

AUSTRALIA

ICOMOS, a Quarter of a Century, Achievements and Future Prospects

A report by Australia ICOMOS for the International Symposium to be held at the Lausanne General Assembly of ICOMOS in October 1990.

This report has been prepared by Australia ICOMOS in response to the invitation to national committees to contribute advance papers to the *Achievements and Future Prospects* symposium. It is the result of extensive cooperation by a group of members of Australia ICOMOS, through correspondence and at a meeting in Sydney in July 1989.

Papers on the three sub-themes of the symposium have been brought together in this one report because the subjects overlap one-another.

1. ABOUT AUSTRALIA ICOMOS

The Australian national committee of ICOMOS was formed in 1976.

There are currently 200 individual subscribers, and 9 corporate members, from all the states and territories of Australia. The individual members include staff of government organisations, teachers in educational institutions and individual professional consultants. Members must be professionally qualified and have had three years' experience in conservation practice.

The executive committee of Australia ICOMOS is a democratically elected organisation of professionals with a changing executive, half being elected one year, the other half the next. No member may serve for more than six years on the executive committee.

1.1 International participation

Since it was formed Australia ICOMOS has sought to contribute to the international affairs of ICOMOS. Max Bourke served as Vice President of ICOMOS from 1984 to 1987. Members have been regular participants at General Assemblies and specialist meetings such as those in archaeological heritage management.

Members of Australia ICOMOS are represented on the ICOMOS international committees on Archaeological Heritage Management, Stained Glass, Vernacular Architecture, Wood and Cultural Tourism.

1.2 Activities in Australia

The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter) was developed out of regular national meetings from 1979 to review the practice of heritage conservation and the application of standards and practices promoted internationally by ICOMOS. Named after a small historic mining town in South Australia where it was ratified in 1981, the Burra Charter and its explanatory documents have become the basis for the practice of heritage conservation in Australia. (See Appendix 1). It is culturally biased for Australia. Therefore we would encourage other national committees to follow our process but adapt it for their own conditions and cultures. We would encourage them to talk with us about the problems and pitfalls of merely translating charters from one country to another.

Australia ICOMOS conducts regular national meetings for members and others interested in heritage conservation. We have three meetings per year of which one is the annual conference. Meetings have discussed such wide ranging issues as cultural tourism, conservation of the artefact in context, conservation and adaptation of central city heritage buildings, cultural landscape conservation, historic goldfields conservation, development of historic place museums, the history of the application of timber in the construction of Australian buildings and the conservation of timber structures, management of significant sites, conservation of historic building interiors and conservation of physical evidence. Smaller groups of members in each State meet from time to time to discuss topical local issues and visit sites to review the work of members and other practitioners.

To keep members informed of activities and developments in the practice of heritage conservation, Australia ICOMOS publishes a quarterly newsletter and jointly publishes a refereed journal

Historic Environment in conjunction with the Council for the Historic Environment. These publications, together with the regular program of meetings represent the major service to members provided by Australia ICOMOS.

Early in its existence Australia ICOMOS drew up principles for adoption in model heritage legislation (Appendix 2). We have been active in commenting on proposed new legislation and reviews of existing legislation in all States and territories.

Australia ICOMOS is entirely funded by members subscriptions (\$A 60 p.a.). Occasional government funding is received to assist in defraying the cost of specialist national conferences.

2. ACHIEVEMENTS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

ICOMOS was and should be an important body. In considering where it has come from over the last 25 years, it is worth looking at its social history. Many of the present international committee were youngish architects engaged in the vital task of reconstructing war-ravished Europe. They had sense and sensibilities and responded to the proposal of Le Corbusier who of course, himself was instrumental in drafting the original prelude to the Venice Charter.

Nowadays ICOMOS consists of an excellent (though geographically patchy) network of people professionally involved mainly in the protection of the urban environment. In some parts of the world those original members form a gerontocracy (particularly in parts of Western and Eastern Europe) while in some important parts of the world ICOMOS has never really had a foothold other than in a tokenistic way (in Asia, Africa and the Pacific).

During the lifetime of ICOMOS a major cultural change has occurred in all western and many developing countries. Post World War 2 in Europe, rebuilding and conservation (in some areas) proceeded apace. In North America, Australia and, first gradually then rapidly in Asia, urban development expanded speedily. More recently this has been a feature of the Pacific. From a climate of hostility to preservation in the 1960s to a mild enthusiasm in the 1970s, the mid to late 1980s saw a strong commitment to «fashionable or market driven conservation». Often this has been at the expense of truly protecting the historic

suburbs of cities, this observably in western Europe, North America, Australia and Asia. (One of its tell-tale signs is facadism and another is to watch large numbers of warehouses along waterfronts being recycled into condominiums.)

We ICOMOS members have been swept along by all of this. For some of our membership it has been an achievement both financially and intellectually to have reached this stage.

What we now have to do though is to face up to issues of principles versus profit or, in other words, being a voice in the wilderness versus part of the popular conception of conservation. These issues pose conflicting difficulties for members in the public sector versus those in government and academia where roles and positions will reverse from time to time and on specific issues. The role and use (and even abuse) of government legislation to protect or enhance the urban environment also plays a role in this process which parallels the role of Australia ICOMOS.

2.1 A view from the Antipodes

We are a new culture in an ancient region. Our country has been inhabited for approximately 40,000 years by Aborigines and the landscape is generally ancient, flat and arid. Two thirds of the world's cultures of ancient origin are located in the Asia/Pacific region.

On the other hand we brought Old Worl (European) cultures into our new world. Australia was a British colonial outpost until World War 2 then there followed the Americanization of our culture, which, with massive postwar immigration has become multicultural and distinctively Australian.

Australia now has a population of 17 million and multiculturalism is the official cultural policy of the national government. However ICOMOS internationally is Eurocentric and antiquarian in concern but it is the spirit and intent of the Venice Charter that we have tried to encapsulate and adapt in our conservation philosophy for Australian places of cultural significance. We have European traditions but located in South-east Asia, we are evolving a new culture.

2.2 Achievements in Australia

The Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the National Estate in 1974 led to a major turning point in Australia's history. For the first time, not only the opportunity, but the responsibility to conserve Australia's cultural and natural components which were judged to be of national importance were acknowledged.

This led to the national government passing the Australian Heritage Commission Act in 1975 and establishing the Commission, one of whose duties is to develop the Register of the National Estate which currently has 7,500 places of cultural significance listed. The Commission also established programs of technical research and financial assistance to State governments through the National Estate grants program. Over the last 17 years, \$50,000,000 has been spent on 3,700 projects under this program and a large portion of these funds has been spent on conservation repairs to places of significance.

At the State level where the most detailed statutory controls for conservation are enacted, heritage legislation has been passed by four of the six states. It is often supported through complementary provisions in the town and country planning legislation and is more effective in some states than others. The major capital cities (except Perth) have varying degrees of heritage control over historic buildings and precincts. In each State there is a small section in at least one government department dealing with heritage conservation issues and, in one State (Victoria), five departments.

Local action is often issue driven and became a major force in the early 1970s with inner suburban residents action groups. The National Trust has 80,000 members nationally and there is a vast array of historical societies and conservation groups. Since the mid 1980s more Australians visited art galleries and museums annually than attended outdoor sporting events.

Professional development has been essential in supporting these grassroots and bureaucratic initiatives and Australia ICOMOS was established at a time when there was a vacuum regarding training for heritage conservation. Our initial membership was largely comprised of architects, town planners and archaeologists. Now we have historians, geologists, conservators, curators,

archivists, engineers, builders, stone masons, site managers, administrators and university lecturers. Conferences, seminars and site visits have helped in developing cross disciplinary understanding and skills. In addition many of our members lecture part-time or for heritage components of tertiary training courses.

We are constantly reviewing professional heritage conservation issues and have responded to requests to advise on new legislation, planning schemes, assessment criteria, architectural competitions for in-fill development, government enquiries into tertiary training and potential World Heritage listings.

We have also responded to a request by international ICOMOS to investigate the feasibility of establishing an international committee on underwater cultural heritage and have secured initial funding from a national government grant to establish the committee.

2.3 International Committees

Australia ICOMOS has representatives on five of the 14 international ICOMOS committees: Vernacular Architecture (Dr Miles Lewis), Wood (Mr R Allom), Archaeological Heritage Management (Dr Sandra Bowdler), Cultural Tourism (Mr Peter James) and Stained Glass (Mr Peter Donovan).

They all report that these committees are ineffective and are only as good as the national committee hosting the activities of the specialist committee. Due to their lack of detailed objectives and ineffectiveness we believe that these committees should be restructured.

We strongly support the need for international committees for sharing knowledge and expertise and suggest establishing expert committees on a regional basis. They should report regularly to the Executive Committee and their work should be disseminated via Paris so that they do not become cosy clubs at the whim of the host committee.

2.4 International Relationships

The negative response to Australia ICOMOS suggestions has reinforced our view that ICOMOS internationally is a closed, exclusive Eurocentric club. Yet ecologically we are all now only too aware of the need to «think globally, act locally».

We believe that we have achieved high standards of professional expertise and have a lot to offer other countries especially in our Asia-Pacific region. Unfortunately there is inactive contact with the regional office of UNESCO which has responsibility for coordinating international matters relating to cultural conservation and for World Heritage sites.

Australia has had eight properties inscribed on the World Heritage List:

- Kakadu National park, stages 1 and 2;
- Great Barrier Reef;
- Willandra Lakes Region of western New South Wales;
- Lord Howe Island group;
- Western Tasmania Wilderness National Parks;
- Australian east coast Tropical and sub-Tropical Rainforest Parks;
- Uluru National Park;
- Wet Tropical Forests of north Queensland.

In every sense, these properties merit their inscription as truly outstanding examples of the world's cultural and natural heritage. Indeed, Kakadu, Willandra Lakes, western Tasmania Wilderness and Uluru National Parks qualified for inscription by virtue of both their cultural and natural attributes, the former being associated with outstanding examples of Australian Aboriginal culture. It is rare to have properties inscribed for both sets of attributes. Equally there are very few places on the World Heritage List from the nineteenth or twentieth centuries and none of the great industrial and engineering works of the nineteenth century (there are earlier examples) and few colonial settlement related sites. UNESCO has not encouraged Australia ICOMOS to submit cases for places representing these themes, yet they would link many places around the world settled and developed during the last two centuries.

An indicative list of cultural places from Australia and its region would allow International ICOMOS, as advisor to the World Heritage Committee, to have a list of potential nominations as a context against which to assess incoming nominations.

UNESCO did sponsor a regional conference on historic places in Sydney in May 1983 and the proceedings were published as a 250 pp. volume entitled, *Protecting the Past for the Future*. However none of the 12 recommendations have been followed through, especially those relating to regional co-operation in sharing of conservation technology and future regional conferences where UNESCO was asked to resolve any breakdown in arrangements!

UNESCO has sponsored regional conferences in Asia but Australia ICOMOS was only formally invited in 1988, to send one representative to participate in a seminar in Japan. Several of our members attended the 1987 Heritage of Asia and Pacific Islands (HAPI) conference in Hawaii and there was a plea from representatives of the smaller countries to provide low cost conservation solutions to assist them. There are 10,000 Chinesees studying in Australia so there is potential for developing professional contacts for those trained here and practising conservation of monuments and places of cultural significance in their own countries.

However the existing regional representation on ICOMOS international and its related UNESCO committees is not working. We have had no feedback or personal communication with our representative since he was appointed following the last General Assembly in Washington, D.C. in 1987.

2.5 Recommendation for consideration at the Lausanne General Assembly:

In order to advance the objectives of ICOMOS internationally we recommend that:

- an executive director of ICOMOS be appointed with appropriate support staff;
- regional meetings of ICOMOS national committees be held annually to bring recommendations to international ICOMOS, in our case from the Asia/Pacific region;
- the international expert committees of ICOMOS be reviewed and restructured so that each national committee has accountable, effective participation.

Despite the current lack of resources, we believe that ICOMOS internationally could have better communications if the Secretariat were more willing and able to harness UNESCO administrative support.

3 THE VENICE CHARTER AND THE BURRA CHARTER

The Venice Charter, drafted in 1964, has become a keystone in international thinking on conservation. Much of it is generalized and imprecise, but it does incorporate important ideas like respect for authentic evidence and for the integrity of the building or site. One of its most important concepts is that of anastylosis, and this best exemplifies the European nature of the conservation philosophy as anastylosis literally means, «raising the columns» and this is the procedure adopted by archaeologists in dealing with the ruins of classical temples and similar monuments.

3.1 Use of the Venice Charter in Australia

The Charter was virtually unknown in Australia in the early 1970s except to a handful of materials conservators in art galleries and architects, knowledge of restoration debate in places like Venice. Its concepts seemed totally foreign.

How do we apply anastylosis to the conservation of thatched roof, or of a mud wall which has crumbled away in the rain? Likewise the term «monument» in the title of the International Council on Monuments and Sites immediately evokes classical temples and Gothic cathedrals. Although it applies equally well to a Hindu or Buddhist temple, it does not seem appropriate to a mud hut or the remains of a village pottery, or to a whole village or urban area.

The Venice Charter is not well suited to dealing with vernacular or primitive buildings, urban conservation areas, industrial archaeological sites or twentieth century buildings. These types constitute the bulk of Australian cultural property so we felt the need to prepare our own document to clarify and expand the Venice Charter particularly in relation to the conservation issues which faced us here.

3.2 The Burra Charter and its development

In February 1979 Australia ICOMOS formed a committee to adapt the Venice Charter to Australian conditions. It included three architects, an archaeologist and a specialist in conservation method and was strengthened by the addition of a solicitor with experience in drafting legislation for conservation. To make funding for meetings possible all participants were made members of the Australian Heritage Commission Technical Advisory Committee and the actual meetings were held under its patronage.

The principles of the Charter were drafted in two exhausting sessions of two days each and the draft was published and circulated to all members of Australia ICOMOS for comment before the August meeting at Burra Burra. General discussion at this meeting resulted in a number of improving amendments and the document was formally adopted for a trial period of a year. Fifteen months later a similar process was followed and minor amendments which arose from the experience of members in implementing the document were incorporated.

In organisational terms it was successful because momentum was never lost and all members of ICOMOS were aware of what was going on and could be involved. The momentum was maintained because of the assistance of the Australian Heritage Commission and without this, it would have been a more agonising and less certain project.

The major ideas behind the drafting of the Burra Charter were:

Firstly, an acceptance of the general philosophy of the Venice Charter.

Secondly, the need for a common conservation language throughout Australia.

Thirdly, an emphasis on the need for a thorough understanding of the significance of a place before the policy decisions can be made.

Fourthly, an approach more flexible and practical than is suggested by the Venice Charter, and one which could cope with the realities of Australia's heritage, and in particular which would permit the stringency of conservation processes to be varied according to the nature of significance.

Fifthly, that technical words or jargon be avoided and that where this was not possible, as in the types of conservation processes, definitions be inserted.

Sixthly, that a neutral or multidisciplinary approach be adopted which would avoid defining the fields of architects, engineers, archaeologists, historians etc. and use instead terms like «place» and «work».

The key difference between the Charters is that the Burra Charter of Australia ICOMOS is applied to all places of cultural significance, not just architectural monuments as in the Venice Charter. The term «place» includes archaeological sites, ruins, buildings, engineering structures, groups of buildings and whole urban areas; «cultural significance» includes all the reasons why we try to preserve places — aesthetic, historic, scientific and social value.

3.3 Guidelines to the Burra Charter

Following the adoption of the Charter, Australia ICOMOS undertook a second stage and developed a series of guidelines which amplify aspects of the Burra Charter.

The first guidelines related to the establishment of cultural significance and recommended a methodological procedure for assessing the cultural significance of a place, for preparing a statement of cultural significance and for making such information publically available. (See Appendix 1). They were adopted in 1984 and revised in 1988.

The second guidelines related to the development of conservation policy for a place of cultural significance and a strategy for the implementation of that policy for a place of cultural significance and a strategy for the implementation of that policy. The policy addresses issues such as the necessity for conservation action, legal constraints, possible uses, structural stability, costs and returns. These guidelines were adopted in 1985.

The third guidelines makes recommendation about professional practice in the preparation of the studies and reports within the terms of the Burra Charter. Attention is also drawn to the advice about ethical, procedural and legal matters provided in the practice notes issued by various professional bodies. These guidelines were adopted in 1988.

All the guidelines have functioned as an aide memoire to practitioners and explain the process to those unfamiliar with conservation practice.

3.4 The Burra Charter in use

Because the Charter was produced at a time of considerable need it has had a surprising degree of acceptance by national and many State government departments. Most public works departments have formally endorsed the Charter as a condition of membership of Australia ICOMOS.

Both national and State government grants for works to places of cultural significance are given subject to the works being carried out in accordance with the principle and procedures of the Burra Charter. Hence the Charter is almost universally accepted in Australia, in word if not always in deed. There have been major public debates reported in the media about varying interpretations of urban conservation work and whether it was carried out in strict accordance with the provisions of the Burra Charter. But it should be emphasised that the Charter has been written as a set of principles to help in the decision-making processes. It is not suited to statutory enforcement.

The name of the Charter has also led to puns, for example, the penguin burrow charter for coastal works. This joking is a sure sign of acceptance by Australians!

Most National Trusts and historical societies and local government authorities or municipalities now understand that restoration works must be preceded by a conservation analysis and this has led to a greater expansion of work for the heritage conservation profession. Most restoration work involves an element of reconstruction because it usually involves the introduction of some new materials. Even the reassembly of displaced elements (anastylosis) naturally requires new elements. The majority of building conservation work in Australia involves a substantial amount of adaptation. This is acceptable where the conservation of a place cannot otherwise be achieved, and where the adaptation does not substantially detract from its cultural significance (See Article 20 of the Burra Charter).

3.5 Use in other countries

The Burra Charter is known and used in other countries because of personal contacts, for example, in Chile, Canada, Zambia, New Zealand, Fiji and Indonesia. Most practitioners have reported following the processes, even if not using the terminology.

3.6 Recommendations for consideration at the Lausanne General Assembly

In order to advance the objectives of ICOMOS internationally we recommend that:

- no more charters be developed but that as the conservation planning process outlined in our Burra Charter and tested over the last ten years is universally applicable, that this should be incorporated into the revised international charter of ICOMOS (the Lausanne Charter updated to replace the Venice Charter?);
- a Charter, or local variant should be adopted by governments for all public works contracts;
- the promulgation of the principles of the conservation process should be improved, for example, through an illustrated document to act as a «field» guide.

4 EXPERIENCE AND EDUCATION

4.1 Development of skills in Australia

Australia ICOMOS developed in the 1970s at a time when the embryonic cultural heritage conservation movement started its quickening to the major political position it occupies today.

There has been an explosion of popular interest in Australian heritage. Australians learn about their history and cultural heritage from film and television, from walking through historic districts or precincts looking at museums and restored buildings. The tourist brochure and the restored streetscape shape dominant images of our past.

A string of official commemorations has added to this mounting interest. The Bicentennial Year of 1988 followed a run of State commemorations. A genuine local interest in one's own commu-

nity has been matched and encouraged by a more pragmatic consideration: tourists (whether from overseas or 50 Kms. away) are attracted by «history» in its material form. Each town can make itself distinct and «worth visiting» through emphasising its past. Historic sites and local museums have become important to the regional economy.

This public interest in heritage conservation has led to Australia ICOMOS becoming the body advocating a professional approach to conservation; firstly, through philosophy and methodology as articulated in The Burra Charter and its associated guidelines; secondly, through the multi-professionalism of its members and thirdly, through the maintenance of the craft tradition and the training of artisans.

4.2 The role of Australia ICOMOS

Australia ICOMOS has become the body representing a multidisciplinary approach to heritage conservation. Members must have professional qualifications and three years conservation practice to qualify for admission. This means that many members belong to the institute or association of their major discipline, like architecture or archaeology, as well as to ICOMOS and this leads to enrichment of concepts and practice to the benefit of both groups. The ICOMOS membership includes tertiary education programs, both on the conservation of fabric and the theory of cultural heritage conservation.

In 1980 Australia ICOMOS carried out an Australia-wide survey of relevant tertiary courses on conservation. The results were published and circulated to universities. In 1984, the national government established a committee to review Australian studies in tertiary education (C.R.A.S.T.E.) and its 1987 report *Windows onto Worlds* received input from Australia ICOMOS members. The review revealed the upgrading and expansion of conservation courses in Australia since 1980.

Tertiary education is a consumer of «heritage» as a resource, and trains students who operate in a broad heritage area: museum and gallery curators, architects, historians, town planners, tour guides, site managers, archaeologists, conservators, archivists, park rangers. The «heritage industry» is, potentially, a major

employer of students with a strong base in Australian studies. Therefore the tertiary education institutions need to be more concerned than they have been in the past with this area: with the education of people who work in the industry or who will seek employment in it, with the material resources on which Australian studies are based; and with enabling people who first develop an interest in this area by informal means to extend that interest through institution-based learning at all levels.

At present there is a shortage of qualified people suited to employment in the area of cultural resource management and Australia ICOMOS has advocated a suite of courses covering the whole process whereby society conserves cultural resources. The combination of highly «academic» research skills with an «applied» orientation challenges the divisions sanctified in much tertiary learning and demonstrates the way in which practical work of a vocational kind can reinvigorate an academic discipline. If the interest in «heritage» can be described as popular in origins, the methods and skills needed to work in the field are highly professional and often «academic» in nature.

The interpretation of our industrial heritage requires particular archaeological expertise and the development of a firm dialogue with historians and engineers. Historical archaeology as a new area of inquiry in Australia suffers from a lack of academic prestige and established funding avenues that prehistoric and classical archaeology have consolidated. The contrast between funds granted to Australian classical archaeologists to investigate European, African or near-Eastern sites and the paucity of funding to Australian historical archaeology is a source of concern. However, in the last twenty years archaeology has ceased to be a subject of purely research or academic interest and has become the concern of many government departments, statutory authorities, Aboriginal communities and public and private developers. Few archaeologists have not been involved in making decisions about site management and conservation.

Nevertheless, what is needed in the tertiary sector are new combinations of skills, new combinations of disciplines, and a new conjunction of vocational and academic training. Theoretical and practical skills need to be brought together, so that education is neither strictly vocational nor narrowly academic.

The academic field on the philosophy and methodology of conservation is well advanced and is reinforced by Australia ICOMOS promoting multidisciplinary field contact through its academic members.

4.3 Australia as a Centre for Conservation Training

Australia is well equipped to fulfil a training role serving the Asia-Pacific Region, through post graduate programs held in Australia, which could be followed by field work in participating countries.

The materials conservation course conducted by Dr Colin Pearson at the University of Canberra has held regional status through UNESCO for ten years. It produces about fifteen students annually, of whom several are overseas students and quite a network of these has developed in the Pacific countries.

Government policy in Australia encourages its regional role in education, and a variety of initiatives are under way for both training and educational exchange programs in cultural heritage conservation.

Australia ICOMOS is willing and able to participate in regional conferences and seminars and, in May 1983 organized a UNESCO sponsored regional conference on conservation of historic places. Its proceedings were published as a 250 pp. volume entitled, *Protecting the Past for the Future*.

However, the desired follow-up meetings for participants have not occurred. In November 1988 Australia ICOMOS supplied a member as a lecturer for a UNESCO sponsored regional training seminar for cultural personnel in Asia and the Pacific at various locations in Japan. The main concerns dealt with authenticity in restoration, the use of traditional technology, the careful use of modern methods and the effects of restoring monuments to their original conditions.

As participation from Pacific countries was limited due to funding, Australia ICOMOS believes that it could conduct a similar training seminar for our near neighbours.

In conclusion, Australia ICOMOS recommends that national committees, with a detailed philosophy of conservation such as outlined in the Burra Charter, and multidisciplinary profes-

sional experience should be contributing to conservation course development in tertiary education institutes. Practitioners should also be involved in regional training seminars on a regular basis.

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Jane Lennon, with assistance from Peter Marquis Kyle, Joan Domicelj, Susan Balderstone, Meredith Walker, Anne Bickford, Max Bourke, Mike Pearson, Jon Womersley, Peter Donovan, Miles Lewis and Jim Kerr.

**The Australia ICOMOS
Charter for the conservation of places
of cultural significance**

(The Burra Charter)

Preamble

Having regard to the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice 1966), and the Resolutions of 5th General Assembly of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) (Moscow 1978), the following Charter was adopted by Australia ICOMOS on 19th August 1979 at Burra Burra. Revisions were adopted on 23rd February 1981 and on 23 April 1988.

Definitions

Article 1. For the purpose of this Charter:

- 1.1 *Place* means site, area, building or other work, group of buildings or other works together with associated contents and surroundings.
- 1.2 *Cultural significance* means aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present or future generations.
- 1.3 *Fabric* means all the physical material of the *place*.
- 1.4 *Conservation* means all the processes of looking after a *place* so as to retain its *cultural significance*. It includes *maintenance and may according to circumstance include preservation, restoration, reconstruction and adaptation* and will be commonly a combination of more than one of these.

Explanatory Notes

These notes do not form part of the Charter and may be added to by Australia ICOMOS.

Article 1.1

Place includes structures, ruins, archaeological sites and landscapes modified by human activity.

- 1.5 *Maintenance* means the continuous protective care of the *fabric*, contents and setting of a *place*, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves *restoration* or *reconstruction* and it should be treated accordingly.
- 1.6 *Preservation* means maintaining the *fabric* of a *place* in its existing state and retarding deterioration.
- 1.7 *Restoration* means returning the EXISTING *fabric* of a *place* to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material.
- 1.8 *Reconstruction* means returning a *place* as nearly as possible to a known earlier state and is distinguished by the introduction of materials (new or old) into the *fabric*. This is not to be confused with either re-creation or conjectural reconstruction which are outside the scope of this Charter.
- 1.9 *Adaptation* means modifying a *place* to suit proposed compatible uses.
- 1.10 *Compatible use* means a use which involves no change to the culturally significant fabric, changes which are substantially reversible, or changes which require a minimal impact.

Conservation Principles

Article 2. The aim of *conservation* is to retain the *cultural significance* of a *place* and must include provision for its security, its *maintenance* and its future.

Explanatory Notes

Article 1.5

The distinctions referred to in Article 1.5, for example in relation to roof gutters, are:

maintenance — regular inspection and cleaning of gutters
repair involving restoration — returning of dislodged gutters to their place

repair involving reconstruction — replacing decayed gutters.

Conservation should not be undertaken unless adequate resources are available to ensure that the fabric is not left in a vulnerable state and that the cultural significance of the place is not impaired. However, it must be emphasised that the best conservation often involves the least work and can be inexpensive.

Article 2

Article 3. *Conservation* is based on a respect for the existing *fabric* and should involve the least possible physical intervention. It should not distort the evidence provided by the *fabric*.

Article 4. *Conservation* should make use of all the disciplines which can contribute to the study and safeguarding of a *place*. Techniques employed should be traditional but in some circumstances they may be modern ones for which a firm scientific basis exists and which have been supported by a body of experience.

Article 5. *Conservation* of a *place* should take into consideration all aspects of its *cultural significance* without unwarranted emphasis on any one aspect at the expense of others.

Article 6. The conservation policy appropriate to a *place* must first be determined by an understanding of its *cultural significance*.

Article 7. The conservation policy will determine which uses are compatible.

Article 8. *Conservation* requires the maintenance of an appropriate visual setting: e.g., form, scale, colour, texture and materials. No new construction, demolition or modification which would adversely affect the setting should be allowed. Environmental intrusions which adversely affect appreciation or enjoyment of the *place* should be excluded.

Explanatory Notes

Article 3

The traces of additions, alterations and earlier treatments on the fabric of a place are evidence of its history and uses.

Conservation action should tend to assist rather than to impede their interpretation.

Article 6

An understanding of the cultural significance of a place is essential to its proper conservation. This should be achieved by means of a thorough investigation resulting in a report embodying a statement of cultural significance. The formal adoption of a statement of cultural significance is an essential prerequisite to the preparation of a conservation policy.

Article 7

Continuity of the use of a place in a particular way may be significant and therefore desirable.

Article 8

New construction work, including infill and additions, may be acceptable, provided:

it does not reduce or obscure the cultural significance of the place

it is in keeping with Article 8.

Article 9. A building or work should remain in its historical location. The moving of all or part of a building or work is unacceptable unless this is the sole means of ensuring its survival.

Article 10. The removal of contents which form part of the *cultural significance* of the *place* is unacceptable unless it is the sole means of ensuring their security and *preservation*. Such contents must be returned should changed circumstances make this practicable.

Conservation Processes

Preservation

Article 11. *Preservation* is appropriate where the existing state of the *fabric* itself constitutes evidence of specific *cultural significance*, or where insufficient evidence is available to allow other conservation processes to be carried out.

Article 12. *Preservation* is limited to the protection, *maintenance* and, where necessary, the stabilization of the existing *fabric* but without the distortion of its *cultural significance*.

Explanatory Notes

Article 9

Some structures were designed to be readily removable or already have a history of previous moves, e.g. prefabricated dwellings and poppetheads. Provided such a structure does not have a strong association with its present site, its removal may be considered.

If any structure is moved, it should be moved to an appropriate setting and given an appropriate use. Such action should not be to the detriment of any place of cultural significance.

Preservation protects fabric without obscuring the evidence of its construction and use.

The process should always be applied:

where the evidence of the fabric is of such significance that it must not be altered. This is an unusual case and likely to be appropriate for archaeological remains of national importance;

where insufficient investigation has been carried out to permit conservation policy decisions to be taken in accord with Articles 23 to 25.

New construction may be carried out in association with preservation when its purpose is the physical protection of the fabric and when it is consistent with Article 8.

Stabilization is a process which helps keep fabric intact and in a fixed position. When carried out as a part of preservation work it does not introduce new materials into the fabric. However, when necessary for the survival of the fabric, stabilization may be effected as part of a reconstruction process and new materials introduced. For example, grouting or the insertion of a reinforcing rod in a masonry wall.

Article 11

Article 12

Restoration

Article 13. *Restoration* is appropriate only if there is sufficient evidence of an earlier state of the *fabric* and only if returning the *fabric* to that state reveals the *cultural significance* of the *place*.

Article 14. *Restoration* should reveal anew culturally significant aspects of the *place*. It is based on respect for all the physical, documentary and other evidence and stops at the point where conjecture begins.

Article 15. *Restoration* is limited to the reassembling of displaced components or removal of accretions in accordance with Article 16.

Article 16. The contributions of all periods to the *place* must be respected. If a *place* includes the *fabric* of different periods, revealing the *fabric of one period at the expense of another can only be justified when what is removed is of slight cultural significance* and the *fabric* which is to be revealed is of much greater *cultural significance*.

Reconstruction

Article 17. *Reconstruction* is appropriate only where a *place* is incomplete through damage or alteration and where it is necessary for its survival, or where it reveals the *cultural significance* of the *place* as a whole.

Article 18. *Reconstruction* is limited to the completion of a depleted entity and should not constitute the majority of the *fabric* of a *place*.

Article 19. *Reconstruction* is limited to the reproduction of *fabric*, the form of which is known from physical and/or documentary evidence. It should be identifiable on close inspection as being new work.

Adaptation

Article 20. *Adaptation* is acceptable where the *conservation* of the *place* cannot otherwise be achieved, and where the *adaptation* does not substantially detract from its *cultural significance*.

Article 21. *Adaptation* must be limited to that which is essential to a use for the *place* determined in accordance with Articles 6 and 7.

Explanatory Notes

Article 13 See explanatory note for Article 2.

Article 22. *Fabric of cultural significance* unavoidably removed in the process of *adaptation* must be kept safely to enable its future reinstatement.

Conservation Practice

Article 23. Work on a *place* must be preceded by professionally prepared studies of the physical, documentary and other evidence, and the existing *fabric* recorded before any intervention in the *place*.

Article 24. Study of a *place* by any intervention in the *fabric* or by archaeological excavation should be undertaken where necessary to provide data essential for decisions on the *conservation* of the *place* and/or to secure evidence about to be lost or made inaccessible through necessary *conservation* or other unavoidable action. Investigation of a *place* for any other reason which requires physical disturbance and which adds substantially to a scientific body of knowledge may be permitted, provided that it is consistent with the conservation policy for the *place*.

Article 25. A written statement of conservation policy must be professionally prepared setting out the *cultural significance* and proposed *conservation* procedure together with justification and supporting evidence, including photographs, drawings and all appropriate samples.

Article 26. The organisation and individuals responsible for policy decisions must be named and specific responsibility taken for each such decision.

Article 27. Appropriate professional direction and supervision must be maintained at all stages of the work and a log kept of new evidence and additional decisions recorded as in Article 25 above.

Article 28. The records required by Articles 23, 25, 26 and 27 should be placed in a permanent archive and made publicly available.

Article 29. The items referred to in Articles 10 and 22 should be professionally catalogued and protected.

Words in italics are defined in Article 1.

Explanatory Notes

Article 25

The procedure will include the conservation processes referred to in Article 1.4 and other matters described in Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Conservation Policy.

Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural significance

These guidelines for the establishment of cultural significance were adopted by the Australian national committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (Australia ICOMOS) on 14 April 1984 and revised on 23 April 1988. They should be read in conjunction with the Burra Charter.

Contents

- 1.0 Preface
- 1.1 Intention of guidelines
- 1.2 Applicability
- 1.3 Need to establish cultural significance
- 1.4 Skills required
- 1.5 Issues not considered
- 2.0 The Concept of Cultural Significance
 - 2.1 Introduction
 - 2.2 Aesthetic value
 - 2.3 Historic value
 - 2.4 Scientific value
 - 2.5 Social value
 - 2.6 Other approaches
- 3.0 The Establishment of Cultural Significance
 - 3.1 Introduction
 - 3.2 Collection of information
 - 3.3 The assessment of cultural Significance
 - 3.3.1 Extent of recording
 - 3.3.2 Intervention in the fabric
 - 3.3.3 Hypotheses
 - 3.4 Statement of cultural significance
- 4.0 The Report
 - 4.1 Content
 - 4.2 Written material
 - 4.3 Graphic material
 - 4.4 Sources
 - 4.5 Exhibition and adoption

1.0 Preface

1.1 Intention of guidelines

These guidelines are intended to clarify the nature of professional work done within the terms of the Burra Charter. They recommend a methodical procedure for assessing the cultural significance of a place, for preparing a statement of cultural significance and for making such information publicly available.

1.2 Applicability

The guidelines apply to any place likely to be of cultural significance regardless of its type or size.

1.3 Need to establish cultural significance

The assessment of cultural significance and the preparation of a statement of cultural significance, embodied in a report as defined in section 4.0, are essential prerequisites to making decisions about the future of a place.

1.4 Skills required

In accordance with Article 4 of the Burra Charter, the study of a place should make use of all relevant disciplines. The professional skills required for such study are not common. It cannot be assumed that any one practitioner will have the full range of skills required to assess cultural significance and prepare a statement. Sometimes in the course of the task it will be necessary to engage additional practitioners with special expertise.

1.5 Issues not considered

The assessment of cultural significance and the preparation of a statement do not involve or take account of such issues as the necessity for conservation action, legal constraints, possible uses, structural stability or costs and returns. These issues will be dealt with in the development of a conservation policy.

2.0 The concept of cultural significance

2.1 Introduction

In the Burra Charter cultural significance means «aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present or future generations».

Cultural significance is a concept which helps in estimating the value of places. The places that are likely to be of significance are those which help an understanding of the past or enrich the present, and which will be of value to future generations.

Although there are a variety of adjectives used in definitions of cultural significance in Australia, the adjectives «aesthetic», «historic», «scientific» and «social», given alphabetically in the Burra Charter, can encompass all other values.

The meaning of these terms in the context of cultural significance is discussed below. It should be noted that they are not mutually exclusive, for example, architectural style has both historic and aesthetic aspects.

2.2 Aesthetic value

Aesthetic value includes aspects of sensory perception for which criteria can and should be stated. Such criteria may include consideration of the form, scale, colour, texture and material of the fabric; the smells and sounds associated with the place and its use.

2.3 Historic value

Historic value encompasses the history of aesthetics, science and society, and therefore to a large extent underlies all of the terms set out in this section.

A place may have historic value because it has influenced, or has been influenced by, an historic figure, event, phase or activity. It may also have historic value as the site of an important event. For any given place the significance will be greater where evidence of the association or event survives in situ, or where the settings are substantially intact, than where it has been changed or evidence does not survive. However, some events or associations may be so important that the place retains significance regardless of subsequent treatment.

2.4 Scientific value

The scientific or research value of a place will depend upon the importance of the data involved, on its rarity, quality or representativeness, and on the degree to which the place may contribute further substantial information.

2.5 Social value

Social value embraces the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a majority or minority group.

2.6 Other approaches

The categorisation into aesthetic, historic, scientific and social values is one approach to understanding the concept of cultural significance. However, more precise categories may be developed as understanding of a particular place increases.

3.0 The establishment of cultural significance

3.1 Introduction

In establishing the cultural significance of a place it is necessary to assess all the information relevant to an understanding of the place and its fabric. The task includes a report comprising written material and graphic material. The contents of the report should be arranged to suit the place and the limitations on the task, but it will generally be in two sections: first, the assessment of cultural significance (see 3.2 and 3.3) and second, the statement of cultural significance (see 3.4).

3.2 Collection of information

Information relevant to the assessment of cultural significance should be collected. Such information concerns:

- (a) the developmental sequence of the place and its relationship to the surviving fabric;
- (b) the existence and nature of lost or obliterated fabric;
- (c) the rarity and/or technical interest of all or any part of the place;
- (d) the functions of the place and its parts;
- (e) the relationship of the place and its parts with its setting;
- (f) the cultural influences which have affected the form and fabric of the place;
- (g) the significance of the place to people who use or have used the place, or descendants of such people;
- (h) the historical content of the place with particular reference to the ways in which its fabric has been influenced by historical forces or has itself influenced the course of history;

- (i) the scientific or research potential of the place,
- (j) the relationship of the place to other places, for example in respect of design, technology, use, locality or origin;
- (k) any other factor relevant to an understanding of the place.

3.3 The assessment of cultural significance

The assessment of cultural significance follows the collection of information.

The validity of the judgements will depend upon the care with which the data is collected and the reasoning applied to it.

In assessing cultural significance the practitioner should state conclusions. Unresolved aspects should be identified.

Whatever may be considered the principal significance of a place, all other aspects of significance should be given consideration.

3.3.1 Extent of recording —

In assessing these matters a practitioner should record the place sufficiently to provide a basis for the necessary discussion of the facts. During such recording any obviously urgent problems endangering the place, such as stability and security, should be reported to the client.

3.3.2 Intervention in the fabric —

Intervention in, or removal of, fabric at this stage should be strictly within the terms of the Burra Charter.

3.3.3 Hypotheses —

Hypotheses, however expert or informed, should not be presented as established fact. Feasible or possible hypotheses should be set out, with the evidence for and against them, and the line of reasoning that has been followed. Any attempt which has been made to check a hypothesis should be recorded, so as to avoid repeating fruitless research.

3.4 Statement of cultural significance

The practitioner should prepare a succinct statement of cultural significance, supported by, or cross referenced to, sufficient graphic material to help identify the fabric of cultural significance.

It is essential that the statement be clear and pithy, expressing simply why the place is of value but not restating the physical or documentary evidence.

4.0 The report

4.1 Content

The report will comprise written and graphic material and will present an assessment of cultural significance and a statement of cultural significance.

In order to avoid unnecessary bulk, only material directly relevant to the process of assessing cultural significance and to making a statement of cultural significance should be included.

See also Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Procedures for Undertaking Studies and Reports.

4.2 Written material

The text should be clearly set out and easy to follow. In addition to the assessment and statement of cultural significance as set out in 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 it should include:

- (a) name of the client;
- (b) names of all the practitioners engaged in the task;
- (c) authorship of the report;
- (d) date;
- (e) brief or outline of brief;
- (f) constraints on the task, for example, time, money, expertise;
- (g) sources (see 4.4).

4.3 Graphic material

Graphic material may include maps, plans, drawings, diagrams, sketches, photographs and tables, and should be reproduced with sufficient quality for the purposes of interpretation.

All components discussed in the report should be identified in the graphic material. Such components should be identified and described in a schedule.

Detailed drawings may not be necessary. A diagram may best assist the purpose of the report.

Graphic material which does not serve a specific purpose should not be included.

4.4 Sources

All sources used in the report must be cited with sufficient precision to enable others to locate them.

It is necessary for all sources consulted to be listed, even if not cited.

All major sources or collections not consulted, but believed to have potential usefulness in establishing cultural significance, should be listed.

In respect of source material privately held the name and address of the owner should be given, but only with the owner's consent.

4.5 Exhibition and adoption

The report should be exhibited and the statement of cultural significance adopted in accordance with Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Procedures for Undertaking Studies and Reports.

Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Conservation Policy

These guidelines, which cover the development of conservation policy and strategy for implementation of that policy, were adopted by the Australian national committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (Australia ICOMOS) on 25 May 1985 and revised on 23 April 1988. They should be read in conjunction with the Burra Charter.

Contents

- 1.0 Preface
- 1.1 Intention of guidelines
- 1.2 Cultural significance
- 1.3 Need to develop conservation policy
- 1.4 Skills required
- 2.0 The Scope of the Conservation Policy
 - 2.1 Introduction
 - 2.2 Fabric and setting
 - 2.3 Use
 - 2.4 Interpretation
 - 2.5 Management
 - 2.6 Control of physical intervention in the fabric
 - 2.7 Constraints on investigation
 - 2.8 Future developments
 - 2.9 Adoption and review
- 3.0 Development of Conservation Policy
 - 3.1 Introduction
 - 3.2 Collection of information
 - 3.2.1 Significant fabric
 - 3.2.2 Client, owner and user requirements and resources
 - 3.2.3 Other requirements and concerns
 - 3.2.4 Condition of fabric
 - 3.2.5 Uses
 - 3.2.6 Comparative information
 - 3.2.7 Unavailable information
 - 3.3 Assessment of information
 - 3.4 Statement of conservation policy
 - 3.5 Consequences of conservation policy
- 4.0 Implementation of Conservation Policy

- 5.0 The Report
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Written material
- 5.3 Graphic material
- 5.4 Sources
- 5.5 Exhibition and adoption

1.0 Preface

1.1 Intention of guidelines

These guidelines are intended to clarify the nature of professional work done within the terms of the Burra Charter. They recommend a methodical procedure for development of the conservation policy for a place, for the statement of conservation policy and for the strategy for the implementation of that policy.

1.2 Cultural significance

The establishment of cultural significance and the preparation of a statement of cultural significance are essential prerequisites to the development of a conservation policy (refer to Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance).

1.3 Need to develop conservation policy

The development of a conservation policy, embodied in a report as defined in Section 5.0, is an essential prerequisite to making decisions about the future of the place.

1.4 Skills required

In accordance with the Burra Charter, the study of a place should make use of all relevant disciplines. The professional skills required for such study are not common. It cannot be assumed that any one practitioner will have the full range of skills required to develop a conservation policy and prepare the appropriate report. In the course of the task it may be necessary to consult with other practitioners and organisations.

2.0 The scope of the conservation policy

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of the conservation policy is to state how the conservation of the place may best be achieved both in the long and short term. It will be specific to that place.

The conservation policy will include the issues listed below.

2.2 Fabric and setting

The conservation policy should identify the most appropriate way of caring for the fabric and setting of the place arising out of the statement of significance and other constraints. A specific combination of conservation actions should be identified. This may or may not involve changes to the fabric.

2.3 Use

The conservation policy should identify a use or combination of uses, or constraints on use, that are compatible with the retention of the cultural significance of the place and that are feasible.

2.4 Interpretation

The conservation policy should identify appropriate ways of making the significance of the place understood consistent with the retention of that significance. This may be a combination of the treatment of the fabric, the use of the place and the use of introduced interpretative material.

In some instances the cultural significance and other constraints may preclude the introduction of such uses and material.

2.5 Management

The conservation policy should identify a management structure through which the conservation policy is capable of being implemented. It should also identify:

- (a) those to be responsible for subsequent conservation and management decisions and for the day-to-day management of the place;
- (b) the mechanism by which these decisions are to be made and recorded;
- (c) the means of providing security and regular maintenance for the place.

2.6 Control of physical intervention in the fabric

The conservation policy should include provisions for the control of physical intervention. It may:

- (a) specify unavoidable intervention;
- (b) identify the likely impact of any intervention on the cultural significance;

- (c) specify the degree and nature of intervention acceptable for non-conservation purpose;
- (d) specify explicit research proposals;
- (e) specify how research proposals will be assessed;
- (f) provide for the conservation of significant fabric and contents removed from the place;
- (g) provide for the analysis of material;
- (h) provide for the dissemination of the resultant information;
- (i) specify the treatment of the site when the intervention is complete.

2.7 Constraints on investigation

The conservation policy should identify social, religious, legal or other cultural constraints which might limit the accessibility or investigation of the place.

2.8 Future developments

The conservation policy should set guidelines for future developments resulting from changing needs.

2.9 Adoption and review

The conservation policy should contain provision for adoption and review.

3.0 Development of conservation policy

3.1 Introduction

In developing a conservation policy for the place it is necessary to assess all the information relevant to the future care of the place and its fabric. Central to this task is the statement of cultural significance.

The task includes a report as set out in Section 5.0. The contents of the report should be arranged to suit the place and the limitations of the task, but it will generally be in three sections:

- (a) the development of a conservation policy (see 3.2 and 3.3);
- (b) the statement of conservation policy (see 3.4 and 3.5);
- (c) the development of an appropriate strategy for implementation of the conservation policy (see 4.0).

3.2 Collection of information

In order to develop the conservation policy sufficient information relevant to the following should be collected:

3.2.1 Significant fabric —

Establish or confirm the nature, extent, and degree of intactness of the significant fabric including contents (see Guidelines to Burra Charter: Cultural Significance).

3.2.2 Client, owner and user requirements and resources —

Investigate needs, aspirations, current proposals, available finances, etc., in respect of the place.

3.2.3 Other requirements and concerns —

Investigate other requirements and concerns likely to affect the future of the place and its setting including:

- (a) federal, state and local government acts, ordinances and planning controls;
- (b) community needs and expectations;
- (c) locational and social context.

3.2.4 Condition of fabric —

Survey the fabric sufficiently to establish how its physical state will affect options for the treatment of the fabric.

3.2.5 Uses —

Collect information about uses, sufficient to determine whether or not such uses are compatible with the significance of the place and feasible.

3.2.6 Comparative information —

Collect comparative information about the conservation of similar places (if appropriate).

3.2.7 Unavailable information —

Identify information which has been sought and is unavailable and which may be critical to the determination of the conservation policy or to its implementation.

3.3 Assessment of information

The information gathered above should now be assessed in relation to the constraints arising from the statement of cultural significance for the purpose of developing a conservation policy.

In the course of the assessment it may be necessary to collect further information.

3.4 Statement of conservation policy

The practitioner should prepare a statement of conservation policy that addresses each of the issues listed in 2.0, viz.:

- fabric and setting;
- use;
- interpretation;
- management;
- control of intervention in the fabric;
- constraints on investigation;
- future developments;
- adoption and review.

The statement of conservation policy should be cross-referenced to sufficient documentary and graphic material to explain the issues considered.

3.5 Consequences of conservation policy

The practitioner should set out the way in which the implementation of the conservation policy will or will not:

- (a) change the place including its setting;
- (b) affect its significance;
- (c) affect the locality and its amenity;
- (d) affect the client, owner and user;
- (e) affect others involved.

4.0 Implementation of conservation policy

Following the preparation of the conservation policy a strategy for its implementation should be prepared in consultation with the client. The strategy may include information about:

- (a) the financial resources to be used;
- (b) the technical and other staff to be used;
- (c) the sequence of events;
- (d) the timing of events;
- (e) the management structure.

The strategy should allow the implementation of the conservation policy under changing circumstances.

5.0 The report

5.1 Introduction

The report is the vehicle through which the conservation policy is expressed, and upon which conservation action is based.

See also Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Procedures for Undertaking Studies and Reports.

5.2 Written material

Written material will include:

- (a) the statement of cultural significance;
- (b) the development of conservation policy;
- (c) the statement of conservation policy;
- (d) the strategy for implementation of conservation policy.

It should also include:

- (a) name of the client;
- (b) names of all the practitioners engaged in the task, the work they undertook, and any separate reports they prepared;
- (c) authorship of the report;
- (d) date;
- (e) brief or outline of brief;
- (f) constraints on the task, for example, time, money, expertise;
- (g) sources (see 5.4).

5.3 Graphic material

Graphic material may include maps, plans, drawings, diagrams, sketches, photographs and tables, clearly reproduced.

Material which does not serve a specific purpose should not be included.

5.4 Sources

All sources used in the report must be cited with sufficient precision to enable others to locate them.

All sources of information, both documentary and oral, consulted during the task should be listed, whether or not they proved fruitful.

In respect of source material privately held, the name and address of the owner should be given, but only with the owner's consent.

5.5 Exhibition and adoption

The report should be exhibited and the statement of conservation policy adopted in accordance with Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Procedures for Undertaking Studies and Reports.

Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Procedures for Undertaking Studies and Reports

These guidelines for the preparation of professional studies and reports were adopted by the Australian national committee of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (Australia ICOMOS) on 23 April 1988. They should be read in conjunction with the Burra Charter.

Contents

- 1.0 Preface
- 2.0 Agreements between client and practitioner
- 3.0 Responsibility for content of report
- 4.0 Draft report
- 5.0 Urgent action
- 6.0 Additional work
- 7.0 Recommendations for further investigations
- 8.0 Exhibition and comment
- 9.0 Adoption and review of report
- 10.0 Further evidence
- 11.0 Accessibility of information

1.0 Preface

These guidelines make recommendations about professional practice in the preparation of the studies and reports within the terms of the Burra Charter.

Attention is also drawn to the advice about ethical, procedural and legal matters provided in the practice notes issued by various professional bodies.

2.0 Agreements between client and practitioner

Before undertaking a study or report, the client and the practitioner should agree upon:

- (a) the extent of the task, for example, up to the preparation of a statement of significance, up to the preparation of a statement of conservation policy or up to the preparation of a strategy for implementation;
- (b) the boundaries of the place;
- (c) any aspect which requires intensive investigation;

- (d) the dates for the commencement of the task, submission of the draft report and submission of the final report;
- (e) the fee and the basis upon which fees and disbursements will be paid;
- (f) the use of any joint consultant, sub-consultant or other practitioner with special expertise;
- (g) the basis for any further investigation which may be required, for example, within the terms of 7.0 below or section 3.3 of Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Conservation Policy;
- (h) the representative of the client to whom the practitioner will be responsible in the course of the task;
- (i) the sources, material or services to be supplied by the client including previous studies or reports;
- (j) any requirements for the format or reproduction of the report;
- (k) the number of copies of the report to be supplied at each stage;
- (l) copyright and confidentiality;
- (m) how the authorship will be cited;
- (n) the condition under which the report may be published or distributed by the client, the practitioner or others;
- (o) the procedure for any required exhibition of the report;
- (p) the basis for comment upon the report and any consequent amendment;
- (q) the responsibility for effecting archival storage in accordance with Article 28 of the Burra Charter.

3.0 Responsibility for content of report

The content of the report is the responsibility of the practitioner. The report may not be amended without the agreement of the practitioner.

4.0 Draft report

It is useful for the report to be presented to the client in draft form to ensure that it is understood and so that the practitioner may receive the client's comments.

5.0 Urgent action

If the practitioner believes that urgent action may be necessary to avert a threat to the fabric involving, for example, stability or security, the practitioner should immediately advise the client to seek specialist advice.

6.0 Additional work

Where it becomes clear that some aspect of the task will require more investigation or more expertise than has been allowed within the budget or the terms of the agreement, the practitioner should advise the client immediately.

7.0 Recommendations for further investigations

In respect of major unresolved aspects of cultural significance, conservation policy or of strategies for implementation of conservation policy, recommendations for further investigation should be made only where:

- (a) the client has been informed of the need for such investigation at the appropriate stage and it has been impossible to have it undertaken within the budget and time constraints of the task;
- (b) further information is anticipated as a result of intervention in the fabric which would not be proper at this stage, but which will become appropriate in the future.

Such recommendations should indicate what aspects of cultural significance, conservation policy or implementation might be assisted by such study.

8.0 Exhibition and comment

The report for any project of public interest should be exhibited in order that interested bodies and the public may comment and reasonable time should be allowed for the receipt and consideration of comment. Where public exhibition is not appropriate, comment should be sought from relevant individuals, organisations and specialists.

9.0 Adoption and review of report

Recommendations should be made for the formal adoption of the report and for any subsequent review.

10.0 Further evidence

If after the completion of the report further evidence is revealed, for example, by intervention in the fabric or information from other sources, it is desirable for this evidence to be referred to the original practitioner so that the report may be amended if necessary.

11.0 Accessibility of information

All material relating to the cultural significance of the place should be made readily available to increase the common pool of knowledge. Publication by the client and/or practitioner should be encouraged.

Australia ICOMOS Objectives for Legislation To Protect the National Estate

Guidelines for discussion with State Governments

This is a statement by Australia ICOMOS on the need to enact in each State and/or Territory appropriate legislation to protect the National Estate. At present such legislation exists only in New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria and in the Commonwealth Territories so far as the Australian Heritage Commission Act is applicable. Even where there is presently legislation it is not necessarily the best that could be achieved. The need for legislation is independent of any differences in priorities between the States and Territories, though it seems evident that the Australian Government's Register of the National Estate, as developed in co-operation with state agencies, will increasingly become the basis for protection. However, ICOMOS believes that in each State and Territory of the Commonwealth there should be effective legislation to protect the National Estate.

Set out below are seven objectives which are considered essentials to any such legislation. There are other matters of detail which would have to be considered before legislation could be prepared in those States which do not so far have appropriate legislation, but these may vary from State to State.

Australia ICOMOS holds that it is the duty of each State and Territory to, without further delay, consider and introduce appropriate new or amending legislation to meet the seven objectives set out below and the principles of the Burra Charter. It is recognised there are many other points of detail to be considered and that these may vary according to local circumstances and other related legislation.

The objectives are:

I. A representative council of informed members with appropriate conservation skills

There must be a majority of members with skills in historic conservation, historians, restoration architects, archaeologists, planners etc. It is essential for the Minister responsible for the

administration of the Act to receive the best advice. The Council must have on it those people most knowledgeable in the conservation field. Representatives of other interests and disciplines may be included but not so as to increase the size of the Council beyond a workable one.

II. It is important that the Council is able to provide a wide range of services and functions to advise the Government and to assist in the conservation of the National Estate. The exercise of legislative powers to ensure compliance by private property owners should only be a small part of its duties. The Council should be able to give general advice on all matters related to the National Estate. It should be able to engage in research, professional training, the provision of information and the promotion of the National Estate. It should also have responsibility for recommending assistance for privately-owned buildings.

It should have a responsibility for all kinds of places (including those parts of the natural environment of National Estate value which are not protected by National Parks or other similar legislation) and with all kinds of ownership which form part of the National Estate. It should not, however, have a responsibility for administration of property. Existing Acts may, however, already protect Aboriginal Places.

III. Adequate powers to list and protect the national estate

This is the area where there may be the greatest variation between States. It is, however, essential that the Act should require that all State Government Instrumentalities take account of the effect of all their actions on National Estate places and should be required to consult the Council before taking any such action.

There must be power to provide an adequate early warning system. That is to say, there must be a system whereby demolition and alteration control can be effectively imposed so that places are not damaged or destroyed without notice being given to the Council. The degree to which the Council makes use of this power will vary but the power must be there. There must be adequate sanctions. There must be penalties severe enough to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Council. These penalties can vary from direct financial ones to controls

implemented under the planning system. Wherever possible conservation provisions should be treated as part of the normal planning system albeit administered by a specialist branch.

IV. An act which is simple to operate and simple to understand

It is absolutely essential that the operative provisions of the Act are simple and that they do not place an impossible burden on the administration staff so that places are lost through inability to complete procedures within a given time. There is no «second opportunity» where the question of demolition or destruction of buildings is concerned. There must be a simple and efficient system of dealing with matters coming before the Council. There must be provision for the interim protection of places until there is time for them to be properly investigated and duly considered, and the general procedure should be that an extensive list of places be accorded interim protection at the outset and that the list be then gradually refined as decisions are made as to which places should be given permanent status and which eliminated. This procedure enables the more urgent cases to be dealt with as the need arises, whereas any other approach results in a bank-up of cases which is counterproductive and frustrating to all parties.

V. Adequate staffing and administration

The Council must be seen to be an expert body making independent and fair decisions, and therefore the reports and decisions (as opposed to any confidential advice it may give from time to time) should in due course be publicly released and tabled in Parliament.

It is essential that there is an adequate and competent staff. The administrative structure should be such that the Council is responsible through its Chairman to the Minister under whose jurisdiction the Act comes. The Council should have a Director and staff responsible through its Director to the Council. An acceptable alternative would be to provide in the Act that professional staff are seconded from the relevant Department to the Council to work at the direction of the Council through its Chairman.

VI. Negotiating devices

There should be provision for «Heritage» Agreements which are binding on places in perpetuity. The Minister should be empowered to waive rates and land tax on the advice of the Council.

VII. Exemptions from other legislation

The Minister should be empowered, with the consent of the Minister administering such other Acts, to waive or vary provisions in them if so doing would encourage the enhancing of a place which forms part of the National Estate, e.g. Building regulations, planning schemes, etc.

Australia ICOMOS urges the Government of each State and Territory which does not have legislation which achieves these objectives to introduce such legislation without delay.

Summary of submission to Lausanne international symposium 1990

Australia ICOMOS was formed as a multi-disciplinary professional body in 1976 and now has 9 corporate and about 200 qualified and experienced individual members from across the country. It meets three times a year to discuss specific topics and is generally self-funded. The Executive Committee is elected regularly; members may serve for a maximum of six years.

Australia ICOMOS has provided one Vice-President of ICOMOS, members on five international committees and regular participation at General Assemblies.

Within Australia its activities include the ratification in 1981 of the Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (the Burra Charter). This document is now accepted as the basis for heritage conservation practice in Australia. Members receive a quarterly newsletter and a jointly published refereed journal *Historic Environment*.

Achievements and future prospects

Much of the world's ancient cultures are found in the Asia/Pacific region; the Aboriginal people of Australia have occupied it for at least 40,000 years. The built environment in Australia represents a new culture within an ancient region.

Australia has a strong tradition of voluntary conservation groups. The National Trust alone has 80,000 members. In 1975 the Australian Heritage Commission was established and since then has granted some \$ 50 million for conservation projects and compiled a computerised Register of the National Estate with some 7,500 places of cultural significance. Most Australian States have heritage legislation and many apply conservation controls under their environmental planning systems.

Australia protects its eight listed World Heritage sites through special legislation but has to date no indicative list. Four of the sites are outstanding for both natural and Aboriginal cultural attributes.

Australia ICOMOS is investigating the feasibility of establishing an international underwater cultural heritage committee. It warmly supports the dissemination of expertise through international com-

mittees but is dissatisfied with the effectiveness of present committees in achieving that extension. It regrets UNESCO's lack of communication on cultural conservation and World Heritage concerns within the region, particularly apparent following the 1983 regional conference on historic places in Sydney.

Recommendations to the General Assembly:

- the appointment of an executive director of ICOMOS;
- annual regional meetings of national committees;
- a review of the effectiveness of the international committees.

The Venice Charter and the Burra Charter

Perhaps because of its context of monuments and anastylosis, the Venice Charter has been little used in Australia. The demand for a version more applicable to local conditions led Australia ICOMOS, over several years, to develop the Burra Charter which:

- accepted the general philosophy of the Venice Charter;
- provided a common and simple conservation language for use throughout the country;
- emphasised the identification of significance prior to policy formation for the conservation of a place;
- established a multidisciplinary approach to the principles of conservation and
- applied to all types of places of cultural significance.

Guidelines to the Charter were adopted in 1984 and revised in 1988.

The Burra Charter is now adopted as a common professional standard by most relevant Australian and State government agencies. Its influence has spread to other countries, both within and outside the Asian Pacific region.

Recommendations to the General Assembly:

- review and update of the Venice Charter to a Lausanne Charter, incorporating universal processes tested in the Burra Charter;
- encouragement of governments to use a charter for public works;
- preparation of an illustrated field guide on the Charter.

Experience and Education

The development of conservation craft skills and tertiary and post-graduate training in Australia grew considerably in the 1980s. It is now well equipped to offer a training role in the Asia/Pacific region, as shown through the UNESCO's ten year recognition of the materials conservation course in Canberra. The Australian government encourages such initiatives. Australia ICOMOS would like to conduct regional training seminars, using the experience and expertise of its members.

Joan Domicelj