



1. **Present:**  
Gavin McLachlan (GM), William Martinson (WM),  
Richard Hill (RH), Elwyn Harlech-Jones (EHJ), Jonathan Stone (JS), David Gibbs (DG),  
Yasmin Mayat (YM)  
Guest: Stephen Townsend (ST)  
Secretary: Grace V Martinson (GVM)
2. **Apologies:** Dorelle Sapere (DS)
3. **Opening and welcome**  
GM noted apologies and welcomed all.
4. **Approval of the minutes** of the previous meetings:  
13 October 2022 - DG proposer, JS seconder.  
24th November 2022 - DG proposer, JS seconder.
5. **Matters arising** from the minutes of the previous meeting –  
Noted as per portfolios on the agenda.
6. **Professionalisation RH**
  - RH stated that regarding feedback on the MoA between APHP and the EAPASA Board, it appears from a telephone conversation with Dr Sithole that the whole professionalisation initiative is moving forward positively, other stakeholders and roleplayers are being brought in, primarily SAHRA. The initiative that APHP has taken is seeding something positive for heritage practitioners in South Africa. When APHP passes on authority to EAPASA (as intended) and they take up registration of PHPs, there are other role players who will play leading roles and APHP will be one party among others. Dr Sithole says that, so far, there is no feedback on the MoA as the EAPASA Board would like more time to look at it. Also, there has been no response from SAQA yet on their progress in processing the application for the registration of the PHP designation. Note that although APHP wanted EAPASA to submit the PHP application to SAQA once the MoA was signed, it was submitted regardless of the fact that no MoA has yet been concluded. Dr Sithole said that Natasha Higgitt (SAHRA) has been in conversation with him and wanted to understand the relationship that APHP has with EAPASA as SAHRA are actually mandated to register heritage practitioners as per



Section 38.2 of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA). Dr Sithole explained to Natasha Higgitt why, if SAHRA is meant to register PHPs, EAPASA is engaging with APHP, and how long this process has been going on. She pointed out that SAHRA has the legal responsibility and they want to work on regulations in this regard. EAPASA is a statutory professional body as they work under the National Environmental Management Act, and APHP always understood the PHP designation would be a non-statutory designation (not underpinned by a statute of Parliament) whether submitted by EAPASA or directly by APHP. SAHRA would need to decide which kinds of heritage practitioners need to be registered and this process could take time given the many years the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) has taken to address the same issue for Environmental Assessment Practitioners (EAPs). So, the process that APHP has instigated is very important and has initiated something bigger that will take time and an ongoing process if SAHRA does get involved as they say they would like to.

- RH noted that Dr Sithole pointed out EAPASA is considering having a Heritage Committee that would look at applications for registering Heritage Practitioners and SAHRA are wanting to tie up loose ends, appreciating the relationship that EAPASA has with APHP, understanding that the designation has already been submitted to SAQA. SAHRA has requested a formal meeting with EAPASA in February 2023, consisting of the Council of SAHRA (10 persons) and the EAPASA Board (9 persons) to share information. RH suggested to Dr Sithole that all role players should be included such as APHP, AMAFA, ASAPA (Association for Southern African Professional Archeologists) etc., but Dr Sithole proposed a meeting later in February 2023 for all role players to meet to understand what the SAHRA Council and EAPASA Board have agreed to. This all lends legitimacy to the process that APHP has started.
- RH noted that Dr Sithole stated that SAHRA wants an MoU with EAPASA, which does not make the APHP and EAPASA MoA redundant, because EAPASA has an MoU with the DFFE (Statutory Authority) and IAIAA (International Association for Impact Assessment South African Affiliate). Dr Sithole suggested that APHP could play a similar role to IAIAA, accrediting courses for CPD points, engage with Heritage Practitioners acting in the capacity as a Voluntary Association, in the same way that IAIAA does with EAPs who must formally register with EAPASA but who are long term members of IAIAA.
- ST notes that it is unlikely that EAPASA will sign an MoA with APHP if they are signing an MoU with SAHRA. However APHP should remain involved in the conversations representing as many different PHPs as are our members and that we can represent in a



general way. Section 38.2 (as mentioned above) only deals with Impact Assessments, not more generally with Professional Heritage Practitioners or Professionalisation. Although it does give the Heritage Authority the responsibility of vetting any person who is going to compile an Impact Assessment, it is not general. Early in the Act, Chapter 1, there are more general requirements that SAHRA must fulfil. We would want to encourage them therefore to set out something broader, not only Section 38.2. Ultimately it is the recognition of the professional title of Professional Heritage Practitioner that we want which SAQA will provide.

- ST notes that the competencies and the testing thereof, is still the most controversial part of what APHP does, and needs to be re-looked at, for instance how EAPASA will evaluate for PHPs Core Competencies need to be articulated and approved in the 'accreditation' process.

#### 7. **Transformation DS - absent**

- GM notes that we need to have a transformation plan as part of the application to SAQA.

#### 8. **Finances - WM**

- WM reports the change of signatories has been concluded with Standard Bank - a bank card is issued and internet banking. The other signatories on the account are from the old ExCo and a process needs to be addressed to remove their signatures.
- The Trial Balance shows the difference between budget and actual. The expected budget Revenue of R96,000.00 was short by R3,000.00 with an actual amount of R93,000.00.
- In terms of expenses, the budgeted amount of R25,000.00 for events is unspent. The consulting for professionalisation was budgeted R34,000.00 and R44,000.00 is spent, thus an over-spend of R10,000.00. The secretary & admin, there is R17,000.00 still available, noting that there are still 3 months until the end of the financial year. The final profit/loss, we had anticipated a loss of R34,000.00 which would have been taken from the existing reserve from prior years, however the current loss is R6,000.00 but in all probability that loss will increase with RH's fees and the secretarial fees and a possible event.

#### 9. **Membership - JS**

- .Currently no new memberships.



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

- DG suggests through mentorship and coaching, APHP could do skills transferral and transformation at the same time. At UCT there is an initiative to develop emerging practices in architecture, engineering, heritage etc. and it has been difficult to identify emerging practices in heritage that could be supported and fulfills all the criteria.
- DG notes that in terms of liaising with the Heritage Authorities, there has been an email discussion internally regarding EAPASA's one year extension and there has been some external correspondence. Until there is more clarity on the role of EAPASA and APHP, the liaising can be put on hold. There has been consideration of how, when the time comes, APHP can approach SAHRA and HWC and other Heritage Authorities.
- GM has contacted the ECPHRA admin secretary who has undertaken to send the matter on to the Chairperson of the board. We aim at communicating and encouraging all Heritage Authorities from all Provinces to be involved, not only SAHRA and AMAFA that EAPASA have been liaising with.
- JS notes that when we do communicate with entities, we should be sure to align what we have say, it would be useful to have a document that forms the body of communication that keeps consistency around our individual interactions with these bodies. GM requests that JS produce a framework that can be worked on by email round robin by the ExCo.

11. **Any other business**

- Neil Schwartz requests that APHP make representation to HWC that meetings return to normal (no more zoom).
  - DG raised this in the past and conveyed the sentiment, they are aware of it. HWC is not answerable to APHP as a voluntary association.
  - GM to email an appropriate reply.
- SAHRA Schedule of Fees for Services - further feedback.
  - DG has not received any feedback yet.
- Previously CPD points were claimed per conference from CIFA if held in Cape Town. There is a suggestion that we register with SACAP in order for APHP Committee members to claim CPD for their service, as well as APHP members. (Prompted by email from Enrica van der Linden).
  - APHP will register with SACAP - GVM to do.
- James Ball email requesting that we share with all APHP members their new directory, is this appropriate for us to do?



- 
- GM notes that if we send it to our members, it appears that we are endorsing a commercial endeavour. EHJ, JS support not sending the email out.
  - YM notes that the James Ball website is a very useful resource and is in place to support Heritage, the cost is to support the website development and website hosting.
  - GM to email response that is supportive but we will not forward the email.
  - Graham Linsley's formal complaint regarding Barnardo van Biljon representing himself as a "Professional Architect and Heritage Consultant".
    - DG confirmed that the term Heritage Consultant / Heritage Practitioner is not a statutory term yet, and is not professionalised, there is no legal reason to protect that term and anybody who practises in heritage from any background, can use that term. Unless he is doing heritage work that is substandard, in which case we could then comment on that but could not take any disciplinary action or recourse. The letter does not demonstrate any malpractice.
    - GM will call Graham Linsley to discuss and explain the outcome of his complaint, coached within the framework of the process of professionalisation and explain that we are not at that point yet where we have a professional designation that is legislatively defensible, and that at such point, one could take action. Mr Bernardo could be invited to consider becoming a member of APHP.
  - Consideration of an APHP event later in 2023.
    - GM advocates the consideration of a hybrid in-person and online half day seminar conference. Considering location, most APHP members are in the Western Cape, but one can consider other alternatives. Consider a theme that supports diversity and South Africa's difficult history, a theme around the contested nature of heritage could be carefully considered. We would need to identify particular people to speak. JS supports the broad theme and that it is open ended. Consider re-visiting previous interpretations and mistakes. APHP can make sure there are papers that are submitted that are published so that the academics and practitioners



can obtain credit. EHJ supports and suggests Bloemfontein. GM to produce a memorandum for the next meeting.

- Possible dates for meetings leading up to the May 2023 AGM:
  - Thursday 23 March 2023 14h00
  - Thursday 20 April 2023 14h00

13. **Date of next meeting**  
Thursday 23rd February 2023.

14. **Closure**  
Meeting closed at 15h52