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Australia ICOMOS has been an active and influential heritage conservation organisation for forty years. As part of its 40th Anniversary, Australia ICOMOS has prepared this concise history of its origins and significant achievements, in particular the evolution of the *Burra Charter*.

We hope this document captures the innovative role that Australians have made on the national and international heritage stage through Australia ICOMOS. It is the collaboration with which we approach so much of our work that makes Australia ICOMOS such a valuable professional organisation and so rewarding for us to be involved in. A collective sense of purpose working for conservation enthuses us all. Hence the title for this publication: *Collaboration for Conservation: A brief history of Australia ICOMOS and the Burra Charter*.

We thank historian Bronwyn Hanna on whose work a great deal of this publication is based. We also thank Nicholas Hall who has prepared this publication and those members that have assisted in this task.

We see this as a first edition, which like all good histories can be updated and revised as more information comes to light. Through this publication, we encourage our members to reflect on years past, take pride in our achievements and be inspired to continue their involvement in our activities both in Australia and globally.

*Kerime Danis, President, Australia ICOMOS*

*Elizabeth Vines OAM, Convenor of Australia ICOMOS History Project*

October 2016
In 2014, Australia ICOMOS commissioned the historian Bronwyn Hanna to prepare a history on the development of our organisation, in line with international intentions to prepare such histories for each of the national committees of ICOMOS. Hanna completed *Innovation in Conservation: A timeline history of Australia ICOMOS and the Burra Charter* in 2015. (Hanna 2015). The document was based on detailed oral histories and published sources and it compiled a detailed record of the organisation’s achievements and included a detailed timeline of events since the establishment of Australia ICOMOS in 1976.

Australia ICOMOS has taken Hanna’s detailed documentary work and prepared a concise history of the organisation’s origins and significant achievements for wider readership. This brief history has been written and prepared for publication by Nicholas Hall who adapted the information from Hanna’s work and from other sources.

In this document you will find more information about Australia ICOMOS and its role, nationally and internationally. The history of the organisation and its achievements is presented in the context of the evolution of heritage practice in Australia and with reference to international development. It provides an overview of the work done by Australia ICOMOS with our international colleagues and partner organisations.

It’s hoped that this publication will be useful for current and future members of Australia ICOMOS, for governments, organisations, project collaborators, students and for community members with an interest in heritage.
Uluru, Northern Territory: Uluru is an iconic Australian heritage place, important for informing Australians about Indigenous culture and heritage from the perspective of the Anangu traditional owners. It has also been a touchstone for Australian advocacy for the concept of cultural landscapes as it was introduced to the World Heritage system. (Photo: Nicholas Hall)

Port Arthur, Tasmania: Port Arthur contains the remains of one of Australia’s most significant convict settlements. It has also been the site of many challenges and innovations for Australian heritage practice. It continues to provide advances in Australian conservation approaches with the advice, assistance and support of Australia ICOMOS members. (Photo: J. Harrison)

Sydney Opera House, New South Wales: Australia has some wonderful legacies of Twentieth Century Heritage. Australia ICOMOS members have worked on the protection of more recent heritage at the national and international level. The Sydney Opera House is a national icon and has been entered into the World Heritage List. (Photo: Christian Mehlführer)
What is Australia ICOMOS?

“The notion of ICOMOS is extraordinary. It is international, professional (yet non-governmental) and inter-disciplinary. Its twin tasks are to care for human creations around the world and across time and to unravel the astounding messages their built fabric conveys”. (Joan Domicelj 1997 quoted in Hanna 2015)

Australia ICOMOS is an association of multi-disciplinary professionals working for the conservation and protection of cultural heritage places, including buildings, historic towns, cultural landscapes and Indigenous heritage sites. Its mission is to “lead cultural heritage conservation in Australia by raising standards, encouraging debate and generating innovative ideas” (Australia ICOMOS 2016).

Australia ICOMOS held its inaugural meeting in 1976 and became an incorporated association in 1984. It is managed by an Executive Committee of 15 members, elected from the membership for a maximum of up to three year terms. Australia ICOMOS currently has over 600 members (in full member, young professional, students as associate and institutional categories) including anthropologists, archaeologists, architects, art and architectural historians, conservators, engineers, geographers, geologists, historians, lawyers, town planners and others.

Australia ICOMOS plays a strong role in advancing heritage practice in Australia and also contributes to the development of heritage practice in the Asia – Pacific region and globally. Australia ICOMOS is bound by the global ICOMOS Statutes but has its own mission statement, ethical principles and code of ethics. Its activities are guided by a strategic plan which is renewed regularly and the activity of the organization is documented each year in an annual report. These documents can be accessed via the Australia ICOMOS website (australia.icomos.org).

Throughout Australia, ICOMOS hosts numerous specialist committees and symposia, with an increasing focus on mentoring early career heritage practitioners. Its national conferences are always well attended events with lively debate. Selected papers from these events, together with erudite articles from its members and colleagues have been published since 1980 in its refereed journal – Historic Environment.
Australia ICOMOS is one of approximately 110 National Committees and 28 Scientific Committees of the Paris-based International Council. ICOMOS is one of the three advisory bodies to the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO (United Nations Environment and Scientific Cultural Organisation). The other advisory bodies are IUCN (the International Union for the Conservation of Nature) and ICCROM (the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property). ICOMOS is the professional and scientific advisor to the World Heritage Committee on all aspects of cultural heritage.

The Australian chapter is one of the largest of the national bodies represented in ICOMOS. Members of Australia ICOMOS have made substantial contributions to the advancement of heritage practice internationally. Australia ICOMOS has also been very active in the governance of ICOMOS, contributing its first representative to the international Executive Committee of ICOMOS in 1981 and being represented there continually since 1991.

Numerous Australia ICOMOS members are also participants in the 28 ICOMOS International Scientific Committees (ISCs) which develop expertise on specific heritage issues from the conservation of stone and wood to theme-based committees such as cultural tourism and Twentieth-Century heritage. Several of these committees were founded or are chaired by Australia ICOMOS members.
Australia ICOMOS is mainly funded by its own membership fees. In the past, it has received support to extend its work from the Australian Government through the Grants to the Voluntary Environment, Sustainability and Heritage Organisations Program, however this funding is no longer available.

Like other non-Government Organisations, Australia ICOMOS supplements its funding by applying for grants and seeking partnerships to further its programs. Over the years, government and corporate employers have provided in-kind support.

By far the largest economic contribution however comes from the time devoted by members themselves. One member calculated their professional time costs of nine years of voluntary ICOMOS engagement nationally and internationally at over $200,000. ICOMOS members most often fund their own travel to attend meetings, forums, conferences and ICOMOS General Assemblies or are sometimes supported by employers.
Hope for the future:
the emergence of Australia ICOMOS

Australia ICOMOS emerged as a professional body with a diverse interest in heritage conservation in the 1970s, a time of burgeoning concern for the future of Australia’s environment and its Indigenous and more recent heritage. The seeds for the emergence of the organization had been sown in the decades before.

The first National Trust in Australia had been established in New South Wales in April 1945. A group of citizens, led by Annie Wyatt (OBE) raised community consciousness of widespread destruction of the built and natural heritage in Sydney from the late 1920s (Goddard and Yates 2007).

Following the Second World War, there was a resurgence in the Australian economy which brought with it a building and development boom. Coupled with this, post-war migration changed the face of Australia’s social landscape and the fabric of its cities and towns.

It was in the 1960’s that concerns for the conservation of natural landscapes and cultural heritage places reached a crescendo. In a few short years in the mid-1960s there was a remarkable confluence of events. In June 1964, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies (now AIATSIS) was established. In August 1964, the Australian Conservation Foundation was formed at a conference in Canberra. In 1965, the Australian Council of National Trusts was established, and in the same year, South Australia became the first State to enact legislation to protect Aboriginal and early historic ‘relics’. At this time, Australian universities were engaged in creating new courses supporting the fields of architecture, history and archaeology and attracting new thinkers from overseas.

Meanwhile in Europe, in May 1964, agreement was reached in Venice on a charter that would provide the springboard for an international movement in heritage conservation. The ripples of this fledgling global collaboration spread back to Australia from two attendees of the Venice meeting, Ted Farmer, the NSW Government Architect and Raphael Cilento, Chair of the Queensland National Trust.
ICOMOS International was founded in 1965, and at its first General Assembly in Cracow, Poland, the *Venice Charter* was adopted as its foundational text. In the same year a White House Conference in Washington, D.C. called for a ‘World Heritage Trust’ that would stimulate international cooperation to protect ‘the world’s superb natural and scenic areas and historic sites for the present and the future of the entire world citizenry’. (UNESCO 2016)

Importantly the combination of natural and cultural heritage was fundamental to the ideas emerging internationally. In Australia, discussion and debate amongst a wide range of interested group and experts also followed this global trend.

In the early 1970s, growing concern for the natural and cultural environment influenced the union movement to establish ‘green’ bans stopping construction work at key development sites that were considered to be threatening natural or historic heritage. Jack Mundey, Secretary of the Builders Labourers Federation at the time, said

“There thinking in the unions then was, what’s the use of getting better wages and better conditions if we choke to death in unplanned, polluted cities?” (Mundey in Hanna 2015)

This highly publicised industrial action, raised new community awareness of the need to proactively support heritage conservation.

In 1972 the cause was taken up in the Federal election where heritage issues became a part of the election campaign, and the Labor Party led by Gough Whitlam committed to “Preserve and enhance the quality of the National Estate” if elected (Hanna 2015).
In 1973, the new Australian Labor Government of Gough Whitlam established a Commission of Enquiry into the National Estate led by Justice Robert Hope who presented his report in April 1974. This pivotal report (known as the Hope Report) contained 99 recommendations, among them that Australia should consider becoming a member of ICOMOS and that a committee of the Council be established in Australia (Hope 1974).

Other Hope Report recommendations were immediately acted on by the Whitlam Government, including Australia ratifying the World Heritage Convention (22 August 1974) and establishing an independent statutory commission, the Australian Heritage Commission, to lead the efforts in conserving the National Estate (19 June 1975).

On 20 October 1976, David Yencken, founding Chair of the Australian Heritage Commission, brought together a diverse group of professionals consisting of architects, archaeologists, historians, Indigenous studies experts, academics, bureaucrats, conservators and representatives of the Australian Heritage Commission, the Hope Committee and the National Trust at the historic mansion of Illawarra in Melbourne for the founding meeting of Australia ICOMOS.

The diverse backgrounds of the inaugural members indicate a great deal about the broad scope of interest in Australia ICOMOS. It is the diversity of voices and cross-disciplinary collaboration which to this day remains highly valued and is a fundamental part of the capacity and dynamism of the organisation.
The development of heritage practice in Australia in context

The evolution of heritage practice in Australia is tied to international developments as well as to unique features of the Australian environment, cultures and politics.

The Federal system of the Commonwealth of Australia provides for a division of power between the Australian Government and the governments of the seven states and territories. The powers to legislate for land use and land management is largely a state and territory matter and heritage protection, heritage lists and heritage policy have developed with statutory force mainly at this level.

Local governments have also been responsible for planning within their jurisdictions and hence, over time, have evolved systems of heritage protection through local legislation and regulation in planning schemes. The County of Cumberland in NSW created a regional heritage list in 1949, although this was not publicly available until much later in 1962 (New South Wales Heritage Office 2000).

*Cumberland Place, The Rocks from Harrington St c. 1901:* Owned and managed by the NSW government, The Rocks precinct has always been an epicentre for heritage conservation practice (Photographer unknown, Source: Property NSW).
After some stalled attempts, the first specific legislation to protect heritage was enacted in South Australia in 1965, with an act to regulate the preservation of Aboriginal and early historic objects and places. Heritage-specific legislation then followed in other states and territories: in New South Wales and Queensland in 1967; Victoria and Western Australia in 1972; Tasmania in 1975; Northern Territory in 1980 and finally the Australian Capital Territory in 2004. The need to protect Aboriginal cultural heritage led the way with the implementation of legislation, with legislation to protect historic heritage following after.

The interest of the Australian public in heritage was stimulated during a dramatic shift in Australian culture and politics toward a new and more independent sense of national pride and identity that emerged in the 1960s and raced forward in the 1970s. It was in this period that the National Trust of Australia raised awareness of the need to preserve Australia’s natural and cultural heritage.

In December 1972, the progressive Australian Labor party came to office after 23 years in opposition, led by Prime Minister Gough Whitlam. A significant program of social change and reform followed, with the concept that the protection of Australia’s national heritage (referred to as the ‘National Estate’) should be a national endeavor. This led to the establishment of the Australian Heritage Commission, the Register of the National Estate and the National Estate Grants Program to fund heritage investigation, awareness and protection.

The Australian Heritage Commission provided an important breeding ground for the cross-fertilization of ideas and practice from one form of heritage to another for it had responsibility not only for the cultural environment (comprising the ‘historic’ and ‘Indigenous’ areas), but also for the natural environment. It was initially the only such agency nationally and internationally (Truscott 2004).

The national role in environmental issues was justified as it became increasingly clear that environmental problems crossed state boundaries and solutions required national and international approaches. And yet the Australian Constitution contains no clear and specific head of powers for environmental stewardship, meaning that many of the federal approaches were administratively messy and open to legal interpretation and challenge.
By the late 1990s, the Commonwealth had enacted over 40 principal pieces of environmental legislation, with the Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975 being one of the most significant (Parliament of Australia 1999). Reform of National environment laws took place following the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment (IGAE) on 1 May 1992, leading finally to a new piece of Commonwealth environment legislation that consolidated these disparate laws and clarified matters of national environmental significance.

The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act was passed in 1999 and came into effect on 17 July 2000. Amongst many roles, the Act includes provisions for the protection of Commonwealth Heritage Places, World Heritage Places and the establishment of a National Heritage List. On 1 January 2004, amendments to the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 create the Australian Heritage Council to replace the Australian Heritage Commission, and the Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975 was repealed on the same day. At this moment, the Register of the National Estate, that had contained records of over 13,000 heritage places around the nation, was transferred to the Australian Heritage Council. On 19 February 2007, the Register of the National Estate was finally closed, with all statutory references to it subsequently removed. Australia ICOMOS at this time lobbied for better legislation regarding heritage and was particularly concerned about the loss of the Register of the National Estate which had built up a record of diverse Australian heritage places over thirty years.

Australia’s national heritage system is now based around a strongly tiered approach with state and territory-based heritage registers and a National Heritage List which is seen as a preliminary requirement for any consideration of World Heritage nomination.
Internationally, Australia has been involved in the rapid evolution of heritage practice that has taken place since the Second World War, however the Australian experience was somewhat different from those of European nations. As the dust settled on devastated towns and cities in Europe, there was understandably a focus on restoration and reconstruction of built heritage, acknowledging the need for cultural heritage to be an agent of peace.

In 1954 the *Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*, sponsored by UNESCO, was adopted in The Hague. The Convention recommended that signatory countries draw up a list or inventory of cultural property of major importance that would constitute an international list of properties that each country would respect, especially in times of armed conflict.

In May 1964, the second meeting of the International Congress of the Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, instigated by UNESCO, attracted over 500 participants from Europe, the Americas, Africa, Asia and Australia. The meeting adopted two important resolutions: the first being the International Restoration Charter, or *Venice Charter*, and the second, put forward by UNESCO, provided for the creation of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS).
The Venice Charter invoked the idea of a common heritage that was later to find its way into the World Heritage Convention, but its approach gave precedence to aesthetic and historical values (Cameron and Rossler 2013) and seemed to be based around monumental built forms of heritage and less attuned to sites that did not have an architectural form (Jerome 2014). Those in colonised nations, particularly those with Indigenous populations that did not construct monumental forms of heritage, found the tenets of the Venice Charter to be at odds with their needs and values.

Layers of significance: The Flinders Ranges in South Australia contain diverse natural and cultural values. This includes internationally significant locations for Ediacaran fossils, places of ongoing significance to Aboriginal people and historic heritage relating to early settlement and mining. (Photo: Gordon Smith)
Development of the criteria for the World Heritage List in June 1977 saw close cooperation between the Australian delegates and those of the USA, Canada and interestingly Iran (Mulvaney 2004). This identification of similar heritage issues from countries outside Europe has been a common theme in Australia’s international engagement in ICOMOS. It has helped Australia develop approaches which both learn from others and which have broad applicability.

Early on in the development of Australian heritage approaches, the influence of the experience in the USA was important, particularly the National Parks system where there had long been an integration of natural and cultural values in conservation. Their approaches to heritage listing were also influential in Australia. Notably Dr Ernest Connally, Associate Director of the US National Parks Service and Secretary General of ICOMOS, was the keynote speaker at the first Australia ICOMOS National Conference in Beechworth in April 1978. Previously, David Yencken, one of the Hope Report Commissioners and first Chair of the Australian Heritage Commission, had visited the USA and was impressed by the approaches developed by the National Parks Service (Hanna 2015).

Similarly, Australians have always felt an affinity with their Canadian and New Zealand colleagues where issues of Indigenous cultural values and broad landscape perspectives have always been important.

Perhaps Australia’s most notable contribution to international heritage practice has been its focus on the primacy of understanding cultural significance, taking the role of identified heritage ‘values’ from a supporting role to centre stage. ‘Values-based management’, as it has become known, has provided a growing paradigm for heritage management globally. As international observers noted, this approach:

“has been significantly shaped by the Australians, who memorialized it in the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, better known as the Burra Charter.” (Jerome 2014)

The Los Angeles based Getty Conservation Institute, influenced by visiting Australians and later Australian staff members, also commenced a major initiative exploring values-based management from 1997 involving representatives from Parks Canada, English Heritage, the US National Parks Service and the Australian Heritage Commission (De La Torre 2014). Major case studies were undertaken analysing the application of values-based management, at places such as Hadrians Wall in the UK, Grosse Ile in Canada, Port Arthur in Australia, Chaco Canyon in the USA and the Jaarash Archaeological site in Jordan.
Values-based management approaches and methods continue to adapt and evolve. One of the significant contributors to the Burra Charter and its revisions, Meredith Walker, reflected recently that the process, planning and regulatory environment for heritage has dominated the way heritage practice has evolved. This has perhaps been at the expense of more creative approaches to the transmission of heritage values, which are in fact central to the definition of heritage itself (Walker 2014).

There is always need for reflection on the nature of professional heritage practice, and it is indeed the stated mission of Australia ICOMOS to ensure that such debates continue in order to generate innovative ideas that inspire future approaches.

**Collaboration for creative solutions:** The new development of a new youth hostel in the historic Rocks precinct of downtown Sydney required protection of the sensitive archaeological site underneath and a negotiated design solution. The result involved the development ‘floating’ above carefully presented archaeological layers, an onsite archaeology education centre and interpretation that included reference to the original vertical streetscape represented in the archaeology. This project demonstrated the increasing interest in actively including interpretation as part of conservation approaches. ICOMOS members bring collaboration and innovation to projects such as this and many others around the country. (Photo: Nicholas Hall)
The Burra Charter

The Burra Charter is a best practice standard developed by Australia ICOMOS for managing cultural heritage places in Australia. The Burra Charter was formally adopted by Australia ICOMOS on 19 August 1979. Importantly, from its outset it has always been considered to be an evolving work and has been the subject of major revisions in 1988, 1999 and 2013.

The origins of the Burra Charter lie in a unique Australian response to the Venice Charter of 1964. The authors of the Venice Charter did encourage nationally appropriate application, the Charter’s preamble states:

“It is essential that the principles guiding the preservation and restoration of ancient buildings should be agreed and be laid down on an international basis, with each country being responsible for applying the plan within the framework of its own culture and traditions.” (ICOMOS 1964)

At the inaugural Australia ICOMOS National Conference in Beechworth in April 1978, it became apparent that in the international arena, there was a lack of appetite to consider evolution of the Venice Charter, the official creed for ICOMOS since its inception. This led to a conundrum amongst Australian ICOMOS members. Many Australians considered that the language of the Venice Charter did not reflect their experience of heritage and heritage conservation. There were concerns for how professional practice in Australia might proceed:

“It was felt that if we adopted the Venice Charter as it was written then it would be ignored or dismissed as irrelevant [in Australia].” (Bourke 2004a)
The need for stronger guidance for practice within Australia was apparent:

“We wanted to bridge professional fields, physical domains and layers of time and we reviewed the expertise across the country. We were looking for a common language and professional standards.” (Domicelj 2004)

Broad agreement was reached at the Beechworth conference about the need for an Australian adaptation of the Venice Charter. The first conference resolution reads:

1. **RESOLVED that Australia-ICOMOS should prepare a statement suitable for interpretation and application by Commonwealth, State, and local government authorities and private institutions. The statement should emphasise the need for a comprehensive approach to heritage conservation, and should discuss the contribution that can be made by various disciplines and skills, and should outline the process by which alternation or conservation of historic structures or sites should be carried out.**

Following the Beechworth conference, the Australia ICOMOS Executive Committee discussed the adaptation of the **Venice Charter** and in December, a copy of the **Venice Charter** with annotations was published in the Australia ICOMOS Newsletter. In February 1979 a sub-committee was appointed to write the Charter and a draft document was thrashed out by June 1979. A first draft Charter was published in the Australia ICOMOS Newsletter in July 1979 alongside the **Venice Charter**.

Australia ICOMOS members next met in the historic town of Burra in South Australia. Discussions at the Burra Conference were informed by case studies such as the restoration works at Port Arthur, Norfolk Island, Hill End and at the Aboriginal settlement at Wybalenna on Flinders Island. Concerns were raised about the various conservation approaches used (Mulvaney 2004) and the discussions firmly underlined the need for prior research into a place’s significance and for coordinated planning approaches that became fundamental to the emerging Australian Charter.

At the Kooringa Hotel on the 19 August 1979, the **Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter)** was endorsed.

**Charter birthplace:** The Kooringa Hotel in Burra, where the Burra Charter emerged after considerable late night discussion on details and wording of the Charter by Australia ICOMOS members. (Source: Mapio.net.)
As the members of the youthful Australia ICOMOS were starting to flex some muscle, there was a need to reassure the parent organization and this involved recognising the ICOMOS position, while also stating clearly the direction Australia ICOMOS was taking. In September 1979, the Chair of Australia ICOMOS, Professor David Saunders, put the position in these terms:

“Australia ICOMOS continues to respect and observe the Venice Charter as a document of International agreement and sees these guidelines as following it closely in most respects: this Australian document, however, is now the working document for use in Australia, binding to ICOMOS membership and recommended to all Australian authorities and organisations concerned with conservation of the built environment and all places with cultural significance.” (Saunders in Hanna 2015)

The Burra Charter was amended before its formal adoption by Australia ICOMOS on 23 February 1981. From the outset, the need for regular reflection, review and revision of the document has been at its heart. This has been a notable aspect and part of the success of the Burra Charter’s credibility quite aside from its content (Bourke 2004b). The principle of continual improvement has in fact been one of the most distinctive features of the Burra Charter in contrast to the static history of the Venice Charter.

Very quickly from its birth, the Burra Charter became an official reference for managers of heritage sites. This was greatly assisted by the Australian Heritage Commission insisting on its use by all applicants for National Estate Grants (Bourke 2004a).

The degree to which the Burra Charter attracted general support both nationally and internationally in its early years has been seen by some as divine providence, “nothing short of a small miracle” (Bourke 2004a). However, it more realistically is a testament to the hard work and collaborative ethos underpinning Australia ICOMOS:
“Its general acceptance has been notable, a tribute to the quality of the work and a reflection of the involvement in ICOMOS and in the framing of the charter of experts from all major institutions and from all the professions.” (Yencken 1982)

As a prominent and much used document, the Burra Charter has been the subject of critique (for example Smith 2006 and Waterton et al 2006). Reviews of the Charter have been influenced by such criticism and analysis, and Australia ICOMOS members have actively engaged in debates challenging views about heritage practice (see for example Ireland and Blair 2015 and the other papers in the 2015 volume of Historic Environment: ‘The Future for Heritage Practice’).

The Burra Charter has stood the test of time and continues to be highly regarded as a statement of principles and a guide for practice.

“For more than twenty years we have lived with that fine Charter – conceived in Beechworth 1978 and Goulburn 1979 and born in Burra – and lived with its wide application, its amendments and guidelines too. It is blessed with clarity of purpose.” (David Saunders in Domicelj 2004)

**Burra heritage landscape:** The copper mines at Burra are a heritage landscape consisting of landscape features as well as built heritage. (Source: Princess Royal Station)
One of the most important innovations for which the **Burra Charter** is noted was to make use of the term ‘place’ instead of ‘monument’ and ‘site’. This was part of the effort to adopt a more multi-disciplinary approach. It was also introduced to allow for those situations where traditional values and intangible aspects were more important than the physical ‘fabric’ and where cultural values were attached to landscape features (Logan 2004). The notion of ‘place’ and the shift away from the physical form or ‘fabric’ of heritage to a more general concept of significance and identifying a range of values has become widely accepted around the world (Logan 2004).

“The Burra Charter has become the best known guide for values-based management. Its methodology emphasizes a collaborative process by providing a well-defined sequence of steps to determine value...Furthermore, since values are identified and assigned, they are attributed rather than intrinsic. Therefore, values can change over time depending on stakeholder’s viewpoints.” (Jerome 2014)

**Challenges for heritage practice:** The resolution of a dispute over the use of a stone from an Aboriginal sacred site for the grave of the Reverend John Flynn near Alice Springs was a demonstration of the challenges of conflicting values for heritage places (Photo: Nicholas Hall).
Requiring a thorough investigation of the significance of places helps to untangle complex issues of apparent conflict as well as allowing and encouraging Indigenous and other voices to articulate the value of places to their communities in their own way. While specific expertise is highly valued, the Burra Charter, also encourages the heritage practitioner to be a facilitator, bringing these diverse perspectives forward where they may otherwise be rendered invisible.

Standing aside from, but hand in hand with legislation, the Burra Charter has achieved tremendous advances in heritage practice in Australia. It is has arisen from a uniquely Australian understanding of heritage informed by our experience of the landscape, by growing awareness of Indigenous perspectives and the diversity of cultural influences in our more recent past.

In having to engage with a diversity of multi-cultural and multi-disciplinary perspectives, the Burra Charter is robust enough to be able to inform cross-cultural dialogue. This has been important in Australia, but also part of its interest and appeal beyond Australia’s shores, extending from New Zealand, to the Pacific, Southeast Asia, China and further afield.

Translations of the Burra Charter in Indonesian, French and Spanish are available on the Australia ICOMOS website.

As it continues to adapt and evolve, it is anticipated the Burra Charter will continue to play an important role as a facilitator for dialogue, and that is its key strength.
The work of ICOMOS in Australia and beyond

The work of Australia ICOMOS is balanced between its national interest and its engagement in the global mandate of ICOMOS to improve heritage practice and to perform its formal role within the World Heritage System.

Within Australia, Australia ICOMOS organises well-attended annual conferences, professional and technical seminars and workshops, produces resource documents and advocates for reform and improvements to heritage practices, government legislation, policies and programs.

The Australia ICOMOS Secretariat, based at Deakin University in Melbourne since 2000, co-ordinates membership, submissions, projects, manages a website and produces a weekly edition of Australia ICOMOS Enews. This electronic update is sent to the membership and others nationally and internationally, offering information about upcoming events, employment opportunities, seminars and conferences and heritage news items. The Australia ICOMOS website provides a valuable range of resources, policies and links to heritage resource documents that are widely used by members, government, students and others within Australia and beyond.

*Historic Environment* is the refereed journal of the organisation. It brings together dynamic, critical interdisciplinary research in the field of cultural heritage and heritage conservation. All articles submitted to *Historic Environment* are double-blind peer-reviewed, and the journal was ranked ‘A’ under the former ERA classification scheme. The journal publishes three issues per year, with many following a specific theme.

Australia ICOMOS has founded National Scientific Committees (NSCs) to progress particular heritage outcomes at home. The first Australia ICOMOS NSC to be formed was the joint NSC for Cultural Landscapes and Cultural Routes in 2010, followed more recently by an NSC on Intangible Cultural Heritage and an NSC on Energy and Sustainability.
Australia ICOMOS’ advocacy role has been a central activity from its commencement, with submissions on cultural heritage legislation and guidelines carrying influence and impact on decisions at the state and national level. Australia ICOMOS lobbies government on heritage issues such as funding, legislation, site protection, listing and protocols and provides expert advice to government and non-government working groups.

Australia ICOMOS has played carefully considered roles in a number of key national debates. This has included providing advice on the proposed Franklin Dam in 1982 and also in relation to a proposed Uranium mine at Jabiluka in Kakadu National Park in 1998. In the case of Jabiluka, Australia ICOMOS was approached by ICOMOS in Paris to provide advice on the matter that was the subject of a mission from the World Heritage Committee looking at whether Kakadu National Park should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In its report responding to the World Heritage Committee, the Australian Government recommended that Australia ICOMOS continue to have a specific role in providing advice for a cultural heritage management plan to ensure that cultural heritage matters are adequately considered in any future decisions (Commonwealth of Australia 1999).

There have always been close links between Australia ICOMOS and statutory authorities in that many employees of such agencies were also Australia ICOMOS members. ICOMOS has always played an important role as a professional association for people working in heritage-related fields. In an individual professional capacity, Australia ICOMOS members have contributed extensively to the development of the national heritage system, including in the process of developing legislation in all states and territories and in contributing to *State of the Environment* reports. They are also active in local and state and territory heritage protection issues.
As an Australian chapter of an international organization, Australia ICOMOS members are actively involved in the global mandate of ICOMOS. This includes conservation advice across a range of specialist fields, evaluation of World Heritage nominations, responses to State of Conservation reports, various forms of missions that visit heritage properties, capacity building and policy development (Harrington and Buckley 2014).

Australia ICOMOS has long been active in the governance of ICOMOS, contributing its first representative to the ICOMOS Executive Committee in 1981 and keeping a representative there continually since 1991: Max Bourke (1981-1987), Joan Domicelj (1991-1996), Sheridan Burke (1996-2005), Kristal Buckley (2005-2014), Peter Phillips (2014-present) and Sheridan Burke (2016 – present as President of the ICOMOS Advisory Committee). All of these individuals also served as International Vice Presidents of the parent body.

Numerous Australia ICOMOS members participate in the 28 ICOMOS International Scientific Committees which meet regularly around the globe to develop expertise on specific heritage issues. In 2016, five of these committees were chaired by Australia ICOMOS members. A significant number of Australia ICOMOS members regularly attend international forums of ICOMOS and the triennial ICOMOS General Assemblies.

Australia ICOMOS members have been instrumental in the development of international heritage initiatives and policy. Australia’s experience in the application of values-based approaches has added significantly to the evolution of the World Heritage Operational Guidelines and the ideas of monitoring conservation outcomes. Aspects of the Global strategy and the recognition of associative cultural landscapes were also strongly influenced by Australian representatives, often in conjunction with our New Zealand colleagues. (Harrington and Buckley 2014).
Australia has often worked closely in conjunction with New Zealand ICOMOS, jointly attending each other’s meetings and collaborating on important global initiatives, particularly in support of colleagues in the Pacific region. This included the formation of ICOMOS Pasifika in 2007 - 2008.

Australia’s collaboration with China to develop heritage conservation principles for the world’s most populous nation stands as a major contribution of Australia to international heritage practice. The process of developing the China Principles demonstrated the capacity of ICOMOS members and the framework of the Burra Charter to be critically reflective and flexibly adaptable to the challenges of conservation in different cultural settings and in facilitating cross-cultural dialogue.

Some of the notable highlights of the Australian influence and individual’s contribution to the work of ICOMOS and its World Heritage mandate, and references which relate to the work, include:

• John Mulvaney’s contribution to the World Heritage Committee meeting in June 1977 which framed the original listing criteria (see Mulvaney 2004);

• Isabel McBryde’s contribution to the expert meeting on Cultural Landscapes at La Petite Pierre, France in 1992 and the framing of the approach to associative cultural landscapes (see McBryde 2014);

• Joan Domicelj’s work on the Eger-Xi’an Principles for The International Scientific Committees and the Global World Heritage Strategy (see Hanna 2015);

• Sharon Sullivan’s work on the China Principles between 1997 and 2002 (see Qian 2007);

• Sheridan Burke’s work on the ICOMOS members’ Ethical Commitment Statement between 1999 and 2002 (see Bourke 2004b);

• Duncan Marshall’s role as coordinating author of Preparing World Heritage Nominations (see UNESCO 2011) and his training role for the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR); and

• Peter Phillips’ role in the amendment to the ICOMOS Statutes, which were adopted at the 18th General Assembly (Florence, Italy) on 12 November 2014 (see http://www.icomos.org/en/about-icomos/mission-and-vision/statutes-and-policies).

As Kristal Buckley remarked in the Australia ICOMOS annual report of 2014, Australia has a robust profile within ICOMOS:

“As one of the strongest Executive Committees, there are many ways that Australian members have participated in the international work of ICOMOS... Many of these contributions were wholly or substantially self-funded. So, although we often feel that the tyranny of distance prevents Australian, New Zealand and Pacific Island heritage practitioners from taking a place in the international work of ICOMOS to the extent we would ideally wish, in fact we are very visible and respected. This is an amazing and substantial contribution.”

The President of ICOMOS, Gustavo Araoz, also wrote in 2015:

“Whether they are issues of funding, of theory, of World Heritage, of governance, statutes and ethical commitments, of the ISCs, of cooperation with affinity organizations, of engaging a new generation, of assistance to the more needy, Australia ICOMOS is always present and active, making great contributions that all of us non-Aussies can use. If all our National Committees were like you, ICOMOS would be in control of the planet.” (Hanna 2015)

Australia ICOMOS members have made remarkable achievements over a few short decades and across a variety of forums: legislative, bureaucratic, professional, technical, historical, scholarly and communicative, and often in their own scarcely available and generously donated time.

The personal and collective commitment of its members underpins the value of Australia ICOMOS as a dynamic and innovative professional organisation devoted to the public good of improving heritage conservation in Australia and internationally.
Keeping the place and stories alive: The Stock Exchange Arcade in the Queensland gold mining town of Charters Towers was built in 1888. Here the price of gold was set and connected to world trade markets, via telegraph, three times per day. Restored in the 1970s, the arcade now takes pride of place as a centre for the town’s tourist trade. New uses have been found including a museum, gallery, café and commercial space to ensure a sustainable future for the building. The original use of the arcade is interpreted via a mechanical display which brings to life the arcade’s former life. Australia ICOMOS members are keenly aware of the need for heritage to find viable new uses in the life of communities. (Photo: Gordon Smith).
### A timeline of key events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Royal National Park is proclaimed on 26 April, becoming the second National Park in the Word, following Yellowstone in the USA in 1872.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Tasmania’s <em>Scenery Preservation Act</em> becomes the first heritage statute in Australia. The Act provided for Boards to be established for the management of specific areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>The International Museums Office (a League of Nations agency) holds a conference in Athens in October 1931. The resolutions of the conference are adopted by the League in 1932 and are often referred to as the <em>Athens Charter</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>The first major Australian cultural heritage institution, the National Trust is established in Sydney on 6 April 1945, modelled on the English National Trust. Further state-based chapters are formed from 1955 – 1963.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>In New South Wales, amendments to the Local Government Act 1906, allow for “preservation of places or objects of historical or scientific interest or natural beauty or advantage” through planning schemes. This is one of the first examples in Australia of legislated protection of heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>There is a rapid growth in conservation groups in Australia, demonstrating an increase in interest in natural and cultural heritage protection in Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>In June 1964, The Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies is established as a statutory body under its own Act of Federal Parliament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>A conference in Venice, Italy in May 1964, passes a resolution including the <em>International Restoration Charter</em> or <em>Venice Charter</em> as it became known. UNESCO also puts forward a resolution providing for the creation of the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). Two Australians attended this meeting. Ted Farmer the NSW Government Architect and Raphael Cilento, Chair of the Queensland National Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>The first Australian legislation dedicated to protecting cultural heritage, the <em>Aboriginal and Historic Relics Preservation Act</em> 1965 is passed in South Australia. Legislation in other states follows in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory follows later.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A timeline of key events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>The first General Assembly and <strong>founding meeting of ICOMOS</strong> is held in Warsaw, Poland on the 21-22 June 1965. The meeting adopts the <strong>Venice Charter</strong> as its foundational text and creed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>A National Council of National Trusts is established in Australia as a federated voice for the state-based National Trust chapters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>In August 1967, the Australian National University hosts a seminar jointly with the newly-formed Australian Council of National Trusts focussing on issues on ‘preservation’ of heritage and attracted 117 participants. Architects and others debated ‘restoration’ issues, but the concept of values and use of the term ‘conservation’ was not present (Mulvaney 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>The NSW Builders’ Labourers Federation (BLF) institutes bans on construction at the Kelly’s Bush site at Hunters Hill on Sydney Harbour. This is to be the first of 42 ‘green bans’ made by the BLF on building sites across Australia in the early 1970s to protect the natural and cultural heritage of these places. This concerted industrial action raises the profile of heritage protection issues nationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>In November 1972, the General Conference of the United National Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) adopts the <strong>Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage</strong>. Known as the <strong>World Heritage Convention</strong>. The convention names ICOMOS as one of the organisations to advise the World Heritage Committee on its deliberations, giving the organization a recognized formal role in global heritage practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Australia’s Labor Government establishes a Commission of Enquiry in the National Estate led by Justice Robert Hope. Seven men and women with interests in natural and cultural heritage prepare a report into the state of natural and cultural heritage – both European and Aboriginal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1974 | In April the Hope Commission of enquiry presents its report to the Whitlam Government. The report included 99 recommendations, including most notably:  
- that Australia should consider becoming a member of ICOMOS and that a National Committee of the Council be established in Australia;  
- that Australia ratify the World Heritage Convention; and  
- that Australia set up “an independent statutory commission” to take a lead in conserving the National Estate. |
| 1974 | The Australian Government appoints an ‘interim Committee of the National Estate’ to begin implementing the recommendations of the Hope Report. One of the Hope Commissioners, David Yencken is appointed interim Chair. |
On 22 August 1974, Australia is one of the first countries to sign the World Heritage Convention.

Victoria passes the *Historic Buildings Act* which is the first significant piece of legislation directed at protecting historic built heritage.

On 19 June 1975, the Commonwealth parliament passes the *Australian Heritage Commission Act*, creating the Australian Heritage Commission and establishing a definition of the National Estate based on the recommendations of the Hope Report. David Yencken is appointed the founding Chair with the responsibility to oversee the appointment of fellow commissioners.

The Fraser Government appoints the first group of Australian Heritage Commissioners. On 27 July 1976, the first meeting of the Australian Heritage Commission is held in Canberra.

On 20 October 1976, **Australia ICOMOS is founded** at a meeting in the historic mansion, Illawarra House in Toorak, Victoria. A group of sixteen people present are the founding members, two of whom were already members of ICOMOS.

The first meeting of the World Heritage Committee is held in Paris in June. Professor John Mulvaney, a founding member of Australia ICOMOS, represents Australia in the first deliberations to frame the criteria for the World Heritage List.

The first edition of the Australia ICOMOS Newsletter is published. At this time, Australia is one of only four of the sixty national committees of ICOMOS producing a newsletter.

The first Australia ICOMOS National Conference is held in Beechworth, Victoria. The meeting agrees that an Australian adaptation of the *Venice Charter* was needed.

The Australia ICOMOS Executive appoints a sub-committee to draft an Australian adaptation of the *Venice Charter* in February. Members included Dr Miles Lewis, Dr Judy Birmingham, Professor David Saunders, Dr Jim Kerr and Peter James.

**The Australia ICOMOS meeting in the historic town of Burra in South Australia on 19 August provisionally endorses ‘The Australia ICOMOS Guidelines for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance’ (The *Burra Charter*)** after exhaustive discussion and debate. The guidelines document is first published in the Australia ICOMOS Newsletter in September.
The first edition of the Australia ICOMOS journal, *Historic Environment*, is published in December.

Australia ICOMOS strategically organizes a visit to Australia by Dr Bernard Feilden, a restoration architect and Director of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property in Rome (ICCROM) to inspect conservation work at sites in Sydney including Hyde Park Barracks and Elizabeth Farm. Dr Feilden emphasises the need for appropriately formulated conservation objectives and policy and advocated a collaborative, multidisciplinary working approach between specialists and the client (Domicelj 1980).

A slightly amended version of the *Burra Charter* is adopted at the Australia ICOMOS meeting in Melbourne on 23 February.

Australian Max Bourke is elected to the ICOMOS Executive Committee at the 6th ICOMOS General Assembly in Rome in May. A copy of the *Burra Charter* is distributed to participants.

In June, David Yencken tables a report in the Australian parliament: *The National Estate in 1981, a report of the Australian Heritage Commission*. This report states that “The *Burra Charter* has been adopted by the Commission and has progressively been adopted by all the heritage authorities and National Trusts around Australia.” (Yencken 1982)

The World Heritage Committee meets at the Sydney Opera House from 26 – 30 October.

Australia ICOMOS resolves to oppose the controversial damming of the Franklin River in Tasmania and writes to the Prime Minister, Malcom Fraser, regarding the dam’s effect on the outstanding natural and cultural values of the proposed South West Tasmania World Heritage Area. Particular concern was raised about the effect on important Aboriginal archaeological sites.

Australia ICOMOS member, James Semple (Jim) Kerr publishes the first edition of *The Conservation Plan* (Kerr 1982), a ground-breaking work that expanded on the methodology of the *Burra Charter*. It has since been revised (Kerr 2013) and is now available on the Australia ICOMOS website.

Australia ICOMOS begins developing guidelines to accompany the *Burra Charter* with the adoption on a trial basis of ‘Guidelines for Conservation Analyses and Plans’.
The Australia ICOMOS National Conference in Victoria focusses on the application of the *Burra Charter* to different types of places. The conference also reviews draft guidelines for assessing significance and preparing conservation policy.

Australia ICOMOS adopts the *Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance* on 23 February, outlining in more detail the concept of cultural significance and the means for collecting information and preparing reports that assess significance. On 25 May, the *Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Conservation Policy* were also adopted.

Australia ICOMOS adopts the *Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Undertaking Studies and Reports* on 23 April.

A draft *New Zealand Charter* (originally known as the *Aotearoa Charter*) inspired by the *Burra Charter* is published. The Charter contains significant differences accounting for Maori belief including where decay is linked to the spiritual significance of places and the long tradition of relocating buildings. It was formally adopted by New Zealand ICOMOS in 1992.

In March, the Australia ICOMOS National Conference is held in Perth. Participants visit the Goonininup/Swan Brewery site, the subject of a conflict between the Indigenous cultural significance of the site and the historic values of the Brewery site. This visit leads to passionate discussions.


Australia ICOMOS hosts the ICOMOS International Conference in Sydney in November with the theme ‘Whose cultural values?’. This is the first ICOMOS meeting held in the Southern Hemisphere and includes meetings of a large number of ICOMOS Advisory Committees.

Australia ICOMOS publishes the first edition of *The Illustrated Burra Charter: Making good decisions about the care of important places* (Marquis-Kyle and Walker 1992), which provides commentary on each *Burra Charter* article with examples from around Australia using a diverse range of places and significance.
Following the debates in Perth and Sydney in 1992, discussions between Australia ICOMOS and the Australian Heritage Commission identifies the need to investigate the issues underlying cultural diversity, heritage places and the ethics of conservation. This leads to a project being funded in 1993 to develop a discussion paper and guidelines for the resolution of conservation disputes (Marshall 2000).


A *Burra Charter* review workshop is held in Canberra in April.


The Australian Government Minister for Environment and Heritage establishes the National Cultural Heritage Forum to represent cultural heritage interests at the national level. Australia ICOMOS provides the Chair and Secretary for the Forum, membership of which also includes the Australian Council of National Trusts, Museums Australia, Royal Australian Institute of Architects, Federation of Australian Historical Societies, Collections Council of Australia, Australasian Society for Historical Archaeology and the Australasian Institute of Maritime Archaeology with the Australian Heritage Council and Heritage Chairs and Officials of Australia and New Zealand heritage agencies also participating.

Australia ICOMOS publishes the brochure *Understanding the Burra Charter: A simple guide to the principles of heritage conservation in Australia* as a brief introduction to heritage practice for distribution by state heritage agencies and others.

A tripartite agreement between the Chinese Government, The Getty Conservation Institute in Los Angeles and the Australian Heritage Commission is enacted to commence development of a set of heritage guidelines for China using the *Burra Charter* as a model. The Australian Heritage Commission consults with Australia ICOMOS regarding the project.

A National Heritage Convention is held in Old Parliament House in Canberra on 6 – 7 August with over 220 participants. Australia ICOMOS members play a prominent role.
In October 1998, Australia ICOMOS provides a submission to the World Heritage Committee Mission investigating the impact on the World Heritage Listed Kakadu National Park of a proposed uranium mine at Jabiluka. Australia ICOMOS’s position supports the local Aboriginal people who are opposed to the mine proceeding. This view conflicts with the Australian Government position which supports the mine going ahead. This creates tension between Australia ICOMOS and the Australian Government.

- **1998**
  - Australia ICOMOS provides a submission to the World Heritage Committee Mission investigating the impact on Kakadu National Park.
  - Australia ICOMOS adopts the *Code on the ethics of co-existence in conserving significant places*.
  - Australia ICOMOS goes online with the launch of its website on 8 May.
  - Australia ICOMOS adopts a major revision of the *Burra Charter* after five years of work at a meeting in Tocal, New South Wales in November.

- **2000**
  - The World Heritage Committee meeting is held in Cairns, Queensland from 23 November – 2 December.

- **2001**
  - Australia ICOMOS releases a video/DVD explaining the *Burra Charter*.
  - Australia ICOMOS prepares a submission and presents to a Senate Hearing on amendments to the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*.

- **2002**
  - The Chinese government finalises the *Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China – the China Principles*, published in both Chinese and English in May. Australian ICOMOS member Sharon Sullivan play a leading role in *The China Principles* which are influenced by the *Burra Charter* approach (Qian 2007).
  - Translations of the *Burra Charter* in Bahasa Indonesian and French are added to the Australia ICOMOS website. Additional translations in German and Tagalog (Philippines) are made.
Taking effect on 1 January, amendments to the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 create the Australian Heritage Council to replace the Australian Heritage Commission. The Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975 is repealed on the same day. The responsibility of the Register of the National Estate, containing records of over 13,000 heritage places passes to the Australian Heritage Council.

Following substantial revisions to the Burra Charter a revised edition of the Illustrated Burra Charter is produced: The Illustrated Burra Charter: Good practice for heritage places (Marquis-Kyle and Walker 2004).

On the 19 February, the Register of the National Estate is closed and places can no longer be added to or removed from the list.

Australia ICOMOS assists Pacific colleagues in the establishment of a new regional committee for ICOMOS representing Pacific Island Nations, ICOMOS Pasifika. Australia ICOMOS supports ICOMOS Pasifika members to travel to Cairns to hold their first board meeting and participate in the Australia ICOMOS National Conference.

The National Cultural Heritage Forum, in which Australia ICOMOS took part, is disbanded by Peter Garrett, the Minister for Environment Protection, Heritage and the Arts.

Australia ICOMOS commences a mentoring program in the Australian Capital Territory linking younger and older professionals. This experience is built on with a mentoring programs established in Victoria and New South Wales in 2012.

Australia hosts the annual meeting of the Twentieth Century Heritage International Scientific Committee at the Unloved Modern Australia ICOMOS conference in Sydney.

On 19 February 2012 all references to the Register of the National Estate are removed from the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 and the Australian Heritage Council Act 2003.

In November, Australia ICOMOS adopts a new revision of the Burra Charter and its three Guidelines are replaced by three Practice Notes. A further four practice notes are added:

- The Burra Charter and Archaeological Practice
- The Burra Charter and Indigenous Cultural Heritage Management
- Interpretation
- Burra Charter Article 22 – New Work.
Australia ICOMOS hosts the meeting of the International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes in Canberra in November. At this meeting, the *Canberra Declaration* is endorsed outlining a position on the heritage listing and conservation of Canberra’s cultural landscape.

After many years of support from the Australian Government, Australia ICOMOS loses annual funding for its secretariat administrative costs as the Government’s Grants to Voluntary Environment, Sustainability and Heritage Organisations Program ceases.

Australia ICOMOS establishes the Jim Kerr Memorial Address. The first address is given by Joan Domicelj AM at the Sydney Opera House on 18 April, the International Day for Monuments and Sites.

Australia ICOMOS hosts the meeting of two International Scientific Committees, Cultural Landscapes and Intangible Cultural Heritage in Port Fairy in June.

In May, after many years of preparation, Australia ICOMOS holds a conservation workshop in Levuka Fiji as part of supporting Pacific heritage practitioners. The workshop was held in conjunction with ICOMOS Pasifika.

Additional translations of the *Burra Charter* into Chinese, Burmese and Japanese are completed.

Australia ICOMOS finalises a report by Bronwyn Hanna on the history and development of Australia ICOMOS.

On the 9 December, the Australia Government releases a National Heritage Strategy.

Australia ICOMOS establishes the Australia ICOMOS President’s Award for early career professionals and tradespersons.
Living cultural heritage:  
This Baobab tree in the Northern Territory is named after explorer Augustus Gregory and his party, who camped near it on July 2nd 1855. It is also highly significant to the Ngarinman people. Australia ICOMOS prides itself in developing conservation approaches which recognise and respect all the contributing values a heritage place may have.  
(Photo: Nicholas Hall)
Australia ICOMOS National Conferences and themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Beechworth, VIC.</td>
<td><em>The Tide of Settlement</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Broken Hill, NSW.</td>
<td><em>Aboriginal and European sites in an Arid Environment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Melbourne, VIC.</td>
<td><em>Analysis of Cultural Significance</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Adelaide, SA.</td>
<td><em>Adaptation of Historic buildings and Places</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Melbourne, VIC.</td>
<td><em>Maintaining City Character</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Canberra, ACT.</td>
<td><em>Cultural Values in Parks and Natural Areas</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Sydney, NSW.</td>
<td><em>Old and New in Australian Cities</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Adelaide, SA.</td>
<td><em>Cultural Heritage and Tourism</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Sydney, NSW.</td>
<td><em>The Past at Work: Industrial history</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Freemantle, WA.</td>
<td><em>Underwater Cultural Heritage: Principles and Practice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Melbourne, VIC.</td>
<td><em>History of the Chinese in Australia and South Pacific</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Launceston, TAS.</td>
<td><em>Railway Heritage</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Charters Towers, QLD.</td>
<td><em>Timber Construction</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Sydney, NSW.</td>
<td><em>No theme</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Tocal, NSW.</td>
<td><em>Rural Heritage: Burra in the Bush</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Canberra, NSW.</td>
<td><em>World Heritage: Listing, Management and Monitoring</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Alice Springs, NT.</td>
<td><em>Making Tracks - From Point to Pathway: The Heritage of Routes &amp; Journeys</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Jindabyne, NSW.</td>
<td><em>Celebrating mountains</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Manly, NSW.</td>
<td><em>Telling tales: Interpretation in the Conservation and Design Process</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Port Arthur, TAS.</td>
<td><em>Loving it to Death: Tourism</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Melbourne, VIC.</td>
<td><em>Corrugations: The Romance and Reality of Historic Roads</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2006  Freemantle, WA.  Challenge and Change
2007  Cairns, QLD.  eXtreme Heritage
2009  Sydney, NSW.  Unloved Modern
2010  Broken Hill, NSW.  Outback and Beyond
2011  Melbourne, VIC.  Watermarks: Water Heritage
2012  Sydney, NSW.  40 Years of the World Heritage Convention
2013  Canberra, ACT.  Imagined pasts, Imagined futures – Centenary of Canberra
2016  Melbourne, VIC.  The People’s Ground

Order in the house: Australia ICOMOS members in deliberation in the House of Representatives Chamber of Old Parliament House during the Australia ICOMOS National Conference held in Canberra in 2013. (Photo: Allan McLean)
Collaboration for conservation

Australia ICOMOS Presidents

1976-78  David Yencken (businessman, environmentalist, academic and founding chair of the Australian Heritage Commission)
1978-79  David Saunders (architect, academic)
1979-81  Clive Lucas (conservation architect)
1981-82  Joan Domicelj (architect, planner and mediator)
1982-83  Miles Lewis (architect, academic)
1983-84  Max Bourke (senior administrator)
1985-86  Michael (Mike) Pearson (archaeologist, heritage consultant)
1986-87  Meredith Walker (town planner, heritage consultant)
1987-90  Jane Lennon (geographer, heritage consultant)
1990-92  Joan Domicelj (architect, planner and mediator)
1992-94  Ian Stapleton (conservation architect)
1994-97  Sandy Blair (historian, heritage management specialist)
1997-98  Robyn Riddett (architectural historian)
1998-2000 Marilynn Truscott (heritage management specialist)
2000-02  William (Bill) Logan (geographer)
2002-05  Kristal Buckley (heritage consultant, academic)
2005-08  Peter Phillips (conservation architect)
2008-10  Susan McIntyre-Tamwoy (anthropologist, archaeologist, heritage consultant)
2010-12  Jane Harrington (archaeologist)
2012-15  Elizabeth Vines (conservation architect)
2015-16  Kerime Danis (architectural heritage consultant)
Australia ICOMOS members elected to ICOMOS roles

1981-1987  Max Bourke (elected ICOMOS Vice President in 1984-87)
1990-1996  Joan Domicelj (elected ICOMOS Vice President 1993-96)
1996-2005  Sheridan Burke (elected ICOMOS Vice President 1999-2005)
2005-2014  Kristal Buckley (elected ICOMOS Vice-President 2005-2014)
2014-      Peter Phillips (elected ICOMOS Vice-President)
2015-      Sheridan Burke (elected Advisory Committee President)

Honours and awards

The Australia ICOMOS Executive Committee can confer a lifetime honorary membership to honour an outstanding contribution made to, or on behalf of, Australia ICOMOS. The existing honorary Australia ICOMOS members are:

- Isabel McBryde (2002)
- John Mulvaney (2005)
- Duncan Marshall (2007)
- Sheridan Burke (2014)

ICOMOS International can also award Honorary membership for those who have made a substantial contribution to the international sphere. The existing Australians who are International ICOMOS Honorary Members are:

- Joan Domicelj (1999)
- Sharon Sullivan (2005)
- James Semple Kerr (2011)
- Kristal Buckley AM (2014)
Many faces of Australia ICOMOS: Many dedicated people have made valuable contributions to the work of ICOMOS over the years. It is however, the capacity to collaborate and harness the experience and wisdom of its members, and to do this in a uniquely Australian way, that characterises Australia ICOMOS contribution to heritage practice nationally and internationally. (Photo collage: Sheridan Burke)
References


ICOMOS International 1964 International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The *Venice Charter*).


Vision and innovation: Industrial and engineering heritage has been celebrated in Australia through the work of both the National Trust and the efforts of Australia ICOMOS members. In Western Australia, the Golden Pipeline was considered a ludicrous idea when it was proposed in the 1890s, and yet it became an international engineering feat diverting water from the coastal hills near Perth inland for 600km. It still provides water for over 100,000 people today. Without vision and innovation, monumental tasks may seem insurmountable. Australia ICOMOS members have often used innovation and creativity to address the challenges facing heritage conservation in Australia and globally. (Photo: Damien Calvert).
Collaboration in conservation: Professional practice in heritage conservation can sometimes feel like a roller coaster of highs and lows, wins and losses. Australia ICOMOS provides opportunities for professionals in heritage-related fields to get together, to support each other, to collaborate and to have fun. At the same time we are rewarded with the experience of visiting heritage places and gaining new appreciation of the diversity of the forms and expressions of heritage. (Luna Park, Melbourne, Photo: Steve Collis)