



ICOMOS **ICAHM**
International Committee
on Archaeological
Heritage Management

ICAHM MEETING
LYON, 8 SEPTEMBER 2004

Present

Members

Brian Egloff (Australia, Chair)
Willem Willems (Netherlands, VP Europe)
Marko Stokin (Slovenia)
Christophe Rivet (Canada, Secretary)
David Breeze (United Kingdom)
Elin Dalen (Norway)

Associate Members

Henry Cleere (United Kingdom)
Marilyn Truscott (Australia)
Ian Lilley (Australia)
Marianna Niukkanen (Finland)
Friedrich Lüth (Germany)
Stefan Altekamp (Germany)
Christopher Young (United Kingdom)
Robert Early (United Kingdom)
Tom Wheaton (United States)
Øivind Lunde (Norway)
Mark Spanzer (Netherlands)

Observers

Elsa Bourguigon (Getty Conservation Institute, United States)
Geoff Carver (Canada)
Perrine Ournac (France)
Anna Komar (United Kingdom)

Regrets

Kevin Jones (New Zealand, VP Indo-Pacific)

Akira Ono (Japan, VP Asia and Southeast Asia)
Douglas Comer (United States, VP North America)
Nelly Robles Garcia (Mexico, VP South and Latin America)
Gamini Wijesuriya (Sri Lanka, VP South East Asia)

Information distributed

- V-P Indo-Pacific Report
- V-P Asia and Southeast Asia Report
- Secretary's Report
- Background information on the archaeo-astronomy workshop organized by UNESCO
- Background information on Bam
- Background information on Ename Charter
- Background information on Rosia Montana
- Background information on ICAHM Charter
- ICAHM 2004 annual report submitted to ICOMOS
- Working Group Agendas

1. Opening of the meeting by chair Brian Egloff.
2. Addition requested to present an update on the Ename Charter by Henry Cleere.
APPROVED.
3. Approval of the Washington D.C. minutes. APPROVED.
4. Activities Report
4.1 Chair's report

Brian Egloff begins by providing a summary of the Advisory Committee meeting in Bergen. The two-day meeting was mainly concerned with International Scientific Committee (ISC) sideline activities: first the ISCs have no real vote on the Executive committee and second ISC don't get funds from ICOMOS revenues and are expected to be self-sufficient. Gustavo Araoz, ICOMOS Vice-President for ISCs, has taken upon himself to bring ISCs into a respectable format and position them in the regular business of ICOMOS. This is partly a result of the harsh criticism ICOMOS has attracted from the UNESCO World Heritage Committee for the quality of the reports. At the present time, there are twenty-one (21) ISCs. At the end of the meeting, three areas were identified for resolution:

- 1) How should ISCs relate to one another in terms of governance?

- 2) How should ISCs related to the Executive Committee and to National Committees?
- 3) How should ISCs participate in ICOMOS work with World Heritage? It appears that ISCs should be involved in providing advice for appropriate experts and in the quality assessment of the reports.

These areas lead to a broader issue of the need to develop a coherent scientific program within ICOMOS.

4.1.A Update on Ename charter workshop, by Henry Cleere

Henry Cleere reminds the members that there are two main authors of the Charter: Jean-Louis Luxen from Belgium and Neil Silberman from the United States. The excellent meeting in Ename enabled participants to compare and contrast points of views. Cleere clarified, following questions by David Breeze, that the focus of the charter was not strictly World Heritage Sites and that like other charters have a wider doctrinal influence.

4.2 Secretary's report

MEMBERSHIP DATABASE AND NEW MEMBERS

The database is not yet operational. The first phase (data collection and fields ID) is completed. However, due to lack of resources it was impossible to complete the database within the initial timeframe. Parks Canada in August 2004 has offered to provide the support necessary to develop and maintain the ICAHM database.

Professionals from the following countries have recently joined ICAHM as members or associate members:

- Armenia, member, Felix Ter-Martirossov
- Canada, associate member, Andrew Mason
- Ecuador, member, Carlos Nunez Calderon de la Barca
- France (Nouvelle Calédonie), associate member, Christophe Sand
- Kazakhstan, member, Yuryi Peshkov
- Slovakia, member, Karol Pieta

Request for WH evaluation

The secretariat has received requests for expert advice on the “outstanding universal value” of five proposed archaeological sites or complexes for nomination on the World Heritage List. These sites include a European site from the Roman period, three sites from the Islamic period located in the Arabian Peninsula, Middle East, and Central Asia, and one complex of sites in the Near East from the Biblical period.

Review and reports coordination

This year, ICAHM members have participated in the review and the provision of advice for the Council of Europe sponsored project APPEAR, the drafting of the Ename Charter, the Heritage @ Risk report, sites proposed for World Heritage List inscription (review of nomination proposals and on-site missions), a UNESCO project on archaeo-astronomy, and projects threatening archaeological sites such as Burrup Peninsula (Australia) and Rosia Montana/Alburnus Maior (Romania).

Requests for assistance and expert advice

Requests for assistance were made by:

- ICOMOS/ Romania/ ICAHM member from Hungary: regarding the threat from mining activities on Alburnus Maior/ Rosia Montana, a Roman gold mine located in Romania;
- ICOMOS: regarding the development of an approach to conserve and protect archaeological sites following a major catastrophic event. This stems from the situation in Bam (Iran) following the earthquake that destroyed most of the earthworks. Bam has been inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2004.
- Associate member from South Africa: regarding the possibility to provide guidance on principles and modes of operation for the conservation and interpretation of sites, with particular attention on sites in an urban setting. This corresponds with the theme of the ICAHM session at the 2004 meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists.

4.3 V-Ps reports

VP INDO PACIFIC REGION (AS PROVIDED IN ADVANCE BY EMAIL)

From Kevin Jones, V-P Asia Pacific

kljones@doc.govt.nz

10 August 2004

I regret that I have not been very active in establishing contact with archaeologists in the wider region, especially in mainland Asia and South-east Asia. However, I plan to circulate a note to all national committees in the region to seek their views on archaeological matters that concern them and to see if there is any need for regular liaison.

World Heritage

With the relinquishing of the Australia state party position on the World Heritage Committee, New Zealand, in the person of Tumu Te Heuheu, has been elected to the committee. This provides a good potential opportunity to further a World

Heritage programme with Pacific peoples in the wider Pacific. The agent of the NZ state party says that Mr Te Heuheu's role will be based on:

- New Zealand's expertise in conservation management
- The special character of World Heritage in the Pacific
- New Zealand's ability to represent Pacific interests and
- The active government support for New Zealand's bid and its leadership by Tumu te Heuheu.

Australia has been a great professional leader in the World Heritage arena and this should not go unacknowledged. They have had success over the years in getting WH recognition for mixed sites with Aboriginal significance such as Katajuta-Uluru. Recently, they succeeded with nomination of a colonial period architectural nomination (the Melbourne Exhibition Building and Carlton Gardens), based in part on its significance in terms of the social history of the Victorian (and later) exhibition movement.

The WHC has established a funded programme World Heritage Pacific 2009 (US \$20 000 pa for 5 years from WHC) with the following aims:

- Training in tentative list process
- Preparation of comparative and thematic studies
- 'Begin to discuss' transboundary and serial nominations
- Existing work on Central Polynesia under a marine theme (atolls etc.)

Source WHC-03/27.COM/11

There seems to have been a busting of the dam that has prevented action on the New Zealand tentative list process, with the agent of the state party calling for suggestions in the standard tentative list format. This may enable serial site work in the wider Pacific.

In my ICOMOS role I am presenting a paper at the Easter Island Foundation conference, Renaca (Chile) Sept 2004 on 'Prospects for World Heritage Cultural Sites in the Pacific'. I would be pleased to send a hard copy of my Powerpoint to interested parties.

Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage

This convention, to which no state has signed up, came on to the UNESCO books in 2003. I believe it is a response to the failure of the proposal for a World Heritage Indigenous People's Committee (WHIPCO) at Cairns. There is publicity going about that the WH Convention is 'material' based and deals inadequately with intangible values. The new convention Article 3 specifically mentions that it should not derogate from the functions of the WH Convention. ICAHM needs to monitor the implementation of this new convention.

ICAHM administration

I would be keen for the Lyon meeting to focus on the following issues:

- A strategic approach to the basic business of ICAHM, rather than reaction to others initiatives
- Resourcing: we are a scattered group and it is very difficult to meet, a situation which is especially acute for we Australasians
- Rationalisation of ISCs: this is not unrelated to the strategic approach and to the resourcing problem. At the least we could argue that there should be no further ISCs established and take the long term view that structure and business of the ISCs needs to be rationalised, without breaking the initiative that is needed to get things happening
- Relationship with ICOMOS national committees

VP ASIA AND SOUTHEAST ASIA (AS PROVIDED IN ADVANCE BY EMAIL)

ICOMOS, ICAHM, Japan.

Akira ONO (ICAHM, V-P . and Voting member)

Masatoshi KISHIMOTO(Associate member)

1) [H@R](#) regional report: We have sent a brief report in this June to Marilyn Truscott, ICOMOS [H@R](#) Editor 2004, on a pattern or tendency of heritage at risk in recent Japan. During the past three decades, archeological heritage management system in Japan has been developed both in the excavation logistics and administrative managements. Most of all archaeological sites have been excavated in advance of development project. It is very rare of destruction without any kind of archeological excavations in present Japan. This is a positive aspect of archeological heritage management in Japan, as a basic treatment through the “ beneficiary payment principle.”

On the other hand, ironically, this positive AHM system now functions as one aspect of rationalization of site destruction or an indulgence of necessary evil, as far as they pay the excavation costs.

Great many archaeological sites were disappeared after rescue excavations, and only a few cases meet with an opportunity to be preserved as a“ historic site” designated by national or local government.

2) We had to limit the geographical area within the Japanese islands in writing above mentioned brief report. As a coordinator of East Asian region, I would like to contact with Korean, Chinese and Siberian colleagues, and make some information on this theme in next occasion in Beijin 2005.

V-P EUROPE

APPEAR (Accessibility Projects. sustainable Preservation and Enhancement of urban sub-soil Archaeological Remains): Nothing to report

Ename Charter: Refer to 4.1.A Henry Cleere’s report

Rosia Montana: The project is very contested. ICOMOS still has not taken an official position. There was an invitation by the Minister of Culture of Romania to come on a mission to assess the situation. There is no word as to whether this was accepted and who went since ICAHM was not involved. Brian Egloff adds that he has sent a letter to the President of ICOMOS indicating that ICAHM was ready to get involved.

Archaeoastronomy:

The ideas behind introducing astronomy in a WH context seemed to be threefold:

- There was a clear objective that the role of science as a theme in the WH context should be strengthened. Within UNESCO, the interrelationship between 'Science and Culture' and 'interdisciplinarity' currently are important issues;
- There is the perceived need to improve the thematic representativity of the WH List in various ways;
- Properties with astronomical aspects are considered 'very important' and introducing them would serve both purposes mentioned above.

The purpose of the meeting was to propose a thematic programme on places of astronomical significance (henceforth to be called 'Astronomy and World Heritage') to the WH Committee in June, incorporating other aspects (cooperation, partnership projects, outreach, involvement of young people and what not....) ; 2009 will be the UNESCO year of astronomy, the programme should have yielded relevant results by then.

There was no real discussion about why properties related to astronomy would somehow merit special attention, that issue was considered more or less self evident at least during most of the meeting. Nevertheless a (in my opinion quite convincing) motive came up both explicitly and implicitly: the sky is part of the human environment, in the past in even more ways than today, and it is in fact the only part of the human environment that has remained unchanged. At the end of the meeting, this was incorporated in the text of a document that was prepared at the meeting and will be sent as a proposal to the WH Committee.

The meeting started out with a discussion of general aspects. In particular, there were presentations and discussions about the world heritage list (its role and the ideas behind it) and about the concept of archaeoastronomy. Awareness was shown of the (very) sceptical attitude among archaeologists towards archaeoastronomy. Most non-archaeologists were apparently unaware of this. In any case, the presentations took away much of my personal reservations. It was quite clear that archaeoastronomy was not defined in a narrow (western, scientific) sense. Rather, it was defined in broader and contextualised ways, e.g. as 'the study of beliefs and practices concerning the sky in the past, and the uses to which people's knowledge of the skies was put'.

Of course this type of approach, while satisfactory from an archaeological point of view, to some degree undermines the idea of using astronomy under the theme of 'science' because the acknowledgement of many 'astronomies' means inclusion of wholly unscientific ones. The word 'archaeoastronomy' was abandoned and replaced by a more general 'properties that possess a connection to astronomy'. Some sensible definitions were made on what properties of astronomical significance could be in the context of the WHC. These may include such things as observatories or properties associated with major events in modern astronomy (house of Galilei and such), not only archaeological sites. They may also include natural phenomena ('significant geomorphic or physiographic features') that have celestial associations in some cultures.

It took quite a bit of discussion to make it clear to many of the participants what the context of the WHC actually meant, what the limitations are and, most important, that all had to remain within these limitations. I doubt very much if all of them really understood this, but from an ICOMOS and ICAHM point of view I have no doubt that all will remain firmly within the framework of the convention.

There were also contributions that in my opinion were totally unrelated to the subject on hand. Space applications, for example. UNESCO is involved in remote sensing by satellite, which may become very relevant indeed for monitoring programmes of WH sites (and many other aspects of UNESCO work). However, I could not understand what such things had to do with the subject on hand except that space was involved....I am not sure, but I suspect the organisers from the World Heritage Centre cannot have been entirely happy about that.

In conclusion, I got the feeling that there is a lot of pressure to realize the proposed programme and that it will go ahead in any case. At the core of that programme is a main point that seems valid and relevant to me: the incorporation of the sky as part of the environment that man has interacted with in various ways, some of them 'scientific', as a thematic aspect to be considered by States in choosing properties to be nominated for the WH List. As far as expert knowledge on the subject is concerned, it seems to me that the people from SEAC (European Society for Astronomy and Culture) and ISAAC (International Society for Archaeoastronomy and Astronomy in Culture) are competent and quite realistic academics with down to earth notions about the subject. There will certainly be no problem with ICOMOS and/or ICAHM working with them if that should become relevant in the future.

I attach the draft text that was prepared at the meeting. The final version will be made on 26 March. What is listed under activities, structure and management was prepared by the people from UNESCO.

(please refer to distributed documents for more information)

No reports provided by VPs North America, South and Latin America, and South Asia.

5. Strategic direction: discussed in conjunction with point 6
6. Funding for international liaison

At the suggestion of the VP Indo-Pacific, there were preliminary discussions about a strategic direction for ICAHM. Much was said about engaging the membership and involving ISCs more closely in World Heritage work. It was pointed out that ICOMOS has a training module to explain how World Heritage works. There was a suggestion that training and capacity building should be a concern of ICOMOS in order to ensure that more professionals be involved such as through missions where experienced professionals could be accompanied by more junior experts in order to train them in missions. Many issues need to be addressed before beginning to provide a strategic direction for ICAHM. Gustavo Araoz's initiative will tackle some important aspects. It was discussed that it could be useful to see the results of that initiative.

7. Working Groups
 - 7.1 H@R

Marilyn Truscott has received reports from Akira Ono (Japan), Zbigniew Kobylinski (Poland), Christophe Rivet and Andrew Mason, and Doug Comer (Canada/United States), and Christopher Young (United Kingdom).

The report from Japan focused on the risks of salvage archaeology, particularly the trend to totally salvage sites. The Eastern European report outlined patterns in archaeological heritage management. The North American report tackled the issue of managing archaeological resources in urban environments.

Marilyn Truscott reminds the members that the purpose of the Heritage @ Risk report is to provide a snapshot of trends and patterns of threats to heritage. Both National Committees and International Scientific Committees provide reports which may focus on specific issues or locations. It is neither a statistical analysis nor a formal monitoring tool.

These reports are presented to such organizations as UNESCO or World Monuments Fund (WMF) for a broader use. There is no formal assessment of use of the reports. One major concern that was expressed is that these reports are too frequent.

David Breeze suggested that future reports underline that there is archaeologists have an agenda and that they are the second most important threat to archaeological sites. Breeze also suggested that Peter Hinton be contacted to

establish a relationship with the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA) in the UK to address the issue of professional archaeology.

7.2 APPEAR

Nothing to report.

7.3 ICAHM Charter

Brian Egloff has written a letter to UNESCO's cultural sector to discuss the matter. Giora Solar has offered to meet with the division's deputy-director Mounir Bouchenaki and discuss the issue.

Henry Cleere stresses that the ICAHM charter was drafted by cultural resource management (CRM) archaeologists and that it was the basis for the European Malta Convention. The 1956 New Delhi recommendations probably need revising. Cleere suggests that the Charter should not be revised but rather interpreted. He also asks, where would the initiative for the revision of the New Delhi recommendations come from?

Christophe Young suggests that it be better to aim for an update of the charter rather than a Convention on the matter since UNESCO is overloaded. There is a real risk that the recommendation would be renegotiated to aim for fewer principles.

ACTION: Charter will be revised and commented. To be promulgated with funding if it does not stand in 2008.

David Breeze suggests that it might be more helpful to produce a document to guide towards existing charter unless there are major gaps.

Brian Egloff indicates that the charter is very deficient in respect to nature of archaeology as development tools, economic enhancement, and relations with community.

Willem Willems agrees with David Breeze. There is further discussion and after much debate and as suggestions from Christopher Young, Ian Lilley, Marilyn Truscott, and Elin Dalen, it was decided to proceed following a dual approach. One would focus on advertising the charter, using such channels as the World Archaeological Congress, online promulgation and leaflets. The other would engage in a review of the charter.

7.3.A Ename Charter

It was decided at Bergen to go ahead with the charter to aim for approval in X'ian. Marilyn Truscott indicated that there would be another round of consultation of NCs and ISCs.

One issue that was raised by David Breeze and Brian Egloff was that the charter assumes that interpretation has to be done instead of asking the question whether the site should be the object of interpretation in the first place.

7.4 Guidelines for the management of WH archaeological sites

Henry Cleere indicated that these guidelines were a request of the World Heritage Committee. Giora Solar was supposed to submit an application for funding to the World Heritage Committee. The total estimate for the project is US\$ 10,000.00.

David Breeze has offered £ 1,000 from Historic Scotland to initiate the project. The World Monuments Fund might be interested in participating financially. Brian Egloff will send a letter.

7.5 Development projects and archaeology

The aim of the working group is to address the issues of development to encompass international development projects such as reservoirs, dams, highways and pipelines. The World Heritage Committee and ICAHM support the World Bank guidelines on archaeology. However, the World Bank has not followed up on the project and has not hired anyone. There is a perception that they implementation of the guidelines would cost too much. The problem with this situation is that other funding agencies follow the lead set by the World Bank. There is a suggestion that Michael Petzet, president of ICOMOS, should write to the World Bank.

8. Other business

Relationship of ISCs to World Heritage.

ICAHM should be given more systematic opportunities to review nominations (assess the outstanding universal value by academics) and have experts sent on missions (expert managers).

Henry Cleere indicated that the perception that it is not always the right people that participate in these projects is inaccurate. He indicated that Regina Durighello and himself had compiled a list of over 300 experts. Most ISCs at the time were blinkered. Christophe Rivet clarified that the ICAHM secretariat has received every year requests for participation in reviews of nominations particularly to evaluate the outstanding universal value. Christopher Young added that ICOMOS, the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Centre were at odds after the last few meetings. That ICOMOS caved in to political pressure and demonstrated a weakness in the high standards of quality it should follow. Marilyn Truscott and Brian Egloff

have offered to prepare a letter to be sent to the ICOMOS executive committee on this matter and to be stressed that there are expert archaeologists available through ICAHM for projects that involve archaeology.

Rosia Montana (please refer to circulated documentation for additional background information).

There was a request from Willem Willems that the ICOMOS president's role in this business be clarified.

Bam (please refer to circulated documentation for additional background information).

There is a need to look at the procedure followed by the International Blue Shield Committee and to recommend an appropriate response protocol.

9. Next venue

The next meeting venue is the 2005 General Assembly in X'ian (China) where the theme of Monuments and sites in their setting will be addressed.

Adjournment

Approximate duration: 3 hours and 40 minutes.