

ICAHM 2003 Meeting

Washington D.C., USA

24 June 2003 4:30 to 6:30P.M.

Present

Members

Brian Egloff (Australia, Chair)

Willem Willems (Netherlands, VP Europe)

Douglas Comer (United States, VP North America)

Nelly Robles Garcia (Mexico, VP Latin America)

Marko Stokin (Slovenia)

Gamini Wijesuriya (Sri Lanka, VP South East Asia)

Christophe Rivet (Canada, Secretary)

Associate Members

Tom Wheaton (United States)

Anne Giesecke (United States)

Ellen Lee (Canada)

Morag Kersel (United States)

Marni Blame Walter (United States)

Hilary du Cros (Hong Kong/Australia)

Frank McManamon (United States)

Stephen Stead (United Kingdom)

Gaetano Palumbo (United Kingdom)

Observers

Jonathan Tourtellot (National Geographic Society, United States)

Aysar Akrawi (Petra National Trust, Jordan)

Pierre Desrosiers (Ministry of Culture of Québec, Canada)

Phyllis Messenger (Hamline University, United States)

George S. Smith (Society for American Archaeology, United States)

McEdward Murimbika (South Africa)

Obare Bagodo (Benin Republic)

Lyn Leader-Elliott (Flinders University, Australia)

Gustavo Araoz (US ICOMOS)

Neil Silberman

Regrets

Marilyn Truscott (Australia)

Kevin Jones (NZ)

Irina Oberlander-Tarnoveanu (Rumania)

Susan Preston(Canada)

Claire Mousseau (Canada)

Bettina Stoll-Tucker (Germany)

Elin Dalen (Norway)

Zsolt Visy (Hungary)

Akira Ono (Japan)

David Breeze (UK)

Felix Ter-Martirosov (Armenia)

MINUTES

1. Opening of the meeting by Brian Egloff who gave a brief presentation, while waiting for members to arrive, of ICAHM, its history, its mandate and its structure (see report by the Chair, Section 5.1). Brian Egloff, in the name of ICAHM, thanks US ICOMOS for hosting the meeting in their premises. Particular thanks go to Doug Comer, the US representative for arranging the meeting.

2. Changes to the agenda: Doug Comer proposes that the discussion about the work being done on the Ename Charter be moved to the first item of the agenda to allow for Gustavo Araoz, President of US ICOMOS and VP ICOMOS International, and Neil Silberman, an active member of the Ename working group, to provide an update on the status of the Charter. Brian Egloff proposes to add a discussion item on the situation in Iraq. CARRIED

3. Ename Charter www.ename974.org : Gustavo Araoz makes a brief presentation on the Ename Charter and its relevance as a Charter. He stresses that, although it initially focussed on the interpretation and the use of new technology in interpreting archaeological sites, it now extends its scope to all historic sites. Therefore, in the process of review and consultation of the draft charters, all scientific committees will be solicited for their input. As Vice-President of ICOMOS responsible for North America, he recently sent an invitation to all presidents of scientific committees to meet at the 14th General Assembly in Zimbabwe. He believes it will be an opportunity for scientific committees to co-operate and cross-pollinate. It will also allow him to perceive the pulse of committees that have been less active in recent times.

Neil Silberman makes a more detailed presentation of the Ename project in the Flemish town of Ename in Belgium. The project is an initiative sponsored by the Institute of the Archaeological Heritage of the Flemish Community and the Province of East-Flanders. It deals with the interpretation of sites, authenticity and community involvement. John Sunderland is the consultant who developed the site's original interpretation tools that were further developed by Project Leader Dirk Callebaut and technology coordinator Daniel Pletinckx, and implemented by Ename Museum curator Marie-Claire Van der Donckt. In light of the experience gained at Ename, it appeared there was a need for guidance in using new technologies. The Ename project produced a draft in the past year that addressed four issues: 1) the scientific documentation of interpretation, 2) the general management of the interpretative infrastructure, 3) tourism and 4) education and training of interpreters.

Over the last year, in consultation with Jean-Louis Luxen and Gustavo Araoz, ICOMOS was identified as the best vehicle to promote the principles developed in the Ename document. As Gustavo Araoz stressed during the presentation, ICOMOS is the only vehicle for the universal spread of values and ideas, since the mandate of the organisation is to address issues of ethics, practice and doctrine and to define them in charters, principles and guidelines. However, it needs to be more inclusive and be relevant also in the case of monuments, structures and sites.

Gustavo Araoz explained that the draft document initially was perceived as a possible subset of the Charter on archaeological management. However, it was also quite clear that there was a need for guidance in interpretation. At the last executive meeting, it was decided that Vice President Sheridan Burke, in close co-operation with the Ename charter group, would send the proposed charter to all national committee members. It is felt that this is a charter that is the concern of all scientific committees and will hence be co-ordinated by the chairs of all scientific committees. It is the first document that crosses over the mandate of all committees and is not pushed by one committee in particular. It is hoped that a final document be presented for adoption to the 15th General Assembly to be held in Beijing in 2005.

Brian Egloff concludes the discussion by saying that the matter has been on ICAHM's agenda since the meeting in Madrid and that the committee had been pro-active by organising a working group to provide advice.

4. Election results. Christophe Rivet presents the new executive. (www.icomos.org/ica hm under "news" section). During the election process, there was discussion as to the role of co-ordinators. To clarify that role, co-ordinators were called Vice-Presidents in this election and were subject to election by the membership. ICAHM's structure and election process have never been formalised (see Madrid minutes). Akira Ono has recently expressed by e-mail to Christophe Rivet his concern that ICAHM's structure was not clear. The question was presented to the meeting attendees for discussion. There was no discussion.

Following this year's election, there are three positions still vacant: V-P South East Asia, V-P Mediterranean and V-P Sub-Saharan Africa. Akira Ono, the member of Japan and previously co-ordinator for South-East Asia presented his candidacy after the election process was completed. Since there was no other candidacy, it is proposed that Akira Ono be designated the V-P South East Asia.
CARRIED

It is also proposed that the executive identifies and names candidates for the vacant positions if necessary. CARRIED

5. V-P reports.

Willem Willems reports on his investigation of the development project in Romania (see Madrid minutes). The European Archaeological Association concluded after its investigation to support local groups against the mining project. He asks that ICAHM adopt the same position. CARRIED

Minutes of the Madrid meeting proposed for adoption by Nelly Robles. Seconded by Willem Willems. CARRIED

Nelly Robles has accepted, as V-P South America, to act as a liaison with Latin and South America.

5.1 Chair's report: Brief history

A brief history of ICAHM can be found on the ICOMOS website. ICAHM was initiated in the early 1990s with strong support from the Scandinavian nations, in particular Sweden. At that time the ICAHM

Charter was drafted as well as a set of procedural rules governing the operations of the Committee. Recently the rules were reviewed and slightly amended in part to conform with the ICONMOS Eger principles and to facilitate electronic elections. Following the initiation of the Committee, the Presidency passed to Canada and following the convening of the symposium on 'In Situ Conservation of Archaeological Sites', the Chair passed to Sri Lanka and then to Australia.

I became aware of ICAHM when I attended in 1993 the 10th General Assembly in Sri Lanka as the Australian representative to the Education Committee. My credentials were not recognised and I was encouraged by Gustaf Trotzig and Ovin Lund, two of the founders of ICAHM, to see if I could assist with bringing ICAHM back to life. They were disappointed that no ICAHM meeting had been scheduled for the General Assembly. I then became Australia's representative to ICAHM and attended the 11th General Assembly in Sofia expecting ICAHM to convene a meeting, but no meeting was scheduled. However an informal get-together indicated that there was continuing support for ICAHM. Sri Lanka did convene a regional meeting in conjunction with a landscape conference. Three years later I attended the General Assembly in Mexico City where again no formal meeting was convened but interested individuals, in particular Henry Cleere, Ellen Lee, Willem Willems and myself, managed to hold a rolling series of meetings and elected an executive consisting of myself, Brian Egloff, as President, Ellen Lee from Canada as Secretary, and Hester Davis from the United States and Willem Willems from the Netherlands as Vice Presidents.

Our priority was to develop a membership as well as hold a meeting each year either in conjunction with the ICOMS General Assembly or with an archaeological association such that there would be a geographical spread to our activities. ICAHM in its revised form has had formal 'regional' meetings in Philadelphia, Lisbon and Alice Springs and then at the General Assembly in Madrid.

ICAHM in 2003

Our recent history has given us an organization where the executive comes from various geographical regions, a reasonable membership spread throughout member nations, various Honorary and Associate members who are there because they assist with ICAHM business. Through the services of Tom Wheaton and Canada ICOMS, we are able to maintain an ICOMOS dependent web site for ICAHM and keep it reasonably up-to-date. Once we had developed a representative membership, we sought a direction, or directions, that would give the Committee a purpose. At the Madrid meeting, it was decided to focus ICAHM activities through the following working groups that more or less represented the key concerns of the membership:

- (a) ICAHM Charter Review (headed by Gustaf Trotzig and Brian Egloff)
- (b) Ename Charter Review (headed by Willem Willems, Dirk Callebaut (newly appointed ICAHM member from Belgium, and Regina Binder/Doug Comer)
- (c) Heritage at Risk (headed by Marilyn Truscott)

(d) Heritage and Development (having discussions on the title and focus of this group) (headed by Tom Wheaton)

(e) Responses to Pleas for support for Endangered Heritage (headed by Zsolt Visy and perhaps Willem Willems and perhaps David Breeze/Tom Hassall)

The first truly representative elections were held during the first quarter of 2003 with considerable effort on the part of the Secretary Christophe Rivet, who had replaced Ellen Lee.

It became more than apparent at the General Assembly in Madrid, particularly when the Scientific Committee meetings were scheduled at the same time as papers were being presented, that although ICOMOS endorsed scientific committees, the committees were seldom involved with ICOMOS core business and in fact in some instances seemed to be by-passed. Of concern to ICAHM was that this was the case with respect to World Heritage activities. Strong recommendations were made to the Executive, and ratified, that the Scientific Committees must be central to ICOMOS operations and that at a General Assembly the Scientific Committees must be given a central role. I would like to report that this recommendation has indeed been acted upon, however I can assure you that at no time was ICAHM involved in developing the ICOMOS response/position to the heritage concerns raised by the Coalition invasion of Iraq.

I believe that we have an inclusive and active scientific committee that has the following:

1. An elected executive;
2. A representative endorsed membership
3. Sufficient Honorary and Associated members;
4. A track record of annual regional meetings;
5. Has provided annual reports to ICOMOS;
6. Has an up-to-date web site; and,
7. Has specific tasks or purposes that reflect the concerns of the membership

Future

I would like to anticipate a later agenda item by stressing the need for us to bring together our shared interests in a key topic, perhaps in development, risk and the conservation of archaeological resources, and convene an ICAHM specific symposium within say the next two years.

5.2 Membership report. Christophe Rivet. There are 22 voting members of which 12 are from Europe. One third of all associate members are from the United States. There is a need for better international representation. The present organisational structure with regional VPs should help to recruit members from other areas.

Willem Willems notes that many European countries still lack proper representation, particularly in Eastern Europe.

Brian Egloff suggests that perhaps they could be made associate members if they cannot get endorsement of their national committees. It is a priority to allow as many to have access to our work. Action: take concerted effort to address this issue.

Tom Wheaton notes that in many countries, national committees of ICOMOS do not allow access to the committee to non-conservation architects. Doug Comer proposes that ICAHM take on an awareness campaign. Gamini Wijesuriya suggests that changes should be made to the statutes.

6. Working Group Activities Report.

6.1 Willem Willems reports on the APPEAR project. Notes that the

schedule is enforced by the European Union timetable. Initially, the project had begun with English being the working language but now it has switched to French. This creates a problem to understand and circulate documents for comments. The APPEAR working group has produced an introductory list and a study of approaches to urban site management in Europe. The guidelines will be useful to provide guidance to manage archaeological sites in an urban context. APPEAR background information and recent information will be distributed to the membership. Willem Willems reminds the meeting attendants that ICOMOS has been asked to participate because of its international scope and also to organise an international conference at the end of the project.

Ellen Lee generously offered that Parks Canada provide translation for short documents.

6.2 Doug Comer reports on the Ename Charter working group. He stresses the relevance that the charter will have for archaeologists and the reality they have to deal with. Consequently, ICAHM should pursue with vigour its participation in the drafting of the proposed charter and make sure that the special needs of archaeologists be acknowledged. ACTION: Brian Egloff will communicate directly with Sheridan Burke to see that ICAHM be particularly involved.

Frank McManamon supports the purpose and sentiment of the draft Ename Charter and agrees with Comer that ICAHM should pursue vigorously the review and any revision of the draft to ensure that archaeological resources continue to be a major focus of the charter. The draft charter is not limited to concerns with the interpretation and presentation of archaeological resources, nor should it be. To limit it in this way would only marginalize concerns about archaeological resources. Yet, archaeologists have an important role to play in the review and adoption of the charter by ICOMOS. Archaeological resources are often, even usually, difficult to interpret to the public. Special attention and guidance on how to do so effectively, the purpose of the draft Ename Charter, will be of great assistance and use throughout the world.

6.3 Report on charter reviews by Brian Egloff. Gustav Trotzig has agreed to be part of the ICAHM charter review. UNESCO is supportive of an update on the 1956 recommendations. There is no update on the UK Historic Environment document.

6.4 Report on the development projects and archaeology working group by Tom Wheaton.

Tom Wheaton stated that the most important thing affecting how AHM is conducted in much of the world is the money and loan requirements of the international development banks. The banks have the money for large, land disturbing projects in the third world, much more than UN and other strictly foreign aid programs and NGOs. The bank is also becoming increasingly aware that projects need to be "sustainable", "environmentally sound", etc. and that in order to be sustainable they need the support and understanding of the local "public". To obtain public support and insure sustainability, projects need to involve the public in the planning stages, and the projects need to take the local cultures, past and present, into consideration. Without this, projects will not be supported by the public and eventually will fail, and/or the effects upon the targeted public will have long-term deleterious results that will cause projects to ultimately fail or cause other problems greater than the one being addressed in the original project.

Archaeology is one aspect of the local culture that needs to be taken into account for the ultimate benefit of the public and thus the project's sustainability.

The World Bank is developing Operational Policy 4.11 and Bank Procedure 4.11 addressing the need to conduct archaeology early in the project planning process any time there is ground disturbing activity.

Currently, doing archaeology is left up to the project managers to determine if there is a potential for archaeological remains, and whether the project will impact them. Unfortunately, these managers are bankers, biologists, engineers, etc. who do not have a clue about archaeological potential or impacts to archaeological resources; and thus they usually figure there are no archaeological remains or impacts.

An OP is the final word in the Bank, and cannot be ignored, at least not in the adherence to the letter of the OP (what actually happens in addition to following the exact wording is often something else). There is resistance to OP 4.11 on the bank's board of directors, including probably the US. These people see this as throwing money away, much like many of them see all the environmental requirements. The result is that, even though the OP has been reviewed and corrected, and has the support of the staff, etc., there is some question on whether it will actually be accepted as bank policy.

Tom Wheaton therefore asked the meeting to support a resolution to encourage the Bank to approve OP 4.11 by sending a letter to the President of the Bank.

This was passed unanimously.

Subsequently, Tom Wheaton prepared a resolution along with Don Jones and Gerry Wait (not ICAHM members, yet) for the World Archaeological Congress (WAC) which was meeting in DC at the same time to send to the bank. This was approved by the WAC and board. A copy is attached.

It is hoped that the Development and Archaeology Work Group will get organized this year and come up with a set of goals and a plan to achieve those goals dealing with economic development, the multilateral lending institutions, and how archaeological heritage management can be incorporated into multilateral development projects worldwide. Rather than a focus on the more traditional granting

agencies and working through poorly funded and little recognized NGO's, our efforts should be directed toward incorporating AHM into the pre-loan project documents required by the World Bank, the African Development Bank, the Latin American Development Bank and other lending institutions.

Resolution presented to WAC5 Business Plenary, June 26, 2003

To Support the World Bank's Efforts to Integrate Heritage Resource Management into Sustainable Development

Cultural heritage sites worldwide are threatened as never before in world history. Environmental change, rapid urbanization, economic pressures, population growth, war, social upheaval, rampant poverty, and other factors combine to place at risk the priceless and irreplaceable sites that represent, collectively, the human heritage on the earth.

There is a global crisis confronting efforts to preserve the world's rich cultural heritage. Unless actions are taken now, too much of this cultural heritage will be lost forever. We call on the world community of scientists, governments, development and funding agencies to take action to better preserve, protect and responsibly manage these cultural heritage sites.

Accordingly, we urge that the World Bank and the IMF adopt Operational Policy 4.11 and Bank Procedure 4.11 for all funding of development efforts worldwide. Although many more efforts are needed for preserving the world's cultural heritage, this proposal will make a significant, positive contribution toward addressing the global cultural heritage crisis.

To be addressed to: Honorable James D. Wolfensohn

President

World Bank

Ian Johnson

Vice President for Sustainable Development

World Bank

6.5 Heritage @ Risk report by Marilyn Truscott.(details sent after the meeting in Washington)

Past ICAHM Reports:

As ICAHM members will know, there have been three Heritage @ Risk (H@R) reports to date - 2000 (Editor Marilyn Truscott), 2001, 2003 (editor Australian archaeologist and ICOMOS member, Jane Harrington). Only 2001 had an extensive report on Archaeological Heritage at Risk based on an analysis of 2000 national committee reports referring to archaeological risks. This report is also online on the ICAHM website.

ICOMOS International is committed to annual Heritage at Risk reports. This is potentially a problem if ICAHM does not establish a strategy to identify / monitor risks to archaeological heritage and define what it will report on regularly - for example, it may be appropriate to select a region or a theme / issue each year, to report on, rather than sending out annual repeated messages, that may not change much and therefore lack emphasis. The value of the H@R reports is that they are now being referred to by international heritage conservation / funding bodies (eg UNESCO; World Bank; World Monuments Fund).

Present ICAHM activities:

An ICAHM H@R sub-committee is being formed. I sent out a call for regional members of an ICAHM group only on 5 June (my report will have been seen by all ICAHM members), and have had the following responses:

East Asia - Professor Dr Akira Ono, Japan, has offered and been accepted to be active for this region and will be contacting China ICOMOS and Korea ICOMOS - he will also follow up Siberia and the Russian Far East and forward a report in December 2003.

Eastern Europe - Zbigniew Kobylinski, Poland, has offered and been accepted to be active for this region, that includes Central and Eastern Europe.

Western Europe - Christopher Young, UK suggested that ICAHM approach the European Association of Archaeologists regarding working on regular H@R reports together. I like this idea, preferring such links and synergies, and seek ICAHM's view on this idea before pursuing it further, eg a letter from the President of ICAM to President of EAA.

Northern America - Christophe Rivet and Ellen Lee, Canada, have indicated that they would be willing to assist, at least for Canada - indicating that they preferred not to make an annual report.

Other representatives are called for: Latin America, South America, South Asia, Middle East, Africa (North West South?), etc - if the ICAHM regional meeting in Washington can gain some more representatives I would be very pleased.

With a greater regional representation, I would then like to start a discussion regarding what risks are out there and what we want to say - some are already clear - and if ICAHM agrees on priorities we can target these in our reporting.

The Future Task:

In my 5 June message received by all members, I raised the issue of what ICAHM might usefully report on in H@R to highlight concerns about archaeological heritage, its risks and threats and also to broadcast case-studies with successful solutions. I also indicated that a conference and an ensuing publication could be allocated to specific risks to archaeological heritage. I would welcome feedback from the ICAHM meeting at WAC on the above points and also the following possible themes:

- looting of archaeological heritage (eg of sites in Iraq but everywhere...)
- development and archaeological heritage (what are the trends...)
- whose heritage is it anyway - experts and communities...

Anne Giesecke suggests that there be discussions with ICUCH (International Committee on Underwater Cultural Heritage) to draft a list of potential underwater world heritage sites and identify those in danger.

Ellen Lee stressed the need to co-ordinate national committee and scientific reports to ensure there is no duplication or contradictions.

Gaetano Palumbo notes that national committees are in a better position to define issues with heritage. ISCs are able to have a global perspective and there is indeed a need to co-ordinate. The World Monuments Fund produces a list of 100 most endangered sites every year. He suggests we use the list as a foundation for ICAHM reports and focus on specific sites, features or problems in a given region. The next list will be presented in September.

Tom Wheaton notes that there is usually an emphasis on the salvage aspect of the work. The World Bank is issuing regulations addressing the integration of archaeology in the impact assessment process. Prior to these coming regulations, bank managers, project managers, engineers, and environmentalists would determine potential and impact on archaeology. Tom Wheaton will present a resolution to the WAC 5 general assembly in support of the World Bank regulations. ACTION: Requests that ICAHM also supports a resolution. CARRIED

ACTION: Write a letter to the World Bank to push forward the adoption and implementation of the regulations and give it a priority.

7. Response to appeals. The protocol to respond to appeals for ICAHM's support to protect 'endangered archaeological heritage' is through its vice-presidents and their consideration of the validity of each case.

8. Issue of internships. Request by Mr. Lukacs to do an internship with ICAHM . Tom Wheaton suggests that requests be transferred to US ICOMOS through their internship programme.

9. ICAHM and Iraq. Doug Comer suggests that ICAHM be ready to provide contacts for expertise in case of need. Brian Egloff stresses that ICAHM should be involved in any ICOMOS response with regards to Iraq. . Brian sent letters to Michael Petzet, President ICOMOS, Gustavo Aroz and Sheridan Burke, both vice presidents of ICOMS expressing his willingness for ICAHM to be an integral part to ICOMOS's response to the heritage destruction in Iraq. He received no reply of substance.

10. Forthcoming activities. Brian Egloff indicates that there are no specific conferences that have been identified for the ICAHM 2004 meeting.

Willem Willems suggests that ICAHM meet at the European Archaeological Association meeting in Lyon.

Doug Comer suggests Jordan as the venue for the next meeting. This was considered to be feasible by Aysar Akrawi of the Petra National Trust, Jordan.

Marko Stokin suggests that ICAHM meet in Slovenia.

Tom Wheaton indicates that the ICOMOS legal committee has had separate meetings that were highly successful. They were able to attract many more attendants and get financial support from foundations to support members from developing countries to attend.

This brings forth the topic of organising an international symposium on an issue of particular concern to the professional community. The last ICAHM symposium was organised in Montreal, Canada, in 1994.

Brian Egloff indicates that there will be no specific ICAHM meeting at the 14th General Assembly in Zimbabwe this year.

ACTION Identify a suitable format and location for the next ICAHM meeting in 2004.

End of the meeting.

Duration 2 hours and 4 minutes.

Christophe Rivet

ICAHM