



Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners

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

PRESENT: Jenna Lavin (JL), Adre Aggenbach (AA), Emmylou Bailey (EB), Ursula Rigby (UR), Louise van Riet (LvR) and Gavin McLachlan (GM)

APOLOGIES: Claire Abrahamse (CA)

Secretary: Muneerah Karriem (MK)

1. Opening and welcome

JL welcomed ExCo members noting apologies from CA.

2. Attendance

Recorded as per minutes.

3. Apologies

It was noted that CA tendered her apologies.

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 22nd February 2021.

6. Matters to be addressed

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

(1) Transformation towards a just heritage practice (2) Development of a Social Impact Assessment Guidelines document and Cultural Landscape Guidelines document. (3) Professional Development and Professionalisation Engagement (4) Standardised application templates and CPD opportunity (5) Interaction with Authorities (COCT, HWC and SAHRA) (6) Suspected plagiarised heritage report (7) APHP Event – Wupperthal Case Study (8) Accreditation Matters

6.1 Transformation towards a just heritage practice

- EB confirmed that there had been no discussion around this matter since and suggested merging agenda items 6.1 and 6.2 with the exception of the Cultural Landscape Guidelines document; making the latter a separate agenda item going forward.
- It was agreed to:

- make the Development of a Cultural Landscape Guidelines document a separate agenda item going forward.
- make the Development of a Social Impact Assessment Guidelines document a subheading under agenda item 6.1 noting that it might diverge once the social impact assessment guidelines document is completed.

6.2 Development of a Social Impact Assessment Guidelines document and Cultural Landscape Guidelines document

- EB reported that everyone had been too busy since their last meeting to reconvene another and thus agreed to collate their ideas, concerns and suggestions in writing considering best practice, case studies and local issues regarding a social heritage assessment and minimum standards document in a South African context and applicable in terms of the NHRA.
- It was agreed to make the Development of a Social Assessment Guidelines document a sub-heading under agenda item 6.1 and the Development of a Cultural Landscape Guidelines document a separate agenda item going forward.
- It was noted that a Cultural Landscape Guidelines committee had been set up comprising, Nicholas Baumann, Sarah Winter, Liana Jansen, David Gibbs, Lize Malan, Jenna Lavin and Emmylou Bailey.
- All attended a Zoom meeting on the 24th March except Lize Malan, who tendered apologies.
- JL provided feedback noting that the committee would be working on a draft document with basic headlines that came out of their discussions.
- JL further added that the committee aims to:
 - Determine the definitions by drawing up basic methodology of understanding cultural landscapes that heritage practitioners should all be using in HIAs; more specifically trying to establish what it would take for a cultural landscape to be worthy of conservation,
 - Determine where the line is and how to determine that line from just assessing a cultural landscape as part of the things you do within a HIA versus getting a very specific cultural landscape assessment for cultural landscape resource that is worthy of some form of proactive management intervention.
 - Have something in draft by the end of next month.
- It was noted that the cultural landscape and social impact assessment studies in terms of process is very much a HWC requirement and not something any other heritage authority asks for.
- JL noted that SAHRA is in fact the only body nationally that asks for HIAs in other provinces; ECPHRA does but with focus on archaeology and palaeontology and that she was not sure whether AMAFA does.
- JL further added that this should be raised with SAHRA as a way for them to start thinking about the things they need to think about when dealing with HIAs; something they not currently doing and by having existing documentation in place, this will hopefully facilitate discussion and get everyone to have an equal understanding of where we at and where to go.
- It was agreed to share the said documentation with the membership first before sharing them with the authorities.

6.3 Professional Development and Professionalisation Engagement

- LvR informed ExCo that:
 - the initial six-core competency working committee comprising of Acc Comm members, JL and Stephen Townsend are now at a point where a one-page

document is being circulated amongst them in which they identified 5 core competencies instead of 6.

- Members are to comment on how these 5 competencies are to be assessed, either via a test or examples of reports done.
 - It was felt that the big issue of using EAPASA core competencies methodology was that when one looked at it in reality, it involved a huge amount of essay writing that potential HAPs (Heritage Assessment Practitioners) would need to do in order to demonstrate his/her competency; something the committee felt would in fact dissuade most of the current membership from registering as a HAP.
 - The committee aims to have something in draft by the end of next month as it has gone to one or two members for comment already.
- JL noted that another issue the committee felt was a challenge was finding the most egalitarian way of being able to demonstrate the 5 core competencies, making it as possible and plausible for both heritage practitioners and heritage officials employed at heritage authorities.
 - JL noted the difficulty current Environmental Assessment Officials are facing in trying to demonstrate their competency by way of EAPASA's current core competency approach, which basically amounts to submitting documents the equivalent of 118 hours and full Master's dissertation of word numbers.
 - EB questioned how easy the transition would be for graduates with a Master's Degree in Environmental studies, to being a practicing EAP registered with EAPASA.
 - JL responded she presumes it to be the same for us, graduates leaving a tertiary institution with a Master's Degree in something (architecture, urban design etc) and having no idea about heritage law, how to engage with the public around heritage issues, processes at heritage authorities and/or how it all works; something potential heritage practitioners need to be competent on in order to do the work we do.
 - JL reaffirmed that this is basically where APHP hopes to go as a recognised professional membership, communicating what we expect of our members and these are the steps one can take to get there.
 - JL further informed that the committee felt it might be the most opportune time, given the circumstances as a result of Covid, for someone to drive this professionalisation process forward again and in that way potentially earn a supplemental income.
 - **ExCo** agreed to:
 - Share the terms of reference previously developed for this position with Acc Comm in order to relook and possibly change and/or update anything therein that needs changing.
 - Discuss and agree upon the amount of money to budget for this as advised by LvR as Treasurer.
 - Ask Acc Comm and Stephen Townsend in particular, who has been doing this work for the past couple of months anyway, whether he would be interested in championing APHP's professionalisation process as per the terms of reference for an x amount of money per month for an x period. (x still to be discussed and determined)
 - Further probe from Stephen Townsend, should he decline, if he would be interested in guiding someone else that does take on the position as Champion.
 - Approach the broader membership should the above proposal not materialise.
 - JL noted that she had still not done the historically summary and proposed that this perhaps form part of the terms of reference for the Champion position.

6.4 Standardised application templates and CPD opportunity

- LvR noted that she had not drafted the templates yet.

- ExCo noted that the focus needs to be on section 34, 27 and 31 applications because there are guidelines for section 38 from HWC; that the template addresses the big gap currently of how much information to include in a section 34 application in particular, and what is appropriate more or less based on significance.
- It was reiterated that the CPD opportunity would be some courses for the membership on what to include in heritage applications.
- UR reminded and asked ExCo whether the flow diagram EB posted to APHP's Facebook page illustrating the heritage application process developed by Mayat and Hart Architects and Heritage Consultants for the Gauteng PHRA, would be something APHP could do as well.
- ExCo agreed that a flow diagram might be a better option and negate the need for full on templates for now, as long as it explains at what point one needs to approach a heritage professional or not, as well as the commenting process.
- ExCo agreed to, as a starting point to develop flow diagrams illustrating the heritage process and to then use that as a foundation to develop the templates later on.
- It was agreed that the following ExCo members would develop flow diagrams illustrating the heritage process:
 - **GM** – section 34 applications for ECPHRA
 - **LvR** – sections 34, 27 and 31 for HWC
 - **JL** – section 38 HIA process for SAHRA
- JL on a separate but related matter informed ExCo members that HWC no longer requires Title Deeds or proof of ownership for NID submissions after an EAP brought this fact to her attention.
- JL further informed that in an email reply to her on the matter, Waseefa confirmed this to be the case, no more Title Deeds, just a Power of Attorney document in order for HWC to align more closely with NEMA requirements because in the NEMA process when doing a NID submission it's almost impossible to get hold of Title Deed information.
- JL added that Waseefa confirmed that the Title Deed information is useful and can be included if sourced but that it was no longer a requirement for a NID submission.
- ExCo noted that it's unclear what exactly the Power of Attorney document would mean and from who; in linear developments it is understood that if it's an Eskom project, an EAP can get a Power of Attorney document from Eskom and that would be sufficient.
- JL however noted that in all the previous regulations up until 2012 HWC wasn't requiring any landowner permission; it was a relatively new addition to the NID requirements as a result of people making applications, particularly mining applications on people's land who didn't know there was a mining application made on their property, hence the change in requiring Title Deed information.
- ExCo agreed to raise this matter with HWC at the next meeting and suggest that perhaps HWC follows a more nuanced approach aligning with NEMA requirements where land owner permission is required and where it is not, HWC aligns as well except perhaps for mining applications where a different approach is needed.

6.5 Interaction with Heritage Authorities/Institutions

- **UR** confirmed that she received the recording of the APHP and HWC meet on the 19th February, will draft the minutes as soon as possible and request another meeting date.
- It was agreed to raise the issue of Title Deeds no longer being a requirement for NID submissions at the next meeting.
- UR reported that she had contacted the regional managers at all COCT districts via email and they all agreed that the best person to talk to would be Dimitri Georgeades, as the Head of the Environmental and Heritage component at the COCT.

- UR further reported that he had since agreed to meet with APHP advising that David Hart and Mark Bell attend the meeting as well.
- UR noted that she also received feedback on agenda items from APHP's membership for the meet, will communicate this to Dimitri and his colleagues and suggest a date in May for the meet.
- **JL** and **AA** agreed to attend online meeting with **UR**.
- JL reported that she received a curt response from Clinton Jackson to the letter she sent him advising of APHP's concerns regarding the perception that SAHRA was using the Survey Project as a way to get rid of Apartheid era statues.
- **JL** noted that there are still a number of issues to raise with SAHRA at the next meeting and agreed to set up another meeting date with the CEO but questioned how fruitful it would be as she herself does not engage with the day-to-day processes at SAHRA; it was felt involving the Executive Managers of the Heritage and APM units might turn the meeting into an antagonistic one.
- JL further noted that the SAHRA CEO does however sit in on the War Room Committee meetings for Heritage along with HWC and DEA&DP.
- JL informed ExCo that Gerhard Gerber of the War Room Committee called her to attend a last-minute meeting a couple of weeks ago at which the SAHRA CEO was present as well.
- JL noted that the meeting was a follow up on the last time we engaged with the War Room as APHP; the progression of things since the last meet, 2 years ago and what remain issues were discussed.
- JL informed that Gerhard Gerber reported that:
 - HWC received additional funding on an annual basis for additional staff members, but haven't rolled out the full component of approved positions for reasons of Covid and training; they would hopefully do so this year should the Covid pandemic die down.
 - The delegations to Municipalities and getting the Heritage Register approved as well as understanding what that means and looks like, the impact that will have on development and development activities all remain ongoing issues.
- JL noted that to this point, she raised the challenge APHP has with the Stellenbosch Municipality who have an approved inventory with development guidelines but they themselves do not follow their own heritage guidelines, leaving heritage practitioners stuck in the middle between HWC and Municipalities.
- **JL** agreed to set up a follow up meeting.
- **GM** informed ExCo that he contacted Andrew Palfram, who confirmed that there had been no in person meetings in PE only one or two meetings online; he noted that he intends to contact JL to gain clarity regarding what exactly the issues are on a National level before insisting on a meeting with ECPHRA and to thereafter try to attend a meeting in PE, if not in person, then via the Zoom platform.

6.6 Suspected Plagiarised Heritage report

- JL reported that there had been no further engagement on this matter from anyone, not even the person who originally raised it.
- It was agreed to park this matter noting that APHP would avail themselves should this case follow the legal route and requires APHP to contribute in terms of advising on heritage process.

- JL informed ExCo on a separate but related matter, that ASAPA recently raised an issue where an EAP attached a heritage report to an application on SAHRIS that was done for a separate project on the same property.
- JL noted however that she personally does not feel this to be an issue as the EAP did not steal any work as it was on SAHRIS, a public domain as part of a process giving an idea of heritage significance of which none was identified.
- It was agreed to rephrase the above agenda item to Plagiarism and Copyright as it remains an ongoing discussion especially at National level in other Provinces around Heritage Impact Assessments.

6.7 APHP Event – Wuppertal Case Study

- EB reported that the event went well from what she heard, she could only manage to attend the last hour of the talk noting a keen interest and lots of questions from those who attended.
- **LvR** agreed to propose the dates of 21st or 28th April to the ClfA team for their follow up presentation.

6.8 Accreditation Matters

- LvR noted that both applicants, Almo Pretorius and Christian Schoeman do not outright meet the criteria for accredited membership; both will be requested to submit heritage reports they authored themselves.

7. Other Matters

7.1 AGM Date

- ExCo agreed that the AGM would provisionally take place on Thursday, 27th May.
- It was noted that the invite and supporting documentation need to be sent to the membership on the 6th May.
- **MK** was tasked to send the membership a save the date notification of the upcoming AGM.

8. Date of Next Meeting

- It was noted that the next meeting would be held on 19 April 2021 at 12pm.

9. Closure

- The meeting closed at 13.00