MINUTES OF THE 80TH COUNCIL MEETING
HELD ON 22ND JUNE 2016 VIA SKYPE

TIME: Malta - 12:00 A.M.  Gaborone, Botswana - 12:00 A.M.
London - 11:00 A.M.  Lahore, Pakistan - 03:00 P.M.
Dhaka, Bangladesh - 04:00 P.M.  Cyprus - 01.00 P.M.
St Kitts and Nevis - 06.00 A.M.  Colombo - 03.30 P.M.

Present
Vincent Cassar (VC)  President  Malta
Rukshan Widyalankara (RW)  Immediate Past President  Sri Lanka
Kalim Siddiqui (KS)  Senior Vice President  Pakistan
John Geeson (JG)  Secretary/ Treasurer  UK
Christos Panayiotes (CP)  Chair (Education)  Cyprus
Jayantha Perera (JP)  Chair (Communication)  Sri Lanka
Chandana Edirisuriya (CE)  Chair (Practice)  Sri Lanka
Dik Jarman (DJ)  Vice President, Oceania  Australia
Sithabile Mathe (SM)  Vice President, Africa  Botswana
Jalal Ahmed (JA)  Vice President, Asia  Bangladesh
Nadeesha Yahampath (NY)  Executive Director  Sri Lanka (Recording)

Apologies
Peter Oborn (PO)  Vice President Europe  UK
Wycliffe Morton (WM)  Vice President Americas  St.Kitts and Nevis

CALL TO ORDER & APOLOGIES
President called the meeting to order and noted the apologies as above.

1.0 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD IN LAHORE 5TH MARCH 2016 (79TH)
Minutes of the 79th Council Meeting were confirmed without any amendment. RW proposed the approval of the Minutes and the rest of the Council agreed and adopted.

2.0 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING
President invited JG to update the Council on his proceedings regarding the CAA Archive matter. JG said he got someone to review the archive and he received the report but could not have a final meeting with the reviewer. He also said that he will forward a detailed index to the Council, so that everyone can have an idea what’s in it and then to decide what we should do. JG said he will have the meeting next week and publish the index to the Council with some recommendation as moving forward and make some option available to the Council for their decision.

Another item arising from the last Council Meeting regarding the Nottingham University “Tshela Project”. Dik had shared a Video along with the Report forwarded by one of the students from the Nottingham University on their experience during the Project. President mentioned that we should publish this news in CAA website and in
the E-journal as well. He also said that we will await the second report from DJ to circulate the report to the Member Organisations after Councils’ review.

Next matter arising was the BEPIC and at President’s request JG elaborated that not much had happened during the recent past. As decided at the meeting late last year it was suggested to have a meeting in spring this year but nothing happened. Another meeting is being fixed to be held on 4th July and Peter is organising it as he is very keen to get BEPIC energised and may be organise some events as was discussed earlier, to organise a regional meeting through the commonwealth to put in hand as per discussions at the London meeting.

JG also said that he looks forward to receive feedback on the draft Questionnaire received from BBA as we have not received any responses so far. VC requested Council to assist JG regarding getting responses through the MO’s to fill the BBA Draft Questionnaire.

3.0 FINANCIAL MATTERS

3.1 REPORT FROM TREASURER

The May Financial report forwarded to the Council by JG was recalled. JG said the reserves are really high and we should look at how CAA can identify the projects. As per discussions had with Vincent, JG said the Council has to identify the Projects and bring them before the Council and allocate some amount of money to the selected projects.

RW asked JG why the Council’s approved GBP10000 to be given to RIBA in respect of the expenses at the last year Summit in London, and any reason why this has not been paid. JG said that Peter wanted to allocate it to an appropriate project which he likes to put that amount towards the City Resilience Agenda which will be commenced in a few months.

RW emphasized that Architectural Residency Programme is scheduled to be held in Sri Lanka for two weeks in September 2016 and this is useful for the Architects and student Architects to develop their Projects in their communities and working with communities. There are international bodies who will be participating in this event from the commonwealth countries. CAA can become a partner and organise some event in this programme or second option is, CAA also can sponsor a student to take part in this event which will cost about GBP2000 or CAA could sponsor a resourced person, a well-known Architect who can afford to spend 2 weeks in this event so he will be a resourced person sponsored by CAA for this event.

The President requested all the Council members to pencil all suggested Projects and forward to the Council for review and take it up how we can proceed with same. JG also said that he and VC should have detailed discussion on future projects which will lead CAA on research projects.
3.2 SUBSCRIPTION STATUS
JG mentioned that we have recovered 70% of the subscription fees for the year 2016. We still have not received from Nigeria, Ghana, Australia and Sri Lanka up to date. However there has been a delay in sending Invoices to the MOs since CAA was awaiting replies on requested member declaration from the MOs. The invoices sent out with the reduction effected as per the decision made by the Council in Lahore March 2016.

JG also stated that there are new memberships who are waiting to receive the information, and NY is asked to contact Papua New Guinea, Fiji and Rwanda to have them under CAA. NY mentioned there had been emails sent to Fiji and Papua New Guinea but emails bounced back since the address was incorrect. SM mentioned that Rwanda is very happy to become a member. DJ said he will resend the correct email addresses to NY, so that she would write to them. However at the request of Kalim and the rest of the Council the President agreed to write to them personally.

4.0 VALIDATION ACTIVITIES - UPDATE
SM elaborated that we have already completed Validation Visit to Durban University and there are a few validation visits still pending.

i. University of Durban
As per the discussions had with the Excom members SM wanted the Excom members to be familiarized with the unique aspects of CAA system of the validation visits or accreditations visits. The validation board to Durban University was Professor Samuel Afram from Ghana, who was thorough in CAA Validation visits, Jayantha Perera, who is having long time experience in academic experiences in Sri Lanka Institute of Architects and herself. SM also stated that the report writing was anticipated by the validation board and CAA will have to find a solution for Report writing in the future. She again said that since CAA’s former Executive Director used to travel with the visiting board on validation visits, the report writing was purely handled by him.

Jayantha also commented that the Durban University validation visit was a good experience.

ii. Kenya Schools
SM pointed out that another validation visit to Kenya was due in May which was cancelled due to student’s strikes. Therefore an alternative date will be reconsidered in August. It is convenient if CAA could review both the Schools at the same time due to the logistic issues and in order to save costs but the decision is still pending and we await their feedback. They also require an advisory visit as a new programme. We are still awaiting initial documents from the two schools to finalise the visits.

iii. Uganda Schools
There is another validation visit due under Uganda Association of Architects and still awaiting responses from the Institute.
iv. **Caribbean School of Architecture**
SM said that Caribbean school of Architecture is in the process of implementing some changes in their programmes and seek advice from CAA. SM has received documents from the schools asking whether it will be affected to their existing programs. SM said that she reviewed their Documents which were circulated to the Excom members as well and the documents can be accepted.

v. **Cape Town University**
It is a revisit to the above University due in September. Only one Panel member will be visiting to this. An experienced member from the validation panel will be nominated.

At the end of her explanation SM also said that the new panelists should be well trained as in the past months she has been rebuilding the distances. She also mentioned about the panel member Kirsten Orr who had been nominated by the Australian Institute of Architects. When evaluating her experiences and potential approaches to be the perfect fit to the position of the Academic reviewer for CAA, However when considering her unavailability due to her busy schedules and lack of time to be committed to validation activities, it was clear that she will not be released for this position as potential Chair for the Excom. SM explained the importance of having a nomination for an Academic reviewer and requested Council to explore one from the existing panelists.

DJ also said that RAIA will be keen in getting suitable nomination for CAA instead of Kirsten since she is reluctantly compelled to withdraw her nomination due to her unbearable work load.

NY commented that one of the former Excom members, Essy Banniassad would be delighted to rejoin CAA and she would like to have comments from the Council regarding her suggestion. SM said that she would propose to the Council to forward the nominations with respective CVs, and request them to forward their consent in writing with an introduction as how they would like to commit planning future validation implementations for CAA.

The Council agreed to her proposal.

SM emphasized that she also find difficulties in finding time for her secretarial work. She said she wants a clarification as how the secretariat will support in validation activities and she believes that there should be a Secretary who can assist with validation visits and keen in report writing knowledge.

JG added that in the past TG accompanied validation visits with the visiting board did the report writing and arranging correspondence in respect of the visits. He also said that we have to decide as how we can manage a position basically cost effective and efficient who can give administration assistance for validation visits.
JP also explained their experience in Durban University as how they completed the CAA report with the Sumuel Afram’s support. JG Said that it is important that CAA have a network in terms of administration support for validation activities.

DJ commented that the Malaysia Institute of Architects has introduced a new validation system of their own and they are trying to charge University in Australia USD 200,000 for their validation since Malaysia Institute market in Australia is huge and it is a direct competition to achieve money. He further stated that there is a possibility when one country wants to make an income where in the future even other Countries also will want to achieve the same. This is a concerning aspect as we provide this service which is independent and reasonably priced across the commonwealth. We should bring all Institutions aware that we wish to strengthen our validation to be continued as an alternative, so that any other Institute like Malaysia will not have any chance at all to charge any life sum from the Institutes.

5.0 CANBERRA ACCORD MEETING – MAY 2017

5.1. Report

SM stated that, she attended the Canberra Accord with a National Academic Body from USA, Professor Oliver to do an assessment of the Korean Architectural Accreditation Board which took place at the end April which was a re-visit. This KAAB visit takes place in every 6 years which is getting reviewed by the other peer members. She also said this visit was an informative for her and they spent 4 days looking at the school and Institutional structures and at the end of the visit the Canberra accord approval was given after writing a report. The visit went really well. In terms of the experience that being more involved in validation activities as a whole across different National institutes, CAA’s participation in Canberra Accord activities, it is clear that CAA continue to go forward.

She further stated that, SACAP is a provisional member of Canberra Accord and South Africa is waiting to become a member of Canberra Accord. Whilst their membership being reviewed for a period of 2 years, there is a visit in September to check whether they are ready to become a full member or not. This visit will be carried out by the representation from Korea and NAAB, and it was convinced that the CAA should not participate as a Canberra Accord Assessor for this visit as CAA has a very close relationship to the SACAP.

The Canberra Accord visit to China next year will be done by SM as a practitioner and Doctor Harhoff as an Academic reviewer.

5.2 General Meeting 2017 proceedings

In Boston, Paul has extended CAA’s invitation to host the 6th General Meeting in Colombo in May 2017 and it was accepted. The number of participants in these meetings has grown significantly, however, since the Beijing meeting in 2011. Canberra Accord now has four organizations with provisional status, and many representatives of other accrediting organizations have been attending as well. This means as many as 45 people may be expected to attend the meeting in 2017. Hosting the meeting means providing a hotel block and reservation system (participants pay their own hotel bills), a meeting space with a layout to
accommodate 25 people at the conference table and 20-22 additional guests at other tables, appropriate audio-visual equipment including microphones and a sound system, as well as two breakfasts, two lunches, and one reception or dinner. This can be a significant financial and logistical burden on an organization, Canberra Accord Secretariat wanted to be sure the CAA understands the nature of the commitment.

As per above requirement SM and NY attended the Canberra Accord Meeting on 17th May 2016. As discussed at the meeting The Canberra Accord 6th General Meeting will be held in Colombo Sri Lanka during first week of May 2017. This does depend on the approval from the Sri Lanka Institute of Architects proposed dates. Any 2 days during the week of 1-7th May 2017. It is best if it is combined with one day from the weekend. Thus Sunday/Monday or Friday/Saturday. The number of participants expected may be around 45. Hosting the meeting, this can be a significant financial and logistical burden but as per JG we have a £10000 in the budget for this event.

NY has presented the draft itinerary for the programme which was forwarded to the Canberra Accord Secretariat for their comments. Once they reply same RW will have a Meeting with SLIA in order to discuss further proceedings. JP mentioned that the SLIA Council will meet up in three weeks’ time and then he will forward a feedback to the CAA Council. RW mentioned that the Canberra Accord Secretariat will have to confirm on the list of participants in order to get Hotel rates and arrange the logistic requirements. He also said that the CAA will have to form up a committee for this task including NY since few people will have to assist the delegations in their visa and travel arrangements and so on. RW explained the draft itinerary to the Council.

At the JA’s question regarding who can attend the Canberra Accord GM in May 2017, SM replied that Canberra Accord full members are eligible to participate and as well as the provisional members. SM will find out whether Bangladesh can attend the GM as an observer.

6.0 STANDING COMMITTEES’ REPORTS

WEBSITE & E-JOURNAL
JP informed that the CAA website problem is being attended and a new drafted structure has been circulated among the Council members for their comments and suggestions. The website will be re-casted soon after the council’s review and will be more organised afterwards. He also said that the 4th E-journal will be published in couple of weeks and the initiatives have been taken already. Write ups are required from VC, KS and DJ in order to cover the sections on Malta Events, Robert Matthew Award and the South Africa Project respectively. VC, KS and DJ confirmed that they have already forwarded the reports and JP said the he will revert if any additional information is required.
7.0 WORKING GROUP REPORTS
Working Group reports had been presented by Peter O'born from the City Resilience and Mark Olweny from the Education Group. Since the reports had been circulated few hours before the Council meeting the Council was asked to read through them and forward their comments later on. JG commented on the PO’s report on City Resilience, and said that PO has reported his discussions on Urban Crises and getting together with as professional organisations to get the consistent responses in this area in the commonwealth. He also reminded about the Princes Foundation proceedings and reminded that the Princes Foundation is waiting for some feedback from our end on the proposal since Commonwealth Foundation Forum is scheduled to be held in July, perhaps they want to take it up and agree on further steps towards funding. This is an opportunity for CAA to become more involved in this process. JG also said that he attended the Meeting in London which was really important, and we really do need some input from the Counsellors, which must be fed back to the Princess Foundation at this stage since we do not want to lose this opportunity. Therefore he requested the Council members to review the papers and to collate that information on behalf of the Institute with your views so that it can be forwarded at the next COGF meeting.

The President emphasised his view and suggested that he would compile all these initiatives and circulate information to the Council members so that the decisions going forward can be discussed at a special meeting. The Council agreed to his proposal.

8.0 STATUS ON WEBSITE
This was discussed under the Item 6 above.

9.0 NEXT EJOURNAL UPDATE
This was discussed under the Item 6 above.

10.0 SACAP MEMBERSHIP – REVIEW
SM stated that, SACAP is the regulatory body in South Africa and it is the Institute, South Africa Institute of Architects that is the CAA member. This is the case with all MO’s currently. SM’s belief is that SACAP needs better representation in CAA due to CAA’s Education and Validation Activities. CAA has not resolved to allow membership beyond civil society organisations and thus SACAP does not qualify. SM suggested that their concerns over representation within CAA be dealt with directly through SIA membership and representation. As per the CAA Constitution memberships are allowed only for the body of Architects, so it is clear that regulatory bodies like SACAP are not allowed to become direct members according to the Constitution.

JG also stated that since CAA wants a secure income, we have to look in to areas where we can broaden up our membership however present constitution does allow the above request of SACAP. VC added that in order to consider any future requests for direct membership with CAA, it has to preceeded with constitution change which has to be agreed at a General Assembly.

SM explained that it is necessary that we convince them the present restrictions we hold in CAA Constitution however CAA should request whether they could present a
position paper as to why they want to become a direct CAA member. Their explanation would be useful to have a clear picture regarding their main concerns. She also said that the CAA should write to South African Institute of Architects regarding this and seek their consent in writing.

VC said that as SM mentioned the necessary letters will be formulated to be forwarded to the respective parties.

11.0 AOB
There were two documents forwarded to be discussed. One is the BBA draft Questionnaire which is already discussed under item No. 2 on Agenda. Second document presented was Princes Foundation which was elaborated by JG above.

12.0 CONCLUSION.
There being no other business the meeting adjourned at 6:30PM.

Nadeesha Yahampath
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR