Mission

Australia ICOMOS’ mission is to lead cultural heritage conservation in Australia by raising standards, encouraging debate and generating innovative ideas.

2002 is the United Nations Year for Cultural Heritage
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The Organisation

ICOMOS is a non-government professional organisation which promotes expertise in the conservation of cultural heritage. It was formed in 1965, and has a responsibility to advise UNESCO in the assessment of sites proposed for the World Heritage List.

Australia ICOMOS, formed in 1976, is one of some 80 national committees. Membership of Australia ICOMOS consists of some 400 members of different categories, and is managed by an Executive Committee of 15 people, elected from the membership. A number of members represent Australia ICOMOS on various ICOMOS International Scientific Committees, as well as on expert committees and boards in Australia.

Australia ICOMOS Goals

1. Membership
   Develop, maintain and support a broad-based membership through effective administration.

2. International
   Participate in the international arena, both within and beyond the ICOMOS international family.

3. Conservation Philosophy and Policy
   Ensure that Australia ICOMOS takes a leadership role in conservation philosophy and practice for culturally significant places.

4. Education and Communication
   Promote an understanding of the cultural significance of places and raise conservation standards through education and communication programs.

5. Advocacy
   Inform and influence key decision makers of Australia ICOMOS' aims and approaches to conservation philosophy and practice.
President’s Report

William Logan

The twelve months since the 2001 Annual General Meeting have been busy and productive for Australia ICOMOS, its Executive Committee and Secretariat. Four new members joined the Executive and all states and territories were directly represented except South Australia. (This will be remedied with the incoming Executive Committee for 2002-2003 when David Jones rejoins the Executive.) It is noteworthy that several new members are considerably younger than average, indicating that our efforts to engage with a new generation of cultural heritage professionals has been successful. In turn, these younger members – in particular Caitlin Allen (NSW) and Ken Horrigan (Queensland) have developed an even more focused campaign to attract new and younger members. The meetings have been well spread geographically, taking place in Adelaide, Sydney, Port Arthur, Castlemaine (Victoria), and Canberra.

The meetings have been expertly organized by our Secretary, Kristal Buckley, in association with the relevant state coordinators and Brian Long in Australia ICOMOS’s part-time Secretariat housed in the Faculty of Arts at Deakin University. We are indebted to Deakin University for its generous support to the organization in providing accommodation and access to computer and other facilities. The website has been updated and expanded and is now looked after by Brian Long. In addition he has been producing a weekly E-News bulletin that has been widely praised not only by members but also by ICOMOS members in other countries.

My personal gratitude goes to all members of the Executive Committee, especially to Kristal Buckley who took on the added responsibility of the Vice-Presidency in June when Jyoti Somerville was forced to resign due to ill health. Kristal also acted as President for several weeks during my absence overseas. I want also to thank the Australia ICOMOS International Scientific Committee chairs and representatives, members of the various Executive Committee Reference Groups and other individual members for their assistance over the year.

Our Treasurer, Peter Lovell, reports on the budget below. Keeping a close eye on the financial balance is a thankless task and I would like to express thanks to Peter from taking over the Treasurer’s role from Hector Abrahams who retired from the Executive Committee last year. Peter has been working with the Secretariat to improve procedures, and a new marketing plan is being developed progressively. One of the new features that will come into effect in the new year is the introduction of post-nominals.

Due to the change of location and date of the ICOMOS General Assembly and Advisory Committee, the AI President will not represent us at these events. Indeed we will not be electing a new President until the incoming Executive Committee meets tomorrow. However Australia ICOMOS will be well represented in Spain by a small band of members, including Sarah Jane Brazil from the Executive Committee and Brian Egloff and Graeme Brooks who are chairs of the Archaeological Heritage Management and Cultural Tourism ISCs respectively.
Another Executive Committee member, Sheridan Burke, has been a member of the ICOMOS Bureau for the past three years and is standing for re-election to one of the international posts at the General Assembly. It is very important to have good people on the international committees as well as to have representation from the Pacific region, and we wish her well in the elections. One of the ICOMOS international initiatives with which Sheri has been involved is the Heritage@Risk report, a third annual volume of which has been prepared during 2002. AI member Jane Harrington has assisted in the editing of this on a voluntary basis. Sheri has spent many long hours over recent years working on an ICOMOS ethics statement. We will be voting on introducing this statement at the national level later in this AGM, and the General Assembly will be considering this for adoption globally.

We were greatly disappointed that the arrangements we made to host a meeting of the ICOMOS Bureau at Port Arthur to coincide with the ‘Islands of Vanishment’ conference had to be cancelled at the last moment due to the regrettable decision by ICOMOS President, Michael Petzet, not to attend. We thank other Bureau members, Yukio Nishimura, Dinu Bambaru and Giora Solar, who did honour the commitments previously made to meet in Australia.

Also on the international front, Australia ICOMOS welcomed the Australian Government’s submission of Purnululu (Bungle Bungles) for World Heritage listing and facilitated the assessment process in various ways. It has also commented on drafts of the Royal Exhibition Building submission that will be made in the 2003 round, noting that this will be the first purely cultural and first non-Indigenous cultural heritage site to be nominated by Australia. Your President was invited by the Gundjehmi Aboriginal Corporation to run a workshop on cultural mapping with the Mirrar people in the Kakadu World Heritage site. This took place in April with the participation of Nicholas Hall from the Australian Heritage Commission. We have provided comment on a number of other possible World Heritage sites, including Broken Hill, the Nullarbor and Barrup Peninsula.

The Australia ICOMOS Executive Committee has continued to encourage stronger connections with heritage practitioners in the region, especially, this year, in the Pacific Islands and Malaysia. An Indonesian translation of the Burra Charter has now been added to our website alongside the German and French translations and a Tagalog (Philippines) translation has been received and will be added in due course. Australia ICOMOS is involved in hosting the visit to Australia in December 2002 of a group of Chinese heritage professionals from Dunhuang Academy (Mogao).

Australia ICOMOS continues to work hard in the national capital to ensure that our role as the nation’s peak body of cultural heritage professionals is understood and respected by national policy makers. Duncan Marshall continues to be our man in Canberra, and your President has chaired the ministerial advisory committee, the National Cultural Heritage Forum. Several meetings have been held with the new Minister for Environment and Heritage, The Hon Dr David Kemp MHR, who assumed the office following the federal elections in late 2001, and with his advisor, Louise Ahern. The Forum met in August and has generated considerable follow-up activity, including in relation to the proposed Integrated National Heritage
Policy, government resources for cultural heritage, and disposal policy for Commonwealth buildings. Duncan Marshall and Brian Long did much of the groundwork for this meeting. The Minister has agreed to a twice-yearly schedule of Forum meetings and it is anticipated at this stage that the next Forum will be in February 2003, but this may depend on the progress of the heritage bills through the federal parliament.

Meetings and correspondence have also occurred with the new Shadow Minister, The Hon Kelvin Thompson MHR, Senator Lyn Allison, the Australian Democrats Environment and Heritage spokesperson, and her advisor Deb Nicholson, Senator Bob Brown, and the new Chair of the Australian Heritage Commission, Tom Harley, in relation to the heritage legislation and other issues.

On the conservation education front, consultants Peter Marquis-Kyle and Meredith Walker continue work on the preparation of a revised *Illustrated Burra Charter* and publication is now expected in early 2003. The Australian Heritage Commission distributed the Burra Charter video, which was completed by the working group led by Sandy Blair in 2001, under AI and AHC banners. Australia ICOMOS again acknowledges the Australian Heritage Commission for its assistance in reproducing, packaging and disseminating the video.

Also during 2001 - the UN Year of Volunteers - Australia ICOMOS embarked upon a trial volunteer and pro bono project with the Arabunna people under the direction of David Young. This project is now under way and, if successful, will provide the Executive Committee with the data it needs in order to expand the volunteers program within Australia and in neighbouring countries. Australia ICOMOS commented in previous years on the Australian Heritage Council’s Indigenous heritage places guidelines draft and welcomed the publication during 2002 of the final document entitled *Ask First: A Guide to Respecting Indigenous Heritage Places and Values*. The Australia ICOMOS nominee to the United States Internship Program this year – Anita Krivickas – was successful. Ken Horrigan and Sarah Jane Brazil are developing an extended internship policy for consideration by the Executive Committee in 2003.

Susan MacDonald prepared for the Executive Committee a response to the request from US/ICOMOS for Australian nominations for a report it is preparing on twentieth century heritage. Your President was invited to join the Heritage Jury for the Royal Architects Institute of Australia (Victorian Chapter) Annual Architecture Awards 2002. The first prize went to the latest restoration phase on the Royal Exhibition Building, Melbourne.

Our conference program has been coordinated again this year by Laura Gray. Two highly successful conferences and a smaller symposium were held during the 2001-2002 year. The first is ‘Twentieth Century Heritage: Our Recent Legacy’, Adelaide, 29 November – 1 December 2001, convened by David Jones. A book containing conference papers is currently being printed. The ‘Islands of Vanishment’ Conference, held at Port Arthur, 8-10 June, was highly successful and included the local launch of *Heritage@Risk 2001* by the Premier of Tasmania, Mr Jim Bacon. The conference was jointly organised by Australia ICOMOS, the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority, the University of Tasmania and the Tasman Institute of Conservation and Convict Studies, with Peter Romey as Convenor. Australia ICOMOS joined
with AusHeritage and Deakin University to run a one-day symposium on 'The Australian Heritage Industry Abroad' in Melbourne on 27 July.

In addition, Juliet Ramsay has been leading a team of AI members working on the Mountains conference that will unfold at Jindabyne in the next few days. Again this conference involved Australia ICOMOS working with other government and community groups to focus on important heritage issues. The Executive Committee has agreed to join in the organization of a National Cultural Heritage Forum conference on the new heritage regime and run one or more workshops on what the new legislation means for practitioners. The timing of these depends on the progress of the heritage bills through parliament. The Executive Committee has also been discussing with New Zealand ICOMOS the possibility of holding a joint Australia/New Zealand conference in the South Island, probably in mid-late 2003.

On the publications front, the electronic newsletter has already been mentioned. This has replaced the former hardcopy quarterly Newsletter. A number of changes are being made in the editing and production of Australia ICOMOS’s journal, *Historic Environment*, which now under the editorial control of Aedeen Cremin in Canberra. I would like to acknowledge the dedication and sheer hard work of the previous editorial group that was led, most recently, by Mandy Jean. Aedeen is developing a proposal for the journal that, frankly, is facing serious financial difficulties and the Executive Committee will welcome the membership’s views on future production.

The report *Cultural Values in Natural Area* by Jane Lennon et al will be published on the Australia ICOMOS early in 2003, following minor updating. This report was done for the Australia Heritage Commission but permission has been granted for us to publish it.

The number, range and intensity of activities demonstrate once again the valuable role that Australia ICOMOS has to play in raising the standards of professional practice and government policy in the cultural heritage field. In this UN Year of Cultural Heritage it is appropriate that we should be seeing the emergence of an Integrated National Heritage Policy, something that Australia ICOMOS strongly supports. We look forward to seeing the new legislation in place. The new Executive Committee will in its next meeting be drawing up a program of activities for the coming year, mapping out a vision for the future. Your input into this process is needed and invited.

This is my last report as President. I would like to thank the members of the three Executive Committees with whom I have worked since becoming President in November 1999 and to all those who have contributed to the organisation over the years. These are busy times for most of us and it is increasingly difficult to ask members to volunteer their assistance. As I said last year, the membership shows time and time again that it cares passionately about protecting the local, national and world cultural heritage. But we could do with greatly increased recognition and support from governments and their authorities at all levels, particularly in a budgetary sense, for the voluntary work we do for the nation. In finishing, I would ask you to give your energetic support to the incoming President and Executive Committee.

William Logan
President
Honorary Treasurer’s Report

Peter Lovell

Financial Statements

The audited Financial Statements for the year ended 30th June 2002 are attached to this annual report. The Financial Statements have been prepared by Elliott House Pty Limited, who have merged with Gosling Accounting Services Pty Ltd, the approved auditors for Australia ICOMOS.

For the financial year the organization recorded a modest operating surplus of $9,113.78, as compared to a loss of $16,879.86 in the previous year. Total member’s funds at the end of the year were $65,497.98 as compared to $56,384.20 for 2000-2001.

Overall the year has been a reasonably even one with relatively few peaks and troughs. Both income and expenditure were significantly down on the previous year; essentially a result of the fact that there were no major directly funded conferences. Other than for changes related to conferences, in the area of income, membership subscriptions and publication sales were both up, while project specific grants were down. On the expenditure side, costs associated with international activities were less, including the Paris subscriptions, while secretariat and overall publications costs were higher.

Within the publication area cost reductions arose as a result of the decision to no longer produce a printed Newsletter and the production of fewer editions of Historic Environment. Balanced against this, however, significant costs were associated with the Burra Charter Video production and the ongoing review of the Illustrated Burra Charter. Both of the latter items are expected to be good income generators in the future.

The secretariat operations continued to run very efficiently and cost generally remained within the operating grants which were received for the year. A significant variation in this area occurred with Australia ICOMOS being appointed to provide the secretariat to run the National Cultural Heritage Forum. The costs associated with this role are provided for by way of direct funding from Canberra.

In the year ahead the major financial challenges for the organization will be to maintain our operations without an Environment Australia Grant, which we failed to obtain and to source the funds required to publish the revised Illustrated Burra Charter. This will inevitably involve some belt tightening and more particularly the pursuit of publication sales and profitable conferences.
Honorary Secretary’s Report

Kristal Buckley

Deakin University has continued to provide an excellent home for the Australia ICOMOS Secretariat. Brian Long, based in the Centre for Cultural Heritage in Asia and the Pacific has operated the Secretariat on a part-time basis. Although our modest finances have limited the capacities of the Secretariat to a small handful of hours each week, Brian has kept track of a wide array of administrative matters on our behalf – including keeping correspondence flowing, distribution of information to members, sale of publications, processing of membership information, maintenance of the web site and general enquiries. The Secretariat has also provided support to the National Cultural Heritage Forum during the past year. The weekly Australia ICOMOS email news has become an increasingly powerful communication tool, and is read worldwide!

As outlined in the President’s Report, after a brief meeting following the AGM in Adelaide last year, four meetings of the Executive Committee were held during the year. These meetings were held in Sydney, Port Arthur, Castlemaine (Victoria) and Canberra (earlier today). The meetings were well attended, and each has had a broad and ambitious agenda. We have started to provide a summary of the main issues discussed at each meeting via the email news service and have had positive feedback from members. Minutes of each meeting have been prepared and approved.

As always, we have relied on Executive Committee members in different parts of Australia to organise meeting spaces and other arrangements. At the Sydney meeting, Caitlin Allen arranged a visit to the recently completed Conservatorium of Music building, where the presentation and preservation of archaeological elements has been a talking point throughout much of Australia. In June, the Port Arthur meeting was planned to coincide with the memorable Islands of Vanishment conference, hosted by the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority. In August, we were the pampered and well-fed guests of Parks Victoria. Our meeting was held at Buda Historic House in Castlemaine in Victoria’s Central Goldfields, and we were able to sample some of the Mount Alexander Diggings cultural landscape – proposed to become the first National Heritage Park in Australia. Finally, we have met today, prior to the AGM, at Old Parliament House in Canberra, thanks to Sarah-Jane Brazil who works here as a senior curator.

The Executive Committee is always keen to improve the services to members - especially the effective communication with and between members. I am sure that the new Executive elected to serve for 2003 will welcome ideas and suggestions about ways of continuing to improve this aspect of our work.

Many thanks to Brian Long, Bill Logan and their colleagues at Deakin University for support to the Secretariat activities of Australia ICOMOS during the year.
Membership Secretary’s Report
Caitlin Allen

The membership of Australia ICOMOS currently stands at 352 (as at 31/6/02). This includes paid up members and members in arrears for no more than six months. The membership is made up of the following:

Member (includes student/retired/unwaged) 332
Associate Member (includes student/retired/unwaged) 7
Institutional Member 13
Libraries & subscribers 62

There has been an encouraging up turn in membership in the last twelve months, with 22 new membership applications lodged. The numbers have been boosted by active marketing of ICOMOS by State Reps and a membership drive at the Islands of Vanishment Conference in June.

It is particularly encouraging to note the number of student and young professional members and the general interest in ICOMOS that seems to be increasing in the newer sectors of the heritage profession. The introduction of reduced membership fees for young professionals is likely to increase this trend in the coming year.

Publicising the benefits of membership and increasing the services provided to members however, continues to be a major challenge for Australia ICOMOS. Over the last twelve months the Executive Committee has been focussing on the production of better advertising material that contains a revised list of membership benefits, increasing the number of State and Territory activities and providing a valuable information service in the form of the fortnightly email newsletter. An improved welcome package to new members has also been developed.

The last year has also seen the implementation of the new membership categories and a rise in member fees.

In the coming year the focus will continue to rest on the improvement of member services with a planned membership survey to inform future planning in this area. Clearer membership criteria will be developed to form part of the revised policy and procedures manual. Following the expected endorsement of the Ethical Commitment Statement at the 2002 AGM, members will also be able to use the post-nominal “MAustICOMOS”.

International Activities
Sheridan Burke
International Vice President

2002 has been a hectic one on the international ICOMOS front, complicated for me by a change of jobs, with all the associated personal and professional upheaval of leaving the public sector after nearly 30 years.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Historic Houses Trust of NSW for its support of my role as an ICOMOS Vice Presidency over the last 5 years and to acknowledge the ongoing support of my new employer, Godden Mackay Logan Pty Ltd in
renewing and strengthening my ICOMOS commitment.

This year I have attended three meetings of the international Bureau and Executive Committee as the international Vice President of the Asia Pacific region, and I am presently preparing for the fourth, in Spain. Detailed reports of each meeting are submitted to Australia ICOMOS, and these are available on request.

Due to the difficulties surrounding the proposed General Assembly in Zimbabwe, the regular pattern of formal Bureau meetings has been disturbed. The opportunity to rationalise international meeting arrangements and costs by conducting a great deal of ICOMOS international business economically by email and teleconference has been utilised to some extent though notably by more distant members.


In January 2002 I attended the Bureau, Executive Committee meetings and the World Heritage Panel meetings in Paris. Major issues arising included the possible transfer or postponement of the Zimbabwe General Assembly; the editorial programme of the 2002 Heritage at Risk world wide report, to be coordinated by Australian volunteer Jane Harrington; and the development of an annual ICOMOS Work programme. I traveled to the Paris meeting via Canada (on the ticket purchased for participation in last year’s proposed Montreal meeting of the MAP Twentieth century project, disrupted by the September 11). In Montreal, I provided editorial input and reviewed direction for the ICOMOS Twentieth Century Heritage report, for which Susan Macdonald later prepared the Australian chapter.

2. Emergency Bureau Meeting, April 2002

In April 2002 an emergency Bureau meeting was called in Bahia, Brazil, which I attended at extremely short notice. It was held in association with an excellent ICOMOS Brazil conference on intangible heritage, at which I spoke briefly about intangible heritage conservation in Australia. The main issues discussed at the Bahia meeting were the alternative arrangements to be developed for the General Assembly- its venue, financing, timing and scientific programme. The impact of the revised programme for the World Heritage Committee meetings and the changes to the ICOMOS conduct of its World Heritage advisory contract were also major issues.

My airfare was paid by ICOMOS international, accommodation was subsidised by ICOMOS Brazil, remaining transit accommodation and costs by Australia ICOMOS.

3. Bureau, Tasmania, June 2002

The regular Bureau meeting set down for June was held in Tasmania, and it was able to progress several matters, despite very poor attendance by international colleagues. Australia ICOMOS’s invitation to the Bureau to meet in Port Arthur had been accepted and confirmed several times in 2001/2, but only myself, Giora Solar (Treasurer General), Yukio Nishimura (EC, Japan) and later Dinu Bumbaru were present. An exceedingly disappointing result, and whilst there were- as always- several legitimate reasons for absences, the reality is that the tyranny of distance is a very real barrier to securing equality of true international participation in and for more distant member countries.

At the Australia ICOMOS Executive Committee meeting held in Port Arthur, we enjoyed the input of Yukio
and Giora and took the opportunity of detailing very frankly with them, the real costs and benefits to Australia of financially supporting international ICOMOS activity. These discussions were in the context of reviewing whether and how the Pacific region should sustain its ICOMOS engagement internationally, given rising costs and decreasing government support funding in Australia. Whilst philosophically committed to participation, could Australia ICOMOS sustain another triennium of support for an international candidate?

After much debate, it was resolved that Australia ICOMOS’s reputation and role as an invigorating influence at the international level was a vital objective and a central ongoing commitment for AI as an international organisation. As the nominated candidate, I believe that regular review of Australia ICOMOS’s international commitment is absolutely essential. The costs- personal and financial-need to be clearly understood and accepted- the finances completely transparent and the support strong, for it is not an easy commitment to undertake, in any sense.

My employer paid the full costs of my attendance in Port Arthur.

4. Ausheritage Seminar, July, Melbourne

In July I attended an excellent one-day seminar organised by Deakin University and Ausheritage, participating in a panel discussion; followed on the Sunday by an special AI meeting re federal legislative change.

The costs of my attendance were met personally.

5. General Assembly, Bureau, Advisory Committee Executive Committee and World Heritage Panel, Madrid, November/December

I am presently preparing to attend the next Bureau and Executive Committee meetings, together with the World Heritage Panel which will be held in Spain in November / December. I will deliver a paper in the legislative stream at the scientific symposium, and will also present the final version of the Ethical Commitment Statement for ICOMOS members, which was approved by the Advisory Committee in Dubrovnik in 2001, and participate in a panel on the Heritage at Risk project.

I will attend the Bureau, Executive and Advisory Committee meetings in Seville, the General Assembly and elections in Madrid and then travel to the World Heritage Panel meeting in Zargoza.

My GA registration will be subsidised by my employer, remainder costs by AI ICOMOS.


Moving directly from the Historic Houses Trust to become a Director of Godden Mackay Logan in March, my first week was immediately absorbed by attendance as the international ICOMOS representative at the UNESCO Regional Workshop for Periodic reporting on the Natural and Mixed World Heritage Properties in Asia and the Pacific, held in Leura, in the Blue Mountains. I presented a formal paper detailing the ICOMOS world heritage role and participated in the development of the periodic reporting procedures and various workshops.
7. ICOMOS Projects

7.1 World heritage

As an international VP, world heritage related issues occupy much of my time. Whether it is participating in seminars such as Leura, or the one held in Adelaide in December 2001, inputting to mission selections, critiquing reports and dossiers, it’s at least a day or two each month in addition to the formal international meetings. It’s a challenging role where our regional input is often unique. My thanks to all those Australia ICOMOS members who have assisted with advice and information on specific issues throughout the year. One regret from this year, is that despite best efforts, Mary O’Keefe (NZ ICOMOS President) was not able to participate in the World Heritage Panel in January.

7.2 Paperwork

About two days each month is consumed by ICOMOS international email traffic of varied and sometimes voluminous proportions- from details of the Secretariat activities to requests from related institutions for involvement or action on the international level.

7.3 Doctrinal development

Otherwise, I have focussed my participation in a selected number of ICOMOS projects- Heritage at Risk, Twentieth Century conservation, the Ethical Statement and ICOMOS Strategic Planning into relevant outputs for our region.

In all, it amounts to a full week’s work every month, with a variety of weekend representations at meetings and seminars or hosting visitors, most recently from the Singapore Heritage Bureau, Vancouver Historic Buildings Commission, English Heritage, ICOMOS Philippines, etc.

8. The future of ICOMOS?

In accepting nomination for an international role, I personally reviewed the possible tasks ahead, especially in view of the deep conflicts and ongoing administrative management difficulties at the international level. I personally find the present style of leadership inappropriate for an international organisation where diversity demands a more consensual approach to decision-making and programming.

After this election, I hope that we shall see an international ICOMOS Committee with a broader its intellectual agenda, actively involving younger members, and becoming less European in its focus to remain a truly international organisation with a future. Easy to say, harder to achieve, but impossible if we are not in there batting!

My own agenda will also include facilitating more international exchanges and voluntary involvement for young members- the US Internships programme; the Australia/Malta volunteer exchange, (mentioned in last years report and about to commence); participation by regional representatives on the International Scientific Committees of ICOMOS, etc.

Developing international institutional relationships- e.g. with organisations such as Docomomo is a high priority. Making certain that there is Asia /Pacific professional involvement wherever relevant- e.g. on each of the scientific reference panels for the General Assembly, ensures that we participate and contribute to ICOMOS doctrine and activity. The establishment of a Pacimos regional group continues to need to be pursued.

The implementation of the Ethical Commitment Statement will mark the
mature recognition of ICOMOS as a professional group. It is very pleasing and appropriate that it seems that Australia ICOMOS will be the first national committee to adopt and implement it at its forthcoming AGM, a few days before the General Assembly and associated meetings.

9. Thank you.

I have enjoyed being an observer on the Australia ICOMOS Executive Committee, rather than undertaking the duties of a full member this year, and appreciate the chance to contribute "corporate memory moments", whilst seeing new younger EC members take on roles afresh, developing a succession plan.

My thanks for the ongoing support of members and Committee of Australia ICOMOS, my long-suffering family, my supportive colleagues and generous employers.

I am happy to discuss these matters further. Please contact me at: Sheridanb@gml.com.au

Publications

Sarah Jane Brazil & Duncan Marshall

The Burra Charter video was launched in May by the Alice Springs’ Mayor, Ms Fran Erlich, at Australia ICOMOS' national conference Making Tracks: From Points to Pathways—a Heritage of Routes and Journeys. The video demonstrates the Burra Charter in practice, showing how its ideas can be use appropriately to conserve all types of heritage places.

This has been an important project for Australia ICOMOS. It follows the release of the revised Burra Charter in November 2000, the result of an extensive review to update the key concepts in the Charter so that it stays relevant.

The video has been produce in a partnership between Australia ICOMOS, the Australian Heritage Commission, the Australian Foundation for Culture and the Humanities (now the Australia Business Arts Foundation) with support from the Australian Local Government Association and the Australian Council of National Trusts.

Revision of the Illustrated Burra Charter

During the year substantial progress was made in revising the popular Illustrated Burra Charter. The need for the revision arose because of the changes made to the Burra Charter on 1998.

The Executive Committee broadly accepted a proposal from the publications original authors, Peter Marquis-Kyle and Meredith Walker, to update it. A Working Group has been established to guide the process. The authors were commissioned to undertake the first two tasks of a longer process, these being to:

- assist in gathering comments on the existing publication; and
- review the publication in the light of comments and recommend changes needed.

Comments were invited through the newsletter and various other meetings were undertaken to gather views on the existing publication. The authors completed these tasks and provided a substantial report including 23 recommendations. The Executive Committee considered this report and,
subject to some qualifications, broadly accepted the recommendations.
The authors were then commissioned to undertake the next stage which essentially involves revising the text and obtaining the necessary illustrations. This stage and the eventual publication are due to be completed next year.

Total funding commitments to date amount to $46,050, with most of this to be paid in next financial year.

Conferences

Laura Gray

Australia ICOMOS convened two National conferences in the 2001/2002 year, one of which was aligned with the Australia ICOMOS Annual General Meeting.

Port Arthur Conference – ‘Islands of Vanishment’ & World Bureau meeting 7-10 June 2002

Over the long weekend of June 7-10 the former Asylum complex at Port Arthur was the venue for the long-awaited (and much planned for) Islands of Vanishment conference. The conference was organised as a joint initiative by PAHSMA, the University of Tasmania the Tasman Institute of Conservation and Convict Studies (TICCS) and of course Australia ICOMOS. The event attracted 165 delegates from all over Australia and also from Great Britain, South Africa, Spain, Hawaii and Israel. Many of those attending were ICOMOS members but the backgrounds and origins of delegates attending were remarkable for their diversity. As Steering Committee member Margaret Scott remarked, “Most conferences cater for a single professional group such as farmers and undertakers. This conference will promote the cross-fertilisation of ideas between tourist operators, historians, cultural heritage practitioners, local residents and many others from places as far away as South Africa, Great Britain and the mainland”.

The Conference was very important to Port Arthur -- which has recently been through difficult times, and an aim of the organisers was to give people an opportunity to experience the site, and to learn about its new conservation plan and the conservation work now in progress as a result.

The delegates who had made the long trip south to Port Arthur in deepest winter seemed to enjoy the conference immensely, and this has since been confirmed by the overwhelmingly positive e-mail and faxed comments received since the event. The delegates were very impressed with work at Port Arthur, with the intellectual content of the Conference, and with the organisation and level and quality of service. They all saw a very sophisticated team operation, which ran very smoothly and coped very well with the myriad mini-crises which such an event always engenders. Organising such a conference as many will know take an enormous amount of effort, discipline, personal involvement and dedication to produce such excellence.
The conference theme, programme and the quality of papers were all mentioned as contributing to the success of the event, as was the venue, catering and general organisation. A number of delegates were overheard over the weekend saying that it was the best conference that they had ever been to.

The steering committee members were Prof. Lucy Frost and Dr. Hamish Maxwell-Stewart of the University of Tasmania; Dr. Margaret Scott and James Parker of TICCS; and the Deputy Chair of PAHSMA Prof. Sharon Sullivan and Conservation Director Peter Romey (both members of ICOMOS). PAHSMA staff Stephen Large, Lesley Kirby, Ian Boersma, Julia Clark, Cathy Howard, Sue Hood, John Featherstone, Ross Reid, Marla Stacey, Vanessa Matthews and Andy Griffiths all performed valiantly, as did Port Arthur's ever-reliable electrician Andrew Cripps. Without the dedication and commitment of all of the above the event could not have been the success that it was.

The conference was opened by the Governor of Tasmania, Sir Guy Green, and the first keynote address was given by the Premier of Tasmania, Jim Bacon MHA. He spoke of his support for Cultural Heritage and his recognition of its importance in the development of his state. He tantalisingly referred to a forthcoming election announcement that he said would be good news for heritage. An outstanding group of keynote speakers contributed, including Professor David Lowenthal (Emeritus Professor of Geography at University College London and author of *The Past Is a Foreign Country*), eminent Tasmanian writer and community advocate Dr. Margaret Scott, noted Australia academics and writers Prof. Henry Reynolds and Prof. Peter Read, Assoc. Prof.

Spencer Leineweber who is responsible for the conservation of the Kaluapapa settlement on the island of Molokai in Hawaii (Father Damian's leper community), and ICOMOS's own Dr Jim Kerr.

As expected, the range and quality of the papers presented was the subject of a great deal of discussion throughout the conference. The inspirational musings of David Loewenthal's *Tragic Traces on the Rhodian Shore* seemed to proceedings off on just the right note, but there were certainly many other inspirational papers. Giora Solar's personal journey into the hell of Auschwitz will not be forgotten, nor will Aedeen Cremin's comparisons between Berlin 1933-44 and Phnom Pehn 1976-79. The paper by Jane Lennon about the resolution of the Broad Arrow Café memorial brought the message of historic reconciliation very close to home. There were also some fine papers on the indigenous heritage in Australia, and the ambivalence of Europeans towards his heritage.

Many of the papers focused on Tasmanian and Port Arthur itself. Port Arthur seems to be one of those places which have a profound effect on the visitor. In particular the experience of this place resonates strongly with anyone who has worked there, and gives each of those people a lasting feeling of ownership of the site and a consequent ongoing concern for it. This led to some lively discussion and debate on Port Arthur's significance and conservation policy.

The final day of the conference included a focus on community issues. Members of the Tasman Peninsula were invited to participate in a workshop to discuss the complex and sometimes difficult relationship between a place as significant as Port Arthur and those that live and work.
there. Another highlight of that day was Joan Domicijl's paper on the tragic events in Chile which she witnessed, and their relevance to our situation in Australia today.

The conference coincided with the completion of some very significant stabilisation and interpretation work at the Coal Mines site by the Tasmanian Parks Service. This was one of the many areas visited by delegates during the course of the Conference. Another highlight of these excursions was the Port Arthur Ghost Tour, which was the subject of much animated discussion and debate.

One disappointment for the organisers was the last minute fail-to-show of most of the members of the ICOMOS International Bureau, the which had accepted an invitation from the Port Arthur Authority and ICOMOS Australia an to meet in Tasmania. The President and the Secretary sent very last-minute apologies. The conference had been carefully planned to immediately follow the dates which the Bureau had insisted on for its meeting, although this caused some disruption and meant that the final date for the conference was not an ideal one for our academic colleagues. The delegates of course came expecting to meet our August International Bureau members, but it is very pleasing that delegates were able to overcome their disappointment and that they found the conference extremely rewarding despite the absence of all but two of the ICOMOS Bureau Members (Giora Solar and Sheridan Burke).

The National Executive Committee of Australia ICOMOS on the other hand held a very successful and useful meeting in conjunction with the Conference.

A selection of the papers will be published and the rest will be available on the ICOMOS and Port Arthur Web sites.

The Australian Heritage Industry Abroad

Australia ICOMOS / AusHeritage / Deakin University Symposium, Melbourne 27 July 2002

The one-day symposium titled The Australian Heritage Industry Abroad held at Deakin University on 27 July 2002 was a great success with almost 70 people from around Australia in attendance.

Speakers from Deakin University's Cultural Heritage Centre for Asia and the Pacific (CHCAP), Australia ICOMOS and AusHeritage tackled issues confronting the Australian heritage industry working in Asia and the Pacific region.

The Chair of the Australian Heritage Commission, Tom Harley co-chaired one of the sessions and AusHeritage presented its draft paper, The Australian Heritage Industry 2001-2015: Australia's Export Industry for the New Millennium, Towards a Heritage Industry Development Policy, which can be downloaded from the "downloads" page of the Australia ICOMOS website: http://www.icomos.org/australia

Proposed Conferences 2003/2004

A joint Australia / New Zealand conference is being developed.

Heritage Tourism conference-Melbourne-2004

Conferences are a major income source for Australia ICOMOS. Both conferences planned for 2001/2002 were initiated as ICOMOS conferences but developed away from that premise. It is critical that Australia ICOMOS host an annual national conference in association with the AGM, but in the current climate, it is also recognised that Australia ICOMOS needs to look at other means of conference involvement. A draft document has been prepared outlining
categories of conferences and has been prepared to move forward with determined criteria for ‘badging’, sponsorship or ownership of a conference.

State Activities

ACT

Dr Aedeen Cremin

Appointments

Peter Freeman was appointed Chair of the ACT Heritage Council and Dr Michael Pearson a Member. ACT Heritage is managed by Dr Sandy Blair, also an ICOMOS member.

Michael Pearson is also a member of the Namadgi National Park-Ngunnawal People Joint Management Board

Comment

ACT members were involved in comment on the following issues:

• Focus group on democracy, at the request of Deakin University
• World Heritage listing of Purnululu, WA: meeting with Kevin Jones

Ongoing:

• Management of Namadji National Park

ACT heritage legislation

Public Activities

Many of the ACT ICOMOS members are also members of government agencies, both federal and state. As these agencies already have programmes of guest speakers, workshops and symposia, most ACT ICOMOS activities consist of participation rather than organization. ACT ICOMOS members participated in the well-attended.

Heritage week debate at old Parliament House on the listing of Canberra for World Heritage, Michael Pearson putting the case against the listing

Departure

Sarah Jane Brazil has been appointed to New Lanark in Scotland and will be taking up her new responsibilities shortly after representing the EC at the ICOMOS AGM in Madrid. She will be very much missed in Canberra.

Arrival

Rachel Jackson and Ben Churcher celebrated the birth of their first child Isabel, earlier this year. Rachel was replaced at the Australian Heritage Commission by Ilse Wurst for the term of her maternity leave.

Conference

An ICOMOS sub-committee has been actively involved in the planning of the International Year of the Mountains conference, ‘Celebrating Mountains’, to be held at Jindabyne, NSW, 25 to 28 November. While the conference is administered by the Australian Alps Liaison Committee, there is an ICOMOS sub-committee, headed by Juliet Ramsay, who has submitted a separate report.

Suspension of courses at the University of Canberra

The proposed closure of the Cultural Heritage and Conservation courses is of major concern to ICOMOS generally. Most of the teachers are AI members: Prof. Colin Pearson , Dr Ken Taylor, Dr Brian Egloff and Dr Linda Young.

Brian Egloff has submitted the following précis:
The University of Canberra has suspended enrolments into the Bachelor of Applied Science degree in Cultural Heritage Studies and the Masters of Applied Science degree in Conservation of Cultural Materials. The Vice Chancellor has stated that the suspension of the degrees will give the University a breathing spell pending an appeal to industry and DETYA for increased support. That process will take approximately six months and is being implemented by the Vice Chancellor with the assistance of Pro Vice Chancellor Mohamed Khadra. The staff would have preferred that the Vice Chancellor's campaign for funds was carried out while the program was operating at full capacity. The Vice Chancellor has indicated that the quality of the courses will be continued for those students enrolled in the degrees.

The Conservation of Cultural Materials program was established by Professor Colin Pearson in 1978 with the Cultural Heritage Management program being initiated by Dr Amar Galla a decade later. At that time there were two separate undergraduate degrees, CCM and CHM, that operated independently.

In 2002, the new Cultural Heritage Studies degree, that combined the CHM and CCM undergraduate degrees, as well as the full-fee paying Conservation of Cultural Materials Masters degrees were opened and some 75 students enrolled in the program. It was intended in 2003 to open the second year of the Masters degree as well as a three subject ‘minor’ that fit within the architecture degree. These initiatives were to be followed in 2004 by a Graduate Certificate in Cultural Heritage Management through distance education mode and in 2005 a Graduate Diploma in Conservation of Cultural Materials would come into play providing the CHS cohort with a fourth year of professional training. These initiatives are now in a holding pattern.

The anticipated grant of $600,000 from the Getty Foundation for infrastructure improvement to the conservation facilities, to follow on from the successful RIEF grant of $30,000 that provided the Infra-red facility, has been stalled until the suspension of the courses is resolved. In January of 2003 a summer school in Cultural Heritage Management, and perhaps one on Traditional Building Materials, will be conducted. In 2002 the heritage and conservation degrees will graduate some 50 students.

Western Australia

Laura Gray

Membership is static, although a number of non members indicate their interest in social events, and exchange of information. No social events have taken place this year.

Northern Territory

Elizabeth Close

1. Construction of the Darwin to Alice Springs Railway has caused a number of concerns in the past 12 months. There has been worry in the community that the construction company Adrail have been very cavalier in regard to the heritage of the Northern Territory.

Incidents have been associated with the destruction of a Gouldian finch habitat, Adelaide River Railway Precinct, and the destruction of old tramway abutments at Grove Hill. The management of Adrail has agreed to consult more closely on any future action around areas of built and environmental heritage.
2. The Review of the Heritage Conservation Act 1991, promised by the Martin Labor Government on its election in October 2001 has been put back from its original 18 month timeline to perhaps being completed within the first term of office of the government. Even this may well be unlikely as the review has not commenced as yet and the resources of the Heritage Conservation Branch are much reduced.

Kon Vatskalis the then minister for Heritage and Environment has lost that particular portfolio in a cabinet reshuffle. The portfolio has been given to a new minister, Dr Chris Burns.

3. The construction of a liquified natural Gas plant in Darwin harbour has raised the ire of environmentalists and a majority of the general public with them. The discussions have taken place over most of this year with the minister announcing the go ahead only this week. It seems that this is the beginning of the end of the pristine harbour environment of Darwin.

4. The Commonwealth government has announced its intention to retain ownership of the two houses it had been intending to sell in the Myilly Point heritage Precinct. This brings to a close a saga that began in 1997. The National Trust see this as a win for heritage especially if the Commonwealth agrees to maintain and conserve the houses for the future using real money.

5. Membership of ICOMOS has grown by two to five members in 2002. The group does not meet formally but have many causes in common.

Tasmania

Robert Vincent

It has been a year of activity and opportunity for ICOMOS members and heritage practitioners in Tasmania.

Getty Values Case Studies

In January, Port Arthur had a visit from a Getty funded project undertaking four case studies on values approach to conservation planning in different sites around the world. Port Arthur was one of the selected places and there was a day-long seminar to which local practitioners were invited to discuss and compare the projects.

ICOMOS National Conference

The conference, Islands of Vanishment, attracted expertise from a broad audience and an intensive program was very successfully run at Port Arthur on themes related to convictism and isolation.

Premier of Tasmania Minister for Heritage.

In opening the conference the Premier made several oblique references. We now know what these were referring to: the Premier’s Office has combined the portfolio of Tourism, Parks, Heritage and the Arts and put in place the Tasmanian Heritage Office with a very much improved and clearly articulated heritage strategy. The Premier’s Office has also announced a funding program for projects related to Tasmania’s European Bicentennary to be held in 2004.

Pugin in the Antipodes.

Brian Andrews curated this very detailed and extraordinarily well documented collection of gothic revival documents and objects and has explained their survival in the Tasmanian Archdiocese. This exhibition has closed in Hobart but you may catch it on its travels through Ballarat, Canberra or the Powerhouse...
in Sydney. Watch out for it – it is extremely worthwhile for those of you who are interested in gothic revival in Australia and particularly for the Pugin connection.

**Ross Bridge and Daniel Herbert’s carvings.**

Ross Bridge is of national and international significance. The convict Daniel Herbert achieved his ticket of leave because of his extraordinary craftsmanship of his carvings over the three arches of Bridge. A proposal to relocate the carvings from Ross Bridge and replace them with replicas hit the press at the opening of the Islands of Vanishment Conference. It justifiably caused an outrage in the local press and raised the issue of the understanding and application of the Burra Charter particularly Article 9 that specifically discusses the issue of keeping objects in situ and in context. Representations were made to the Bridge’s managing authority the then Department of Energy, Infrastructure and Transport who clearly recognised the importance of the Charter and of retaining the carvings in position.

However, the debate goes on like the Elgin Marbles, because the issues of artistic and aesthetic judgements seem to be overriding a proper assessment of the materials conservation issues that have been unfortunately and mistakenly applied to the bridge. The suggestion is that the situation should be monitored but that some degraded carvings will need replacing. There is a lot more to this story and it should form a national case study. Conservation techniques undertaken 25 years ago – no doubt with good intentions – appear to have increased the rate of deterioration. Application of the Conservation Planning process would contribute to our understanding of the effect of techniques applied 25 years ago. Now is the time to care for this structure with as little as possible and as much as necessary to retain its significance.
International Scientific Committees

International Committee on the
Underwater Cultural Heritage (ICUCH)

Graeme Henderson

I was until the latter part of this year the Australian representative on the International Committee on the Underwater Cultural Heritage (ICUCH). Because of museum redevelopment commitments I did not stand for re-election this year. We are fortunate however in having a new Australian representative on ICUCH: David Nutley, who is also the current President of the Australasian Institute for Maritime Archaeology (AIMA).

The past year has been a particularly significant one for ICUCH because of the adoption by UNESCO, on 2 November 2001 in Paris, of the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. ICUCH was initially brought together by Australia ICOMOS at the beginning of the 1990s, with the UNESCO Convention as the prime objective. There had been concern, within ICOMOS and UNESCO, about the effects of fast-developing access to deep-sea cultural heritage in the absence of clear public policy. I was honored by Australia ICOMOS with the position of inaugural president of ICUCH, a position retained at the subsequent election.

A key strategy of ICUCH was to develop the ICOMOS International Charter on the Protection and Management of Underwater Cultural Heritage, with the intent of making this available to the drafters of the UNESCO Convention in the form of rules for activities conducted on underwater cultural heritage sites. The Charter was ratified by the ICOMOS General Assembly in Sofia in 1996. The rules derived from the Charter now take the form in the Convention of an annex, titled 'Rules concerning activities directed at underwater cultural heritage'.

The Convention holds much promise. Now that it has been adopted by UNESCO the next major challenge for ICUCH members is to encourage and facilitate its implementation with the governments in the countries that voted for its adoption.

I thank Australia ICOMOS for giving me the wonderful opportunity through ICUCH to gain international experience with a heritage project of very great global significance.

CIAV (Comité International d’Architecture Vernaculaire)

Miles Lewis

It is depressing to report that this committee has been largely inactive since its meeting in Canada in October 2001. This is largely due to the fact that the planned meeting in Zimbabwe this year had to be cancelled because of the political situation. However a non-statutory meeting is to be held in Madrid during the ICOMOS General Assembly, and there further work will be done on the proposed international history of traditional building, as well as a session on the use of guidelines in the conservation of the vernacular heritage.

If this committee is to be revitalised it will depend upon individual initiatives, and it would seem worthwhile to try to form a
vernacular group within Australia, as well as to encourage activity amongst our south-east Asian neighbours, few of whom are represented on the present committee. I would welcome contact from those interested in being involved in these proposals.

On either of the above matters, please contact me at milesbl@unimelb.edu.au.

International Scientific Committee on Cultural Tourism

Greg Young
Australia ICOMOS Nominee
International Scientific Committee on Cultural Tourism

A National Committee on Cultural Tourism was created this year following an advertisement for expressions of interest in membership. A number of volunteers agreed to participate, including members from Western Australia, Victoria, Queensland and New South Wales.

I regret to announce however that I am stepping down as Chair of the National Committee to concentrate on doctoral research and writing for a period, although I will continue on as an ordinary member of the Committee.

Ms Sharon Veale, a member of the Committee, and Historian to the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, has agreed to take over the Chair on an interim basis. The Committee will re-advertise for additional expressions of interest for membership in 2003.

I am also stepping down as the Australia ICOMOS nominee to the International ISC on Cultural Tourism and believe it is now appropriate for Australia ICOMOS to call for new nominations to that Committee.

The National Committee endorses the efforts of Graham Brooks for his work with the International Committee to date, particularly for the proposal to develop stronger practical and intellectual links between the diverse ISCs. This had represented a neglected opportunity for some time.

Activation of the Cultural Tourism Charter will be a significant part of the National Committee's work in the upcoming year and it is hoped that the forthcoming advertisement for membership will attract potential members with a background in the areas of tourism policy and tourism industry representation.

International Scientific Committee for Historic Towns and Villages

Ian Hocking

During 2001 and 2002 CIVVIH has been re-energised under the guidance of Jean Louis Luxen and with the appointment of Ray Bondin, initially as Secretary-General following an Extraordinary Bureau Meeting in February 2001, and then as President from the April 2002 Annual Meeting.

I was able to attend the:

CIVVIH Annual Meeting and Conference, Porto, 01-05 November, hosted by CRUARB.

The subject of the Conference was THE INTANGIBLE DIMENSION OF THE HISTORIC CITY, held in both the historic centre of Porto and in the Duoro Valley. The conference was notable for the:
• Largest number of attendees at a CIVVIH conference;
• Excellent papers from a wide background and wide range of disciplines. The papers are currently being published and sent to participants;
• The wonderful conference setting within the Old Directorate and Mint in the heart of Porto;
• A fascinating tour of the Duoro Valley introducing the participants to the rich palimpsest in the area from pre-Roman times to the present, including the world famous port producing region;
• Both the historic centre of Porto and the Duoro Valley are engraved on the World Heritage List.

Matters of relevance from the Annual Meeting for Australia ICOMOS were:
Advice of election of Ray Bondin, as Secretary General;
Organisation of Porto meeting and conference by Joao Campos, CIVVIH Portugese member, and Rao Rui Losa, Director CRUARB, the conservation agency for the historic centre of Porto;
Jean Luis Luxen advising of the need for CIVVIH to fulfil an important role as a scientific committee. CIVVIH is very dependent on input from National Committees and their representatives;
Urban Bibliography of Historic Cities is being co-ordinated by Teresa Colletta, from University of Naples;
Due to the death of Daryl Fowler the committee appointed Sofia Augerinou-Kolonias, from Greece, as Vice President;
The committee agreed to encourage and assist the formation of Regional Committees, with interest being shown in the Mediterranean, the American area and Australasia;
The next meeting of CIVVIH was set for Corfu in April 2002.

Attendees were provided with documentation of CRUARB’s 25 years of notable conservation, refurbishment and economic restructuring of the historic centre of Porto. The general lack of appreciation within the English speaking world of the conservation achievements within Portugal and Porto, in particular, is regrettable.

Electronic Databases
During the year members of CIVVIH have been advised of:
the expanded online BCIN and AATA databases, through the Canadian Heritage Information Network and the getty Conservation Institute respectively;
the Bibliographical Database of the UNESCO_ICOMOS Documentation Centre.

Towns at Risk
In April the ICOMOS and CIVVIH supported the appeal of the Director-General of UNESCO for the protection of historic, cultural and religious heritage in the Palestinian Autonomous Towns.

Triennial Assembly General of CIVVIH, Corfu, 18 April 2002
ICOMOS Hellenique hosted the Triennial Assembly attended by 29 members of CIVVIH.
The subject of the conference was The meeting dealt with the following matters of pertinence to Australia ICOMOS:
Tamas Fejerdy stepped down as President and Ray Bondin was elected as President;

Jean Louis Luxen stated that CIVVIH was too European, should have representatives from other regions and perhaps have meetings in other regions;

Alvaro Gomez Ferrer advised of the Ibero-American Regional Committee and it was considered that the members of the Regional Committee should be considered full members of CIVVIH;

Bureau membership was determined to be:

- 1 President;
- 3 Vice Presidents;
- 1 Secretary General;
- 1 Treasurer;
- up to 10 Members, with 6 chosen in Corfu and 4 co-opted;
- members should be chosen to represent regions.

Next CIVVIH meeting is at Madrid, 03.12.2002.

Establishment of an Australasian / Oceania Regional Committee of CIVVIH

I have raised the matter with:

Ray Bondin, who advised that there is no recognised procedure or protocol for establishing Regional Committees, although the Ibero-American Regional Committee establishes a precedent;

William Logan, who advised there is no recognised procedure or protocol in Australia ICOMOS for establishing Regional Committees;

Sheridan Burke, who advised the desirability of Regional Committees reflecting UNESCO regions, therefore Oceania may be preferable to Pacific Rim;

Alvaro Gomez Ferrer (Spain), who advised that the Ibero-American Regional Committee, brings together Mediterranean states with a shared Spanish / Portuguese colonial background. He is to forward documentation;

Graham Brooks, Chairman of the Cultural Tourism Committee, who advised of the intention to form a Pacific Regional Committee for Cultural Tourism;

David Reynolds, New Zealand ICOMOS representative on CIVVIH, who hopes to explore the matter further at a forthcoming joint Australia/New Zealand ICOMOS Conference.

I will advise of progress in further reports.

ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Shared Colonial Heritage

Graham Brooks

Australia ICOMOS Representative
ICOMOS International Committee on Shared Colonial Architecture and Town Planning

This briefing paper provides Australia ICOMOS with a short report on the activities of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Shared Colonial Architecture and Town Planning Committee during 2002.

This Committee was formed in Stockholm in 1998 and held its first meeting in Mexico City as part of the 1999 ICOMOS General Assembly. It developed plans for the publication of a series of papers and journals, but
unfortunately this project has yet to eventuate.

There has been very little activity by the Committee in the year, as the founding Chairman, Prof Frits van Voorden, sadly died of cancer in late 2001.

The Dutch based Executive Secretary of the Committee has surveyed the emerging ideas generated by the Committee in preparation for the appointment of another Chairman, at the Madrid General Assembly. The Committee Vice Chairman, Serban Cantacuzino, in London, has declined to take up the role of Committee Chairman.

Mr Cor Dijkgraaf, former Director of the Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies in Rotterdam, has been appointed as interim Chairman in relation to the meeting that will be held as part of the Madrid General Assembly. He is standing for election to the Chairmanship at the Madrid meeting.

The current primary idea for future Committee activities is the staging of an annual meeting and conference in a city renowned for its Shared Colonial Heritage, where the assembled experts can discuss ideas with local authorities and inhabitants. The results of these conferences will be published annually.

The option of an initial publication arising from the work of the Committee to date has not proven to be feasible.

Enquiries are in progress within Europe to identify a source of funding for the Committee Secretariat. In the meantime, the Dutch ICOMOS National Committee has provided valuable support.

The Committee will meet in Madrid on 4th December between 12.00 and 14.00.

In preparation for that meeting, the Dutch Committee Secretary has requested that all members confirm their mailing and emailing contact addresses, to facilitate the work of the Committee into the future.

International Scientific Committee
Historic Gardens and Cultural Landscapes

Juliet Ramsay

After a number of letters to the ISC a response was received from the President, Robert de Jong 5 November 2002. He included a copy of the ISC Fact Sheet 2002, prepared for the ICOMOS Executive Committee. In that document I am noted as a “Corresponding Member rather than a Full Voting Member. As this does not appear to reflect the Eiger Principles, the matter is to be followed up at the Executive Committee of ICOMOS as Madrid.

Further to receiving the Fact Sheet, I have contacted Robert de Jong for copies of the ‘Buenos Aires Memorandum on Cultural Landscapes and Historic Gardens’ and the ‘Document on Education’, both prepared by the committee.

Australia ICOMOS Sub-Committee Activities

Celebrating Mountains Conference

This conference has been the major focus of activity and commitment by member of the Australia ICOMOS ISC sub-committee for the last 18 months. ICOMOS members, Sarah-Jane Brazil, Aedeen Cremin, Alistair Grinbergs, Eva Logan, Juliet Ramsay and Marilyn Truscott have been extremely involved in the planning of the Celebrating
Mountains Conference (Nov. 2002) which has a particular focus on cultural landscapes, Aboriginal values, intangible values, and other historic sites in mountain environments. Being part of a multi-discipline conference, it covers the management issues of mixed and conflicting values. Report on the conference have been provided to AI executive.

Apart from the above there has been a sharing of information.

A meeting of the sub-committee members attending the Celebrating Mountains Conference will be held at Jindabyne.

State and Territory relevant events and activities

The following brief comments outline selected activities relating to historic gardens and cultural landscapes that have been conducted during the year. The summary is not comprehensive, but rather covers activities that have been made known to this sub-committee.

Conferences held during the year that have included papers on cultural landscapes.

Islands of Vanishment explored the intangible values and interpreting places that commemorate painful or ambivalent themes in the society’s history.

Gardens of the Imagination the Australian Garden History Society conference was held in Tasmania October 2002.

Heritage Victoria Cultural Landscapes Program

Heritage Victoria has a staff member, Karen Olsen, employed 2 days a week on cultural landscapes. Various seminars on ‘Assessing’, ‘Protecting’ and ‘Managing’ landscapes with cultural heritage significance have been conducted in 2001 and 2002. And guidelines for assessing cultural landscapes have been prepared.

Tasmanian Heritage Council Tasmanian Cultural Landscapes

Tasmanian Heritage Council undertook a series of three workshops on cultural landscapes in Tasmania, July 2001 to explore the concept and form of cultural landscapes in Tasmania. The proceedings of the workshops are documented as a report, covering presentations from State and Local politicians and heritage professionals. Dr Oliver Rackham from Cambridge was principal visiting project advisor provided comparisons of Tasmanian cultural landscapes with landscapes in America, England and Japan. One outcome is a map delineating Cultural Landscape Character Regions of Tasmania.

Heritage Victoria -Hands on Heritage

Heritage Victoria has a program called Hands on Heritage that has been successfully using conservation volunteers to assist in works on heritage related projects, particularly heritage landscapes. This has involved developing partnerships with Conservation Volunteers Australia, Green Core and Green Reserve programs. Programs such as these are value adding in a number of directions. Where volunteers can work with skilled gardeners to supervise they can provide labor and in turn, learn good gardening skills. These schemes have been successfully applied in historic gardens and cemeteries where the volunteers have assisted in weeding and fencing.
Australian Heritage Commission - Inspirational Values of Landscapes

The Australian Heritage Commission has been funded a study to explore this theme. It is being conducted by Chris Johnston of Context Pty Ltd. And is now well underway. The first stage involve the preparation of essays by people selected for their knowledge of landscapes and for representing a range of different perspectives. This was followed by an on-line conference – Inspirational Landscapes - Heritage Places? run over 6-7 November involving over 200 participants. As these conferences are based around chat forums there many ideas and opinions were generated. The final stage of the project is an expert workshop that will synthesise the information gained provide directions for assessing these types of places.

Designed Landscapes

Although most of the best extant 19th and early 20th century designed landscapes have been documented in heritage registers and some have their values safeguarded by conservation management plans. Sadly lacking in heritage registers, are recordings of the best of the late twentieth century designed landscapes.

Incremental changes and poor management practice have caused serious degradation to civic landscapes developed during the 1960s and later. This has meant that many landscape architects now looking back at their best works during the 1960s and later find them seriously change. Despite good management plans being provided, there is often a lack of understanding of the design and a commitment to retaining its integrity. The Australian Institute of Landscape Architects has not taken the same interest in the heritage value of their discipline as have the Royal Australian Institute of Architects and the Royal Australian Institute of Engineers.

The University of NSW Program

However the University of NSW, School of Landscape Architecture is developing a program with students to record some of these late 20th century landscapes in the Sydney region. These recordings will form the basis for significance assessments and hopefully they can be picked up in heritage registers and their values safeguarded.

Sculpture Gardens of the ANG

This year is the 20th anniversary of the Australian National Gallery, including its Sculpture Garden. To celebrate the event, the National Gallery held a number of events including some specifically related to the Sculpture Garden, one of these was a seminar that paid tribute to the Garden and its designers – the late Harry Howard, Colin Madigan, Barabra Buchanan and Roger Vidler. The Gallery and the Sculpture Garden are both on the Register of the National Estate and a conservation management plan for the Gallery and Sculpture Garden is in its final stages.

Canberra following Griffin by Paul Reid, brings together the planning history of Canberra- covering the origins of the city, Griffin’s visionary concept and the evolvement of the city covering the multitude of designed landscape features.

The National Capital Authority of the ACT are commencing a study of the Griffin legacy.

The Oxford Companion to Australian Gardens, edited by Richard Aitken and
Michael Looker. This major work has recently been published and was launched at the Australian Garden History Society Conference in Tasmania. Many people contributed articles and the book will be a major reference for designed gardens.

International Scientific Committee on Risk Preparedness (ICORP)

Robyn Riddett

The focus of ICORP is risk preparedness in the event of man-made and natural disasters and their effect upon cultural heritage as defined in the ICOMOS documents.

In this regard, 2002 has been a particularly illustrative year for ICORP, particularly in connection with the recent flooding of European cities including Dresden, Prague and Budapest where unexpectedly high flood levels have put civil defence and heritage institutions on alert, and tested of their state of preparedness. While affected state or privately run institutions organised their own disaster preparedness operations, including emergency relocation and storage of art objects as floodwaters swirled into basements and regular storage areas, other repositories were not so lucky. The Czech architectural archives collection was ruined and our ICOMOS colleagues launched an appeal to assist in salvage operations. Other ICOMOS members, particularly US ICOMOS, variously offered help with disaster recovery in the areas affected by the floods. Not surprisingly, these events have been the catalyst for a focus on risk preparedness in one of the conference streams at the forthcoming 13th General Assembly in Madrid and the further development of the role of ICOMOS in the field. In addition, ICOMOS has also been liaising with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre to organise a post-flood session on risk preparedness along the lines of the Kobe-Tokyo Conference of 1997, that followed the tragic earthquake of 1995.

In April 2002, Leo van Nispen tot Sevendaer (Netherlands) resigned as President of ICORP. A former Director of ICOMOS Secretariat, Leo was founding President of ICORP, risk preparedness being a topic close to his heart. He is to be duly credited for having brought ICOMOS as an international organisation to address preparedness as an integral part of proper heritage management and conservation, rather than focusing solely on remedial treatments and doctrinal debates after the event of a disaster. Committee members thank him for his initiatives and wish him well for the future. The work of the committee has been continued by Dinu Bumbaru (Canada), Vice-President and Robyn Riddett (Australia), Secretary-General. Two visits by Dinu to Australia, this year have been fruitful in enabling face-to-face meetings furthering this endeavour.

ICORP welcomed new representation from the United Kingdom and member countries now include Australia, Austria, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Macedonia, Malta, Netherlands (currently no representative), Russia, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain, United States of America and Zambia.

As presented at the workshop organised during the meeting of the Advisory Committee of ICOMOS in Dubrovnik (Croatia) in November 2001, ICORP is one of the ICOMOS’ initiatives taken in the field of protection of cultural
heritage. In addition the *Heritage at Risk* Report, prepared by a task force which includes international vice-president Sheridan Burke (Australia), and the International Committee of the Blue Shield (ICBS), of which ICOMOS was an instigator and is a founding member together with ICOM (museums), ICA (archives) and IFLA (libraries).

A Blue Shield meeting was organised at the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris) in November 2002 to which ICORP was invited by the International Secretariat, but because of short notice and general preparations for Madrid, ICORP was not represented in person. ICORP was also invited to make a nomination for the Melina Mercouri International Prize for the Safeguarding and Management of Cultural Landscapes (UNESCO-Greece) to be awarded in 2003.

In Australia, risk preparedness, the work of ICORP and Blue Shield were highlighted in an issue of *Historic Environment* which was favourably received internationally. Teaching of the risk preparedness unit, as part of the Cultural Heritage Studies Course at Deakin University, continues to be popular with participants.

---

**International Scientific Committee on Stone**

**David Young OAM**

I am new to this committee this year, and the committee itself has been reformed only in recent times, so this report is necessarily brief. There have been three meetings of the committee, all in Europe, none of which I have been able to attend. The committee is developing a standard glossary of stone decay forms, processes and general terms. A committee website is being developed and it is planned to eventually include details of meetings and future events, glossaries, a bibliography and databases of conservation treatments.

---

**International Scientific Committee on Legal, Administrative and Financial Issues**

**Graeme Wiffen**

I attended the fifth annual meeting of the Legal, Financial and Administrative Issues International Scientific Committee of ICOMOS. The Meeting was held in Athens, Georgia in the USA, 3-6, April, 2002.

Previous Meetings of the Committee have been held in:

- Weimar, 1997;
- Toledo, 1999;
- Croatia, 2000; and

**The ISC**

The Meeting was attended by representatives from UNESCO, Paris, and representatives from the following national committees: from the Americas - USA, Canada, Mexico and Peru; from Europe - France, Germany, Spain, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Poland, Bulgaria, and Croatia; from Asia - Japan and Sri Lanka; from Africa - South Africa, Ghana, Benin and Togo; one member from Israel and me from Australia. The organisers were pleased with the attendance. They feel that the Committee is one of the more active of the ICOMOS ISCs.

The Committee is chaired by Dr Werner von Trutzschler from the German
National Committee, and organisation for this Meeting was by Prof. James Reap of US ICOMOS, the Secretary General of the ISC. The organisation of the Meeting was extremely well done.

Athens meeting

The Committee’s Meetings take the form of a seminar on a legal aspect of heritage preservation and conservation, followed by a half day business meeting. This year the seminar was two days and two issues were discussed in parallel sessions: the listing process, and the 1954 Hague Convention (protection of cultural property in time of war).

Differences in approach to heritage and therefore to listing in the various jurisdictions came out in the papers. The European members discussed a narrower approach of the listing of historic monuments. Most of the delegates from Africa, surprisingly to me, seemed to have a similar focus. A second model was evident in the similarities between the American and Australian legislation, and in that of South Africa, in taking a much wider view of ‘what is heritage?’. The relevant South African legislation was influenced by the Australian Heritage Commission Act. These themes will be more obvious when the papers are available. I was interested to hear of recent American experience with their legislation, clearly a model for the Australian Heritage Commission Act, and will watch how the South Africans develop their practice.

Publications

The organiser of each meeting takes on the task of publishing the papers. I was given a copy of the papers of the Weimar Meeting, which have been published for some time as: “Legal Structures of Private Sponsorship”, Journals of the ICOMOS International Committee on Legal, Financial and Administrative Issues, No. 1. The papers from the Toledo and Israel meetings are about to be issued. The organiser of the meeting in Croatia is trying to raise the necessary funds. Professor Reap has imposed a June deadline for revisions to the papers from the Athens meeting, so publication is likely to be quick. Copies of these publications are given to the members of the Committee and to the ICOMOS office in Paris.

Business meeting

The business meeting was concerned with the Committee’s work schedule, future Meetings and responding to the postponement of the ICOMOS Congress. A number of delegates volunteered to hold future Meetings, even though it must be an expensive undertaking. Bulgaria is favoured for the 2003 Meeting. It is likely that there will be a small ad hoc Meeting of the ISC in Madrid. I attach a copy of the ISC’s work program.

Future developments

The Athens Meeting was held in the Dean Rusk Center for International, Comparative and Graduate Legal Studies, which is affiliated with the Faculty of Law of the University of Georgia. (While Athens is quite small, the University of Georgia at Athens is huge, with around 40,000 students.) The Law Faculty co-sponsors a combined degree course in heritage law and environmental design. The Dean Rusk Center seems quite keen to become a centre for international studies and programs in heritage law, and is considering how this might best be effected. Former centres for heritage law in the USA, I think at universities in Virginia and Maryland, seem to have
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lost their momentum. I will watch these developments.

Obvious questions that arise seem to be how to bring the work of the Committee to a wider ICOMOS audience, and how, as a national representative, I could do the same in Australia.

Work Programme of the International Committee on Legal, Administrative and Financial Issues:

Topics and problems to be discussed on a comparative international level:

- Listing of monuments and historic buildings (constitutive versus declaratory nature of listing)
- Definition of monument and historic building (scope of protection)
- Integrity of a monument or historic building (protection of fixtures and fittings)
- Protection through planning; public participation in planning and listing processes
- Regulation of threats to monuments and historic buildings
- Differences between private and governmental threats?
- Differences between private and government-owned monuments or historic buildings?
- Protection of the surroundings of monuments
- Enforcement measures in the protection of monuments and historic buildings
- Impact of international legislation and domestic legislation
- Effectiveness of the UNESCO recommendations on cultural heritage (1958-1966)

Independence of conservators within administrative structures

Economic impact of financing conservation and restoration (grants, tax incentives, others)

Teaching of law and administration in training conservators

International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management

Brian Egloff, Chairperson and Ellen Lee, Secretary

Chairperson: Brian Egloff (Australia)

Immediate Past Chairperson: Senake Bandaranayake (Sri Lanka)

Secretary: Ellen Lee (Canada)

Vice Chairperson: Willem Willems (Netherlands)

Vice Chairperson: position vacant upon resignation of Hester Davis

ICAHM meeting in 2002

Following on from the ICAHM regional meeting at Alice Springs, Australia in conjunction with the Australian ICOMOS conference ‘Making Tracks’, in May of 2001, it was decided that the next meeting of ICAHM would be in conjunction with the 13th General Assembly in Zimbabwe in October 2003. It is now planned to have a meeting on 3 December associated with the General Assembly in Madrid.

Preparations for 13th General Assembly in Zimbabwe

Actions were taken for ICAHM to have a presence at the General Assembly in Zimbabwe. Correspondence between ICROM and ICAHM was leading to participation by ICAHM in the Africa 2009 workshop to be held in conjunction
with the General Assembly. This initiative was not pursued when ICOMOS shifted the General Assembly to a venue other than that of Zimbabwe. Travel funds were sought for 3rd World members to attend without success from the Wenner-Gren Foundation.

New members of ICAHM

Confirmation of the appointment to ICAHM of the following individuals has been received:

The President of France ICOMOS, Benjamin Mouton, has confirmed in writing the appointment of Monsieur Jean LuC-Massy as the member to ICAHM.

The President of Belgium ICOMOS, Miek Goosens, has confirmed in writing the nomination of Mr. Dirk Callebaut as the member to ICAHM.

Contact with National Committees

Dr Akbar Zargar, president of Iran ICOMOS, has made contact with ICOMOS. Brian Egloff took the opportunity to write to Dr Zargar asking that the Iran National Committee nominate a member to ICAHM.

Ename Center for Public Archaeology

It is noted that Mr. Dirk Callebaut the ICAHM member from Belgium is part of this new center and will be able to keep ICAHM up to date on its activities as well as search for joint ventures. As the nearest member of the executive, Wilhelm Wilhelm, will keep in touch with Ename.

Associate Membership of ICAHM

A relatively long list of proposed Associated Members has been received from USA ICOMOS. ICAHM is reluctant to accept such a large body of Associate Members for two reasons. Firstly, communicating with a body of Associate Members that outnumbers the actual members will be cumbersome. Secondly, there is concern that the Associate Members might represent themselves or be represented by others as having the status of Members of ICAHM.

Heritage at Risk

Marilyn Truscott, Associate member of ICAHM, worked with Jane Harrington and others on the preparation of ‘Heritage at Risk: ICOMOS World Report 2001/32002 on monuments and sites in danger’. A brief report on behalf of ICAHM was prepared by Marilyn Truscott with input from Brian Egloff and incorporated into that volume (refer to pages 220 to 227). An appeal from the ICAHM executive to the members for material to incorporate into the subsequent volume received no response and both Truscott and Egloff were too busy to undertake the task.

ICOMOS Advisory Committee Meeting in Dubrovnik, Croatia 16 to 19 October 2001

Marilyn Truscott was appointed to represent ICAHM at the ICOMOS Advisory Committee Meeting in Dubrovnik, Croatia from 16 to 19 October 2001 as none of the Executive were free to attend. Ms Truscott presented the annual report of ICAHM including the deliberations of ICAHM at Alice Springs in May of 2001. Considerable discussion focussed upon the following ICAHM motion:

‘that the Committee will take no position on specific site/state issues but will respond in the case of broad issues relating to standards (such as the ICAHM Charter) and to the general
strategic issues related to archaeological heritage management’. It may be worthwhile discussing this issue further at the General Assembly meeting of ICAHM and clarifying the ICAHM position with specific exemplars as well as develop a response process.

Guidelines for archaeological heritage management abroad

Tom Wheaton raised the matter of the Society for American Archaeology wishing to become more active internationally. Dr Wheaton’s concern is that SAA does not seem to have an established set of protocols or guidelines for undertaking activities abroad in an ethical fashion. It is suggested that ICAHM could be active in this area.

Awareness Survey

A survey was conducted of all members of ICAHM to determine the awareness of, and the effectiveness of, the ICOMOS Charter to the Protection and Management of Archaeological Heritage. The mail-out included an update from the Chairperson, minutes of the meeting in Alice Springs and the survey form. The results of that survey will be presented by the Chairperson at the ICHAM meeting to be held in conjunction with the 13th General Assembly in Madrid.

Israel Meeting on World heritage Archaeological Site Management Guidelines, 2 to 9 February 2002

Kevin Jones, of New Zealand ICAHM, represented ICAHM at the meeting on World Heritage Archaeological Site Management Guidelines held in Israel. He has presented a full and detailed account to ICAHM that will be tabled at the ICAHM meeting to be held in conjunction with the 13th General Assembly in Madrid.


The World Archaeological Congress will be having its fifth meeting in Washington from 21 to 26 June. The theme of the conference is ‘Of the Past, for the Future: Integrating Archaeology and Conservation’. Brian Egloff will be assisting the Getty to develop a sub-theme ‘Staking a Claim: national monuments’. This may be an opportunity for ICAHM to play a key role and perhaps derive a product.

US ICOMOS

US ICOMOS meeting in Santa Fe was attended by Ellen Lee, Secretary of ICAHM, who will provide ICAHM with an update at the Madrid meeting.

Correspondence on the Dampier Rock Art, Western Australia

The ICAHM Executive, after receiving several opinions on this matter, addressed a letter to the Premier of the State of Western Australia expressing their concern with the development planned for the Dampier Peninsula in the light of the Dampier Peninsula having one of the most extensive collections of world renown rock art. The letter expressed the need for appropriate heritage planning to take place before any development was planned.
The International Polar Heritage Committee (IPHC)

Michael Pearson

Membership

Dr Susan Barr (Norway - President/Chair), Dr. Peter Boyarsky (Russia), Paul Chaplin (New Zealand - Secretary General), Dr Rosamunde Codling (United Kingdom), Prof.Dr. Louwrens Hacquebord (Netherlands), David Hart (South Africa), Cornelia Luedecke (Germany), Jean-François le Mouël (France), Doug Olynyk (Canada), Dr Michael Pearson (Australia), Dr. Ruben Stehberg (Chile), Dr. Urban Wråkberg (Sweden).

Corresponding members: Jaco Boshoff (South Africa), Geoff Ashley (Australia), Prof. Colin Pearson (Australia), Angie McGowan (Australia), Martin Weaver (Canada), Dr. Glen Sheehan (USA)

Activities of the IPHC

The IPHC has been pursuing the agenda set at its first meeting in Cambridge in 2001. The President and Secretary General have been active in maintaining liaison with external groups including government and non-government agencies with interests in the polar regions. The IPHC has been accepted as a non-partisan expert group for consultation purposes by the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC) and the Committee for Environmental Protection of Antarctica (CEP), and informal association has been established with a number of other bodies.

The business of the committee has been conducted by email. Members of the Committee are meeting in conjunction with the Madrid ICOMOS General Assembly in December. Membership has increased since the last report, with new members from Germany and Chile and correspondents from Canada and the USA.

The IPHC continues to be funded by the Norwegian Directorate for Cultural Heritage.

The following outlines some of the specific areas of interest of the IPHC during the year.

Website

A website has been established, largely through the work of Paul Chaplin, (www.polarheritage.com). The site came on-line in April 2002, and had over 15,000 visits by October. The site has news on polar and related ICOMOS issues, information about the IPHC, a list of the Antarctic Historic Sites and Monuments identified in the Antarctic Treaty, links to related sites and bibliographies, links to polar history sites, registers of expertise and organisations in the polar heritage field (more information and names welcomed) and the capacity for links to scientific reports and field reports.

Information brochure

An information brochure has been produced, outlining the polar heritage and the work of the IPHC. 2,000 copies have been printed and are being distributed.

Technical papers

A series of papers have been produced by IPHC members for consideration as part of the ICOMOS publication program. Delays have meant that this has not made it into this years program, but hopes are held for next years.
TICCIH

IPHC President Susan Barr attended the fourth meeting of the Trustees of TICCIH (The International Committee for the Conservation of Industrial Heritage), and was elected Polar Correspondent for TICCIH. This was the first time TICCIH had elected a representative for a whole region or theme, rather than representing a country.

Heritage at Risk

The IPHC has contributed reports on polar cultural heritage to the ICOMOS Heritage at Risk report for both 2001 and 2002.

Broadening membership

The IPHC is considering introducing a new category of corresponding membership (‘Associates’) to encourage greater flow of information and meet the committee’s objectives of promoting interchange of experience, ideas and knowledge, and expanding technical cooperation. This proposal will be discussed at the Madrid meeting.

International Committee on Cultural Routes and Itineraries

Dr Sandy Blair

I presented a paper (on behalf of several authors) on the heritage of Australian routes and journeys at the international congress of the committee held in Pamplona, Navarra, Spain 21-23 June 2001.

The theme of the congress was an examination of cultural routes and intangible heritage within a universal context. The committee intends to prepare an inventory of significant cultural routes world-wide. Member countries have agreed to document the significant cultural routes of their country and region as a contribution to the inventory.

The paper I presented as representative for Australia ICOMOS on this committee summarised and presented the findings of the national Australia ICOMOS conference ‘Making Tracks” held in Alice Springs in May 2001. It presented the issues discussed and the recommendations of the conference in relation to understanding and conserving the heritage of cultural routes of the Australian and Asia-Pacific region. I have attached a copy of the paper to this report (Appendix 1). The full set of conference papers from the ‘Making Tracks’ conference is available on the Australia ICOMOS website and is soon to be published as an issue of Historic Environment.

The next meeting of the committee is to be held in association with the ICOMOS General Assembly in Madrid next month. I am unable to attend but will organise a member of the Australian delegation to participate as an observer. The focus of the committee meeting is to explore the significance and scope of cultural routes and their relationship to the concept of cultural landscape as used within the World Heritage Convention and Its Operational Guidelines.

I have been nominated as Assistant Vice President for Asia-Pacific within the scope of our committee’s work. Elections will take place at the committee meeting. The committee is likely to meet again early next year to pursue its work program. I am happy to respond to any inquiries about the work of the committee. My contact telephone is 02 62077378 or email: sandy.blair@act.gov.au.
# Executive Committee Members for the 2002 Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name &amp; Responsibility</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
<th>Mail Address</th>
<th>Business Tel/Fax/Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Caitlin Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:caitlinallen@hotmail.com">caitlinallen@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Sarah Jane BRAZIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: 02 6270 8221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication (including WWW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 02 6270 8107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation practice – Burra Charter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M: 0409 716 696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sarah-jane.brazil@dcita.gov.au">sarah-jane.brazil@dcita.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Kristal BUCKLEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: 03 9380 6933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria co-rep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 03 9380 4066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M: 0416 126 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation Practice – Indigenous Heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kristal@context-pl.com.au">Kristal@context-pl.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Sheridan BURKE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: 02 9319 4811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICOMOS International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 02 9319 4383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation practice – ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M: 0418 216 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:SheridanB@gml.com.au">SheridanB@gml.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Elizabeth Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: 08 8981 2848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NT Rep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 08 8981 2379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:director.national.trust@octa4.net.au">director.national.trust@octa4.net.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Aedeen Cremin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:aedeen@bigpond.com">aedeen@bigpond.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT Rep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Alan Croker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: 02 9319 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design 5 Architects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 02 9557 3310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 Myrtle Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:alancroker@design5.com.au">alancroker@design5.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Laura GRAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: 08 9561 6695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conference Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Laura.Gray@bigpond.com">Laura.Gray@bigpond.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA Rep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation practice – heritage and community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Ken HORRIGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ken.Horrigan@epa.qld.gov.au">Ken.Horrigan@epa.qld.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QLD Rep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon</td>
<td>Barry JONES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T/F: 03 9349 2526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M: 0418 399 196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:barry.jones@alp.org.au">barry.jones@alp.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>William LOGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: 03 9244 3903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 03 9244 6755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International (World Heritage working group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:wl@deakin.edu.au">wl@deakin.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Peter LOVELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: 03 9662 3344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 03 9662 1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allom Lovell &amp; Associates 35 Little Bourke St, Melbourne VIC 3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:phil10@bigpond.com">phil10@bigpond.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Peter ROMEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: 03 6251 2330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISCs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 03 6251 2322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:peter.romey@portarthur.org.au">peter.romey@portarthur.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Sharon SULLIVAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: 02 6649 4176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies/promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 02 6649 4176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red Bank, 580 Boundary Creek Road Nymbodia, NSW 2460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Robert Vincent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T: 03 6224 2656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasmania Rep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 03 6223 7094 [contact before sending]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M: 0419 896 043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robert.Vincent@AAD.gov.au">Robert.Vincent@AAD.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Making Tracks, Key issues about the heritage of Australian routes and journeys

International Congress of the ICOMOS CIIC
June 21-23, 2001 (Pamplona, Navarra, Spain)
Cultural Routes and Intangible Heritage within a universal context

MAKING TRACKS

Key issues about the heritage of Australian routes and journeys

Sandy Blair, Nicholas Hall, Diana James and Lee Brady

Introduction

This paper discusses some of the key features of routes in Australia, in particular the relationship between understanding the significance of routes and the connection to the Australian landscape. The paper is very much informed by the recent conference held in Alice Springs and will present some of the key outcomes of the conference.

Alice Springs, the ‘red centre’ of Australia, is a favourite destination for Australian as well as overseas visitors. It is at the centre of many journeys – from Aboriginal dreaming tracks that cross central Australia, to the routes of explorers, the Central Australian (Ghan) Railway and the Overland Telegraph Line. And it’s a place where the stories of these journeys intersect. What better place to meet and talk about journeys and routes with long histories and deep meanings, sacred and secular.

The purpose of the conference was to reach a better understanding of the cultural routes of the Australian and Asia-Pacific region as a contribution to broader research in the global context. The conference mainly focussed on Australia and was aimed at the range of people who are involved with heritage places – owners, managers, researchers, interpreters and visitors. However, overseas delegates presented case studies from Canada, the Middle East, Malaysia, South Africa and the United States and Australian delegates included examples from Vietnam, Nepal and China.

The conference was focussed around a number of key issues or topics which participants were invited to address in their paper. These were:

- The relationship between routes and the natural environment, including impacts on the natural environment;
- Routes and cultural identity, the links between cultures and the impact of routes on cultural practices and territory;
- The appreciation and understanding of land and culture through routes;
• The distinctiveness of cultural routes in Australia compared with other countries, and links between Australia and the Asia-Pacific region; and

• The relevance of cultural routes in today’s world – recognition, interpretation and management.

I would like to briefly present the discussion at the conference under each of these issues, and outline the conclusions reached by the conference participants in the plenary session.

Routes and the natural environment

Australian travel routes often have multiple natural and cultural heritage values that demonstrate the close interrelation of natural and cultural environments and the way in which values are often layered.

Australia is a vast continent, the driest on earth, and one that has always been sparsely populated. Naturally, water has often been a decisive factor for people moving across the continent and in determining lines of travel. There are certain logical lines of travel, and key nodes centred around water sources such as springs, soaks, and the major waterholes on the few inland rivers. These logical lines of travel have an essential layer of cultural significance connected to tens of thousands of years of Aboriginal tradition. The trade and development routes connected with the last two hundred years of non-Indigenous history in the continent, invariably have a close relationship to these well-used Indigenous routes.

One of Australia’s most richly layered movement, trade and communication routes is that associated with the mound springs of northern South Australia researched over three decades by Colin Harris (Harris, 2001). These unique sources of water have been supremely important to Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Mound springs are the natural outlets for the pressurised ground water of the Great Artesian Basin, one of the largest of its kind in the world. They have a lineal alignment because many of them are located in water-bearing aquifers around the margins of the Basin. They are totally unique concentrations of flora and fauna, many critically endangered. With their lineal alignment over hundreds of kilometres and their unfailing supply of drinkable water, they have provided an environmental corridor for successive transport and communication links over time.

The layered natural and cultural values associated with the mound springs can be experienced by travelling along the Oodnadatta track, a famous outback road stretching from Marree to Oodnadatta in the far north of Australia. Some conference participants made this journey, with tour guides from the local Arabunna community, who shared some of their stories and cultural traditions along the route. This journey also traces the routes of early European explorers, and the building of the Central Australian (Ghan) Railway and the Overland Telegraph Line.

The importance of the natural and cultural heritage associated with the springs has been well documented and some important conservation management measures have been put in place over the past two decades (Harris, 2001). However a great deal more work needs to be done to recognise and ensure an appropriate balance between conserving all the
values associated with these routes, natural, Indigenous and historic.

Routes and cultural identity

Key water sources through inland Australia, along with other important natural features are connected through Aboriginal law – the law that documents the formation of the landscape. Places are related along the travel routes of creation ancestors – the so-called ‘Dreaming tracks’. Through this law, and the Dreaming tracks which criss-cross the Australian landscape, Aboriginal groups have established legal and social responsibilities which have formalised the relationships between groups on a vast geographic scale.

Along the lines of the Dreamtime ancestors’ travels, groups traded commodities they could not procure in their own country, they exchanged ideas, components of religious tradition, and they gathered socially from far afield, intermarried and formed extended family and social relationships.

The stories, songs and dances that retell the Dreamtime creation along a line are divided into sections and owned and looked after by groups along the line. The rights to tell parts of the story, or to put together sections of the story along a line, are strictly controlled. The way these parts fit together, forms an immensely strong basis for social relationships and exchange.

According to Professor Isabel McBryde’s work (1994), the complex long-distance exchange networks which linked – and still link – the Aboriginal societies of Australia are amongst the most extensive in the hunter-gatherer world. McBryde has recorded the archaeology and ethno history of distributions of axes and axe stone across south eastern Australia. The exchange networks stretching from the Gulf of Carpentaria in the North to Spencer Gulf in the South are important in an international context. Along these routes, goods such as high quality ochre, sandstone grinding slabs and the narcotic tabacco, pituri was traded.

Other items such as pearl and baler shells were also dispersed into this area and across vast distances.

These routes and networks were also means by which cultural traditions were developed, shared, transferred and transmitted between groups. In the historical period, components of ceremonies have been documented to appear in the north of the continent and be transferred to groups along these routes south and then west across the continent.

The scale of these routes along which people, materials and cultural traditions travelled are vast, and easily comparable to the well-known trade routes such as the Silk Road and Frankincense route. In addition, these routes have a complexity beyond that of a singular linear route. There are in fact many routes, which criss-cross to form a vast net across the continent.

The significance of these complex systems of human communication lies not only in their physical extent, and an anthropological or archaeological significance, but also in continuing social importance to Aboriginal people. At the national level, to this point, these routes and networks have only limited protection. The Commonwealth and State governments are however looking at how they can recognise the national significance of these networks, raise awareness of them in the Australian community, and in a coordinated way improve the protection of associated
sites. Aboriginal communities are interested in the social and economic development opportunities that will flow from interpreting these routes and networks to tourists.

Understanding of land and culture through routes

How routes are understood and appreciated depends on who tells the story and how the overall story is recognised and communicated. It is critical that all significant natural and cultural aspects of the particular route are investigated and that there is a meaningful way to experience parts of the route. The modern travelling of routes is an important part of recognising and understanding their significance.

The cognitive and emotional appreciation of routes by the modern traveller depends very much on the way they travelled and on the access of the traveller to appropriate information and presentation.

One reason why cultural routes are attractive to visitors is that they can themselves take a journey, which contributes to their independent, personal exploration and adventure with the experience of the stories and physical remains of the past. This is a unique coordination of experiences, often not available at particular, fully interpreted historic buildings and sites.

Travelling on and using cultural routes inevitably contributes to the history of that route and can add a layer of meaning, or can abrade or damage both the tangible and intangible values of the site.

In Australia, cultural routes, especially living cultural Indigenous routes, are often not well understood or appreciated by government. There is a lack of understanding of the full significance and value of routes, and a failure to recognise and take advantage of the increasing sophistication of visitors and their ability to appreciate the interpretive and management subtleties of, for instance, living traditional routes.

Routes are, par excellence, the sum of their parts – a combination of often subtle indicators of past journeys and events – no site in isolation perhaps crossing the threshold for heritage listing – but a combination of sites forming a powerful and significant cultural experience for travellers.

A lovely example of how modern travelling is closely related to developing an understanding of the cultural values of routes is the Ngintaka heritage trail. The Aboriginal communities on the traditional Pitjantjatjara Lands through control of their own tourism business have designed a unique Tjukurpa or ‘Dreaming’ trail. The Pitjantjatjara elders have ensured wide community consultation and anthropological clearance of the route prior to opening sections to the public. The Ngintaka heritage trail is their own expression of how they want to share a living cultural tradition. (James & Brady, 2001).

The Pitjantjatjara Aboriginal people of Central Australia are sharing some of their rich cultural heritage with visitors who participate in cultural tours of their country. At Angatja, Lee and Leah Brady take the tourists or ‘students’ along the Ngintaka, Perentie Lizard Trail. The elders, Nganyinytja and her brothers, have determined what information and sites are appropriate to show and share of this important Tjukurpa or Dreaming Songline.
Pitjantjatjara land is cris-crossed by the tracks of many Creation Beings; the lizard, the carpet snake, dingo, emu, honey ant and witchetty grub, among others. Leah has the right to tell the story of the Ngintaka Lizard Man as her mother Nganyinytja is senior custodian of Angatja.

Mt Woodroffe, the highest mountain in S.A, is also the Ngintaka Man as he rears up to look over the country. He is returning to his home in the west. The significance of these cultural routes is central to Pitjantjatjara spiritual connection to land. Each individual is custodian of the land they are born in and the Creation Ancestor who walked and sung that land into being in the beginning. If the land and Songline is destroyed people are severed from the core of their being, they get sick and die.

Nganyinytja and Tjulkiwa, elders of the Angatja region, sing the song saga of the Ngintaka Lizard Man. The stanzas of the song follow his travels through the land, thus the trail is called a Songline. They have opened some sites on this route to the visiting public. Sacred sites are protected physically from vehicle and foot traffic, and the cultural heritage value and interpretation is controlled by only accredited guides accompanied by Aboriginal custodians can bring small groups of visitors to the sites on the Songline Trail.

Visitors are only taken to part of the 500km long Songline, a 40km section around Angatja. The last site is a large cave, the belly of the Ngintaka. Here a fire is lit to warn the spirit of the approach of visitors, the Dickie Minyintirri tells the story and sings the song of this site. Access is restricted to small numbers, a single route through the cave and fragile rock is protected.

The Pitjantjatjara people own and operate their own tour company Desert Tracks. They protect their cultural heritage by ensuring all interpretation is through Aboriginal guides chosen by the community and sanctioned by the elders, the oral histories, stories and songs are being recorded for their use and sale. Stanley Douglas proudly dances the Ngintaka dance, the Dreaming his people are keeping alive, interpreting and preserving their culture through development of the Ngintaka Heritage Songline Trail.

**Distinctiveness of Australian cultural routes**

The recognition and conservation of cultural routes in Australia raise issue at a national level for a number of reasons. Many travel routes occur on a vast scale, literally traversing Australia and linking our continent to the world beyond. As such, these routes connect places across state borders and through many jurisdictions.

Many routes relate strongly to themes that are important to our national identity and understanding, such as migration, the network of Indigenous law, trade relationships, or exploration, for example.

Heritage routes continue to be vitally important as a national social and economic resource. Routes of historical importance now have an important contemporary role in tourism, such as The Great Ocean Road, the Canning Stock Route, the Birdsville and Strezlecki tracks. We need to have a very pragmatic approach to the future uses of these heritage features. At the least, we need to ensure that uses such as tourism are compatible, sustainable and sensitive to the natural and cultural
values found along the way. The Federal body responsible for Australia’s heritage, Australian Heritage Commission, has recently released a new framework document *Successful Tourism at Heritage Places*, building on the *ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Charter*, which pragmatically links tourism codes of practice with heritage conservation philosophy (Australian Heritage Commission, 2001).

Recognition, interpretation and management

In Australia, cultural routes are often living traditional routes of indigenous people, and therefore depend for their full appreciation on the generosity, explanation and interpretation of their traditional owners. In many cases, visitors have the opportunity to experience for themselves the tangible and intangible experiences of the route.

Cultural routes are often geographically complex. They do not conform to modern political or land ownership or management boundaries. This has implications for their identification, recognition, conservation and management. Cooperative and/or joint management structures are usually needed for their effective conservation. The continental scale of many Australian routes also means that a national approach, based on cooperation across state boundaries, is essential.

Finally, places along routes invariably contain points that are a convergence of activity and meaning in a vast landscape. Sites will invariably have multiple values and a close interrelationship with the natural environment. Classic examples are: the combination of natural, Indigenous and historic values around the linked series of mound springs in northern South Australia; or the similarly broad values associated with sites along the Telegraph Line. We need to continue to develop integrated approaches to heritage conservation across natural, Indigenous and historic environments and be vigilant that we are not protecting some values at the expense of others.

In conclusion, the conference recognised that there is much more work to do to identify, document and conserve major Australian routes. There was a recognition in particular of the need to work much more closely with the tourism industry. In terms of the CIIC definition, the case studies presented in this paper have potential national, and sometimes universal, significance; they are routes or networks that have been walked by humans often over thousands of years; they have a mix of intangible and tangible values; and they represent a big challenge for conservation and management.
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