



Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON
24 MAY 2021
at 12:00 via Zoom Conference Call**

PRESENT: Jenna Lavin (JL), Emmylou Bailey (EB), Louise van Riet (LvR) and Gavin McLachlan (GM), Claire Abrahamse (CA)

APOLOGIES: Adre Aggenbach (AA) and Ursula Rigby (UR)

Secretary: Muneerah Karriem (MK)

1. Opening and welcome

JL welcomed ExCo members to the last official meeting for the 2020-2021 ExCo, sadly noting apologies from AA who informed she would not stand for re-election to the 2021-2022 ExCo.

JL noted UR's absence and hoped she would still join the Zoom meet as it would be her last one as an ExCo member; UR previously noted she too would not stand for re-election to the 2021-2022 ExCo.

2. Attendance

Recorded as per minutes.

3. Apologies

It was noted that AA tendered her apologies and that UR would subsequently do the same.

4. Approval of Agenda

It was agreed to approve the agenda.

5. Approval of previous minutes

ExCo agreed to approve the previous minutes of meeting held on the 29 March 2021 and 19 April respectively.

6. Matters to be addressed

JL noted that matters to be addressed at this meeting included:

(1) Professional Development and Professionalisation Engagement (2) AGM (3) Transformation towards a just heritage practice (4) Development of a Cultural Landscape Guidelines document. (5) Interaction with Authorities (COCT, HWC and SAHRA) (6) APHP Event Wupperthal Case Study (7) Heritage process flow diagrams for Standardised application templates and CPD opportunity (8) Possible collaboration between APHP and ClfA (9) Cape Town Fire – APHP Public Statement (10) Accreditation Matters (11) Plagiarism and Copyright on heritage reports

6.1 Professional Development and Professionalisation Engagement

- It was agreed to forward the proposed budget and Terms of Reference for the Champion position to the **new ExCo** for them to take further.
- LvR reported that Acc Comm members felt that the summarised 6 core competency document that has been circulated and workshopped amongst themselves had gone far enough; that the **new ExCo** present it to the prospective Champion to take further.
- ExCo noted their preference in offering the Champion position to Stephen Townsend but agreed to hold over such discussions for the **new ExCo** to pursue.
- JL reported that the letter regarding candidate member, Chris Murphy's concerns about an incident he experienced at a BELCom meeting had been sent to HWC.
- JL further reported that the Chairperson of BELCom refuted the claims made by Chris Murphy, but that Colette Scheermeyer, the acting CEO of HWC agreed to raise the matter with the BELCom for resolution.

6.2 AGM

- JL informed ExCo that Stephen Townsend had put forward a motion for the AGM regarding professionalisation that read:

"That the Exco be required to:

(a) pursue the process of professionalism through the association's registration as a "specialist association" under the aegis of the future Council for the Environment (or whatever; when that aspect of the national strategy is pursued) with EAPASA, other specialist subsidiary professions, and relevant state bodies

(b) reconsider the question of accreditation and the question of the necessary skills/competencies required by accredited heritage professionals and whether those competencies should be demonstrated through an examination and/or a portfolio of reports or similar, and

(c) establish a small sub-committee (which must include an APHP-funded representative) dedicated to these tasks."

- MK confirmed that members had not sent through any nominations yet.
- JL confirmed the resignation of LvR, UR and AA from ExCo after they reaffirmed their decision to step down.
- **MK** was tasked to make a final call for the membership to send in their nominations of fellow accredited members to serve on the Executive Committee, and that this call includes inviting candidate members to note their interest in sitting in on Executive committee meetings.
- It was agreed that current ExCo members would also nominate fellow accredited members they felt could make a meaningful contribution on the new Executive.
- **CA** and **EB** agreed to liaise regarding a watermark for the 2021-2022 membership certificates.

6.3 Transformation towards a just heritage practice

- It was noted that the draft document on social impact assessment guidelines meant to form part of the appendices to the Chairperson report was incomplete and could thus not be attached.

- **JL** and **EB** agreed to review and collate the comments the SIA team made before distributing it to the new Executive Committee and then the membership.

6.4 Development of a Cultural Landscape Guidelines document

- It was noted that the draft document on cultural landscape assessment guidelines meant to form part of the appendices to the Chairperson report was incomplete and could thus not be attached.
- EB noted that a lot of the proposed guidelines were taken from international best practice standards and that the **new Executive Committee** be tasked to take this forward properly.
- EB noted her concerns regarding the way certain EAPs are getting away with doing the bare minimum in EIA reports and if there was nothing that APHP, from an ethical point of view could do to mitigate that.
- JL noted that if authorising bodies like ECPHRA and SAHRA are rejecting integrated Heritage Impact Assessments, and are only interested in reports on archaeology and palaeontology, you cannot blame EAPs for only doing what the authorities are requesting.
- JL further noted the following:
 - that this was indeed a symptom of a much bigger problem that needs to be resolved as the cultural landscape in the Eastern Cape is valuable and no one is considering it.
 - That ECPHRA needs to be functional and do what they are supposed to do in terms of the NHRA and
 - That SAHRA needs to engage with ECPHRA and ensure they take heritage issues seriously and are considering them properly.
 - that APHP has at every SAHRA meeting raised the issue of ECPHRA rejecting integrated Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) only looking at archaeology and palaeontology.
 - that SAHRA itself does not recognise this as a problem because their own archaeology and palaeontology heritage officers are the ones dealing with HIAs and they too do not look at cultural landscapes.
 - HWC was the only heritage authority approaching and managing these big HIA projects holistically.
 - That the Eastern Cape is an area that has been identified 10 years ago already as being appropriate for renewable energy development and is thus gazetted as a REDs (Rural Economic Developments) area.
 - That the process of assessing such impacts on the cultural landscape was clearly flawed and done 10 years ago which has now long passed but remains a huge challenge as heritage authorities have not yet found an appropriate way to respond to these private identified RED areas.

6.5 Interaction with Heritage Authorities/Institutions

- CA and JL reported on APHP's 3rd May meeting with the COCT and noted the following:
 - There is no standard process that is followed for heritage applications at the COCT, it differs between the various districts and is often left up to the various district heads and the heritage officers working under them.
 - That there seemed to be an unwillingness from the City to recognise that their processes need to be tightened up and solidified, especially around instances where new comments and/or requirements are made on a matter within a project that had already been agreed upon, then backtracked and that is not necessarily case specific; UR and CA both reported experiencing such instances.

- The lack of meaningful communication between COCT and HWC regarding heritage audits and inventory; COCT claims to have submitted its inventory online and HWC claims not to have received it in a way they deem reasonable.
 - That the City was vehemently opposed to APHP's proposal of having a public workshop to discuss the SDFs highlighting specific aspects therein that heritage professionals would be interested in, in order to facilitate a proper and engaged comment.
 - It was noted that the municipal by law and updated district SDF had been sent to the membership and that the **new ExCo** be encouraged to find the time to apply their minds properly in formulating comments.
 - It was noted that the draft minutes of this meeting with various comments have been circulated as well as the request for a public discussion on the SDFs.
 - **JL** agreed to send a follow up email.
- It was noted that there was nothing further to report on in terms of feedback from SAHRA nor the Gauteng PHRA and that the **new ExCo** request further engagement on the noted issues after the AGM.
 - GM reported that he last engaged with Nicola Panell and heard nothing further, but that discussions and progress may just improve should William Martinson, a fellow Eastern Cape heritage practitioner and APHP accredited member, agree to be nominated onto the new ExCo.
 - JL noted her concern over the delay in response time for NID applications submitted to HWC as well as a PAI (Public Access to Information) application she made in March already to which she had still not received the documents she requested.
 - EB noted issues of capacity in terms of the greatly reduced number of staff currently working there and the work away from office scenario which can impact accountability.
 - EB further noted that the cut to the budget allocation for staff was due to Covid and that there was talk of further cuts; the original budget that catered for an additional staff compliment of 19 had now been cut down to 5.
 - CA proposed that it might assist heritage officers at HWC if our heritage professionals take on the responsibility of the public participation themselves by advertising and engaging with the various known stakeholders in order to alleviate the burden on the officials; JL however pointed out that legally speaking, it is the authorities duty to request public participation inputs, and because there is no clarity with regards to guidelines for public participation, let alone heritage statements in section 34 applications this complicates things, leaving officials unempowered to make decisions on their own, as opposed to HIAs within section 38 applications that has an executive summary list which assists them in summarising reports.
 - ExCo noted that guidelines for heritage statements within section 34 applications has been requested from HWC on numerous occasions.
 - It was agreed that the **new ExCo** notes and raise the above issues with HWC at the next meeting and possibly attempts to set up an executive summary list for heritage statements as a way forward to assist not only our membership but HWC as well.

6.6 APHP Event – Wupperthal Case Study

- It was noted that the follow up presentation on Wupperthal: The Other Side of the Road presented by the ClfA team comprising, John Wilson Harris, Trevor Thorold and Laura Milandri went very well; it was well attended and interactive.
- **CA** agreed to pursue the issuance of CPD points.
- It was noted that an attendance register was not taken, **MK** was thus tasked to find out who of the membership attended one or both of the events and report back to CA.

6.7 Heritage process flow diagrams for Standardised application templates and CPD opportunity

- ExCo noted that this could assist our membership and general public on the steps to take in making and submitting a heritage application.
- It was also noted that a standardised approach on what all to include in such applications would help our members professionally via the CPD opportunity and creation of an executive summary list for heritage statements.
- It was agreed for this matter to be pursued by the **new ExCo** after the AGM.
- ExCo noted and discussed the progression of candidate members to that of accredited and agreed to wait till APHP's 6 core competencies have been fully established so they have a clear understanding of each competence and how they are to demonstrate it.
- It was however agreed that candidate members who feel they meet the current requirements for accredited membership, can in the meantime apply for accredited membership; **MK** was tasked to email the candidate member group inviting such applications by attaching the accreditation guidelines and reminding candidates of UCT's upcoming Heritage Resources Management course, should they feel they need further development.

6.8 Possible collaboration between APHP and ClfA

- ExCo noted the shared opinions and members between APHP and ClfA, welcoming the cross pollination of ideas and collaboration between the two organisations, particularly around comments of mutual interest.

6.9 Cape Town Fires – APHP Public Statement

- ExCo noted that APHP's public statement on our grief and offer of assistance regarding the Cape Town Fires at UCT had been posted to our website and Facebook page.
- ExCo further noted that the email regarding UCT's request for updating and expanding its built environment consultant database had been sent to our membership.
- It was agreed that this item could be removed from future meeting agendas.

6.10 Accreditation Matters

- It was noted that Christian Schoeman had not responded to his candidate membership accreditation.
- ExCo noted the accredited membership application of Will Archer.
- LvR noted that Acc Comm are still deliberating but that copies of reports he authored would be requested.
- LvR further noted the interest and potential candidate membership application of Shilo Hope.

6.11 Plagiarism and Copyright on Heritage reports

- It was agreed to keep this as a standard item on the agenda and that it is raised with SAHRA at our next meeting.

7. Other Matters

7.1 Concern regarding cultural landscape assessment within EIAs

- It was agreed to note the discussions and resolutions of this matter under item 6.4.

8. Date of Next Meeting

- It was noted that the next meeting would be decided upon via email.

9. Closure

- The meeting closed at 13.25