

Professor John I. Cooper

B.Arch., M.Arch., LFRAIA

My principal interest in terms of the Review is the area of international aspects of architectural education and practice, and in quality assurance.

Following training in the UK, where I was registered in 1962, I had a career with a major UK and international practice, with nine years as a partner and senior partner, before coming to Australia in 1976 to take up an academic position. In 1977 I was appointed as Head of Architecture at the South Australian Institute of Technology, applied for registration, and in 1978 was elected to the Architects Board of South Australia. Between 1977 and 1990 I was at various times RAIIA Chapter President, National Councillor, AACA Education Committee member, COM examiner in Germany, and external examiner and adviser to the Universiti Sains Malaysia and the Institut Teknologi Mara. Throughout this period I remained a consultant to my former practice.

Returning to that practice in London in 1990, I developed its quality assurance system to BS 5750 Part I, now ISO 9001, having developed an interest in the quality assurance of architectural services. At that time Government departments and agencies and some major private clients were moving towards requiring architectural practices to be QA certified as a pre-condition for being considered for work, but the effects of the recession at that time and the considerable costs of OA implementation has resulted in such dilution of QA credibility that it has largely fallen into effective disuse. It is not seen as a replacement for registration.

In 1991 I was appointed Dean of Art, Architecture and Design at what is now the University of Lincolnshire and Humberside. I was asked by the Vice Chancellor to assess the relevance of ISO 9001 OA certification to the University, and to maintain and develop contacts in Australasia. I was appointed as a quality assessor for architecture by HEFCE and HEFCW, and trained up to lead assessor level with HEQC, I served on the Education Committee of ARCUK until 1997, and on the Yorkshire Region Council of RIBA.

Following my return to Australia in 1998 I remain a Director of Development and Cooperation, Australasia, for the University of Lincolnshire and Humberside, have been appointed to the UniSA's Alumni and Friends Committee, and am currently an AACA assessor for its NPrA programme.

Since 1982 I have made frequent visits to Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei to develop and sustain educational relationships on behalf of SAIT and ULH, and have also established working relationships between ULH and Australian universities, with

formal MOUs in several cases. Normally the three areas of collaboration are student exchange, staff exchange and joint research activities, whilst in SE Asia there is a parallel strand of recruitment of overseas full fee paying students.

In practice I established a working relationship for my UK office with a firm in Germany in 1990, and am familiar with its office in Dubai, and of course with its activities in Australia, South Africa and elsewhere in earlier years.

In my view the repeal of the Australian Architects Acts would adversely affect the export of both architectural and education services. It should be remembered that the UK Warne Report, commented upon favourably in your Draft Report, was not acted upon by the UK Government largely because it was recognised that abandoning registration would severely damage the UK's ability to export architectural and education services. The stance of the EU and its member countries was significant, with for example Germany and Holland insisting that an architect or an architectural practice could not practice on their own account without being registered. Admittedly unregistered architects from countries such as Sweden or Denmark could work for architects in other EU countries, but I am doubtful that they could simply establish their own firms there.

More generally, many other countries retain registration including the USA, Canada, Malaysia, Singapore and other SE Asian countries. SE Asia is perhaps Australia's prime market, and one where competition is strong from the UK, USA and elsewhere. The Report makes the point that in several countries Australian registered architects can only operate by linking up with a local practice, akin to joint ventures. To assume that this means Australian registration is immaterial in those situations is dangerous. If Australian architects lacked registration they would no longer be viewed favourably as joint venture partners, and competing UK or US registered architects, for example, might be preferred as more credible.

It is also dangerous to assume that the two-year notification period prior to the repeal of the Australian Registration Acts suggested in the Report would be one of benign neutrality overseas. My belief is that, for example, UK practices and universities would immediately use the first news of this situation in SE Asia to exploit a perceived weakening of Australia's professional reputation. There would be no question of waiting for the two-year period to elapse before striking for this advantage.

In terms of exporting architectural education, loss of registration would be critical. The reciprocal recognition of architectural courses across those countries which have registration as providing the essential educational Prerequisites for registration, and therefore practice, depends upon courses being so recognised by their home registration body. The registration body in Malaysia, PAM, for example, maintains a register of those courses which it recognises on this basis, including those of Australian and UK universities. Loss of Australian registration would result in the removal of Australian courses from the PAM list, and since courses are typically of five or six years duration I suggest this removal would occur immediately the two-year notification period was announced.

My impression is that many countries are strengthening their registration procedures rather than abandoning them. Some are linking registration of those individuals and firms wishing to practice in their own right, as distinct from employees, with the issue of annually renewable practice certificates and the maintenance of compulsory professional indemnity insurance linked to turnover. This provides the community benefit of ensuring some reasonable recompense to clients who successfully claim against architects, whereas an unregistered "designer" might simply go bankrupt.

I do see advantage in a single national registration system replacing the present situation of separate registration boards in each State and Territory. I believe registration is important for Australian architects to practice internationally, and if they are to practice internationally then they are surely capable of practicing across Australia. Old arguments of different conditions between States and Territories justifying separate registration requirements are, in my view, no longer valid.

**Professor John Cooper**

Adelaide, 1 June 2000

Prodcom3