

Union International des Architectes – International Union of Architects
Professional Practice Commission

MINUTES

Meeting Dates: March 12-13, 2004

Meeting Location: Ballroom, Hotel Nikko, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

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

CONTENTS	PAGE
1. Call to Order and Welcome	2
2. Adoption of the Minutes of the April 4-5, 2003 Meeting	3
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	7
6. Report on the UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education and the UNESCO-UIA Validation System	10
7. Report of the Drafting Panel for the Recommended Guideline for Accord Policy on Professional Bodies	15
8. Report of the Drafting Panel for the Recommended Guideline for Accord Policy on the Form of Practice	18
9. Report of the Drafting Panel for the Recommended Guideline for Accord Policy on the Scope of Practice	24
10. Report of the Drafting Panel for the Document on Computer Practice	27
11. Report of the Drafting Panel for the Recommended Guideline on Building Project Delivery Systems	31
12. Report of the Drafting Panel for the Document on Mutual	

Recognition

36

13. Report of the Drafting Panel for the Document on Codes and Standards	40
14. Report of the Drafting Panel for Recommendation on the Use of the UIA Accord with National Governments and Relevant Authorities	41
15. Report on Revisions to the Recommended Guideline for Practice in A Host Nation as Considered by the UIA Council, June 2003	47
16. Summation of the Status of the Commission's Documents	50
17. Recommended Commission Program for the Period 2005-2008	51
18. 2005 Commission Meeting Date and Location	52
19. Resolution of Thanks to the Malaysian Institute of Architects	53
20. Open Forum	54
21. Meeting Adjournment	55
22. Appendices	55

Friday, March 12

1. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

The Chair opened the meeting. He noted that 2004 represented the 10th anniversary of the founding of the Commission. He thanked the Malaysian Institute of Architects for serving as the host for this meeting.

The Commission members introduced themselves. The Chair acknowledged and welcomed those members attending their first Commission meeting. A list of the participants is appended to these minutes as Appendix 1.

Mr. Lai on behalf of the Malaysian Institute of Architects extended a welcome to the Commission.

“On behalf of the Malaysian Institute of Architects I welcome all of you to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. This is the first Professional Practice Commission meeting held in Malaysia and the third held in UIA Region IV. It is an honor for our Institute to be able to host this thirteenth meeting of the Commission. My colleagues and I are delighted to receive the Commission members in our country. 37 participants from 20 countries are participating in this meeting. Our Institute is especially pleased to have our past-president, Hisham Albakri, and past-president on our Council, Esa Mohammed, who have been very active members in the work of UIA and this Commission. Mr. Mohammed also serves as the Chair of the Drafting Panel on the Recommendation for Communicating the UIA Accord to National Governments and Relevant

Authorities. We look forward to your participation in Sunday's guided tour and welcome your staying on to explore the many other attractions that Malaysia offers to its visitors. We wish you a fruitful and productive meeting as well as an enjoyable stay in Kuala Lumpur.”

The Chair thanked Mr. Lai for his welcome.

The Chair invited the Commission to stand in a moment of silence in honor of the victims of the bombings in Madrid, Spain.

2. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4-5, 2003 MEETING

The Minutes of the April 4-5, 2003 meeting of the Professional Practice Commission were distributed via e-mail to all attendees at the Tokyo meeting. An Executive Summary of this meeting was prepared and e-mailed to the Commission members not present in Tokyo, the UIA Council and all UIA member sections. The Minutes were posted on the PPC's web site, www.aia.org/international/uia.

Mr. Bourdrez suggested that a final list of the attendees at each Commission meeting be appended to the minutes when they are circulated.

Mr. Peck moved the acceptance of the minutes. Mr. Bourdrez seconded the motion. The motion was accepted by acclamation.

3. ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

The Chair reported that it had been circulated with the initial meeting announcement. He received one additional recommended agenda item from Mr. Prinz concerning the UIA Accord and the development of international business opportunities for architects working in another country. The Chair also requested the addition of an agenda item concerning a resolution from this Commission in support of the new UIA Committee on Continuing Professional Development.

Mr. Peck recommended that in future meeting we add a new agenda item that would deal with "Items Arising from the Previous Meeting Minutes." He cited the example of this Commission having adopted a unanimous resolution at the Tokyo meeting dealing with the UIA creating a new committee to deal with UIA Public Relations and Communications.

Hearing no further comments, the Chair stated that the Agenda would be accepted as amended.

4. REPORT OF THE PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE COMMISSION SECRETARIAT

4.1. 2003 UIA Council Meeting, Istanbul, Turkey: The Co-Directors of this Commission are invited to attend the UIA Council meetings. This Commission brought forth two documents for the consideration and adoption by the UIA Council. The first was the revised "Introduction" to the UIA Accord which as accepted by the Council. The second was a proposed amendment to the UIA Council approved Recommended Guideline on UIA Accord Policy on Practice in A Host Nation. The Council considered this amendment but declined to endorse it. Thus, the Commission will revisit this subject as Agenda Item 15 at this meeting.

4.2. Case Studies: During the Tokyo meeting we heard interesting comments by Commission members, particularly those representing Korea, on how they were using the UIA Accord. As a result the Chair, together with the FIKA representatives, prepared a first Case Study which documents their efforts. It was circulated to the Commission membership with an invitation for them to prepare a similar document demonstrating how they may have used the UIA Accord. A second case study was prepared in collaboration with Mr. Peck on the presentation of the UIA Accord to the World Trade Organization. These two case studies have been posted on the Commission's web site. No other suggestions have been received for other case studies.

4.3. Web-Site: All of the Commission's documents are posted and available at www.aia.org/institute/uiia. The UIA Bureau at their recent meeting in Moscow, Russia took note of how this Commission has gone about keeping all of its documents accessible to UIA members and the public. Additions have been made to reference sources for other translations of the UIA Accord into Chinese, Japanese and Korean.

4.4. Advisory Committee Meeting: The Chair noted that the Advisory Committee consists of the Co-Directors and the Chairs of the currently active Drafting Panels. Yesterday's meeting addressed the following topics:

A. Treatment of Commission documents not currently having UIA Accord Policies:

There are four documents currently being addressed by the Commission that do not have UIA Accord Policies - Alternative Procurement and Project Delivery, Codes and Standards, Computer Practice and Mutual Recognition Agreements. It was the sense of the Advisory Committee that two of these documents merit the addition of new policies to the UIA Accord - Alternative Procurement and Project Delivery (which is now titled Building Project Delivery Systems) and Mutual Recognition Agreements. Regarding the other two, there was recognition that while they needed to be incorporated into the broad framework of the Accord they do not yet represent subjects that merit separate

UIA Accord policy statements. The Advisory Committee is recommending that the Commission create a third category of documents to accommodate these two subjects - Professional Practice Information Notes. This third level of such "Notes" could be referenced under the existing Accord Policy on the Practice of Architecture.

B. Recommended Guidelines - The current approved triennium work program calls for the Commission to complete work on the three recommended guidelines for those UIA Accord policies currently not having such guidelines - Role of Professional Bodies, Scope of Practice and Form of Practice. Once accepted by this Commission these documents are then presented to the UIA Council for the approval.

C. 2005-2008 Triennium Work Program - The Commission is obligated to submit to the Secretary-General in advance of the 2005 UIA General Assembly a proposed Work Program for the next three-year period. The announcement for this meeting invited Commission members to forward their suggestions for such programs. The presentation of these suggestions will be addressed under Agenda Item 17.

D. 2005 UIA Congress and General Assembly - The Commission has been active in past Congresses in presenting programs that have been well attended and received. The Advisory Committee is recommending three potential programs for potential presentation in Istanbul - 1) how UIA member sections have and are using the UIA Accord; 2) an updated presentation on the International Practice Standards Data Base and analysis of the survey findings; 3) a presentation on the completed set of Recommended Guidelines for the UIA Accord Policies.

Pending the acceptance of these program proposals by the organizers of the UIA Congress, he would be seeking volunteers to organize, coordinate and present these three sessions in Istanbul.

4.5. Commission Process - Before moving on to the rest of the meeting agenda, the Chair recalled that the Commission has historically always operated as a democratic body. All UIA member sections are invited to have representation on the Commission. The announcement for this meeting was sent to all UIA member sections not presently represented on the Commission. Once the Commission has established their work program, the major body of the work is conducted through Drafting Panels addressing a specific subject and chaired by a volunteer chair. These chairs make the major presentations at this meeting. Nearly all of the documents being considered at this meeting have been before the Commission at prior meetings. The active participation of every individual present at this meeting is encouraged. The Commission generally attempts to reach agreement by consensus. However, if that appears not to be possible, the Commission will hold a formal vote in order to move a document forward.

It is the hope of the Advisory Group that by the end of this meeting we can reach closure on at least the three recommended guideline documents that relate to the UIA Accord Policies that do not have Recommended Guidelines - Role of Professional Bodies, Form of Practice and Scope of Practice. This is important if we are to be able to present to the 2005 UIA Congress and General Assembly a completed assemblage of Recommended Guidelines for the UIA Accord as adopted in Beijing in 1999. Thus we need to have these documents submitted to and approved by the UIA Council between now and July 2005. The next UIA Council meeting will take place in Mexico on May 26-28.

Discussion:

Mrs. Cox indicated that it was likely there would be a UIA Council meeting in early 2005 to ensure that they had acted on all the items to go before the UIA General Assembly.

Mr. Peck observed that historically the Commission has attempted to be aspirational in approach to our work product. Our products are intended to serve UIA member sections throughout the world. Further, we have attempted to provide a set of accepted international standards that can be used by UIA member sections in their relations with their national governments and in negotiations between both UIA member sections and between their national regulatory bodies when undertaking mutual recognition agreements. We have not merely attempted to document the existing conditions found in architectural practice around the world.

Mr. Wachi noted that it is his view that the Commission will need to consider if the document on Mutual Recognition Agreement should be treated as a higher level document above the UIA Accord.

Mr. Yi asked for a clarification on where the Recommended Guidelines for the UIA Accord Policies currently stood.

The Chair indicated that the UIA Accord as approved by the UIA General Assembly in Beijing in 1999 contains 16 policy statements. Of those 16 policies, three were viewed as being developed to the point where there was not a need for a separate Recommended Guideline. Of the remaining 13 Accord Policies, the Commission has developed and had approved by the UIA Council 10 Recommended Guidelines. There are three UIA Accord Policies that currently do not have approved Recommended Guidelines and it is those that we will be addressing at this meeting.

Mr. Yi inquired as to how the approved UIA Accord Recommended Guidelines are announced once they have been approved by the UIA Council.

The Chair noted that they are announced in the UIA Newsletter, shared with the Commission members and posted on the Commission web-site. There is not yet a published compendium of all of the approved Recommended Guidelines for the UIA Accord.

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

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

Presentation: Mr. Farrando reported that 2,500 copies of the survey were published and distributed through a number of venues. Copies were provided to the Commission members at the Tokyo meeting.

Since Tokyo the survey form has been revised and restructured. This was done to unify the data provided by those completing the questionnaire. The goal was to secure more accurate information and reduce the need to try to interpret the data provided. The new form incorporates both the survey and instructions in one document and provides for more detailed instructions. With the old format being more than four years old, there was now a need to add new data elements. These new data elements derive largely from the new issues being addressed by this Commission.

He proceeded to review the changes to the form made since the Tokyo meeting. There were three categories of changes - grammatical, revisions suggested at the Tokyo meeting and elements added since the Tokyo meeting. These were included in the document circulated in advance of this meeting. He invited comments by the Commission members.

He indicated that they have begun using this revised format to assemble updated information from the UIA member sections. By the end of 2004 the new survey format was distributed to the 92 UIA member sections, six countries which are not currently UIA members, Portuguese speaking countries that are not UIA members, and additional countries in UIA Region V that are not UIA members. The total distribution has amounted to 104 countries. 15 responses have been received. Assuming there are enough responses, they are planning to produce an updated version of the survey data by the time of the 2005 UIA Congress.

Discussion:

Mr. Peck referenced Question 2. In many countries when they are asked for the number of architects in the country it is clear that where the title is protected there can only be one answer. The problem lies in the Accord definition because it says "an

architect is a person professionally and academically qualified and generally registered/licensed...” He suggested that perhaps the question should be framed in terms of the number of architectural graduates in the country and then there can be no confusion. It is a problem. Some countries are going to be answering this with respect to those that are registered; many other countries will provide the numbers who have finished a course/degree in architecture.

Mr. Farrando responded stating that the problem goes beyond that. For some countries the definition of an architect is very different from that in other countries. He acknowledged, based on experience that countries will respond to this question with different things in mind. He stated that it will be difficult to refine the question far enough to make sure that all of the answers are strictly homogeneous.

Mr. Naga stated that providing the number of architects is a problem in Egypt. He suggested further categorization of the answers into: 1) number of student architects, 2) number of graduate architects, 3) professional practitioners, 4) others providing architectural services, and 5) perhaps retirees. It is also hard for them to collect the number of student architects in their country. There is also a conflict in collecting information on architect fees between those used by the professional body and those set by the government.

Mr. Prinz stated that for Germany determining the number of architects is also a concern. He suggested that the calculation of the UIA member section fees should be separated from the UIA member section number used in this survey. It is currently the only figure the UIA Secretariat relies on. He supported the suggestion to use categories in answering this question. He suggested in a future revision allowing some space at the end for the provision of some additional notes to reflect ongoing changes and new developments, i.e. architectural education in many European countries. He suggested a future repositioning of the internship question following those related to education and immediately before those dealing with professional practice.

Mr. Silcher referenced the need for future clarification of the bodies issuing fee scales. Professional is clear while governmental may lead to a misunderstanding. For example, in the case of Germany it is the legislative body, not an executive branch of government, who issue the fee schedules.

Mrs. Siola noted in the case of Greece it is obligatory to be registered as an architect so there is no ambiguity in their survey response. She suggested dividing the answer into two parts - the number of registered architects and the number of non-registered architects. She suggested future refinement of the question relating to the number of student architects with regard to the inclusion of nationals who are studying architecture in other countries. She too is concerned over the UIA using this survey as an element in establishing UIA member sections fees, particularly in regard to the possibility of UIA

member sections using a figure that would be advantageous to the level of their UIA membership fees.

Mr. Verma, in reference to Question 1, he believes it is important to identify in the public version of the survey the name is of the UIA member section that provided the survey data. The second is in regard to Question 64 where the survey asks about others allowed to practice architecture. He suggested that it would be useful to ask the UIA member section what they are doing to correct the situation(s) that might be described in their answers to “B” and “C”.

Mr. Wachi recommended that when a respondent to the survey believes there is a deviation in their answer to a question, they should be expected to provide accompanying documentation which adequately explains the deviation(s). For example, in the case of Japan the registration system is very different from that used in other countries. They have provided information in their response to explain the system. He believes it is difficult, if not impossible, to arrive at a system of questions and definitions that are equally applicable to all survey respondents.

Mr. Yi stated that Korea also has difficulty in defining the architect. It is easy for them to provide the number of legally registered architects but it is difficult for them to provide a number related to those that are academically qualified. Likewise, due the large number of differing educational systems, it is difficult for them to provide the number of architectural students.

Mr. Albakri stated that the data base has been very useful to Malaysia in their understanding of what other countries are doing and in being able to make comparisons between what is currently being done in their country. He too acknowledged that there is a problem in arriving at the definition of an architect that is equally applicable to all UIA member sections. He suggested that it might be useful to ask the UIA member section to provide what their definition/categories of an architect is as it relates to their country. For example in Malaysia they have professional architect, architect and registered draftsman.

Mr. Otrakul recommended adding a statement of purpose at the beginning to the survey document. He suggested that it was time for the UIA to alter their calculation of the UIA member section fees so as not to use the number of architects. He agreed with the previous speakers who voiced their concerns on this matter.

Mr. Hyett stated that he agreed with previous speakers who noted that not all architects in a country may be registered. In Britain they produce some 2,500 architectural graduates per year but there is no system in place to track what happens to them following their graduation. It is important for the survey to reflect the variations between countries, i.e. in Britain there is a major use of project managers and quantity surveyors.

They do not have protection of function. In the USA architects are much more adept at dealing with building costs. In Japan there is a greater emphasis on engineering capabilities. These variations are going to exist and we cannot impose a universal standard. This survey reveals variations between countries and offers a chance for the UIA, in future, to identify areas of different practice much more precisely and to establish and recommend best practices that some countries may wish to move towards. There may be cases where harmonization becomes desirable and where new practices may be advantageous to a country. He views it as an immensely valuable document that merits being kept up-to-date over the coming years and decades.

Mr. Farrando responded to the comments made by recalling that the survey is intended as a living document. What he presented today is only the second version of this work. The comments presented today will be taken into consideration in the third revision to the survey document.

Action: The Chair, hearing no other comments, thanked Mr. Farrando and the Colegio for their extremely dedicated and hard work on behalf of this effort.

The revised Standard Format for Reporting Practice Standards is included as Appendix 2.

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

Introduction: The Chair recognized Mrs. Cox to make this report. For those attending their first Commission meeting he noted that there is a UIA Accord policy on education and that there had been joint meetings of the UIA Education Commission and the Professional Practice Commission.

Presentation:

UNESCO/UIA Validation Council for Architectural Education

Mrs. Cox reported that the Council's second meeting was held in Paris in October 2003. At that meeting the Chairman of the Commonwealth Association of Architects' (CAA) Validation Committee, Prof. George Henderson, gave a presentation explaining how CAA organizes and conducts accreditation visits to schools of architecture. He made the following points: 1) The baseline of competency is the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) level. 2) It is run using a validation panel of 40 people from all its member institutes who are experts in education and/or practice and who remain on the panel for six years. 3) Since 2003 CAA has out-sourced the day-to-day administration to RIBA Services on a three year trial basis. 4) CAA has meetings by teleconference internationally through New Zealand because it is cheaper than face-to-face meetings.

It costs something like 300 pounds for a teleconference as against 12,000 pounds for a face-to-face meeting. 5) They share costs with the school being visited and the school pays the airfares and accommodation expenses for the eight panel members. 6) When they have an advisory visit one person goes informally to the school and discusses how they should prepare for a full visit. Anything that needs to be upgraded or changed which may take that school up two years until it feels it is ready for the full visit to occur. Mr. Henderson suggested that it may be possible for the UNESCO/UIA to recognize the existing accreditation systems that have equivalent standards, such as the RIBA, NAAB, CAA and the Australian system.

Further, UNESCO/UIA could be a conduit for those schools that are recognized by one of the above systems. It would then be possible to encourage the rest of the world where systems do not operate to set up national systems that could be recognized by UNESCO/UIA.

Since then, James Scheeler of the American Institute of Architects has prepared a draft Protocol for Mutual Recognition of Validation Systems. This will be discussed next week at the Council's Paris meeting.

Other items to be discussed next week are the situation with the draft information and training manuals for the validation systems. The costs of the visits to systems or schools. The progress with the validation of the four systems that have already applied. These are validation systems in Germany, Spain, Brazil and Mexico. One study program in Paris and the system operating in Japan will be discussed more fully. The second trial of the system in Australia will also be discussed.

The UNESCO/UIA Relationship

A new relationship is required between UNESCO and UIA by the end of next year for validation and for the charter. It may be a different section of UNESCO dealing with UIA. The present section dealing with the UIA doesn't want to deal with education validation items in the future. We are trying to sort out this problem.

UNESCO/UIA Charter for Architectural Education

The Charter was first adopted in Barcelona in 1996. In July 2002 at the Berlin General Assembly it was agreed that the Charter would be revised every six years. This is being undertaken at the moment. Comments were received up to September 2003 which resulted in version six which were discussed at length at the October 2003 Validation Council meeting. There was some reluctance around the table to change the original version. It was agreed to create a sub-committee consisting of Fernando Ramos (Spain), Roland Schweitzer (France) and Valdimir Slapeta (Czech Republic), James Scheeler (USA) and myself. We have met and version seven will be discussed at the

UIA Education Commission meeting in Paris this coming Sunday and at the Validation Council meeting on Monday. The UIA Education Commission is looking at the Charter as well and researching student exchanges between different regions and implementing the UIA education policy.

There is a new UIA Committee on Continuing Professional Development which held their first meeting in Paris this past November. Nine UIA member sections have contributed information on their continuing professional education requirements and programs.

Discussion:

Mr. Yi asked if, based on the discussions regarding the Japan architectural education system, there were any conclusions or resolutions.

Mrs. Cox indicated that while they had a presentation at the Region IV Validation Committee meeting in Tokyo in October they had not had any discussions beyond hearing the presentation. She indicated that they had additional information on the changes in Korean system where 75 schools have gone from four year programs to five year programs.

Mr. Wachi inquired if by considering a mutual recognition system among established national systems they would be abandoning the validation of individual programs.

Mrs. Cox indicated that they would be working in both venues. If there is an established national validation system of accreditation/validation in a country they would want to look at that first before they look at individual study programs with schools of architecture in that country. If there is no national system, such as in France, and a school comes forward to invite an examination of their program, they would look at that individual program.

Mr. Wachi inquired what would happen if the Validation Council validated an individual program in a country and then subsequently was asked to validate that country's national system.

Mrs. Cox indicated that hopefully they would first validate the national system. She acknowledged that his question raised a point that would require further consideration.

Mr. Naga expressed a concern for who is going to cover the cost for such validation exercises. He noted that this is a major issue for the schools of architecture in UIA Region V.

Mrs. Cox acknowledged that the cost issue has not yet been fully discussed. There has been a Validation Cost Paper prepared and submitted to the Validation Council which needs further consideration.

Mr. Naga inquired as to when this UNESCO/UIA Validation system will be put into effect.

Mrs. Cox responded indicating that they wished to start it as soon as possible but there are still many issues yet to be resolved.

Mr. Bourdrez inquired if they had been asked by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) in the United States to look at their system.

Mrs. Cox responded that they had been looking at the NAAB system.

Mr. Silcher wished to clarify her statement that the UNESCO department they had been dealing with was no longer interested in education.

Mrs. Cox responded that it was her understanding the UNESCO person in charge of that department was no longer interested in the validation of education systems. Overall this department is still involved with higher education.

Mr. Siew indicated that the UNESCO department dealing with the UNESCO/UIA Validation Program is the Department of Social Science. The directorship of the department has changed. The new individual does not want to deal with education. Education will now be focused in the UNESCO Department of Culture and Education. This reorganization has not yet been finalized. He continued to note two points of concern for UIA Region V. One is with the costs of validation visits. The second is the with the make-up of the Validation Visiting Committee. There is a feeling that there should be membership on such committees by representatives from UIA Region V.

Mrs. Cox responded that the proposal calls for two representatives from the UIA region in which the national system or the individual school is being validated would be members of the visiting team. The Region UIA Validation Committee will decide who those representatives will be.

Mr. Verma inquired if the validation of a national system meant that all of the schools covered by that system will then be considered to be validated.

Mrs. Cox responded that this would be the case.

Mr. Prinz noted that a new national validation system is being created in Germany but there is much discussion and need for clarity since it is a totally new undertaking. He will forward information to Mrs. Cox.

Mrs. Cox noted that the Validation Council had received a draft paper on this proposed system. They had reviewed it and shared their comments on the draft but had not yet received any response to their comments.

Mr. Hyett noted that he had written a letter in June 2003 to the UIA President in which he stated that while the Royal Institute of British Architects welcomed the UIA establishing a program to validate systems it did not believe that the UIA attempting to set up a system to validate individual schools was going to be either workable or affordable. The discussion at this table shows the affordability is clearly a concern. He expressed a concern that if the UIA pursues a program where it attempts to both validate national systems and individual schools, it will end up in a muddle. He stated his view that the UIA should withdraw from any program to validate individual schools and maintain only an independent authority to look only at systems. He also believes that it will bring the UIA into conflict with the mutual recognition agreements.

Mr. Sauveur inquired if the Validation Council is concerned with the Accord of Bologna.

Mrs. Cox acknowledged that the Validation Council is very concerned with the proposal in the Accord of Bologna dealing with a three-year undergraduate degree.

Mr. Yi observed that the Validation Council has accredited two university programs in Paris and one in Sydney. He inquired as to who was the source of the invitations to undertake these validations. In the case of Australia he noted there is a national validation system and was interested in knowing how the Validation Council dealt with one university that he assumes was also validated by this existing national system.

Mrs. Cox responded that the two universities in Australia have been only treated as trials and are not intended to receive UNESCO/UIA Validation at this time. Australia has decided not be part of the Commonwealth Association of Architects and that meant that there was no international system Australia could relate to at that stage. There are now additional Australian university programs who have expressed an interest in participating in such trial visits.

Mr. Peck noted that he had been appointed to a joint committee made up of members of the Professional Practice Commission and the Education Commission. To his knowledge the committee has never met.

The Chair responded that he did not have personal knowledge of such a committee and it would be necessary for him to review the history with Mr. Scheeler.

Mrs. Cox indicated that once the UNESCO Charter on Architectural Education and the UNESCO/UIA Validation document were approved by the UIA General Assembly, there had not been any further joint meetings. She thought such joint meetings were needed and would discuss it at the next Education Commission meeting.

Mr. Mohammed concurred with the importance of re-establishing joint meetings of the two Commissions. There is an ongoing link between the UIA Accord policy on education and the work of the Education Commission.

Mrs. Siola concurred noting the example of the Bologna Accord and its differences with the UIA Accord and the UIA Education Charter.

The Chair thanked Mrs. Cox for her report.

7. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE RECOMMENDED GUIDELINE FOR ACCORD POLICY ON PROFESSIONAL BODIES

Introduction: The Chair noted that Mr. Bucher was unable to attend this meeting and he asked Ms. Moreau, a member of the Drafting Panel, to make the presentation in his place. He introduced Ms. Moreau and noted that this represented the fourth reading of the document.

Presentation: Ms. Moreau stated that both the comments made at the Tokyo meeting as well as those received subsequently from Commission members had been incorporated into a revised document which was circulated in advance of this meeting. She made particular note of the issue of whether the professional body also served dual roles as both the national professional body and that of the registration/regulatory body. This dual role is the existing situation in a number of UIA member sections, i.e. France, Spain, Germany, and Italy. Ms. Moreau reviewed the changes made in the document as a result of the Commission's discussion and comments.

Discussion:

Mr. Peck emphasized that the edited document is focused only on professional bodies that are made up of architects for the purpose of advancing architecture. While it identifies the other types of bodies but confines this guideline to the policy which is about professional bodies concerned with the advancement of architecture.

Mr. Mohammed questioned the inclusion of the discussion of GATS since there is no other reference to it in the document and it is already included in other guidelines.

Mr. Peck recommended moving it to the preamble.

Mr. Verma recommended clarification of the reference to members of the regulatory body. Professional bodies have members whereas regulatory bodies grant professional licenses.

Ms. Moreau responded that in numerous UIA member sections the professional body and the regulatory body are one in the same and thus are members.

Mr. Lush questioned the wording under the entry democratic representation as to the necessity of having the constitution of a professional body jointly agreed with the authorities. This is not the case in many countries for self-regulated professional bodies. He suggests a conflict with other statements in the document.

Mr. Hyett noted that in Ireland they have recently merged the professional body and the regulatory body.

Mr. Yi, reflecting on the Korean situation, expressed the view that the focus should just be on the professional body and not on the regulatory body.

Mr. Silcher noted that in Europe, in those countries where the professional body and the regulatory body are the same, the government body is involved in approving the statutes/bylaws that govern the regulatory functions.

Mr. Farrando recalled that in earlier reviews of this document we had changed the title from professional institutes to professional bodies in order to recognize that it needed to reflect that there were situations where the professional and regulatory body were one in the same as well as to incorporate all forms of bodies dealing with architects.

Mr. Siew stated that the confusion being evidenced in the discussion is reflective of the where the individual comes from. This paper is intended to cover the situation where there are separate professional and regulatory bodies as well as the condition where the professional and regulatory bodies are the same.

Mr. Wachi expressed concern over the use of the term "architects interest".

The Chair, in view of the discussion, read the approved UIA policy statement on this subject.

Mr. Prinz emphasized that the importance of the policy and the guideline is an attempt to insure that every country have a professional body of architects. This is what is stated in the policy. As a representative of a body that encompasses both the professional and regulatory functions, he views that paper as presented as recognizing his situation.

Mr. Peck indicated that while the preamble recognizes that two systems do exist, is responding to and in keeping with the policy statement, it is focused on the professional bodies. It could be suggested that at some point in the future might produce a UIA accord policy and recommended guideline on regulatory bodies.

Mr. Verma noted that historically the professional bodies in many countries had a role in bringing into being the regulatory body for architects.

Mr. Lush questioned the wording under the promotion of research and development of architecture and under the promotion of architecture as being too prescriptive and unnecessarily.

Ms. Moreau, in consideration of the comments, suggested revising the document and returning with a revised edition at this meeting. She did so and the Commission considered the revised edition.

The Chair asked if everyone believed that their comments had been reflected in the revised document. He asked if there were any further comments.

Mr. Harris questioned referencing on page 9 "contributing to the promotion of architecture" and "to a sustainable environment" in the same sentence. Any new building has an impact on the environment.

Mr. Hyett disagreed observing that architecture should be delivered in a more ecological manner thus lessening the damage to the environment.

Mr. Lush concurred with Mr. Harris on his observation.

Mr. Silcher observed that our existence as architects is founded on the belief that this combination is possible. We could not function as architects if one believed that the world needs to remain untouched.

Mr. Peck recommended that the point be revised to make it clear that we are referring to contributing to the promotion of the art and science of architecture. Then have a separate entry indicating the promotion of the principles of ecologically sustainable development.

Mr. Sauveur noted that the numbering needed to be revised.

Mr. Shim questioned why on page 10 under the heading of "democratic representation" why the word "statutes" has been replaced by "articles, rules and bylaws" and yet in another location it has not be changed.

Mrs. Cox questioned whether this last reference is needed at all.

Action: Mr. Hyett observed that this document is intended for countries where professional bodies do not yet exist. It is not intended to impose it on countries already have a professional body. In the absence of a professional body, this is a laudable document and recommended it be approved for presentation to the UIA Council. He moved acceptance of the document.

Mrs. Cox seconded the motion.

The Chair, hearing no objection, stated that the document was approved by the Commission. He thanked Mrs. Moreau for role in finalizing the document at this meeting.

The Recommended Guideline as approved by the Commission is included as Appendix 3.

8. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE RECOMMENDED GUIDELINE FOR ACCORD POLICY ON THE FORM OF PRACTICE

Introduction: The Chair noted that this was the second reading of the document. He introduced Mr. Wachi as the Chair of the Drafting Panel to make the presentation.

Presentation: Mr. Wachi noted that since the April 2003 presentation in Tokyo he had received several additional comments which were integrated into the revised document. That draft was circulated to the members of the Drafting Panel in October and responses were received in November. The draft circulated in advance of this meeting was prepared in January. He reviewed the major changes reflected in this draft. He concluded by emphasizing that the essence of this document reflects what the Accord policy states, i.e. that we allow any types of form of practice that are in accordance with the law. It also emphasizes that the relationship of the architect to any form of practice be disclosed to the client.

He invited any further comments.

Discussion:

Mr. Peck stated that he had a number of suggested changes to the wording in the document which involves a better expression of the idea already reflected in the document. There are no fundamental changes to the ideas being expressed in the document. He did have some specific changes to propose with regard to the definitions contained in the document, such as unlimited companies and limited partnerships.

Mr. Silcher shared a concern over the need for further consideration of the definitions. There are a number of forms of practice included which are unknown in Germany.

Mr. Lush observed that these standards aren't exclusively in the public interest; they are also in the interests of practicing architects. As presented, he believes there is an element of exclusivity to the public interest.

Mr. Peck responded that the reason for having international standards is not to serve the architectural profession but to serve the communities that the architectural profession serves. We have agreed in the past that we should continually stress the importance of the public interest.

Mr. Hyett stated that he was concerned that he does not see in this document any reference to architects who are working directly for a building company. There are many such examples of this form of practice in Britain. The RIBA had formerly outlawed this form of practice but no longer maintains this view. He regards this as a fundamental issue which needs to be addressed.

Mr. Peck noted that Mr. Hyatt's concern is being addressed when we get to the agenda item dealing with building delivery systems.

Mr. Wachi suggested that if the changes being proposed by Mr. Peck were more editorial in nature than changes in the basic structure or intent of the document that they meet separately to review his proposed changes and return to the meeting with a revised draft.

Mrs. Cox supported this approach if there was nothing basic to the document that was being proposed in Mr. Peck's changes.

Mr. Yi observed that in Korea there are only two forms of practice, the sole practitioner and the corporate form of practice. He views there being two general approaches, one the business approach related to generating the architectural firm's economic income and the other the professionally related approach which he views as being related to the liability for the design. He believes the focus should be on whom, in what form of practice, has the liability for the design.

Mr. Wachi stated that there are many forms of architectural practice in existence around the world. We cannot simplify what they are. This document is attempting to acknowledge that fact that they exist and to briefly recognize and categorize them. The liability issue is one of the subjects found in the matrix. It is not intended to suggest that every country one will find all of these forms of practice. This document is not intending to restrict any form of practice.

Mr. Albakri stated his view that there are three basic forms of practice: 1) sole proprietor, 2) partnerships and 3) companies. There are many forms of partnerships. When it comes to companies, you are governed by public laws related to the establishment of companies. The ability to form architectural companies in Malaysia is a more recent development. It is now possible for one individual to have all three forms of practice. Among the factors influencing this change is the expansion of Malaysian architects into international practices.

Mr. Hyett acknowledged that the document is a comprehensive survey of the many forms of practice. He questioned if it might not be treated as a Professional Practice Note rather than a Recommended Guideline.

Mr. Wachi responded that as a Recommended Guideline it is supporting an approved Accord policy statement. It serves to outline the many potential forms of practice that are employed in the practice of architecture. It should assist clients in understanding the different forms of practice. There is no intention to have it serve as a law or suggest that every country has to have all of these various forms of practice.

The Chair, in view of the discussion, directed the attention of the Commission to the language of the approved Accord policy on Form of Practice. "Architects should be allowed to practice in any form legally acceptable in the country in which the service is offered but always subject to prevailing ethical and conduct requirements. The UIA as it deems necessary will develop and modify its policies and standards to take into account of alternative forms of practice and varied local conditions where these alternatives are thought to extend the positive and creative role of architects in the interests of society." This is the policy for which this recommended guideline is intended. Historically, the charge to this Drafting Panel was to inventory these forms of practice and to inventory them as a resource. It was not intended to then recommend or ask the UIA Council to endorse or approve any one form of practice. Thus, in assembling this inventory one cannot eliminate examples if they do happen to exist in your country.

Mr. Silcher stated that it was important that the UIA recommendation be that the responsible person for a firm, which has the title architect in its firm name, shall be an architect. UIA member sections should be encourage to see that in their country an architects company must be led by an architect.

Mr. Prinz noted that changes in the form of practice, such as the formation of companies, are also taking place in Germany. He believes that the objective of having the architect serve the client's best interest should come out even though there may be different forms of practice being utilized.

Mr. Wachi responded that this document is not generating anything new with regard to forms of practice. The emphasis is placed on illustrating that in whatever form of practice the architect does not have a conflict of interest when it comes to their serving the client and that there is a responsible architect who is making the decisions.

Mr. Lush expressed a concern regarding sweeping statements in the document that may frustrate good intentions. By having such a lengthy document that is so detailed we are exposing ourselves to certain contradictions. The document speaks of serving the public interest and serving the client but these are not necessarily complimentary or exclusive. It is our duty to serve the client's best interests while being legal but yet such a situation may not be in the public's interest. In his view we should be addressing one or the other but not both. He suggested that we should speak of neither but rather we should be ethical. He stated his agreement with Mr. Hyett's previous comments regarding the role of architects in the design-build process in Britain. It is his view that in those alternative forms of practice where architects are not in control they are not necessarily contrary to the public interest. We need to recognize that what is in the public interest may not always be in architecture's interest. He feels the document is too utopian and ambitious.

Mr. Wachi responded by referencing the UIA Code of Ethics. This is not intended as a guideline to lead all firms in a good way. It is a guideline that is a benchmarking. It clearly states what are the responsibilities of the architect. This document is not attempting to address all issues. This is intended to guide the individual architect to understand his/her role in the various forms of practice.

Mr. Naga observed that in Egypt they have different terminology to describe their forms of practice - 1) registered architect, 2) consultant specialist and 3) expert.

Mr. Wachi responded that this document was not intended to define architects. That has already been addressed in the existing Accord. This document is intended to address the forms of practice that the qualified architect is engaged in.

Mr. Peck emphasized that this document is about various forms of practice. We should not become confused with other entities which provide, as part of their services, architectural services. This document speaks to recommended forms of practices and it has focused on three generic levels: 1) individuals, 2) partnerships and 3) companies. The essential point of the document is to respond to the existing Accord policy. In the spirit in the policy, if one wishes to form a partnership, these are the essential things that conform to the intent of the policy. He believes the document needs to provide a definition to what is meant by the architect as a member of the corporation - is it an employee, a shareholder or a director? He suggested clarification to make clear that a member of a corporation is an equity holder in the corporation.

The Chair, while expressing appreciation for the comments being presented, expressed a concern that they had not been shared with the Drafting Panel at an earlier point in time following the 2004 Tokyo meeting. In recognition of the need to keep with the agenda schedule, he asked that Mr. Peck meet with Mr. Wachi to review and incorporate his editorial changes in the document. He suggested that a revised document be brought back to the Commission at tomorrow's meeting for presentation and consideration.

Mr. Hyett responded to Mr. Lush's comments and suggested they need consideration in the document as being fundamental whether we are serving the public interest or individual client interest. He noted that for the first time in his career he is working in a firm of 145 persons that is not headed by an architect. The firm is producing quality work and more efficiently than it has ever done before. He sees this work as being in the public interest since their focus is on public buildings, primarily hospitals. The UIA needs to recognize and acknowledge that the practice of architecture is dynamic and is constantly changing and it should be reflected in our documents.

Mr. Wachi responded stating that working for the public interest is not necessarily working for the client and visa versa. That is not only an issue for the form of practice, it is an issue for the architect. He views it as an essential issue for the architect. He does not believe it has to be addressed in the form of practice.

Mr. Silcher having listened to the discussion suggested dividing the document into two distinct elements - the recommended guideline and an annex which sets forth the inventory of the known existing forms of practice. He questioned if the UIA should be in the position of recommending to its member sections forms of practice, in certain forms when the forms of practice are much more a reality of the national jurisdiction rather than an international professional body.

Mr. Peck responded that Mr. Silcher's comments could be easily dealt with by changing the wording in the headings, i.e. "Current Forms of Practice" rather than "Recommended Forms of Practice".

Mr. Wachi, in consideration of the comments, suggested revising the document and returning with a revised edition at this meeting. He did so and presented the revised document that incorporated the Commission's comments. He invited any further comments.

Mrs. Cox suggested adding "major" to further describe the five forms of practice referenced.

Mr. Hyett noted that in the United Kingdom they have very large building companies that practice both nationally and internationally. These companies employ architects and have architectural departments. They come in two types - one is architects who work for the company who interpret drawings produced by architects outside the company and the second are the architects who work for them and are responsible for the entire project. He questioned where such a situation would fit under the A, B and C categories used in this document.

Mr. Wachi referenced the category B.6 where he believed such conditions were accommodated.

Mr. Hyett then referenced the point that in the document there is a statement the only shareholders in a company should be architects.

Mr. Wachi responded that this point is only a recommendation. He acknowledged that this may not be the case in all situations. He referred to the actual Accord policy which acknowledges that there are many forms of practice. The document recognizes any form of legally acceptable form of practice.

Mr. Hyett indicated that he was uncomfortable accepting a document which recommends certain forms of practice and by implication casts a shadow over other kinds of forms of practice. The RIBA has over 30,000 members and many of them work in senior positions in such building companies. They happen not be the overall superior authority, even over architectural matters, and they are part of a company with a responsibility to shareholders. It is not acceptable for him to accept the principal that they should be somehow categorized as a second preference of practice which is accepted only because it is legitimate in a country but is not endorsed as equal to the other forms of practice.

Mr. Wachi responded stating that he viewed the document has being a description of the existing forms of practice without having any hierarchy. The only over-riding criteria in the document was that in whatever form of practice employed there was no conflict of interest. The intent is ensuring that in any form of practice the relationship of the architect to the client is disclosed.

Mr. Hyett suggested that he could accept the document if a category was added which recognized architects who were directly employed by building companies. In his view this is a form of practice by architects in the United Kingdom and it is even being used by foreign companies coming currently working in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Wachi responded indicating that this document is intended to focus on the form of practice by architects, not by building companies.

Mr. Hyett noted that any RIBA member who works for a building company has direct responsibility to the building company and they also have professional duties through that building company to clients. For those RIBA members working in such situations they are still subject to the RIBA Code of Conduct and the Architectural Registration Board Code of Conduct.

Mr. Wachi indicated that it is not the intent of this guideline to deny any legally acceptable form of practice.

Mr. Mohammed suggested the possibility of elaborating B.7. He stated that many large international corporations are providing architectural services under the banner of construction services as used in the GATS commitments. Thus they can move into a country as a corporation and provide architectural services. Most of the requests by developed countries to developing countries ask for the deletion of the requests related to professional services in architecture and engineering and to allow commercial presence as commercial corporations. This is a big issue. The UIA needs a guideline on how to handle the issue of protecting domestic economies from such foreign commercial corporations.

Mr. Otrakul noted that many architects in Thailand work for developers. If we are going to characterize that condition, we have many forms of practice to categorize.

Action: The Chair, noting the time element, stated that further comments would need to be forwarded to Mr. Wachi as soon as possible and concisely as possible. He stated that we could not reach closure on this document at this meeting.

A copy of the revised draft recommended guideline as presented in the agenda is included as Appendix 4. Additional comments may be addressed to Mr. Wachi at his e-mail address: Wachi@nikken.co.jp

9. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE RECOMMENDED GUIDELINE FOR ACCORD POLICY ON THE SCOPE OF PRACTICE

Introduction: The Chair recognized Mr. Wachi to make the presentation and noted that this was the second reading of the document.

Presentation: Mr. Wachi stated that he received seven comments following the presentation at the Tokyo meeting and he integrated them into the document. This revised document was circulated to the Drafting Panel in October and comments were received by the end of November. A revised document was then forwarded to the Commission Secretariat in January which is the document circulated in advance of this meeting. He noted the major changes and invited comments.

Discussion:

Mr. Silcher noted that under core services there is no reference to obtaining the project approvals from public authorities. He views this as a major step in every project.

Mr. Wachi noted that it is included later in the document.

Mr. Hyett welcomed the document and noted the important work done by Gordon Chong, Past-President of the AIA, regarding expanding architectural services. Mr. Chong made a very well received presentation at the 2002 UIA Berlin Congress. He suggested that there be a reference to this in this document.

Mrs. Cox suggested the addition of a reference to where the architects form and write the project brief with the client identifying the requirements and limitations of the project. She recommended adding post-occupancy evaluation.

Mr. Peck noted that he had a number of comments on the document that do not make any fundamental changes in the document but are primarily editorial in nature. He suggested that he share these with Mr. Wachi and then return to the Commission with a revised document for later presentation at this meeting.

Mr. Moleko inquired whether under the heading of design it would be possible to incorporate a reference to design coordination with other professionals. It is a fundamental role.

Mr. Shim noted that under the heading of "other services" there was a statement regarding the architect being qualified to offer these services. Can the condition being described be interpreted as meaning that education, training and experience described to be able to offer such services be legally required pre-condition.

Mr. Hamzah wondered if one could actually define "appropriately educated". This point relates to past conditions in Malaysia where they had the concept of "privilege" where a senior architect with RIBA qualification could tutor a prospective architect for a number of years to prepare this individual to take the RIBA Part II examination. Would this meet the test of appropriately educated or would one need a paper qualification?

Mr. Wachi responded that this matter is more appropriately a part of the UIA education policy.

Mrs. Siola stated that she viewed the document as being based on construction. Some of the subjects referred to as core services are very important for the profession, such as restoration and urban planning. The present core services statement minimizes these services by putting them in one paragraph. She asked that they be listed as individual

bullet items. Urban design and urban planning in many universities are important elements of architectural education.

Mr. Verma in reference to the list of "other services" questioned the need to include the subjects included in the parenthesis, i.e. specialist detailing (curtain walls).

Mr. Yi based on his experience, observed that it is difficult for an individual architect to have the in-depth skills necessary to perform all of the "other services" included in this document. He suggested that it should be recognized that architects retain specialized consultants to undertake specific tasks for which they are better qualified. The project architect is still must coordinate and manage such services. He is concerned that such a listing implies that one individual is fully capable in each of these areas.

Mr. Wachi responded that this was intended as more an inventory of services rather than implication that every architect could provide all the referenced services.

Mr. Naga observed that arbitration, mediation and expert witness are not included in "other services".

Mr. Harris question the language implying that a UIA member section architect had to abide by this guideline. He noted that this appears to be in conflict with the stated intent of this being viewed as a recommended guideline.

Mr. Peck stated that he viewed the final section on professional conduct as being superfluous to this guideline since it is already addressed in other guidelines. He recommended deleting it.

Mr. Sauveur noted that in many countries architects are more engaged in working with the client earlier in the procedure to arrive at a better definition of the client's needs. He does view this as not being part of the feasibility study as used in the document.

Mr. Wachi, in consideration of the comments, suggested revising the document and returning with a revised edition at this meeting. He did so and the Commission considered this revised edition. He proceeded to present a revised document which incorporated the comments offered by the Commission members at this meeting. He reviewed each of the changes and invited any other comments.

Mrs. Cox suggested the need to give further clarification to the role of the architect in the reference to differing project delivery systems.

Mr. Peck responded to this suggestion by indicating that he thought this was not the way to proceed since it would require the qualification of nearly each entry.

Mr. Harris recommended the addition of post-occupancy evaluation.

Mr. Moleko questioned whether there should be a reference to coordination with consultants and engineers under design.

Action: The Chair, hearing no other comments, requested that the Commission approve the Recommended Guideline on the UIA Accord Policy on the Scope of Practice. The Commission concurred.

The Chair thanked Mr. Wachi and the members of the Drafting Panel for their work.

A copy of the Recommended Guideline as approved by the Commission is included as Appendix 5.

10. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE DOCUMENT ON COMPUTER PRACTICE

Introduction: The Chair recognized Mr. Prinz to make the presentation and noted that this represented the third reading of the document.

Presentation: Mr. Prinz noted that the document has changed in character since work first began on it. The February 2004 version circulated for this meeting reflected the comments made at the Tokyo meeting. He reviewed the basic changes in this version. He stated that it was not the intent of the UIA to establish standards for computer practice. Rather the UIA could alert its member sections to the significance and importance of changes in information technology on the practice of their members, both domestically and internationally.

The Advisory Group, having considered the subject and its historical development, has recommended that this not be treated as a Recommended Guideline, with the need for an accompanying new UIA Accord policy, but rather as “Professional Practice Information Note”. It could be viewed as a helpful document to UIA member sections who are having to face the changing environment of professional practice due to changes in information technology. It was agreed that this new category of document have a link to the UIA Accord. The most appropriate link is to the existing UIA Accord Policy on Architectural Practice. He hoped the Commission could reach closure on this document at this meeting.

Discussion:

Mr. Peck suggested that in view of the presentation, it would represent a fundamental change in the way in which the document should be presented. It needs to be reworked so that it is seen as a note rather than a standard. He views this as but one in a potential series of notes related to various tools of trade that architects use in their practices.

Mr. Prinz responded that by changing the introductory material, Mr. Peck's concerns could be met. However, he viewed the body of the text as already having been edited to not have it serve as a standard setting document.

Mr. Wachi stated that with the change in approach described by Mr. Prinz, this should no longer be viewed as a guideline but rather as an information document. With the continuing changes in information technology, this "Note" will have to be revisited in the future. However, information technology is having an impact on the profession and we should be addressing issues that should be of concern to UIA member sections.

Mr. Silcher stated that in his view and experience, information technology has begun to change architecture because it has made possible to design and construct buildings which would not be possible without the application of such technology. This brings a new demand for self criticism for the architects because with this technology anything goes but not anything that goes is good architecture. This aspect is a subject that deserves further reflection by the UIA.

Mr. Siew suggested that it was his view that at some point it should become an Accord policy with a recommended guideline. It has and will continue to affect the profession in a significant way. There are two primary ways in which he sees it affecting practice. First it allows transnational practice without being registered or licensed in any jurisdiction. Second an increasing number of firms are using outsourcing in different countries to sub-contract a part of their architectural work overseas and then reimporting back into their own country. A motivating element is that of fees. These two situations need to be addressed by the Commission because they are affecting the profession. There are important legal and licensing issues involved.

Mr. Harris observed that the paper really refers to automated information management rather than just computers. The information addressed in the current paper is a fraction of the issues developing that greatly affect both architects and the entire building process. He noted that standards are being adopted by a number of national and international organizations as well as private sector and governmental clients setting forth the formats in which submissions will be required. Thus, the document will need to be regularly revisited to keep it reasonably current. He cautioned that the changes currently underway with regard to the future application of information management to the

practice of architecture requires the active engagement of architects in order that they not let other elements of the building industry reduce their role in the process.

Mr. Albakri recognized the changes information technology is having on the practice of architecture. He views the current paper as a steering paper to have this Commission and the UIA recognize this impact on the profession. It can serve the purpose of alerting UIA member sections to their potential future roles in this subject.

Mr. Yi stated that the computer has become a common tool of trade in cross-border practice. He sees this document as being related to the document we will be considering on building delivery systems as well as to that on copyright. The subject is now such an integral part of architectural practice that it merits further consideration as a UIA Accord policy together with a recommended guideline.

Mrs. Siola while acknowledging that while all of our documents are seen as living documents, she has a concern over the possibility of trying to change the UIA Accord every three years. We are obligated to produce some documents which are able to be changed more frequently. She supports treating this first document as a Professional Practice Note at this point in time rather than attempting to produce a new Accord policy. She proposed accepting the document as presented while acknowledging that it will be necessary to change it in the future.

Mr. Naga suggested that the Accord should at some point include a policy on this subject since it has become such an integral part of national and international practices. He noted that there are positive and negative aspects to the use and application of this technology. He observed that the Accord is seen as a positive UIA document by the younger generation of architects and that we have a professional obligation to keep it current with the changing environment in which practice is conducted.

Mr. Peck suggested that we go to the UIA Council to propose that there are issues related to the practice of architecture that the Commission has become aware of that are at a level where the Commission would like to issue advice in the form of Professional Practice Notes. We would be able to issue such Notes without the delay process in securing UIA Council approval for such Notes. We should seek the delegated authority of the UIA Council for the Commission to prepare and issue such notes. He suggested that it might be more appropriate to title this Note to "Information Technology and Electronic Data Transfer".

Mrs. Cox recommended that we seek the authority of the UIA Council to allow the Commission to prepare and issue Professional Practice Information Notes. She suggested that the language in the present document be changed so as to not imply that UIA member sections can ensure a given course of action.

Mr. Lush observed that many of the practices referenced in this discussion have not basically changed, i.e. sub-contracting, copyright, etc. but what has changed is that it is now much easier with computers.

Mr. Hyett stated that the UIA needs to consider where it can be useful and helpful. It cannot impose standards on UIA member sections but it most certainly can provide useful and timely information to UIA member sections. The UIA will be better served if it can shift from attempting to set international standards to gathering and disseminating information to facilitate better practices in the UIA member sections. It will be more relevant to the individual practices within its member sections.

Mr. Mohammed noted that Malaysia is moving towards electronic submissions for approvals. However, within the country there is no national standard on the format in which electronic documents are to be submitted. It is resulting in many problems for architects practicing in differing governmental jurisdictions. The costs of acquiring and applying potentially up to twenty different vendor systems is but one such problem. Based on their past experience in using the Accord policies and recommended guidelines within Malaysia, he suggested that UIA guidelines on such a subject would be of help in solving this problem.

Mr. Sauveur expressed the view that there is a need to return to the technological aspects of this subject. In his view there are three elements: 1) is the legal aspect that is addressed in this document, 2) the technical aspect, and 3) the philosophical aspect of using this technology.

Mr. Verma supported the idea that the Commission return to the subject of computer practice as a future Accord policy.

Mr. Prinz responding to the comments, stated that the document does not address any technological elements but rather only address the legal issues related to computer practice. He subscribes to the views expressed by Mrs. Cox and Mr. Peck with regard to securing the endorsement of the UIA Council to produce a new series of documents, Professional Practice Notes. Should the Commission wish to consider the development of a new Accord policy on information technology as it relates to professional practice, he stated that it would then be necessary for an architect engaged directly in this activity to lead the effort.

Action: The Chair thanked Mr. Prinz for the presentation and the Commission members for their comments. He proposed that the Commission propose to the UIA Council that it authorize the Commission on its own initiative and in accordance with an approved UIA Work Program to proceed with the development of a new category of documents called Professional Practice Information Notes. Further, that the Commission use this Note and the other to be proposed on Codes and Standards as

examples of this new document. Further that Mr. Prinz consider the discussion at this meeting and make the necessary revisions to treat it as a Professional Practice Information Note which is to be viewed as a living document subject to future updating and revisions.

He noted that Commission members expressed the view that the Commission should return to this subject in the context of a potential Accord policy and this should be considered in the Commission's future work program.

Mr. Hyett supported the summary by the Chair.

Mr. Siew also supported the summary. He observed that there are a number of aspects of the document that likely bear on other documents already produced by the Commission, i.e. copyright, practice in a host nation, etc. It would be timely to revisit these when we return to the subject of this potentially being treated as an Accord policy.

Mr. Peck supported the Chairs summary and recommended that in the tradition of the Commission's operation, it treated as having been resolved.

A copy of the "Professional Practice Information Note 1: Computer Practice" as approved by the Commission for presentation to the UIA Council is included as Appendix 6.

The meeting adjourned for the day.

Saturday, March 13

The Chair reconvened the meeting at 0915. He thanked our hosts for the Friday evening reception and dinner the Petroleum Club in the Petronas Towers.

11. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE RECOMMENDED GUIDELINE ON BUILDING PROJECT DELIVERY SYSTEMS

Introduction: The Chair introduced Mr. Peck and noted that this represented the third reading of this document.

Presentation: Mr. Peck began by reading the Preamble to the UIA Accord. He suggested it was important for the Commission to revisit the foundation of all of the Commission's work.

He noted that this Recommended Guideline originated in an idea that we should look at building procurement methods that impact on the role of the architect in delivering

his/her services. It was originally titled, “Building Project Procurement” but because we use “procurement” elsewhere in the Accord in regard to the procurement of architectural services, it was agreed at the Tokyo meeting that we would change the title of this paper. The paper presented at this meeting reflects the comments made in Tokyo as well as other changes suggested by Mr. Wright, the Drafting Panel Co-chair. He reviewed the changes in the document circulated in advance of this meeting. He noted that with a few amendments the paper is that basically presented in Tokyo. He noted that this is a Recommended Guideline for which we do not have an approved UIA Accord policy.

Discussion:

Mr. Hyett inquired if the Commission had prepared definitions for their understanding of the “consumer”, “the public”, and “clients” in relation to this UIA work.

Mr. Peck replied that the Commission had not done so.

Mr. Albakri recommended that if this is to be treated as a new policy to be added to the Accord that it then needs the addition of a page which follows the accepted policy presentation format – Definition, Background and Policy Statement.

Mr. Peck concurred and agreed to prepare one based on what was in this document and present it at this meeting. He noted that it would be this document, as approved and recommended by the Commission, that would go first to the UIA Council for approval and then to the UIA General Assembly for their approval. The accompanying Recommended Guideline, as approved and recommended by the Commission, needs only to go to the UIA Council for their approval.

Mr. Mohammed observed that the need for such a policy statement is resulting from the growing trend of alternative building systems. He questioned where the traditional systems are included. He inquired if we are to introduce a UIA accord policy on alternative building delivery systems, do we not have to include the traditional building delivery system.

Mr. Peck noted that the Recommended Guideline text is generic and Appendices C and D include references to the traditional systems.

Mr. Siew noted the existence of procurement policies in the existing Accord.

Mr. Peck restated that the title of this has been changed from the previous drafts to make clear that it is addressing building project delivery systems and not the procurement of architectural services.

Mr. Lush acknowledged that the paper is a comprehensive review of what is available as building project delivery systems. He expressed three concerns. First, the reaction of clients in Hong Kong to subscribing to such a policy. Second, in the case of arbitration architects could be found negligent if they were found not to be serving the interests of their client first and foremost. They cannot afford to be found negligent and must do their duty as required under the laws prevailing in Hong Kong. Third, he questioned drawing a simplistic distinction between the public at large and our clients.

Mr. Peck responded that all of the work of this Commission is guided by the Accord itself. If Mr. Lush has concerns with the language of the Accord as approved by the UIA General Assembly in 1999, that is another subject. It is not one we can address at this meeting in considering this document.

Mr. Peck, responding to Mr. Hyett's question on definitions, stated that the definition of "client" is clear. It is the individual or the body that commissions the architect's work. The consumer of that work is often not the client. The public are the people that are affected by the urban and built forms that are the product of the architect's work. If we are to be a profession, it is not just a simple matter of doing what the client bids within the legal framework. It is an important philosophical issue for the architectural profession. With the use of the term "professional", architects, together with lawyers, doctors and engineers, separate and distinguish themselves from other service providers. The definition they apply to the term "professional" is that the duty of care goes beyond a duty of care just to the commissioning agency.

The Chair observed that in the context of this discussion the Hong Kong Institute of Architects has been an active participant in the Commission's work and voted in support of the UIA Accord at the 1999 UIA General Assembly.

Mr. Wachi recalled that all of the Commission's work has been viewed as being aspirational. Professional bodies have a role and a responsibility to represent their members to the public. There are now many ways to deliver buildings with the traditional ways decreasing in many countries. Increasingly, clients are retaining third parties to watch and monitor what the architect is doing. We need to acknowledge where we are in the building project delivery system and our role in relation to these systems.

Mr. Peck observed that while he sensed the Commission is basically in accord with the paper's content there are concerns with the proposed overall policy statement.

Mr. Verma, in reference to Appendix B and C, noted the need to be sure that the characterizations and information we are including in this document is similar to that referenced in other documents such as the Scope of Practice and the Form of Practice.

Mr. Peck did not believe there was any conflict between these appendices and these other documents.

Mr. Yi recommended that: 1) all of our terminology needs to be consistent and 2) there are so many possible combinations between the differing forms of practice and the building project delivery systems that it will require a good matrix to communicate them.

Mr. Peck stated his view that the form of architectural practice is not relevant to this paper. What is germane to this paper is the contractual relationship that governs the project delivery system.

Mr. Wachi stated the purpose of the Form of Practice is to define the entity. Building project delivery system is important because it places the professional architectural entity within these varying delivery systems.

Mrs. Siola recommended; 1) changing the title to “project delivery systems” and 2) changing the reference in the Conclusion from “construction industry” to “construction process”.

Mr. Hyett stated that his view that the title should remain as "Building Delivery Systems". Making it general will lose the essence of the document.

Mr. Peck responded stating his view that it should remain titled as "Building Delivery Systems". If it were to be changed to only "Project" because the content is focused on the architect's role in producing buildings. If it is made too general it will lose its impact.

Mr. Silcher viewed this as a classic discussion among architects. We are realizing what the reality is but yet trying to avoid recognizing it. He fully supports Mr. Hyett's position. He suggests inserting language in the policy statement that gives recognition to the traditional method. The guideline is intended to recognize that there are other forms and to give guidance as to how to handle them. Every architect in practice is always engaged in having to give consideration to the balance between meeting the needs and interests of the client and those of the public.

Mrs. Cox noted the need to review and clarify who the client is. In Appendix B, Item 10 she recommends deleting "construction manager".

Mr. Hyett observed that this discussion underscores the need for a set of definitions.

Mr. Harris recommended that definitions incorporated into any UIA document be similar to those already developed and in use by other related organizations representing the total construction team.

Mr. Peck responded by acknowledging that it would be useful for the Commission to develop a glossary for terminology used in all of the Commission's documents.

Mr. Hyett observed that Great Britain currently involved in the biggest building program for hospitals ever experienced, approximately 18 billion in US dollars. There is similar program for schools. It is so big that the architectural profession is experiencing difficulty in coping with it. It is noteworthy that the British government is not using any traditional forms of contract for any of this work. The only systems being used are design-build, peer buy or framework agreement. It is imperative for architects to understand the relationship between themselves and their clients. We need to make two things clear in this paper. One is aspirational towards long term public interests and the second is contractual duties. It is very timely, necessary and important for the UIA to address the issues presented in this paper. This subject also goes to the heart of how we educating future architects to be able to work in delivery systems other than that of the traditional form.

Mr. Peck responded by indicating that he felt it was important to get the document to a point where it is generically covering all of the issues. It is important not to delay the finalization of this proposed UIA Accord policy and guideline to the next triennium because many of these ideas that come from governments that are exploring these new delivery systems will develop new systems. We run the risk of never reaching closure on the subject so that we may bring it to the UIA Council and UIA General Assembly.

Mr. Wachi stated his support of the document.

Mr. Prinz recommended editing the statement "alternative methods of procuring buildings have evolved which can in some cases may have advantages over traditional methods and architects are likely to encounter the situation in which..." to remove the qualifier in the middle of this statement. In Europe there is the Public-Private-Partnership which is a huge issue and he recommends that it be noted in bullet 2. It is a different systems that multi-party contracts. His experience in Europe is that small architectural firms are left out of this process entirely and thus he recommends that the document make some reference as to the potential for their role in these new systems. With regard to the aspect of quality, the guideline should include additional references to quality in these systems. Quality criteria standards should be included in the governing contracts for these building delivery systems.

Mr. Peck responded that in his experience small architectural firms can, and are, working under any of these arrangements. It doesn't mitigate against small practices. With regard to the matter of quality, he views it as a difficult proposition and invited Mr. Prinz to provide further clarification.

Mr. Lush clarified that he viewed the document as being acceptable and sensible. His

reservations are with the UIA Accord itself.

Mr. Albakri recommended that the Commission proceed with preparing the new policy for this subject for the Commission's approval and then forwarding it to the UIA Council for their approval and then on to the UIA General Assembly. The Recommended Guideline can then accompany the policy to the UIA Council for their approval. This has been done by the Commission in the past.

Action: Mr. Peck acknowledging the Commission's comments and discussion stated that it was evident that the Commission was not prepared to adopt the document at this meeting. He would proceed to prepare a draft of the new proposed Accord policy in the standard format for consideration by the Commission. The Drafting Panel would revise the Recommended Guideline to reflect the comments presented at this meeting.

The Chair, in view of the earlier discussion related to the subject of the Recommended Guideline on Form of Practice, suggested that the draft Accord policy, together with the revised Recommended Guideline, be electronically circulated to all of the Commission members present at this meeting for their review in advance of the early 2005 UIA Council meeting.

A copy of the draft UIA Policy and the Recommended Guideline, as revised based on the Malaysia meeting presentation, is included as Appendix 7. Additional comments may be addressed to Mr. Peck at his e-mail address: mpeck@netlink.com.au

12. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE DOCUMENT ON MUTUAL RECOGNITION

Introduction: The Chair noted that this is a document that does not have an Accord policy. He indicated that this was the second reading and recognized Mr. Farrando to make the presentation.

Presentation: Mr. Farrando noted the active role of the Drafting Panel members. He reviewed the primary conceptual changes to the document since the Tokyo meeting.

- Tools for equivalency among national systems have been expanded with the addition of recognition for a reasonable term of professional practice experience in their home jurisdictions following education and registration.
- The need to have mutual recognition agreements ratified by public authorities in the participating jurisdictions.
- The addition of references to the UNESCO/UIA Charter for Architectural Education and the UNESCO/UIA Validation Council.
- Further emphasis on the basic purpose of a mutual recognition agreement.

Following the Tokyo meeting, Drafting Panel members made additional suggestions focused on the following points.

- Additional reference to roles and responsibilities of registration bodies.
- The addition of a reference to national registration fees not becoming a dissuasive element for trans-national practice.
- The addition of citations to existing internet website data bases where information is to be found on national registration systems.

In conclusion he noted the addition of a proposed Accord policy statement. He invited comments.

Discussion:

Mr. Wachi recommended that this not be one of the Accord policies but rather this should be viewed in a higher category as an over-riding document for the entire UIA Accord.

Mr. Silcher indicated his support of Mr. Wachi's recommendation. The document deals with the entire sense of the UIA Accord. This should be expressed in the policy statement.

Mr. Prinz referenced the language in the existing "Introduction" to the UIA Accord which specifically references mutual recognition agreements. He believes that the policy and guideline should also be part of the UIA Accord. He recommended that it be treated as the last policy.

Mr. Peck stated his agreement with the views expressed by Messrs. Wachi and Silcher. The title of the Accord is "The UIA Accord on Recommended International Standards of Professionalism in Architectural Practice." He views this document as an elevated issue which is underpinned by the Accord. It is an issue larger than the work heretofore done by the Commission. It is a fundamental responsibility of the UIA as a whole and should be treated as a distinct policy by the UIA.

Mr. Peck stated that the current language refers to mutual recognition agreements between its member sections. However, because nearly all of the UIA member sections are not the regulatory bodies in their countries, he recommends the deletion of the reference to the UIA member sections.

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

Mr. Mohammed views this as a very good document in terms of supporting the UIA member sections to work with their national governmental authorities in promoting the

use of the Accord. He concurs with the views expressed that it should be a document which is above the Accord.

Mr. Naga stated that he also viewed this document has being important in facilitating the promotion of the Accord with the government bodies that would sign mutual recognition agreements. He supports bringing it to the UIA Council as a policy recommendation.

Mr. Silcher supported the idea of treating this as a self-standing policy declaration by the UIA. He believes it is a justifiable approach.

Mr. Hyett stated that it has been his experience that there is a tremendous injustice around the world regarding the relocation of salaried architects in other countries. Practices are also unable to perform work in countries where they have won a contract or a competition. This document is dealing with an injustice that merits the attention of the UIA.

Mr. Yi viewed this document as being a resource that UIA member sections could provide to their government bodies responsible for negotiating mutual recognition agreements dealing with professional architectural services.

Mr. Albakri recalled that the aspirational character of the Accord serves a resource to UIA member sections wishing to revise their own practices and standards to be more closely aligned with an accepted international standard. He sees the Accord being utilized as a reference standard in the negotiation of mutual recognition agreements. He does not view this as being included as a policy within the Accord but rather as a UIA policy.

Mrs. Siola recalled that when the Commission started work on this document we were concerned that those responsible for preparing mutual recognition agreements might be doing so without the involvement of the architectural profession. Mutual recognition agreements are the very essence of this Commission. A standard and a policy are two separate items.

Mr. Verma suggested that the end result of mutual recognition agreements be more clearly articulated in the document.

Mr. Farrando indicated that he believes that this is already contained in the document.

Mr. Wachi recalled that the charge to the Commission was to develop recommended professional standards. This document addresses procedures. It should stand alone as a UIA policy and be issued by the UIA.

Mr. Bourdrez, based on the recent experience of the Architects' Council of Europe and the United States in their mutual recognition agreement negotiations, believes it does need to be kept in the context of the Accord. It makes a material difference when it is acknowledged that the mutual recognition agreement negotiating authorities all recognize the Accord.

Mr. Silcher observed that we need to be mindful of who has the legal authority to conclude a mutual recognition agreement. In the end it has to be the legally binding agreement between those public authorities legally responsible for the registration of architects.

Mr. Siew stated that in the Accord we have produced a document addressing defined international standards. In this document we have a direct application of the Accord for governments. This is a different level document and we need to acknowledge it as such.

Mr. Prinz, while agreeing with the previous speakers that it needs to be treated separately, still believes it needs to be linked to the Accord. In his view it cannot work without the Accord and indeed must work with the Accord.

Mrs. Cox recommended that the appendix should only contain those mutual recognition agreements that are actually signed and in effect.

Mr. Farrando stated that he needed the assistance of Commission members in carefully documenting only those MRA's that are signed and in effect for inclusion in such an Appendix. He is not seeking to include other forms of mutual accords, agreements, etc. between UIA member sections that do not cover the subject of mutual recognition agreements as addressed in this document.

Action: Mr. Farrando stated that based on this discussion the edited document be first presented to the UIA council a "Recommendation". He asked for the concurrence of the Commission with this approach. The Commission concurred.

The Chair summarized his understanding of the discussion as follows:

1. The Commission agrees that it is a document that should be forwarded from this Commission to the UIA Council and perhaps eventually to the UIA General Assembly, as an over-reaching document within the UIA.
2. The approved document then needs to be embedded and linked with the UIA Accord.
3. With the exception of the suggested changes in specific wording, there were no major concerns with the basic form and content of the document.

He thanked the members of the Drafting Panel for their many contributions.

A copy of the “Recommendation on Mutual Recognition Agreements” as approved by the Commission for presentation to the UIA Council is included as Appendix 8.

13. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR THE RECOMMENDED GUIDELINE ON CODES AND STANDARDS

Introduction: The Chair recognized Mr. Harris to make the presentation. This represents the second reading of the document. He noted that this document does not have an Accord policy.

Presentation: Mr. Harris indicated that the primary intent of the document was to provide a basic primer to: 1) architecture students, 2) architects in developing countries, 3) architects desiring to practice in another country, and 4) a consistent outline of the topics to all architects. It provides a source of information about emerging trends in the codes and standards arena and a resource to those who are seeking more specific institutional sources.

Throughout the document the role of architects in codes and standards activity that so dramatically affects the practice of architecture. Architects have very useful practical knowledge that can be used to improve codes and standards. There is a constant growth in the topics addressed by codes and standards such sustainability, security, accessibility, energy, etc.

The revisions incorporated in this draft are based largely on comments made at the Tokyo meeting and follow-up comments from a few commission members. The title has been condensed to just codes and standards to reflect these comments and recommendations. The appendix has been organizationally modified to reflect continents and then countries, together with citations of international standards.

He invited any further comments concerning how codes and standards may vary in their possible varying applications among countries.

Discussion:

Mrs. Cox feels the document has come together very well. She recommended placing a reference to the International Standards Organization (ISO) in the appendix and taking out the one remaining reference to the United States under the standards section in order to make the document generic. She suggested that we title this document as a "Professional Practice Information Note."

Mr. Wachi views this as very good international resource document. He suggested it would be useful for each UIA member section to provide citations to their relevant codes and standards for incorporation in the appendix. He inquired if we should include references to international contract standards such as FIDIC as used in Europe.

Mr. Lush indicated that he would forward additional references related to Hong Kong.

Mr. Yi suggested that any solicitation of UIA member sections should make clear that we are seeking only citations to codes and standards that bear on the practice of architecture. He questioned if the FIDIC reference is appropriate in this document since it relates only to contracts.

Mr. Harris concurred and observed that the solicitation for the appendix entries needs to make a distinction between practice and technical standards.

Mr. Naga observed that in some developing countries there has been opposition to the creation of national building codes and that building codes are often applied in differing ways by jurisdictions within a country. Thus the country entries may need clarification on this point.

Mr. Harris noted the existence and work of the International Alliance for Interoperability. There are currently eleven chapters worldwide. The focus is to develop standards by which data in one software system related to the building process can be transported to another program. It has wide reaching application through the building process and will have a dramatic effect on the practice of architecture. He encouraged the UIA member sections to become involved in this process since it will have such an impact.

Action: The Chair, in the absence of other comments, asked if the Commission was prepared to endorse the document being forwarded to the UIA Council as another example of a Professional Practice Information Note. The Commission concurred.

He thanked Mr. Harris for his leadership of this Drafting Panel.

A copy of the approved “Professional Practice Information Note 2: Codes and Standards” is included as Appendix 9.

14. REPORT OF THE DRAFTING PANEL FOR RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE USE OF THE UIA ACCORD WITH NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS AND RELEVANT AUTHORITIES

Introduction: The Chair recognized Mr. Mohammed for this presentation and noted this is the second reading of the document.

Presentation: Mr. Mohammed noted the absence of any volunteers following the Tokyo meeting to assist in the further development of this document. He proceeded to highlight the changes in the draft document as circulated. These included: 1) treating the recommendation on two levels- a) by the UIA Secretariat and b) by UIA member

sections; 2) the creation by UIA member sections of a Relevant Contact Point for the purpose of using the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines; 3) preparation and submission of an annual report on how UIA member sections are using and applying the Accord; and 4) a prototype reporting template by UIA member sections.

He noted that a copy of this reporting template has been prepared reporting on the progress by the Malaysian Institute of Architects. A copy was provided to each attendee.

Discussion:

The Chair thanked Mr. Mohammed for his presentation. He noted that after the adoption of the UIA Accord in Beijing, China in 1999, the Commission prepared and submitted to the UIA Council a “Communications Plan” for the UIA Accord. It was his view that not much has happened in regard to implementing that plan. Subsequently the Commission has begun compiling and posting on the web site case studies of how UIA member sections are making use of the UIA Accord. Two have been completed and posted – one by the Korean Federation of Architects Associations and the other by the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. It was not intended that this current document be viewed as a separate new Accord Policy but rather as a recommendation for the approval of the UIA Council and subsequent application by the UIA Secretariat and UIA member sections.

Mr. Peck noted that it is an important document and that is important for the UIA Council to follow-up on these recommendations. In addition to what is stated in this document, it is his view that it is imperative for each UIA member section to formally adopt the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines through their own deliberative and formal governance procedures of their respective organizations. Unless this takes place, the possibility exists for individual UIA member sections to disassociate themselves from this process.

Mr. Prinz questioned Mr. Peck’s recommendation. He believes it would have been very difficult for this Commission to have done what it has if we had to achieve a formal endorsement of each UIA member section’s governing body. We sit at this table as the representatives of UIA member sections. He viewed the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines as having several primary purposes – a) the facilitate the movement towards the negotiation of mutual recognition agreements; and 2) to assist UIA member sections in the enhancement of their own national policies and standards.

Mr. Mohammed noted that the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines are advisory, not a mandatory, documents. From his experience as a member of Malaysia delegation to the World Trade Organization, he believes there is a gap among the

individuals sitting at the negotiating tables in their knowledge of the resources that have been developed by this Commission

Mr. Verma agreed with Mr. Mohammed comments. He recalled the presentation at the Commission's Berlin meeting by Dale Honeck of the WTO which clearly indicated that it was incumbent on the individual UIA member sections to communicate the UIA Accord and Recommended Guidelines to their own national ministries of trade and their WTO member delegations. He recalled that Mauritius had offered to table the document with the WTO through their delegation. It was his view that governments in developing countries would give a document such as the UIA Accord with more attention if it were to come to them through the secretariat of an organization such as the WTO.

Mr. Siew confirmed that Mauritius had formally tabled the UIA Accord to the WTO in October 2002. There was an invitation in December 2002 from the WTO to UIA inviting the UIA to comment on whether the WTO Disciplines for the Domestic Regulation of Accountants was a suitable model for the profession of architecture. The UIA responded to the letter in February 2004 with a letter prepared by the Co-Director of this Commission.

The Chair responded that there has just been a response from the WTO. The UIA has been invited to participate in workshop in Geneva at the end of his month for the benefit of the WTO Working Party on Domestic Regulation. Based on his experience working with the WTO, it is his view that we cannot expect the WTO to accept and recognize the entire UIA Accord. There are numerous elements of the UIA Accord that are not directly related to the focus of the WTO. In order to successfully work with the WTO we need to carefully identify those policies within the overall UIA Accord that are directly related to the ongoing work within the WTO, i.e. the Working Party on Domestic Regulation.

Mr. Siew concurred with Mr. Peck's comments. It was his view that before a UIA member section can successfully work to convince their national government of the value and applicability of the UIA Accord that they will need to have the support of their own national professional bodies. He noted that he recently communicated with the top ten foreign architectural firms working in Africa and found in their responses that none of them were aware of the UIA Accord and in any case they viewed it was not binding to them. This suggests that there is some work to be done nationally.

Mr. Peck's responded suggesting that we have to be aware of potentially being charged with mis-representation if our own national constituent bodies have not formally acted on the UIA Accord.

The Chair observed that having been present at the UIA General Assembly when all the eligible voting UIA member sections unanimously adopted the UIA Accord, it was his understanding that these official delegations of UIA member sections were going on record as approving the UIA Accord.

Mr. Peck acknowledged the Chair's observation but also noted that it was his experience that successive officers and boards of UIA national member sections might not see themselves as being bound by that action unless the UIA Accord was formally a part of the adopted policies of an individual UIA member section.

Mr. Silcher stated that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for the UIA member section in Germany to introduce the UIA Accord into the German national legislative procedure to have it adopted. What can be, and is being, done is to use the UIA Accord to educate and advance specific policy issues of concern within Germany.

The Chair noted that the same situation would be found in the United States. The American Institute of Architects has, and continues, to keep the United States Trade Representative, well informed on the work of the UIA Professional Practice Commission. However, the USTR has no national role related to the multiple ongoing mutual recognition agreement negotiations involving the AIA and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards. They are kept informed of what is happening.

Mr. Wachi noted that the Japan Institute of Architects has widely distributed the UIA Accord within Japan and holds regular meetings with concerned parties within the national government. He noted that in the earliest period of the Commission we did invite a WTO representative to participate in the Commission meetings. He suggested that it would be useful to invite such participation in the future.

Mr. Prinz indicated that he is more concerned with effectively communicating the UIA Accord to those who need to know that it exists and what it means. He is less concerned with having it formally adopted by other bodies.

Mr. Mohammed recommended the adoption of this Recommendation on Communicating the UIA Accord to National Governments and Relevant Bodies.

Mr. Prinz and Mr. Silcher concurred but recommended that the language in the "Policy" be changed to state "...promoting the awareness of and use of the UIA Accord by national governments."

Mr. Siew had two final observations. The mutual recognition agreement relates the UIA Accord to WTO articles of GATS "The Relevance of the UIA Accord to the WTO" He would suggest that this document would be useful to UIA member sections in speaking and dealing with their national governments.

Mr. Siew reiterated two points. First that UIA member sections should either adopt or make all their members aware of the Accord, its existence and how it will affect the future. The second is maybe not to formally adopt the UIA Accord because of individual situations but rather to promote the use of the Accord in conjunction with negotiations for MRAs or whatever. When he requested his government to table the UIA Accord with the WTO, he was asked by the government to prepare a document that relates the Accord to WTO language, i.e. market access, national treatment, articles of GAT, etc. This document is available to UIA member sections to assist them in more effectively communicating with their governments why the Accord is important to what they are doing with the WTO.

Mr. Peck questioned the statement in the first sentence where reference is made to being globally recognized by architects. A close analysis of the statement would show that it is not very strong. What the UIA needs is to have governments believe the organizations that represent the architects around the world have adopted and recognized these standards. He would suggest having it changed to read that it is recognized by UIA member sections.

Mr. Lush concurs with Mr. Peck's comments regarding having the Accord adopted by the UIA member sections.

Mr. Peck inquired as to how many UIA member sections present had actually adopted the Accord as has the RAIA.

Mr. Siew indicated that the Accord had been adopted by the UIA member section in Mauritius.

Mrs. Siola stated her view that the UIA member sections were already on record in Beijing as having adopted the UIA Accord. She does not view it as being necessary to then go back to each UIA member section to ask them to adopt what was already adopted at a UIA General Assembly.

Mr. Albakri stated the UIA Assembly did adopt the Accord. The Assembly is constituted of those voting members officially designated by the individual UIA member sections. The UIA Accord in the course of preparation beginning in 1994 was widely and regularly circulated to all of the UIA member sections well in advance of the 1999 Beijing Assembly. He sees the problem as being that UIA member sections are failing to use the Accord with their governmental bodies and/or with their members.

Mr. Lush questioned if UIA members attending a UIA Assembly have the delegated authority from their member section. He inquired if a majority of the voting UIA members at the 1999 UIA Assembly voted in favor of adopting the Accord.

Mr. Albakri responded indicated that the vote of the UIA member sections at the 1999 UIA Assembly was unanimous in support of the adoption of the Accord. As a then UIA Council member, he recalls formally signing the approved document.

Mr. Otrakul stated that he viewed adoption by the UIA Assembly of the Accord as one thing but adoption by a national government is another subject. He believes it should be up to each UIA member section to decide how best they should go about utilizing the Accord within their country.

Mr. Silcher, commenting on the show of hands as to what UIA member sections have formally adopted the UIA Accord in their own right, he noted that the Architects' Council of Europe, representing all of the UIA member sections within the European Union, has formally adopted the UIA Accord at its General Assembly.

Mr. Albakri noted that the Architects Council of Asia (ARCHASIA) has also formally adopted the UIA Accord. With regard to Mr. Otrakul's comments, he noted that the Accord is an advisory document and not a mandatory document.

Mr. Peck stated that he is seeking dedicated commitment from UIA member sections. He questioned whether the people sitting at this table had formal authority from their UIA member section to speak and vote on their behalf.

Mr. Hyett, in view of the discussion, questioned if he had the binding authority of the RIBA as their representative to this meeting. In the case of the RIBA the consideration of the Accord and UIA member section authority would be handled within the RIBA International Committee.

Mr. Prinz questioned whether we are creating a problem that we really don't have in his view. With regard to the WTO he views it as being a matter of documented record that the UIA General Assembly in 1999 unanimously accepted the Accord. In going to national governments there is obviously a disparity of communication between UIA member sections and their national governments. We do agree that we want to see UIA member sections further promote the awareness of and use of the Accord.

Mr. Farrando stated that the Commission is not a decision making body within the UIA. It is a working body. We prepare the work to the best of our ability and submit it to the UIA Council and, if necessary then to the UIA Assembly. The Assembly is the UIA's ultimate decision making body. The Assembly is legally constituted of the formally presented delegates by each UIA member section. When the UIA Accord was

adopted by the UIA General Assembly, there was no statement or indication that each UIA member section was then expected to formally, in their own right, adopt the Accord.

Mr. Moleko, based on his experience in South Africa, believes it is incumbent on each UIA member section to pursue the goal of being sure that their members are aware of the Accord.

Action: The Chair to conclude this agenda item recommended that Mr. Mohammed take into consideration the comments made on the document, produce a revised version and then have the Secretariat share it electronically with each of the Commission member attending this meeting. He views this as a subject on which the UIA Council is seeking the advice and recommendations of this Commission.

A copy of the draft recommendation as presented in the agenda is included as Appendix 10. Additional comments may be addressed to Mr. Mohamed at his e-mail address: esa@pc.jaring.my

15. RECOMMENDED GUIDELINE FOR ACCORD POLICY FOR PRACTICE IN A HOST NATION

Presentation: The Chair noted that the revisions recommended by the Commission at the 2003 Tokyo meeting were not accepted by the UIA Council at their June meeting in Istanbul, Turkey. The discussion at the UIA Council meeting indicated that there was concern over the potential problems with the literal application of the term “of equal standing” when applied to the foreign architect and the local architect.

Based on the UIA Council discussion, the Chair has proposed language that he feels would be acceptable to the UIA Council and that was circulated in advance of the meeting.

The Chair subsequently received a suggested alternative from Mr. Peck which was also presented. This statement read as follows: “The foreign architect should not be permitted to enter into an agreement to provide services in another jurisdiction without the material participation of a local architect in the provision of the design, documentation and contract administrative services of the project. Foreign architects entering into an international competition in a country where they do not hold a license should be required to enter such an arrangement only when they win the competition and are commissioned to proceed with the project.”

Mr. Harris suggested the addition of “jurisdiction” to country since in some countries it is not the country that issues the license but rather other jurisdictions.

Mr. Sauveur observed that it may be special to Belgium but in their country they are required to control the all works. Further, he believed that the local architect should also play a role in the conception of the work, not just in the execution of the work.

Mr. Wachi responded to this observation by noting that many clients specifically wish to secure the services of a foreign architect to provide comprehensive design services and that it may not be appropriate in all instances to suggest the local architect play a major role in conceptual design.

Mr. Farrando noted that change from “substantial contribution” to “material participation”. He has concern over the term “professional stature” being subject to the same possible mis-interpretation by some UIA Council members. He indicated his preference for the eliminating the last sentence of the original version, taking out “professional stature” and using that as our recommendation. He also believed that the reference to foreign competitions is already covered in some other part of the Guideline.

Mr. Peck noted that this is the only place that international competitions are addressed in the Guideline.

Mr. Lai observed that was his view that the local architect would usually have a lesser role in the overall design process and a more substantial role in the actual construction process. He would prefer not to have such a broad generalization of all aspects of the role of the local architect in all stages of the work.

Mr. Lush questioned if this document is not engendering some element of protectionism of the local architects and is therefore at odds with the intent of the GATS. He questioned if consideration been made for jurisdictions where the services of a local architect are not required at all, for example in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Hyett confirmed that you are not required to have an architect to submit plans in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Siew noted that it is already an accepted principle and recommendation by WTO that for developing countries to have joint ventures for two reasons: 1) the enhancement of local capacity and 2) to facilitate the transfer of technology know-how. This guideline is in line with this policy.

Mr. Lush responded noting that Mr. Siew’s comments qualified it as being applied to developing countries. Thus, should this recommendation be applied only to developing countries and a set of different standards be applied to OECD countries?

Mr. Tillman noted that this matter had also be a major debate within the European Union because it goes against the EU's single market principles. In the UIA we discussed this at length and believe it is a correct one to promote at the governmental level.

Mr. Peck noted that we have this for those situations where no MRA's exist and it is intended to assist in filling that vacuum until such time as MRA's are more widely developed and applied.

The Chair noted that in the discussion at the UIA Council this recommended Accord Policy and Recommended Guideline were welcomed by architects in developing countries because they were all too often being ignored by foreign architects receiving commissions in their country.

Mr. Wachi believes this is not counter to the GATS.

Mr. Lush observed that it his view that the term "foreign architect" invited ambiguity. There are many foreign architects whose license does not accord with their nationality but might accord with their residency. Could this be reworded to a "non-registered local architect"?

The Chair responded noting that such a revision would have to be done in the context of reviewing the approved Accord and accompanying Recommended Guidelines since this terminology is already embedded in these documents.

Mr. Shim noted that there are instances in Korea where the collaboration between the foreign and local architects have not been successful due to the lack of clear definition of roles. He believes the reference regarding international competitions perhaps needs more clarity in terms of under what conditions the winning foreign architect can proceed.

Mr. Silcher suggested that the second version should be accepted with the change of the word "material" to "substantial".

Mr. Naga indicated that this UIA Accord policy and recommended guideline is very important for the UIA member sections in Region V. He noted that there are numerous categories of "foreign architects", i.e. those that might come from a neighboring country, those from the region and those seen as international. Thus, we may wish to give further definition to what constitutes a "foreign architect". Secondly, the aspect of cultural awareness and the related transfer of knowledge and experience is an important element of such partnerships.

The Chair again reiterated that such a proposed change cannot be made only in one place but rather needs to be considered in the context of the existing UIA approved documents.

Mr. Otrakul expressed the view that “substantial” was preferable to “material” especially in the context of international competitions. It would improve the quality of the work.

Mr. Lai recommended the addition of “...meaningful and substantial participation and contribution...”.

Mr. Mohamed concurred with Mr. Lai and observed that it would be very difficult to find and define architects of equal standing anywhere in the world. However, the contributions of the local architect can and should be meaningful and substantial.

Action: The Chair hearing no objections to this proposed revision stated that the revised text would be forwarded to the UIA Council for their further consideration. The revised text is included as Appendix 12.

16. SUMMATION OF THE STATUS OF THE COMMISSION DOCUMENTS

The Chair summarized the work of the Commission at this meeting as follows:

1. The Recommended Guideline on UIA Accord Policy on the Role of Professional Bodies has been approved for recommendation to the UIA Council.
2. The Recommended Guideline on UIA Accord Policy on the Form of Practice has been reviewed and revised but not yet approved.
3. The Recommended Guideline on UIA Accord Policy on the Scope of Practice has been approved for recommendation to the UIA Council.
4. The document on Computer Practice has been approved and will be recommended to the UIA Council as the first in a new category of documents, “Professional Practice Information Notes,” together with a request for the authority to continue to prepare such documents.
5. The Recommended Guideline on UIA Accord Policy on Building Project Delivery Systems, together with the UIA Accord Policy on Building Project Delivery Systems, has been reviewed and revised but not yet approved.
6. The document on Mutual Recognition Agreements has been approved and will be recommended to the UIA Council as an over-riding UIA policy document and if approved, then also reflected in the existing UIA Accord as a related document.
7. The document on Codes and Standards has been approved and will be recommended to the UIA Council as the second in a new category of documents, “Professional Practice Information Notes.”

8. The document on Communicating the UIA Accord to National Governments and Relevant Authorities has been reviewed and additional comments are to be directed to the Chair of the Drafting Panel.

9. The amendment to the existing Recommended Guideline for the UIA Accord Policy on Practice in A Host Nation was approved and will be recommended to the UIA Council.

Upon recommendation of the Chair, the Commission agreed that documents 2, 5 and 8 would be circulated via e-mail to the Commission members attending the meeting for their further review, comments and indication of acceptance in order that they might be forwarded to the UIA Council, and in the case of the new policy statement in document 5, to the 2005 UIA General Assembly.

The Chair noted that the UIA Council will next meet on May 26-28 in Mexico. All of the Commission documents going to the UIA Council need to be sent to the Council members in both English and French. The Commission Secretariat's first priority will be to prepare the approved documents to forward to the UIA Secretariat for the translations into French.

Mr. Hyett suggested that a copy of the Chair's summary of the meeting's accomplishments be distributed via e-mail to the meeting participants prior to the preparation of the formal meeting minutes.

17. RECOMMENDED COMMISSION PROGRAM FOR THE PERIOD 2005-2008

Presentation: The Chair noted that members had been invited to submit suggestions for future Commission programs. He combined those received into a draft document that was shared with the Advisory Committee for discussion. Based on that discussion, he presented and reviewed a revised draft document.

Discussion:

Mr. Prinz suggested that in view of the UIA Accord Policy and Recommended Guideline on Practice in A Host Nation referencing working with a local architect, it would be useful and helpful for UIA member sections to be in a position to be a reference data base where such interested local architects may be identified. Such a networking data base now exists in Germany; it contains some 200 architects who have expressed an interested in working with foreign architects coming to Germany to execute projects. It would be evidence that we not only promote the idea of working with a local architect but also make it easier and more efficient to actually find a local architect in another country.

Mr. Prinz observed that a great barrier in cross-border services are the differences in contractual systems and models. Such differences include differences in the meaning of specific terminology and words. This has already had to be addressed within the European Union. He suggested that a long-range goal for the UIA would be to have a system of at least the outline format for international model contracts for the use of architects. It would greatly facilitate cross-border services. The Commission should begin by creating an inventory of the existing systems and models.

Mr. Peck suggested that for clarity using the term “different client architect agreements” in the UIA member sections. The word “contracts” for many architects refers to building agreements.

Mr. Bourdrez, based on his experience in working on mutual recognition agreements with Canada and the Architects’ Council of Europe, recommended that it would save a great deal of time and effort if the UIA was able to at least recommend an outline format and a series of choices to facilitate the work of others going through this process for the first time.

Mr. Hyett suggested that the Commission develop a glossary of the terms used in its documents.

Mr. Harris recommended that a reference be made under the heading of “Ongoing” programs to the responsibility of the Commission to keep the new Professional Practice Information Note series current.

Mr. Lush suggested the development of a statement that gives a definition and clarification of what the UIA understands to be the strength of the UIA Accord with regard to UIA member sections.

Mr. Silcher, in response to Mr. Lush’s comment, recalled that when the UIA member sections forward the names of their voting delegates to the UIA General Assembly, they are required to verify that they are fully authorized to speak and vote on behalf of the UIA member section they represent.

Mr. Albakri, reflecting on his service on the Commission since it was created, recalled that all of the Commission’s work in the development of the UIA Accord was fully transparent and that the Commission actively solicited and invited the involvement of all of the UIA member sections. It repeatedly circulated the draft documents related to the UIA Accord to all UIA member sections for their review, comments and input.

Action: The revised Recommended Commission Program for the Period 2005-2008 is included as Appendix 13.

18. 2005 COMMISSION MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

The Chair noted that 2005 is the year of the UIA Congress and General Assembly in Istanbul, Turkey. The Congress takes place on July 4-8 and the General Assembly on July 9-11. It was noted that the Commission held their 2002 meeting in conjunction with the UIA Congress and General Assembly in Berlin.

In discussing the possibility of meeting in Istanbul, the Advisory Committee as concerned with: 1) the ability to fit a Commission meeting into an already busy schedule; 2) the potential addition of another full-day meeting to an already long schedule that is of concern to UIA delegations; and 3) the benefit of allowing Commission members to save travel costs by combining attendance at both events.

The alternative is to consider scheduling a Commission meeting at a time and place separate from the UIA Congress and General Assembly. It has been learned that the UIA Council may meet early in 2005 at some yet undetermined location.

Mr. Siew recommended that we take a decision in principle to meet separately from the UIA Congress, perhaps in conjunction with the UIA Council meeting early 2005.

Mr. Farrando noted that while he concurred with Mr. Siew's suggestion, historically the Commission meetings have been sponsored hosted and the local arrangements have been made by the host UIA member section. If we were to meet in conjunction with a UIA Council meeting, he questioned if the UIA member section hosting the UIA Council meeting would be prepared to also host a Commission meeting.

The Chair noted that the Commission has attempted to convene meetings in different UIA regions. Further, The American Institute of Architects is prepared to host the 2005 meeting in Washington, DC at some agreed upon date.

Pending more specific information regarding the UIA Council potential meeting in early 2005 and more detailed information concerning the overall schedule for the 2005 UIA Congress and General Assembly, the Commission elected not to make a decision at this meeting on the date and location for their 2005 meeting.

19. RESOLUTION OF THANKS TO THE MALAYSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

The Chair presented the following certificate of appreciation to Mr. Lai, President of the Malaysian Institute of Architects.

“The Professional Practice Commission of the International Union of Architects presents this citation of appreciation to the UIA Malaysian Section and the Malaysian

Institute of Architects for hosting the thirteenth meeting of the Commission March 11-14, in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

The Commission expresses particular gratitude to the Malaysian Institute of Architects, their colleagues, and the Malaysian members of the Commission for their dedication to the advancement of the work of the Commission. This support reflects the long standing commitment and continuing dedication of the Malaysian Institute of Architects and its members to the profession of architecture and the work of the International Union of Architects.”

20. OPEN FORUM

The Chair reported that the UIA Council has established a new Committee on Continuing Professional Development. Recognizing the origins of this new committee's charge is found in the Accord Policy on Continuing Professional Development and the accompanying Recommended Guideline, the UIA Secretary-General suggested that it might be desirable to have a resolution from this Commission acknowledging and supporting the work of this new committee.

The Chair proposed the following resolution:

Whereas, the UIA Accord on Recommended Standards of Professionalism in Architecture includes a policy statement in support of continuing professional development, and

Whereas, the UIA Council has approved a Recommended Guideline Policy on Continuing Professional Development, and

Whereas, the UIA Council at their June 2003 meeting in Istanbul included on their agenda the subject of the UIA's role in continuing professional development, and

Whereas, there was an invited presentation on The American Institute of Architects Continuing Education Program, commentary on other UIA member section's continuing education programs, and the discussion by the Council of continuing professional development, and

Whereas, the UIA Council did establish and appoint a special committee consisting of UIA officers, representatives of the UIA Education Commission and the UIA Professional Practice Commission and representatives of The American Institute of Architects charged with the responsibility of giving further consideration to the potential roles for the UIA in facilitating continuing professional development in and among its member sections, and

Whereas, the UIA has conducted a preliminary survey of UIA member sections to inquire as to their potential interest in developing such a UIA program,

Now therefore, the UIA Professional Practice Commission does recognize, encourage, and support the work of the UIA Committee on Continuing Professional Development and recommends that their work be done in accordance with the UIA Accord Policy and Recommended Guideline on Continuing Professional Development. The Commission offers its continuing support, knowledge and experience to the committee in the conduct of its responsibilities.

Whereas, the UIA Accord on Recommended Standards of Professionalism in Architecture includes a policy statement in support of continuing professional development, and

Whereas, the UIA Council has approved a Recommended Guideline Policy on Continuing Professional Development, and

Whereas, the UIA Council at their June 2003 meeting in Istanbul included on their agenda the subject of the UIA's role in continuing professional development, and

Whereas, there was an invited presentation on The American Institute of Architects Continuing Education Program, commentary on other UIA member section's continuing education programs, and the discussion by the Council of continuing professional development, and

Whereas, the UIA Council did establish and appoint a special committee consisting of UIA officers, representatives of the UIA Education Commission and the UIA Professional Practice Commission and representatives of The American Institute of Architects charged with the responsibility of giving further consideration to the potential roles for the UIA in facilitating continuing professional development in and among its member sections, and

Whereas, the UIA has conducted a preliminary survey of UIA member sections to inquire as to their potential interest in developing such a UIA program,

Now therefore, the UIA Professional Practice Commission does recognize, encourage, and support the work of the UIA Committee on Continuing Professional Development and recommends that their work be done in accordance with the UIA Accord Policy and Recommended Guideline on Continuing Professional Development. The Commission offers its continuing support, knowledge and experience to the committee in the conduct of its responsibilities.

Discussion:

Mr. Prinz proposed an amendment to resolution that would add a statement that recommends that the committee's work be conducted in conformance with the Accord policy and Recommended Guideline.

Action: In the absence of any other comments, the Chair declared that the resolution, as amended, would be forwarded to the UIA Secretary-General.

21. ADJOURNMENT

The Chair thanked the members for attending this meeting. There being no further business, the thirteenth meeting of the UIA Professional Practice Commission was adjourned at 18:00, Saturday, March 13, 2004.

Mr. Lai moved a motion to commend the Chair for his conduct and leadership of the meeting.

Submitted by:

Russell V. Keune, FAIA
Co-Director and Secretary

APPENDICES

The following 12 appendices to the meeting minutes are attached as individual documents to the electronic distribution of the meeting minutes.

Appendix 1 - Attendee List

Appendix 2 – Revised Standard Format for Reporting the Practice Standards of Each UIA Member Section

Appendix 3 – Approved Recommended Guideline for Accord Policy on the Role of Professional Bodies

Appendix 4 – Revised Recommended Guideline for Accord Policy on the Form of Practice

Appendix 5 – Approved Recommended Guideline for Accord Policy on the Scope of Practice

Appendix 6 – Approved Professional Practice Information Note 1: Computer Practice

Appendix 7 – Report of the Drafting Panel for the proposed UIA Accord Policy on Building Project Delivery Systems and the Recommended Guideline

Appendix 8 – Approved Recommendation on Mutual Recognition Agreements

Appendix 9 – Approved Professional Practice Information Note 2: Codes and Standards

Appendix 10 – Revised Recommendations on the Use of the UIA Accord with National Governments and Relevant Authorities

Appendix 11 – Revised amendment to the Recommended Guideline on Practice in A Host Nation.

Appendix 12 – Approved Recommended Commission Program for the Period 2005-2008