



1. **Present:**
Gavin McLachlan (GM), William Martinson (WM), Richard Hill (RH), Elwyn Harlech-Jones (EHJ), Jonathan Stone (JS), Yasmin Mayat (YM)
Secretary: Grace V Martinson (GVM)
2. **Apologies:** David Gibbs (DG), Dorelle Sapere (DS)
3. **Opening and welcome**
GM noted apologies and welcomed all.
4. **Approval of the minutes** of the previous meetings:
26th January 2023 - WM proposer, JS seconder.
5. **Matters arising** from the minutes of the previous meeting –
Noted as per portfolios on the agenda.
6. **Professionalisation - RH**
 - RH & GM to prepare an information sheet to go out to members by the end of March 2023.
 - RH reported that Dr Sithole has advised that Natasha Higgitt is the new DAU (Development Applications Unit) manager for SAHRA and she needs a few weeks to acclimatise to her new position and that she and Dr Sithole will meet in mid-March. Dr Sithole says EAPASA can synchronise so that APHP and other relevant organisations are present as well (he had previously said that in mid-February there would be a high level EAPASA Board - SAHRA Council meeting and in the latter half of February there would be an open meeting with EAPASA, SAHRA, ASAPA, AMAFA and interested parties which did not happen). Given that EAPASA has been in touch with a range of authorities like AMAFA and SAHRA, RH suggests that APHP could also meet with Ms Higgitt. It may be useful if anybody on the ExCo who knows Ms Higgitt could make contact with her. This would be advantageous because Ms Higgitt would not be conversant with APHP's proposed MoA through which we have sought to protect the rights of Heritage Practitioners once they are absorbed into EAPASA which has similar though somewhat divergent interests. Given that SAHRA may be the Competent Authority with whom EAPASA are engaging, the APHP perspective could be useful for



Ms Higgitt. There are no present ExCo members who know Natasha Higgitt. (Ask DG whether he knows her from HWC.)

- GM suggests we set up a meeting with Natasha Higgitt to explore common ground. What is not clear is what EAPASA thinks SAHRA's role will be, because SAHRA is not a professional registering body and it does not represent the professionals and only represents the government with regard to the protection and conservation of National Heritage. If SAHRA becomes the recognised authority because it's a government authority, we need to think through whether we have an objection to that.
- RH notes that SAHRA's role is a statutory government agency, in the same way that the Department Forestry, Fisheries and Environment (DFFE) is a national department. SAHRA would not become a professional body and register practitioners, the registration of practitioners must go through SAQA. SAQA could appoint EAPASA as the professional body to register not just EAPs but PHPs as well. Underpinning EAPASA's initial appointment and registration of EAPs is the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the DFFE. Thus EAPASA is a registration authority, after which EAPASA applied independently to SAQA to become a recognised professional body, thus EAPASA acts in two ways (1) as a registration authority appointed by the DFFE, and (2) as a professional body recognised by SAQA. In what we are envisaging, EAPASA will continue to be the professional body under SAQA (registering PHPs) but SAHRA will have an interest in what EAPASA does. Thus what Dr Sithole is saying, in the same way that EAPASA has a relationship with the DFFE, EAPASA could have a relationship with SAHRA; and in the same way that EAPASA has a relationship with IAIA as the voluntary association to which EAPs belong, EAPASA will have a relationship with APHP as the voluntary association to which heritage practitioners belong. There are clear parallels between EAPASA's current engagement with the DFFE and with IAIA and they see that in future they will have a similar relationship with SAHRA and with APHP.
- RH notes that in the same way that the DFFE provides funding to EAPASA, so SAHRA could provide funding to assist EAPASA as the PHP registration authority. Regarding section 38.2 in the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), Stephen Townsend has noted previously that it pertains specifically to people who do heritage impact assessment and he said there is a broader ambit for the registration of heritage practitioners that needs to be captured in this whole process. From RH's understanding, Dr Sithole alluded to the fact that SAHRA may be interested in undertaking some statutory or regulatory change which could take some time. That could well be setting



up a statutory registration authority, because APHP envisages that if we go under EAPASA with the application we currently put to SAQA, it is a non-statutory designation, which means it is not compulsory to be registered in order to practise. There is the question of what kind of heritage practitioners need to be registered. After EAPASA's appointment only the private sector consultants that do EIAs applied to be registered and state officials at national and provincial level were not coming forward. The question that DFFE had to answer is it only the officials who review EIAs who need to be registered, or should registration be extended to include waste management officials or air pollution control officials, who review and approve parts of EIAs? There was uncertainty as to who needs to be registered under EAPASA in order to give effect to the regulations under the National Environmental Management Act. It took the DFFE about five years to resolve this issue, which they have done in regulations under the National Environment Management Act. With SAHRA getting involved now, we can anticipate a timeline of several years judging by the timeline of the EAPASA process. SAHRA would need to change the NHRA to make registration compulsory.

- RH has agreed to contact Natasha Higgitt.

7. **Transformation - DS**

- DS apology submitted.

8. **Finances - WM**

- WM shared the trial balance. As of today the Standard Bank account has a balance of R 46 662.00 and the only real change in revenue was the revenue for the associates went up by R150.00 and revenue for applications went up by R400.00.

9. **Membership - JS**

- JS notes there were two applications: Herman Solomon (registered as Associate Member) and Royi Muroyi is now a Professional Heritage Practitioner (PHP) member. Their applications were circulated to the membership committee and all were in agreement.
- JS notes that it is only in matters where there is dissension and difficulty in reaching agreement by the Membership Committee that we would bring that sort of detail in front of the ExCo.
- JS spoke on the issue of what constitutes the core values of membership. When we engage with heritage authorities etc. our membership has credibility, means something



to them and they can understand the rigorous professional process that has been undertaken. Particularly in the context of those sitting on the provincial committee who are completely reliant on the heritage report in front of them. If they can feel confident in the fact that the report is compiled by an APHP member, it would relieve them of any difficulties in coming to any decision or recommendation that is made. There needs to be thorough protocols that are clear to follow in terms of membership. The code of conduct is useful but broad, as each point raised in its generality has exceptions, for example, it would be unethical for a heritage practitioner to draw up a heritage impact assessment, conservation management plan and application to the heritage authority if they are in fact going to be the practising architect who is going to undertake the work. However one could also argue that the heritage practitioner who is the architect should do the work, as that is where the knowledge lies. This type of conflict of interest would need to be disclosed, as it would skew the outcome which would result in a negative outcome for the broader needs of heritage. Also there needs to be protocols for tendering that one can be secure in the fact that APHP members would follow. There need to be intrinsic advantages that are seen to be in place if one is dealing with an APHP member. These ideas need to be further specified. (Note the suggestion that APHP member studies be accumulated on an APHP database that can give valuable information on local day-to-day studies; and appropriate contracts for APHP members.)

- GM requests that JS takes Code of Conduct and makes suggestions for amendments.

10. **Liaising with Heritage Authorities and Related Bodies – DG**

- DG's apology was submitted.

11. **Any other business**

- CPD (GVM)
 - The SACAP list of required documents has been obtained; and the changes to the Constitution from the AGM in 2022 has been checked by RH as part of the submission.
 - GM notes that Landscape Architects, Town Planners and likely Archaeologists etc. also need CPD points thus we need to investigate how that can be actioned. EHJ suggests looking into the Construction Management profession and their registration body.
- APHP 2023 event (GM)



- Zoom online conference, 3-4 individuals (not necessarily APHP members) presenting 20-40 minute presentations that are relevant to GM's proposed theme (see email sent to ExCo).
 - Request presenters pre-record and send to the secretary in case of technical difficulties.
 - Possible dates for meetings leading up to the May 2023 AGM:
 - Thursday 23 March 2023 14h00
 - Thursday 20 April 2023 14h00
 - AGM 25 May 2023
13. **Date of next meeting**
Thursday 23rd March 2023.
14. **Closure**
Meeting closed at 15h18.