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ISC20C Meeting Minutes
AGM, Paris, France
November 27, 2011
1.0 WELCOME

1.1 The President, Sheridan Burke (Australia), warmly welcomed attendees to the meeting. Sheridan provided a special welcome to Gideon Koren, President ICLAFI committee and an invited guest Mr. Masashi Akibi from Japan who will also attend our seminar on 2 December.

2.0 ELECTION OUTCOMES

2.1 Election Results: Gideon reported that ICLAFI conducted the elections for many ISCs. Our election process had been efficient and clear, as our membership data was up to date and in good format. Twenty four votes were received, of which 20 were valid.

2.2 Candidates for the offices of President, Secretary and Treasurer were unopposed and so they are elected. Sheridan Burke (Australia) as President; Kyle Normandin (USA) as Secretary and Laura Robinson (South Africa) as Treasurer.

2.3 Of the seven candidates who ran for the position of Vice-President, Natalia Dushkina received the majority of the votes from eligible national committee nominated voting members of the committee. Natalia is therefore the newly elected Vice President. Given the regional representation on the bureau from these election results, Enrique Xavier de Andas (Mexico) is therefore elected as the second Vice-President to achieve maximum regional representation within the bureau as per ISC20C statutes. The election results were duly declared, and all candidates congratulated.

2.4 Proposed Statutes Amendment: Gideon indicated that there had been extended discussion with the outgoing bureau regarding the current process used to achieve regional representation on the bureau. The committee wants to maximise worldwide activity and engagement in the work of ISC20C, led by engagement on the bureau, but at present there is no definition of what constitutes “regions” or “regional representation” in the statutes.

2.5 He discouraged adding any definition of regions within the ISC20C statutes, as there are so many different distinctions that could be discussed ad infinitum - geographical, cultural, UNESCO official etc. He suggested two statute amendment options were proposed to achieve the ISC20C aims:

Option 1 Direct Vote: Allow direct voting for a specific number of vice presidents. This may not assure regional or cultural representation world wide.

Option 2 Co-Opt: Allow co-option by the elected bureau of additional vice presidents to achieve regional representation. This solution is as used by the ICOMOS Executive committee and allows for more flexibility as the committee can determine what extra
regional representation is needed once elections have been completed every three years.

The meeting was opened for questions to Gideon. After much discussion, it was concluded that given the election results, as the statutes currently stood; only one VP candidate is in a position to be co-opted in order to achieve regional representation. Secondly, to clarify the issue of regional representation and encourage as much participation as possible, a future statute amendment to the statutes re the election process is needed.

The President spoke strongly of the need for broad representation on the bureau and active engagement of members in the work of the committee. She invited volunteers to swiftly review the statutes and propose an amendment to encourage wide representation at the Bureau level and coordinate an appropriate text recommendation with ICLAFI (via Gideon) for presentation to membership asap.

**ACTION:**

1. Susan Macdonald volunteered to look into this further in order and coordinate the statute amendment text and process with Gideon Koren and ICLAFI.
2. Secretary to advise all candidates and members generally of the election outcome and proposed investigation of changes to statutes
3. Amendments to be circulated to voting members ASAP to resolve quickly.
4. New Bureau to discuss co-options as a temporary measure, pending statutes change.

### 3.0 PRESENT AND INTRODUCTIONS

3.1 Dinu Bumbaru (Canada); President Sheridan Burke (Australia); Josef Braeken (Belgium); Nune Chanlingayan (Armenia); Amel Chabbi (United Arab Emirates); Louise Cox (Australia); Natalia Dushkina (Russia); : Fernando Espinosa de los Monteros (Spain) ; Gunny Harboe (USA); Jorg Haspel (Germany); Susan Macdonald (Australia/USA); Carlos Messen (Costa Rica) (part); Secretary General Kyle Normandin (USA); Vaidas Petriulis (Lithuania); Laura Robinson (South Africa); Riitta Salastie (Finland); Leo Schmidt (Germany); Christiane Schmuckle -Molland (France); Prisca Schmuckle Von Minervitz (France); Vladimir Slapeta (Czech Republic); Yoshiyuki Yamana (Japan); Britt Wisth (Sweden).

**Partner organisation représentatives:** Louise Cox (UIA)

**Invited guests:** Mr. Masashi Akibi (Japan)

**Apologies Received:** Dr. Hans-Joachim Haasengier (Germany); Pierre Antoine (France); Christophe Bory (France); Christine French (USA); Bernard Furrrer (Switzerland); Enrique Xavier de Anda Alanis (Mexico); Dominic Galicia (Philippines); Emmeline Henderson (Ireland); Enrique Madia (Argentina); Robert Moore (Australia); Jack Pyburn (USA); Luiz Fernando Rhoden (Brazil); Eduardo Luis Rodriguez (Cuba); Stuart Tappin (UK); Sandra Uskokovic (Croatia); Anke Zalivako (Germany); Ana Tostoes (Docomomo International); Helen Lardner (TICCIH);

### 4.0 MEETING MINUTES, JUNE 2011, MADRID, SPAIN

The Madrid meeting minutes have been previously circulated and floor was opened for comments and suggestions. No suggestions. A motion was made to accept the Madrid
Meeting Minutes from June 2011. KN motioned to accept the meeting minutes which were seconded by GH. All approved for the Minute Meetings to be accepted.

4.1 Matters Arising from minutes not covered by today's agenda

Dublin Meeting 2010: SB reminded that the text of the ISC20C member talks from Dublin need to be forwarded to SG for uploading to the website.

Space Heritage Initiative: Laura Robinson (LR) provided a short update on the Space Heritage Initiative. LR reported that the heritage of international space travel is considered an important aspect of Twentieth century heritage and that NASA has decided to commence protection of space heritage and that the ISC20C committee is the appropriate committee to carry out more discussion. The ICOMOS Interpretation Committee is also interested. LR reported that Jorg Haspel has completed publications on flight heritage. Leo Schmidt (LS) explained that some of the origins of space heritage that may be related to rocket and military sites which is not always reviewed in a positive light but there should be a way to look at this holistically as it is part of the history of the 20th Century. ACTION: LR will remain as the ISC20C point person on the Space Heritage Initiative in liaison with LS.

ICOM Partnership: Susan Macdonald (SM) indicated that the GCI has a watching brief with ICOM as the GCI has a contemporary art program. SB indicated that the proposed twinning of the relationship between ICOMOS and ICOM is in a state of flux as reported in the ICOMOS Scientific Council meeting. SB indicated that Sandra Uskokovic (SU) has volunteered also to be a liaison for ISC20C with the ICOM Contemporary Art committee. ACTION: SB invited SM and SU to coordinate action on this matter.

5.0 PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Sheridan Burke provided a brief overview of major activities since the ISC20C June 2011 meeting in Madrid. She particularly welcomed and acknowledged the work that Fernando Espinosa de los Monteros (FEM) has contributed to the development of the ISC20C through both to the conference and its splendid publication of the papers and in separately publishing the Madrid Document in three languages. She thanked the Working group who met in Madrid in June and the co-ordinating authors FEM, SM and Bernard Furrer (BF) and foreshadowed later discussion.

SB highlighted the work of the ISC Heritage Alerts process this year, thanking Gunny Harboe and his subcommittee for all their hard work and foreshadowed the need to discuss and resolve the best course of action regarding repeated the problems with lack of national committee responses.

She mentioned the presentation to the Advisory Committee regarding development of an ICOMOS Toolkit (modelled on ISC20C’s toolkit initiative) and encouraged all members to submit references and PDFs to the further development of the ISC20C heritage toolkit, especially French and Spanish publications and guidelines. The Heritage Toolkit information leaflet was circulated (Attached).

Membership drive 2011 In October SB issued an invitation to all national committees and Scientific Committees to nominate new members to the ISC20C. This had also prompted clarification of the documentation for all existing members’ status and she thanked Riitta Salastie and Kyle Normandin for their hard work in sorting the membership list, and members for assisting with verifying documentation.
SB reported on the currently time consuming process of preparation of the **ISC20C annual report**, a formal ICOMOS requirement of all ISCs. She invited all committee members to use the report templates issued for this meeting to share each individual members’ work that has advanced the work of the ISC20C committee throughout the year, which can together form our annual report, instead of the work falling to a single person. She asked all members to engage in this task as a demonstration of their active involvement in the committee’s work worldwide and write a one page report for inclusion in the ISC20C annual report.

SB warmly thanked the 2009-2011 bureau for their hard work over the last three years and indicated that she would recommend co-opting members onto the 2011-2014 bureaus ASAP, and move swiftly to amend the statutes in parallel.

**ACTION:** KN to distribute a template which can be used for individual annual reports which will more efficiently develop the ISC20C annual report to be submitted to ICOMOS.

**6.0 SECRETARY GENERAL’S REPORT:**

**6.1 Social Networking:** KN reported that the social networking webpage is launched and operating. Christine Madrid French has volunteered to assist in managing the information postings and website including web links to heritage sites that need to draw on advocacy for sites in danger. Statistics reported that a majority of the users are between the ages of 30 and 45. 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 summarized on the main website.

**6.2 Membership Drive:** Invitations to nominate new members were sent to all of the NCs and ISCs in October 2011 and there have been responses and appointments since this email solicitation. A membership policy was agreed in 2010, and is accessible on the ISC20C website. The process for acceptance of expert members is that the subcommittee assesses each application (with full CV) and recommends to Bureau ASAP after receipt. Current membership of the committee is as follows: Expert Voting members 37; Expert Members 26; Associate Members 13; Institutional members 4; The following membership lists were circulated including the Founding Membership list (attached).

SB noted the regional imbalance of our membership currently and encouraged representatives of regions to encourage new membership, reporting on her recent initiatives to build membership at the UAI Congress in Tokyo in October and the mAAN Conference in Korea in September.

**6.3 Membership lists:** KN recommend posting on the ISC20C website the Voting, Expert and Associate membership lists including contact information, as do many other ISCs. DB indicated that there could be a concern for internet piracy and that member email contact information should be posted in such a way that contact names and information will not be pirated. DB recommended that a clear space/break with the person’s name be completed so that the various membership lists are not hacked. All members present were happy to post to their contact info on them but to advise all members prior and seek agreement, as some may ask not to have contact addresses included.

**Action:** KN, RS and CMF to advise members of proposal to upload, invite any comment
6.4 Gilles-Nouissier Database Membership: ICOMOS has established and setup the Gilles-Nouissier Database to input all of the expert members into the database which includes their CV information, areas of expertise etc, so that it can be easily searchable by ICOMOS. Over the course of the next several months, ICOMOS will be setting up a section of the database for the ISC20C to input all of its expert members. Once this is completed, KN will notify each member of the committee to fill out their database information entry. Once the entries have been completed by the ISC20C committee, (anticipated mid 2012) a link will be provided on the ISC20C website which can then be accessible by ICOMOS members

Action: KN/ RS will invite members to provide entry information into the GN database once it is setup by ICOMOS.

6.5 Website KN reported that a new tab on the website has been added which provides a new link to resources which have been uploaded for the ISC20C Toolkit. Resources are currently being uploaded as they are received and are credited to the person who submitted the referenced materials. Currently, the Toolkit pages are not using an indexing system but can be adopted in the near future to fit this purpose.

KN noted that a new ICOMOS website has been redesigned and launched by ICOMOS this week. This was carried out with an aim for ISC websites to be integrated with the new updated website. If ICOMOS offers hosting of ISC websites, it may be possible to move the ISC20C website to the host website.

7.0 TREASURER’S REPORT:

Laura Robinson (LR) reported briefly and noted we have a modest bank account of 1078 Euros held in an interest generating account by the ICOMOS Secretariat for all the ISCs in France. Our income is largely as a result of a gratuity which is paid from review of the nominations for the WMF Watch List 2011. To date individual bureau members have been footing bills for website, translation, editing etc.

SM requested that it should be noted as part of the Treasurers report that the website domain registration was paid for by the Getty Conservation Institute (GCI). KN noted that a receipt will be forwarded to Laura for reflection as part of the ISC20C expenses.

SB Thanked LR and noted that the GCI should be thanked for its contribution of supporting the website in the meeting minutes.

8.0 PROJECT REPORTS

8.1 Heritage Alerts

Gunny Harboe (GH) reported that Heritage Alert template has been updated and amended post Dublin discussions. SB noted that the Heritage Alert template has been adopted as the Resolutions template by the General Assembly and will be used for site specific resolutions.

GH noted that the few alarms that the ISC20C has received over the past three years have all raised awareness, but few have proceeded the whole way, often due to resistance/non communication by national committees. He proposed that the HA subcommittee of the ISC20C should meet to discuss the new amended template and the ongoing issue of how the Heritage Alerts system can be approved more quickly by an ICOMOS National Committee. SB recommended that the sub-committee should discuss these issues and engage with President Gustavo Araoz. Gunny indicated that there must be a way to work faster on these issues and to consider a better framework by
which to evaluate Heritage Alerts - perhaps these need to become Executive Committee decisions.

*Groendaal grandstand, Belgium:* GH indicated that the grandstand in Belgium was brought to our attention through a member of ISCARSAH. A full heritage alert was completed but it remains idle until the ICOMOS NC can endorse the heritage alert. GH reported that it is very important to discuss the Heritage Alert ahead of time with the NC so that when the Heritage Alert is completed and it reaches the NC, it does not remain in a state of flux. Josef Braeckin (JB) indicated that the property is in a legal process and that some of the surrounding buildings will be kept but it had been decided that the grandstand would most likely not be kept because some of the areas surrounding the Hippodrome would be designated to be returned to nature. JB indicated that the Grandstand is seen as a significant work of engineering but it is not necessarily recognized as an icon of cultural heritage.

**Action:** SB requested JB to prepare an update on the situation of the Grandstand and let the ISC20C sub-committee know if there is not anything which we can do on behalf of this work.

*La Halle Freyssinet, Paris:* CSM indicated that there is a property currently in danger in Paris which is the La Halle Freyssinet. CSM indicated that perhaps a visit to the station site may be important and that the ISC20C may wish to write a GA resolution on this property as it is scheduled to divide the building into three parts which will be carried out by the railway administration. CSM indicated that this building is a fine opportunity to save this 20th Century structure. CSM has shared the same information with the ISCARSAH committee and perhaps, it could be a joint Heritage Alert proposal.

**Action:** SB asked CSM if it would be possible for her to provide the background on the train station in Paris in Freyssinet and prepare a Heritage Alert to present to the Assembly or to at least prepare a statement SB will try to visit site.

ND gave a brief report that despite the letters of support which have been submitted to the authorities in Moscow that the Children’s Department Store in Moscow is seriously in danger as although they will retain all of the interior contents of the store, they have decided to destroy the entire interior envelope of the building structure and reconstruct the Children’s Department store.

SB reported that she had written a letter which was submitted to the heritage authorities in Moscow after the ISC20C June meeting in Madrid. It was noted that the letter was also signed by the Louise Cox from the UIA and DOCOMOMO. SB indicated that no response was received and asked ND what we could do to advance this initiative?

**Action:** SB asked what ND recommended to raise awareness here at the ICOMOS General Assembly. SB asked ND to prepare a draft statement on this issue for review, and perhaps a resolution re Russian Avant Garde generally.

*Kamakura Museum of Modern Art, Japan:* The Kamakura Museum of Modern Art has been something that Prof. Yamana (YY) has talked to the ISC20C about extensively. SB reported that she visited the site in October and it is partly the subject the World Heritage nomination for the Tsurugaoka Tachibana Shrine site. It was built by the prefecture and is on land leased from the shrine. The lease finishes quite soon and technically the lessor is responsible for clearing the site. The museum building itself is regarded as a significant work by Junzo Sakakura who was a disciple and greatly influenced by the work of Le Corbusier. It is an important work of its own. SB and YY
indicated that the ISC20C have written letters of support to the Shrine, the Museum and ICOMOS Japan to protect the museum, several together with the UIA and DOCOMOMO. She visited the site in October and has met with the director of the museum as well as the head of the shrine to show our support for the building’s conservation. We delayed sending the letters for quite some time due to the sensitivity of these matters and wish to secure ICOMOS Japan’s support for action so, the support letters were only sent last week. All of the letters of support have been copied to the Secretary General of ICOMOS so ICOMOS is aware of it, especially regarding the pending WH mission re-nomination.

Action: SB noted that the ISC20 Committee should write to the WH Secretariat also to inform future WH missions that may take place. We have sufficient documentation to initiate the Heritage Alerts template for the museum. SB requested that GH and YY continue to work to complete the HA template, then the HA alert should be agreed with ICOMOS Japan and uploaded to the website.

**Chicago Prentice Hospital: ongoing issue GH**

### 8.2 Heritage @ Risk Report

Jorg Haspel (JH) reported on the ICOMOS Heritage @ Risk publication and noted that the publication was started in 1999 and the first issue was in 2000. This was a project of Michael Petzet, Sheridan Burke and Dinu Bumbaru, who served together on the ICOMOS Executive Committee at that time. ICOMOS Germany has sponsored the editing of consecutive volumes on risks occurring world-wide during this time. Some have been thematic reports (Underwater Heritage) and some on what is occurring in Europe (Russian Avant Garde). The H@R publications are financed by the Commission of Culture in Germany. The publication will continue and NCs and ISCs are encouraged to send report about heritage at risk for in a written publication but also on the website of ICOMOS for access by everyone. The publication focusses not only on world heritage sites but allheritages. SB inquired what the deadline for submission of reports is – JH indicated that it depends on how many reports we collect and how much financial support is available. If there are a lot of reports that we try to find the right financial support to publish the report. JH encouraged everyone to prepare reports that the ISC20C could coordinate.

GH indicated that we need to strengthen this link and we should talk about this in relation to the Heritage Alerts for ISC20C. LR stressed the importance submission of reports through the NCs and ISCs rather than an individual persons opinion LR indicated that she thought the Heritage Alerts experience was a good basis for the ISC20C to submit a H@R report upon. SB indicated in the past, individual members have presented ISC20C contributions to the H@R reports, for example Bernard Furrer submitted an excellent article for the H@R last edition.

SM indicated that she is agreement with LRs comment in that if we really want to be more credible about where 20th Century heritage stands in relation to other places at risk, it might be actually be worth doing a little more work to prepare the next report. For instance, the work that the WMF has done and that we have been a part of, is an interesting snapshot of where 20th Century fits at risk in comparison to other things. She noted that there were a lot of places from the 20th Century that were nominated last year and quite a high portion actually went on the WMF Watch list but not all of them. Considering this globally and comparing it to other studies, such as the UK’s national study would help to contextualize twentieth century risks. She suggested that ISC20C
could thereby gain a picture of where it fits perhaps globally reflecting on the types of things we are getting alerts for and develop some commentary on what the triggers are, eg is it a lack of understanding/appreciation or is it more technical issues –that would make an ISC20C report more ‘meaty’.

JH indicated that it would be great to create a Twentieth Century H@R annual report on a global scale Normally the H@Risk report, are more national items. And so, if there was a special report from the international scientific committee, it would be a wonderful possibility from a number of points of view.

DB thinks an ISC20C report such as this would be a very good contribution to the Advisory Committee work plan as well. Now technology can really create an interesting mosaic for gaining a global understanding of H@R.

SB indicated that she is now aware that the ISC20C committee is unique to all of the other NCs and ISCs in that we have actually emailed and made a call for membership to all of the committees. Apparently no other NCs or ISCs has done that, gaining membership simply from interested applications. Hence, we now have a very wide perspective and it could be very timely to reach out and to think about how who might undertake co-ordination of some of these ideas in the H@R reports.

SB asked JH what would be involved putting together a publication in 2013 – if ISC20C collected the articles and did the analysis, how would we be sure that we would be published? JH indicated that we are never really sure!!!! However, in the last 10 years, ICOMOS Germany has somehow always succeeded in publishing all of the information. Currently it may not have all of the money but once we have the text materials, he is quite sure that he can make a publication. JH feels that ICOMOS as an institution needs to make this report.

LS reported that there is currently some work being researched at Cottbus University in Germany that proposes to analyses trends re world heritage sites online, not just related to threats but possibly related to best practice. LS noted that the purpose of establishing this database is to really ask the right questions related to monitoring of heritage sites. There are a number of sites which are currently working on this type of gathering of this information however, this initiative is being thought to also link with Wikimedia however, many aspects are being considered now as it is vastly complicated in terms of constructing such a database.

SM reported that the Getty has just spent two years working with WMF to develop an open source GIS based software system with heritage sites in Jordan and Iraq and spent lots of money on how to work out that relation within the system identifying all the risks and there will be a booth here at the conference. The system is free and is continually updated.

JH inquired if it would be possible to help develop one of the fields in the database specifically for 20th Century heritage.

*Action: SB suggested that JH, LS and BW, LR, SM get together to follow-up on the concept of developing coordination and synthesis of the ISC20C issues for the H@R report and development of respective databases. SB recommended that the members of the Heritage Alerts committee should think about possible members to form a sub-committee to work on the H@R risk report together with JH.*
8.3 Post War City And Identity

Jörg Haspel (JH) reported that the City and Identify is a project that was created by ICOMOS Poland and ICOMOS Germany together with respective national conservation authorities to begin a discussion on post-war heritage in the so called post-socialist countries as a segment of the 20th Century Heritage which is threatened and in need of protection, especially Socialist Modernism of the 60s and 70s. He proposes to organize a series of workshops and sessions on post war heritage from these socialist countries, discussing the potentially of a serial site nomination for world heritage. JH wanted to know if the concept would be supported by the ISC. VP inquired if there would be a possibility of other countries participating outside of Poland and Germany. JH reported that discussions with Romania, Hungary etc. and other countries have already started and he welcomes other participants. It started as a bi-national project but it is now larger.

ND indicated that we should give a broader picture of this post war heritage. We should also reach out for more partnerships in particular China which has produced a lot of this type of architecture. Perhaps, there could be a representative from China on this committee. DB suggested that we might get a nominee from China by asking the right question. For example, if you ask for a particular building from 1950 then it is most likely that China will provide a building or two or three from this period. However, it is important to ask China directly for the type of heritage that you are looking for. It is not that there is a lack of interest from China; it is more that you have to ask the correct question.

SB inquired from JH what does he need from ISC20Cfor this exciting project. JH said that we are waiting for more support in partnership with Poland and Germany and for the support from ‘big brother’ [Russia] to move – however they have not moved yet. SB indicated that it sounds an excellent project and it might be good to invite UIA and DOCOMOMO for partnering and assistance in this issue.

ACTION JH to keep ISC20C aware of progress

8.4 MAP20 Project:

SB reported that in the last ISC20C meeting it was decided that there were two key issues which need to be followed up by SU/DB. 1.) Whether we can upload the existing MAP20 report onto our website and whether we have permission to do so from the authors 2.) Whether we wanted to reissue that series of MAP20 questions and update the information in it

SM noted that if we could get this information up on the website we start to understand the progress and change of risks and their causes, over the last decade. KN reported that there is now currently enough space on the website to upload it since the beginning of 2011 and we will await an answer on when to move forward with uploading the data upon permission. GH strongly supported the updating and uploading of the info.

DB was an originator of MAP20 and he believes that this is a new ambition for the MAP20 project which was not originally planned. He will talk further with SU about a possible meeting in Montreal to further develop these issues and investigate possible meeting 2013?

Action: DB and SU to advise re Montreal meeting

8.5 The Madrid Document:

SB congratulated FE on the successful event and especially the collaboration with the Universities. The publication of the conference
proceedings and the Madrid Document are great long-term outcomes. SB indicated that copies of both of these documents would be made available at the ICOMOS Assembly Forum event which will take place tomorrow evening.

She thanked the Working Group of authors who met in Madrid and the co-ordinators SM, BF and FEM. We now have a basic guideline regarding intervention for 20th Century heritage that is architecturally focussed. Originally, we had envisaged a document that covered the committees' whole remit and responsibility – so, the question is what steps we should take next in advancing this excellent work.

FEM reported on the publication of the proceedings and also the Madrid Document. FEM distributed copies of the proceedings to ISC20C members in attendance. FEM indicated that we now have this document which we can use in our daily practice and also in education for the university setting. We have the Madrid Document for working together with ICOMOS professionals and thanked our ICOMOS President Gustavo Araoz and Sheridan Burke for repeatedly supporting the conference and the publication of the Madrid Document. He noted that the University already has specific project applications in mind.

FEM outlined the steps needed to develop the MD to ICOMOS doctrine, as per the recent doctrinal development policy of ICOMOS over next 3 years.

SB requested opinions from each committee member present.

DB stated that MD is an important document but ICOMOS must be careful not to have too many documents specific to centuries, for example, a document for the 19th century, 18th Century, etc. DB indicated that the document focuses on notion of architecture and he felt that we should focus on ICOMOS’s whole role– which is universally ‘Monuments’ and ‘Sites’, by including landscapes and planned settlements. It should also be noted that these doctrinal text take time to develop and that this text should be reviewed by the ICOMOS Advisory Committee via ISCs and NCs circulation and typically a doctrine cycle is of three years. Having just been through the doctrinal process with the TICCIH Charter, he strongly suggested making it an ICOMOS Statement, rather than a charter.

SM commented that having worked in the 1990s for English Heritage that it was really important that we try to ‘mainstream’ places conservation of the 20th Century integrating it into general conservation practice because when we started calling it out as ‘different’, it called attention to some of the difficulties in other areas like industrial heritage that we faced many times before. SM noted that she has never been supportive of the idea of the Madrid work becoming an ICOMOS doctrinal text or charter for that specific reason and believes that there are already too many charters. However, she noted the specific issues that are different and particular to C20th related to design and material authenticity, and some issues to do more specifically with the materiality of 20th Century heritage – for example, you cannot repair concrete in the same manner as you can repair stone or wood.

She congratulated the working group and FEM who have bought the MD thus far but, hopes that the MD will emerge as guidelines because hopefully, in 20-30 years’ time, we will not be struggling with this issue of identification of the importance of C20 sites and it will be the same task to identify a less accepted places from 1850 as for 1950. She suggested that the MD could be developed as ICOMOS Guidelines or Principles, and built upon and illustrated with case studies and solutions.
However, if we are going to end up with an ICOMOS doctrinal text, what would be useful would be to focus or concentrate on the very few aspects or issues that are modern or 20\textsuperscript{th} Century, but broaden the text to cover all of the modern era- if we miss site types now, we will lose sight of them in future work. At the moment the MD could almost be applied to the architecture of any period. If this is to be progressed as an ICOMOS doctrinal text, she felt that it should be broadened to encompass the wide range of heritage places and so, in that respect, she differed from FEM. SM asked, what does C20th mean for us as a committee? It’s that we need to focus on a range of heritage types in time and place. We need to say how we should manage and conserve the various aspects of C20 sites and landscapes (including but not excluding architecture). She noted that the whole committee has done a lot of work to get us to this stage, and probably not much more is needed to get it across all site types. She felt that there is great benefit to continue to work on this and to think about the path we are going to take with it in the long term.

CSM said she would also try to elaborate the text more broadly, but this will take time. For example, ISCARSARH. It took nine years to define the subject and text which is very short. ISCARSARH has guidelines specifically for structures and the document is also more general with principles. The ISCARSARH type of document helps us in our work to convince authorities for the protection of important structures.

JH indicated that when the first draft of the document was circulated, he wrote a lot of ideas to the working group. One of the ideas was to cover all kinds of heritage of the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century – urban, landscape, and architecture, garden, technical and industrial but now he is happy that all of his recommendations have been ignored and we have a single document that is concentrated on the built architectural heritage in Spanish, English and French and we are discussing a German version. Maybe we could include a Russian version and everyone should participate in this process. As this document is to be reviewed by ICOMOS as a whole, we could ask everybody how it could be improved and see if we can obtain reactions and ideas, to start communication on the heritage of the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century. This is just a first step.

BW indicated that in her experience, she would prefer to see this document with some illustrations and examples and put it in the hands of those who need it most, for example, property owners, firms of architect designers. This is not an ICOMOS charter but practical guidelines.

VP indicated that it is important to have such a document, whether as a document or charter, because it addresses worldwide issues and it can be used with government officials to help protect 20\textsuperscript{th} Century Heritage.

NC believes it is an excellent document as it stands for architecture; maybe a parallel document for modern landscape is needed?

ND indicated that she would like ISC20C not to be in a rush. She thinks that we need at least three years to debate and consider this as a serious doctrinal document. As this document is produced in the committee of 20\textsuperscript{th} Century, it is a 20\textsuperscript{th} Century heritage document but it should really also be aligned with DOCOMOMO. We should consider maximum dissemination for comments and feedback but we should also really think hard on whether or not we need another ICOMOS doctrinal document. For example, it took twenty four years for doctrinal text on Historic Cities! Why, because the world is changing so fast and we could create a document that could be out-dated very quickly.
LS indicated that, at first glance of this document, there is only one article that refers to 20th Century heritage specifically and that is Article no. 3. All the other articles and general principles of conservation. He thinks this may be the strength of this document in that it demonstrates (as SM said) that 20th Century Heritage is ‘NOT’ different from all the other heritage types and eras except for a few technical issues. He liked the fact that it does not have to come back to the architect’s original intention every time, but respect layers of change – that is an excellent approach. He would like to see how this core idea can be built on in this document.

VS Found the article on change the most difficult. He was afraid of setting the document in stone as a charter, leave it as the MD, from that conference.

YY will arrange discussion with ICOMOS Japan. Managing change is of critical import.

RS indicated that she also would like this document be considered for use in world heritage sites and for sites of the 70s and 80s that are increasingly threatened. She initially wanted it to cover all heritages of C20, and recognising the immense work to get this far, thinks it’s an excellent document as a resource and we should promote it. People outside of this group should know that they can use it for various purposes. She has already begun this process with ICOMOS Finland and presented the MD in the newsletter and written to the Finnish Architects Association about the document. She thinks the MD is very important for younger professionals.

GH indicated that he was very grateful to FEM and authors for getting the work done so far, and that we need to get it out to people who can benefit from it. He understands the hurdles of trying to get through all the steps of the ICOMOS doctrinal approval process for this document – and is not sure how important this is really. He thinks that the important thing is that people start to use this document and it is really what people make out of this document. He thinks that we could revisit the MD in three years and review the relevance and how it has been used and then decide if it should be a charter. A document like this could also apply to Post-Modern architecture.

KN Congratulated all involved on such a fine publication. He thinks now is the time to accumulate comments and see what more specific ideas people have for inclusion. Let’s leave it for more input and debate now- don’t set ant time limits, let it evolve.

LC congratulated FEM. She is pleased with the document as it’s architectural, and she represents UIA, so she is glad that we have done it. She thinks before we move forward, we need to circulate the document and wait to see what broadening comments come back to the committee.

LR indicated that she would like to see more feedback after we see what happens when the MD settles in our minds and consciousness. If we want to broaden for example if we want to include landscapes, we need to talk with IFLA- are we going into what some of the other committees or organizations are doing in writing their own charters? She would like to see how it may apply to say apartheid townships, too. She does not think we need to proceed forward with doctrinal text until we have an opportunity to evaluate how what we have done to date works in practice.

TSP Will discuss it with University colleagues

AC Important and novel principles, good groundwork so far.

GH indicated that he thought this document would be a good document that promotes guidelines but that we should provide case studies and illustrations.
JB Not a fan of doctrine, feels a good practice guideline is enough, can be extended in future or now if easy. Illustration with good practice is important

SB indicated that she presented the Madrid Document yesterday at Scientific Council meeting as part of her report on Raising the profile for conservation of Twentieth Century Heritage which also covered the thematic framework initiative.

Hence, the document was circulated yesterday with an invitation to all NCs and ISCs to have comments back by March 30, 2012.

SB indicated that she is personally of the view that we are a committee that focuses holistically on 20th Century Heritage, and would like to see modest changes to allow the MD to cover the whole resource, not just architecture. She would like to see the comments arising through ICOMOS circulation and decide then what partnerships might arise, and what we want in terms of doctrine, which is a long hard slog.

LR agreed that if we reach the stage of moving forward the document to doctrine, then we should consider illustrations.

FEM indicated that the important thing for this document for all of us is that each country (NC) needs this document and we should try to use this document and make it available. We should think of the next steps and it is important that we think about moving forward with this soon.

Extensive general discussion followed on how we could reach a way forward. It was confirmed that the circulation for comment already underway within ICOMOS and our partner organisations was supported. It was felt by most present that broadening the MD scope to match the scope of the committee’s role would be useful for many people, as would illustrations/case studies. A resolution to the GA noting this circulation was supported. A report to our next meeting on comments received and next steps would be helpful.

**Action Required:** Having considered the comments received and discussion today, the ISC20C will seek to expand the document to cover the resource of C20 holistically. The committee will collect and assess further comments until March/April 2012 and FEM/SM/ SB will prepare a report on the comments received at the next meeting.

ISC20C to draft a GA resolution from the ISC20C noting the contribution that this document makes and that the document is a product of the ISC20C now in circulation for comment.

SB to organise full ISC and NC distribution via Secretariat.

**KN to upload and invite comments via Facebook.**

**All to consider refinements, illustrations and case studies for discussion in Helsinki and send to Fernando and Susan (FEM/SM).**

**8.6 The C20 Thematic Study:** SM reported that the C20th Thematic Study was one of the tasks which was included on our triennial action plan and it arose because of the need to better contextualize the nominations which were coming through the World Heritage Working Group (WHW) for 20th Century Heritage. It would enable the WHWG to understand how to put these places in context, carry out comparative analysis to determine outstanding universal value. Secondly, given the fact that thematic studies
are commonly used in many places to identify heritage for the purposes of protection, it could also be a framework that might operate on regional or national levels and for those who have not been able to do their own thematic studies that they could take this framework and therefore use it.

It was agreed that the best way to progress the framework idea would be to have a meeting which brought together different people from various places that had experience in thematic histories for the purpose of identifying heritage places for protection - to try and come up with a very broad outline. Historians and practitioners from all the regions of the world were invited. Committee representatives at the Los Angeles meeting included SB, SM, LC, KN, LS.

We had also agreed at previous ISC20C meetings that the professional way to advance this framework project would be to consider looking for funding and having someone take it forward as a paid commission rather than rely on volunteers which would make it slow and probably unwieldy. The other thing that was important is that there are a number of organizations which give advice to the world heritage centre on this period such as DOCOMOMO and TICCIH and the UIA, so it was important that we engage with them.

The May meeting in Los Angeles was hosted by the Getty Conservation Institute, that has just started a new program on Conserving Modern Architecture. Ron Van Oers from the World Heritage Centre participated, which was extremely useful because he was the person who was running the Modernism program at UNESCO when they first started to look at this issue and he hosted an associated series of UNESCO meetings around the world.

After the meeting in May the Getty produced a report which was based on the discussions and presentations which were held there. Some of the background documents are listed in the bibliography.

The meeting was able to come up with a draft outline on what the key themes or drivers for the heritage of the Twentieth Century, the economic, social, cultural and environment drivers which were specific to the 20th century. Then we identified subthemes within these overarching themes and then a table that shows specific site examples which might pop-out from such a thematic study.

There are a number of things that were already talked about at today’s meeting that identified synergies from this –the issue of space, cold-war heritage. Susan invited anyone who would like to engage further in developing the framework project to be in touch with her. She noted that this project needs some intellectual thought and needs someone to look at the history and how it is linked to this heritage.

SM is very keen to get the initial paper out to people and to have further comments on it, especially from the members of this committee. We would like some more discussions with ICOMOS Secretariat and the World Heritage Working Group of ICOMOS that has been engaged with numerous thematic framework studies previously. And then, we want to take it to the next stage, when we feel that we have broad comments on the initial framework, we will be seeking funding and commissioning people to take it to the next stage. We do not envision a huge global thematic study of the 20th century but the next stage of work may provide more detail and depth and we might want to commission specific research areas. For example, TICCIH may carry out some specific thematic studies related to transport and infrastructure. There might be other things that have
links to the work of the WHC more broadly like 20th Century urban planning and cities – so, for example, the next step might be to focus on specific studies.

SB thanked SM for her outstanding contributions to the project to date and commented that it was a great professional experience to be part of that May meeting discussions. She noted that her initial enquiries of the ICOMOS Secretary General, president and treasurer were responded to by “ICOMOS is very challenged for funding”, so it is probably going to be difficult, we may need to find other sources and we should encourage more people to come on board with this project. She encouraged all members to provide comments to SM.

GH indicated that we should broaden our exposure to other groups that are not thinking about ICOMOS for example Society for Architectural Historians (US) = it may also be a way to broaden our membership for this group.

LS reported that at this stage that his University has a master studies program and it would be a good project for the master’s students to look at this topic. Perhaps they could take over some of the work?

SM indicated that we do have some geographic gaps like Asia. The thematic study is posted on the ISC20C website.

Action: SM would like to know if anyone would like to join a sub-committee to work hard on this or to hear from you by email ASAP.

8.7 ISC20 Heritage Toolkit: SB reported that the ISC20C toolkit section has now been updated on the ISC20C website and the resource list is now a separate tab on the ISC20CH website. SB encouraged all members to identify up to ten reference documents that we use in our daily practice. These resources links could be references which exist as hotlinks or PDFs, and should be useful for wider audiences who visit our website. It will also be linked to the ICOMOS toolkit in the fullness of time.

Action: SB requested that a new member should be able to take over this project from now. LR may be possible helper or to form a subcommittee to work on this project.

8.8 WORK PLAN FOR 2012-2014 TRIENNIUM (LR/SB):

LR took committee members over the updated triennial work program that we looked at in Madrid. LR indicated disappointment that there are very few people signed up on the list. A few people are doing all of the tasks. Our present successes have been directly related to those 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 and members nominated to lead them include:

- **Heritage Alerts** GH/LR/BW
- **Heritage at Risk Reports** – JH/ KN
- **World Heritage Program** – SB/SM
- **C20 Thematic Study** – SM/ LS/ YY/ CMF/SB
- **WMF Reviews** – KN
- **MAP20 Project** – SU/ DB
- **Membership Development / Gilles Nouissier Database** – KN/ RS
• **Regional Representation Expansion of Committee Membership**
  - **Asia**: SB YY
  - **Latin America**: EA EM
  - **Europe**: JH FEM CSM
  - **NAmerica**: GH KN SM
  - **Africa/Arab World**: LR and CSM

• **Younger Professional Development** – LR/All

• **Partnership Organization Relationships**
  - DOCOMOMO KN/SM/SB/RS
  - UIA LC/GH
  - ICCROM SB/DB
  - ICOM: SU
  - MAAN SB
  - TICCIH: HL ST

• **Other ICOMOS Committees**
  - Theory Committee – DB/ JH/ ND
  - ISCARSAH – GH/CSM/PJ
  - Interpretation – SB
  - Shared Built Heritage - ???

• **Website/ Facebook / Communication** – KN/ CMF

• **Scientific Council** – PJ/SB

• **Education/ Future Meetings and Conferences** – FEM/ VP/KN

• **ISC20C Heritage Toolkit** - LR/SB

• **Archives and Oral Histories** – VP

• **Madrid document**: FEM/ SB

LR reiterated that we could focus more on further membership outreach including Asia, Africa and South America, and that we need additional persons to assist with this effort. Regional meetings are encouraged to engage potential new members locally.

SB stressed the need for all members to be active in the committees work. She noted that it was difficult for all members to get to meetings such as this, but felt hopeful that we have worked extremely well through email to involve a range of members. She particularly hoped that the bureau could reduce its administrative load now that the membership records are clarified, and the secretariat is running so well under KN management.

She asked members to particularly participate promptly in the annual report production which would also provide an idea of the issues members wanted to become involved with.
10.0 NEXT ISC20C MEETINGS 2012 - 2014:

Tokyo – February, 2012

ISC20C Seminar/Workshop in Tokyo – Yoshiyuki Yamana to organize the meeting. 
Action: YY to liaise with SB regarding a meeting in association with the NMWA on Modern World Heritage and serial site nominations.

Finland – August, 2012

ISC20C Meeting 2012, Helsinki, Finland, prior to Docomomo conference
Action: RS to liaise with ICOMOS Finland regarding a meeting in association with the Docomomo meeting in August 2012.

SB noted that the Advisory Committee will be held in China Oct/Nov and there may be potential for an ISC20C event/meeting then

2013 Meeting

LR would like to express an initial interest in Cape Town. She will need to contact her colleagues.

Vlad Slapeta has indicated the possibility of a meeting in Czech Republic in 2013, and there is also interest in holding a meeting in Chandigarh.

SM indicated that we might be able to consider Los Angeles as an alternative.

A meeting in Latin America would be welcomed by ISC20c
Action : KN

A Meeting in Montreal was suggested by DB

2014 Meeting: ISC20C will be held in conjunction with next ICOMOS General Assembly in Florence, Italy.

Action : KN

ISC20C Serial Site Nomination workshop to be held at the Suisse Pavilion at the Cite Universite originally designed by Le Corbusier and is recently restored. The workshop meeting is scheduled to be held from 16.00 – 20.00 to be held on Friday, 2 December.
INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON
TWENTIETH CENTURY HERITAGE
MONDAY 27 NOVEMBER 2011
l'Institut National d'Histoire de l'Art à Paris (I.N.H.A.)
2 Rue Vivienne, 75002 Paris, France

Actions Arising

- **Minutes Item 4.1 Space Heritage Initiative**: LR will remain as the ISC20C point person on the Space Heritage Initiative in liaison with LS.
- **Minutes Item 4.1 ICOM Partnership**: SB invited SM and SU to coordinate action on this matter.
- **Minutes Item 5.0 Membership Drive**: KN to distribute a template which can be used for individual annual reports which will more efficiently develop the ISC20C annual report to be submitted to ICOMOS.
- **Minutes Item 6.3 Membership Lists**: KN, RS and CMF to advise members of proposal to upload, invite any comment
- **Minutes Item 6.4 Gilles-Nouissier Database Membership**: KN/RS will invite members to provide entry information into the GN database once it is setup by ICOMOS.
- **Minutes Item 8.1 Heritage Alerts (Grandstand)**: SB requested JB to prepare an update on the situation of the Grandstand and let the ISC20C sub-committee know if there is not anything which we can do on behalf of this work.
- **Minutes Item 8.1 Heritage Alerts (Freyhssinet)**: SB asked CSM to provide the background on the train station in Paris in Freyssinet and prepare a Heritage Alert to present to the Assembly or to at least prepare a statement. SB to visit site.
- **Minutes Item 8.1 Heritage Alerts (Russian Avant Garde)**: SB asked what ND what is recommended to raise awareness here at the ICOMOS General Assembly. SB asked ND to prepare a draft statement on this issue for review, and perhaps a resolution re Russian Avant Garde generally.
- **Minutes Item 8.1 Heritage Alerts (Kamakura)**: SB noted that the ISC20 Committee should write to the WH Secretariat also to inform future WH missions that may take place. We have sufficient documentation to initiate the Heritage Alerts template for the museum. SB requested that GH and YY continue to work to complete the HA template, then the HA alert should be agreed with ICOMOS Japan and uploaded to the website.
Minutes Item 8.2 Heritage @ Risk Report: SB suggested that JH, LS and BW, LR, SM get together to follow-up on the concept of developing coordination and synthesis of the ISC20C issues for the HR report and development of respective databases. SB recommended that the members of the Heritage Alerts committee should think about possible members to form a sub-committee to work on the HR risk report together with JH.

Minutes Item 8.3 Post war city and identity: JH to keep ISC20C aware of progress.

Minutes Item 8.4 MAP20 Project: DB and SU to advise on results of the Montreal meeting and whether the DB and SU can move forward with the MAP20 project.

Minutes Item 8.5 Madrid Document: Having considered the comments received and discussion today, the ISC20C will seek to expand the document to cover the resource of C20 holistically.

The committee will collect and assess further comments until March/April 2012 and FEM/SM/ SB will prepare a report on the comments received at the next meeting.

ISC20C to draft a GA resolution from the ISC20C noting the contribution that this document makes and that the document is a product of the ISC20C now in circulation for comment.

SB to organise full ISC and NC distribution via Secretariat.

KN to upload and invite comments via Facebook.

All ISC20C members to consider refinements, illustrations and case studies for discussion in Helsinki and send to Fernando and Susan (FEM/SM)

Minutes Item 8.6 The C20 Thematic Study: SM would like to know if anyone would like to join a sub-committee to work hard on the C20 Thematic Study. Please send email to SM if you would like to volunteer to be part of a subcommittee.

Minutes Item 8.7 ISC20C Heritage Toolkit: SB requested that a new member should be able to take over this project from now on. LR may be possible helper or to form a committee to work on this project.
ICOMOS ISC20C Heritage Toolkit

INTRODUCTION TO THE ICOMOS ISC20C HERITAGE TOOLKIT

a web based toolkit of reference resources for ISC20CH members

This on-line reference collection of benchmark “best practice” documents is being constantly assembled by and for members of the ICOMOS ISC20C. The entries identify the range of work being done across the world to simultaneously advance the development of heritage principles and technical research that is worth sharing to assist the conservation of Twentieth Century Heritage.

The ISC20C toolkit aims to share new methodologies and approaches to conservation practice, by providing access to information and sources that its own members find useful. All ISC20C members have been invited to share up to 10 benchmark heritage tools (guidelines, policies, publications, websites) that they use regularly as reference resources - with a brief summary and a hyperlink or PDF where practical (and legal) to make them electronically accessible to everyone.

Contributions from all ISC20C members in every language are welcome.

SHERIDAN BURKE
President
ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage
September 2011

____________________________________________

SECTION 1. CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES

Burra Charter, The Australia ICOMOS 1999

The 1999 revision of the Burra Charter is available from Australia ICOMOS

Go to the [ICOMOS Australia website](http://www.icomos.org.au) for further details and to download the document

*(From personal reference resources of ISC20C member Sheridan Burke)*

The Illustrated Burra Charter Australia ICOMOS 2004

This companion document to Australia ICOMOS’s 1999 revision of the Burra Charter is now available

Go to the [ICOMOS Australia website](http://www.icomos.org.au) for further details and to download their order form Conservation

*(From personal reference resources of ISC20C member Sheridan Burke)*
SECTION 2. GUIDELINES

Conservation Principles, policies and Guidance

Publication:  The primary aim of the Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance is to support the quality of decision-making, with the ultimate objective of creating a management regime for all aspects of the historic environment that is clear and transparent in its purpose and sustainable in its application. http://publications/conservation-principles-sustainable-management-historic-environment/

(From personal reference resources of ISC20C member Sheridan Burke)

Enabling development and the conservation of significant places

Publication:  The guidance now concentrates on those areas of practice that are particular to enabling development (and by extension other proposals where financial viability is a key issue), rather than common to most proposals affecting significant places, on which other guidance is now available. http://publications/enabling-development-and-the-conservation-of-significant-places/

(From personal reference resources of ISC20C member Sheridan Burke)

Design in Context; Guidelines for Infill Development in the Historic Environment

- NSW Heritage Office, RAIA NSW Chapter 2005
- Description: advice on designing high quality buildings in heritage areas
  - Design in Context

(From personal reference resources of ISC20C member Sheridan Burke)

Heritage Interpretation Policy

- NSW Heritage Office, 2005
- Description: guidance on best practice in interpreting heritage places and objects. See also Interpreting Heritage Places and Items
  - Download PDF document [107 KB]

(From personal reference resources of ISC20C member Sheridan Burke)

Photographic Recording Of Heritage Items Using Film or Digital Capture

- Description: a checklist for making an archival photographic record. Revised in 2006 to include digital photography
  - Download PDF document [174 KB]

(From personal reference resources of ISC20C member Sheridan Burke)

Statements of Heritage Impact

- NSW Heritage Office and Department of Urban Affairs & Planning 1996, revised 2002
SECTION 3. MATERIALS CONSERVATION

Investigation and Repair of Historic Concrete

- NSW Heritage Office 2003
- Description: practical advice on repairing reinforced concrete. Available in hard copy.
- Download PDF document for free [742 KB]

(From personal reference resources of ISC20C member Sheridan Burke)

SECTION 4. REALLY USEFUL WEBSITES


Historic Scotland professional publications: http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/heritage.htm

English Heritage technical publications: http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/

Australia ICOMOS: http://australia.icomos.org/publications/other-publications/

UIA Twentieth Century Heritage index: http://www.archi.fr/UIA/

Docomomo: http://www.docomomo.com/history.php#

SECTION 5. REALLY USEFUL REFERENCES
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ISC20C Serial Nomination Workshop Minutes
Paris, France
December 2, 2011
INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON
TWENTIETH CENTURY HERITAGE

WORKSHOP
MODERN HERITAGE SERIAL SITES: Nomination Analysis

FRIDAY, 2 DECEMBER 2011, 6 PM
Pavillion Suisse, Cité Universitaire
Paris, France

DRAFT MINUTES

Background: There are at least 4 architectural oeuvres on World Heritage tentative lists already: Le Corbusier, Frank Lloyd Wright, Henry Van der Velde, and potentially Alvar Aalto. Great men, great movements, but which properties demonstrate OUV? Selection, context and management are all critical areas for analysis- as well as the test evaluation of authenticity and integrity.

The General Assembly in Paris in December 2011 provided the ISC20C with an opportunity for informal discussion about the experience to date with serial nominations and identify what is needed in terms of comparative and thematic analysis for twentieth century heritage properties. The perspectives of nominators, advisers and assessors as well as ICOMOS were invited and enthusiastically discussed.

Present: Members of the ICOMOS ISC20C (Sheridan Burke, Alfredo Conti, Fernando E.L. Monteros, Dinu Bumbaru, Kyle Normandin, Natalia Dushkina, Riitta Salastie, Yoshiyuki Yamana, Masashi Akiba (Japan) Prisc a Schmuckle Von Minerwitz, Gunny Harboe, Leo Schmidt, Susan Macdonald, Laura Robinson; Maija Kairamo (Finland), Louise Cox (Australia), Louise Noelle Gras (Mexico), Peter Cox, Agnès Cailliau (France), Bénédicte Gandini (Fondation Le Corbusier, France) and others, 25 in all.

Apologies: Christiane Scmuckle Mollard

Invited speakers:

Alfredo Conti (AC), ICOMOS WHWG: The ICOMOS perspective: serial nominations
Regina Durighello (RD), Director of the WH Programme, ICOMOS: Managing and Assessing the serial process
Susan Denyer (SD), ICOMOS WH Adviser: Modern serial sites experience
Susan Macdonald (SM), ISC20C: Thematic Study project of the ISC20C
Sheridan Burke (SB), President ISC20C, gave a brief overview of the WH nominations regarding Modern heritage, including serial ones (cases of Aalto 2005, Le Corbusier...
2008, Van De Velde and Wright in WH Tentative Lists). She also marked the specificity of serial groups, existing difficulties and presented speakers.

1. Alfredo Conti recalled the WH Convention as the most successful of all UNESCO documents and reminded that the notion of ‘series’ (as monuments, group of buildings, sites) appeared in the Convention, the text of which never changed since 1972. ‘Operational Guidelines’ (OG), 1977, have been revised repeatedly, with the last version adopted in November 2011. The notion of ‘serial nomination’ (first understood as linked thematically in different geographical locations) was supported by ICOMOS which stressed that ‘series as a whole is much important than individual’, with a special care of OUV (Outstanding Universal Value).

The OG 2005 specifically pointed out for ‘series’: 1) necessity of management for each component and their coordination, with establishment of a special management body; 2) possibility of serial national/transboundary nominations; 3) concept of ‘adding’ new properties as extension (case of several countries involved, with OUV demonstration).

In 2009 (Switzerland meeting), the notion of a serial inscription was enriched with: 1) a possibility of additions within each state party (serial national/transnational properties); 2) an idea of complimentary properties; 3) an integration of separate components into one ensemble; 4) a view at series as illustrating specific historical process/evolution (including buildings, sites, cultural routes, unique territories). These positions were implemented into the OG final version, 2011(III C: Transboundary properties, 137-139; Serial properties, 137-139).

In June 2011, while assessing new serial properties into the WH List, the necessity of substantial OUV scientific research as ‘easily understood and communicated’ was stressed anew, as well as of a ‘common management process’.

2. Regina Durighello gave an overview of the WH inscription procedure, explaining the time table (including ‘serial nominations’). She described the process of the ICOMOS assessment (desk and evaluation reports); and the role and interrelations of ICOMOS thematic working groups, experts, advisers, ICOMOS WH panel and the UNESCO WH Centre. She mentioned that up to 14 advisors may play a role in any one nomination assessment, a huge co-ordination exercise in 2011 when 48 sites were reviewed.

In concluding RD marked the importance of the changes in the 2011 version of the OG for ‘serial nominations’ (including OUV assessment, justification of the components selection, authenticity/integrity balance, comparative analysis, management and legislation) and stressed that to get a consensus is a quite sophisticated process.

3. Susan Denyer addressed her presentation to a wide range of the 20th C examples (comparing the single nomination of Horta buildings in Brussels that represented stylistic evolution; the two separated nominations of works by Gaudi in Barcelona which resulted in 7 properties selected form a larger group proposed, and the variety of inclusions for the ‘Bauhaus’ with separate inscriptions including six Berlin housing settlements, educational and industrial buildings etc). She stressed the fundamental role of comparative analysis and voiced concern about a tendency for serial nominations ‘to become a catalogue of sites with unclear OUV’, commending close reading of the 2009 Ettinger meeting report.
The core of SD’s contribution was devoted to the revised and twice deferred serial/transboundary nomination ‘Architectural works of Le Corbusier, an outstanding contribution to the Modern Movement’ (France, Germany, Argentina, Belgium, Japan, Switzerland).

She enumerated the major ICOMOS objections for inscription expounded in the ICOMOS report to the WHC: 1) unclear whether the LC’s works are exceptional for MoMo to compare with other architects of the period; 2) lack of key characteristics of MoMo with uncertain influence either of the whole series, or of LC personally; 3) lack of urban dimension within nomination; 4) doubts on selection process; 5) lack of clear justification that selected list is of outstanding significance; 6) objection to emphasizing the role/personality of architect rather than stressing series of properties and their architectural attributes to be of the outstanding MoMo manifestations; 7) belief that intellectual aura of LC changed the world stronger than the influence of his individual buildings; 8) concluding that only several masterpieces of LC were demonstrated to deserve WH inscription on their own rather than part of serial nomination; etc.

SD stressed the necessity to continue the international debate of these issues (started after Paimio nomination was withdrawn) in order to allow a clear way forward for the nomination of other 20th C properties, and commended the Finish authorities for facilitating open international dialogue. SD noted that this subject needs strategic vision of the existing problems based on clear framework and convincing justification.

4. Susan Macdonald presented ‘Historic Thematic Framework to Assess the Significance of 20th C Cultural Heritage’ a major ICOMOS ISC20C initiative, briefly presenting the outcomes of the meeting held in Los Angeles, California in May 2011, sponsored by the Getty Conservation Institute (GCI).

ISC20C is aiming to develop (in collaboration with TICCIH, DOCOMOMO, UIA, national heritage organizations) a thematic framework that articulates the heritage of the twentieth century by examining the major historic changes and built outcomes of the era. ‘Serial’ methodology is a part of this ambitious project. It aims to provide a historic context for the WH nomination assessment, and will assist in the identification of the 20th C heritage resources and conservation on national levels, too. She enumerated the main ‘themes’ for analysis (technology and science, governance, globalization, increased mobility, culture and society, with many others typological and conceptual lines within each thematic groups; see the LA meeting report of SM at ISC20C web-site). Concluding, SM stressed that this framework will significantly help comparative analysis.

Discussion- Natalia Dushkina (ND, ISC20C VP) marked that ‘serial nomination’ is an objective notion, not specifically for the 20th C and should be analyzed as such; she also addressed ‘series’ as a ‘mechanism’ regulating the quantity of the WH sites inscribed on the List, which could not be endless. As for evaluation process, ND (being on the ICOMOS evaluation missions both for Aalto and Le Corbusier), expressed her doubts on final decisions taken by ICOMOS WH panel in both cases as—they appeared to oppose each other (Aalto to be series, LC – to reject from collection principle). She also pointed out that in case of great masters/architects, the position of ICOMOS/WH Committee calling for addressing of ‘properties’ rather than their authors, to some extend is contradictory to the criteria (i) regarding ‘a masterpiece of human creative genius’. ND also called for a need of more transparent position of both ICOMOS/WH
Committee for the 20th C nominations. The time for preparation and assessment of a dossier for series (e.g. LC, second version – 1600 pages) takes significant human and financial resources. The current situation with ‘LC collection’ might discourage other State parties to go on forward with serial nominations.

SD also regretted the timeframe imposed, but felt that ICOMOS/WH group aimed at constructive recommendations and in case of LC nomination versions (even in the second round ) there was no clear justification of OUV as for the whole series, as for separate structures. She indicated that it was felt by the WHWG that there was sufficient justification to go on forward with only three individual nominations - Marseilles, Villa Savoye and Ronchamp (and possibly NMWA in Tokyo) is based on a lack of this basic justification in the second dossier approach. In general, the concept of serial nomination needed more discussion, and emphasized that the staff are always ready to do so. She spoke briefly about the current Silk Road(s) nomination where extensive upstream negotiation is underway, with a thorough thematic study providing initial overview, specialist essays about critical sites and their context.

AC continued the preparation theme pointing again that in case of series it is very important to show how each component can contributing to a potential of collection. He also stressed the difficulties in assessing authenticity for the 20th C properties being built with a short life span. For serial transboundary nominations (if being rejected for WH inscription) enormous political impact is inevitable.

SB suggested that for modern architecture, the transboundary influence of individuals like Mies, Le Corbusier and FL Wright needed thoughtful analysis.

Dinu Bumbaru marked that ‘serial nomination’ is a confusing approach as people want to know ‘what is really outstanding’, what achievements are standing behind especially in the case of 20th C. Other dimensions of serial are important. He talked on necessity to work out Tentative lists for Modern heritage in order to assess what is prospective – groups of buildings or separate structures, explore the existing lists and national inventories to better see the context.

Maija Kairamo being involved in Aalto case treats ‘Corbusier List’ as a test in a way. She thinks that Aalto will never be listed as a serial as was recommended by ICOMOS. This architect was very rich in construction and his best buildings are in permanent use with inevitable losses through time (even for Villa Mairea or Aalto’s Own House, now Aalto Foundation). Application of WH evaluation criteria are apparently opposing this ongoing living functionality and adaptation, though from the very beginning Aalto was included to all Tentative lists, including DOCOMOMO.

Gunny Harboe reminded the case of FL Wright with Taliesin nomination, which was rejected and advised for serial group, similar to Aalto. If now to take the recommended line for LC, with several individual nominations, this will be an enormous work for the country. The works of Wright are all related to each other and representing a ‘creative genius’. Individual approach ‘diminishing the meaning of the whole group’. SD stressed anew that Convention is not about architects, ‘we inscribing properties reflecting the ideas’.

Agnès Cailliau, Chair DOCOMOMO/France, insisted that only the variety of LC works presents OUV. She compared this case with the sonatas of Beethoven when they could
be estimated only as a whole. Agnès recalled LC’s paintings, color, material, philosophy sacred/social architecture, etc, which only in combination are unique universally, as a process and creative achievement.

Peter Cox (Ireland) questioned whether there was a need to review the Convention as a whole, not just the Operational Guidelines!

Laura Robinson (South Africa) called for rejecting from ‘gigantic’ dossiers and preparing very simple ones, really to the point and significance in order to get essence, not a reference book.

Louise Cox (UIA) appealed to the quality of individual components in serial nomination as a core problem. She also commented the case of Charles Darwin nomination mentioned by SD saying that his ideas are important as intangible heritage, not properties connected with this historical figure. She recommended a “selection of the fittest” approach.

SB raised a point that all nomination cases should be seriously discussed within the context of Tentative lists, and at the level of the ICOMOS ISC20C, before nomination by a State party. To assist this work, the thematic framework described by SM was essential. A special methodology based on Thematic studies and tentative analysis could then be worked out, as was presently happening for industrial heritage nominations in Japan.

SD agreed, and marked the importance of comparative analysis questions and a need for supporting context in order to explain values of the nomination within a framework. In order to evaluate significant values in serials (on local, national and international levels), wide publications and promotion are important.

Concluding AC, RD and SD expressed their thanks and congratulations to ISC20C for launching this discussion and pointed out at the necessity of thematic and typological framework as useful tools for the WH communities (States parties, experts, etc) and very important for the future. SD said that for recent heritage this framework is of great significance as we facing potentially large numbers of nominations for 20th C structures.

Proposed actions for the future action by ISC20C:

- To encourage development of Tentative lists for C20 properties nationally, and for the WH
- To continue developing Thematic history framework for recent heritage
- To develop a toolkit of relevant Conservation tools and information on the ISC20c website;
- including a data base on evaluation of the 20thC heritage (including existing chronological, typological, etc Tentative lists worked out since 1985 within ICOMOS, DOCOMOMO, WH Centre);
- To promote further discussion on the value and construction of ‘serial nomination’ including ones for the 20thC;
- To establish a joint working platform with the ICOMOS/WH group and possibly the WH Centre for 20thC promotion and an elaboration of strategic guidelines.
SB thanked everyone, especially the members of the WH secretariat and advisers for their open and enthusiastic participation and was encouraged by the open doors that seemed available for further discussion with the ICOMOS WHWG and the secretariat through Alfredo Conti. She emphasized her personal commitment as President of ISC20C to facilitating further discussion such as this, and welcomed the opportunity offered by the Japanese government to continue this debate further at an expert symposium early next year in Tokyo.

Chair of the meeting: Sheridan Burke

Rapporteur: Natalia Dushkina
President Report
By Sheridan Burke
Helsinki, Finland
President’s report
AGM ISC20CH August 2012 – Helsinki, Finland

1. Brief Summary position objectives
This position aims to lead, co-ordinate and represent the activities and objectives of the ISC20C as part of an active bureau team. It engages with the work of ICOMOS as a whole, and ISC20C partners and seeks to identify issues which lie ahead for the committee. It takes final responsibility for ISC20C actions, and contributes to a shared forum for communication, debate and teaching about Twentieth Century heritage.

2. Accomplishments

The role of the president is fundamental in many of the activities of the committee, including:

Meetings: A business meeting for ISC20CH was held in conjunction with the Paris General Assembly of ICOMOS in November 2011. The agenda of the annual meeting was fully covered and included reports on the ISC20C four major projects, as well as our ongoing work program and administration.

Heritage Alerts The ISC20CH has adapted the Heritage Alerts concept for ICOMOS more generally, and it was successfully used as the basis for the Paris GA resolutions for all sites at risk.

At present we have four Heritage Alerts underway, in which the president is closely involved, working with a small subcommittee led by Gunny Harboe, with Laura Robinson and Britt Wisth. It is a time consuming process to do well.

  • Kamakura Museum of Modern Art, Japan
  • Central Government Offices Hong Kong, China
  • Kyoto Kaikan, Japan
  • Prentis Hospital, Chicago, USA

After the General Assembly in Paris, I visited the Hall Freycinet and met with a range of stakeholders, drafting letters and briefings, liaising with the ICOMOS Secretariat and with Docomomo France. The threat to the site has been successfully resolved.

General Assembly Resolutions: ISC20C proposed three resolutions: Russian Avante Garde(Natalia Dushkina); Halles Freycinnet(Christiane Scmokele Mollard); Twentieth Century Guidelines (Sheridan Burke), which are attached to this report.

World Heritage: The ISC20CH has been approached to provide further advice to the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel and WHWorking Group on the Le Corbusier nomination, and its subsequent revision. ISC20C organized meetings in Paris, December 2011 and with the assistance of the NMWA in Tokyo in February 2012. Following my participation in several teleconferences with the ICOMOS World Heritage Secretariat on this matter, I have organized a further discussion session whilst in Helsinki with available members. The issue of serial site nominations for modern places will continue to be a major project for ISC20C.
Membership  Following a membership drive to all ISCs and NCs membership is growing, utilizing the agreed membership management policy. Riitta Salastie is kindly taking the membership role over from Kyle and are confident that our records are up to date.

Website: I prepared a new ISC20C Information Sheet, also to be used as introduction for the website.

Representing ISC20C: I have participated in the following seminars and conferences:
- Paris Advisory Committee and Scientific Committee, November 2011. Two ppt presentations on ISC Toolkit; ISC20C Guidelines for consideration by ICOMOS as a whole
- UNESCO World Heritage Convention 40 years On. Tokyo February 2012
- Serial Sites Workshop NMWA Tokyo February 2012
- UNESCO Asia Pacific Heritage Awards Jury Bangkok May 2012
- Docomomo Congress, Helsinki August 2012
- Marion Mahoney Griffin Annual Lecture, Canberra August 2012

Statutes: During the 2011 ISC20C elections, which were run by ICALFI in accordance with ICOMOS process we found that the current wording of the statutes limited the appointments. After extensive discussions with ICALFI an amendment to the statutes was put to the Bureau and will eventually circulate to voting members shortly. Meantime, the bureau resolved to expand to ensure regional representation, and welcomed the following co-opted members:
Nune Chilingaryan (Armenia)
Fernando Espinosa de los Monteros (Spain)
Gunny Harboe (USA)
Susan Macdonald (Australia/USA)
Yoshiyuki Yamana (Japan)
Riitta Salastie (Finland)

ISC20C Annual Report for ICOMOS Prepared and delivered to ICOMOS May with Kyle Normandin.

3. Actions November 2011- August 2012

1. Implementing the 2011-2014 initial triennial action plan with those responsible
3. World Heritage: Serial Site nominations development(with ICOMOS Secretariat); and the development of the Twentieth Century historic themes framework (Susan Macdonald)
4. The Madrid Declaration on architectural interventions and ongoing C20 Guidelines development (Fernando Espinosa De Los Moneros, Jorg Haspel and Susan Macdonald)
5. Communications: Numerous letters, references, advices (with Kyle Normandin)

Other contributions to other ISC20C projects underway:
- Implementing the draft Triennial Action Plan for the committee (LR)
- MAPs upload: The uploading of this study to our website as a reference resource. (DB/SU)
- Space Heritage: ongoing connections. (LR)
- Partners ISC20CH has three active partners: UIA, Docomomo and TICCIH. collaborating on issues of mutual interest
- Various Annual reporting requirements of ICOMOS
• Organisation of 2013 Meeting opportunities: Chandigarh or Montreal?
• Forthcoming AC meeting in Beijing, enquiries re development of China committee on ISC20C

4. What has not advanced and needs support, please

Heritage Toolkit initiative, developing it for ICOMOS generally via the ICOMOS Document Centre.

Finances. I enjoy the benefit of my office as a sponsor of ISC20C, but further support would assist the operation of the secretariat.

Expansion of membership amongst young professionals via mentoring and meaningful participation in its projects and conferences, to secure our committees sustainability.

5. Over 2011-2014, this position will be actively contributing to the triennial work plan by…

Working closely with the expanded bureau, supporting and encouraging all bureau members to take on a Triennial Work Programme project leadership role such as further developing the toolkit, ongoing Heritage Alerts, broadening the Madrid document, world heritage work, regionally developing and representing ISC20C.

Continuing the tradition of offering a public forum / workshop with each ISC20C meeting as a means of spreading information and attracting new members. Making membership of the ISC20C professionally and personally rewarding and fun!

I am always happy to receive comments and suggestions
Ms Sheridan Burke, President ISC20C Email: sheridanb@gml.com.au

ISC20C RESOLUTIONS AT THE ICOMOS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, PARIS

Resolution 17GA 2011/23 – La Halle Freysinnet
Considering that “La Halle Freysinnet” is an exceptional Parisian building situated behind the French National Library (Bibliothèque Nationale de France, BNF) and is currently under threat and in danger of being partly demolished;
Taking into account that Eugène Freysinnet (1879-1962) was an innovative engineer who was a pioneer in pre-stressed and post tensioned concrete structures in the early part of the 20th century;
Recognizing that the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee for 20th Century Heritage and the Analysis and Restoration of Structures noted the importance of celebrating “La Halle Freysinnet” as a unique and significant concrete building structure, which set a precedent for the advent of 20th century building innovation internationally;
Strongly recommends to the French authorities to preserve the building with all of the 18,000 square meters of interior space and with its full integrity;
Requests the Executive Committee to seek contact with the responsible authorities to support its full protection now and in the future and to offer the collaboration of ICOMOS towards this goal.

Resolution 17GA 2011/24 – Heritage of the Russian Architectural Avant-garde
Taking into consideration the continuous degradation of globally known monuments of the Russian Architectural Avant-Garde;
Sustaining efforts of international organizations including ICOMOS, DOCOMOMO, UIA and WMF in previous years to prevent the on-going destruction of this valuable heritage resource; Recalling the “Moscow Declaration on 20th Century Architecture and World Heritage”, signed by
ICOMOS, DOCOMOMO and UIA in 2006; 
Calls upon the Russian authorities to take urgent steps for the preservation and restoration of the world famous monuments of the Russian architectural Avant-Garde, including Melnikov’s House-Studio, Rusakov Club and Ginsburg’s Narkomfin House in order to prevent their degradation and destruction.

Resolution 17GA 2011/37 - Resolution on Twentieth Century Heritage Guidelines

Recalling that the identification, conservation and presentation of the heritage sites of the modern and postmodern era have long been a matter of concern and commitment by ICOMOS;
Noting with satisfaction the development of the draft text Approaches for the Conservation of Twentieth Century Architectural Heritage (The Madrid Document) by the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Twentieth Century Heritage, and its distribution for comment and discussion, and considering the full breadth of 20th century heritage;
Encourages the wide participation of National and International Scientific Committees in the on-going development of these draft concepts.
ISC20C Statute Amendment Report
By Susan Macdonald
Helsinki, Finland
Proposed statutes amendment (AGENDA ITEM 4.3) Report by Susan Macdonald
ISC20C August 6, 2012 – Helsinki, Finland

1. Brief Summary of project or position objectives
This position aims 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.

At the Paris AGM it was recommended by ICOMOS International Bureau member Gideon Koran that a committee member who is not a member of the ISC20 Bureau take this forward and Susan Macdonald agreed to undertake this task.

2. Accomplishments (Brief Summary of Project Progress /Position during the last 12 months)
Since Paris various proposals have been presented to Gideon Koren for advice to ensure legality and consistency with ICOMOS practice. The proposed amendment as circulated on 20th July 2012 to voting members is the outcome of those discussions. These have been referred to the ISC President and Secretary General and a proposed amendment was sent to members in advance of the Helsinki meeting as agreed in Paris in order that it is resolved by that stage. 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.

A copy of the existing statutes dated 2008 is at Annexure A.
A copy of the email of 20th July is provided in Annexure B.
The proposed statutes included the amendments marked in bold are at Annexure C

3. Actions (proposed for 2013)
That the matter of the statutes be resolved at the meeting in Helsinki with those unable to attend providing comment by email by close of business Helsinki time 4th August 2012.
4. **Recommendations** *(Committee involvement or decisions required)*

The following involvement and decision is requested from ISC20C members in advance and the AGM:

1. Any further comments are provided to the Secretary General about the Statute amendment by close of business Helsinki time 4th August 2012.
2. That members discuss any issues raised.
3. That members approve the amendment to the statutes as proposed in Annexure C.
4. That members note that this statute change will come into effect for the next election cycle in 2014.
5. That members approve the proposal that in the interim (NOW between 2012-2014) the bureau will proceed to invite via co-option of the following additional members to enhance regional representation and facilitate and lead the ongoing activities identified in the Action Plan which are currently underway:

   - Fernando Espinosa de los Monteros: who is very actively working on the development of the Madrid Document
   - Gunny Harboe: who is busy chairing the Heritage Alerts subcommittee and provides our UIA nexus
   - Susan Macdonald: who is developing and managing the Thematic Framework Study.
   - Yoshiyuki Yamana: who we would ask to continue his work on serial site issues, and to specifically develop ISC20C engagement with Asia and look at our archives and oral history work (with Vaidas Petrulis)
   - Nune Chanlingayan: who we would ask to work on the Toolkit project (with Sandra Uskovic), and to actively pursue younger member engagement given Laura Robinsons now busy role on the ICOMOS EC.
   - Riitta Salastie: who is currently facilitating all Membership issues.

5. **Future Goals and Activities for the ISC20C Triennial Work Programme 2012-2015**

5.1 Over 2012-2015, this project/position will be **actively contributing** to the triennial work plan by enhancing the reach and capacity of the Bureau to achieve this work plan.

5.2 The project/position contribution to **providing a shared forum** for communication, debate, teaching and will be that it expands the number of people actively involved in core management of the committee and responsibility for taking forward agreed activities. This provides for additional people to be involved, whilst assuring the activities stay true to their intent.

5.3 The project/position contribution to **bringing in new members** will be by expanding the Bureau and then requiring these people to engage others in furthering activities outside the Bureau.
6. ISC20C Committee Member comments on report /recommendations

- A number of members agreed the proposal and additional minor questions were raised.
- One member provided specific comments on the email of 20 July 2012 and identified that some of the content of the statute being amended had been deleted and alerted the Bureau to this problem as part of the voting process. As a result this member disagreed with the statute amendment. This has resulted in this issue being re-referred at the meeting. These comments include:

Responses are provided in bold following each comment:

a. “That the matter should be discussed at a meeting”
Response: this process was agreed by the committee at the meeting in Paris so should proceed as agreed by the committee. It is however referred for discussion.

b. That the amendment as provided deleted the requirement for members to be elected.
Response: Yes agreed - this requirement must be reinserted and is included in the version at Annexure C.

c. That the election process be public and undertaken at the AGMs.
Response: It is important to retain the electronic votes to be organized by the ICLAFI committee given that many members of our committee are not able to attend every meeting. The committee could choose to require that ICLAFI provide our committee with the voting results each election (including how many votes each candidate receives).

Any change to the voting process would need to be a new proposal to amend the statutes and was not part of the discussion at the Paris meeting.

d. “That the statutes stating "Time Spent on the Interim Management Committee (2006-08) will not count Towards term limits" could be an agreement of the committee and not a rule in the statutes”
Response: This has been agreed on a previous occasion and was not a proposed change to the statutes discussed in Paris. Any additional changes to these statutes would need to be proposed to the Committee.

- Following receipt of these comments one member recommended further discussion, and thought there several vague and unclear points.
Response: The revised proposal at Annexure C corrects the key point raised by the previous member. Discussion at the meeting will hopefully clarify any uncertainty of members as to the revised wording, which has been checked by Gideon Koren.
ANNEXURE A
Proposed statutes amendment (AGENDA ITEM 4.3) Report
ISC20C August 6, 2012 – Helsinki, Finland

Existing statutes
ANNEXURE B

Email to voting members on 20 July 2012

“Dear ISC20C Voting Members,

Since we met in Paris in November 2011, the Bureau has been in the process of working with ICLAFI to amend our ISC20C statutes (attached) based on increasing the regional representation as we decided in the Paris meeting (please refer to the Paris meeting minutes from November 2011). Susan Macdonald was actioned then to propose a statute amendment text and has consequently co-ordinated this with Gideon Koren from ICLAFI. While the amendment has proved very difficult and time consuming to resolve, the proposed text for the amendment shown below is now approved by ICLAFI and seeks to achieve the widest possible regional representation that is practical, at the same time, considers that we have enough bureau members to co-ordinate and lead the projects on the Triennial Action plan of the committee.

The current ISC20C bureau has APPROVED this approach and as a designated voting member of the ISC20C you are now asked to vote on the following change to the current ISC20C statutes:

IT IS PROPOSED TO AMEND THE ISC20C STATUES REGARDING BUREAU COMPOSITION IN THE FOLLOWING WAY:

DELETE EXISTING WORDING

SECTION 4.3 BUREAU

Section 4.3 Bureau: The Bureau shall consist of members elected from the expert members of the Committee. There shall be a President, a Secretary General, a Treasurer and one Vice President, all from different countries. There shall be additional Vice Presidents providing regional representation. All Bureau members shall serve a term of three years, and may serve a maximum of three consecutive terms in each office, but in no case will serve more than fifteen years.

Time spent serving on the Interim Management Committee (2006-08) will not be counted towards term limits.

REPLACE WITH THE FOLLOWING PROPOSED WORDING

SECTION 4.3 BUREAU

Section 4.3 Bureau: the Bureau shall consist of a President, a Secretary General, a Treasurer and four Vice President all from different countries. The Bureau has the option to co-opt up to 2 or 4 additional Vice Presidents to assist in achieving regional representation and fulfilling the Committee’s Triennial Action Plan. The regions reflect the 5 UNESCO regional groups as follows: Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Arab States. All members shall serve a term of three years and may serve a maximum of three consecutive terms in each office, but in no case will serve more than fifteen years on the Bureau in total. Time spent on the Interim management Committee (2006-08) will
not count towards term limits. Each Vice President will be required to lead and co-ordinate a major project identified from the Committee’s Triennial Action Plan during their term in office.

If agreed, the statute changes necessary for this amendment will come into effect for the next election cycle in 2014.

In the interim (NOW between 2012 -2014) the bureau will proceed to invite via co-option additional members to enhance regional representation and facilitate and lead the ongoing activities identified in the Action Plan which are currently underway.

- Fernando Espinosa de los Monteros: who is very actively working on the development of the Madrid Document
- Gunny Harboe: who is busy chairing the Heritage Alerts subcommittee and provides our UIA nexus
- Susan Macdonald: who is developing and managing the Thematic Framework Study.
- Yoshiyuki Yamana: who we would ask to continue his work on serial site issues, and to specifically develop ISC20C engagement with Asia and look at our archives and oral history work (with Vaidas Petrilis)
- Nune Chanlingayan: who we would ask to work on the Toolkit project (with Sandra Uskovic), and to actively pursue younger member engagement given Laura Robinsons now busy role on the ICOMOS EC.
- Riitta Salastie: who is currently facilitating all Membership issues.

We request that you please provide your comments on the proposed amendment stated above no later than Tuesday, July 31, 2012.

Please note that if I do not receive comments by Tuesday, July 2012, the statute amendment is adopted as noted above.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Kyle Normandin
ANNEXURE C
Proposed statutes amendment (AGENDA ITEM 4.3) Report
ISC20C August 6, 2012 – Helsinki, Finland

Proposed statute amendment to Section 4.3
New text highlighted in bold

PROPOSED REVISED SECTION 4.3 BUREAU

Section 4.3 Bureau: The Bureau shall consist of members elected from the expert members of the Committee. There shall be a President, a Secretary General, a Treasurer and four Vice Presidents all from different countries. The Bureau has the option to co-opt up to 2 or 4 additional Vice Presidents to assist in achieving regional representation and fulfilling the Committee's Triennial Action Plan. The regions reflect the 5 UNESCO regional groups as follows: Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Arab States. All members shall serve a term of three years and may serve a maximum of three consecutive terms in each office, but in no case will serve more that fifteen years on the Bureau in total. Time spent on the Interim management Committee (2006-08) will not count towards term limits. Each Vice President will be required to lead and co-ordinate a major project identified from the Committee's Triennial Action Plan during their term in office.
Article 1: Establishment and Aims

1.1 Establishment:
The Twentieth Century Heritage International Scientific Committee of ICOMOS (hereafter referred to as « the Committee ») is established in accordance with article 14 of the ICOMOS Statutes and the Eger Principles for International Scientific Committees. The draft statutes were adopted by representatives of the Committee on 6 February 2005 and approved by the Executive Committee on 7 February 2005. In 2008 the statutes were revised in accordance with the Eger-Xi’an Principles and were adopted by the Committee on 29 September 2008.

1.2 Aims:
The Committee aims to:
1.2.1 Promote and celebrate the value of heritage of the Twentieth Century and its creators;
1.2.2 Support the active identification, evaluation, management, safeguarding and conservation of Twentieth Century Heritage places;
1.2.3 Collaborate with and contribute to the work of other ICOMOS International Scientific Committees and relevant organisations in relation to Twentieth Century Heritage conservation, management and interpretation;
1.2.4 Develop and contribute to the archive of Twentieth Century Heritage documentation;
1.2.5 Provide a forum for organisations with interests in Twentieth Century Heritage to facilitate communication, debate, teaching and collaboration;
1.2.6 Provide specialist advice to ICOMOS on matters relating to Twentieth Century Heritage and the World Heritage Convention;
1.2.7 Organise at least one annual international meeting of the ISC and participate regionally in relevant activities, meetings and forums;
1.2.8 Raise funds and co-ordinate resources to support these aims and;
1.2.9 Address other Twentieth Century Heritage issues as they arise.

Article 2: Committee Objectives and Scope

2.1 Objectives:
The objective of the committee is to lead, support and sustain ICOMOS actions involving the conservation, management and interpretation of Twentieth Century heritage places.

The committee will act as a permanent international and multi-disciplinary group of experts addressing the conservation and management issues affecting Twentieth Century Heritage places, co-ordinating and integrating the various specialisations and research themes particular to this subject, facilitating international collaboration and disseminating knowledge thus acquired.

Actively identify forthcoming issues which impact the conservation of Twentieth Century heritage places

The committee will actively encourage the involvement and development of young practitioners as associate members.
2.2 Scope
Twentieth Century Heritage includes buildings, structures, urban ensembles and plans, cultural landscapes, industrial and historic archaeology including all forms of heritage, tangible and intangible. The heritage of the Twentieth Century has its origins in the nineteenth century and includes the products of more recent times.

Article 3: Membership
This Committee will be multi-disciplinary by its very nature and recognise the diversity of regional and cultural expression in Twentieth Century Heritage.

3.1 Expert Members: Expert members may be nominated by national ICOMOS committees, ISCs or may be self-nominated. If self-nominated, two supporting letters of recommendation from ICOMOS members who know the nominee are needed. In addition, nominees are to submit a letter of interest and their CV. Applications will be assessed by the Committee’s Secretary General and two other members.

Expert members must demonstrate competency in the subject through a minimum of ten years professional experience, relevant education and training, and most importantly, they must commit to actively participate in the work of the Committee.

Expert members must be ICOMOS members, and agree to abide by the Ethical Commitment Statement for ICOMOS Members, Madrid 2002. Failure to behave accordingly may result in dismissal by the Bureau.

In accordance with the decision of the 2007 Scientific Council meeting in Edinburgh, National Committees will designate one expert member to vote for the Committee Bureau and on changes to the C20 ISC Statutes. There is no limit on the number of expert members that can be nominated by national committees and ISCs to the committee, and to vote on other committee decisions.

3.2 Associate Members: Associate members are ICOMOS members who wish to build up their interest and expertise in Twentieth Century Heritage conservation. Associate members will generally be younger practitioners willing to actively participate in the work of the Committee. Associate members are conditionally accepted for a period of three years, after which time their contribution to the Committee will be evaluated for possible elevation to be an expert member. Associate members are accorded no voting rights.

3.3 Honorary Members may be appointed by the Committee in recognition of the services they have rendered to the Committee or in recognition of their activities in favour of the Committee’s objectives. Honorary members have no voting rights.

3.4 Institutional Members: Institutional members may include organisations, institutions, academic programmes, government agencies and NGOs whose work and mission closely align to those of the Committee. Institutional membership is generally valid for one triennium but may be renewed indefinitely in three year periods. Institutional members are accorded no voting rights.

3.5 Dismissal: The Committee Bureau will have the right to dismiss any member who is inactive for more than one year without explanation, who commits an action which may bring the Committee into disrepute, or who does not behave in accordance with the Ethical Commitment Statement for ICOMOS Members. Dismissal procedures will include notification of the ICOMOS International Secretariat.

Article 4: Committee Management

4.1 Annual Meeting: The Committee shall meet once each year. A written invitation by the Bureau including the agenda and any draft resolutions will be distributed to all members at least two weeks prior to the meeting.
4.2 **Quorum:** A minimum of 25% of expert members will be required to form a meeting quorum.

4.3 **Bureau:** The Bureau shall consist of members elected from the expert members of the Committee. There shall be a President, a Secretary General, a Treasurer and one Vice President, all from different countries. There shall be additional Vice Presidents providing regional representation. All Bureau members shall serve a term of three years, and may serve a maximum of three consecutive terms in each office, but in no case will serve more than fifteen years.

Time spent serving on the Interim Management Committee (2006-08) will not be counted towards term limits.

4.4 **Advisory Committee:** In accordance with article 12 of the ICOMOS Statutes, the President of each ISC will be an ex-officio member of the Advisory Committee of ICOMOS. Under article 7 of the Rules of the Advisory Committee, the president may be represented by a designated member of the ISC at the Advisory Committee meetings. To do so, a written proxy must be sent to the President of the Advisory Committee via the ICOMOS Secretariat at least 15 days before the Advisory Committee meets.

4.5 **Elections:** Written advice regarding the election will be distributed to members at least one month in advance of the election date.

Nominations for the Bureau from amongst expert members shall require nomination and seconding by expert members. All nominations shall be accompanied by a summary of the nominated candidate’s qualifications and experience.

Nominations for Bureau Members shall be invited electronically with a call for submission of nominations, followed by a two-week period for the receipt of nominations. The list of nominees will then be circulated electronically, followed by a two-week period for casting votes. At the close of polls, nominees with the majority of votes shall become the Bureau Members.

The first election shall be called by the foundation Co-Presidents in 2008, and thereafter, by the Secretary General of the committee.

The election will be held in time to conclude before the annual meeting held in association with the ICOMOS General Assembly. It may be held by verifiable postal or electronic vote under the supervision of a neutral party appointed by the Bureau, or in the first instance, by the Interim Management Committee. Written proxy votes may be admitted following due verification processes.

4.6 **Annual Report:** The Bureau shall report annually to the members of the Committee and to the Scientific Council and the Executive Committee of ICOMOS. This report shall include a list of members, the minutes of meetings of the Committee and of the Bureau, reports on the activities conducted by the Committee and progress made in respect of its Triennial Action Plan.

4.7 **Triennial Action Plan:** In the year of the ICOMOS General Assembly, Bureau shall draw up a Triennial Action Plan indicating a clear and precise set of goals for the coming three-year period to be approved by the Committee and forwarded to the Executive Committee of ICOMOS at least three months prior to the date of the ICOMOS General Assembly.

The Action Plan will include training initiatives in relation to Twentieth Century Heritage and opportunities for associate members and young professionals to develop their specialist knowledge and competency in Twentieth Century Heritage conservation.
4.8 Secretariat: The Secretariat or seat of the Committee shall be located in the country of which one of the members of the Bureau is a resident. The Secretariat will maintain the archives, service the Bureau, disseminate information and manage the website and list serve of the committee.

4.9 Languages: The working languages of the Committee are English and French.

4.10 Website: The committee will maintain a website, linked to the ICOMOS website.

Article 5: Finances

5.1 Funding: The activities of the Committee shall be financed by funds allocated by ICOMOS, by funds obtained by the Committee on its own initiative from international and national organizations including ICOMOS National Committees, and by funds from any other source provided by way of gift, bequest or sponsorship towards the achievement of the aims and objectives of the Committee.

5.2 Members’ Funding: The members of the Committee including the Bureau shall themselves obtain the funds necessary to ensure their own participation in the activities of the Committee, especially their presence at meetings. As a general rule, ISC work is entirely voluntary.

5.3 Budget: The Treasurer shall draw up a triennial budget and financial plan to be approved by the Committee and shall maintain an appropriate record of all committee financial transactions, prepare an annual statement, and Treasurer’s report.

Article 6: Miscellaneous

6.1 Administration: If required, the Committee shall conform to the legal, administrative and financial requirements of the country where its seat is located.

6.2 Amendment of Statutes: Proposals for the amendment of the statutes may be made by the Bureau or by a 2/3 majority of the National Committee designated expert members of the Committee. Revised statutes will then be subject to the approval of the Executive Committee of ICOMOS.

6.3 Eger-Xi’an Principles: Any interpretation of these statutes should be made in accordance with the Statutes of ICOMOS and the Eger-Xi’an Principles. Any disputes over the interpretation of the statutes shall be arbitrated by the Executive Committee of ICOMOS.

6.4 ISC Dissolution: In case of dissolution of the Committee, the management of the assets of the former Committee will be subject to the approval of the Executive Committee of ICOMOS.

6.5 Approval of Statutes: The Statutes enter into force with approval of the committee proposal by the Executive Committee of ICOMOS.

Revised, Quebec, October, 2008
Secretary General Report
By Kyle Normandin
Helsinki, Finland
1. Objectives
The goals and responsibilities are to distribute and circulate minutes of the meetings, pursue and work with appointed bureau members to oversee the work and implement the work program of the committee. The SG is to ensure collection of candidates and nominations from the membership subcommittee during elections and to maintain report documentation to support the work of the ISC20C Bureau and the committee. The SG will help organize and co-ordinate the activities of the ISC20C as part of the bureau and work with ISC20C members and partners to implement the triennial work program. Over the past few years, the SG has also simultaneously assumed the role of webmaster for maintenance of the ISC20C website and database.

2. Accomplishments
The role of the secretary general is a fundamental supportive role to the President, the Bureau and to the members and activities of the committee, including:

Meetings – Paris General Assembly Meeting and Conference, November 2011: A business meeting for ISC20C was organized and carried out prior to the 17th ICOMOS General Assembly and Scientific Symposium ‘Heritage, driver of development’ 27 November - 2 December 2011, Paris, France. It is noted that meeting minutes were distributed (attached). The objective of the meeting was found to continue discussion on guidelines for the conservation of Twentieth century heritage and to focus on development of the guideline document with all bureau members which is noted as the Madrid Document.

Website: The website has been updated to include new space for the Heritage Toolkit initiative. Heritage Alerts, Membership, and 2012 Meetings are currently on separate tab listings. Event listings and minutes have been updated and posted on the website, including downloadable links to related documents. Additional types of information and further development of the web site with graphics including a Facebook page are also now linked. Through the Facebook link, additional joint group meeting collaborations, additional web links and information postings can be linked to ISCARSAH, ICORP and other partner organizations like the UIA and DOCOMOMO.

It is noted that additional space is currently set aside by the network to post larger project initiatives such as the MAP20 project. However, it is noted that complications regarding contacting of original materials, text and obtaining of image copyrights may provide more challenging than originally anticipated. Discussions took place with the ICOMOS Secretariat to host and to restructure the website to include a more standardized website format which is in alignment with the new ICOMOS website recently unveiled at the General Assembly Meeting in Paris. However, after further consideration of the protocol required to implement regular updates to the ICOMOS website, it was decided to remain with the current website which is more flexible and streamline.

Social Networking: In an effort to increase greater social contact between committee members, outside partner organizations and groups, a social networking site was setup to assist the ISC20C. Social networking tools like ‘Facebook’ and ‘twitter’ are being utilized by many ISCs and NCS to create awareness and nation-wide collaboration. The social networking tool allows its member users, in particular younger professionals, to connect and share information on a variety of related subjects.
and topics rapidly and easily. We’ve created a Facebook page which is now linked to the revised and updated website. The Facebook page was setup by the SG and Chris Madrid French and is being regularly updated with events and links to heritage awareness initiatives which may be ongoing. Some of the recent event postings from the CATH20 Conference in Madrid and also some event photos from the regional Berlin meeting have been posted. All this information is current and being updated regularly, please visit: http://www.facebook.com/pages/Icomos-International-Scientific-Committee-on-20th-Century-Heritage/158516047547589

Since the inception of the ISC20C Facebook page in September 2011, the ICOMOS ISC20 page now has approximately 164 active users. Since the ISC20C meeting in Paris in December 2011, the number of active users has increased from 92 to 164.

**Membership:** The current ISC20C membership policy is posted on the website and can be accessed under the current membership tab. The types of membership are sourced in the ICSC20C statutes. It is recommended that in the policy, each class of membership have a specific activity requirement to ensure the committee stays active (e.g. expert members should have involvement in policy development, input to annual reports, and relate to their national ICOMOS committees).

The SG greatly acknowledges the assistance of Ritta Salastie (RS) who is now in charge of maintaining and the updating of the membership files and NC nomination letters. All potential new candidate committee members will be forwarded to and evaluated by RS who when then forward the results to the Secretary General for inclusion in the membership database.

**ICOMOS database:** The Scientific Council has indicated that the membership database is now ready for access and has requested that each ISC now make use of the new Giles Nourissier ICOMOS database. The database has been carefully prepared to assist networking among the ICOMOS membership and to improve membership management and services within the organization. It is operational as of now and its core objectives are:

- To complement one of ICOMOS core aims “to put expertise of highly qualified professionals and specialists at the service of the international community”;
- To permit the identification of skills and experience to be deployed in the conservation of cultural environments, and in the enhancement of best practice in design, administration and management, and in the application of laws, regulations and guidelines to fulfill national and international policies; in this age of Information Technology and international co-operation, to strengthen the participation in debate on cultural policies and practice;
- To strengthen support for communities’ world-wide, through enhancing the flow of ideas and scientific understanding;
- To strengthen the access to necessary holistic expertise required to resolve complex contemporary challenges;
- To enable the World’s media, public and private agencies to more easily find expert skills and experience, and find suitable biographies for contribution to public debate.

The Secretary General is expected to commence creation of expert members list for the ISC20C into the database. A link to the Giles Nourissier database will eventually be made available on the ISC20C website once it is available. It is important to note that each committee member must have current membership updated with the Secretariat in order to access the Giles Nourissier database. The SG will be providing directions to each expert member of the committee to access the database once the SG has structured the committee expert database listing.
Young Professionals and Students: Current engagement of young professionals and students is an ongoing work of the committee. The SG notes that the next step using the Facebook page is to contact academic institutions with announcements through Facebook. The ongoing discussion to include efforts to engage young professionals under 25 years old and universities could be drawn easily through social media networking sites and as future Associate members for the ISC20C committee. There is certainly a dynamic energy at many universities as seen during the CATH20 conference in June in which the committee could engage our initiatives.

Statutes: See separate report on Statute Amendment.

3. Actions proposed for 2012 – 2013

Implement the 2011-2014 initial triennial action plan.

Encourage more membership through the NCs and ISC committees.

Encourage more membership with younger professionals and Universities, a process that can be carried out through the social networking initiative which has just been started in September.

4. Future Goals and Activities for the ISC20C Triennial Work Programme 2011-2014

Work on the proposal to work with the ICOMOS Secretariat to update the Gilles Nourssier database. Committee volunteers knowledgeable in the website database design have volunteered to assist with this effort over the course of the next year. Once this database is implemented, it will be connected to the current website for use by ICOMOS committee members.

In addition, there are a number of Heritage Alerts which are currently in progress which will need to be uploaded to the website. Over the last few months, the Heritage Alert for the Hong Kong Government West Wing was uploaded and there will be a series more over the course of 2012-2013.

These proposals would aim to create enhanced interconnectivity with the new ICOMOS website which is more dynamic and wide reaching including separate interface tabs for access to the Gilles Nourssier database and also, useful tools like social networking sites.

Work on expansion and proposal for adaption of indexing system to build the Heritage Toolkit which is currently being adopted as an initiative by ICOMOS-wide.

Kyle Normandin, Secretary General ISC20C Email: knormandin@getty.edu
Treasurer Report
By Laura Robinson
Helsinki, Finland
## Patrimoine du 20e Siècle - Compte tenu par ICOMOS à Paris

**20th Century Heritage - ISC20C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Années</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Donateurs</th>
<th>Dépenses</th>
<th>Recettes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9-Oct</td>
<td>W.M.F. - Contribution ISC 20th (300$US)</td>
<td>200 total</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>31-Dec</td>
<td>Desk Review, 1 Site 2010</td>
<td>200 total</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15-Sep</td>
<td>W.M.F. - K. Normandin and his Committee (850$)</td>
<td>607 total</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Sep</td>
<td>W.M.F. - Expert Hon.-David Jones (50$)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Sep</td>
<td>W.M.F. - Expert Hon.-Enrique Xavier (50$)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Dec</td>
<td>Desk Review, Donation Christiane Schmuckle (Fr)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Dec</td>
<td>Laura Robinson - Sale of Publications</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Balance

**Account ISC20C**

1,348

Exchange rate is 1€ = 1,40 $US
Madrid Document Report
By Fernando Espinosa de los Monteros
Helsinki, Finland
REPORT ON THE RECEIVED COMMENTS - 3/7/2011

Based on 17 GA 2011/37 resolution of the General Assembly of ICOMOS held last December in Paris, and in response to the letter from our President Sheridan Burke to the national and scientific committees of ICOMOS seeking comment about the MD. I attached to this report, summarize and extract, those who have been through, and make a general comment of them.

The comments received are listed by order of receipt (arrival), except those issued by ISC20C members who participated in the working group and therefore already know.

DOCUMENTS POSTED BY MEMBERS OUTSIDE ISC20C

Mónica Luengo – President ISC Cultural Landscape

The importance of MD lies in being a specific document on twentieth-century architecture heritage. If it becomes a generic document all assets would not provide new values that are not already covered by other letters or documents, losing much of their interest.

In any case, the Cultural Landscape committee and especially some of its members more involved that have participated in the discussion, would love to work with our committee to make a specific document on the cultural landscape heritage of the twentieth century.

Nuno Alexander Rocha – ICOMOS Portugal

Considers that the MD is an important contribution to preserving the architectural heritage of the twentieth century.

Given its importance, requests permission to translate the document into Portuguese according to the DOCOMOMO and ICOMOS and give the diffusion they deserve. It has been already translated.
Jan Haenraets – DOCOMOMO ISC/U+L

It has a long and repetitive report, which generally raises the total modification of the MD, from the title to its spirit, removing all specific references to the architecture and its problems, with particular emphasis on terms such as landscaping and urban planning.

It also proposes review the spelling of the sentence "twentieth century heritage" and the clarification of the term "recent past".

Proposed that the MD explain more clearly the need to differentiate this twentieth heritage, from previous heritage.

Make a comparison of the MD with other existing documents and letters considering that there are some topics that should be included in the MD.

Finally he proposes to make a new document, different and generic to any heritage.

Patricia O'Donnell – ISC Cultural Landscape

Welcomes the report of his colleague Jan Haenraets emphasizing the need to use the term "recent past" and the need for a document containing the landscape rather than being specific for architecture.

James Ashby – ICOMOS Canadá – Getty Conservation Institute

Congratulates the committee for the importance of the document prepared, which certainly we support.

He makes specific comments on some articles, most of them help to clarify concepts and better understanding of the MD, such as included in the glossary the term "approach".

Jane Harrington - President Australia ICOMOS

Proposed by a reasoned document that the MD should include all heritages, not being specific of architecture. With reference to landscape and urban planning in relation to the "site".

Specifically recommended to replace the term "architectural heritage" by the "site of cultural significance" and remove any reference to specific architectural terms.
**Bruce Petry – Director M. Arch**

Has not clear the object of the MD.

Proposes a more concise and shorter articles and explain the need for a specific text of the twentieth century heritage and propose to generate a further discussion on specific issues of the twentieth century heritage, although don’t specific which of them.

A review through the text of the MD, offering a multitude of nuances, changes, deletions, etc., ... difficult to summarize because we would have to list all of them…

**Ofelia Sanou Alfaro – President ICOMOS Costa Rica**

More than contributions to the MD, presents general comments on aspects related to the customs or local problems of their country, although some issues may be generic as those that determine the application of safety rules for people in historic buildings.

**Sofía Avgerinou-Kolonias – CIVVIH - Urbanism Professor of the Athens University**

Proposes to extend the MD to urban and landscape heritage as they are highly developed in the twentieth century. So on a view through various articles of the MD proposes specific changes in concepts directly related to urban planning, as in the articles on: the methodology, the specialists, the "site", the tangible or intangible value, ...

Proposes to revise the text in French, because finds some differences with the English text, and propose to refer the MD to the principles of The Valletta.

**Kerstin Westerlund Bjurström – ICOMOS Sweden**

Consider the MD a useful text for all professionals involved in the conservation and propose to make a shorter version as a preface of the document.

Propose a translation into Swedish.

**Elainie Lawson –**

Consider the MD concise, practical and great.
**DR Bronwyn Hanna**

Consider the MD concise, clear, well organized, practical.

Proposes to clarify the term "architectural heritage" and further on the criteria of preserving the integrity of modern designs, or how the conservation of the patina can distort the appearance or meaning of a modern monument.

**Ken Horrigan – Protection of Heritage Department**

Consider the MD a very comprehensive document and proposes to extend Article 8 in reference to other measures of sustainability which can damage the image of heritage or landscape, as water, sun, etc.

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

From the received comments, I make the following conclusions of the generically issues raised:

1- There have been only a few comments.

2- It is considered an important document, clear, concise and practical.

3- Some colleagues propose to extend the MD to other heritages, but they only speak about urbanism and landscape, forgetting the other aspects of heritage ... while others colleges consider a mistake, understanding that extend it to other heritage can make it lose value, as they consider there are any new aspects not included In other documents and charters.

4- Keep the MD as a specific document in architecture heritage and make a new document for cultural landscape or urban plane of the twentieth century heritage.

5- Make a shorter document.

6- Refine the concept of "architectural heritage".

7- Refine the concept of "recent past".

8- Clarify terms such as "approaches", "sustainability", "patina" ..

9- Relate to the principles of The Valletta

10- Checks spelling and translation

11- Perform translation into other languages
HOW TO GO ON

After considering these comments collected by our colleagues and from our on committee I propose to act as follows:

1. Decide if we want the MD to continue its way to be accepted as ICOMOS doctrinal document, as we agreed and adopted in Paris in the GA, or we prefer to keep it as it is.

2. Decide if we want the MD to be an architecture-specific text, maintaining their original spirit, or we prefer to do a general extensive heritage text of the twentieth century, in which case we would have to decide if we modify the MD or make a new text.

3. Decide if we want to include certain aspects relating to the landscape or urban design, related to the site and architecture or prefer to create a specific document for the cultural landscape and urbanism heritage.

4. Decide if we want a shorter text.

5. In case of proceeding, we should make a commission of 3 or 4 colleagues, willing to work, concerned to implement the amendments adopted in our Committee to the MD, and continue the process.

6. To promote the translation of the MD as many languages as possible.

7. Broaden the MD.

Finally I will just like to say, that as a promoter of the MD I offer to continue working for the document, according to the approaches and decisions that will be adopted at the Helsinki meeting. Although I will not be with you, you know clearly my opinion of each and every one of the main points treated.

With any doubt I will respect the opinion and decision of the majority. It is a document of ALL of US

Hoping that this report will be useful for you, and sorry for my English that I hope you will be able to understand, I send you all a big hug and wish you a very good and pace holidays...

Fernando EM
20th Century World Heritage Thematic Framework Report
By Susan Macdonald
Helsinki, Finland
1. **Brief Summary of project or position objectives**

This project/position aims to advance the Thematic Framework Study, which is an identified project under the Triennial Work program.

In May 2009 the ICOMOS ISC 20C noted the lack of a “comprehensive or broad thematic study that moves beyond the framework of modern architecture.” In July 2009, ISC 20C members agreed upon a process to develop an historic thematic framework study for use in assessing the significance of the broad spectrum of twentieth-century heritage places which has the support of the four representative organizations: the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH), the International Committee for Documentation of Buildings, Sites and Neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement (DOCOMOMO), the International Union of Architects (UIA), and ICOMOS. An ISC 20C subcommittee was convened, including representatives from TICCIH, DOCOMOMO, and UIA, to conceptualize, manage, and review the development of such a framework.

In order to support this process, in May 2011, the Getty Conservation Institute organized and sponsored a two-day meeting bringing together ICOMOS ISC20 thematic framework subcommittee members and an international group of invitees who understand and have experience with thematic frameworks for heritage assessment, as well as expertise with a range of twentieth-century heritage types across a wide geographic span.

The meeting goals were to gain consensus between TICCIH, DOCOMOMO, ICOMOS, and UIA on the framework outline, to identify key historic themes for the twentieth century, to develop an outline for the historic thematic framework that will guide the work of a consultant who will later be hired to draft the detailed document, and to discuss ways to advance this study.

The next stage of the project is to source funds to advance the study, appoint a consultant to carry out work to develop the thematic framework, to consult on the draft and finally to produce a framework document that achieves the project aims.

The final work will be provided for use by the representative organizations as well as UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee. This framework will assist the World Heritage Committee in its consideration of nominations to the World Heritage List by facilitating their contextualization in relation to the history of the twentieth century and the comparative analysis of sites. It will also be useful in advancing the identification and protection of the undocumented legacy of the twentieth century at the local and national levels in places where a framework has not yet been developed.
At the Paris ISC20 the following actions were agreed:

“In the next 12 months this project/position will aim to advance the project to Stage 2 by:

• Seeking comments from ISC20 members in advance of the Annual meeting in Paris in December 2011.
• Discussing the document at the ISC20 meeting in Paris in December 2011, with the insight of committee members.
• Seeking feedback from the ICOMOS Executive Committee World Heritage Working Group.
• Soliciting funding for advancing the study by a consultant
• Undertaking a limited bid process for consultants to undertake the outline framework research.
• Commissioning a consultant to undertake the work.
• Consulting with ISC20 members, docomomo, TICCIH representatives on the work.
• Completion of the study.”

2. Accomplishments
Since the Paris meeting no comments have been received, therefore the intent is to proceed as detailed previously.
At the Paris World Heritage workshop the thematic study was discussed with those present from the ICOMOS Bureau and Susan Denyer assessor of ICOMOS nominations and they confirmed the usefulness of such a project.
Some very preliminary discussions with potential funding organisations have been undertaken as a precursor to developing a funding proposal.
In recent work undertaken with US professionals at the GCI it is clear that such a study is badly needed and these discussions will help provide data for approaching funders.
To date Enrique Javier de Anda Alanis has expressed interest in remaining involved in this work.

3. Actions (proposed for 2013)
In the next 12 months this project/position will aim to:
1. Seek feedback from the ICOMOS Executive Committee World Heritage Working Group.
2. Solicit funding for advancing the study by a consultant
3. Undertake a limited bid process for consultants to undertake the outline framework research.
4. Commission a consultant to undertake the work.
5. Consult with ISC20 members, docomomo, TICCIH representatives on the work.
6. Completion of the study.

4. Recommendations
The following support/involvement/decision is requested from ISC20C members at the AGM:
   a. To support the advancement of the work as agreed by the ISC20.
   b. To provide suggestions and contacts for seeking if funding support for the work
   c. To actively participate in the sub-committee to advance the work
   d. To provide suggestions on potential historians well versed in using such frameworks for heritage assessment and a sound knowledge of 20th century heritage.
e. To provide comment on draft documents as they proceed through the process.

5. **Future Goals and Activities for the ISC20C Triennial Work Programme 2012-2015**

5.1 Over 2011-2014, this project/position will be actively contributing to the triennial work plan by advancing the Thematic framework study to Stage 2 as identified under the heading of World Heritage Program.

5.2 The project/position contribution to providing a shared forum for communication, debate, teaching and will be via the development of drafts which will be circulated for (virtual) discussion. It may be useful to hold a second meeting or provide sufficient time for discussion on the framework as it advances through the process.

5.3 The project/position contribution to bringing in new members will be by engaging with other professional working in this area of conservation outside the ICOMOS Committee. This includes members of TICCIH, Docomomo and other organizations and individuals. This may enlarge our membership to new audiences with the same areas of interest.

6. **ISC20C Committee Member comments on report/recommendations**

   NA
Heritage @ Risk Report (Update)
By Jorg Haspel
Helsinki, Finland
Committee Structure and Membership
Jörg Haspel

"TOP 9.5 Heritage at Risk Report"

With reference to my former report of November 2011 (which is attached) and after consulting the chief-editor Christoph Machat I can update the current state of the project:

Christoph Machat (ICOMOS EXCOM; ICOMOS GER) will edit the next volume, when the financing / funding is secured (by ICOMOS International and/or ICOMOS Germany).

He is planning a formal call for papers / for articles to all NCs and ISCs after the summer break and will fix an editorial deadline in December 2012.

Of course he accepts papers, proposals and hints even now; and all members and experts of ISC 20C are cordially invited to contribute articles (including photographs, plans etc. to be published free of charge).

The report will be edited in preferably in English language; non-English entries should at least include headings/titles, image captions and summaries/abstracts in English language.

The Heritage@Risk report shall be published in a print version and (as in the years before) in a digital version / download version on the websites of ICOMOS International.

As to our ISC 20C activities and 20C heritage at risk problems Christoph Machat would like to take in consideration automatically all cases of Heritage Alert and document our ISC 20C activities resp. process of the ISC 20C Alert Advocacy Sub-Committee, if we agree. Gunny Harboe already provided information and documentation on the Heritage@Risk report shall be published in a print version and (as in the years before) in a digital version / download version on the websites of ICOMOS International.

As to our ISC 20C activities and 20C heritage at risk problems Christoph Machat would like to take in consideration automatically all cases of Heritage Alert and document our ISC 20C activities resp. process of the ISC 20C Alert Advocacy Sub-Committee, if we agree. Gunny Harboe already provided information and documentation on the Heritage@Risk report shall be published in a print version and (as in the years before) in a digital version / download version on the websites of ICOMOS International.
As to our ISC 20C activities and 20C heritage at risk problems Christoph Machat would like to take in consideration automatically all cases of Heritage Alert and document our ISC 20C activities resp. process of the ISC 20C Alert Advocacy Sub-Committee, if we agree. Gunny Harboe already provided information and documentation on the former *Prentice Women's Hospital* and mediated contacts to an expert and potential author for the next [H@R-edition](#).
TOP 11: Heritage at Risk Report
November 27, 2011 – Paris, France
Jörg Haspel – Berlin, 20th of November 2011

Committee Structure and Membership
Jörg Haspel

Background and Programme

ICOMOS Report Heritage @ Risk and endangered heritage of the 20th century

On occasion of the International Monument Day 2011 ICOMOS Germany presented the current issue of the “ICOMOS Report on Monuments and Sites in Danger”, in short, “Heritage @ Risk” or even shorter “H@R”, in Schinkel’s Altes Museum - the key monument of the World Heritage Site Museumsinsel Berlin - on the 18th of April 2011: Heritage at Risk. ICOMOS World Report 2008-2010 on Monuments and Sites in Danger. Berlin 2010 (Hendrik Bäßler-Verlag Berlin, ISBN 978-3-930388-65-3). The latest publication was edited by Christoph Machat, Michael Petzet and John Ziesemer and funded (as all preceding editions of the H@R series) by the German "Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and the Media" (BKM).

The reports and observations of the latest volume cover about 40 countries. Main topics are monuments and sites destroyed or threatened by natural disasters, such as earthquakes in Chile, China and Haiti. Further it deals with heritage at risk in Turkey, Pakistan and Brasilia or Cambodia and Afghanistan etc, but also points at threats caused by huge new construction projects in the context of the old towns and world heritage sites of Budapest, Istanbul, St. Petersburg, Vienna et al.. Some articles present endangered monuments of the 20th century heritage, such as the legacy of the Russian/Soviet avant-garde movement especially in Moscow or losses in Tel Aviv. A comprehensive contribution is devoted to the Power Station Rheinfelden in Germany / Switzerland, the world’s oldest hydroelectric energy plant, and the futile alert activities and joint protests of ICOMOS and TICCIH.

ICOMOS H@R Programme

The Heritage @ Risk program was endorsed by ICOMOS members at the General Assembly in Mexico in 1999. An invitation was sent to all ICOMOS National Committees, International Scientific Committees and ICOMOS' world-wide professional network, to provide short reports outlining risks in their country or area of expertise including case studies. ICOMOS Heritage @ Risk reports aim is to identify threatened heritage places, monuments and sites, present typical case studies and trends, and share suggestions for solving individual or global threats to our cultural heritage.

The ICOMOS reports H@R were started in 2000 by the Heritage@Risk Taskforce Dinu Bumbaru (Canada), Sheridan Burke (Australia) and Michael Petzet (Germany). Until 2011 nine volumes have been published in a print version and immediately became available on the ICOMOS website. Thanks to Christoph Machat, the new editor in charge, who analysed all previous editions of the last decade, the new volume supplies an index of all monuments and sites mentioned in H@R since the
beginning. More than 1,800 heritage places or conservation topics from 107 countries have been covered by H@R in the years 2000-2010.

There are two different types of printed Heritage at Risk reports. First of all there are annual, bi-annual or three annual global reports (until today 6 volumes) documenting current threats and losses of World Heritage Sites inscribed or applying for inscription (tentative lists) as well as endangered monuments and sites from all periods and regions in general. Additionally, a series Heritage at Risk Special (3 volumes up to now) has been launched, such as the H@R Special on Underwater Cultural Heritage at Risk: Managing Natural and Human Impacts (2006) or on The Soviet Heritage and European Modernism (2008), dedicated exclusively to the period of the 20th century and geographically focusing on Russia and former Soviet Republics. Moreover, the ICOMOS website presents the internet publications Heritage at Risk Special Reports on acute dangers and disasters, such as the Statement by the International Committee of the Blue Shield on threatened cultural property in the Middle East conflict (2006), the collection of material on the Earthquake in Haiti (2010) or the reports on the Tohoku Pacific Earthquake in Japan on 11 March 2011.

**Links and Partners**

The heritage at risk programme and reports are linked to similar international activities and projects of watching and warning against threats, such as the UNESCO-List of World Heritage in Danger and the bi-annual World Monument Watch list of the World Monument Fund. On the ICOMOS level the H@R observatory can be related to both the growing network of International Committee on Risk Preparedness (ICORP) as well as the support of the International Blue Shield Committee, founded in 1996 to provide protection from attack in the event of armed conflict and comprising Non-Governmental Organisations in the field of archives (ICA, CCAAA), museums (ICOMO), Libraries (IFLA) and ICOMOS. The ICOMOS ISC20C Heritage Alert System and the ISC20C Heritage Alert Advocacy Sub-Committee or the “Heritage in Danger” programme of DOCOMOMO International offer also opportunities for close cooperation. A strategic link between the ICOMOS H@R activities and the Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus (Chair: Leo Schmidt) will provide a data-based Global Heritage Monitoring Network (called “ICOMOS Heritage Trends Observatory“) to to document and record trends of monument conservation and monument change worldwide. Regional initiatives and institutions of preventive monitoring as the European Cultural Heritage Observatory (ECHO), the European Heritage Legal Forum (EHLF), the permanent information system European Heritage Network HEREIN of the Council of Europe or the Dutch project of a European co-operation “Monumentenwacht“ network will benefit from the global H@R system too.

All National Committees and International Scientific Committees and their members as well as experts from our partner organisations, like DOCOMOMO, TICCIH or UIA, are cordially invited by the editors to contribute to the Heritage at Risk report by sending articles, reports or brief comments and statements, not to forget photographs, illustrations, graphics, maps and plans or authentic documents. Statements and contributions coordinated and authorised by ICOMOS NCs or ICOMOS ISCs are preferred, individual expert opinions and comments are possible as well. Contact: secretariat@icomos.org or nc-machatch@netcologne.de and cmachat@netcologne.de
Triennial Work Plan 2011-2014
Helsinki, Finland
ICOMOS ISC20C WORK PLAN PARIS 2012-2014

1. Membership/ Gilles Nouissier Database: implement strategies to expand the ISC20C membership; encourage and assess proposed members via agreed criteria; invite membership from all national ICOMOS committees; integrate ISC20C with ICOMOS database [KN/RS]

2. Younger members: Engage and develop younger practitioners as members [LR/ ALL]

3. Communications: Continue regular list serve communications between ISC20C members [KN]

4. Website/ Facebook: Continue improvements to ISC20C website using website software for design and organization of changing programs and content. Additional improvements to consider may be an ISC20C Newsflash or newsletter circulated annually. [KN]

5. 20TH Century Thematic Study - World heritage: Provide World Heritage advice to ICOMOS Secretariat through policy development, mission experts, research and discussion papers etc [SM/ SB]


7. ISC20C Meetings: Utilize conferences and workshop events to meet, implement work plans and participate in regional activities. ISC20C bureau and membership to meet annually. [SB]

8. 2012 Meeting: Promote next conference in Helsinki, Finland, with ICOMOS Finland, and DOCOMOMO [RS]

9. WMF Nomination Reviews [KN]

10. MAP20 Project [SU/DB]

11. Heritage Alerts: Proactively develop the Heritage Alerts Project and Pilot ( GH, LR BW SB )

12. ICOMOS Heritage at Risk Program. Continue 'Twentieth-century heritage' as a theme in the ICOMOS H@R reports. [JH/KN]

13. Partnerships: Continue development of a strong collegiate collaborative engagement with Docomomo, per the Istanbul Principles. [KN FV for Docomomo] : TICCIH (HL,SB); ISCARSAH. [GH.KN] ; UIA engagement as per Agreement [LC,GH]

14. Research: Identify and promote good solutions for Twentieth-century heritage problems. eg MAP 20 project [ SU, ALL ]

15. ISC20C Heritage Toolkit [SB/ EA]

16. Archives: Contribute to the archive of Twentieth-century heritage documentation e.g. oral history interviews, etc.[ALL]