

**ICOMOS TWENTIETH CENTURY HERITAGE
INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY 6 AUGUST 2012, 8:30 AM – 1 PM**

*The City Planning Department of the City of Helsinki
Kansakoulukatu 3, 00100 Helsinki, Finland*

DRAFT MINUTES

1.0 WELCOME, PRESENT, INTRODUCTIONS, GUESTS

1.1 The President, Sheridan Burke (Australia), welcomed attendees to the meeting. Each bureau and committee member present introduced themselves including representatives and guests from partner organizations.

1.2 **ICOMOS ISC20C Bureau** included: President: Sheridan Burke (Australia); Vice-Presidents: Natalia Dushkina (Russia); Susan Macdonald (USA/ Australia); Riitta Salastie (Finland); Yamana Yoshiyuki (Japan); Treasurer: Laura Robinson (South Africa); Secretary General: Kyle Normandin (USA).

Members included: Josef Braeken (Belgium); Louise Cox (Australia); Marianna Heikinheimo (Finland); Vaidas Petrulis (Lithuania); Robert Mayr (Austria); Robert Moore (Australia); Jack Pyburn (USA); Leo Schmidt (Germany); Vladimir Slapeta (Czech Republic); Stuart Tappin (UK); Britt Wisth (Sweden); Anke Zalivako (Germany).

Partner organisation representatives: Past President: Louise Cox (UIA); President: Ana Tostoes (Docomomo International);

Apologies Received: Enrique Xavier de Anda Alanis (Mexico); Dinu Bumbaru (Canada); Nune Chanlingayan (Armenia); Gunny Harboe (USA); Jorg Haspel (Germany); Carlos Mesen (Costa Rica); Fernando Espinosa de los Monteros (Spain); Eduardo Luis Rodriguez (Cuba).

Guest: Ana Paula Arato Goncalves (Brazil)

2.0 MEETING MINUTES, NOVEMBER 2012, PARIS, FRANCE

2.1 Minutes were confirmed by all

The Paris November 2011 meeting minutes have been circulated and floor was opened for comments and suggestions. No suggestions. Moved accepted SB seconded LC. Minute Meetings were accepted.

2.2 Matters Arising

Item 2.2.1 - Space Heritage Initiative: Laura Robinson (LR) will remain as the point person for the Space Heritage Initiative together with Leo Schmidt. Refer Agenda 8.7

Items 2.2.2 – ICOM Partnerships: SB indicated NFA from ICOMOS re mutual representation on committees. SU and SM indicated interest in modern art committee. Refer Item 7.0

Item 2.2.3 – Committee member reports: KN reported that template has been circulated which was used for annual reports to better develop the reporting process.

Template reports have been circulated. Thanks to those who responded, task is completed. SB asked to be sure that these reports will be available on ISC20C website for those who can't attend meetings. *Action KN.*

Item 2.2.4 – Membership lists: KN and RS reported that committee lists will be uploaded to the website as PDFs and that email addresses will not be included. *Action Required: KN to post membership lists to the website.*

Item 2.2.5 – Gilles Noussier database: KN reported that details of each member of the committee should be uploaded to the ICOMOS database personally. Each member is now responsible for uploading directly onto the website their own membership data including uploading of CV information areas of expertise so that it can be easily searchable by ICOMOS. Discussion noted that the system time consuming and complicated to navigate.

Action Required: Each ISC20C committee to update their membership data onto the ICOMOS Expert database.

Item 2.2.6 – Heritage Alerts – Refer agenda item 3.1

Item 2.2.7 – MAP20 project – Refer agenda item 5.1.2

Item 2.2.8 – 20th Century Thematic Framework - Refer agenda item 8.2

Item 2.2.9 – Heritage Toolkit – Refer agenda item 3.2

2.3 ISC20C Serial Sites Workshop 2012, Paris, France

ND presented a summary of the meeting minutes which were circulated to participants and an overview of the serial site discussion currently underway throughout ICOMOS. AT noted that DOCOMOMO could assist ISC20C in the organization of a method for a clear solution to the challenges of the discussion on the serial site nomination. SB welcomed on-going UIA and DoCoMo Mo collaboration. This is a major issue for longer discussion at item 8.6.

2.4 Serial Sites Symposium February 2012, Tokyo, Japan

YY reported that after the organization of the meeting in Tokyo in February 2012, a draft publication of the meeting was created, which he then distributed. There have been on-going discussions regarding the Le Corbusier serial nomination and more challenges with other serial nominations may follow eg Frank Lloyd Wright and Alvar Aalto. YY expressed hope that ISC20C would be able to assist in finding a solution collaboratively and indicated that he would like to continue to participate in the sub-committee to further develop a solution to serial site nominations generally. SB added that this is one of the first times that information on this topic has been published thanks to YY and the Japanese Government. Some follow up is needed with several speakers to finalise text and permit full publication. *(Action YY/SB)*

SM indicated that there is information on serial site nominations that have been successful (e.g. the Australian Convict Sites). SM noted that the issue maybe to focus on a link between the LC serial nomination and the heritage of the 20th century. As a first step, the sub-committee might scan of all the serial nominations that already exist and carry out research to see how similar issues were specifically addressed in the past. The current LC serial nominations (and others) are trans boundary and we should start to think about how a database maybe successfully utilized in these nominations

including any crossover in the identification of issues. A suggestion was made that a national committee like US/ ICOMOS could arrange for an intern to further research on this topic.

SB inquired if anyone would like to volunteer to be part of this sub-committee. SM, YY, SB and ND indicated interest.

Action Required: SB to circulate further inquiry to the ISC20C members for interest in a subcommittee to work on 20th Century serial nominations.

SB to chase up outstanding authors to correct their verbatim texts to YY.

KN to coordinate with YY to upload post meeting report from February 18, 2012 once finalised along with the working papers from the Tokyo meeting on Twentieth Century World Heritage Listings to the ISC20C website.

3.0 Presidents Report:

SB spoke to a written report pre-circulated to all attendees, highlighting two issues.

3.1 Heritage Alerts program which has been extremely time consuming, and we currently have four underway. We have a small *subcommittee* working on these efforts which consists of BW, GH, LR, KN and SB. When a Heritage Alert requests comes in, the information is circulated to the subcommittee and depending on each person's availability at the time, responses can be difficult. The Heritage Alert template was developed as a way to respond to the call for the Alert and to collect available information for the subcommittee to assess the situation and move forward. The template has been accepted by ICOMOS for use by national committees and other ISCs and was used for the GA resolutions.

Kamakura Art Museum: SB reported that there is a Heritage Alert underway for the Kamakura Art Museum. She has attended two meetings with the museum and the shrine with YY. The situation is well understood by ICOMOS Japan as well. While we are still in the process of collecting the information on the template, we have been able to move forward with series of visits meetings, letters and negotiations positively, with the support of ICOMOS Japan. ICOMOS WH Secretariat is aware of the implications for the nomination of the shrine for World Heritage Listing.

ACTION YY to complete the HA template. YY/SB keep in contact with ICOMOS Japan

Hong Kong SAR China Government West Wing Building: SB circulated documentation and photographs about the Heritage Alert including a description of the Central Government Offices complex and its setting, its history and the background to the risk of demolition now facing the West Wing, the third and final stage of the Government office complex.. SB noted that HA dossier template was completed by local advocacy groups and verified by the ISC20C HA Subcommittee, thanks to GH LR and BW. The HA involved a letter from SB to the HK Chief Executive and a press release.

There has been a large amount of public attention and press inquiry to this alert. The UIA and DoCoMo Mo supported the action and co-signed the letters. The SAR government of Hong Kong has replied with a strong response and SB indicated that the ISC20C is developing a response for the new government for further negotiation. SB reported that the Heritage Alert had the exact right impact as it had showed that international, well-articulated perspectives on the conservation issues can provide

valuable input into the consideration of a nationally important building complex. SB indicated that despite many approaches China ICOMOS had not commented, and that ISC20C had proceeded only following discussion with President Gustavo Araoz and Advisory Council President John Hurd. She thanked Louise Cox (Albert Dubler) UIA and Ana Tostoes for their timely support .

Action: SB indicated that the response letter to the government of Hong Kong is will be developed in consideration of the political situation and it will also be co-signed with DoCoMo Mo and UIA.

Prentice Hospital in Chicago, USA: SB indicated that there is a Heritage Alert under consideration for Prentice Hospital in Chicago. GH will advise when action is timely.
Action: GH to prepare the Heritage Alert template of information.

Kyoto Kaikan, Japan: YY provided a report on the Kyoto Kaikan including the building history and background to the risk it faces due to redevelopment for a different performance programme. The building was designed by Kunio Maekawa and is a masterpiece. Currently, the City of Kyoto has announced as the winner of a design competition a solution which will demolish half of the theatre, partially enclose the courtyard and create a new skyline. YY indicated that this has reached a critical stage as the tender documents have been issued regarding companies for demolition. ND indicated that information regarding the links between LC and Maekawa should be made clear and included as part of the discussion for heritage listing. SB indicated that we do not yet have agreement from ICOMOS Japan to proceed forward with the Heritage Alert. SB indicated that draft letters had been developed, and we will wait for JI advice. Once again the documentation will be co-signed with UIA (DoCoMo Mo having already written)

Action: SB asked YY to finalise the text for the Heritage Alert ASAP SB will coordinate letters with Japan ICOMOS and GH.

Melnikov House: ND has requested that letters of support are needed for on-going support of the Melnikov house. Issues of new development next to the site have raised new concerns on the soil hydrology of the site. ST indicated that he may be able to assist in helping to draft a letter as he completed an engineering report back in 2005 and could comment on the structural issues.

Action: SB requested that ST and ND start a draft of the letter which could be circulated to ICOMOS, DoCoMo Mo and UIA for support. ND will commence with ST.

NOTE: SB indicated that it is important to note that all of the Heritage Alerts take a large amount of time to carry out and so, the subcommittee must be selective about how many of these are taken on. SB noted that the HA templates are essential basis for taking action, and that the HA subcommittee needs significant lead time to get the facts assembled and the political approach resolved. The time involved for the President is especially significant in terms of checking NC liaison, media calls etc.

3.2 Heritage Toolkit: SB provided a brief overview of the purpose of the Toolkit which is to gather links and PDFs of relevant guidelines and case studies that are useful to our daily practice and work for the conservation and management of twentieth century heritage places and upload them to the website. These documents are being made available through web links and also through downloadable PDF documents (eg. the MD, the Burra Charter). SB indicated that this is an initiative that needs assistance to

moving it forward given LR's Busy role as treasurer general. SB explained the next steps to carry out this project in co-ordination with the ICOMOS documentation centre.

ACTION: LR/SB urgently requested volunteers to organize and manage the toolkit project to move it forward for ICOMOS. Perfect task for a University based member. Modest time input. SB will follow up with Lucille Smirnoff the ICOMOS Documentalist

4.0 PROPOSED AMENDMENT, ISC20C STATUTES

SM presented the report, which sought to implement the decision of the Committee in Paris to make minor amendments to the ISC20 Statutes to reflect the need to expand the Bureau to achieve wider regional representation and achieve the aspirations of the work plan.

The proposed amendment as circulated on 20th July 2012 to voting members, was developed in consultation with Gideon Koren (ICOMOS ICLAFI) and referred to the ISC President and Secretary General. A sentence was however missing from the proposal circulated that removed the need to vote for the officers of the committee. This was an editing problem NOT THE INTENT OF THE PROPOSED AMMENDMENT.

The email of 20 July 2012 stated that unless comments were received this statute change would be approved. As there was a mistake in the proposed statute change circulated, this requires this exercise to be redone. It was noted that these amendments would come into affect in 2014 following the next general assembly.

SM reiterated the report which stated that the few comments on the statute amendment proposal. These comments related to the following:

- 1.) time spent towards the interim management committee
- 2.) term limits and
- 3.) about how we should we should make public the actual number of votes to reflect the voting results.

SM acknowledged these useful comments however, items 1 & 3 had been previously discussed and agreed by the committee and were not proposed as part of this statute amendment proposal as discussed by the Committee in Paris. Item 3 is unrelated to the proposed statute amendment. The idea of making public of the election results was discussed.

Action: The SG to organize a vote on the amendment by electronic ballot on the proposed statute amendment.

On the matter of co-opting members in the interim period (until 2014) the voting members agreed to the Bureau's co-option of seven interim bureau representatives. The proposed and approved representatives for co-option are as follows: Fernando Espinosa de los Monteros (Spain); Gunny Harboe (USA); Susan Macdonald (Australia/ USA); Yoshiyuki Yamana (Japan); Nune Chanlingayan (Armenia); and Riitta Salastie (Finland).

5.0 SECRETARY GENERAL'S REPORT:

Paris Nov 2011 meeting minutes have been distributed and circulated. No comments were received meeting minutes accepted.

5.1 Website/ Social Media:

KN indicated that new Heritage Alert information has recently been posted to the website related to the Hong Kong West Wing heritage site.

Action: The SG shall upload the next Heritage Alerts for the Kyoto Kaikan and also for the Prentice Hospital when they are completed and approved.

Action: The SG shall also upload the new translated versions of the MD with the ISC20C foreword and local Introduction letters as they become available.

5.2 MAP20 Program: KN indicated space remains available for uploading of the MAP20 program. Remaining questions on authors consent and the possible use of images for uploading to the website needs clarification from DB and SU.

ACTION: DB and SU are to provide recommendations on obtaining author consents and uploading the MAP20 digital files and photos to the website copyright fee,

5.3. Facebook: KN noted that CMF has been assisting with maintaining of the ISC20C Facebook page including posting articles, links to sites and alerts. Statistics reported that a majority of the users are between the ages of 30 and 45. KN has included photos from the Paris meeting and it was reported that registered users of the page has increased to approximately 160 from 92 since the Paris meeting in November 2011. Facebook links have been established to the main ICOMOS pages and it is anticipated that an increase of ISC20C registered users may results through additional web links to partner organizations. It was noted that the aim of the Facebook network is to grow the Associate membership and raise awareness with practitioners who may not be members to provide background on the ISC20C program activities which are linked to the main website. All committee members are encouraged to provide to KN information, web links and local events for addition to the webpage.

Action: Ongoing ALL.

5.4 Membership

KN reported that ISC20C membership as of August 2012 has a total of 79 members. Additional members may be finalized upon the next Scientific Council meeting in Beijing, China at the end of October. The membership summary currently for each membership category is as follows:

Voting Members: 37

Expert Members: 26

Associate Members: 16

6.0 TREASURER'S REPORT:

Laura Robinson (LR) reported that there has been no income over the last year. The committee did generate some income from individual member work related to review of the nomination forms as part of the WMF Watch List. LR reported that the ISC20C currently has an account balance of \$1,348 Euros. The account is an interest generating account managed for us by the ICOMOS Secretariat. SM noted that the

next review for WMF will take place in 2013 and so perhaps there will be an opportunity to raise more income from dossier reviews.

Action: Ongoing LR

7.0 Partner Organization Reports:

7.1 UIA (LC): Louise Cox advised that it is as yet unclear who will be nominated as the UIA representative to ISC20C. In the meantime; she reported that there is support currently for the 2014 UIA conference in Durban, South Africa. LC indicated that there has been considerable support by the UIA of the Heritage Alert program including the Hong Kong West Wing and Prentice Hospital alerts.

Action Required: LC to liaise with Albert Dubler as to who will represent UIA from ISC20C.

7.2 DOCOMOMO (AT): Ana Tostoes reported that it is important to make synergies to safeguard 20th Century and Modern Movement architecture and sites. One of the greatest joint challenges at the moment is the WH serial site nomination and the UIA website database project from DoCoMo Mo. AT indicated that the next step is to make the database information available through the Docomomo website.

Action Required: AT to liaise with ISC20C.

7.3 TICCIH (ST): report presented by Stuart Tappin. ST reported that the primary aim of work is on industrial heritage in London. The annual congress is in Taiwan in November.

Action Required: ST will forward web links to post to the ISC20C website.

7.4 mAAN: SB reported that she attended mAAN's conference in 2011 in Korea focused on sustainability. The organization model of no office bearers has been highly successful including posting a majority of their activities through their website portal. SB indicated that mAAN has remained in regular contact with the ISC20C.

Action Required: SB to liaise with mAAN for ISC20

8.0 ISC20C Project Reports

8.1 Madrid Document (SM):

SM reviewed the discussion which took place in Paris which had agreed to collect comments from ICOMOS members through to August 2012 and a report was requested advising on their content and any changes. As a follow-up to the Paris meeting, there was an invitation to all ISCs and NCs by SB for comments on the Madrid Document. About a dozen sets of comments were received, not always consistent. There were several minor changes that could be readily made as a second edition; other issues were more substantial and related to the original plan of ISC20C of providing guidelines for care of 20th Century heritage more generally. Unfortunately we do not have a report that details the comments received.

A report by FEM had been circulated to all members prior to the meeting, which recommended review of the comments collected by colleagues, that the committee should decide if it would like to accept the Madrid Document (MD) as it is or to consider proceeding forward to present it as a doctrinal text to the

ICOMOS Secretariat. If the MD is left as is, the committee should decide whether to keep it as architecture-specific text or to amend it to include the extensive heritage of the 20th Century including landscape and urban design. If the text is left as is, it is clear that we are to recommend that the translation of the MD be in as many languages as possible. FEM indicated that he will continue to provide his support on this project based on the recommendation the committee and the approach is ultimately decided upon.

SM summarized that there are three options ahead now, which were also discussed in Paris in 2011.

- 1.) Option 1: Madrid Document: The ISC20C should leave the Madrid Document as is which reflects the outcome of the Madrid meeting. It would not become an ICOMOS doctrinal text and it would be left as is to address architecture only. To date, Edition 1 has been translated into six languages. We need to standardize the publication presentation format.
- 2.) Option 2: Minor changes/tweaks can be made as a result of comments received and we can as produce Edition2, with the standard ISC20C foreword. SB suggested adding a local intro para (By an ISC20C national member)
- 3.) Option 3: ICOMOS doctrine (amend to broaden scope as originally proposed): The ISC20C could expand the Madrid Document to provide guidelines for Twentieth Century for heritage places generally. It could be decided about becoming ICOMOS doctrine later.

As part of the discussion, each committee member was asked to give their opinion on which option to choose.

- Marieke Kuipers: Its being used in Netherlands already There are two ways to address this question. We should look again at the comments – for example, how do we deal with the comments – a second edition or a new document? We already have a basic document that was approved – we should use this now then see what can the comments bring us to expand and reinforce what we have already to be wider later Marieke Kuipers – I would like to promote this to those in conservation who are in charge of protecting heritage in a broader sense. It should be used as guidelines for intervention and development of architectural heritage. I would urge against development of doctrinal text
- Riitta Salastie: I agree with Marieke – keeping it as it is for now, making a few tweaks. Good basis. It is very important that we can use this document. I do support a broader document but with not too much change to the basic document. I translate the MD into Finnish with Maija Kaijamo who is a founding member of the committee.
- Louise Cox: I believe we should leave the Madrid Document as is however, I think that we should have a second guideline document that also includes settings beyond architecture eg landscape, town plans.
- Vladimir Slapeta: I am against doctrinal text. I am afraid of it per se.

- Robert Moore: I see this as a way to disseminate good guidelines for architects and planners and decision makers. Use it as it is, maybe add minor tweaks, but don't lose sight of the need for a broader document for the future.
- Leo Schmidt – I believe that we should make minor changes to the Madrid Document (edition 2) and I think only make minor changes are also needed to make it a broader text.
- Petrus Vaidas: I believe we should move the Madrid Document towards becoming an ICOMOS doctrinal text – however, we need to reassess the goals of the document. I need it as a tool for city officials – it is a goal.
- Marianna – I am not sure it should remain as it is – we may want to consider broadening the text -but then it would be another text. We should discuss - what is the strategic significance if we leave it as such? We should take care that it is noted by local and national committees.
- Jo Braeken: I think we keep it as Madrid document – we could perhaps make small changes as a second version but not change the spirit of the document. What is the importance of making it doctrinal text? The comments are quite varied and many comments seek to broaden the text-that's a different job.
- Anke Zalivako – The document is finished – it was a positive process and should stay as it is. Use it now and see how it works. Collect comments and keep them in mind – and revisit them in time. Doctrinal text may sound too bureaucratic.
- Norbert Mayr – keep the document as it is. Big Comments should go towards a second document in time.
- Natalia Duskina — the Madrid Document has already reached a milestone in the protection of 20th Century heritage, minor wording changes are OK. What to do with the bigger comments? Should add more transparency to the process and collect the comments and perhaps post them to the website then decide what to do? Let's think about this for longer what should we do to promote the document? I will promote through the Russian Architectural academy. We should all do this at home.
- Britt Wisth – Question of broadening the document was discussed from the beginning of forming this text – I am for keeping it as it is, small tweaks are OK. I am against making it doctrinal text. I think that putting the comments received on the website is.
- Stuart Tappin – I think it is a good toolkit for people to use in the protection of 20th C heritage. I am reasonably happy with the document and it should be kept as it is. Minor adjustment for each language translation may be required and small tweaks could be second version.

- Jack Pyburn – I find it very useful from a pedagogical and dissemination standpoint – this could be a foundation for a bigger project that may have a broader scope.
- Susan Macdonald – I think that the document has been extraordinary successful as a platform for dissemination and discussion. I think this document represents the feeling of the meeting in Madrid meeting very well. I think we need to really decide what to do with the minor comments - maybe put them up on the website or just do a second edition to catch up the minor tweaks. Alternatively may want to make it broader, as originally thought. I am less interested in a doctrinal text. I like the idea of having it being a set of guidelines and be able to see how it in the context of conservation more broadly is a good idea.
- Ana Paul Goncalves – Keep the document as it is and then perhaps later think more about the idea of having a larger/broader document.

Yoshiyuki Yamana: Keep it as is – I use the document as it is with Kyoto city. Currently, there are no other guidelines for 20th Century architecture available in Japan. There are already websites in Japan linked to this website and it shows some spreading of Western principles for presentation of 20th Century heritage. For living heritage, the context is different we need to examine new programs for this active functional architecture – but, I didn't think we needed another document for this. Perhaps, in 3/5 years, we will need another document. I translated the document into Japanese and have used it already in two DoCoMo Mo workshops.

Laura Robinson: I think we should leave the document as it is. We should have comments on a website. In South Africa, we really need a much broader based document. We would like to see landscape covered and town planning – issues that are particular relevant to us. We have an opportunity to create a much richer text for another document as a second phase to this. We should really think very carefully about whether we want the Madrid Document to become doctrinal text which will take years.

Kyle Normandin: I think we should leave the document as it is- as the outcome of a conference. The document has been translated into a number of languages and it is already being used currently as a useful as a set of guidelines by professionals. We can collect more comments, but let's not make it doctrine

Sheridan Burke: I use the MD in my own practice it's been very successful. I am going to give a presentation at the pechakucha session on a case study of applying the MD to writing architectural guidelines for owners to deal with interventions. I'd leave it as it is so that it serves as architectural guidelines but I think we should regularize it in terms of the way it is being published so it can be accurately cited, includes the standard ISC20C foreword, ISBN and a local (language) introduction etc. I'd be happy to see us do the minor tweaks for a second edition quickly. I'm not in favor of having it go to become an ICOMOS doctrinal

text unless the committee is willing to commit time and energy to this process. I'd like to see a broader ISC20C Guidelines document eventuate at some time soon, because I feel that landscape and town planning contributions of C20 are too often overlooked in redevelopment projects and are seriously threatened.

Susan Macdonald: In summary then, we seem to agree that the Madrid Document should be left as it is – leave it as it is as a moment in time document-as edition 1, minor edits can be done to issue as Edition 2, but it will not become ICOMOS doctrine. I recommend we (FEM/SM/JH/KN) upload the comments to the website.

The next step would be to move forward with a subcommittee that creates/adapts the MD3 text to the 20th Century heritage more generally, scoping a broader C20 guideline text.

We should also regularize the publication of the document. Because the Madrid Document resides on the website, KN should look at the ISBN and coordinate to make sure that the right ISC20C foreword is published and included as part of the document on the website and in various translations. We need to check ICOMOS format/requirements for publications too.

Summary Results/ Actions Required:

1. *The ISC20C will not proceed through the process set out for the MD to become ICOMOS doctrine. The ISC20C agreed that there is too much bureaucracy, would absorb too much of our resources and energy.*
2. *The MD should be left as a document in time, referring to architecture with some minor tweaks to improve expression/language and including an ISC20C updated foreword as edition 2.*
3. *A second edition (MD2) should be prepared ASAP. Action: MD subcommittee KN JH FEM SB SM to identify/agree on the minor revisions, possibly invite local intros.*
4. *SB to revise ISC20C foreword following Helsinki discussions, so that it is standard for ALL translations of MD1 ASAP and a refreshed foreword for MD2.*
5. *Continue original ISC20C project to develop broader guidelines for C20heriatge (landscape, planned areas etc.) using the MD2 as the start. A call for that output should be referred to by a different name XD3. Subcommittee to proceed by scoping this document for next meeting, developing a proposal and process. Consider issue of uploading comments to date. This may simply be an addendum to MD2, or it might be a third edition, or a totally new document XD3. Action: SM, LR, BW, JH, FEM, SB*
6. *Develop an ISC20C publications policy to always ensure that any ISC20C document is published with an ISC20C foreword and copyright and contact information. Action: SB/KN*

7. *Regularise publication/dissemination process of ISC20C, quickly resolving any arising confusions re MD copyright/ISBN/contact info etc. of MD1 and MD2. Action: KN, FEM*
8. *Upload all the translations of MD1 (Action: Original ISC20C foreword should be translated in each case. Later discussion developed the idea of when doing so; we will invite national ISC20C members to write a short local introduction (similar to FEMs Spanish one) to also upload with the translations. Action: KN, SB*
9. *Encourage translation/ amendments of MD1 to MD2 by approaching all those ISC20C members who have already translated to update and invite addition of short local introduction*
10. *Encourage dissemination of MD2 broadly. Action: All*
11. *Consider doing an illustrated version of MD as MD4? Action: KN FEM SB JYS SM. Note this was a later dinner discussion of the petcha kucha session outcomes.*

8.2 C20 Thematic History Framework (SM)

SM reported that she did not receive any comments back on the Thematic History Framework report circulated in November. SM reported that she did need to have a broader discussion with the World Heritage working group and she has spoken to Kristal Buckley which really highlighted the need for this Framework. SM recommended to go again to the World Heritage committee of ICOMOS to start to inquire about possible funding that could be used for this framework. SM inquired with the committee members to see that any potential financial support that could be obtained should be forwarded to her. SM reported that Enrique Andas indicated that he would like to be part of the subcommittee. If anyone is interested in working on the subcommittee, including ideas for historians that are very well versed in this area of framework, please notify SM.

ND recommended creating a project name would be useful to people beyond ISC20C.

Action Required: SM to follow up with the WH working group and inquire about potential support for moving forward with the historic framework.

Interested committee members to volunteer to work with SM as part of this subcommittee shall respond directly to SM.

New project title?

8.3 MAP20 Project

SB noted that in Paris we agreed to upload this database to website as a snapshot in time along with a good introduction. Also the possibility of a reflection meeting in Montreal to be organised by DB.

Action Required: DB and SU will follow-up on outstanding questions to upload database to the website as is including requirements for copyright and use of images.

8.4 Heritage @ Risk:

JH has provided a list of deadlines in the circulated report but LR indicated that there is no guarantee that the next H@R will be funded but there will be a decision later in the year.

No Action Required: JH ongoing

8.5 Oral Histories:

Vladimir Petralis reported that it may be interesting to work together with DB and SU on the MAP 20 initiative to gain oral histories. VP indicated that they may work together to put together a database that could be uploaded possibly onto Facebook. SB requested that VP come back with a proposal or to start with a survey by email to inquire with the committee to then define how the program may take shape. Perhaps, there is a way to start with just a few oral histories and later link to other databases. ST indicated that there is quite a bit of oral history work completed in the UK.

Action Required: VP shall inquire with SU DB and other committee members about the possibility of forming a proposal to put together a database for future oral histories. This project should be linked to universities and could be setup as a database that could also be utilized by social media sites.

8.6 World Heritage Activities:

SB reported that a number of Twentieth Century heritage properties were listed WHC meeting in St. Petersburg. LR reported that it was a very difficult meeting. The World Heritage Committee is very politically driven and appears to be getting more challenging toward ICOMOS. It was reported that there was a lack of transparency and a call for more diverse advisors. SP Members from Estonia, Switzerland, and Germany were quite good and positive in terms of their engagement. SM inquired about the impacts of massive funding cuts to UNESCO and how this must have affected the progress of work. LR reported that there is a 10% funding cut in the funding LR indicated that ICOMOS simply cannot do the work that is required and it does not look positive for the next couple of years.

SB spoke about the on-going discussions with the WH Secretariat about the Le Corbusier dossier and the need for further advice on developing a solution. We are fortunate that in Helsinki this week all of the ICOMOS experts who reviewed the dossier will be in a single city. Those individuals and a small task force will meet this afternoon to discuss how to best provide advice on refining the dossier and the nomination. To maintain confidentiality, she noted that no states parties reps from ISC20C will be at that meeting.

Action: A report will be provided to the WH Secretariat thereafter.

SB indicated that ISC20C often does not get ample time to respond and to make decisions and provide advice on ICOMOS WH activities. For example, often late night calls are received asking for immediate response and this is extremely difficult to support. SM noted that we often get only 2-3 week notice to attend an international meeting and this is simply not enough time to make arrangements. In cases where people have the resources to attend meetings, it would be beneficial to have advance notice from the WH Secretariat to make arrangements to attend these meetings. MK comment that often, advance notice does have lots to do with specific missions but perhaps it would be a beneficial to work with more transparency in these matters in particular, when we are speaking about OUV and the number of participating individuals with opinions which are knowledgeable and can provide advice going forward. SB to discuss improvements with Alfredo Conti and Kristal Buckley

Action Required – SB to continue to liaise with WH Secretariat, AC and KB directly

8.7 Space Heritage Initiative:

LR reported on the work of two colleagues in the US on the Space Heritage Initiative. LR showed the Space Heritage Initiative website and reported that Lisa Westwood and Beth O'Leary of the Apollo 11 Preservation Task Force in the US have been working on space flight on earth and lunar landings which also involves work with NASA and the sites. This work has been carried out under the program entitled, Tranquillity Base: An Archaeological Site Representing the First Human Presence on the Moon which references the Apollo 11 Landing Site, July 20, 1969. This team is looking for international protection on the "Tranquillity Site". They have created a transverse Map on the Site including a number of artefacts and objects that have been documented. The team is looking at the historic context and why we should WH list this compared to other similar achievements. LR noted that there is currently no reference to sites on earth only to space. LR indicated that it may be possible to setup a link to the presentation on the ISC20C website if it is of interest to committee members.

LS also discussed examples of space initiatives and obviously linked to this. For example, LS is currently working on a conservation plan for 25 sites where the first rockets were sent to the moon during the war. These sites were developed during Nazi Germany which is now an archaeological site. Through the aid of GIS, a system of sites has been recognized and setup. The history of the sites dates back to a few years in the 1930s and 1940s. While the sites are now largely destroyed it is considered a historical cultural landscape. There are various layers of historical information including the background of a whole time that goes back to the first rocket test sound of Berlin. It is an interesting period in which the same team developed the rocket drive and when German scientists went to USA and Russia and also actually went into space during the cold war. This site is an opportunity to observe where it all started which include rocket sites in the mountains in Germany where 20,000 concentration camp workers were employed working on these rocket sites. LS reviewed the website and how the GIS currently links all of the bunker sites in northern France for V2 rockets including the military and 3,000 rockets which were launched in Antwerp. This project is part of larger discussion going on about how to list these sites because it is typically left to individual states and it is also a politically sensitive issue in German history but it will most likely also involve a serial nomination.

Action Required: LR and LS to combine current initiatives on both projects and coordinate further on how the ISC20C may collaborate. LR and LS may propose a separate task group to work on the Space Heritage Initiative based on the outcome of suggested coordination efforts.

9.0 Work Plan for 2012-2014 Triennium (LR/SB): LR took committee members through the triennial work program that we looked at in Madrid and indicated that there are too few people signed up on the list. A few people are doing all of the tasks. Our successes have been directly related to individual's time availability and enthusiasms, but that now was the time to determine what issues we should carry on with, and what new projects we might engage with. ISC20CH needs to provide outline of our 2011-2014 work programme to SC early September. Ongoing projects would include:

1. Membership/Gilles Nourissier database. We need to expand our ISC20C membership and can use the database to help us with this by promoting our information to ICOMOS members (KN/RS to date)

2. Younger members - there is a need to engage and develop younger practitioners in our work (LR/All)
3. Communications - we will continue to send out regular information via the listserve (KN)
4. Website and social media: (KN)
5. 20thC thematic study - World Heritage: there is a need to provide expert advice to the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel and working group. Also ref to our le Corb input recently.
6. Scientific Council: Input ICOMOS SC related activities that support our activities (SB/SM)
7. ISC annual meetings: assist with support and organisation generally (All)
8. WMF reviews (KN/All)
9. MAP20 project - not sure about continuing with this, we discussed it but thought that it has possibly come to the end of its useful lifespan???
10. Heritage Alerts: we need more involvement by our members (to date GH, LR, SB, BW)
11. Heritage @ Risk: there is a need to keep our ISC in the forefront of this program (JH/KN) but also liaison with ICOMOS EXCOM - LR
12. Partnerships: Continue to engage our partners especially Docomomo, TICCIH, ISCARSAH, UIA (KN/FV/HL/SB/LC/GH)
13. Research: identify and promote good solutions for 20C (All)
14. ISC Toolkit: (SB/EA/LR)
15. Archives: Contribute to the archive of 20C heritage documentation - including oral histories etc. (All)

Members were reminded that it is a condition of membership that all are active in the work of the committee

Action: Please select a task and contact KN SB or LR!

10.0 Next ISC20C Meetings 2012 - 2014:

10.1 ICOMOS Advisory Committee and Scientific Council Meetings in Beijing, China, October 2012

SB to attend and engage new potential members in China for the ISC20C committee. Evening ISc20C lecture event to be organised if possible

10.2 Chandigarh, India Meeting: ISC20C, October, 2013

A formal proposal was presented by the SG on behalf of founding ISC20C member Kiran Joshi from ICOMOS India for an ISC20C meeting and symposium to be held on 6-7 October 2013. The proposal for the meeting includes arrival on Thursday, 5 October into Chandigarh prior to the ISC20C meeting and symposium scheduled the following two days, 6 – 7 October. The proposed ISC20C events will coincide with city

celebrating LC's birthday including Chandigarh's original inauguration on 7 October 1953.

Action: All committee members agreed to accept the invitation to hold the next annual meeting in Chandigarh, India c. October 6-7, 2013 with an aim to continue to work with the local organizing committee to further identify a theme and title for the symposium.

10.3 Additional Potential meetings 2013 - 2013 Montreal Meeting in March/ April 2013 – SB indicated that there is interest in Canada and may host a meeting to take place in Montreal which is actually 10 years from the MAP20 project. SB indicated that Canada has been followed up with by the ISC20C however they have not come back with a formal proposal for this meeting.

Action Required: KN liaise with DB to submit a formal proposal including proposed event dates for circulation to the ISC20C for current consideration in the early part of 2013.

DRAFT