

**ICOMOS TWENTIETH CENTURY HERITAGE
INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE MEETING
ISC20C Annual Meeting, Tuesday, October 1, 2013**

*Chitkara University
Corporate Office Sector 9, Conference Room
Chandigarh, INDIA*

DRAFT MINUTES

1.0 WELCOME, PRESENT, INTRODUCTIONS, GUESTS

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

1.2 **ICOMOS ISC20C Bureau** included: President: Sheridan Burke (Australia); Vice-Presidents: Gunny Harboe (USA); Susan Macdonald (USA/ Australia); Yamana Yoshiyuki (Japan); Secretary General: Kyle Normandin (USA).

Members included: Dinu Bumbaru (Canada); Pamela Jerome (USA/ Scientific Council); Jorg Haspel (President ICOMOS Germany); Kiran Joshi (India); Christiane Schmuckle Mollard (France); Stuart Tappin (UK); Britt Wisth (Sweden); Anke Zalivako (Germany).

Observers: Robert Moore

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

Apologies Received: Enrique Xavier de Anda Alanis, Vice President (Mexico); Jozef Braeken (Belgium), Nune Chanlingayan, Vice-President (Armenia); Leo Schmidt (Germany); Fernando Espinosa de los Monteros, Vice President (Spain); Vaidus Petrulis (Lithuania); Sandra Uskokovic (Croatia); Laura Robinson, Treasurer (South Africa/ ExCom); Riitta Salastie, Vice President (Finland).

2.0 MEETING MINUTES, AUGUST 2012, HELSINKI, FINLAND

2.1 Minutes were confirmed by all

The Helsinki August 6, 2012 meeting minutes have been circulated and floor was opened for comments and suggestions. No suggestions. Moved accepted SM seconded LC. Minute Meetings were accepted.

3.0 Presidents Report:

SB spoke to a written report pre-circulated to committee members, and noted that there were many activities carried out by the ISC20C. SB congratulated RS who hosted the very successful ISC20C 2012 annual meeting in Helsinki for its excellent organisation. The Pecha Kucha evening was very well attended and is an event that

has now become a tradition at all of our ISC20C meetings. It is an opportunity for committee members to share what they have been doing throughout the year.

3.1 Advisory Committee Meeting, Beijing, China October 2012: SB reported that the Pecha Kucha format was also organized as part of the last Advisory Committee in Beijing, China. Sheridan, Pamela Jerome and Peter Cox presented three case studies and the event was organised by the Beijing University of Technology and attended by many members of the ICOMOS Executive Committee. The evening included the launch by the President of ICOMOS China, Tong Mingkang, of the Mandarin translation of the Madrid Document, kindly undertaken by Cheng Yang, which is quite different in that the methodology for translation a line by line translation of the Madrid Document. There was a great deal of interest in the document in China and over 100 copies of the translated Madrid Document were distributed at the meeting.

3.2 European Regional Meeting, Dubrovnik: SB also noted that she attended the European Regional meeting in Dubrovnik held in conjunction with a conference entitled, *Our Modern: Appropriating Vulnerable Twentieth Century Heritage*, organized by ISC20C Member Sandra Uskokovic together with the Inter University Centre in Dubrovnik, Croatia. Eight members enjoyed the conference and associated site visits. Discussions included the need to develop Institutional Membership for ISC20C and the contribution of ISC20C to research into the heritage of Socialist Realism. A boost to the updating of the MAP20 project was agreed and an invitation for the 2015 meeting in Berlin was welcomed.

3.3. ISC20-ISCCL-CIVVIH Joint Meeting, Florence, Italy: SB reported on the proposal discussed in Australia with the chair of the ICOMOS ISC on Cultural Landscapes (ISCCL) for a joint meeting with the ICOMOS ISC on Historic Towns and Villages (CIVVIH). This would implement our discussion of the Madrid Document in Helsinki that we should meet jointly to move forward the Madrid Document to cover all aspects of Twentieth Century heritage.

3.4 Heritage Alerts GH reported on the HA program which has been taking a prodigious amount of time and energy on behalf of the HA sub-committee members (GH BW, LR, KN) and the president. EA has been invited to join the HA subcommittee. The Hong Kong Central Government Offices West Wing HA is still active although the imminent danger period is over.

YY updated on the Kamakura Art Museum in Japan where we currently have a watch brief following several meetings and visits by the President. The Kyoto Kaikan has, unfortunately been severely damaged.

We also have a watch brief on the Paimio Sanatorium in Finland as this building is going out of community use and into a private medical use. JH updated on Ljubljana Stadium in Slovenia. Melnikov House in Moscow, Russia, had several letters sent to President Putin by Sheridan, but without. ND continues to use the letters of support widely with the press nationally and internationally. A HA was also completed on the Darling Harbour in Sydney, Australia. Unfortunately the government had already let a contract for demolition LC provided an update. It was noted that the HA for Darling Harbour was one of the most thorough templates received. A reply was received from the government on the HA expressing that the site was going to be 'alright'. The Novartis site in Paris was also subject of a full HA with DoCoMo Mo, headed by

Christiane Schmuckle Mollard. There is also a HA at Mier Pesado in Mexico. EA has been the key contact for advancing this Heritage Alert and has provided a report

3.5 World Heritage Issues: SB reported that the ISC20C workshops on C20 serial sites continue. SM will lead a workshop on October 2, 2013. SB also reported that she has been engaged in active discussion with the World Heritage Centre regarding the Le Corbusier nomination on behalf of ISC20C (in consultation with the Bureau. SB and YY reported that there have been three audio conferences on the Le Corbusier nomination. The conferences have been very important in helping to developing up an approach that is currently being used by the state parties that is collaborating and putting forward the nomination.

3.6 ISC20C Statute Amendment: SB reported that the committee also had a change to the statutes in 2013. KN had found a number of challenges getting members of the committee to respond and vote on the statute amendment, which raised the issue about member participation in the committee and noted that all of the voting members to be more responsive, to avoid wasting administration time we simply do not have, since we are all volunteers...

4.0 SECRETARY GENERAL'S REPORT:

Helsinki August 2012 meeting minutes have been distributed and circulated and will be posted on the website.

As part of this meeting in Chandigarh and similar to the Helsinki meeting, committee member reports were pre-circulated prior to the meeting which enables a synopsis of activities to be reported and made available to members who are not able to attend the meeting.

5.1 Website/ Social Media:

KN reported on the extensive reorganization carried out on the website. Five additional new tabs have been added to accommodate a growing number of activities including the annual meeting, conferences, news updates, and the Heritage Alerts. The Toolkit webpage has been streamlined and updated with new information and web links made possible with the help of Associate Member Smriti Pant (SP).

A great deal of activity has occurred over the past year with new Heritage Alert information which has all been posted to the website. The current protocol includes submission of the HA template and review by the HA subcommittee. Once the HA template is approved and related materials including letters and press release are submitted, all the information is uploaded to the website. KN reported that the HAs are being accessed across a number of countries and activity on the website increases tremendously with each HA posting. Many websites and social media pages link to the ISC20C website mainly through the HA program.

Action: The SG will reorganize the Heritage Alerts webpage if additional alerts are added. The SG recommends that once a HA is no longer active that it be moved to "Heritage Saved" section so that viewers may observe when an alert has changed status.

Action: The SG will continue to upload new translated versions of the MD with the Isc20C foreword and local Introduction letters as they become available.

5.2 MAP20 Program: KN indicated space remains available for uploading of the MAP20 program. Remaining questions on authors consent and the possible use of images for uploading to the website needs clarification. Once the materials become available for uploading, additional volunteers will be needed to provide assistance in uploading text, materials and images. KN recommended that it may be ideal to upload information in stages. This would help to also setup a format for the MAP20 page on the website so that the information is clearly presented and as concise as possible.

ACTION: KN request that the MAP subcommittee (SU SB and LM) provide recommendations on obtaining author consents and uploading the MAP20 digital files and photos to the website free of copyright.

5.3. World Monuments Fund Watch List Reviews: KN reported that a review of twenty one watch list properties was requested from members of the ISC20C. . KN reported that turnaround time to review applications to the watch was approximately four weeks which did not allow much time for members to fully review the properties and apply the criteria. The Scientific Council helped facilitate payment for the WMF desktop reviews to the ISC20C account and in some cases, to the student scholarship funds which are promoted by the Secretariat and to which select committee members donated funds received from the desktop reviews.

ACTION: KN recommends that the Scientific Council

- 1. request WMF allow an additional two to three weeks additional time for committee members to carry out desktop reviews in future.*
- 2. develop and formalize a protocol for student scholarship donations in advance of the WMF desktop review process so that each ISC can have ample time to decide how e to distribute funds.*

5.4 Membership

The SG reports that there are three new Voting expert members, six new expert members, and seven new associate members have joined the committee. KN acknowledged the assistance of Ritta Salastie (RS), co-opted Vice President, who is now in charge of maintaining and the updating of the membership files and NC nomination letters. As of the date of this report, the total committee members are summarized as follows:

Voting Expert members: 41

Expert members: 33

Associate members: 23

KN noted that a number of new members of the committee are Associate members which demonstrate that there is continued new interest by younger professionals who would like to become more active in the committee. Expert members need to take a more active role in engaging with the younger members in specific regions and via national committees. PJ commented that that there are a number of committees that do not allow Associate members to their committee and that it is really positive to see that the ISC20C is actively engaging new Associate members and to assist them in participating in the committee to take on more responsibility in the near future. SB noted that what the ISC20C is additionally trying to give the Associate members a task

so that they are actually encouraged to make an achievement that may be reflected in their CVs.

KN raised the issue of how the committee should consider incorporation of "Institutional Memberships" on the Committee, a matter also raised by Jorg Haspel in the Dubrovnik meeting. It was noted that we have informal support by some organizations which is noted in the meeting minutes (e.g. Getty Conservation Institute). There are other organizations that have requested to be supporters of the ISC20C. KN noted that the committee should discuss how to propose ideas for formalizing a protocol that is reasonable for Institutional Memberships that could benefit the ISC20C. JH noted that the Landesdenkmalamt Berlin is an Institutional Member of ICOMOS Germany and there about 10 or 12 institutional members in Germany and some of them are interested in cooperating with the ICOMOS International Scientific Committees (ISCs). Landesdenkmalamt Berlin is very well experienced in 20th Century Heritage and Garden and Landscape Heritage and interested in institutional membership. JH noted that it may be helpful for the committee to ask such institutions for experts from different fields and to include them in the continuous work of the committee. PJ noted that quite a few ISCs do have institutional members and it is helpful to each committee for them as these members bring different perspectives to the committee that are useful. PJ noted that the Scientific Committee has been encouraging its ISCs to go out and obtain institutional member support. For example, Universities should become institutional members of ISCs – there are a number of advantages to grow this particular area of support for the ISCs but it has not been utilized substantially yet. PJ noted that CIPA has a number of institutional members but that many of the other ISCs have not really utilized this opportunity compared with CIPA.

ACTION:

ACTION: KN will follow-up with CIPA on the protocol for institutional membership in the committee and provide a report for the next annual meeting and co-ordinate with JH who will prepare a short paper and proposal on the possibility of Institutional Membership for the ISC20C for the Florence meeting.

5.5 PROPOSED AMENDMENT, ISC20C STATUTES

Following agreement at the AGM in Helsinki in August 2012, the voting members agreed to the Bureau's co-option of seven interim bureau representatives for the period until the next election in late 2014. The proposed and approved representatives for co-option are as follows: Fernando Espinosa de los Monteros (Spain); Gunny Harboe (USA); Susan Macdonald (Australia/ USA); Yoshiyuki Yamana (Japan); Nune Chanlingayan (Armenia); and Riitta Salastie (Finland).

An amendment was circulated to ALL National Committee designated expert voting members and the SG organized an electronic ballot in April 2013, by ICLAFI. At the close of poll, the amendment was passed with the majority of votes received to pass the amendment.

All committee members present engaged in a discussion on the next Bureau election voting protocols, which will be carried out by ICLAFI. All committee members confirmed that the SG and ICLAFI would organise the ballot and requested a full report back on voting statistics and that ballots be case even if only one candidate stands for a position.

ACTION: KN will seek the advice of ICLAFI on voting protocols for elections including the listing of candidates on a single ballot who are running for office. Advice will also be sought on the manner to report and provide the actual number of votes received for each candidate to all the committee members.

5.6 Social Networking: KN reported that in order 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' are currently being utilized by many ISCs and NCS to create awareness and nation-wide collaboration in particular with younger professionals and practitioners who are actively engaged in the committee.

KN reported that Laura Matarase (Australian associate member) will be assisting with daily management of the Facebook page. As the social networking tool is growing rapidly and allows its member users, in particular younger professionals, to connect and share information on a variety of related subjects and topics rapidly and easily. The ISC20C Facebook page was established 4 years ago and now has 963 Facebook followers. It is particularly active when a Heritage Alert has been posted or a newlink is posted and spreads across several organizations. Often, web links with DoCoMoMo, are active among committee members and young professionals internationally. The ISC20C website has once again doubled in size from 2012 – 2013 with twice as many information tabs available online through the website portal. Website: <http://www.icomos-isc20c.org> The ISC20C Facebook page is also linked to the ICOMOS Open Facebook page with approximately close to 4,000 followers.

5.7 ICOMOS database: KN reported that expert members are encouraged to fill in and list areas of expertise into the membership database. A link to the Giles Nourissier database is available on the ICOMOS website. 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 which was launched in 2011.

ACTION: The SG and VP Riitta Salastie will continue to encourage ISC20C expert members to access the database. All members should aim to have their membership files and CVs uploaded by the next AGM in Florence 2014.

5.8 ISC20C Annual Report 2012: KN circulated the annual report 2012 which was sent to the Secretariat. SB noted that although it was a considerable effort, the annual report is the principal interface with ICOMOS including all the other Scientific Committees. It is considered an opportunity which allows other members of scientific committees to understand in more detail the activities of the committee including those of its bureau and expert members

ACTION: KN reported that for those that did not have an opportunity to submit materials for this report, are encouraged to review the report on line and consider what contributions they could be made for the next annual report in a timely way.

5.9 TREASURER'S REPORT:

Laura Robinson (LR) provided a report that indicated that the committee's only income over the last year related to review of the nomination forms as part of the WMF Watch List. KN reported that the account is an interest generating account managed for the committee by the ICOMOS Secretariat. Currently, the account holds an account

balance of \$1,348 Euros as reported at the close of 2012, with additional funds from the WMF work yet to be added.

Action: LR to provide an annual balance sheet for ISc20c records.

6 Partner Organization Reports:

7.1 UIA (LC): Louise Cox reported that she is longer the UIA representative to ISC20C. LC reviewed that the UIA is comprised of five regional committees – Region one is Europe and they are very active and have been holding to meetings to prepare for the World Congress in August 2014 in Durban, South Africa. The European committee of UIA will be partnering with the Sustainability group to target a program for the congress. Also, in Xian, China there is a UIA Region 4 Conference together with DoCoMo Mo International meeting in October.

SB indicated that the ICOMOS still has had a formal written agreement with UIA since c 2006. DB confirmed that the formal written agreement has not been cancelled, but all agreements were to be reviewed by the SG. DB noted that around the world, there are international architectural competitions which threaten heritage and this has not been dealt with and there could be an opportunity to find a solution to this. DB indicated that perhaps the committee could be more active together with UIA to develop a protocol that addresses this and offers a solution and is more advantageous to heritage protection.

SB inquired about what could be done to clarify the ICOMOS Executive Committees position regarding renewal of such organisational agreements. *ACTION: PJ will look into whether the agreement between UIA and ICOMOS needs to be updated. In particular, it is important to raise the issues around design competitions which too often lead into Heritage Alerts. PJ will also raise the issue with the Advisory Committee in Costa Rica about the development of a response to UIA over development of a standard architectural competition context which raises the awareness of heritage values and also addresses the protection of heritage sites within the context of UIA design competitions. LC to also carry this concept into discussions going forward in UIA.*

7.2 TICCIH (ST): Stuart Tappin reported that Stuart Smith is retiring and had requested that ST attend the meeting although there is nothing to report at the moment. SB asked about the background of the TICCIH thematic studies which have been completed – for example, a study on coal mining. SB noted that the ISC20C is supportive of carrying out a Thematic History and study of the Twentieth Century which includes industrial sites. It would be very important to have TICCIH engaged together with the ISC20 as part of the development of the thematic framework.

SB asked that TICCIH contemplate the Madrid Document in more detail to ensure that fits well for industrial sites and complements its recent charter. JH also reported that there will be an upcoming conference in Freiburg at the end of October 2013 supported jointly by ICOMOS and TICCIH focused on the topic of industrial landscapes. JH emphasized the importance of this category of heritage- not only cultural landscapes but industrial landscapes. There are currently proposals to nominated industrial landscapes (mainly European ones) but nevertheless, this information could be useful to other countries facing the challenges of heritage protection in these areas.

Action Required: ST indicated that he would ask TICCIH to review the Madrid Document and follow-up with any comments. Also, he emphasized that he will also follow-up with TICCIH on future engagement on the process to develop of the thematic framework.

7.3 DOCOMOMO (YY): Yoshiyuki Yamana discussed the DOCOMOMO international conference in Seoul, Korea entitled, Expansion and Conflict c during the week of September 22, 2014. YY indicated that the call for papers has been established and soon the conference website will have more details on the conference. It was also indicated that there is an initiative to make the DoCoMo Mo database information available through the DoCoMo Mo website together with the UIA website database project. Additionally, there is the possibility to make available fiche updates in the form an international exhibit which could travel around the world to demonstrate and showcase examples from this project.

Action Required: AT and YY to keep the ISC20 informed of these proposals including the upcoming conference in September 2014. AT and YY to liaise with ISC20C.

7.4 ICOMOS India (KJ): Kiran Joshi (KJ) reported on a few updates for the upcoming conference in Chandigarh. KJ indicated that the program has been recently updated and issued. Copies of the conference program will be made available to all ISC20C committee members. SB thanked Kiran and Rohit Jigyatsu of all the hard work involved in pulling together the conference and the attendant meetings and workshops. The committee is very appreciative of all the efforts made.

8.0 ISC20C Triennial Work Program Reports

8.1 Heritage @ Risk Report:

JH has requested from all of the members to send entries and to send articles for the Heritage @ Risk report. The Heritage @ Risk report will be finalized towards the end of the year. At the moment, articles and photos are being collected and accepted. JH requested that any photographs which are sent should be free of copyright restrictions and 'free of charge' for use and publication of the photos in the report. JH indicated that there are some examples of 20th Century Heritage in the report however there is no profile of the ICOMOS ISC on 20th Century Heritage and we should consider using this as an opportunity to provide a profile for the committee within the report medium especially the activities of the committee which are currently underway. The Heritage Alerts which have been carried out could be part of the report and a summary could be provided on those that have gone forward. All entries would have to be received very shortly by the end of October and could be considered for publication by the end of the year.

Action Required: GH to put together a summary of the HA and forward to JH for review and inclusion in the report.

8.2 World Heritage Activities (SM):

SM reported that the first of more formal workshop on World Heritage was held in Paris in 2011. In Helsinki, we did not host a formal workshop like the one organized in Paris. But we did host a meeting of the subcommittee and advisers in Helsinki to discuss and provide some advice back on the Le Corbusier nomination. We also met with some members of the Le Corbusier delegation to discuss the relevant topics. One of the most important factors that has developed out of the workshop meeting in Paris and the recent discussion in Helsinki was the issue of managing the serial listing and the

issues that arise of comparative analysis including the range of significance as well as a range of criteria used. SM also reported that specific advice on comparative analysis was also provided after the Sydney meeting which was forwarded through the WH Secretariat. SM reported that a workshop is planned tomorrow in Chandigarh. As part of the program, a presentation will be given from the LC nomination team, a presentation will be given on the tentative list including works by Frank Lloyd Wright by Gunny Harboe, and a presentation will be given on the Socialist Realism work by Jorg Haspel. The program will include some time to discuss issues which may arise from these presentations and how we might look at the strategic issues we should provide advice on.

SB reported that we were requested to nominate one person for a mission to the Van Nelle Factory. SB circulated a request to the ISC20C bureau for suggestions and SB did put forward some names. SB reported that she does not know whether these people were actually selected to carry out the mission but she reiterated that after Bureau consultation, the advice was put forward.

No Action: SM/SB ongoing.

8.3 ISC20C Thematic History Framework (SM)

SM reported that there has not been more development of items discussed in Helsinki regarding this project. SM reported that a brief needs to be developed for this project so that it could be used to inquire about potential sources of funding to take the project forward.

SM reported that there has been consideration on whether this particular area of work could be undertaken by the Getty. It seems that there is at least the capacity to engage a consultant who could undertake the work to develop a brief however, this it was noted that this particular piece of work is going to need a really carefully considered framework in terms of peer review and consultation as there are other organizations that have been involved in this so far like DOCOMOMO, TICCIH and UIA. There are certainly others that have not been involved in these discussions to date which should be reached out to as well. SM reported that she has spoken to various contacts on whether through may be funding through the ICOMOS Secretariat and the message has been that could there is no available funding to move this forward and so we need to approach this in a different way.

SM reported that a brief has been started however, she recommended that more discussion is needed between the various groups to ensure that we serve its purpose. For example, we need to think about how we use the information that came out of the workshop that the Getty sponsored in May 2011 and got us to a point where we developed a basic draft outline of the Thematic Framework which could possibly be developed and augmented. SM further added that when you examine the drafted general framework that came out of the Getty workshop, it really looks beyond the scope of an organization like DOCOMOMO and TICCIH that may have a targeted focus.

SM noted that other thematic frameworks have focused around one theme like railway heritage or industrial sites whereas, for this thematic framework, we have examined this from a band of time. For example, the first step was to identify what are themes that make the twentieth century different, extraordinary, or worth representative. It is a very different approach and much more ambitious as a piece of work and because of

that, it is going to be more challenging and may require a consortium of organizations to work on this as it is clearly beyond the scope of one person working on this. SM reiterated that the scope of this work and project is something that most likely cannot be coordinated by a volunteer of this committee. The future development of this work is too large and complex and requires a great deal of focus and concentration which we should all be aware of.

SB inquired with members of the executive meeting present that, this is a project that the ISC20C has come forward with numerous times. There has been much communication and discussions about trying to move this forward and we have always received feedback that there is no financial support for thematic studies. In fact, there is scarce funding to have people go on missions these days. DB raised the issue that there are a number of institutions and organizations examining similar issues in modern heritage however a thematic framework of the twentieth century should not only focus on architecture. DB agreed with SM that the issues which have come up with the tentative list spread across a number of themes represented by various scientific committees and that there should be more collaboration on the development of this framework. SB and SM agreed in that this was one reason for planning a joint meeting workshop in Florence was to examine these issues and develop a strategy to provide advice on these matters in the future.

DB recommended that this committee setup a meeting with Alfredo Conti to review and discuss how a brief for the thematic study should be developed which could address some of the issues of the tentative list.

Action Required: SM/SB to follow up with DB and PJ to see what opportunities and financial support there might be through the bureau and executive committee to further investigate if there are any opportunities for partnership.

8.4 Madrid Document (SB):

SB reported that the Madrid Document (MD) has been successfully circulated and Kiran Joshi (KJ) has now translated it into one of the Indian languages. Acknowledgement was also given to Christiane Schmuckle-Mollard (CSM) who has successfully being using it in France. After the Paris meeting, the committee requested that the MD be circulated for comments and that has now been completed. SB reported that a sub-committee of the ISC20C collect those comments and inquire if any changes were necessary. SB indicated that most of the comments based on review of the comments are minor however, the report that we have received back from Fernando (FEM) who is responsible in part for that committee is that he is recommending, as he recommended for the meeting in Helsinki, that we do not make any changes because he does not consider the comments to be significant. SB indicated that she does not agree with this approach because if we circulate a document internationally seeking input, then it is actually our responsibility to look at those comments, and not to actually make a personal decision. So, it is important to reflect that we have received and reviewed FEM's report – it has been circulated with the members of the committee. SB indicated that we need to review the comments – while it may be possible that committee does not accept any of the changes, it is the responsibility of the committee to acknowledge and review the comments.

SB reported, with some reluctance, that the committee needs to appoint a small group to work with FM, and take on that role to do what the committee has decided now, both

in Paris and Helsinki. SB strongly recommends that we now proceed with this task to go through the comments which have been received, identify any changes that are necessary to the text, and to send them back to the ISC20C committee for ratification. This would then become the Madrid Document Version No. 2 (MD2). SB reported that there are relatively small changes however; we have had a generous offer from SM to assist in undertaking this task. SB recommends that undertake this review in the form of a comments log which is common practice in most academic traditions – this is simply to list the comments that have been made and to add a second column which correlates includes the response that has been completed to those comments. This is followed by a marked up copy of the MD in track changes of any alterations that need to be made.

SB recommended that this be circulated to all the committee members before the next meeting in Florence. The committee can finalize this in Florence by email. SM agreed to take on this task and was open to having assistance from any member of the committee. Louise Cox (LC) agreed to assist SM with this task. SM indicated that a report will be prepared which includes a copy of MD1 as well as the suggested MD2 and attached may be an appendix which includes all of the comments and how the comments were dealt with. At this stage, SM recommended that this report could be produced and that will then come back to the committee. SM indicated that this could be completed in February and circulated in advance of the Florence meeting so that members of the committee may review it.

DB commented that while he does not have a copy of the comments, indicated that a table would be useful of the comments. DB inquired could the comments that were received be considered an additional element or covenant? SM responded that what the committee decided what MD2 should be – was to include minor changes in response to the comments. SM reported that the committee decided not to make substantial changes to the MD (Refer to Helsinki Meeting minutes, p.8). All committee members agreed that the MD is meant to reflect a moment in time.

SB reiterated that if there was an MD3 that it not only be illustrated but also broadened to include more issues to ensure that industrial heritage, cultural landscapes, towns and villages are all reflected in the document. In summary, MD1 is what we are currently translating and which is on our website at the present time (seven languages), MD2 is a result of the comments log and the aim is to launch this in Florence, and MD3 will come out of the discussion the committee will have with CIVVIH and with other groups such as TICCIH and be illustrated.

Action Required: SM will circulate a comments log together with a tracked version of the current version of the MD including slight revisions which might be necessary.

8.5 Madrid Document (Digital Upload)

KN reported that FEM has produced a compiled digital version of the MD which includes all of the translated versions (nine versions) put into a single document. This document is a single document which is graphically designed. KN reported that this document has been reviewed and a number of comments were forwarded to FEM including minor grammatical ones so that these corrections can be updated. KN reported that each translated version of MD1 is uploaded separately on the website which makes it possible to download each translated MD based on the language required.

JH indicated that it could be helpful to have a single document which has all of the translated versions. It demonstrates that this is an international document translated into many languages. SB noted that this version looks entirely different from the current versions of MD1. SB noted that the English version of the MD is the reference version and that the Mandarin version includes both the English with the Mandarin together. This is important because it provides a comparison of each language and helps to determine how the translation needs to be.

SB indicated that the designed version does in fact enhance the graphics of the MD document which would improve how the MD looks on the website but inquired with the committee whether everyone would rather look at each translated version separately. SB noted that most people will not want to look at one single version but it is easier to look at each translated version separately. KN suggested that we request FEM to use the new graphic designed version for both cases: 1.) each language separately of the MD and, 2.) the single document which compiles all of the translated language versions of the MD. It is noted that the footer should identify the date of each version and that the ICOMOS logos should be standardized graphically throughout. All members suggested that perhaps it could be considered using the dark color page only on the cover of each document and have the text pages appear lighter.

Action Required: KN to follow-up with FEM on using the new blue graphic format for the MD1 for each language separately and also for a single document. Action SM/FEM/JH to prepare MD2 ASAP, with consultation pre GA and adoption in Berlin 2015.

8.6 Heritage Alerts (GH)

GH reported that the HA Committee has been quite active in 2012 and 2013. The effort to address a large number of requests to issue Heritage Alerts (HA) has been very time consuming and is challenging. GH indicated that the committee works across multiple countries and sites represented from across the globe and as such, the committee continues to find it difficult to issue HAs in a timely manner. GH reported that it continues to be quite difficult to get responses and/or agreement from the National Committee in the country where the threatened site is located. GH reported that there are also language issues that make the editing and refinement of the HA (in English) a time consuming process. Despite this, GH reported that the work of the committee has been quite significant. GH indicated that the sites where a HA has been worked include:

1. Central Government Offices, West Wing, Hong Kong, China (issued June 2012)
2. Melnikov House, Moscow, Russia (issued April 2013)
3. Halle Freyssinet, Paris, France (issued July 2013)
4. Kyoto Kaikan, Kyoto, Japan (not issued)
5. Darling Harbour, Sydney Australia (issued July 2013)
6. Novarits, Rueil-Malmaison, France (issued July 2013)
7. Ljubljana Stadium, Ljubljana, Slovenia (not issued)
8. Mier Y Pesado, Orizaba, Veracruz, Mexico (not yet issued but anticipated it will be soon)
9. Prentice Women's Hospital, Chicago, Illinois, USA (not issued)

LC indicated that she is willing to join the committee and would like to self-nominate herself to work on this initiative. Also, SB reported that Enrique de Anda has

volunteered to work with FEM to act as the Spanish speaking representatives for the committee. GH suggested that it may be prudent to put forth a solicitation to the entire committee. SM indicated that there are many people on the committee who are not active that should be contact and request to assist in the review work of the HA.

Action Required: GH will seek additional assistance from more members to help with the work load in the near future. As well, GH will seek committee members which include a diverse group of languages so that the HA template can be properly drafted and submitted. GH indicated that the HA template should be updated and edited.

8.7 Heritage Applause:

SB discussed the Heritage Applause initiative which was proposed as a means to publicly celebrate and promote positive publicity for outstanding private, government and corporate initiatives that support the conservation of Twentieth-Century Heritage places. SB noted that this was proposed as an ISC20C initiative in Helsinki and that an idea paper was put out and a number of comments were received as noted in her report. There were a number of comments received that are all quite spread across a range of ideas. SB and SP derived the scope of the Applause from the comments received and recommended that a small sub-committee be formed with French, English and Spanish members on it and we pilot the program. That is, we will try to use the Heritage Applause on a case study to see how it works. It is a bit like the trial of the Heritage Alert template. If we can make this work and have it work well, we may be able to launch this in Florence.

SB noted that the process would be quite similar to the Heritage Alerts but more obviously in the opposite direction. SB noted that the Heritage Applause would examine how the project or initiative was successful – it would use a specific template similar to how a template is utilized for the Heritage Alerts. So, we will go out to the ICOMOS National Committees and International Scientific Committees and any relevant scientific committees like DOCOMOMO. There would need to be a chair to this committee and we would need to pass the template review process very similar to how we review and carry out the Heritage Alerts.

SB indicated that this initiative is meant to show the positive side of Heritage showing how things are being well done and showing what are the good cases. SB noted that this is proposed an ISC20C initiative and not an ICOMOS-wide prize proposal and is really about recognizing a professional job well done. DB indicated that it may be worth looking at the Montreal Architectural Heritage Campaign website to look at how this program is setup as it may provide further ideas about how to develop the scope of the Heritage Applause.

SB indicated that FEM would like to be part of the Applause Subcommittee. Also, DB and SM have volunteered to provide advice and be part of the committee.

Action Required: Adopted SB and SP recommend that an ISC20C Applause subcommittee be formed and then to start a pilot project for the Heritage Applause program. Committee: SP, SB and FEM.

8.8 Heritage Toolkit (SB)

SB provided a brief overview Heritage Toolkit as a multi-lingual, on-line reference collection of benchmark “best practice” documents which aims to share new methodologies and approaches to conservation practice, by providing access to

information and reference sources that the ISC20C members find useful. SP has taken the following steps to revive the Heritage Toolkit and to check and revive all of the web links and resources which are now accessible online at <http://www.icomos-isc20c.org/id5.html>. Specifically, the steps which were taken include the restructuring the Toolkit's table of contents, fixing/updating existing broken links and inviting ISC20C members to contribute a maximum of 10 recommendations towards the expansion of the Toolkit in as many languages as possible.

SB explained that the Heritage Toolkit has now gotten mixed in with the requests to link to the Open Archive through the Secretariat. SB explained that she was quite concerned and does not want to see the idea of the Heritage Toolkit being taken over for another purpose. The idea is about putting searchable, linkable, documentation onto the web and currently the ISC20C website has all of the information that is made available uploaded. SB noted that the suggestion that the ICOMOS Secretariat is now linking the toolkit into the Open Archive and to fundamentally change the way the current ISC20C toolkit works. . PJ suggested that the Scientific Council respond to the Secretariat by indicating that the ISC20C toolkit should be left as is and it really requires discussion.

Action Required: SB will encourage the committee to continue to send resource documents that can be uploaded and linked to the current toolkit page. SB would also like to engage with the National and International Scientific Committees to contribute to the ISC20C toolkit. PJ will contact the Secretariat to discuss the ISC20C toolkit.

8.9 MAP20 Project

SB reviewed updates of the MAP20 project that have been discussed at the Paris and Helsinki meetings of ISC20C. SB indicated that the objective is to ensure that the remarkable MAP20 data assembled in 2003-2005 is utilized. SB explained that there is now very little formal record of the outcomes, in fact, the survey material is not accessible, and so we want to revisit the exercise and get an update on progress since, as well as getting permission to upload the original data. SB noted that just as the original MAP20 survey provoked action and engagement from National and scientific committees, so too will this update.

Going forward, SB outlined the proposal which was discussed together with Sandra Uskokovic (SU) in Dubrovnik was to engage committees to look towards active conservation support for the sites. For example, some of the original responses demonstrated that what ISC20C wanted to achieve which was cross fertilization among disciplines and broader thinking beyond architectural styles and precepts. Ultimately, the proposal aim is to upload the type of data that will stimulate practitioners and researchers to think along these lines. However, at this time, SB explained that all of the SB proposes to update the original MAP20 questionnaire – this then will become an updated version 2 survey for 2013- 2014. A letter will also need to be drafted to the President of the National Committees and International Scientific Committees who replied to the original MAP20 project in 2001. The letter will need to address permissions for uploading and assumed copyrights for the photos. Also, the letter will request that each property entry from the prior survey be updated and include any progress which may have occurred towards the protection of the selected modern heritage site either at the local or national level.

SB reported that SU has kindly agreed to lead the ISC20C subcommittee for MAP20 version 2 projects in 2013-2014 together with DB, GH, and associate member Laura Matarese (LM). SB reported that she will advise US/ICOMOS as a matter of courtesy that the ISC20C is currently updating the MAP20 project and will be uploading the revised version 2 based on responses from the updated survey.

SM commented that the work of the subcommittee should tie with the work completed on the Thematic Study.

Action Required: SU will update the questionnaire and coordinate with LM to issue questionnaires to the National Committees and International Scientific Committees. SB to advise US/ICOMOS that the process to update MAP20 has commenced with updates and commencement of uploading to the ISC20C website to be reported on during the next upcoming meeting in Florence.

8.10 Socialist Realism Project Initiative:

JH reported that the Socialist Realism project has started because national committee experts, they carried out discussion on post-war heritage in the Eastern bloc which is often not yet listed or protected – and, not well respected in the public realm or with politicians. The ideas were to create a kind of network amount these Eastern and Central European States of Post-War Heritage. As well, the idea was to use the World Heritage ideas as a driver for this whole network because it was revealed that this heritage of this Socialist Realism is very similar in these countries and part of the European Post-war heritage and is different from the classical Modern typology that we are used to.

JH reported that there were a number of meetings that took place in which expert members were engaged with the discussions. For example, ND and NC indicated that the Socialist Realism did not start in 1945 in Eastern and Central Europe. In the former Soviet Union, it was Socialist as well, in the inter-war period and during WWII and so, the starting point should be 1932. There was quite a bit of discussion to raise the issues around the identification of this period around the initiative and the final recommendation was to name this ‘Socialist Heritage’.

JH reported that a meeting was convened in Russia to discuss the possibility of a serial nomination of Socialist Heritage. The next meeting will be in Riga, Latvia with the International Scientific Committee of Theory and Philosophy. The title of the meeting is ‘Heritage Trends in the Mirror of Socialist Change’. One section of this meeting will be devoted to Post-war heritage and Post-war conservation philosophy. The meeting will take place from May 8-10, 2014 in Riga, Latvia.

JH reported that after the last European regional meeting of the ISC20C in Dubrovnik, Croatia, a letter on Socialist Heritage was generated and SB was requested to send the letter to the National Committees and International Scientific Committees. The letter was sent but no responses were sent to SB or to JH. So, it is clear that more letters will need to be sent in order to encourage them to participate in this issue. JH summarized the report from NC and shared it with the members of the committee. JH indicated that a copy of the report could be made available for those interested in reviewing the last series of meetings including defining periods of architecture which are detailed such as Socialist Modernism or Socialist Functionalism of the 1950s, 1960s and perhaps including the 1980s with the industrialized constructions.

The report raises the question on how to support experts in field and in a number of countries who are working on the protection of this particular part of twentieth century heritage. Could it be helpful to submit articles to the Heritage @ Risk or perhaps to commence submission of Heritage Alerts for some of these endangered sites? JH recommended that NC submit an article to the Heritage @ Risk on the demolition of the Market Hall in Armenia together with a series of photos documenting the destruction of this important work of heritage with is comprised of Socialist Mannerism with traditional forms of architecture.

Action Required: JH will follow up with support measures for Socialist Heritage including drafting of additional support letters to be co-signed by SB and to be disseminated to the national committees and international scientific committees. JH will work with NC to create a brief or profile on Socialist Realism for the ISC20C which is to be circulated and used to provide a background and promote more in-depth understanding of this important heritage from the 20th Century.

8.12 Modern Olympics (YY):

YY reported that he had a discussion with Tadao Ando and that he is the one of the architects responsible for 2020 Olympics (Games of the XXXII Olympiad). YY indicated that Tadao Ando would like to consider the significance for Kenzo Tange's Olympic Stadium as twentieth century heritage completed in 1964 in Tokyo, Japan. Around the Olympic games stadium is a heritage area and Tadao Ando has expressed an interested in working with the ISC20C on how to determine the cultural value of the Olympic Stadium – and then, he wants to give a new idea for the next Olympic game while balancing conservation and retaining cultural value. YY recommended that this is a good opportunity for the ISC20C in the sense that Tange's Olympic Stadium is one of Tange's most important works during this period. YY recommends that perhaps we could host a meeting or a conference around the evolution of Modern Olympics and it could be lead to a broader discussion on Olympic Games stadium from around the world. It is a specific type of twentieth century heritage that the committee needs to consider.

JH indicated that this is a specific mechanism in sports and sport events and in world championships of football - soccer and Olympic Games. JH indicated that these sites are always being destroyed. This could be quite interesting to discuss this phenomenon at an international level and context and also, to provide a greater understanding to those responsible, that this is a very important heritage which should be protected. Also, DB raised the issue of adaptive reuse for these buildings and how challenging it is because there is not really a viable option for reuse and presents a dilemma on how to use these buildings in the future. DB recommended that this idea should be embraced and thought about sooner rather than later as this heritage fits within the thematic framework and needs to be thought about and discussed at an international level.

Action Required: DB, JH, CSM, and SB will follow-up with YY on next steps to continued discussions for an international meeting on Olympic Games heritage and future conservation strategies and its protection.

9.0 Work Plan for 2012-2014 Triennium (SB): SB took committee members through the triennial work program that we looked at in Helsinki and indicated that there are too few people signed up on the list. A few people are doing all of the tasks.

SB indicated that our successes have been directly related to individual's time availability and enthusiasms, but that now was the time to determine what issues we should carry on with, and what new projects we might engage with. ISC20C needs to resubmit an outline of our 2011-2014 work programme to SC. Ongoing projects would include:

1. Membership/Gilles Nourissier database. We need to expand our ISC20C membership and can use the database to help us with this by promoting our information to ICOMOS members (KN/RS to date)
2. Younger members - We need to engage younger practitioners in our work (LR/All)
3. Communications - we will continue to send out information via the list serve (KN)
4. Website and social media: (KN/LM)
5. 20thC thematic study - World Heritage: there is a need to provide expert advice to the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel and working group. Also ref to our Le Corbusier input recently. (SM/SB)
6. Scientific Council: Input ICOMOS SC activities that support ISc20C (PJ/SB/SM)
7. ISC annual meetings: assist with support and organisation generally (All 2014 KN 2015 Berlin JH 2016 Japan YY?)
8. WMF reviews (KN/All)
9. MAP20 project - (SU/LM)
10. Heritage Alerts: we need more involvement by members (GH, LR, SB, BW, EA)
11. Heritage @ Risk: there is a need to keep our ISC in the forefront of this program (JH/KN) but also liaison with ICOMOS EXCOM - LR
12. Partnerships: Continue to engage our partners especially DoCoMo Mo, TICCIH, ISCARSAH, UIA (KN/FV/HL/SB/LC/GH)
13. Research: identify and promote good solutions for 20C and add to toolkit (All)
14. ISC Toolkit: (SB/EA/LR)
15. Archives: Contribute to the archive of 20C heritage documentation - including oral histories etc. (All)

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

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

9.1 ICOMOS Assembly Meeting in Florence, Italy –

November 7, 2014 (ISC20C Meeting) all day;

November 15, 2014 (ISC20C-ISCCL-CIVVIH Joint Meeting and Workshop)

Action Required: KN/SB to arrange meetings and possible tours during these dates.

DRAFT