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Heritage and the city

When is a city more than a city?
– the CIVVIH perspective

Cities everywhere are undergoing massive transformations. Most are facing extremely heavy pressures to expand, to offer new accommodation, new retail space, more hotels and public spaces. Whilst some historic cities have faced depopulation of their cores, most have seen their peripheries grow and grow. As curators of the historic city our task is becoming increasingly complex. How can we defend the historic core of our cities whilst still allowing change? How can we strike the right balance between conservation and progress?

These are not easy questions. The meeting “World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape” organized by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre in cooperation with the Austrian authorities and ICOMOS (12 to 14 May 2005, Vienna) – which led to the adoption of the Vienna Memorandum – did not resolve these issues but certainly sparked intensive discussion on the role of the historic city, its relation to the surrounding landscape, and the insertion of contemporary architecture.

We at CIVVIH (the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Historic Towns and Villages) are well aware of the enormous responsibility we have to come up with answers – and have led in-depth email consultations and attended numerous meetings on this issue. In the last three years, the World Heritage Centre has focused major attention on the problems facing cities as the number of listed cities struggling with the challenges posed by new architecture is growing.

At its last annual meeting in Helsinki, CIVVIH discussed the Vienna Memorandum, in an attempt to develop better definitions. Our Committee has been looking at upgrading the ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (Washington Charter - 1987) and has collected and circulated documentation from various meetings, the latest being those organized by the World Heritage Centre in Olinda (Brazil) and Chandigarh (India) – the latter showing that even a “modern” historic city is facing similar challenges.

My concern is that too much of the discussion is centred on terminology but not enough on how to assist cities in dealing with the challenges they are facing. In most countries, the authorities are highly aware of the need to preserve historic cities – as a prime source of tourism – but also easily succumb to the demand for new architecture, sometimes within the same historic urban core. City managers are looking to us for help in finding the right solutions and need our input to provide the right answers to politicians.

A historic city will always remain a historic city whatever we call it. However, we can certainly no longer accept the definition that a city is a “group of buildings” as given by the World Heritage Convention. A city is much more than that and cannot ignore the landscape around it. An important monument in a city, such as a cathedral or a temple, was built to give service to the city around it and that city was built in a particular landscape that serviced the city. After years in which we developed stronger awareness for the historic city as a whole, and not just as a group of buildings, some countries are going back to the notion that as long as you conserve the important historic buildings there is no “problem”. This is unacceptable. A historic city has to be treated as a whole, as an urban fabric with all its minor detailing.

CIVVIH will continue this discussion at its meeting in Corfu this year and certainly in Quebec, on the occasion of the ICOMOS General Assembly. We do not have answers yet but there is strong demand for new insight and strong definite conclusions on this issue. We need to come up with a new Charter that will incorporate all these thoughts, not simply amending the Washington Charter and the Vienna Memorandum, but a completely new document. We hope to find the resources to be able to do this in the coming months.

Ray Bondin
President of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Historic Towns and Villages
The ICOMOS Historic Urban Landscapes Initiative

In recent years, increased development pressures resulted in the construction of large-scale structures and infrastructures in historic cities already inscribed or proposed for inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List, and in cities that have World Heritage monuments and sites within their urban territories. The accumulation of cases where proposed development projects of such magnitude threatened the visual integrity of World Heritage sites eventually led the UNESCO World Heritage Committee to request that a UNESCO recommendation be prepared, that would “complement and update the existing [recommendation] on the subject of historic urban landscapes, with special reference to the contextualization of contemporary architecture.”

The UNESCO World Heritage Centre consequently established an expert committee in order to prepare the recommendation. In 2006, the ICOMOS Scientific Council suggested that ICOMOS support the effort of the World Heritage Centre by instigating a parallel process that would be strictly focused on conservation. It was envisaged that the two initiatives would advance in close coordination and cooperation in order to allow each to benefit from the experience and expertise of the other. Two ICOMOS International Scientific Committees (ISC) – the Committee on Historic Towns and Villages (CIVVIH) and the ICOMOS-IFLA Committee on Cultural Landscapes – have offered to lead the discussion which came to be known as the “Historic Urban Landscapes initiative” (HUL). Michal Firestone was appointed coordinator of the initiative.

First electronic discussions were held through an inter-ISC working group at the end of 2006 and its summary circulated. Shortly after, it was decided to expand the discussion forum to enable as many ICOMOS members as possible to take part. To keep the discussion manageable, it was conducted in small groups – each with its own moderator. In time, four discussion groups totalling more than 200 members joined the HUL initiative: a US/ICOMOS group (moderated by Gustavo Araoz); an Ibero-American group (moderated by Pedro de Manuel); an Australian group (moderated by Sue Jackson-Stepowski); and a Finnish group (moderated by Leena Makkonen and Marianne Lehtimaki).

A proposed discussion outline was distributed – although groups were free to determine their own work structure and encouraged to follow local interests. A reading list – compiled by Gustavo Araoz, Michel Bonnette, Michal Firestone and Patricia O’Donnell – was distributed to all groups. Electronic discussions were conducted concurrently during summer 2007 and the moderators prepared periodic and final summaries, which were distributed to all groups, allowing them to benefit from each other’s work.

The discussions also contributed to, and were informed by, three other ICOMOS initiatives dedicated to the subject of HUL: CIVVIH’s 2007 annual meeting; the ICOMOS Asia-Pacific region’s 4th annual meeting; and a small group of ISC members proposed a revision to the Vienna Memorandum. The final summary of the discussions will be circulated upon its completion.

Michal Firestone
Coordinator, ICOMOS Scientific Council

Ibero-American exchanges on Historic Urban Landscapes

A group of Ibero-American ICOMOS experts (members of 11 National Committees and of ICOMOS ISCs) discussed the subject of historic cities and historic urban landscapes (HUL) from May to July 2007. The group agreed that the term “historic city” is still valid and that in the current state of debate, it does not appear urgent or convenient to establish new categories or typologies. There is, however, a need to adjust conceptual and methodological aspects in the protection and management of historic cities.

The term “historic urban landscape” may be conceived as a very important part of the set of components that make up the historic city, the part that is perceived by the eye and liable to be studied using objective (colours, volumes, typologies, etc.) and subjective (perceptions depending on culture, age, ethnicity, etc.) techniques. Therefore, there is nothing that can convert a historic city into a historic urban landscape, because the latter is already included within the city itself. All historic cities have a historic urban landscape, but this landscape is not always their most important value. There may be outstanding historic cities whose values (intangible or which escape the eye) do not correspond to a historic urban landscape of note.

The historic urban landscape acquires an identifiable cultural value of its own; it should be conserved if we wish to conserve the historic city. Contemporary architecture within the historic city should not be an aim in itself and must be of excellent quality; new buildings should not compete or contrast with one another or become autistic objects. On the contrary, if new constructions or refurbishments in a historic city are required, these interventions should be done respecting each and every element.
that, according to the terms, in particular Article 2, of the ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (Washington Charter - 1987), lend authenticity to historic cities. These interventions should be the fruit of a thorough knowledge and analysis of the history, culture and architecture of the place, in harmony with the defining features of its setting without creating pseudo-historic elements. They should facilitate the reading of the place's history, and integrate into the character and atmosphere of the city without distorting the traditional image of its historic urban landscape.

The participants in the Ibero-American ICOMOS discussion group recommend maintaining the use of the term “historic city” and not replacing it by “historic urban landscape”. Any action involving protection or intervention in a historic city, and which has repercussions on its historic landscape, should be approached from the perspective of the general management documents (master plans, special plans, etc.) for the historic city. When such interventions may generate an impact on the values, authenticity and integrity of the city, the opinion of recognised experts in heritage conservation should be a priority concern for the competent authorities.

This text is a summary of group discussions prepared by Alfredo Conti, President of ICOMOS Argentina.

The 2007 Seoul Declaration on Heritage and Metropolis in Asia and the Pacific

From 2005 to 2007, ICOMOS Korea hosted a cycle of three Asia-Pacific regional meetings. The 2nd Asia-Pacific Regional Meeting in 2005 on “Managing Tourism in Historic Towns and Areas in Asia” issued The Seoul Declaration on Tourism in Asia’s Historic Towns and Areas which was endorsed by the 15th ICOMOS General Assembly in Xi’an, China (see ICOMOS News Vol.16, n°1, April 2006). In 2006, the 3rd Asia-Pacific Regional Meeting was held in association with the ICOMOS International Cultural Tourism Committee in Seoul and Andong City under the theme of “Impact of Mass Tourism on Historic Villages: Identifying Key Indicators of Tourism Impact” and issued The Andong Recommendations on Impact of Mass Tourism on Historic Villages (published in ICOMOS News Vol.16, n°2, December 2006 – central supplement p. 3).

From 29 May to 1 June 2007, around 110 participants from 12 countries, including Korea and also colleagues from Central Asia, in particular Kazakhstan, gathered to discuss “Heritage and the Metropolis in Asia and the Pacific” in Seoul. This 4th Asia-Pacific Regional Meeting discussed the challenges for heritage conservation in the large and rapidly growing cities of the region. Yukio Nishimura, former ICOMOS Vice President, gave a keynote speech on the integrity of historic urban landscapes (HUL) and Ron van Oers from the UNESCO World Heritage Centre presented the background and progress of developing new standards for the conservation of HUL. The Seoul City Government presented the heritage of Seoul and its historic neighbourhood, examples of conservation and restoration works in the city, and organised a guided visit to selected heritage sites. The 2007 Seoul Declaration on Heritage and Metropolis in Asia and the Pacific (see p. 5 of the central supplement for full text) was drafted based on the shared experiences from 10 case studies in the region, and assisted by the valuable comments of the Secretary General and two regional Vice Presidents.

These three successive Asia-Pacific Regional meetings have shown the ICOMOS Committees in the region the importance of meeting regularly, exchanging information and discussing problems and possible solutions on a broad range of subjects. The Seoul Declarations of 2005 and 2007 and the Andong Recommendations will be useful practical guidelines for day-to-day practice.

Hae-Un Rii
Member of the ICOMOS Executive Committee and ICOMOS Korea
Public Policies for the Rehabilitation of Historic City Centres – Mexico and the Americas

Participants at the XXVII International Symposium on the Conservation of Monumental Heritage organized by ICOMOS Mexico and the authorities of Mexico City, from 6 to 8 December 2007, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the inscription of the historic city centres of Mexico and Xochimilco on the World Heritage List, gathered at the former Convent of San Bernardino in Xochimilco, to discuss the topic “Public Policies for the Rehabilitation of Historic City Centres”. Several prominent personalities attended the event, such as Dinu Bumbaru, ICOMOS Secretary General, Amalia Garcia, Governor of Zacatecas, Alejandra Moreno, from the Historic City Center Directorate; Elena Zepeda, Director of Cultural Affairs for Mexico City, and Javier Villalobos, President of ICOMOS Mexico.

During the Symposium participants discussed the importance of the design, discussion and implementation of public policies in the field of cultural heritage conservation. They agreed on the fact that in a globalized world there is a need for policy that contributes to the preservation of cultural heritage and its role in the process of sustainable development. It was also noted that any public policy aimed at successfully conserving the heritage needs to take into account the different social meanings, expressions and relationships that coexist and give meaning to heritage buildings, thus forcing public policy to be based on a broad, open and inclusive concept of heritage.

Following presentations by 47 national and 18 international speakers, and as a result of the discussions in the four panels, “Assessment of Public Policy”, “Participation of Civil Society”, “Rehabilitation of Public Spaces”, and “Preservation of Intangible Heritage”, the participants at the Symposium adopted a list of resolutions and recommendations.

One of the main conclusions was that since cultural heritage needs to be integrated with the life of the community, policies should be global and be related to a wider set of subjects such as: tourism, urban development, economic development, education, housing, and transportation. In this respect, public policies for heritage must always also contribute to the improvement of living standards and the reduction of poverty.

It was found necessary that the normative framework which regulates cultural heritage policies should be subject to constant review and upgrading, in order to ensure that programs and instruments created by the authorities do not contradict the objectives of the policies related to cultural heritage. The public policies related to heritage conservation also need to be translated into short-, mid- and long-term projects that contribute to sustainable development. These projects, in turn, need to be supervised using well-defined evaluation mechanisms that are able to indicate the positive and negative effects the policies have with respect to the cultural heritage and the community.

As for the concrete projects that emanate from the public policies in relation to cultural heritage, they should fulfil various aspects such as linking tangible and intangible heritage, as well as contributing to the research, preservation and rescue of the Flora and Fauna which is of heritage value. They should also integrate with concepts such as eco-tourism and natural auto-sustainability.

Above all, however, the implemented projects must have legitimacy in the eyes of the local communities and enjoy their support, which supposes that the local communities be involved in their definition, design, execution and evaluation. Only through a close relationship with the communities can the projects achieve their objectives such as reinforcing a sense of identity, promoting the idea of diversity, and stimulating cultural interchange.

Finally, in order for the cultural heritage policies to be successful, it is necessary to rehabilitate public spaces by improving transportation and mobility, street lighting, public services, and public safety. In this undertaking, tourism plays a defining role and should be conceived as a strategic catalyst for the preservation of heritage and for fighting poverty. It is important, however, to ensure that tourism exists at the service of heritage and not vice versa. Only in this way can tourism contribute to the sustained management of heritage resources by local groups and through this also reinforce the socio-cultural links between heritage sites and local communities.

The symposium also issued a series of site specific recommendations for a number of cities and sites in Mexico, and the wider Americas region.

Javier Villalobos Jaramillo
President of ICOMOS Mexico

ICOMOS expresses its formal gratitude to ICOMOS Korea and the Korean authorities for their sponsorship of three Asia-Pacific regional meetings between 2005 and 2007.

For more information on the World Heritage Centre’s Thematic Programme on cities:
http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/?pattern=&search_theme=11
In many societies, this heritage concentrates most of the arts and skills. As such, it constitutes a major document and a unique witness to the human endeavour and its achievements. Based on resolutions of our General Assembly, the theme “Religious Heritage and Sacred Places” chosen to mark 18th April 2008, the International Day of Monuments and Sites, provided a special opportunity to explore the challenges of the conservation of this heritage in the contemporary world.

A major theme of cultural heritage
Shrines, temples, monasteries, necropolises, sacred mountains or trees, steles, inscriptions, refuges, routes, etc. The heritage places linked to religious practices are numerous and greatly diversified. This heritage comprises individual or groups of buildings, sites as well as vast and complex areas such as holy cities, sacred landscapes (including those formed by ancient place naming) and pilgrimage routes, all of these being the type of “monuments and sites” ICOMOS takes interest in.

Yet, it is impossible to disregard the importance of objects, archives and documents as well as, of course, the rites, rituals, traditions and other forms of intangible cultural heritage which contribute to the reality and meaning of these sacred places, reflecting the religious practices they are associated with. ICOMOS already explored the relationship between material places and their intangible dimensions at its 14th General Assembly in Victoria Falls (Zimbabwe) in 2003. We will explore it further in 2008 at the coming General Assembly in Québec (Canada) under the theme of the “Spirit of Place”. Devoting the 2008 International Day to this theme fits into this sequence.

Due to their significance to the community, as well as their artistic, historical, scientific or anthropological importance, it comes as no surprise that religious buildings or sites make up a considerable part of national or local heritage lists. This situation is echoed in the World Heritage List which includes over one hundred sites listed under an explicit religious reference, mainly temples, churches, monasteries or sacred mountains. In addition, a great majority of the cultural or mixed sites on the List cover territories which include sacred places as in the case of historic towns or cultural landscapes.

Among the criteria used to articulate and acknowledge the Outstanding Universal Value of a property nominated for inscription on the List, criterion vi is the one that explicitly refers to “beliefs”. Yet, other criteria somehow apply more easily as they do not raise the delicate question of putting a particular religion on the List for its universal value. For example, religions and spiritual practices have generated masterpieces such as the stave church in Urnes (Norway) or the rock-hewn churches in Lalibela (Ethiopia), the temples at Angkor (Cambodia), the Buddhist monuments of Horyu-ji (Japan) and the remarkable mud tower-houses (Takienta) with their associated altars of the Batammariba in Togo. Deeply rooted in the history of human societies and the development of arts and sciences, religions have also generated sites or structures that bear witness to significant exchanges and influences (criteria ii, iii, iv or v) such as the Osun-Oshogbo Sacred Grove (Nigeria), Biblical Tels in Israel, the minaret in Jam (Afghanistan), Confucius Temple and Cemetery (China), Mont Saint-Michel (France) or the churches of Chiloé in Chile.

As an international and interdisciplinary non-governmental organisation assisting the World Heritage Committee, ICOMOS looks at the protection, conservation and presentation of heritage sites and places rather than at the theological issues themselves. Yet, the will to close the various gaps in the World Heritage List relative to religious sites confronts us with new questions. For instance, how do...
we address the concept of “Outstanding Universal Value” in relation to the diversity of religions and beliefs on a local and global scale? How does one assess the authenticity and integrity of an active and possibly evolving sacred site? How can worshippers and growing tourism interest for such sites be reconciled? How can one prevent the risks associated with inter-religious tensions or the transformations of rituals? How are general conservation principles applied to such sites? What links, if any, are possible between the World Heritage and the Intangible Cultural Heritage conventions?

**Heritage, religions and tourism**

This theme is also of interest to the tourism sector. For millennia, sacred places and religious celebrations have attracted worshippers. In October 2007, an international conference was organised in Cordoba (Spain) by the UN World Tourism Organisation, a specialised UN agency with which ICOMOS cooperates. This conference explored the logistical, economical, cultural and ethical issues encountered in the relation between religions and tourism (http://www.unwto.org/sustainable/cont/cordoba/Cordoba_English.htm). On this occasion, Mr. Francesco Frangialli, the Secretary General of the organisation, reminded participants that “tourism and religions share the use of the same cultural heritage built up in a complex relationship that is both constructive and conflictive at the same time”. Many interventions referred to activities by ICOMOS and its committees.

**Towards an ICOMOS programme on religious heritage**

The theme of religious heritage and sacred place has already generated activities and symposia within ICOMOS and its committees. The principles of ICOMOS have also inspired and guided major conservation work such as the programme of the Quebec Religious Heritage Foundation which invested close to $250 million in the restoration of places of worship and sacred artwork in the province of Quebec through a rather uncommon interdenominational and community approach using the ICOMOS charters (www.patrimoine-relieux.gc.ca). Also, ICOMOS maintains fruitful working relations with the authorities in charge of the heritage of the Catholic Church which has developed internal guidelines and specialised bodies to ensure the adequate management of its immense built, artistic and archival heritage. Other organisations such as ICCROM and the Council of Europe have also developed publications, recommendations and tools on the subject.

Considering the great interest it raises, the impressive pool of experience available and the huge conservation challenge religious heritage and sacred places represent, the engagement of ICOMOS on the subject is particularly timely. Resolution n°32 of the 15th ICOMOS General Assembly held in Xi’an (China) commits our organisation to developing an international thematic programme on religious heritage. Focusing on this theme for 18th April 2008 is a first step in this direction. We hope National and International Committees and all ICOMOS members will take this opportunity to suggest possible elements of that programme to us.

In many countries, cultural heritage legislation includes specific clauses relative to religious properties. Besides these legal specificities, the question of religious heritage offers opportunities to develop conservation guidelines and management tools – for example on inventories – to address the needs of the tangible and intangible heritage of such places. The many technical questions it raises (e.g. stability of minarets and cupolas or the conservation of wall paintings) provide a perfect opportunity for ICOMOS International Committees to cooperate. The subject even connects to our Scientific Council’s working theme on urban landscapes where the symbolic presence of religious landmarks is strongly threatened by development pressures. Finally, there is the development of a network of strategic partnerships to support ICOMOS in this vast task.

All this must induce ICOMOS to adopt a work plan on religious heritage and to develop principles for its conservation. The work of the Scientific Council on urban landscapes and climate change offers a useful model. We would appreciate your suggestions and your collaboration to better engage ICOMOS in this fundamental theme for conservation.

**Call for ideas: themes for 18 April 2009, 2010 and 2011**

In recent years, themes suggested by ICOMOS covered a diversity of topics: historic villages; underwater heritage; earthen architectural heritage; monuments of nature. Yet, the impact of this International Day can be improved. For that, our Committees, members and partners need to have the suggested theme in advance so they can eventually develop related activities.

What theme should we chose and propose for the International Heritage Day of 2009, 2010 and 2011? The heritage of sciences and education? The heritage of agriculture? Ports and transports? The heritage of tourism? Natural disasters? Heritage routes? I invite you to send in your suggestions, if possible, by 26 June 2008 so that we can consider them in the preparation of the draft 2008-2011 Action Plan which we will present at the next General Assembly in Québec.

**Dinu Bumbaru**

**Secretary General of ICOMOS**

The International Day for Monuments and Sites was created on 18th April 1982 by ICOMOS and later endorsed by UNESCO at its 22nd General Conference in 1983.

For further information on the Day, previous themes, the report on activities held in 2007 and the calendar of activities organized in 2008 – consult http://www.international.icomos.org/18thapril/index.html
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An invitation from ICOMOS Canada

Dear ICOMOS colleagues,

On behalf of my ICOMOS Canada colleagues, the members of the Organizing Committee and its President, Michel Bonnette, I am delighted to invite you to attend the 16th ICOMOS General Assembly and International Scientific Symposium that will take place in Québec City from 29 September to 4 October 2008.

I am certain that it will be an exciting event. The Symposium’s theme is “Finding the Spirit of Place”. The General Assembly will elect the new officers and members of the Executive Committee for the next triennium. The International Forum of Young Researchers and Professionals in Cultural Heritage will precede the event and will be an opportunity for those under the age of 30 to share their experience and exchange ideas on worldwide conservation practices. Special events and receptions will allow participants to find out more about our Canadian culture including its aboriginal people and customs, and the specially prepared post-conference tours will offer a unique opportunity to discover the many facets of our vast and beautiful country.

For detailed information please visit the General Assembly’s website at http://quebec2008.icomos.org.

We look forward to welcoming you to Québec City.

François LeBlanc
Interim President of ICOMOS Canada

Information and Registration

The final program, the list of hotels, the post-conference tours, the receptions and other details are available on the General Assembly’s website. The registration form is also now available. Registration is easy and can be done on-line. We have reserved blocks of rooms in many hotels located within proximity of the main venues or easily accessible by bus. If you are an ICOMOS member, we invite you to register for the cost of $450 CDN ($500 after 15 July). The registration fee for participants 30 years of age and under, who do not wish to participate in the Youth Forum, is $300 CDN.

Scientific Symposium – Theme: Finding the Spirit of Place

Finding the Spirit of Place remains central to the presentation and enhancement of tangible and intangible heritage. But how can it be identified and brought to the fore? This issue, exploring the relationship between spirit and place, between the material and the immaterial, will be at the heart of the discussions conducted throughout the General Assembly Scientific Symposium.

We have identified four tracks or sub-themes for thought and discussion:

1. Re-thinking spirit and place
   (Key words: material culture theory, objectification, heritage making, social use, community, commemoration, memory, remembering, forgetting)

2. The threats to the spirit of place
   (Key words: conflicts, frontiers, degradation, destruction, abandonment, tourism, folklorization, innovation, cultural behaviour, nostalgia, migrations, listing, inventories)

3. Preservation of the spirit of place
   (Key words: conservation policies and practices, legal framework, plurality, reflexivity, restoration, integration, tradition bearers)

4. Transmitting the spirit of place
   (Key words: interpretation, transmission, safeguarding, meaning, mediation, transformation, appropriation, recontextualization, revitalization, technologies)

Papers

The call for papers, widely circulated since November 2007 and available on the
conference web site, was a tremendous success. By the deadline of 1 March 2008, a total of 535 abstracts were submitted and the Symposium Scientific Committee now has the daunting task of selecting the most relevant papers for this important scientific event.

A New Initiative: an International Forum for Young Adults

The Organizing Committee is preparing an International Forum for Young Researchers and Professionals in Cultural Heritage that will also be held in Québec City on 27 and 28 September. The Committee is happy to report that its call for papers was well received throughout the world and a total of 104 abstracts from all continents were submitted. This enthusiastic response guarantees that there will be lively debates during the Forum.

The Committee invites young researchers and professionals still pursuing academic studies or who graduated less than five years ago and are 30 years of age or under, to convene in Québec City within the framework of the Forum to discuss a draft declaration in relation to the Symposium’s theme Finding the Spirit of Place that will be tabled for adoption by the General Assembly. The Forum should bring together several hundred participants. We invite you to actively promote the Forum among young researchers and professionals in your country.

Context

The main objective of the Forum is to determine the attitudes that need to be adopted, and the approaches and methods that could be developed, to ensure that the spirit of place is integrated in the process that leads to the recognition of the historic value of certain objects and practices, as well as the imperative need to ensure that they are protected.

General theme

The theme of the Forum reflects the overall theme of the General Assembly Symposium, and will be structured around the following sub-themes:

1. The role of memory: the focal point of the first workshop will be the acknowledgement of the role played by memory in defining the spirit of place.
2. The fragility of spirit of place: the second workshop will analyse the various causes of deterioration to heritage sites that pose a threat to its spirit.
3. Safeguarding and transmitting the spirit of place: the third workshop will enable participants to examine the strategies used for protecting and enhancing heritage sites so as to determine which avenues are most likely to bring to light their inherent spirit.

Forum program

Four speakers will be invited to present the theme under discussion at the beginning of each workshop; these introductions will be followed by round table discussions. Participants can submit their papers in the form of posters (poster session) and are also invited to take part in a friendly design competition that will be held during the Forum. The working languages of the Forum are English and French and simultaneous interpretation in these two languages will be provided for oral presentations and the round table reports. Assistance may also be offered to participants who speak another language, notably Spanish. Detailed information on the program is available on the Forum’s website.

Registration

Participants must register using the on-line registration form on the Forum’s website. The registration fee for the Forum alone is $100 CDN. The registration fee for both the Forum and the General Assembly is $200 CDN for participants aged 30 years and under. The registration fee for the General Assembly and International Scientific Symposium for young adults aged 30 years and under, who do not wish to participate in the Forum, is $300 CDN.

General information

Meeting Facilities

The Opening Ceremonies will be held at the Palais Montcalm and the Scientific Symposium at the Québec City Convention Centre. Both venues were recently renovated and enlarged, and are located within walking distance of Old Québec, a site inscribed on UNESCO’s World Heritage List.

About Québec City

There are lots of things to see and do in Québec City and the surrounding area at this time of year, including natural parks of exceptional beauty. It will be the fall season when nature and forests adorn themselves with their most beautiful colours. During the day, temperatures are quite mild (15-20°C) but evenings can be a bit cooler (5-10°C). You will therefore need to bring warm clothes. English and French are spoken in most commercial establishments. Local restaurants offer an excellent and diversified cuisine and you will most certainly enjoy great meals at the numerous typical restaurants located throughout the city.

Post-Conference Tours

We are currently putting the finishing touches on the post-conference tours. As Canada is an extremely vast country extending over 5 ½ time zones, you will of course have to make choices. In collaboration with ICOMOS Canada members across the country, we have organized excellent study tours. Two six-day study tours, a three-day study tour and a one-day study tour will be offered. We are currently finalizing the detailed itineraries, in collaboration with conservation experts involved in the regions in question and a travel agent who is helping with the logistics and costs.
Western Canada – The six-day study tour of southern Alberta will allow participants to discover the vastness of the Great Plains and the majesty of the Rockies, as well as a number of exceptional World Heritage sites and the region’s natural heritage, cultural landscapes and modern and aboriginal heritage.

The Maritimes – This six-day study tour will take participants from the north to the south of Nova Scotia, where they will discover, among many beautiful sites, the country of Acadians and the story of their deportation, the elegance of the Fortress of Louisbourg, the irresistible charm of small town Lunenburg (a World Heritage site) and the magnificent landscapes of Cape Breton Island where participants will discover the multi-faceted aboriginal, Acadian, Gaelic, French and military heritage.

The Centre – This three-day study tour will take participants first to Montréal, where they will discover Mount Royal, the Lachine Canal, Montréal’s Main Street and Old Montréal, then on to the Castle of Montebello, a rustic, charming and elegant historic hotel entirely built with red cedar logs and finally to Ottawa where visits to Parliament Hill and the Rideau Canal, a site recently inscribed on the World Heritage List, have been organized. Participants will discover the spirit of place, cultural and urban landscapes and contemporary and historic architecture in urban settings.

And, for those who would like to simply escape into the Québec countryside for a single day:

Charlevoix and whale-watching – This one-day tour will take participants along the St. Lawrence River through the Charlevoix region all the way to the mouth of the Saguenay River. They will discover Canada’s fiery autumnal colours, typical historic villages and local art and traditions. A boat cruise on the river will give participants a close-up view of the wide variety of whales that live and pass through this region.

The conference website provides detailed itineraries of the tours, as well as their costs, dates, and other relevant information.

Special Program for Accompanying Persons
The Organizing Committee has planned a special program for accompanying persons. The program, costs and registration form are available on the General Assembly’s website.

Information from the International Secretariat related to the 16th General Assembly

Resolutions
The growing interest of Committees and members in the ICOMOS General Assemblies has led to a significant increase and diversification of the resolutions presented for adoption and which then serve as a basis for preparing the ICOMOS action plans. This increase brings with it a logistical challenge for the organisers of the Assembly and for those in charge of preparing the ICOMOS Triennial Action Plan. Without prejudice to either the authority of our General Assembly or its Rules of Procedure, we invite you to inform us in advance of any draft resolution you might consider submitting to the General Assembly. Please communicate these to the International Secretariat, if possible, by 26 June 2008, in time for the ICOMOS Bureau meeting on 30 June 2008.

The Piero Gazzola Prize and Honorary Membership
Established in 1979, the Piero Gazzola Prize – which is the highest distinction awarded by ICOMOS - commemorates our founding President, an outstanding personality in the history of the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites.

Every three years the prize, symbolized by a commemorative medal, is awarded during the ICOMOS General Assembly to an individual or a group of people who have worked together and contributed with distinction to the aims and objectives of ICOMOS.

In accordance with Article 6.a. of the ICOMOS Statutes, Honorary Membership is also conferred by the General Assembly, at the proposal of a National Committee, upon individuals who have rendered distinguished service in the field of conservation, restoration and enhancement of historical monuments, sites, and groups of buildings.

The Selection Committee, specially appointed by the ICOMOS Executive Committee, is currently selecting the laureate of the Gazzola Prize and the new Honorary members from among the ICOMOS members put forward by the National or Scientific Committees before the deadline of 31 March 2008.

Financial support to attend the 16th General Assembly
ICOMOS again expresses its warm thanks to the Getty Foundation for its continued support by awarding a 75 000 US$ grant to enable the attendance of delegates from countries facing serious financial difficulties at the 16th General Assembly and Scientific Symposium. The call for funding applications was mailed to members via the National Committees of eligible countries and posted on the General Assembly web site – with a deadline of 31 March 2008.

Thanks to the generosity of the members of several ICOMOS National Committees, who together donated 8955 €, ICOMOS will for the first time be able to provide a few additional grants to support attendance at our General Assembly through our own ICOMOS Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls Fund (see p.9, Vol. 16, n° 2, December 2006) created for this purpose. The funds will be allocated by the same Selection Committee, and along the same criteria, as for the Getty Foundation grant. We thank ICOMOS Belgium, Australia and Finland for their contributions and invite all ICOMOS members and Committees to consider making a donation to further grow the fund.
Voting rights

Below some procedural matters, as stipulated by the Rules of Procedure of the ICOMOS General Assembly, which National Committees must respect so that their representatives can cast their votes at the election in Quebec:

Article 23.3.b (see also articles 27.2 and 45.4) – “Chairmen of National Committees must have submitted to the ICOMOS International Secretariat and not less than one month before the General Assembly a list of their voting members, signed by the National Committee Chairman.”

Article 15.2 “Any voting member may give his proxy to another voting member of his National Committee who must hand the Secretariat a signed and dated proxy form before the time fixed on the programme of the General Assembly for the meeting of the Credentials Committee. No member shall be entitled to have more than five votes in addition to his own.”

Article 45.2 “The number of votes is limited to 18 for each National Committee.” (This includes proxies).

Article 23.3.a (ref. also to article 27.2b and 45.2) National Committees must be up to date in their membership fees (and arrears) so as to have the right to vote during the General Assembly.

In addition, the Executive Committee unanimously decided that the final deadline for payment of the totality of membership fees of a National Committee will be the same as the statutory deadline for the handing over of voting lists, that is to say one month before the start of the General Assembly (Art. 23.3.b RoP).

Consequently, to be able to vote at the 16th General Assembly, National Committees must be up-to-date with all their membership fees at the latest by 30 August 2008.

The ICOMOS Statutes and Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly are available on the General Assembly web site for your information.

Candidatures for election to positions as officers and for the Executive Committee of ICOMOS

List of nominations received up to 31 March 2008

At the 16th ICOMOS General Assembly in Quebec, the ICOMOS members, present at the General Assembly and delegated by their eligible National Committees to vote, will elect the officers and the ICOMOS Executive Committee for the 2008 – 2011 mandate (1 President, 1 Secretary General, 1 Treasurer General, 5 Vice Presidents and 12 Executive Committee members).

A call was posted and e-mailed to all National and International Committees, in accordance with Article 12.c. of the ICOMOS Statutes, inviting them to send proposals for candidatures, both for positions of officers and for ordinary members of the Executive Committee. Following this call, the ICOMOS International Secretariat, by 31 March 2008, received the nominations listed below (2 for President, 1 for Secretary General, 2 for Treasurer General, 6 for Vice President and 15 for the Executive Committee). All candidates to a position of officer which are not elected to one of these can automatically also stand for the Executive Committee.

In accordance with the ICOMOS Statutes, this list is herewith forwarded for information to all ICOMOS members 120 days before the date of the General Assembly. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly (art 54.1), the members of ICOMOS can still propose further candidates until no later than 5 p.m. on the first day of the General Assembly – 30 September, after which all candidature files will be handed over to the Candidatures Committee for verification. For information on what elements the candidature files must include, please contact the ICOMOS International Secretariat.

All candidates have been invited to address the ICOMOS membership with a short statement on their vision and ambitions for ICOMOS. These statements, as well as the candidate’s photograph and their brief curriculum vita, if the candidate provided them and only in the language versions they supplied, can be consulted on the General Assembly web site and directly through the ICOMOS home page, www.icomos.org.

PRESIDENT
Gustavo Araoz – United States of America
Dinu Bumbaru – Canada

SECRETARY GENERAL
Bénédicte Selfslagh – Belgium

TREASURER GENERAL
Jadran Antolovic – Croatia
Ray Bondin – Malta

VICE PRESIDENTS
Kristal Buckley – Australia
Guo Zhan – China
Andrew Hall – South Africa
Wilfried Lipp – Austria
Francisco Lopez Morales – Mexico
Carlos Mesen – Costa Rica
Olivier Poisson - France

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Sofia Avgérinou– Greece
Sabry Abdel Aziz – Egypt

Alfredo Conti – Argentina
Gideon Koren – Israel
Kirsti Kovanen –Finland
Philippe La Hausse – Mauritius
Christoph Machat – Germany
Yasuyoshi Okada –Japan
Angela Rojas - Cuba
Hristina Staneva - Bulgaria
Lazar Sumanov – Macedonia
Boguslaw Szmygin –Poland
Hae Un Rii – Korea
Luigi Zangheri – Italy
New draft ICOMOS Charters submitted to the General Assembly

The ICOMOS Charter on the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites

The proposed ICOMOS Charter on the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites – to be presented for ratification at the 16th ICOMOS General Assembly – deals with the methods and technologies of effective, responsible public heritage communication. Indeed, the need for internationally-accepted principles of interpretation and presentation is a matter of increasing urgency at a time of intensifying environmental and human threats to heritage and with the growth in many regions of elaborate heritage “theme-parks,” designed primarily for income generation rather than conservation or education.

The final text of this Charter, developed under the auspices of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Interpretation and Presentation (ICIP), does not prescribe specific content for site presentations, nor does it impose a “uniform” pattern on how particular monuments, sites, or cultural landscapes should be explained to the public. Rather, it deals with the fundamental issues of “Access”, “Information Sources,” “Context and Setting”, “Authenticity”, “Inclusiveness”, “Sustainability”, and “Research, Education, and Training”. It seeks to ensure that these issues are considered and incorporated into public communication with all heritage stakeholders, including tourists, local and associated communities, and local educational systems.

After extensive revision and comment by an editorial committee appointed by the ICOMOS Executive Committee in January 2004; consultation with an advisory panel of other ICOMOS specialists in June 2004; internal comment and revision by the members of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Interpretation and Presentation (ICIP); seven drafts and three rounds of review and comment by ICOMOS National and Scientific Committees between 2004 and 2007, we believe that this text represents a consensus by the ICOMOS community on the central principles of the interpretation and presentation of cultural heritage sites. For more information on the activities of ICIP please visit our web site at: http://icip.icomos.org/

Neil Silberman
President of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Interpretation and Presentation

The ICOMOS Charter on Cultural Routes

In 1993, on the occasion of the evaluation of the Route of Santiago as a UNESCO World Heritage site, ICOMOS raised the need to better define this specific category of cultural heritage not encompassed by any of those established by the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention at that time.

In November 1994, a first meeting contributed to this task but did not clearly delineate and define this new category or establish an appropriate methodology for its identification and management. Members from many countries continued to work on this subject, leading to the creation of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Cultural Routes (CIIC) in 1998.

As a result of the CIIC’s efforts and the growing interest in Cultural Routes, the revised World Heritage Operational Guidelines issued in 2005 recognized the existence of Heritage Routes as a new category, including both Natural Routes, such as the migratory movements of birds, and Cultural Routes. This recognition made it necessary for ICOMOS, both as a scientific body and as advisor to UNESCO, to contribute to clearly establishing the conceptual and operational aspects concerning the latter.

Following over a decade of in-depth reflection, matched by the field experience gained through numerous research projects around the world, as well as scientific meetings and publications, the CIIC has developed a definition, basic principles and a specific methodology for the identification, research and proper assessment of cultural routes, as well as some guidelines aiming at their protection, conservation, correct use and management. These aspects are reflected in the proposed ICOMOS Charter on Cultural Routes, which after consultation among the CIIC members, distribution to all the ICOMOS National and International Committees for comment, and submission to the Executive Committee, will be presented for ratification at the forthcoming ICOMOS General Assembly (Quebec 2008).

Maria-Rosa Suarez Inclan Ducassi
President of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Cultural Routes

The full texts of both draft Charters are available on the 16th General Assembly web site http://quebec2008.icomos.org
From 9 – 13 October 2007, the ICOMOS Executive and Advisory Committees met at the University of Pretoria at the invitation of ICOMOS South Africa which we warmly thank, in particular its President, Ntizizi November and his predecessor, Andrew Hall, as well as Karel Bakker who brilliantly solved all logistical aspects with remarkable calm.

Before these meetings in Pretoria, Laura Robinson and Beverly Crouts-Knipe in cooperation with organisations in Cape Town and with SAHRA, the South African heritage agency, organised a professional programme exposing participants to a diversity of conservation issues at the World Heritage Site of Robben Island, District Six, the castle of Good-Hope, the ancient mission settlement of Genadendal, the wine estate of Boschendal and Table Mountain, the imposing monument of nature.

After Rabat (1997) and Victoria Falls (2003), this was the third such meeting of our Advisory and Executive Committees in Africa. The challenges of this continent are striking and again, we could appreciate the great dedication and competence of our colleagues facing these. ICOMOS needs to find ways to help them participate in international activities and both the Advisory and Executive Committees have committed to work on this priority.

The Executive Committee first coopted Olivier Poisson, Vice President of ICOMOS France, to complete the mandate of the late Gilles Nourissier, our colleague who sadly passed away in May 2007 after fighting illness. Gilles’ contribution to will be commemorated through the member database he worked to build for the benefit of ICOMOS.

Bénédicte Selfslagh accepted to be the meeting’s rapporteur. We thank her for the rigour and professionalism she once again put to such an essential task for the healthy management of ICOMOS.

2005-2008 Action Plan – Partnerships and Observatory

A reference paper will be prepared on the development of strategic partnerships between ICOMOS and relevant institutions or organisations. Members of both the Advisory and Executive Committees have been invited to indicate potential partners in the professional, academic and volunteer sectors.

The “ICOMOS Observatory on Monuments and Sites” (provisional title) will provide a consistent framework to integrate current activities such as Heritage at Risk or the Preventive Monitoring programme our President Michael Petzet exposed to National Committees. A proposal will be presented to the Executive Committee in March and to the General Assembly in September.

Management

The Executive Committee is engaged in updating its internal rules of procedure to ensure a better management of ICOMOS without damaging the spirit of collegiality and initiative which is inherent to the non-governmental sector we belong to. This exercise will continue at the meeting of the Committee in March 2008 and is complemented by a decision to forge a stronger link between the Action Plan and the budget planning process.

World Heritage

The Executive Committee thanked the World Heritage Working Group for all its work. It commissioned the Group to prepare recommendations on rules for the assignment of missions to experts stipulating that members of the Executive Committee or the World Heritage Panel cannot receive such assignments. The Executive Committee also asked all ICOMOS National and International Committees to inform the World Heritage Unit of our International Secretariat of any contacts they may have with the World Heritage Canter relative to the Convention or to the state of conservation of sites on the World Heritage List, so as to help ICOMOS act in a more informed way.

Victoria Falls / Mosi-oa Tunya Solidarity Fund

The establishment of the Fund was materialised through decisions to assign responsibilities to the International Secretariat, the Treasurer and the Advisory Committee. Our National Committees are invited to contribute to the Fund. Management criteria were also adopted along with other measures to encourage participation at the next General Assembly in Canada.

The Executive Committee also congratulated the Scientific Council for its symposium and meetings in Pretoria. Proposals to improve the situation of our headquarters in Paris were reviewed, as well as the progress in the organisation of the 16th General Assembly and the call for proposals for the 17th General Assembly in 2011. A progress report on the ICOMOS International Conservation Center in Xi’an was presented. The Executive Committee endorsed the draft doctrinal texts on Cultural Routes and on Interpretation / Presentation so that they can be submitted to the General Assembly and was informed of the progress made in preparing joint ICOMOS-TICCIH Principles for the conservation of industrial heritage. It also examined the case of some problematic National Committees and discussed some heritage cases, including that of the restoration of the Guggenheim Museum in New York.

Dinu Bumbaru
Secretary General of ICOMOS
2007 meetings of the ICOMOS Advisory Committee and Scientific Council

The ICOMOS Scientific Council (SC) and Advisory Committee (AC) met respectively from 7 to 11 October 2007, under the wonderful Jacaranda trees, in the campus of the University of Pretoria. The meeting was kindly organised by ICOMOS South Africa and the University of Pretoria, assisted by the ICOMOS Secretariat.

On 7 October the ICOMOS Scientific Council held a symposium on “Heritage and Global Climate change”, 33 people attended the afternoon workshop including seven National Committee members, and the remainder representing 15 International Scientific Committees (ISC). The symposium was organized by Scientific Council Co-ordinator Pamela Jerome. (see p. 14 )

Scientific Council

On 8 and 9 October a meeting of the Scientific Council was chaired by Susan Barr, President of the Polar Heritage Committee, and minutes were taken by Kristal Buckley (ICOMOS Australia). The meeting discussed in detail a range of issues.

Annual reporting and compliance to Eger-Xi’an principles: ISC annual reports are to be timed so that all are available for SC meetings. The three-year timeframe set up at Xi’an did not provide any milestones for the progress of the Eger-Xi’an process. Despite that one of the reasons for the preparation of the Eger-Xi’an principles was to bring a unified reporting and membership protocol for the ISCs. Several committees did not conform to the principles and did not produce reports. It was suggested that a small task force be set up to establish a procedural paper outlining the mechanisms that would be involved, allowing the SC to act transparently and to take clear steps, including ultimately recommendations to the Executive Committee. Transparency is a very important issue. It was agreed that Michal Firestone (SC Coordinator) will form the task force.

Membership: Defining levels of membership was still a problem within the revision of the statutes of many of the ISCs. Representatives of ISCs reported on progress.

Relationship with National Committees (NC): Members of the SC expressed satisfaction with the number of National Committees who attended the SC meeting. It was reported that there was good and positive communication between the ISC and NCs and that few NCs had problems with the way the Eger-Xi’an principles had enhanced relations.

Doctrinal texts: Two proposed doctrinal texts, the Interpretation and Presentation Charter and the Cultural Routes Charter, were discussed in depth. It was resolved that both draft Charters be recommended favourably to the Executive Committee (EC) and that the texts be presented at the next General Assembly.

Proposed new International Committees: Two new ISCs were proposed - Tropical architecture/heritage and Astronomy and cultural heritage. In both cases the SC wanted to see broader definitions of interest. It was proposed that the question be passed to the AC and while it is the role of the EC to accept such proposals, they should be developed at a much more detailed level.

Scientific Council Initiatives:

• Historic Urban Landscapes - ICOMOS is a member of the expert steering committee established by UNESCO, but does not have a lead role. The SC decided to work on this issue as a tool to strengthening the role of ICOMOS. Five discussion groups had been formed. The Spanish NC was congratulated for its initiative of translating all of the relevant documents.
• Climate Change - A paper arising from the symposium held on 7 October will be prepared by Pamela Jerome for wide distribution and in preparation for a substantial presentation to the General Assembly in 2008.
• Scientific Development - Planning for interdisciplinary research. The SC was reminded of the list of potential research topics assembled at Edinburgh. These included the following:
  - Cultural Heritage and Development (including poverty relief, sustainable development)
  - Social Equity and Differential Wealth
  - Population Growth
  - Tourism Growth
  - Environmental Disasters
  - Cultural conflict and lack of tolerance
  - Marginalization of cultural heritage
  - Information Technology
  - Governance and Site Management
  - Stakeholders
  - Heritage of the Metropolis

“Values and significance” was proposed as an addition. It was recognized that some of the topics overlapped and it was recommended that the list be taken back to the ISCs for further discussion.

• Student research: Gustavo Araoz, ICOMOS Vice President, made a short PowerPoint presentation on a US ICOMOS initiative to facilitate student research on priority issues identified by ICOMOS. It was moved that ISCs should examine the proposal and develop suggestions for student research topics.

Contribution to ICOMOS activities and programmes:

Dinu Bumbaru, ICOMOS Secretary General, presented a short PowerPoint to remind the SC about the structure of the current triennial plan.

16th General Assembly and symposium: Michel Bonnette, ICOMOS Canada, provided an update about the General Assembly programme, including which elements are planned for each day. The GA will occur during the 400th anniversary year of the founding of Quebec city.

World Heritage Programme: Sofia Avgerinou (SC Coordinator) reported on progress being made in establishing a list of ISC experts available for World Heritage missions and evaluations.
International Conservation Centre, Xi-an: The SC were reminded of its three main streams activity:
1. Promotion and dissemination of the Xi’an Declaration.
2. Conservation of the heritage along the silk roads.
3. Traditional knowledge and conservation science.
Guo Zhan provided an overview of the establishment of the Centre and it was accepted that it would need to work more closely with the ISCs.

Membership database: Gaia Jungeblodt, Director of the ICOMOS Secretariat, outlined the progress toward this initiative. She recalled the presentations by Gilles Nourissier at Edinburgh which were extremely well received by the SC, AC and the EC.

Advisory Committee
The meeting of the Advisory Committee, on 9 and 10 October, was chaired by John Hurd and minutes were taken by Andrew Hall (ICOMOS South Africa) and Axel Mykleby (ICOMOS Norway).

At the start of the meeting and after a silence to remember colleagues who have passed away, special tributes were paid to Jacques Dalibard (ICOMOS Canada) and Gilles Nourissier (ICOMOS France).
The hosts conveyed messages, first from Mr Ntsizi November, Chairperson of ICOMOS South Africa and then from Prof Antony Melck, Advisor to the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Pretoria.

Presentations were then made by partner organisations represented by:
• ICOM - Prof. Henri C. (Jatti) Bredekamp, President ICOM South Africa.
• UIA - Laura Robinson, President of the Cape Institute of Architects and Director of the Cape Town Heritage Trust
• TICCIH - David Worth, South Africa delegate and board member.
• The Holy See - Miroslaw Adamczyk, Papal Nuncio of South Africa.
• DOCOMOMO - Hannah le Roux, South African member.

Reports
John Hurd, President of the AC, gave a verbal report on his many visits to NCs around the world during 2006-2007. A letter had been received from the Norwegian committee raising several issues. The letter was discussed and a task team appointed to take the matter forward.

The President, Michael Petzet, thanked ICOMOS South Africa for organising the meeting. In his report, he went on to mention activities over the past year focussing on publications, the World Heritage Working Group, the Scientific Council and the International Conservation Centre in Xi’an, a project on which ICOMOS China; Germany and Australia are cooperating.

Mr Petzet reminded the committee that the French government had offered the organisation a new office just outside Paris that offered many possibilities.

Problems in certain NCs, in particular India and Italy, were raised and the hope expressed that the EC would be able to resolve these.

He focussed on the international mission of ICOMOS saying that having 120 NCs was not sufficient an indication of the discharge of the ICOMOS mission and that ‘sleeping’ NCs needed to be reactivated and new work done in countries where ICOMOS was not present. He understood the need to respect the traditions of all regions of the world, but not at cost to the conservation traditions of ‘old Europe’ which were frequently criticised.

The Secretary General, Dinu Bumbaru, used the Triennial Plan of the organisation as the basis for his presentation, raising matters under each of the four parts of the document. In conclusion he raised questions around the following:
• Current and anticipated needs of heritage and its conservation?
• Short term priorities?
  - Membership
  - ICOMOS Headquarters
  - Scientific activities, references
  - Partnerships
  - Article 5 of the World Heritage Convention

The Treasurer General, Giora Solar’s report was delayed by his late arrival in South Africa. (Positive report distributed separately). During the delay questions of finance, especially concerning WH activities within ICOMOS were discussed in depth.

National Committees: Following meetings of the four National Committee task teams, John Hurd thanked the teams for their hard work and Gideon Koren for his leadership in these matters.
Reports were then taken from the task teams.
• Task Team 1 - Membership and statutes: Presidents or appointed members from ICOMOS Australia (chair), Germany, Sweden, Norway, Lithuania and Israel.
• Task Team 2 - Regional co-operation: Presidents or appointed members from ICOMOS South Africa (chair), Finland, Hungary, Norway, South Korea, Australia.
• Task Team 3 - Co-operation between ISCs and the Scientific Council: Presidents or appointed members from ICOMOS Bulgaria (chair), Belgium, USA, Netherlands, Greece.
• Task Team 4 - Involvement of ICOMOS National Committees in World Heritage work of ICOMOS: Presidents or appointed members from ICOMOS France (chair), Ivory Coast, Switzerland, UK, Macedonia, Japan, Italy, Czech Republic, South Korea, South Africa, Norway, and possibly Spain and China.
• Protracted discussion followed on the reports of the task teams and several resolutions were passed.
  • The AC thanked the task teams for the work undertaken and asked them to continue under the same leadership and co-ordinator as in the preceding year.
  • The EC will look into the recommendations made by all task teams, and in particular those ready for immediate implementation in the course of the next year. The Secretary General to report on implementation at the next AC meeting.
• A listserv is to be set up for the continuation of the valuable discussion among NC presidents present in Pretoria as well as those who have not participated in the process so far.
• The AC asked the four task teams to complete the process by way of drafting an amendment to the Dubrovnik Guidelines for NCs.

Regional reports
Regional reports were given by the four regional groups.
• Americas.
• Africa.
• Asia Pacific.
• Europe.
Regional reports received wide discussion.

Scientific Activities
The Scientific Council reported on activities and the following points were noted:
• The work of the Historic Urban Landscapes working group, particularly the contribution of Spain to translation of material.
• The outcomes of the Global Climate Change Symposium held in Pretoria and thanked those who contributed in various ways to it and contributions on climate change to the 2007 H@R report.
• The SC is committed to finding other areas of common purpose that can be the focus of future work by ISCs in conjunction with the SC.
• Welcome for the work of US/ICOMOS in the area of student exchange and research.

ICOMOS General Operations
These included discussion on:
• The World Heritage programme.
• International Monuments Day 2008
• 16th General Assembly 2008
• Future General Assemblies
• Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls Fund

ICOMOS South Africa arranged a particularly moving post conference tour which led delegates, through the jacaranda lined streets and past the landmarks of Pretoria, such as its Union Buildings and Church Square, and on to Johannesburg, where a visit was arranged to Walter Sisulu Square of Dedication in Kliptown, the former Number Four Prison and the new Constitutional Court. The tour was followed by a delicious lunch of traditional African dishes. Other resounding successes with delegates were evening receptions at Freedom Park and the African Window Museum, where delegates danced the night away to the accompaniment of an excellent Jazz band. A few strains and other injuries were reported!

The Advisory Committee and the Scientific Council offer their gratitude and recognise the hard and productive work of ICOMOS South Africa especially the exceptional and successful efforts of Karel Bakker, and the ICOMOS Secretariat. Warmest thanks also go to the University of Pretoria and National Heritage Council for making this a well-hosted and most enjoyable event.

John Hurd
President of the ICOMOS Advisory Committee

The Advisory Committee manages the input to the Executive Committee from the ICOMOS National and International Scientific Committees and advises it on all matters, both on policy and in any area of interest to ICOMOS, within the Committee’s community. The Advisory Committee also supports the activities of the Executive Committee and reviews and facilitates instructions and requests from the Executive Committee.

The Scientific Council is a strategic and permanent forum recently established by adoption of the Eger-Xi’an Principles at the 15th General Assembly in Xi’an, China. Unlike the Advisory Committee, it is not a statutory body but rather one set up to enhance ICOMOS’ action through its International Scientific Committees (ISCs) and in regards to scientific development. The Scientific Council consists of the ISC Presidents or their designated representatives. Besides supporting the Executive Committee and ICOMOS in general in its work, a purpose of the Scientific Council is to create a framework for ISC interdisciplinary work.
Meeting in Seoul from the 29th May to the 1st June, 2007 at the invitation of ICOMOS Korea, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the Cultural Heritage Administration of the Republic of Korea and the Seoul Metropolitan Government, to share experience and reflect on the theme of Heritage and Metropolis in Asia and the Pacific,

Benefiting from reports demonstrating the great variation in practices, capacity, tools and experiences of the conservation of heritage sites of various types and periods, including the 20th century, in the metropolitan areas in Asia and the Pacific, and from the particular experience of Seoul and the ongoing efforts of the Korean and metropolitan authorities to protect and conserve cultural heritage sites and their surroundings, including sites inscribed on the World Heritage List and traditional neighbourhoods, as well as the successful achievements of major urban revitalisation projects like the Cheonggyecheon,

Noting the very rapid growth, change and modernisation of metropolitan areas in Asia and the Pacific as these cities gain strategic roles as national, regional and international economic engines and figureheads, with major public and corporate investments in real estate densification, new urbanisation and infrastructures,

Concerned that adverse effects can occur as a result of this accelerated expansion of metropolitan areas, such as deep social, economic and physical transformation and pressures of an unprecedented scale and nature on communities and the heritage which contributes to the distinctive qualities of urban settlements and communicates their particular history, leading to the large scale loss or alteration of significant structures, sites and areas,

Equally concerned that the lack of policy, basic management tools and resources might prevent authorities from adequately facing such situations, and associated phenomenon like land speculation, loss of traditional knowledge, corruption or increased risks,

Conscious of the various initiatives undertaken at the metropolitan, national and international levels by public authorities as well as academic forums, non-governmental organisations as well as ICOMOS and UNESCO to address the threat of permanent loss of heritage and distinctiveness in large cities and the opportunity for the sustainable development they can bring by exploring further the ways to integrate cultural heritage at the policy level and in the planning process, as well as the specific design and planning of urban development projects, calling for an increased responsibility from private and public corporate sectors,

Referring to internationally recognised documents such as the ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (Washington, 1987) and the ICOMOS Declaration on the Conservation of the Setting of Heritage Structures, Sites and Areas (Xi’an, 2005) as well as the UNESCO World Heritage Convention (Paris, 1972) and its Operational Guidelines, and the Recommendation concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas (Nairobi, 1976) as well as the conclusions of the previous ICOMOS Asia-Pacific Regional meetings and the Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape which was requested by Member States to the World Heritage Convention to serve as the basis for a future UNESCO recommendation on the urban landscape and its conservation,

The participants of the 4th ICOMOS Asia-Pacific Regional meeting, coming from the Republic of Korea, Australia, Canada, China/Taiwan, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Thailand and the United States of America and an observer from the World Heritage Center of UNESCO, would like to express their gratitude and appreciation to their hosts for providing the opportunity of a fruitful exchange on the timely theme of conservation in the particular context of large cities.

Finally, the participants wish to express the following recommendations and principles relative to the conservation of cultural heritage as a key component of the sustainable development of metropolitan areas in Asia and the Pacific, requesting that ICOMOS disseminates them, further investigates the concept of the «Historic Urban Landscape» as a tool to evaluate both the values of heritage in a metropolitan setting and the degree of acceptable change, and continues to support the sharing of experience at the regional level to help enhance the protection and management of this very important heritage.

1. Cultural heritage should be recognised as a diverse and non-renewable asset, essential to the sustainable and human development of metropolitan areas in Asia and the Pacific.

The cultural heritage of the metropolis takes diverse forms such as buildings, neighbourhoods, districts, monuments, archaeological sites, place names, urban layout, traditional activities or uses, events and rituals, public spaces, sacred
places and cemeteries, gardens and parks, topography and natural features, and panoramas. These heritage sites contribute to the life and memory of the metropolitan areas by the diversity of their uses. Aspects such as visual links, pattern, scale, and sounds are often important elements and contribute to the character of the streetscapes or nightscapes.

Whether it is currently listed or not, the city’s heritage illustrates the various periods of ancient or recent history of the metropolis, and the memory, skills and wisdom of the successive generations of its inhabitants and leaders. It provides those who live in and use the city with important references, landmarks and spaces, contributing to their quality of life.

Along with geographical features and the living social ecosystem, cultural heritage contributes strongly to the personality and character of the metropolis. It is a source of a truly sustainable development of the metropolitan areas in Asia and the Pacific in achieving their strategic and economic roles.

Conservation of cultural heritage should be integral to the development of the city, including policies, programmes and projects, from their planning to their approval, implementation and updating.

2. Whereas the practice of conservation of cultural heritage has long focused on individual architectural or archaeological sites, the increased recognition of the heritage significance of the overall cityscape calls for the integration of the protection and management of cultural heritage in planning programmes at the metropolitan and local levels, so that heritage conservation can contribute to the quality of urban development.

The goal of this integration is to reduce the risks of costly conflicts between development and cultural heritage, and to provide opportunities for creative approaches and solutions to maintaining the cultural heritage of the city, while recognising its dynamic and complex nature.

Such integration encourages the consistency, transparency and efficiency of the various policies and tools needed in the metropolitan context. It also facilitates the early consideration of heritage issues in the development process.

3. Conservation is comprised of the on-going identification, evaluation, protection and management of cultural heritage supported by the necessary human, scientific and financial resources.

The cultural heritage of metropolitan areas includes a diversity of places and values. It is greater than the sum of its individual components.

Cultural heritage identification is an on-going and inclusive practice which should look at both the tangible and intangible dimensions. The formal processes such as listing or scheduling should be carried out by authorities operating in a legal framework, utilising adequately trained and skilled professionals and sound research. These processes are also conducted by the academic, non-government and volunteer sectors.

Evaluation should address the vulnerability factors, threats and opportunities which may affect cultural heritage and its different values. The results of these processes should be taken into account in developing and implementing broad policies, regulations and individual development projects.

Successful conservation outcomes in metropolitan areas depend on the allocation of adequate human and financial resources to services in charge of the conservation, protection and presentation of cultural heritage. The education and information of decision makers, professionals, owners, developers, citizens and the youth are also essential.

4. Conservation of cultural heritage requires the development and implementation of adapted tools founded on recognised best practice and local conditions and traditions.

Heritage value statements should be prepared to characterise the heritage of metropolitan areas, based on the documentation of their history, social and cultural values and traditions. These should support the development and implementation of tools for values-based heritage management, including the review of projects for their heritage impact and specific provision for heritage in disaster management plans.

Best practice in the development and design of projects is a particular responsibility of the corporate sector. Management policy for publicly owned properties should take heritage impact into account to show leadership.

The establishment of local strategic plans for specific sites or districts within metropolitan areas can illustrate the principles and develop models that can be further applied to other districts. Heritage and planning legislation should include measures to protect and manage the settings and surroundings of heritage structures, sites and areas and may provide for a range of assistance and incentive measures for owners and developers in achieving conservation goals.

Because of the scale and complexity of urban development in metropolitan contexts, new approaches are needed to ensure that heritage outcomes and community needs are effectively integrated into the design and implementation of major development and infrastructure projects. These include the recognition of the underlying economic and strategic planning forces at play, and negotiations based on a good understanding of the interests of all parties involved in the planning and decision making processes.

Further discussion is needed to refine the definitions relevant to the heritage of the metropolis in the region, so that a common language informs the dialogue.
Concerned with the increasing evidence of the unprecedented changes in global climate patterns and the impacts these have on heritage sites, buildings, settlements, landscapes, movable objects and the living traditions in various regions of the world;

Considering the assessment reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the work being undertaken within the framework of the UN Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) for climate change mitigation and adaptation;


Further recalling the Resolution of the 15th General Assembly of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) at Xi’an in October 2005 to fully co-operate with UNESCO and other relevant organisations to document the impact of climate change on cultural heritage and to develop a strategy for reducing the risks to cultural heritage; and

Taking into account the evidence contained in the publication “Case Studies on Climate Change and World Heritage” published in 2007 by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre;

The experts participating in “The International Workshop on the Impact of Climate Change on Cultural Heritage”, organized in New Delhi on 22nd May 2007,
**Recommends** that climate change adaptation strategies for cultural heritage should be mainstreamed into the existing methodologies for preservation and conservation of sites, buildings, settlements, landscapes, movable objects and the living traditions and that appropriate standards and protocols should be developed for the purpose. Equally cultural heritage needs and concerns should be mainstreamed into institutional processes and policies for disaster reduction;

**Requests** the national governments and international organisations to acknowledge the importance of cultural heritage for national economies, tourism, employment and community bonding and to involve the governmental and non-governmental organisations, academic institutions and individuals concerned with raising awareness, conservation and protection of cultural properties with the national and international protocols for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation;

**Further requests** the national governments, inter-governmental, non-governmental organisations and the private sector to engage and commit resources for the protection of specific heritage sites from the threats of damage and irretrievable loss;

**Encourages** scientific, technical, academic, research organisations and individuals to collaborate on specific studies related to the impacts of climate change on cultural heritage; and

**Appreciates** the efforts made by the National Institute of Disaster Management, New Delhi and India-ICOMOS in collaboration with the Institute of Archaeology in organising the workshop, which for the first time brought together climate change specialists and cultural heritage experts on the same platform facilitating interaction, exchange of views and cross-fertilization of ideas, and expects these institutions to take the lead in this region of the world to promote such interactions in the future;

**Encourages** the dissemination of this resolution and the Delhi Recommendations of the ICOMOS International Committee on Risk Preparedness (ICORP) Workshop on Risk Management of Heritage Sites as means to promote further collaboration between professional, scientific and institutional networks.

*Adopted in New Delhi, on 22nd May, 2007*

---

**Recommendations from the Scientific Council Symposium**

**Cultural Heritage and Global Climate Change (GCC)**

ICOMOS Scientific Council

Pretoria, South Africa

7 October 2007

Final Draft: 21 March 2008

**Introduction**

At the meeting of the Scientific Council (SC) in Edinburgh, Scotland in September 2006, the SC voted to adopt an interdisciplinary research program on the effects of Global Climate Change (GCC) on heritage. A working group was formed and a brief was circulated in November 2006 to the members of the Scientific Council. Twelve papers were prepared for *Heritage @ Risk*, scheduled to be published in 2008. Of these, five were presented at the scientific symposium that took place on 7 October 2007 in Pretoria, South Africa. An additional paper was presented that focused on maintenance as a method of adaptation. There were brief summaries of four ICOMOS meetings that dealt with climate change in 2007 prior to Pretoria. Breakout sessions during the afternoon explored the question of how GCC affects each International Scientific Committee's (ISC) area of expertise and what adaptation measures should be proposed. 33 people attended the afternoon workshop including seven National Committee members, and the remainder representing 15 of 28 ISCs. The following are the recommendations from the workshop.

---

1. Introduction: GCC and Its Effects on Cultural Heritage, Pamela Jerome; Coastal Erosion Threatens Arctic Sites, Susan Barr; York Factory, Canada, Marc de Caraffe (with Mell Chapple); New Orleans, Stephen Kelley; and Summer Fires in Greece, Sofia Averinou-Kolonias.

2. Presented by John Hurd, President of ICOMOS’s Advisory Committee.

3. ICORP meeting, New Delhi, Dinu Bumbaru; Regional Meeting in Tahiti, Kristal Buckley; Australia ICOMOS meeting in Cairns, Susan McIntyre-Tamwoy; and Partnership Meeting in Ushuaia, Argentina, Dinu Bumbaru.

4. ISCs represented in the breakout sessions included CIAV (Vernacular), CIF (Training), CIIC (Cultural Routes), CIP (Stone), CIVViH (Historic Towns and Villages), ICAHM (Archaeological Heritage Management), ICICH (Intangible Heritage), ICIP (Interpretation and Presentation), ICOFORT (Fortifications), IFLA (Cultural Landscapes), IPHC (Polar Heritage), ISCARSAH (Structures of Architectural Heritage), ISCEAH (Earthen Architectural Heritage), ISC20C (20th Century Heritage), and TICCIH (Industrial Heritage).
Cultural Heritage and Global Climate Change

The York Factory presentation described the problem for the site as “managing static remains in a dynamic landscape”. This is a good description of most conservation work in cultural heritage, whether climate change is involved or not. Climate change accelerates and magnifies the dynamism of the landscape.

Polar Heritage: Climate change affects both the landscape and structures within it. The main observable effect is that elements accustomed to or designed for the cold deteriorate rapidly when the environment warms up. Changes in the landscape result in changes to the setting of a place and may lead to the disappearance of the place altogether (from erosion or loss of foundation rigidity when the permafrost melts).

Earthen Architectural Heritage: Earthen architectural heritage is also greatly at risk. Structures made of mud are often vernacular in nature and hence, very linked to the environmental conditions of their regional context. In addition, mud as a construction material is ephemeral because it has undergone very little modification from its source; therefore, without maintenance it more readily returns to its origins.

Stone: Stone is a material traditionally selected for longevity, based on experience in a particular environment. When climate change alters the environment, the longevity of the material may be seriously reduced. One of the main impacts of climate change is an increase or change in both the wet/dry and freeze/thaw weather cycles, which hastens decay of porous materials including stone. New chemical effects may also occur on significant stone structures previously seen as robust.

Fortifications: For coastal sites, sea level rise is the most obvious impact of climate change. In addition, changing weather patterns, including the increased frequency and intensity of storms, will have an affect. Fortifications such as those in island regions, for instance the Caribbean, are located at water’s edge and sea level. These phenomena may also have an accelerated impact on World War II sites that are often constructed of materials such as steel and reinforced concrete that are not naturally durable. Many fortifications inland are built on sites selected for their defensive qualities, and climate change may alter their cultural landscape setting.

Structural Stability: The principles of assessment, diagnosis and treatment of historic structures are largely unaffected by climate change; decay and deterioration phenomena arising from climate change are reasonably well understood. What will change is the vulnerability of particular structures (due to climate change) to different kinds of problems from the ones they were originally designed to cope with. Examples include timber structures that become vulnerable to termite attack owing to migration of wood-eating insect species; movement of lower level biological growths to follow their ecological niches; and new settlements of structural foundations as the permafrost melts, and clayey soils become wetted or dry out.

20th Century Heritage: The built heritage of the 20th century was characterized by experimentation and innovation in construction materials and techniques, many of which had neither the resilience nor the longevity of traditional construction. Examples include cinder concrete, particleboard, panellised construction, and cladding systems with little redundancy. In addition, the International Style gave little regard to regional context, thereby creating buildings that require massive artificial climate control, which could become unsustainable in a GCC future. Climate change will result in accelerated decay of 20th century structures and there is a need to develop philosophical and practical responses to their conservation.

Archaeological Sites: The physical impacts of climate change on soils, hydrology, chemistry, etc. will affect sub-surface archaeological remains and sites. Site conservation complications caused by “bad” conservation in the past, accelerated by GCC, will be a problem. This includes archaeological excavations that left trenches and sites exposed with little or no conservation, partial walls, etc. There will be an increase in “underwater” archaeological sites, so there is a need to prepare sites for a submerged future. In many countries, there will be literally thousands of archaeological sites that will be submerged or destroyed by wave wash and storm surges over the next several decades. For example in Australia, there are thousands of Aboriginal sites attesting to Holocene (or in some cases earlier) occupation of the continent, as well as important sites that attest to the initial period of European/Aboriginal contact. Most of these sites remain undocumented. It is urgent that countries adopt a strategic approach to the investigation and salvage of information from such sites before it is too late.

Vernacular/Historic Villages and Cities: Professionals need to establish historic context, identify values and significance, and provide an acceptable definition of values. Defining conservation objectives and goals clearly will better express them to the public and help to create awareness. Regional guidelines should be established, areas in danger identified, and gaps in documentation filled. There needs to be a close look at problems of faulty municipal regulations. Architecture follows industrial products, and these are often not environmentally friendly. Urban sprawl is an issue that affects the economics of the environment; if people pay the real price for clean air and safe water, they would not take these for granted. It is important to promote vernacular architecture as energy efficient, as well as socially, culturally and ecologically efficient. The energy efficiency of traditional buildings could be upgraded, but also, the practice of conservation needs to become more “green”.

Training: There is an evident need to develop training programs that specifically address climate change problems and adaptation methods. These must be founded on a solid understanding of materials science, so that conservation interventions do not involve materials and methods that will make problems worse in the future.
Cultural Tourism: The slow degradation and/or catastrophic destruction of cultural heritage places and communities, as well as the vast array of natural cultural heritage sites, irrespective of the simple recreational attraction of many places, will have major impacts on the travel patterns and choices available to the 800 million plus international tourists and the countless hundreds of millions of domestic tourists. Apart from the impact on those places that travellers will no longer see as attractive, the increased impact on those that are currently less affected could be significant. Potentially, a vast shift in the existing patterns of activity in one of the world’s biggest industries is expected. The tourism industry is beginning to become aware of these issues, but more on the “cause” side than the “effect”. The airline industry has begun to look at better-designed aircraft and increased passenger charges to buy carbon-trading offsets. The hotel industry has been embracing environmental sustainability; nevertheless, there are still thousands of hotels and resorts around the world that are deliberately located on marginal land just to exploit dramatic landscape. However, the tourism industry is quite susceptible to ideas and pressure from well-formulated arguments.

Intangible Heritage: The inevitable loss of natural features, flora and fauna will impact cultural landscapes and with it, living traditions. The intangible and tangible heritages are intertwined; impacts from the loss of tangible values affects intangible values. Loss of coastal land will result in the movement of population and industries, which in turn will result in pressure on hitherto un-impacted cultural landscapes and sites. Similarly, there will be population migration from drought-stricken and chronically flooded areas. The increase of urbanization, population movement and relocation will result in loss of traditional caretakers and repair technologies for sites, as well as impact cultural practices.

Cultural Landscapes and Heritage Ensembles: Cultural landscapes and heritage ensembles are vulnerable to climate change, not only through damage to the built or landscaped environment, but also through changes to the natural environment. Desertification of a pastoral landscape, or a mountain landscape cut by landslides and other climate influences can lose meaning as their intangible or spiritual values are non-transferable. Traditional vernacular ensembles are often totally tied into the landscape, both because the construction materials are those readily available in a given region but also because their form may have evolved over centuries as a direct response to the local environment. Archaeological landscapes can also lose value and require greater interpretation because of landscape degradation and flooding. Depopulation and abandonment of living sites is possible as a result of climate change; as their inhabitability becomes untenable, their defining characteristics are at stake. Although heritage bodies and professionals tend to be concerned with individual cultural places, wider cultural landscapes and building ensembles need to be better quantified, documented and prepared for adaptation to the negative impacts of global climate change.

Interpretation: The issue of climatic variation is not just a contemporary one, but is the constant background to all monuments and all of human history. Should interpretive programs about GCC deal primarily with the situation before the recent climatic changes, or should they deal with the current phenomenon of GCC itself, or should they set the current change in context by referring to the history of such change relevant to the site and its location? Interpretation of GCC has two main functions: to report on the current state of conservation, and to report on the current state of research. Yet there is another distinction that is crucial to the reflection of GCC and cultural heritage sites, namely the distinction between information and significance. And if “significance” is to be communicated, what exactly is the significance of GCC? Is there any reason to evade discussion about global responsibility for adapting to climatic change? This could be accomplished in the course of reporting scientific phenomena and their implications, which can vary widely. For instance, a single degree rise in temperature in Costa Rica resulted in the virtual extinction of a particular species of monkeys. The extraordinary heatwave during the summer of 2007 in southeastern Europe not only affected specific monuments but also brought all conservation work to a halt. Changes in climate, such as wind directions in West Ireland during 2007, resulted not only in changed impacts but also impacted on capacity to work in that environment on research and conservation, etc.

Difficult Choices

All of these examples underline an important dimension of GCC as it impacts cultural heritage, namely, that it is often about loss and destruction as much as preservation. In the cases where the loss of cultural heritage resources cannot be prevented or mitigated, its significance actually transforms itself from that of tangible to intangible heritage. Monuments or natural features documented before their destruction become cultural memories. In that respect, the interpretation of GCC-impacted sites cannot restrict itself only to conservation information, but must also attempt to deal with the “why” questions.

The sheer scale of the destruction and threats now being caused by GCC needs to be considered. Priorities must be established to determine which relatively few sites can be saved or protected completely and those in which documentation or archaeological salvage and research can be carried out. This will still obviously leave a great many sites that will be lost forever. Understanding the “vulnerability” of a site will become part of prioritising salvage conservation work. Quantifying what will be affected will enable informed decisions about “what to save”. At present, most work in this area has been ad hoc rather than based on a holistic understanding of the range, nature and locations of places which will be affected. Efficiency could be increased through multidisciplinary cooperation.

Should the prioritisation be made on the basis of the rarity of examples? Or on their value as exemplars of certain types of heritage? Or their relative historic importance? Perhaps there may be, in addition to the scholarly and professional evaluations, a matter of local significance and context. A particular site or monument type may be represented by thousands of examples, and thus (at least from the professional
will help clarify the affects to all people who will be impacted. However, since entire landscapes and ecosystems will be affected by climate change, one needs to consider whether or not all of these examples are located in “at risk” environments and, if so, whether they might all be at risk. Simple statements on site type abundance and representativeness need to be revisited with a view to assessing the risk to the landscape and ecosystem.

There is also the danger that GCC impacts and response may be "expert/scientific-driven" imposed upon communities. From the perspective of a local community that has a strong attachment to the site or the monument and the memories that it preserves, its destruction may have serious local social impact, despite the fact that from a professional perspective it was a relatively insignificant heritage site when viewed in objective, taxonomic terms. On the other hand, the professional may need to accept that a cultural heritage site may not be a community’s priority. If there is confidence that decisions are well informed, professionals may need to accept community decisions to abandon or ignore conservation needs. There is a need to provide the resources and programs so that communities can take part equitably in discussions about choices.

**Recommendations for Adaptation**

Professionals cannot assume that there is a global understanding of GCC. How is knowledge improved or disseminated in the face of political resistance to the acceptance of that knowledge? ICOMOS could pool information from conferences, workshops, etc. and make it accessible online; this might lead to identifying gaps for cultural heritage places. The information should be collated and distilled into digestible information bites. Key documents and case studies need to be translated and made readily available. Local and indigenous knowledge should be integrated into strategies and information databanks. Information and methods could be rolled out through low-cost community workshops. There is a role for cultural heritage in feeding back mitigation strategies for climate change.

Professionals and stakeholders need to keep in mind the historical evolution of cultures to environmental and other changes, so that there is no need to demand static cultural memory, as new emerging cultures lead to new knowledge. Yet, there is still a need to identify a range of places across an area/landscape based on rarity and representativeness, along with other historic, aesthetic, research and community/social/intangible heritage values. These could provide a way of engaging the wider GCC bodies, as well as advocacy to local, regional and national governments and international agencies.

In addition, there is a need for more training for heritage practitioners in the area of GCC that will improve practice and credibility to advocacy, so that they can make more informed inputs on policy. The quality and appropriateness of the information and knowledge used to make decisions must be impeccable and above reproach. Disseminating this knowledge will help clarify the affects to all people who will be impacted.

Cultural heritage practitioners must factor in GCC impacts into sustainable management and development plans.

The voice of the community in regards to their space and places needs to be heard in discussions and plans around GCC strategic responses. Anchor points for cultural memory should be evaluated; there is a need to recognize that even after severe impact or loss of place, “memory” needs to be considered. More case studies are necessary in order to propose suitable strategies and responsibilities. The education of heritage practitioners and communities will lead to better decisions and responses.

ICOMOS can have a role to play with the tourism industry’s agenda. Site and destination managers will need to take the potential effects of GCC into their medium- and long-term planning. ICOMOS could identify a range of check-list style questions that could be widely distributed to interested parties raising their awareness of the potential threats that may arise and planting the seeds in their planning processes that encourage them to start preparing for the future.

Practitioners need to understand what is “healthy” cultural heritage. Maintenance is an important factor, but may be irrelevant in cases of rapid, major change; however, in other cases, the slow creep of GCC will require a strong resilience in buildings to cope with insidious and subtle change.

The following “toolbox” is recommended:

**Monitoring**

Setting up a series of data gathering techniques:

• Air temperature
• RH, internal and external
• Ground temperature – surface
• Ground temperature – minus 1 m
• Ground moisture content
• Monument wall temperature
• Monument moisture content
• Low/high tide marks
• Mobilization of salts
• Proportion of soluble salts
• Quality of water
• Technical data
• Meteorological data (precipitation—amount and pattern, freeze/thaw, maximum/minimum temperatures, wind velocity and direction, altitude)

**Research**

• Case studies
• Condition assessment, current compared to historic
• Local, regional and international comparative studies
• How is it affecting the populations and intangibles
• Demographics
• Loss of traditional knowledge
• Development of local/regional research strategies to identify potential research questions to drive investigation and salvage of archaeological sites that will be lost as a result of GCC
Maintenance
- Environment
- Maintenance monitoring programs
- Management

Built environment and in use
- Maintain building envelope systems
- Foundations
- Rainwater management
- Wastewater management
- Boundary/building perimeter

Un-conserved archaeology
- Survey and research aimed at identifying the range, nature and location of archaeological sites
- Documentation and recording
- Backfilling
- Shelters
- Shelter coating
- Capping
- Introduction of drainage

Conserved archaeology
- Monitoring
- Research
- Maintenance plan
- Interpretation that explains the relationship of the site to the changing environment, which might also include reference to other sites that have been "lost"

Advocacy
- Prioritisation
- Publication

- Sensitivity and public awareness
- General education
- Government partnerships
- International partnerships
- Regional workshops towards dissemination
- Lobbying
- Outreach to civil society

Training
- Regional workshops for professionals
- Training for specific phenomena changes
- Conferences
- Training of emergency service

Risk Preparedness
- Plan
- Unifying emergency services
- Inspection regimes
- Security types
- Observatories – lookouts (teams of people)
- Mobilize civil society

Conclusion
The heritage of GCC is the heritage of loss, and the significance of that loss must be stressed. Interpretation of GCC must stress both the continual impact of the climate on human culture and the changes occurring today. Clear priorities must be established in determining which GCC sites will be saved. Efficiency in conservation can be increased through multidisciplinary cooperation. Both expertise and local attachment must be considered when setting conservation priorities.
ICOMOS declares Amazonia a “Monument of Nature”

Concluding a year of world-wide activities around the theme of “Cultural Landscapes and Monuments of Nature”, selected to mark the International Day of Monuments and Sites 2007, members of ICOMOS met in Manaus, Brazil, from 16 - 19 November 2007 and declared Amazonia as the First International Monument of Nature.

Amazonia encompasses a vast territory. It includes lands belonging to Brazil, Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Guyana, Suriname and French Guyana. In Brazil, nine states constitute the Legal Amazonia (Amazonas, Pará, Amapá, Maranhão, Tocantins, Mato Grosso, Acre, Rondónia and Roraimá).

The meeting in Manaus was attended by experts from Argentina, Brazil, Canada, and Germany and its discussions took into consideration a wide array of experiences and perspectives, including the World Heritage Convention of UNESCO, signed by 184 countries.

"Over 200 years ago, Amazonia inspired the first use of the expression ‘Monument of Nature’ by the famous explorer Alexander von Humboldt. Today, in a world concerned over global climate change or the loss of cultural diversity, Amazonia deserves international recognition. The current interest observed world-wide for cultural heritage, even in sites seen so far as exclusively natural, is bringing us to pay a very special homage to Amazonia, a vast area so essential to the World and its identity” said Michael Petzet, ICOMOS President.

ICOMOS will follow up from the Manaus meeting with activities to identify other Monuments of Nature (rivers, forests, mountains, sacred rocks or trees, geological formations, waterfalls, etc.) with its 150 National and International Committees.

Michael Petzet
President of ICOMOS

Declaration of Amazonia as a Monument of Nature

Being aware of the ecological threat to our planet and taking into account the protective measures already implemented or planned by the peoples and governments of the concerned countries;

Appealing to the responsibility of all people and countries benefiting directly or indirectly from the largest continuous forest area on earth;

Especially in honour of the traditional populations that interact with the rainforests resources on the basis of a sustainable development since thousands of years;

ICOMOS declares MONUMENT OF NATURE the tropical rainforest of the Amazon region in its natural boundaries and in its integrity.

Manaus, 17 November 2007

Jaime Litvak King
- Archaeologist, member of ICOMOS Mexico

Kausar Bashir Ahmed
- Vice President of ICOMOS Pakistan

Freddy Guidi
- President of ICOMOS Argentina

Ahmed Nabi Khan
- founding member of ICOMOS Pakistan

Constantino Reyes Valerio
- historian, member of ICOMOS Mexico

Robin Letellier
- Vice President of CIPA and member of ICOMOS Canada.

Gilles Nourissier
- member of the ICOMOS Executive Committee and Secretary General of ICOMOS France

Mr Alfred Steinmetzer
- founding member and first President of ICOMOS Luxembourg

Pefkios Georgiades
- Cypriot Minister of Education and Culture and founding President of ICOMOS Cyprus

Bagher Shirazi
- President of ICOMOS Iran

Edgar Vargas Vargas
- founding President of ICOMOS Costa Rica

Jacques Dalibard
- founding President of ICOMOS Canada and Honorary member of ICOMOS

Stephan Tschudi-Madsen
- former President of ICOMOS Norway and Advisory Committee President

Hernán Crespo Toral
- Honorary member of ICOMOS Ecuador and former UNESCO Assistant Director General for Culture

In memoriam:
Eminent ICOMOS members who passed away since end 2006
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- historian, member of ICOMOS Mexico
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- Vice President of CIPA and member of ICOMOS Canada.
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- member of the ICOMOS Executive Committee and Secretary General of ICOMOS France

Mr Alfred Steinmetzer
- founding member and first President of ICOMOS Luxembourg

Pefkios Georgiades
- Cypriot Minister of Education and Culture and founding President of ICOMOS Cyprus

Bagher Shirazi
- President of ICOMOS Iran

Edgar Vargas Vargas
- founding President of ICOMOS Costa Rica
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- founding President of ICOMOS Canada and Honorary member of ICOMOS

Stephan Tschudi-Madsen
- former President of ICOMOS Norway and Advisory Committee President

Hernán Crespo Toral
- Honorary member of ICOMOS Ecuador and former UNESCO Assistant Director General for Culture
Scientific Council Research on Global Climate Change and Culture

Following the ICOMOS Scientific Council (SC) meeting in Rome, June 2006, three ICOMOS International Scientific Committees (ISCEAH – Earthen Architectural Heritage, IPHC – Polar Heritage, and ICORP – Risk Preparedness) agreed to collaborate on a preliminary review of the effects of Global Climate Change (GCC) on cultural heritage. A subject on which, despite several decades of study on the risks to the natural environment, surprisingly little research has been accomplished. In September 2006, at the Scientific Council’s meeting in Edinburgh, the results of this preliminary study were presented and the SC chose GCC and its effect on cultural heritage as the interdisciplinary research theme for ICOMOS’s 28 International Scientific Committees (ISCs).

A brief was prepared and circulated among the Scientific Council in November 2006. Twelve papers were submitted for a special chapter of the Heritage@Risk volume 2006/2007 (see announcement p. 17). A selection of these was later presented at a one-day symposium “Heritage and Global Climate Change” organized in Pretoria, South Africa on 7 October 2007 in the context of the annual ICOMOS Scientific Council and Advisory Committee meetings.

Presentations included a general overview, four case studies – two on polar heritage (the Arctic region and the York Factory, Canada) and two on cities and landscapes (New Orleans and the Peloponnesus) – and a paper on maintenance as a method of adaptation. Brief summaries of four other recent ICOMOS meetings where climate change was discussed in relation to culture were also given, followed by a workshop exploring how GCC affects each ISC’s area of expertise and what adaptation measures should be proposed. 35 professionals, representing 15 ISCs and several National Committees, participated in the workshop, and the results of the five workshop groups were then presented to the entire symposium.

This very important theme has been emphasized by UNESCO’s World Heritage Centre, which recently published the volume Case Studies on Climate Change and World Heritage. At the World Heritage Committee meeting in Christchurch, New Zealand in July 2007, the Policy Document on Climate Change and World Heritage was adopted for recommendation to all States Parties to the Convention at their October 2007 General Assembly in Paris. In a presentation to the United Nations, in September 2007, the World Heritage Centre’s director, Francesco Bandann, noted that a questionnaire sent to all States Parties received responses from half, and of those, 50% of the World Heritage sites, both natural and cultural, are being affected by climate change.

As noted, the Scientific Council symposium was only one of a series of ICOMOS workshops and symposia on the subject held in 2007. On 22 May, a one-day workshop “Impact of Global Climate Change on Cultural Heritage”, held in New Delhi (India) as part of ICORP’s annual meeting, produced the New Delhi Resolution. Australia ICOMOS’s annual conference, held in July in Cairns, also devoted one day to climate change and culture, under the title "Extreme Heritage". In August, an “International Forum on the Heritage in the Pacific” held in Tahiti, with the participation of ICOMOS Pasifika, discussed the topic, as did the CIPA (ICOMOS International Committee on Heritage Documentation) meeting in Athens, Greece. Subsequently, ICOMOS Argentina hosted a meeting on the subject at the University of Patagonia, in Ushuaia in September.

In addition, culture and climate change will be the focus of ISCARSAR’s (ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Analysis and Restoration of Structures of Architectural Heritage) upcoming meeting, taking place on the occasion of the international conference “Global Climate Change and its impact on Structures of Cultural Heritage” to be held in Macau, China, in May 2008, with ICOMOS patronage. The ICOMOS Scientific Council will also organize a second workshop on the topic on the occasion of the ICOMOS 16th General Assembly in Quebec, on where it proposes to present a Manual on the issue.

Clearly, the topic of climate change and culture requires additional research and observation, along with more case studies. The Scientific Council intends to continue to explore the consequences of climate change on heritage, both tangible and intangible, for the near future. Recommendations for adaptation have and will emerge from these deliberations. Next steps should include regional training workshops for heritage professionals, as well as proposals for and implementation of adaptation pilot projects. Greater public advocacy is also necessary.

Pamela Jerome
Coordinator, ICOMOS Scientific Council
Vice President of the ICOMOS
International Scientific Committee on Earthen Architectural Heritage

For further reading
- The full recommendations of the ICOMOS “Heritage and Global Climate Change” Symposium (Pretoria, October 2007) and The New Delhi Resolution are available in the central supplement of this newsletter and on: www.international.icomos.org/climatechange
- Australia ICOMOS “Extreme Heritage” 2007 Annual Symposium full papers : www.aicomos.com
- Case Studies on Climate Change and World Heritage (UNESCO WHC) - PDF download: http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/473/
Some of the achievements during 2007 include:

- publication of Chinese translations of 48 international charters;
- the first meeting of the IICC-X Steering Committee, consisting of the President of ICOMOS and 2 others appointed by the ICOMOS Executive Committee (Sheridan Burke, Australia, and Yukio Nishimura, Japan), and representatives of Xi’an Municipality, Shaanxi Province and ICOMOS/China, supported by SACH (the Chinese State Administration of Cultural Heritage);
- 4-day training program for Chinese and Central Asian officials working on the transnational World Heritage nomination of the Silk Road;
- 2-day workshop on the development of an ‘archaeological park’ at the Tang Dynasty site of the Da Ming Palace, followed by a summary paper prepared by an ICOMOS task group;
- 2-day international symposium on the heritage of the Silk Roads and a summary declaration from the meeting;
- conservation projects for the Xi’an Archaeological Institute, including work on some detached wall painting panels and a lacquered wooden coffin from the Ming Dynasty;
- further consideration of the siting and design of the proposed facility for the IICC-X within the complex of the Small Wild Goose Pagoda (Xiaoyan-Ta) to ensure that it complies with conservation planning practice; and,
- work toward the website and brochure for the IICC-X.

While in Xi’an in October 2007, the Steering Committee was happy to meet with Sun Fuxi, the Managing Director of the IICC-X and the 8 staff members of the IICC-X.

The 3 major strands of the IICC-X work program are:

1. Applying the 2005 Xi’an Declaration, particularly with respect to the urban context in Asia
2. The Silk Roads and other Cultural Routes of the Asia-Pacific region
3. Traditional Knowledge and Conservation Science in Theory and Practice

A 4th strand will be the future involvement of the IICC-X in the Da Ming Palace project.

The establishment of the IICC-X in China is a new direction for ICOMOS, while pursuing its ongoing mission of facilitating international cooperation for the conservation of cultural heritage.

The coming year will be a time of consolidating the work program and governance, and establishing the necessary international partnerships for the IICC-X.

We hope that there will be opportunities for ICOMOS members in many parts of the world to participate in the future work of the IICC-X. In the meantime, we offer congratulations to our Xi’an colleagues for the impressive progress during 2007 and look forward to further news at the 16th ICOMOS General Assembly in Quebec in 2008.

Kristal Buckley and Guo Zhan
ICOMOS Vice Presidents
ICOMOS and its partners: The International Union of Architects (UIA)

Since its creation in 1965, ICOMOS has established and maintains working relations of various degree of formality with over 20 international or disciplinary organisations whose goals converge with our own.

One such organisation is the International Union of Architects (UIA) which, like us, is based in Paris and cooperates with UNESCO. In 1971, a meeting with UIA’s Secretary General led ICOMOS to encourage all its National Committees to invite representatives of the corresponding UIA National Sections to their activities, which remains a very relevant proposal in 2008. The two international organisations also agreed on the need to cooperate more closely on issues such as the introduction of contemporary architecture in heritage contexts which was the theme of our 3rd General Assembly in Budapest in 1972. Here again, the topic is very relevant today as we see strong debates on urban landscapes and their conservation.

Both ICOMOS and UIA have evolved greatly over the last 30 years, in terms of their network, in the way they interpret their mission and in their relation with UNESCO. In order to stimulate and reinforce this longstanding cooperation, Michael Petzet, President of ICOMOS and Gaétan Siew, President of UIA, signed a cooperation agreement between the two organisations on 21 March 2007 in Paris so as to renew our cooperation on a more current basis. The agreement covers the following six points:

1. ICOMOS – UIA Future Relationship
   Invitation to participate in each others General Assemblies; meetings, and congresses; as well as reciprocal links between our websites

2. 20th Century Heritage
   Participation of UIA in the ICOMOS International Committee on 20th Century Heritage; sharing ICOMOS conservation guidelines with UIA; contribution to the UIA’s 20th Century Architectural Heritage website by ICOMOS National Committees.

3. Architectural Education and Heritage
   Participation of an ICOMOS delegate in the UIA Architectural Education Commission Theme 7 (we thank Gunny Harboe of US/ICOMOS who accepted to act as our representative at the Commission’s recent meeting in Barcelona).

4. ICOMOS and UIA Committee work plan
   Participation of ICOMOS representatives in UIA’s relevant Committees including those on architectural competitions, human settlements and natural disasters; participation of UIA representatives in ICOMOS International Committees (historic towns and villages; structures; training; risk preparedness).

5. World Heritage and Heritage at Risk
   Contribution of UIA to ICOMOS’ role as an advisory body to the World Heritage Committee and to the ICOMOS Heritage at Risk programme

6. Liaisons with other organisations
   UNESCO, Docomomo, mAAN (modern Asian Architecture Network) etc.

As expressed in the ICOMOS Triennial Work Plan, we plan to enhance existing partnerships or establish new ones in order to reinforce our positioning within the expanding network of international organisations working in the field of heritage.

Dinu Bumbaru
Secretary General of ICOMOS
This ICOMOS World Report 2006/2007 on Monuments and Sites in Danger is the latest volume of what is already a whole series of World Reports, starting in the year 2000 and followed by the volumes H@R 2001/2002, H@R 2002/2003 and H@R 2004/2005. So far this series has also been complemented by three special editions: H@R Special 2006 Underwater Cultural Heritage at Risk: Managing Natural and Human Impacts, H@R Special 2006 The Soviet Heritage and European Modernism, and H@R Special 2007 Natural Disasters and Cultural Heritage. Soon another H@R Special on the work of ICOMOS in Afghanistan, i.e. on salvaging the fragments of the Bamiyan Buddhas, will be printed.

The new World Report 2006/2007 consists of contributions from about 40 countries, complemented by thematic reports from International Committees (underwater archaeology, rock art, vernacular architecture, legal questions, and polar heritage) and by 12 reports on a special focus which is of topical interest worldwide: Global Climate Change. Until recently this topic was barely addressed internationally in regard to cultural heritage protection and conservation. The climate change papers discuss, for instance, fundamental considerations of threats to our cultural heritage today and in the future (“every cultural heritage at risk”), changes in the Polar regions, examples such as the impact on the frozen tombs in the Altai Mountains, disasters like the fires in Australia and Greece, and the impact of Hurricane Katrina on the New Orleans area. The contribution on “Amazonia, Monument of Nature” is another special focus with regard to the correlation between culture and nature. By looking at this correlation from a new angle this paper on Amazonia aims to draw more attention to the very crucial topic of preserving the Amazonian rainforest – a topic which in the recent worldwide discussion on global climate change (GCC) has been unjustly neglected. In this way the subject of last year’s International Day for Monuments and Sites, “Cultural Landscapes and Monuments of Nature”, will open up new perspectives for our work, if – together with other categories of monuments of nature, such as famous rocks, caves, trees or waterfalls – we consider the South American rainforest, the largest possible monument of nature, as an extraordinary phenomenon combining natural and cultural history. Here we have both natural and cultural heritage at risk.

The Heritage at Risk Report 2006/2007 is proof that the situation of the cultural heritage is still highly critical in many regions of the world. While time and again billions are being invested into the preparation of war and destruction, the responsible often lack the necessary commitment when it comes to preserving the threatened heritage of past centuries and millennia. Therefore, we can only hope that the H@R report will inspire further commitments on national and international levels, generate new initiatives in preservation, and provide an additional positive impulse for existing institutions such as the ICOMOS-supported Blue Shield. The effect should also extend to international foundations that are involved in preservation such as the Getty Foundation or the World Monuments Fund. Their good example could also influence other internationally operating sponsors, now that there is also increased awareness of the economic importance of heritage conservation and its special role in terms of “sustainable development”. In this sense, with its Heritage at Risk Report ICOMOS hopes not only to gain the moral support of the world public in the battle against all kinds of threats, but also to achieve practical results in co-operation with all forces that are interested in preservation/conservation of the cultural heritage.

Heritage at Risk Special 2007: Cultural Heritage and Natural Disasters

This volume gathers the papers of a conference organized by ICOMOS in cooperation with ICCROM, at the Heritage Conservation Fair in Leipzig, 27-28 October 2006.

Man’s cultural works have always been threatened not only by the “ravages of time” and by war but also by natural disasters. Individual instances of natural disasters have had an enduring influence on cultural history and historic consciousness (Pompeii, Lisbon, Messina, San Francisco...). The number and intensity of natural disasters is expected to rise in the course of the climatic changes that are now being observed on the earth. The destructive force of such events is increasingly impressed upon our consciousness by their almost instantaneous worldwide depiction through the media. Impressive international reconstruction programs also present a challenge to heritage conservation professionals. As the signs intensify that natural disasters will be increasingly frequent worldwide the question of preventive measures for disaster protection arises more and more often, also in the field of cultural heritage and particularly regarding immovable cultural goods (historic buildings, historic cities and open spaces, cultural landscapes). Experiences in this field are still relatively scattered, and there is a great need for clarification of issues ranging from the possibilities and limits of technical solutions and, in this context, destruction through prevention, to ethical aspects in potential conflicts between the protection of people and the protection of cultural goods. Conceptual, technical and...
organizational aspects were taken up in the conference, in part through up-to-date reports concerning damages caused by recent disasters around the world.

Issues discussed included:

• What conclusions regarding disaster prevention?
• Cultural consequences of disasters, in particular regarding the cultural heritage?
• The limits of security and feasibility?
• Weighing technical prevention against its, undesirable, side effects on the cultural heritage
• High-tech solutions versus traditional methods

The publication is divided into 4 sections: 1. Disasters and Society: The Task of Prevention, 2. Earthquake Disasters, 3. Storm and Flood Disasters, 4. Risk Preparedness and Long-term Perspectives, and includes an annex listing relevant International Charters and Recommendations and providing a selected bibliography. All papers are in English, and some also in German.

To purchase the publication (ISBN 978-3-940046-64-2) – see http://www.tudpress.de or contact mail@tudpress.de.

It is also planned to make it available as a PDF download on the ICOMOS web site.

Heritage at Risk Special 2006: “The Soviet Heritage and European Modernism” now online

This special edition, printed in 2006, is devoted to the architectural heritage of the 20th century, especially in Russia and the former Soviet Republics and gathers 38 contributions by distinguished authors in English, Russian und German. For the most part the articles and case studies are based on papers presented at the Moscow conference “Heritage at Risk - Preservation of 20th-Century Architecture and World Heritage” held in April 2006 on the occasion of the International Day for Monuments and Sites and co-organised by ICOMOS.

A focal point of the documentation is to show the international correlation between architecture and urban planning in the young Soviet Union, while also putting an emphasis on the intensive German-Russian professional contacts between the two World Wars and immediately after the Second World War.

This Heritage at Risk edition also presents preliminary results of the current research project The Architecture of Russian Constructivism (Moscow 1920–1934, Building Materials, Building Construction and Preservation of Buildings, currently being carried out under Dr. Anke Zalivako’s guidance at the Technical University of Berlin and sponsored by the German Research Community (DFG).

Comparative and background material about 20th-century World Heritage sites and World Heritage candidates complete this publication. With its inscribed World Heritage sites Völklingen Ironworks and Zollverein Coal Mine Industrial Complex as examples of industrial heritage as well as with the Bauhaus sites in Dessau und Weimar as heritage of Modernism and the World Heritage site Rammelsberg the Federal Republic of Germany has profound experience in the management of World Heritage sites of the 20th century.

The publication documents the threatened heritage of the 20th century in the former Soviet Union, especially world-famous examples of avant-garde architecture in Moscow and St. Petersburg. In addition, this documentation offers a survey of encouraging best practice projects started successfully by state-aided or non-governmental initiatives to save threatened monuments of 20th-century architecture in Russia, including international initiatives and networks. The inclusion of years of conservation and restoration experience in looking after World Heritage sites of the 20th century provides manifold information, suggestions and assistance; hopefully it is also a motivation for increased conservation efforts to save internationally renowned architectural witnesses in the former Soviet Union.

To consult the Heritage at Risk 2006/2007 report, the Heritage at Risk Special 2006 and previous reports see www.international.icomos.org/risk/index.html.
Natural and man-made threats to Peru’s cultural heritage

While Peru enjoys international prestige for its cultural heritage, particularly for its pre-Hispanic sites and monuments, a set of threats endangers the preservation of its immovable properties. These problems are linked to the cultural policy which has been implemented in the country and to the attitude of indifference towards the social and cultural values of this heritage by the various governments and civil society itself. It has not been considered that these cultural assets represent the material register of the country’s memory as they bear witness to its history and are important for strengthening identity and social cohesion; conditions necessary for national integration and to promote economic and social development. These attitudes have been apparent in three instances.

The 2007 earthquake
The disaster which occurred on 15 August 2007 in the central-southern zone of the country, 150 km south west of Lima, due to an earthquake measuring 7.9 on the Richter scale, with successive aftershocks of magnitude 5 and 6. The quake left 595 dead, 1800 injured; destroyed 76,000 homes and damaged 319,886; the electricity supply broke down, the mobile and fixed telephone networks collapsed and road transport was interrupted. The corpses in the streets, squares and collapsed buildings in coastal cities such as Pisco, Chinchac, Ica and Cañete, as well as in the villages of the nearby mountains, such as Lunahuanà, Pacarán, Zuniga and Yauyos, were a dramatic sight.

Although it was known that the coast of Peru is located within the so-called Pacific “Ring of Fire”, one of the world’s most active seismic zones, where events of this kind have occurred every 100 years, no assessments had been made and no preventive actions taken. The seismic waves had fatal results on lives and structures.

In the heritage field assessments showed that many churches, built since the period of the Viceroyalty, and some archaeological sites had suffered.

State and social intervention in face of the disaster has been inadequate. In the days following the earthquake, the Iglesia La Compañía in the city of Pisco was demolished using heavy machinery, despite the fact that experts had recommended restoration; not even the canvases and paintings were saved, but were also stolen or destroyed.

Similarly, the demolition of the "templo del Señor de Luren", religious image of profound significance was announced; a decision which was based on a report of the National Institute of Culture, which indicated that reconstruction was unfeasible and determined its de-listing. This procedure has become quite common in the country and has been implemented by this body since several years.

New legislation
In December 2007, the Law 29164 was enacted, under the name "Law on the Promotion of Sustainable Development of Tourism Services in the Immovable Properties of the National Cultural Heritage". It aims at delivering concessions for the construction of luxury restaurants and hotels, at archaeological sites and reveals the lack of knowledge of some politicians of international standards in cultural heritage conservation and the absence of consultation with the specialized professionals in the conservation field.

Interventions in Lima
The recent attack on the integrity of the historic monument, known as “Parque de la Reserva”, by the Municipality of Metropolitan Lima, through the construction of large ornamental pools, which modify its original design and alter its cultural and historical presentation. Following this kind of alteration, the announcement made by the Municipality of imminent planned interventions in the Historic Centre of Lima is of great concern. Here the National Institute of Culture has been "de-listing" historic houses so that they can be replaced by new constructions or approving permits for interventions in historic buildings, as has been the case with the "Casona de la Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos" which was restored using modern materials, without taking into account criteria of authenticity or the use of appropriate materials, rather than concrete, cement and bricks. Even though Lima has insalubrious neighbourhoods and overcrowded buildings this does not justify the use of de-listing nor demolition to make way for a misunderstood progress.

These actions show that in the conservation of the cultural heritage of the country, technical criteria are not being applied, but that, on the contrary, through a misguided view of modernity the originality, authenticity, integrity and stability of the buildings is being attacked. Added to this man-made factor of bad interventions, comes the use of rigid materials, neglect of the ongoing monitoring and maintenance of sites and monuments; erosion by weathering (sudden changes in temperature, wind, humidity) or by biological agents (insects, bird guano); deterioration through material fatigue and physicochemical transformations.

All these factors are affecting the cultural heritage of the nation. Last year’s seismic event had an extremely destructive effect as the conditions were already set due to the above mentioned natural and man-made factors. Such disastrous effects can happen again anywhere along the Peruvian coast, if one does not take into account the need to preserve the immovable heritage through appropriate interventions, which are regularly monitored, with the advice from conservation professionals. It is therefore necessary that ICOMOS Peru is supported by ICOMOS international so that we can assume a more active involvement.

Ruth Shady Solís
President of ICOMOS Peru
Sungnyemun (The Great South Gate) in Seoul destroyed by fire

On the night of 10th February 2008, most Koreans stayed in front of their TV sets to follow the fire at Sungnyemun. All broadcasting stations provided continuous live coverage from the site where the fire raged from 8:48 pm on the 10th to 2:05 am on 11th February. After only 5 hours and 17 minutes, the n° 1 National Treasure of the Republic of Korea collapsed.

Sungnyemun was the main South Gate of the city wall of Hansung, the old name of Seoul, during the Joseon Dynasty (1392-1910). The gate was constructed over three years from 1395 to 1398. Some parts of it were restored in 1447 and 1479, and by 1961, when it again underwent restoration, the Gate had survived the Japanese invasions of 1592, and the Korean War 1950-1953. Therefore, Sungnyemun was the oldest wooden building in Seoul and had a long history with its citizens.

Sungnyemun consists of a two-tiered wooden architecture on a stone base. In contrast to other great gates, its hanging board, bearing the gate’s name, is vertical, based on Pungsu [Fengshui]. From 1961 to 1963, when Sungnyemun was restored – all the parts were taken apart, and the pieces were re-assembled or replaced with new materials. On this occasion, detailed drawings and documentation of the Gate were made. Original materials which were not re-used at that time have been stored, along with the records. This full documentation and original materials stored away from the Gate have now become very important information to assist with the reconstruction of the structure.

The fire aroused much sadness and most Koreans feel deep sorrow about the loss of Sungnyemun. Many could not sleep and even cried for days after the fire. Countless members of the public have come to Sungnyemun to express their condolences to the burned Gate with flowers, memorial addresses, etc. This has influenced the government’s attitude with regards to the future of Sungnyemun and its management. A great number of people have expressed their interest and strong wish for the reconstruction of Sungnyemun, and asked to be able to follow its progress. For this reason, the government has provided a viewing window at the site to allow citizens to witness the ongoing work and the care taken by the workers.

The government has decided to reconstruct the Gate based on the detailed documents and original materials stored in 1961 when the repair work was completed. It will also engage a revision of the management systems for cultural heritage, especially wooden heritage. This fire and the loss of a very important cultural heritage site is a great misfortune and a miserable experience for Korea and Koreans. However, due to this event, all Koreans have become more aware of the importance and value of cultural properties. The national and local governments have also become more concerned about the conservation of cultural heritage, and will take the opportunity to inspect all cultural properties and review their management systems.

Therefore, the misfortune of the loss of Sungnyemun seems to be turning into a fortune for the other remaining cultural heritage in the Republic of Korea.

In the recent past, when people thought about the iconography of Seoul or Korea, they forgot our greatest national treasure, but for Koreans it has become a landmark again, and Sungnyemun is becoming a new tourist attraction both for locals and foreigners.

Hae-Un Rii
Member of the ICOMOS Executive Committee
Member of ICOMOS Korea
Preventive Monitoring and World Heritage

One of the most essential tasks of ICOMOS within the framework of the 1972 World Heritage Convention is our work as Advisory Body to the World Heritage Committee and to UNESCO on issues concerning the World Cultural Heritage, in particular the evaluation of monuments and sites that have been placed on the World Heritage List or are under consideration for listing.

The mandate and function of the Advisory Bodies – ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM – result from Articles 8 (3), 13 (7) and 14 (2) of the World Heritage Convention in connection with Paragraphs 30 and 31 of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. One of the responsibilities of the Advisory Bodies is “to monitor the state of conservation of World Heritage properties” (OG § 31). The role of ICOMOS is described in Paragraph 35: “The specific role of ICOMOS in relation to the Convention includes: evaluation of properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List, monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage cultural properties, reviewing requests for International Assistance submitted by State Parties, and providing input and support for capacity-building activities” (OG § 35). Just as Article 5 of the World Heritage Convention commits the State Parties to take care of the protection and conservation of the entire cultural and natural heritage within their territories, i.e. not only of the individual World Heritage sites, every ICOMOS National Committee has – in accordance with Article 4 of our Statutes – a special responsibility for the monuments and sites of its country, of course in cooperation with all institutions concerned with protection and conservation.

Under these circumstances, based on the different experiences in their countries, individual National Committees have already developed special initiatives for the monitoring of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites in their countries, and in reports they have highlighted imminent dangers (many reports also published in our Heritage@Risk series). Overall, this is a programme which can be called proactive or preventive monitoring. With its continuous observation, such preventive monitoring differs from the Periodic Reporting described in the Operational Guidelines (OG V, 199-210) and from Reactive Monitoring (OG IV A, 169-176). For this preventive monitoring refers not only to individual World Heritage sites of outstanding universal value, but in accordance with Article 5 of the World Heritage Convention to the entire cultural heritage, – which means that ICOMOS with over 9000 members acts as a sort of general “monument watch” observing the state of conservation worldwide.

The obligation of the State Parties to carry out Periodic Reporting results from Article 29 of the World Heritage Convention, together with Chapter V of the Operational Guidelines (OG § 190,191, and 199-210). Independently of the Periodic Reporting, the World Heritage Centre is to be informed about exceptional circumstances or work “which may have an effect on the state of conservation of the property”: Reactive Monitoring comprises all procedures initiated by reports of the State Parties to the Convention or by information from a third party with regard to measures at or near World Heritage sites. The World Heritage Centre can consult the Advisory Bodies, asking them for their evaluation. Practice has shown, however, that the handling of the monitoring mandate in the context of Reactive Monitoring does not always have the desired results. Especially in acute problematic cases the whole procedure has proved to be too slow and can only be applied in particularly serious cases. However, big or small problems and threats may occur with regards to the state of conservation of every World Heritage site, which are either not sufficiently taken care of or not recognised early enough by the State Parties or by the authorities responsible for the protection and conservation of monuments and sites. Generally speaking, there are an abundance of sometimes very acute threats to the historic fabric, and normally these problems are not mentioned in the process of Periodic Reporting, nor can they be solved in time through Reactive Monitoring. Especially at extensive sites, values defining World Heritage can be affected by an immense number of plans and projects.

Therefore, in this wide area of conservation problems a continuous proactive observation has to take place, i.e. preventive monitoring, which takes into consideration the more general conservation concerns and the special criteria of the World Heritage justifying the Outstanding Universal Value. As far as the World Cultural Heritage is concerned, this task can only be tackled by the Advisory Body ICOMOS and its worldwide network of over 9000 members organised in more than 150 National and International Committees. The corresponding mandate can be deduced from the above-mentioned articles of the World Heritage Convention, together with the mandate to be found in the Operational Guidelines “to monitor the state of conservation of World Heritage properties” (OG § 31).

After the concept of preventive monitoring was discussed at the ICOMOS Advisory Committee meetings in Edinburgh (2006) and Pretoria (2007) and a discussion paper was sent to all our committees asking them for comments (see message of the President of 31 August 2007), I would like to encourage all members of ICOMOS – given the many positive reactions (also at the recent meeting of the Advisory Bodies in Paris) – to take part in this important task. It is very much to be hoped that all ICOMOS National Committees, in special cases supported by the International Scientific Committees, will in future attend to the task of Preventive Monitoring. After all, the National Committees, which have to look after the state of conservation of the entire stock of monuments and sites in their country, are our first contacts at the national level. It is also easier for the National Committees to obtain the necessary information on the state of conservation of World Heritage sites in their country, and to report on all current threats and problems. The reports by the National Committees will be sent to the International Secretariat of ICOMOS so that our headquarters in Paris can decide how to inform the World Heritage Centre. Then, in particularly serious cases, the procedure described above as Reactive Monitoring can be the result. In any case, from our experience, involving the ICOMOS National Committees as early as possible with the task of Preventive Monitoring will make it possible in many cases to avoid threats and conflicts with other interests through appropriate counselling.

Michael Petzet
President of ICOMOS
News from the Secretariat

Subscribe to the ICOMOS e-news!
At regular intervals (more or less every 2 weeks) the ICOMOS International Secretariat sends out an electronic newsletter with news from National and International Committees, conference announcements, interesting publications etc. Since 2007, over 30 issues have been produced. It is the easiest and quickest way of staying informed on ICOMOS activities and initiatives, and all members are strongly encouraged to subscribe free by sending an e-mail message (in "text" and not "html" format) to majordomo@icomos.org with "subscribe doc-centre" as the only line in the message body.

ICOMOS Annual Report 2006 available on the ICOMOS web site
The report provides information on the activities of the ICOMOS statutory bodies, the National and Scientific Committees which contributed and of course the International Secretariat. Our thanks go to Ms Joy Parry, our volunteer editor. The 2007 issue is under preparation.

Use the ICOMOS Documentation Centre bibliographical database for your research
At a click and through the user-friendly on-line search interface – all the 32 327 bibliographic records held at the Centre are at your disposal. In addition, over 1500 ICOMOS documents can now be downloaded directly from the database or via the PDF documents section on the web site. The database is available under http://databases.unesco.org/icomos

New Thematic Studies
Rock Art of the Sahara and North Africa
The study Rock Art of the Sahara and North Africa is now available on the ICOMOS website at the following address: http://www.icomos.org/studies/rockart-sahara-northafrica.htm

It follows a first study on the Latin American and Caribbean regions, and amasses data on regional characteristics in order to begin to link more strongly rock art images to social and economic circumstances, and strong regional or local traits, particularly religious or cultural traditions and beliefs.

In order to understand these links, further research may be needed on the context of rock art. It is hoped that these thematic studies will help identify where further support is needed. This volume on the Sahara and North Africa will be followed in due course by further volumes on other regions in Africa, and other parts of the world, in order to identify sites that appear to have the potential to demonstrate outstanding universal value.

Cultural Landscapes of the Pacific Islands
The thematic study on Cultural Landscapes of the Pacific Islands edited by ICOMOS, in collaboration with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, is now available on the ICOMOS website at the following address: http://www.icomos.org/studies/cultural-landscapes-pacific.htm

Belonging to the least represented regions on the World Heritage List; only few of the Pacific Island countries have documented their cultural heritage sites or have legislation to protect them. The character and diversity of cultural heritage places in the region is therefore not well known. The study aims to give an overview of cultural landscapes in the Pacific Islands.

This volume provides comparative data to support the identification of cultural properties for nomination to the World Heritage List and identifies gaps in current knowledge of particular kinds of cultural landscapes and/or sub-regions in order to set priorities for further detailed studies.

Remembering András Roman
To honour and remember András Roman (former President of ICOMOS Hungary and founder of the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on Historic Towns and Villages, as well as former Vice President of ICOMOS) who passed away two years ago, ICOMOS Hungary on 7 December 2007 formally inaugurated the “András Roman Archive” with a small solemn ceremony. The Archive, situated in András Roman’s former office at ICOMOS Hungary’s headquarters, has been created to safeguard his library, a collection of Hungarian and international documents, gathered throughout his long and rich professional life and of which he took great care right up to the last moment. The collection contains exceptional and unique documentation on cultural heritage conservation, especially on ICOMOS’ activities in Hungary and at the international level, and in particular his private collection of 5000 slides. The catalogue of this treasure can be consulted on the web site: www.romanandrasarchivum.hu (currently only in Hungarian due to lack of funds). ICOMOS Hungary is deeply grateful to his wife, Mrs Vera Szekeres-Varsa, for consenting that the archive be made publicly accessible and thanks her for all her help and active contribution towards ensuring that this precious heritage be available to the profession and public.

On 9 December 2007, the Hungarian village of Hollókő, celebrated its inscription in 1987 as first vernacular ensemble on the World Heritage List. On the occasion of this 20th anniversary, the village named its new visitor centre after András Román, to pay homage to his devoted and committed efforts over several decades to safeguard the values of the village and obtain its inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage list.

2008 René Pechère Year – dedicated to the art of gardens
To mark the 100th anniversary of his birth, the Bibliothèque René Pechère is organizing throughout 2008 in the Brussels-Capital region (Belgium) a programme of exhibitions, visits, competitions, publications to pay homage to one of the major international figures in landscape architecture. Founder of IFLA’s landscape architecture committee, René Pechère, among other created the gardens of the 1958 Universal Exhibition in Brussels, and in 1968 the remarkable “Jardin du Coeur” dedicated to Alice Van Buuren. The programme of celebrations aims not only at raising awareness about his works but also but also to highlight Brussels’ green spaces and historic gardens, as well as promote garden and landscape architecture.

For more information: www.bvpr.net

---

For more information: www.bvpr.net
A SELECTION OF BOOKS RECEIVED BY
THE UNESCO-ICOMOS DOCUMENTATION CENTRE


This volume examines various problems, opportunities and challenges encountered in current heritage debate and practice worldwide. The first part outlines the general background and current issues central to understanding the discourse on culture, heritage and identity at the beginning of the 21st century, not only in Europe but throughout the world. The second chapter deals with the specific situation and developments in Central and Eastern Europe since 1989, highlighting the many achievements and challenges brought about by the economic and political transformation in the region. The third chapter records the proceedings of the first official scientific session conducted by the members of the new ICOMOS Scientific Committee on Theory and Philosophy of Conservation, presenting issues and problems of current heritage protection theory and practice in different contexts, circumstances and cultural circles. The final section of the book brings to light the rising importance of non-governmental and civil society initiatives in fostering heritage education and protection.

Monuments and Sites


Published by the ICOMOS National Committee of Lithuania, this volume gathers contributions about the conservation and protection of cultural heritage in the 21st century at the national and international level.


These are the proceedings of the ICOMOS Asia and the Pacific Regional Meeting held in Seoul in 2007 on the conservation and management of cultural heritage in metropolitan areas. Issues discussed include urban development, cultural tourism, policies, tools, programmes and projects in the Asia Pacific Region.


Armed conflict is known to be among the principal causes of damage to our cultural heritage worldwide. This volume deals with the problems and issues regarding the safeguarding and conservation of cultural heritage in war zones. A book, both rational and pragmatic in its recommendations, which should become a valuable tool for any personnel charged with the protection and conservation of cultural property as well as for all those involved in development projects and peace operations worldwide.

Editor: Gaia Jungeblodt
Design: Midsea Books
Translations and Proofreading: ICOMOS International Secretariat
Printing: Biedermann Offsetdruck, Parsdorf, Germany
16e Assemblée générale et symposium scientifique international
Québec, Canada, 29 septembre au 4 octobre 2008
Où se trouve l'esprit du lieu ?

16th General Assembly and International Scientific Symposium
Quebec, Canada, September 29th to October 4th
Finding the Spirit of the place

16ª Asamblea General y Simposio científico internacional
Québec, Canadá, 29 de septiembre al 4 de octubre de 2008
¿Dónde se oculta el espíritu del lugar?

PROGRAMME

Forum international des jeunes chercheurs et professionnels en patrimoine culturel
Forum international of Young Researchers and Professionals in Cultural Heritage

International Scientific Committees’ Day

29 septembre / September / septiembre

PROGRAM

Opening Lectures

30 septembre / September / septiembre

PROGRAMA

Conferencias de apertura

01 - 03 octobre / October / octubre

Simposio científico

04 octobre / October / octubre

Tour post-conférence

05 octobre / October / octubre

Quebec2008.icomos.org