guideline on Scope of Practice. It is recognized that this subject is closely related to the ongoing discussions with FIDIC. It was discussed and suggestions made for further development and presentation at the next meeting.
- **i.** An initial report was received concerning the subject of integrated practice. It was discussed and suggestions made for further development and presentation at the next meeting.
- **j.** An initial report was received concerning the existing Recommended Guideline on the Roles of Professional Bodies. It was discussed and there was consensus that it merits significant revisions. It will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

- **k.** There was no report on the possible revisions to the existing Recommended Guideline on Codes and Ethics. It will be on the agenda for the next meeting.
- **l.** There were two resolutions adopted related to the proposal by the UIA President for a UIA Charter on Fair Practice. These resolutions will be communicated to the UIA President and the UIA Council.
- **m.** A status report was received from each of the Commission members who had previously indicated their willingness to take the "Draft Disciplines on Regulation of the Architectural Sector" to their national WTO representatives with a request that they forward them to the WTO's Working Party on Domestic Regulation. A number have succeeded in accomplishing this task.
- **n.** The proposal to establish an Editorial Panel was discussed and approved.
- **o.** The proposal to communicate with all UIA member sections as to the status of their endorsing and promoting the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines was presented and approved.
- **p.** The status of the ASEAN Mutual Recognition Agreement for Architecture was discussed.
- **q.** The subject of off shoring and outsourcing was discussed and will be on the agenda for the next Commission meeting.
- **r.** The elements of a proposed Commission work program for the next UIA triennium were presented and discussed. It will be formulated for presentation to the UIA President, UIA Secretariat and the UIA Council.
- **s.** A specialized program for the Commission for proposed inclusion in the 2008 UIA Congress has been proposed and will be further developed and forwarded to the Congress Scientific Committee.

26. 2008 COMMISSION ANNUAL MEETING, MOROCCO

Introduction: The Chair recognized Ms.Oussidhoum to make the presentation.

Presentation: Ms. Oussidhoum presented an invitation letter on behalf of the President of the National Order of Architects of Morocco inviting the Commission to conduct their 2008 Annual Meeting in Morocco in 2008. The letter is appended to these Minutes as Appendix 14.

She indicated her admiration for the work of the Commission and stressed its relevance to what is currently taking place with regard to architectural practice in Morocco, especially in regard to the opening of the market as a result of free trade agreements. It is also a period in which the Order is in the process of proposing revisions to relevant national laws. The melding of traditional values and heritage with advancing technical developments in architectural practice is a challenge.

The Chair having received no other invitations to host the 2008 Annual Meeting accepted in invitation on behalf of the Commission.

Mr. Peck inquired as to the likely dates of this meeting.

Ms. Oussidhoum responded that it would like be scheduled for sometime in November but they would confirm the dates and location at a later date.

Follow-up Action: The Co-Director and Secretary will provide the relevant entries from the Commission's Secretariat Handbook to Ms. Oussidhoum for their reference in scheduling and planning this meeting. The dates and location will be announced to the Commission upon their receipt by the Secretary.

27. OPEN FORUM

Mr. Yi summarized the schedule for this evening program at the KIRA Architect's Night and the informal dinner to follow. He reviewed the schedule for the Saturday tour.

28. APPRECIATION TO MEETING HOSTS

The Chair expressed the Commission's appreciation to the KIRA for hosting his meeting and especially to those officers and staff who have done so much to make the meeting an enjoyable and successful experience.

29. ADJOURNMENT

The Chair on concluding his chairing his last Commission meeting, expressed his pleasure at being able to meet and work with participants from the entire world. He thanked The American Institute of Architects for all of the support they have provided during his years of service. It has been a rich and rewarding experience and is he proud of what the Commission has accomplished.

Mrs. Cox speaking on behalf of the UIA and the Commission members present thanked the Chair for his exceptional commitment to the Commission. She wished him good luck in his future endeavors.

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:50 pm.

30. APPENDICES

NOTE: These appendices are available for viewing on the UIA Professional Practice Commission web site at www.aia.org/about_uia. They are found under the heading of "UIA-PPC 2007 Annual Meeting, Seoul, Korea".

1. List of Participants
2. Minutes of the 2006 Annual Meeting, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
3. 2006-2007 Report of the Secretariat
4. Report of the UIA Col-legi d'Arquitectes de Catalunya (COAC) Standard Format for Reporting the Practice Standards of Each UIA Member Section
5. Report on the UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education and the UNESCO-UIA Validation System

6. Report on the May 2007 Accreditation/Validation Roundtable Conference, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
7. Report of the June 2007 Meting of the UIA Joint Oversight Committee on Continuing Professional Development.
8. Report of the Drafting Panel for the Study of Increasing the Portability and Recognition of Required Professional Internship Experience
9. Report of the Drafting Panel on Revisiting the Existing Recommended Guideline on Procurement.
10. Report of the Drafting Panel on Revisiting the Existing Recommended Guideline on Scope of Practice
11. Report on Integrated Practice
12. Report of the Drafting Panel on Revisiting the Existing Recommended Guideline on the Roles of Professional Bodies
13. Proposal by the UIA President for a UIA Charter for a Fair Practice of Architecture
14. Letter of Invitation from the President of the Order of Architects of Morocco

Submitted by:

Russell V. Keune, FAIA
Co-Director and Secretary
Professional Practice Commission
International Union of Architects
The American Institute of Architects