



1. **Present:** Gavin McLachlan (**GM**), William Martinson (**WM**), Richard Hill (**RH**), Jonathan Stone (**JS**), David Gibbs (**DG**)
Secretary: Grace V Martinson (**GVM**)
2. **Apologies:** Elwyn Harlech Jones (**EHJ**), Dorelle Sapere (**DS**)
3. **Opening and welcome**
 - GM noted apologies and welcomed all.
4. **Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting (26th July 2022)**
 - Item 11, bullet point 4 MG must be written GM
 - JS proposes, WM seconds.
5. **Matters arising** from the minutes of the previous meeting – Noted as per portfolios on the agenda.
6. **Professionalisation**
 - RH recapped, Dr Sithole tabled the MoA to the EAPASA ExCo on the 14th of June 2022 and the feedback was that EAPASA did not believe it necessary to have an MoA, and requested that APHP provide a motivation stating why an MoA is important to APHP. A letter was prepared with input from the ExCo and sent to Dr Sithole on 8th August 2022. The EAPASA ExCo meets mid-September and the board meeting approximately 17th September. Dr Sithole agreed not to submit the application for the registration of the PHP designation to SAQA until the issue of the MoA is resolved which EAPASA would sign with the APHP ExCo.
 - GM noted that APHP ExCo have been mandated by the APHP Members to do the MoA, and APHP has a substantial history that's been running formally and successfully for a long time. In the event EAPASA does not agree to sign the MoA, APHP may need to adjust our strategy in some other way. It is possible that we rephrase our approach so that we can elicit some kind of compromise. The mandate from members is to go ahead through EAPASA with a Memorandum of Agreement and if this is not possible APHP will need to go back to members and ask if we can forego the MoA or find another route such as a partnership with the archaeologists or APHP applies directly to SAQA with the associated implications. The APHP members need to decide and mandate us on which way they want us to go forward if the MoA is not accepted by EAPASA. We currently have a particular mandate and we need to follow that through.



- RH noted that APHP had a positive meeting with ASAPA (archaeologists) in preparation for professionalisation a few months ago, which is a less onerous route than directly to SAQA. Going directly to SAQA requires a lot more items to be put in place, like a transformation policy, and registering as an NPO. The quotation to modify the APHP constitution in order to register as an NPO was at least R10,000.00. The alternative route of partnering with ASAPA means that all documents are already in place as the same documents sent to EAPASA are relevant to ASAPA and can be sent to ASAPA to apply to SAQA under their auspices. In terms of the timelines, going via EAPASA or ASAPA, 4 months from date of submission and 6 months when applying directly to SAQA.
- GM noted that going directly to SAQA requires ongoing costs that may not be sustainable unless the membership increased substantially, and that there are voices that are anti-APHP which would be quieted by professionalising via EAPASA or ASAPA.
- RH clarified for the new members of the APHP ExCo, the cost implications: SAQA is not charging fees to professional bodies yet; there was a lot of unhappiness among members regarding the possible introduction of the proposed SAQA fee structure so SAQA proposed an alternative where there is a fee per member (bigger organisation would pay a lot more) which would mean that this fee might not be onerous to APHP should the route default to SAQA directly; but APHP would need to cover the cost of an office and administration staff etc.

7. Transformation

- DS absent. RH did forward DS the EAPASA transformation policy and plan.
- GM noted that we need a proper plan that is implementable to increase the pace of transformation and it is a very important policy.
- RH explained that in terms of the application to SAQA the requirement that there is a transformation policy would be manageable because SAQA states that if you are not transformed, you need to show that there is a plan to transform. SAQA publishes in the Government Gazette in which they indicate that EAPASA has applied for the registration of a new designation of a PHP which is then open for comment. Should APHP apply to SAQA directly, and SAQA publishes this intention in the Government Gazette and opens for comment, there may be some opposition from those who believe APHP to be insufficiently transformed.

8. Finances - WM

- Trial balance showing pertinent figures:



- WM Bank R 76 390.00; Accounts Receivable R 17 328 (7 PHP, 8 CHP, and other) and suggests we propose to those outstanding that they pay their membership over a 6 month period.
- RH wonders whether, since the AGM, those that think APHP is moving to EAPASA are not paying. He suggested that an email could be sent out to those unpaid saying that the change-over to EAPASA is only likely to occur in 2023 and that fees need to be paid to APHP in the interim.
- GM suggests that WM consider changing banks due to Standard Bank being very difficult to access. WM has wasted 2 x 1.5 hours waiting in queue with no result.

10. Membership - JS

- JS notes that the rules of membership need a re-visit. There needs to be clear understanding of the term professional and what it means. We attract members from a variety of disciplines, and much of the criteria is dealt with in the individual discipline e.g. the Act governs architects or town planners. It is the public that require indemnity from professionals and APHP needs to fulfil all those requirements. The post graduate qualification deals with APHP's academic requirement, it is not the committee's role to challenge any of the institutions that grant qualifications. The notion that one should have experience in this or that particular aspect may exclude people who are less mainstream but may nevertheless be an enriching addition to what it is we do. We need clarity in regard to the criteria that need to be applied to membership.
- GM requests JS puts this in writing and reduce it to a series of clear points to get consensus on that.
- GM considers contacting those that have criticised APHP and get feedback.
- DG can reach out to Quanita Samie to find out what her constructive criticism is.
- GM we need a written document of our own, describing the current problem, and a way forward plus finding out what the criticism of those who don't like APHP actually is, so we can identify the serious issues worth taking into account.
- DG notes that membership is a way of addressing transformation by being as welcoming and enabling as possible. Membership is a form of gatekeeping and there needs to be a nuanced approach in how we handle membership criteria.
- Regarding membership of the Heritage Association of South Africa (HASA), GM notes that it is not necessary for APHP to become a member, but we could circulate their invitation to all of our members. From a CPD point of view, the upcoming HASA conference could be relevant.



- DG observes that Heritage Association of South Africa are an association of associations! There doesn't seem to be a conflict of interest with APHP for people to attend in a private capacity. There could be a reciprocal arrangement with HASA regarding CPD. Otherwise we would need a mandate from members to join corporately.
 - RH recalls IAIAsa conference in August 2019, when Jenna Lavin presented on the notion of APHP becoming a professional body. He suggested that APHP could request a 15-minute slot at the HASA conference to speak about what we are doing in terms of Professionalisation. GM will discuss whether JS would agree to do the presentation as he is Johannesburg based.
- 11. Liaising with Heritage Authorities and Related Bodies – DG**
- DG discussed the email from SAHRA regarding fees charged for heritage applications. SAHRA has without engagement with voluntary associations (but is still open for comment until the 2nd October) stated it will be charging where there were previously no charges. There is an existing regulation published by SAHRA and promulgated in 2005 that states that SAHRA cannot charge for permits for research, which is in direct contradiction to what they are now planning. Charges are for NID and for a review of an HIA. The concern is that this will add to the delays in the issuing of permits and the heritage processes will be circumvented by developers etc. The most concerning item is the charge for site inspections which is part of their job in the first place. They should go to Treasury rather than the private sector if they are short of funding. Jenna shared the letter of a similar situation in Western Cape. DG will draft a letter to reach SAHRA before the October deadline.
- 12. Any other business**
- 7th member required: Karin Dugmore-Strom was contacted by GM and is considering joining. In the event that she does not accept then the alternative name was Bruce Eitzen.
- 13. Date of next meeting**
Tuesday 20th September 14h00
- 14. Closure**
Meeting closed at 15h10