

Minutes of the 2005 meeting of the ISCARSAH – 15 -16 June, Barcelona,

Present

Gorun Arun, Giorgio Croci, Milos Drdecky, Patricia Emmett, Wilfred Ferwerda, Toshikazu Hanazato, David Look, Paulo Lourenco, Giovani Manieri Elia, Androniki Militadou, Claudio Modena, Michael Pittas, Pere Roca, Maria Margarita Segarra Llagunes, Yaacov Schaffer, Wolf Schmidt, Vitor Silva, Ramiro Sofronie, Gennaro Tampone, David Yeomans.

Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Susan Balderstone, Kenichiro Hidaka, Christiane Schmuckle, Koen Van Balen, , Lyne Fontaine, Mehrdad Hejazi, Stephen Kelley, Juhani Pentinmikko.

Initially Giorgio Croci took the chair.

Discussion of the Recommendations

The Secretary had received a number of comments on the recommendations, which he had circulated to members. These principally comprised:

Comments from Gennaro Tampone

Collected comments from the Athens meeting sent in by Androniki Militadou,

The amendments by Lyne to take account of ISO

Comments from the UK working groups,

plus shorter comments from Yaacov Shaffer on the issue of maintenance and Ramiro Safronie on the use of polymer grids to reinforce masonry..

In addition Prof. Croci had made some amendments, which he tabled at the meeting. The principal issue therefore was how to deal with these.

Prof. Roca noted the difficulty of digesting material that had arrived very late and noted that some of the comments concern rather fundamental issues (although others are only editorial in nature.) Discussions centred *inter alia* on the revised document by Lyne Fontaine, the comments received from the Athens meeting as presented by Androniki Militadou and the revisions to section 4/5 of the document from Prof. Croci.

A number of detailed points were discussed with the general result that it was decided not to modify our text at this stage. The different coverage of the *Principles* and the ISO document (which are referred to within the latter) was noted. It was decided not to change the term ‘safety’ to ‘reliability’ as proposed in the LF document. Moreover a clear definition of the term reliability is required as its use can be ambiguous. We should be clear about whether or not we are in contradiction with other documents and why.

The need for the *Recommendations* to refer to other documents, especially other ICOMOS documents, was suggested in a number of comments. It is possible for the ISO be treated as another document to which we refer in this way. The question of whether such

references should be made within the text of the document or simply referred to in an appendix remained unresolved, but the importance of Lyne Fontaines's document and the fact that it provides a platform for future discussion, was recognized.

Claudio Modena pointed out the importance of discussing on the relationship between the recommendations and the ISO document, concerned that as the ISO has general international acceptance it might be insisted upon by some authorities. He believed that we have to make it clear how the *Recommendations* deal with buildings that are not covered by the ISO.

There was a long discussion of the document tabled by Giorgio Croci. His principal changes to the *Guidelines* comprised a modification of the end of section 4, the insertion of a new section 5 with the present section 5 as becoming a technical annex. The principal comments on this considered the need for a clear section dealing with the decision making process, the lack of such a section being seen as a weakness of the present text.

The secretary agreed to redraft a new section 5 before the beginning of the next day's meeting bearing in mind the various comments that he had noted.

Gorun Arun noted that at the Athens meeting there was a call for a *Glossary* and that she had undertaken to prepare this. It had previously been sent to the secretary, However, Prof. Croci decided that it was not appropriate for discussion at this meeting and it was left for future discussion.

Chairman's statement

Giorgio summarised the achievements of the committee over the 9 years since it was set up and thanked the members for their hard work. The Recommendations have been written and the Principles adopted while the document has been translated into a number of languages. They have been formally adopted by the Italian ministry of Culture and used as the basis for the Ankor document. This is in addition to the development of a working relationship between the various members of the committee and the generally useful meetings that we have had. It was suggested that a summary of the activities of the committee should be sent to ICOMOS.

Chairmanship

Prof. Pere Roca was elected (unopposed) as the new chairman of the committee and took the chair. He thanked Prof. Croci for his leadership over the past years and hoped that he would still play an active role in the work of the committee.

The chairman proposed to nominate Giorgio Croci as honorary president of the committee in recognition of his work in setting up the committee and steering it during its initial years. All those present accepted this proposal. He will examine the constitution of the committee to see whether it allows for Prof Croci to be nominated to an honorary position

The new chairman started a discussion on a set of objectives and considerations for the new triennium. These objectives are related to membership, the future of the

recommendations, future meetings, workgroups, publications and involvement in research projects.

Membership

As the committee has been in existence for three, three-year periods a number of founding members have reached the end of their terms as voting representatives of their countries. The list of members was reviewed and those who are in this state noted. In some cases countries have already nominated those who are to become the new voting members and this was also noted.

The secretary will write to national committees to obtain the names of new voting members where these are needed.

It was assumed that all former voting members who have been active will wish to remain as corresponding members and the secretary will write to those who are not present to confirm their interest in the committee.

The names of those who have been inactive were removed from the list.

Nominations for the management group were received and accepted. The new members of the board are Pere Roca (chairman), Patricia Emmitt, Paulo Lourenco, Michael Pittas, Heinrich Schroeter and David Look.

Androniki Militadou who continues as a member of the board was elected as treasurer. For a summary of the changes as they stood at the close of the meeting see the attached list.

Workshop

The chairman outlined the programme for the presentations on Friday and encouraged those who are to speak to send written texts if they are able. He intends to prepare a publication of these and also encouraged all members of the committee to prepare something on their work. This should be sent to him before December. He will circulate guidelines for the preparation of these texts.

Future of the Recommendations

The chairman noted that there is a need to continue to disseminate the *Recommendations*. It is not enough to have translated them into several languages. However he notes a problem in Spain because of the differences in interests of the professions with engineers taking little interest in conservation and architects little interest in structural issues. Clearly each country will have its own particular problems associated with dissemination of our work but we need to seize what occasions we can.

He noted that we should be prudent about making changes to the document to avoid creating confusion. However we do need to be receptive to comments – an obvious conflict. Moreover compiling and categorizing the comments is not easy and we need to find a means to manage this challenge. He suggests that we compile the comments and present these as complementary document. He proposes to prepare a compilation of comments for distribution to and discussion by the committee. In this way we can discuss

them and prepare for a change in the document. The chairman noted the very diverse character of the comments made on the *Recommendations*. Some are editorial in nature while others concern fundamental points. He suggested that we could develop the complementary document to take account of the various comments but that this should be internal to the committee, otherwise it would lessen the authority of the main document.

Although the *Recommendations* have been translated into several languages (the secretary noting that he had recently been sent Japanese and Hebrew translations) we have no translation of the *Guidelines* into French. The secretary was asked to correspond with Christiane Schmucke about this in the hope that the new French voting member will take care of this translation.

We also need to be concerned about the application of the *Recommendations*. This can be dealt with by the production of additional and complementary documents dealing with its application in particular situations. However, Gorun Arun noted a problem of funding for some of these projects.

Wolf Schmidt noted the possibility that there may be documents produced in other countries that draw on the *Recommendations* and suggested a standing item in which members could report on such publications in their country. He thought that the willingness to undertake such a task should be a requirement for being a voting member. The chairman thought that we might then publish real examples of studies and interventions on monuments where the *Recommendations* have been used which could then be used as a guide elsewhere.

Future meetings

It was agreed that we need a wider distribution of our meetings; we are becoming too Eurocentric. Steve Kelley has proposed that there should be a meeting in Chicago next year. His proposal is to hold this in association with ASCE meeting in Chicago, which would be a good means of disseminating our work to American engineers. Plans are in hand to hold the meeting in Unity Temple, Oak Park. However, an alternative was suggested, as there is to be a conference in New Delhi in November 2006 dealing with historic structures. It might be appropriate to hold our meeting in association with this. (Members were sent a notification of this conference on 30/3/05.)

It was agreed to plan for an additional meeting in Cyprus in February. We will need to know as soon as possible how many people plan to attend. Michael Pittas will notify the secretary about dates and other arrangements for this.

Maya reported that Mexico ICOMOS organises a meeting every October and suggested that this could focus on structural issues for 2007. This is a very important meeting for the whole of Latin America and we could usefully organise an ISCARSAH meeting in co-ordination with this. .

Gennaro Tampone would like us to consider the possibility of Iran as a place to meet and Prof. Croci would like us to have a meeting in Ankor. There are a number of teams working there from different countries so there is an opportunity to compare different approaches.

Working groups.

The chairman noted the present working groups and encouraged them to continue.

Yaakov Schaffer noted the work intended to be done by the Construction-technology working group and the document describing this that had been circulated.

The secretary noted the working groups formed in the UK. There are three dealing with: timber and masonry, metal and concrete structures, and safety. It would be possible for other members to be sent notes of the meetings of these groups and to correspond with them if they wished. The secretary would send notes of meetings to anyone who requested them.

Claudio Modena suggested making a connection between the product of the safety working group and the main work of the committee. Wants to work on the way we can make our document accepted by public authorities – try to match it to legal standards. This is clearly a serious problem. The chairman thought that there should be a working group to look at the relationship between ISO code and our *Recommendations*, following the paper from Lyne. He suggested that Claudio Modena be a member of the committee, which could also include issues on earthquakes. The group needs to notify the secretary on who is to be its chair.

There were some concerns about making our voice heard in other organisations. Yaakov suggested that people who are speaking at conferences should note that they are members of ISCARSAH in order to raise the profile of the committee. Claudio Modena would like us to have a representative on the Joint Committee of Structural Safety.

Outcome and publications

The proposed proceedings of the workshop together with other papers which members may submit has been noted above. The intention is to produce a publication of our activities. If we continue to have workshops then we can publish the proceedings of these and use them to introduce Committee and give a notice on its activities.

Androniki Militadou asked for people to correct the draft of the Athens conference and send corrections to her.

There was some concern that ISCARSAH does not appear among the list of scientific committees on the ICOMOS web site. The secretary was instructed to contact ICOMOS with a view to correcting this.

Involvement in scientific projects

There was a discussion of the possibilities for members of the committee to be involved in research. Clearly we form a group of people that are already in touch with each other, share common objectives, and have the possibility of collaborating in scientific and

technical projects. When there is a call for collaborative work the committee structure should provide a basis for this.

As an example Francois LeBlanc from the Getty had suggested to Wilfred Ferwerda the possibility of producing a first aid book for disaster area. What they need is something dealing with temporary support for buildings while assessment is made. Giorgio reported a similar conversation but said that it would require some money. He had heard nothing since. Wilfred Ferwerda is to follow this up.

Milos Drdecky had circulated a proposal to the European Commission. He thinks that we can include some proposals within the priorities identified for research funding. An issue that particularly concerned him was the problems for conservation that are created by European standards and directives. The problem is there is no pressure from organizations like ICOMOS for creating EU research funding in the conservation area. This should perhaps come from Petzet. Wolf Schmidt agreed to contact him about this.

The letter from Gustavo Araoz to the ISCs was discussed. The secretary reported the reaction of the UK Executive Committee to this. It was agreed to wait to see what discussions occurred at the meeting in China before taking any stance on the points made.