



102nd UIA Council session  
Istanbul (Turkey) 3 July 2005

English (original: English)  
Distribution: UIA Council & Sections

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of participants	2
Opening remarks	4
<b>0. Adoption of the agenda</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Analysis of the resolutions of the 101st Council session</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Admission of Members</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. Finances</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4. Triennial programme of activities 2005-2008</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>5. Evaluation Committee 2002-2005</b>	<b>9</b>
<i>5.1 Articles and Bylaws Revision committee</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>5.2 Congress and Assembly Preparations committee</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>5.3 Future Vision and Strategy committee</i>	<i>10</i>
<b>6. UIA Continuing Professional Development Programme</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>7. Humanitarian Action Programme</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>8. Election of UIA Bureau and Council members</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>9. Reports on UIA Congresses</b>	
<i>9.1 Turin Congress 2008</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>9.2 Istanbul Congress 2005</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>9.3 Candidatures 2011</i>	<i>14</i>
<b>10. Miscellaneous questions</b>	
<i>10.1 Interior Architects</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>10.2 Proposition for an Auguste Perret Medal</i>	<i>15</i>
Closing remarks	15

Paris, 20 September 2005

FT/102 session



102nd UIA Council session  
Istanbul (Turkey) 3 July 2005

English (original: English)  
Distribution: UIA Council & Sections

## PARTICIPANTS

were present :

### Bureau members:

Mr.	Jaime Lerner (Brazil)	President UIA
	Vassilis Sgoutas (Greece)	Immediate Past President UIA
	Jean-Claude Riguet (France)	Secretary General UIA
	Donald J. Hackl (USA)	Treasurer UIA
	Gaetan Siew (Mauritius)	1st Vice- President - Region V
	José Luis Cortes Delgado (Mexico)	2nd Vice- President - Region III
Ms.	Louise Cox (Australia)	Vice- President - Region IV
Mr.	Peter Hanna (Ireland)	Vice- President - Region I

### Council Members - Region I

Ms.	Regina Gonthier (Switzerland)
Mr.	Jean-François Quelderie (France)
	Luut Rienks (Netherlands)
	<i>Jordi Farrando (Spain), Alternate to J. MUR</i>

### Council Members - Region II

Mr.	Martin Drahovsky (Slovakia)
	Tomaz Kancler (Slovenia)
	Suha Ozkan (Turkey)
Ms.	Elisabeth Siola (Greece) and <i>Mr. Nikos Fintikakis (Greece), Alternate</i>

### Council Members - Region III

Mr.	Ronald Altoon (USA) and <i>Mr. Jim Scheeler (USA), Alternate</i>
	German Suarez Betancourt (Colombia)
	Roberto Simon (Brazil)

### Council Members - Region IV

Mr.	Sung Jung Chough (Rep. of Korea)
	Chong Chia Goh (Singapore)
	Kazuo Iwamura (Japan)
	<i>Cui Kai (PR of China), Alternate to C. Song</i>

### Council Members - Region V

Ms.	Patricia M. Emmett (South Africa)
Mr.	Reuben Mutiso (Kenya)
Ms.	Zakia Shafie (Egypt) and <i>Mr. Seif Abou AlNaga, Alternate</i>

**Past Presidents :**

Ms. Sara Topelson de Greenberg (Mexico)  
Mr. Rod Hackney (United Kingdom)  
Olufemi Majekodunmi (Nigeria)  
Georgi Stoilov (Bulgaria)

**other participants :**

Mr.	Russell Keune (USA)	Co-Director – Professional Practice Comm.
	Xu Anzhi (PR of China)	Co-Director – Professional Practice Comm.
	Fernando Ramos (Spain)	Director – Architectural Education Comm.
	Wolf Tochtermann (Germany)	Director – International Competitions Comm.
Mr.	Giancarlo Ius (Italy)	CNAPPC representative
	Yqing Tang (PR of China)	ASC Deputy Secretary General
Ms.	Francine Troupillon (France)	UIA Director of Administration
	Patricia Meunier (France)	Co-ordinator of relations with the UIA Member Sections and UIA Council

**participated in parts of this session :**

Mr.	Oktay Ekinici (Turkey)	President of the Chamber of Architects of Turkey
	Douglas Steidl (USA)	AIA President
	Fabian Llisteri (Spain)	Coordinator of the International Relations Commission / Superior Council of Spanish Architects
Ms.	Emine Komut (Turkey)	Director of the UIA Work Programme <i>Human Settlements and Natural or other Disasters</i>

\*\*\*\*\*



102nd UIA Council session  
Istanbul (Turkey) 3 July 2005

English (original: English)  
Distribution: UIA Council & Sections

## MINUTES

### **OPENING REMARKS**

Jaime Lerner thanked all of the Council members for their work over the triennial period. He expressed a special thanks to Suha Ozkan and the Turkish organisers, stating his assurance that this would be a marvellous congress. After two days in Istanbul, J. Lerner pointed out that the atmosphere was excellent, and the organisers had truly accomplished miracles.

J. Lerner thanked CAT President Oktay Ekinici for his presence, and expressed his thanks to all the architects of Turkey for their extraordinary accomplishments.

O. Ekinici stated that, conscious of their responsibility, the CAT had worked relentlessly toward this congress over the past year. During this time the organisers realised that it was in fact the whole country that was in preparation for the event. He informed Council that due to health reasons the President of the Republic could not attend the opening ceremony, but had prepared a video message; the Prime Minister would speak in person.

O. Ekinici stated his hope that this congress would be a success not only for the organisers but also for the populations awaiting its results in order to better understand the benefits architecture can offer them. He stressed that the media was present in force, with two channels broadcasting live, in addition to radio and satellite coverage, and that of the Italian *ArchiTV* web network. He then welcomed the UIA Council to Turkey, adding his wishes of success for the event.

POINT 0 OF THE AGENDA
-----------------------

0. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA FOR THE 102 COUNCIL SESSION**

Because there were no comments on the provisional agenda, the following resolution was adopted.

<b><i>Resolution 1</i></b> <b><i>The Council adopted the agenda of its 102nd session.</i></b>
--

POINT 1 OF THE AGENDA
-----------------------

1. **ANALYSIS OF THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE 101st UIA COUNCIL SESSION**

Concerning Resolution 36 of the 101st session, R. Gonthier insisted that the UIA must set an example in this situation by launching a collect of funds to finance the restoration of the building that currently houses its offices, instead of simply abandoning this piece of architectural heritage. D. Hackl stressed that the UIA has a new offer of office space, and cannot be sure that the apartment it now occupies will not be sold, even if the UIA pays for the refurbishment.

Francine Troupillon specified that the restoration costs attached simply to the current office space would equal close to 600,000 Euro for the UIA, and stressed that the Union has no official status in or rights to this office space. The UIA can therefore be kicked out at any moment if the association that owns the apartment decides to sell, and the UIA cannot buy the apartment.

J.C. Riguet emphasised that the French government had agreed to give space to the UIA within the new *City of Architecture and Heritage*, which will open in late 2006. This will give the UIA a prestigious address, space for exhibitions, conferences, and meetings, as well as open up cooperation on cultural programs, such as the protection of 20th century architectural heritage. In addition, the French Order of Architects has offered office space to the UIA in its new local, which will give the Union a modern and appropriate workspace, in contrast to the museum quality of the historical apartment it currently occupies.

P. Hanna agreed the UIA would be sending out a very harmful message if it abandoned a building of architectural value because it could not afford the upkeep. J. C. Riguet asked Council not to confuse the protection and restoration of this building with ensuring a sure, effective workplace for the UIA secretariat, stressing that the UIA could move into a modern office space, with a rental contract, and at the same time help the owners of the August Perret apartment to preserve that space. In response to a question, J.C. Riguet added that the building bears a particular type of historical classification and protection adapted to privately owned structures.

POINT 2 OF THE AGENDA
-----------------------

2. **ADMISSION OF MEMBERS**

F. Troupillon reread the list of new members that had already been approved by the Council during its previous 2002 to 2005 sessions.

In addition, she stated that since the last Council session (February 2005), India, after much discussion and its suspension from the UIA, had applied for re-admission and made the required payments. Senegal had also petitioned for readmission following a time of economic difficulty. In addition, Brunei and Niger completed their application for temporary membership. Consequently, the following resolution was approved.

<b><i>Resolution 2</i></b>
----------------------------

<b><i>The Council approved the readmission of India and Senegal as Member Sections of the UIA, and the admission of Brunei and Niger as Temporary Members of the Union.</i></b>
---

F. Troupillon specified that Argentina (whose admission had already been approved by the Council in 2002) had, a few days before this Council meeting, made the payments corresponding to the membership fees due since its admission. She therefore pointed out that they had been added to the list of new Members whose admission would be submitted to the Istanbul Assembly for ratification.

POINT 3 OF THE AGENDA
-----------------------

### 3. FINANCES

P. Hanna asked if there was a list of the Sections having the right to vote, as it was his understanding that the limit was now one month before the Assembly. D. Hackl pointed out that to vote Sections must be up to date one day before the Assembly opens. In consequence, the final list of voting Sections would be read at the Assembly.

D. Hackl underlined the significant decrease in the UIA's assets from 2003 to 2004, stressing a steady decrease in the amount of membership fees received from the Member Sections. He added that the non-payment of fees places the Union in a precarious financial situation over the short and long term, despite the regular income from the organisation of future congresses. In the comparative tables for the last three years, he asked Council to note that the Union had also reduced its expenditures, though it was impossible for this reduction to match the one in income.

D. Hackl then pointed out that the new system of fee calculation would be presented to the coming Assembly. This system takes into account the PPP (purchasing power parity), which is a comparison between the purchasing power of a certain currency and the American dollar, instead of the GNP or GDP.

On the subject of membership fees, G. Suarez Betancourt stressed that only about 50% of the South American countries are members of the UIA, because of the membership fees it requires. He also stated that for the countries that are currently deep in debt, a compromise must be found to allow them to remain in the Union. He stressed, on the one hand, that the Union needs to find a way to reduce the income needed from dues, and on the other, that an immediate solution needs to be found to keep the countries of Region III in the Union by alleviating their debts.

J. Lerner agreed that a compromise or other solution needed to be sought for the situation regarding membership fees in Region III. Also, he stressed that the UIA was organising new means of non-dues revenue, notably with the UIA Regional Forums that it had instigated

In reference to the countries with several years arrears M. Drahovsky stated that he found it difficult to be understanding with countries that had not paid a penny to the UIA in three years. If they felt their fees were unjustly high, they should at least have paid what they felt was a fair amount to prove their commitment to the UIA and desire to participate.

Concerning the 2006-2008 budget, P. Hanna pointed out his concern over the fact that it did not show the remaining deficit accrued over the past 2 years. He asked for the Treasurer and Finance committee's ideas on how to face this deficit, and on the amount of expenses that the UIA could realistically cover in consideration of its limited resources.

D. Hackl first responded that as Treasurer, it was not within his authority to negotiate special deals concerning the membership fees of individual countries, but only to apply the system of calculation adopted by the Assembly. He then emphasised M. Drahovsky's argument, stating his belief that there is no country so poor that it cannot pay anything, not even a miniscule symbolic amount to demonstrate its desire to participate in the UIA, especially when each country is aware of the burden it places on all of the other Member Sections by refusing or delaying payment.

Concerning the budget D. Hackl pointed out that there is a 50 000 Euro buffer built in to allow for payments that Union does not receive. He nonetheless stressed that the only real answer to the question of membership fees and the UIA budget is to find and establish means of non-dues revenue. He reminded the Council of his past efforts and stated his belief that the evolution of the profession would engender new opportunities.

G. Suarez Betancourt agreed that the Council must limit dues revenue in the future but, at this time, stated that it must deal with the countries that are currently several years in debt by finding a way for them to retain membership in the UIA. He said the Council should accept that three years ago an unjust system was adopted, and for the countries affected, should allow them to pay the equivalent of their 2006 fees (under the new system) minus 10 % for 2005, 20 % for 2004, and 30 % for 2003.

P. Hanna once again asked where the 120 000 Euro deficit accumulated over the last triennial period had gone, since it was not counted in the 2006-2008 budget. He also pointed out that the projected dues revenue for 2006 exceeded largely the amount received in 2004, and expressed his concern that the UIA would soon be in trouble if it tried to pretend that these deficits did not exist. L. Rienks agreed that the UIA should face up to the realities its financial situation.

D. Hackl responded to these concerns by agreeing that this projected budget would reduce the net worth of the Union, but stated that he could not take the option of raising the fees to make up for these losses. The fees budget was therefore kept at approximately the same amount, and other sources of revenue must be found to make up the gaps.

G. Siew underlined the fact that the Council is working toward a budget that will be based on an increasing amount of non-fees revenue. He then called for a vote on this budget.

***Resolution 3***

***The Council approved the 2006-2008 provisional budget proposed by D. Hackl by 19 votes for and 2 against.***

G. Suarez Betancourt insisted that the Council should present a proposition on how to recuperate the debts owed by South America while keeping the countries as members, and S Topelson agreed that a solution must be found to keep South America in the Union. M. Drahovsky stated that individual cases should be studied by the Finance committee and propositions made by them to the Council.

**POINT 4 OF THE AGENDA**

**4. TRIENNIAL PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES**

J. C. Riguet reiterated his feeling that this program should be developed by the next Secretary General. Nonetheless, he informed the Council on certain questions linked to the Work Programmes and the UNESCO-UIA Validation Committee for Architectural Education.

**4.1 Work Programmes**

He stated that the Director of the *Public Health* WP wished to resign, and an interesting candidature for this post had been submitted by the BNA, for Mr. Luub Wessels. Also, Ms. Ann McNicholl had been nominated as Director of the *Architecture and Children* WP. These decisions should be made by the incoming Secretary General/Council.

J.C. Riguet then presented a recommendation made by the *Architecture and Children Work Programme* concerning the rights of children. This recommendation was adopted by the Council.

***Resolution 4***

***The Council approved the UIA Built Environment Education Network Charter established by the Work Programme Architecture and Children.***

***The Council noted that this Charter, presented on this programmes Internet site, "adhere to the principles of the UNICEF Convention on the Rights of the Child, in particular Articles 2.1, 17, and 29".***

***The Council invited the UIA Member Sections to visit this site and in this way support this Charter.***

4.2 UNESCO-UIA Validation Committee for Architectural Education

J.C. Riguet then gave the floor to F. Ramos, who described the resolution written by the UNESCO-UIA Validation committee, and intended for presentation to the Assembly. This resolution is meant as a short and clear summary of all the other UIA directives and guidelines on the issue of the length of architectural studies, and in particular, with regard to the separation of architectural studies into two cycles. The resolution contains 5 points:

- 1) at least 5 years of full-time study centred on architecture
- 2) if divided into two cycles, there must be an educational continuity in architecture
- 3) if divided into two cycles, a certificate may be awarded at the end of the first cycle, but this non- professional certificate must not give the right to professional practice nor permit and confusion with the title of qualified architect
- 4) to practice as an architect, in addition to the 5 years of study, students must undergo at least two years of professional internship, at least one of which takes place after the end of their studies
- 5) the knowledge and skills necessary to architectural practice must be shown in an adequate manner, at the end of the internship, through exams and other appropriate means.

F. Ramos proposed that the Assembly adopt this short document as a recommendation for all the Member Sections. He then mentioned that the German Section had suggested that a phrase suggesting some flexibility be added at the end of this document. He stated his feeling that immediately talking about flexibility would greatly weaken this declaration, adding that no changes can be made at this point, as they must also be approved by UNESCO.

R. Keune asked Council to note that the German Section presented to the Professional Practice Commission in 2003 a motion to uphold the 5-year minimum on architectural education; this motion was approved unanimously by the Commission and brought to Council. He stressed his surprise at this blatant change of direction that the Professional Practice Commission had not been informed of. E. Siola suggested that the UIA should stand firm on 5 years of recommended study, even if certain countries only require 4 years. Any compromise would be a step backward for the Union and the profession. L. Cox also supported the resolution as written by the Validation Committee.

***Resolution 5***

***The Council approved the resolution written by the Architectural Education Commission proposing a concise document on the length and contents of architectural studies. It suggested that this document should be submitted to the General Assembly for information.***

POINT 5 OF THE AGENDA
-----------------------

## 5. EVALUATION COMMITTEE

G. Siew reiterated that following the Berlin Assembly it became obvious that the UIA needed a revision of its statutory texts, an improvement in the preparation of its congresses, and a new strategic direction. For this reason, three subcommittees were created.

### 5.1 Subcommittee on the Revision of the UIA Articles and Bylaws

M. Drahovsky pointed out that two minor amendments had been made since the last Council meeting: firstly, the 9-year service limit on Council members will be applicable starting in 2011, and secondly the approval of the home Member Section for any outside financial aid for candidates to the UIA Council was added to Bylaw XV.5.1.

<b><i>Resolution 6</i></b>
----------------------------

<b><i>The Council approved the last amendments made to the UIA Articles and Bylaws (concerning Article 8.3 and Bylaw XV.5.1).</i></b>
---

M. Drahovsky also underlined the creation of several documents entitled *Rules* that would compliment the Articles and Bylaws, and that the Council had the authority to adopt and enforce according to the mandate given to it by the UIA statutory texts.

### 5.2 Subcommittee on Preparations for UIA Congresses and Assemblies

J. Farrando reminded Council that the new terms of reference for organising a UIA congress had already been accepted, as well as the idea of a bond to ensure the newly selected Section's financial commitments. The UIA logo has also been registered as an international trademark. He then asked Council to approve the four documents contained in the meeting file:

- terms of reference for organising a UIA Forum – J. Farrando stressed that they tried to define Forums as a new type of regionally inspired event, and not simply a miniature UIA congress. The document gives the basics for these events, and should develop with experience.
- a precise schedule or calendar of congress preparations – giving deadlines for the completion of preparation tasks, and designed to help both the congress organisers and the Council to ensure that preparations progress in an orderly and timely manner
- a methodology for overseeing congress preparations – with the goal of ensuring that Council is informed of the progress being made, and at the same time limiting costs to the host Section. The main changes are a reduction in the number of participants in the Coordinating Council, and the obligation for the Coordinating Council and the General Secretariat to make regular reports to the Council on preparations.
- a model contract for organising a UIA congress – which basically adapted the previous model contract to the stipulations of the new terms of reference, including more details than the earlier version.

J. Farrando also mentioned this committee's collaboration on the Rules of the Council and those of the Assembly, developed by the Vision and Strategy committee.

D. Hackl requested confirmation on 3 points: 1) that the new model contract was still in conformity with the legal approval that the previous version had received, 2) that the bond required was really necessary or feasible, and 3) he asked if it were specified that the monetary amounts mentioned are not subject to VAT or other taxes. He suggested that perhaps the UIA's non-taxable status as a not-for-profit organisation should be mentioned.

J. Farrando confirmed that the legal approval was still valid, and specified that the tax-free status of the UIA on all amounts mentioned in the contract was in fact specified both in the contract and in the candidature documents for a host city. He also stated that the question of the bond has already been discussed and approved, and would be tested with the next congresses.

***Resolution 7***

***The Council approved the four documents submitted by the UIA Congress and Assembly Preparations Committee: terms of reference for organising a UIA congress, schedule of preparations for a UIA congress, methodology for overseeing congress preparations, and a model contract for organising a UIA congress.***

***Resolution 8***

***The Council thanked and congratulated J. Farrando and M. Drahovsky, and the others who helped them in the preparation and finalisation of the documents produced by the Articles and Bylaws Revision committee and the Congress and Assembly Preparations committee.***

**5.3 UIA Future Vision and Strategy committee**

G. Siew first underlined the measures this committee developed that could be put into practice immediately, these mostly concern governance, or the orderly running of meetings, and are contained in the Rules of the Bureau and Council, and Rules of the Assembly. The measures that need further development concern non-dues sources of revenue, improving the UIA's image and its communication strategy and network.

There are other questions such as the complete re-structuring of the UIA that remain on the table, but that this committee has not treated. A list of these considerations, to be examined during the next triennial period, has been submitted to the approval of the Council.

***Resolution 9***

***The Council approved the Rules of the Bureau and Council, and gave its agreement in principle to the Rules of the Assembly, with the understanding that they would be adapted according to the experiences of the Istanbul General Assembly.***

**POINT 6 OF THE AGENDA**

**6. UIA CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

J. Lerner welcomed D. Steidl, President of the AIA (USA), and F. Llisteri representing the CSCAE (Spain) for their presentation of the joint CPD programme they have been developing. He specified that this was, in his opinion, one of the UIA's most important achievements over this triennial period. J. C. Riguet also underlined the importance of this programme for the Union and stressed that it corresponds to the requirements defined by the *Architectural Education* and *Professional Practice* Commissions. He reiterated that this programme has in principle been accepted and approved, and asked Council to give its full attention to the development of this joint effort that was to be presented.

D. Steidl thanked the Council for this invitation, and informed them that since the Tokyo Council meeting the AIA and CSCAE had met on several occasions to discuss and pursue the very positive directives given in Tokyo. They have addressed in detail questions from the criteria for course providers, to courses of study and how they can be accredited, to finances. D. Steidl stated that they had put together a great deal of data that they hesitate to share with the UIA because it is really a question of policy, and it is the UIA that is responsible for setting the policy of this programme. He therefore stated that the programme and the ideas have been developed and they now need a consensus from the UIA on their work. He then stated that they had 2 requests to the UIA, in order to enable them to move forward with the CPD programme.

F. Llisteri first mentioned the joint oversight committee (JOC) that was a part of the basic programme structure presented in Tokyo, and whose job will be to coordinate CPD policy and ensure the link between the UIA Council and the programme operators. He stated that their work is currently at a point where they need the UIA to appoint its representatives to this committee and give its input on CPD policy in order for them to be able to advance in the development of the programme. He added that representatives of the *Professional Practice* and *Architectural Education* Commissions were suggested, and stated that the other posts could be appropriate for representatives of other Sections that wished to follow closely the CPD programme. Also, three persons were to be named to negotiate and elaborate all the official documents, the names mentioned in Tokyo were D. Hackl, G. Siew, and V. Sgoutas. He stated their wish that these committees begin meeting in the very near future

D. Steidl then underlined the AIA's excitement about this programme. He stated that the AIA left Berlin angry, but over the past few years they have seen this UIA Council respond to their concerns and show its vitality, though it did not always take the path the AIA would have chosen. Within the renewed AIA commitment to the UIA, they feel that the CPD programme is the most interesting aspect, because it will help American architects to loose some of their self-centredness and discover how things are done in the rest of the world. The AIA feels that this programme will benefit all architects, all around the world.

D. Hackl asked all of the Council members to be advocates for this programme and all the work that has gone into it, during the Assembly, and to help explain its virtues and implications to those delegates that might not fully grasp its workings.

J.C. Riguet underlined how remarkable this programme was by the initiative in favour of architects made by the UIA, and the initiative of one Member Section that made a clear proposition. He stressed that the openness to other countries expressed by this Section and the collaboration of many Sections would ensure the richness and efficacy of the UIA CPD programme.

L. Cox stated that this was the most exciting thing that has happened for architects for a long time, and the most important thing that this Council has accomplished.

J. Lerner agreed with these remarks and thanked and congratulated the AIA and the CSCAE for their work, patience, openness, and willingness to cooperate.

In response to F. Llisteri's request concerning the joint oversight committee, J. C. Riguet stressed that for the moment, the oversight committee was, on the part of the UIA, to be made up of the Secretary General, the Treasurer, the Directors of the *Professional Practice* and *Architectural Education* Commissions, and two other Council members, designated provisionally as G. Siew and V. Sgoutas.

F. Ramos agreed that the two commissions should and wanted to participate in this committee, either through their directors or through another member designated by the relevant commission.

In closing, F. Llisteri expressed their openness to and preoccupation with regard to the other Member Sections that want to participate in the CPD programme. He stated that he had met with the Board of ACE regarding their concerns, and it was decided that representatives of the UIA programme would be a part of the ACE's CPD task force to ensure coordination between the two. The RIBA has also expressed some concern, and F. Llisteri stressed that they are completely open to the contribution and participation of the RIBA and any other Section.

***Resolution 10***

***The Council agreed that the UIA would be represented on the CPD joint oversight committee by the Secretary General, the Treasurer, the directors of the Professional Practice and Architectural Education Commissions, as well as Gaetan Siew and Vassilis Sgoutas, subject to approval/modification by the new Council elected by the Istanbul Assembly.***

**Resolution 11**

*The Council expressed its enthusiasm for the UIA Continuing Professional Development programme, underlining its importance for architects worldwide, and the dynamic light in which it shows the UIA. Council expressed its thanks and congratulations to the American Institute of Architects and the Superior Council of Colleges of Spanish Architects for their hard work and commitment.*

## POINT 7 OF THE AGENDA

7. **HUMANITARIAN ACTION PROGRAMME**

G. Siew informed Council that a meeting was held on this issue in April 2005, following communications and suggestions from Y. Reyes and the ARCASIA task force, the Director of UN Habitat, who is interested in collaborating with the UIA in this domain, and a communication from E. Komut, director of the *Human Settlements and Natural or other Disasters* WP. In conclusion to this meeting it was confirmed that the UIA would not attempt to become a provider of disaster relief. In addition, two principal domains were defined:

- 1) prevention – planning, design, awareness, and education in order to minimize the consequences of disasters
- 2) appropriate aid in disaster recovery situations and rebuilding.

The goal is for the WP to become an international platform or network for communication, information, advice, and aid. It was also decided that this WP should be enlarged and expanded, but without creating another WP. The French Section was chosen to support and ensure some of the new tasks given to the WP, in collaboration with the Turkish Section. All of the Sections will now be invited to participate in this new enlarged structure. Furthermore, a reassuring legal opinion was obtained concerning the responsibility for field actions in the realm. It has been clearly set out that the providers of action will retain all responsibility for their acts.

J. Lerner insisted that through this group or a competition the architects of the world need to contribute to this issue through concrete propositions for shelters than can be built rapidly to house disaster victims.

S. Ozkan put the Council on guard against sidetracking a professional organisation toward a political platform, stressing that architects must work to provide safe buildings and safe environments, but would be wrong to try and play at being a fire brigade. He insisted that the UIA is a professional organisation that needs to deal with its peers, and remain within its boundaries, which in this situation include things such as professional education on reducing the architectural consequences of disasters, or designing disaster relief shelters. He applauded the compassion being expressed, but stated that they should be careful to keep it directed toward appropriate means and channels. J. Lerner agreed with these remarks.

N. Fintikakis stated that the biggest help architects could provide in this realm is ideas on how to best use immediate and local materials, he thus suggested a collaboration between this programme and the one he directs, notably on a competition based on local materials, climatic conditions, water supply, and environmental resources.

J. Bhalla insisted that the opportunity should be turned into a challenge for architects to show how they can really make communities safer and limit the consequences of disasters, while also insisting on the study of vernacular architecture which generally shows an incredible adaptation/resistance.

S. Topelson suggested that as architects they should use their relation with manufacturers of construction materials to set up a competition to design immediate shelters and then to have prototypes built, and units waiting and ready to be used when needed.

V. Sgoutas reiterated his reservations over legal responsibility in relation to actions in the field, and stressed that there should be a real UIA structure, a network providing architectural information for planning, relief, and advice. L. Cox emphasised that an important session at the congress would be dedicated to this topic, and asked that its results be integrated into this work. G. Siew assured Council that this would be done.

J. Lerner reiterated that the UIA's role will be to provide information and ideas, and not to take official decisions or actions, this will be done by the national organisations, governments, or international NGO's. He stressed the importance of getting all of the Member Sections interested and active in this domain. G. Siew agreed totally with these remarks, he also insisted on the fact that the main focus of this work will be on prevention: using appropriate materials and methods, preparing for disaster situations, perhaps having transitional facilities or temporary shelters ready and waiting, etc. This will be the mandate of the WP as soon as its new structure is finalised.

G. Stoilov stressed the growing social role played by architects, and suggested that the UIA should address the important social question of the time. K. Iwarmura prevailed on the Council to remain realistic in the role it was developing for this program. E. Siola called for more clarity in the description of this programme and its mission.

S. Ozkan emphasised that there is no real problem with approving this report as a working document, but pointed out that it gives a mandate to the Turkish Section that the CAT President does not agree with, and they were therefore against having it ratified by the General Assembly.

***Resolution 12***

***The Council agreed to continue research and development of a UIA Humanitarian Action programme, with the understanding that the UIA would not directly provide disaster relief. This programme will be based on prevention and appropriate design both in permanent and temporary structures. The main goal of this programme should be to provide an information platform on the architectural aspects related to natural disasters.***

**POINT 8 OF THE AGENDA**

**8. ELECTION OF UIA BUREAU AND COUNCIL MEMBERS**

J. C. Riguet specified that everything was in order except for the post of Member of Council in Region V, where there are three available posts and three candidates. However, for Francis Sossah from Cote d'Ivoire, his Member Section had sent in its declaration of support after the deadline. The Bureau was therefore asked to either accept or refuse this candidature: given the circumstances, Francis Sossah's candidature was validated by the Bureau.

***Resolution 13***

***The Bureau, under its authority to oversee the elections, validated the candidature of the Cote d'Ivoire for the post of UIA Council Member – Region V.***

POINT 9 OF THE AGENDA
-----------------------

## 9. UIA CONGRESSES

### 9.1 Turin Congress 2008

G. Ius underlined the fact that the Italian Section had accepted, in its work with the UIA, to publish the electronic and paper versions of the *Celebration of Cities I* catalogue, to organise the *Celebration of Cities II* as an electronic competition, to set up the web television network, and to organise the *Promobus*. He stated that they were present in Istanbul with all of these projects, despite financial and other difficulties.

G. Ius stated that the electronic version of the *Celebration of Cities I* catalogue had been online for a couple of months, and that the paper version, sponsored by companies in Italy, contained all of the projects submitted to the international judging process. The *ArchiTV* web channel has been on-line for 3 months, with new films added every week for a current total of over 200 videos. All of these videos are accessible within the *Promobus*. G. Ius stressed that all of these projects are UIA projects and not CNAPPC projects for the UIA. Their goal is to work within and with the UIA, to improve the Union in general.

G. Ius presented the first brochures on the *Celebration of Cities II*, pointing out that they hoped to launch it in November, and have already named a webmaster for it in Italy who will, until the launch, help the other Sections to technically organise their participation. He also reiterated that if a national organisation does not participate, there will be a regional level so that the competition will be open to all architects. He specified that *Arca* magazine was sponsoring this competition as well as the *Promobus*, which would greatly help in the publication and promotional aspects.

Finally, G. Ius informed the Council that they had to pay nearly 10 000 Euro in taxes to bring all this material to Istanbul, which cut into their budget for printing the *Celebration of Cities II* brochures, but all the information is available on their Internet site.

<b>Resolution 14</b>
----------------------

<b><i>The Council approved the proposed organisation of the Celebration of Cities II competition by the UIA Italian Section.</i></b>
--

### 9.2. Istanbul Congress 2005

S. Ozkan informed the Council that they were approaching 5 000 participants, at the last count, and had 264 papers, 203 posters, 16 multi-media presentations, 19 thematic meetings and 21 chat rooms. In addition to this academic programme, they set up a series of parallel events, open to the public, including workshops, forums, exhibitions (over 100 throughout the city), etc. S. Ozkan once again underlined the tremendous media support and coverage of this congress. He stated that their main objective is to bring respect and dignity to the profession. S. Ozkan thanked the municipality of Istanbul for donating over 1 million dollars to the Congress Valley project, and emphasised that this included snacks, entertainers, and a free, open-air movie theatre showing films on architecture.

S. Ozkan stressed their large national promotion of the congress, thanking J. Lerner, G. Siew, V. Sgoutas, and L. Cox for their participation in the national, pre-congress events. He pointed out that 26 % of participants were from Turkey, and that the government had helped to fund their participation. Three hundred municipal authorities will attend the congress, and 2600 beds are available almost free-of-charge to students, and to architects from developing countries. He stated that though the organisers are not turning a profit with this congress, they most will not lose money either.

As a member of the Scientific committee, S. Topelson congratulated the congress organisers, who were always ready to listen to new ideas and pursue them, for the very positive results they achieved.

### 9.3 2011 Candidatures

R. Simon confirmed that the Brazilian Section was withdrawing its candidature to host the UIA 2011 Congress and General Assembly in Rio de Janeiro.

## POINT 10 OF THE AGENDA

### 10. MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

#### 10.1 Interior Architects

V. Sgoutas raised this subject by mentioning his surprise that events concerning interior architects have been announced in the UIA Newsletter. He stated that the profession should be on guard, as those formerly known as "interior designers" are more and more claiming the title of "interior architects" and infringing upon the profession of architect. He pointed out that the AIA, based on the strength of the UIA Professional Practice Accord in their country, had recently won two legal victories over questions that would have allowed interior architects to do the work of architects.

#### 10.2 Auguste Perret Medal/Medallion

R. Altoon underlined the fact that the UIA Council Members are generally anonymous, particularly in situations like this congress. To remedy this, he presented a proposal for an Auguste Perret Medal that would be awarded to all Council Members at the end of their first year of service, and would make them recognizable during internal or external UIA or professional events. Because architects must get involved in civic, social, and environmental issues as well as volunteerism, the UIA should be recognized as a leader in this cause, and this medal would contribute to this goal.

J. C. Riguet pointed out that there is already an Auguste Perret Prize awarded by the UIA, and any confusion over the names of these two honours should be avoided. M. Drahovsky suggested that a committee, perhaps Vision and Strategy, should analyse the details of this medal and the name it would bear for the next Council meeting.

#### ***Resolution 15***

***The Council approved the creation of a medal to be awarded to all Council members, to be worn during UIA and professional events to make them more recognisable as UIA officials and in this way promote the UIA and its image. The details and name of this medal are to be defined.***

### CLOSING REMARKS

J. Lerner expressed his gratitude to all of the Council members for their participation over the last three years. He stated that his presidency was an extremely gratifying experience for him, and that he hoped he could be helpful to the Union in the coming years as the Immediate Past President.