

**INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON  
TWENTIETH CENTURY HERITAGE**

**MONDAY 27 NOVEMBER 2011, 1 PM – 5 PM**

*l'Institut National d'Histoire de l'Art à Paris (I.N.H.A.)*

*2 Rue Vivienne, 75002 Paris, France*

**DRAFT MINUTES**

**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 world-wide 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 Petrulis (Lithuania); Laura Robinson (South Africa); Riitta Salastie (Finland); Leo Schmidt (Germany); Christiane Schmuckle -Mollard (France); Prisca Schmuckle Von Minerwitz (France); Vladimir Slapeta (Czech Republic); Yoshiyuki Yamana (Japan); Britt Wisth (Sweden).

**Partner organisation representatives:** 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 Furrer (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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 PRESIDENTS 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 Braekin (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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 Hachiman 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 all heritages. 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> Century fits at risk in comparison to other things. She noted that there were a lot of places from the 20<sup>th</sup> 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 analyse 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 ISC20C for 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 19<sup>th</sup> century, 18<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 these very few aspects or issues that are modern or 20<sup>th</sup> 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, ISCARSAH. It took nine years to define the subject and text which is very short. ISCARSAH has guidelines specifically for structures and the document is also more general with principles. The ISCARSAH 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<sup>th</sup> 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 20th 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<sup>th</sup> 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<sup>th</sup> Century, it is a 20<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 any 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 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.
- **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](#) 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](#) 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

- NSW Heritage Office 2001, revised 2004, 2006
- 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

- Description: originally published as part of the NSW Heritage Manual
- [Download PDF document](#) [34 KB]

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

#### **Street Smart: Corporate Development in Historic Town Centres**

- NSW Heritage Office 1998
- Description: policy for introducing new businesses into heritage town centres
- [Download PDF document](#) [16 KB]

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

### **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**

Heritage Council of NSW publications: [http://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/03\\_index.htm](http://www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/03_index.htm)

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**