

Résultats de la 3^{ième} consultation sur la modification des Statuts de l'ICOMOS
7 octobre 2013 – 31 janvier 2014
Contributions reçues au 31 janvier 2014, dans la (les) langue(s) d'origine

Results of the 3rd consultation on the amendment of the ICOMOS Statutes
October 2013 – 31 January 2014
Contributions received by 31 January 2014, as received

The Merged Working Group on Statutes warmly thanks all who participated in the 3rd consultation: by the deadline of 31 January, 2014 the International Secretariat received contributions from:

21 National Committees, and 3 International Scientific Committees

It also received:

10 contributions from individual members on general issues,
1 contribution from the International Secretariat on general issues.

The use of languages and of Spanish in particular triggered a lot of responses:

27 contributions from 30 members,
13 contributions from non ICOMOS members,
2 petitions signed by members and non-members.

Many persons chose to sign the two petitions, or sign a petition in addition to sending a contribution.

Only two National Committees submitted comments on the review of the 'Ethical Commitment Statement', probably due to the circulation problem of the documents. The deadline for contributions on this subject has been extended until 26 February 2014.

This compilation presents the contributions in the language(s) in which they were received. For the benefit of the Statutes Working Group, all contributions submitted in French have already been translated into English and the translations are included here as well.

The International Secretariat received a number of contributions a few days after the deadline:

1 contribution from ICOMOS Norway
1 contribution from CIVVIH

some extra contributions on the languages.

The first two provide comments on general topics and have already been included in this compilation for consideration by the Merged Working Group, if they agree that this is appropriate; a compilation of the remaining contributions will be made by the International Secretariat asap. Formatting problems will be fixed later.

Bénédicte Selfslagh
Co-chair of the Working group

Table des matières - Aperçu
Table of content - Overview

Comités nationaux / National Committees

Argentina (Cfr Petition 1)	7
Australia	8
Belgique	11
Principes éthiques: propositions de rédaction	17
Statuts: propositions de rédaction	19
Brazil	22
Canada	23
China	27
Colombia (Cfr Petition 2)	28
Costa Rica	31
Cuba	33
Finland	34
France	36
Principes éthiques	40
Principes éthiques: propositions de rédaction	43
Hungary	58
Ireland	59
Mexico	65
(Cfr contribution Mr Gustavo Araoz, Mr Alfredo Conti, Mme Olga Orive, Mr Daniel Young)	
Nicaragua (Cfr Petition 2)	68
Norway	69
Romania	72
Spain (cfr Petition 2)	73
Sweden, supported by Estonia	74
Uruguay	80
Venezuela	81

Comités internationaux scientifiques / International Scientific Committees

Historic Towns and Villages	85
Legal, Administrative & Financial Issues	86
Vernacular Architecture	88

Membres individuels – plusieurs thèmes
Individual Members – several themes

Mr Dinu Bumbaru, Canada	93
Ms Angela Rojas, Cuba	97
Mr Emad Khalil, Egypt	98
Mr Grellan Rourke, Ireland	99
Mr Toshiyuki Kono, Japan	101
Mr Jad Tabet, Liban	102
Mr Roland Silva, Sri Lanka	104
Mr John Hurd, UK	109
Mr Smriti Pant, UK	111
Ms Darwina L. Neal, USA	112
Mr Bernd Paulovitz & Romain Prado, International Secretariat	118

Membres individuels – sur l'utilisation des langues uniquement
Individual Members – on languages only

Mr Gustavo Araoz - Mr Alfredo Conti - Ms Olga Olrive - Mr Daniel Young, Americas (Cfr text NC Mexico) Ms Margarita Ruiz, Cuba Ms Elisa Serrano Gonzalez, Cuba	121
Ms Monica Luengo, Spain Mme Mabel Contin, Argentine Ms Margrethe Floryan, Denmark Mme Renata Lodari, Italie Ms Margarita Montanez, Uruguay (2 contributions) Mr Fernando Britos di Clemente, Uruguay	124

Dans l'ordre alphabétique des Comités nationaux
In the alphabetical order of National Committees

Mr Manuel Vila, Argentina Mr Juan Pedro Dillon, Argentina	128
Ms Betina Adams, Brazil (Cfr text Petition Nr 1)	129
Mr Orestes Mr del Castillo del Prado, Cuba Ms Nidia Cabrera Huerta, Cuba Mr Daniel Taboada Espiniella, Cuba	130
Mr Athanasios Nakasis, Greece	131
Ms Maria de Guadalupe Zepeda Martinez, Mexique Mr Francisco Lopez Morales, Mexique	132
Ms Celia Martines Yanez, Spain Mr Jorge Benavides Solis, Spain Mr Miguel Angel Odriozola Guillot, Uruguay Ms Ana Luengo, Spain Mr Cristobal Garcia Garcia, Spain Mr Luis Mansilla Plaza, Spain Mr Guillermo Laine San Roman, Spain Mr José Duneas Molinas, Spain Ms Hal Moggridge, United Kingdom	133

Contributions individuelles de non-membres : professeurs d'espagnol et autres
Individual contributions from non-members: language teachers and others

Mr Angel Losa Ubeda	140
Mr Miguel Angel Troitiño Vinuesa, Spain	
Ms Juana Velasco	
Mr Octavio Puche i Riart, Espagne	
Mr Francisco Miguel Bravo Bastida	
Mr Luis José García Pulido	
Mr Inaki Garcia Pascual, Spain	
Mr Guillermo Melendez Hevia, Spain	
Mr Xavier Aurell	
Mr Xavier Adot Fernández	
Ms Josefa Morón Manzano	
Mr Virginio Mantesso, Brésil	
Mr Victor Marin Crespo, UNESCO La Havanna, Cuba	

Pétitions / Petitions

Petition Nr 1 – same text as NC Argentina	145
61 members from 8 National Committees (including 42 members of ICOMOS Spain), 2 non-ICOMOS members	
Petition Nr 2 – same text as NC Colombia, Nicaragua and Spain	147
58 members from 14 National Committees (including 30 members of ICOMOS Spain) ISC Cultural Routes 5 non-ICOMOS members	

Many members signed both petitions, or signed a petition in addition to their individual contribution.
As a result the numbers of the signatories cannot be added

Comités nationaux
National Committees

ICOMOS Argentina

Contribution sent in Spanish and English by Mr Ruben Eduardo Vera, President, 2014-01-30

Note: this is the text of Petition Nr 1

Spanish

Sobre la revisión en curso de los Estatutos de ICOMOS.

No estamos de acuerdo con la propuesta de suprimir las lenguas oficiales existentes de ICOMOS.

Por favor, téngase también en cuenta que, sin ánimo de hacer comparaciones desagradables, el español es de hecho la segunda lengua en expansión, que hay un elevado número de Comités Nacionales de ICOMOS cuya lengua oficial común es el español y que el patrimonio cultural de sus correspondientes países es verdaderamente sobresaliente a escala mundial.

English

On the ICOMOS Statutes undergoing revision.

We do not agree with the proposal of suppressing the existing official languages of ICOMOS.

Please, take also into account that, even trying to avoid any unpleasant comparison, nowadays Spanish is in fact the second language in expansion, there are a large number of ICOMOS National Committees whose official common language is Spanish and that cultural heritage of the corresponding countries is really outstanding in world terms.

Australia ICOMOS

Contribution sent in English by Ms Elizabeth Vines, President, 2014-01-31

Australia ICOMOS (AI) outlines the following comments re the proposed Revised Statutes

Background

ICOMOS has launched a process to amend its Statutes and two consultations have already taken place. Out of the 6 objectives for amending the Statutes, 5 have been achieved already: ensuring conformity with laws and regulations, clarification of governance, a better structured text, correction of contradictions, and elimination of disparities between the English and French version.

The evolution of the National Committees now requires assessment of their operations with the following issues requiring consideration:

- Maintaining a good functioning National Committee has become too heavy a burden in some regions: the association should not depend on National Committees only;
- There are great disparities in the numbers of members in the National Committees – even between countries that are otherwise comparable – and the total number of members in all countries is far lower than ICOMOS could reasonably expect;
- As a result of the uneven distribution of membership numbers in the National Committees, the current system for the allocation of the votes does not represent an equitable balance any more between the principles of ‘1 member - 1 vote’ and ‘1 Committee - 1 vote’ but creates problems of representation and quorum;
- The membership dues collected by the National Committees are transferred to the International Secretariat with so much delay that the financial stability of the association is at risk.
- There are also several provisions in the Statutes that do not work well any more, that complicate the functioning of the statutory bodies, or that might put the good reputation of ICOMOS at risk. For example, there is overlapping in the description of the responsibilities of the statutory bodies and office bearers. In addition the Statutes contain some contradictions and there are disparities between the English and French versions.

Specific Comments on draft proposals

Membership categories:

Young members are proposed as a special category. This is supported as there is a need to encourage the younger generation of ICOMOS members.

The Affiliate member category is proposed to cover those who are interested in conservation but not professionally active in conservation. This is appropriate.

The Honorary membership category is now proposed for non-ICOMOS members only. AI considers that another new category (eg Life Member) should be added so that there is a statutory provision for honouring outstanding ICOMOS members.

Statutory bodies

The Scientific Council resolved at the recent AdCom that it should be recognised as a statutory body in the Statutes. While AI supports this proposal in principle, the statutory role of the Scientific Council needs to be defined, presumably in line with the Eger-Xian Principles.

General Assemblies

AI supports the proposal for an annual General Assembly to approve the annual accounts. The most practical way for this to occur will be to hold the GA in conjunction with AdCom.

Electoral systems proposed for Executive Committee

The issue of long term survival and dynamism of ICOMOS was frequently discussed at the October ADCOM held in Costa Rica. It is acknowledged that many EXCOM, ADCOM and Scientific Council members are older, and there is a challenge to attract younger and mid career members to become involved internationally and take on leadership roles.

Current ICOMOS statutes allow for 3 x 3 year terms for Executive members, then admission to the EXCOM via other roles, so that there is potential for people to remain on the ExCom for more than the maximum 9 years envisaged by the Statutes. Certainly the wisdom and confidence of older members is extremely useful. It is also acknowledged that many mid career professionals do not have the time or resources to contribute internationally, and that early career professionals might not have the experience. AI acknowledges with gratitude the long service and dedication of past and present Executive Committee members, but respectfully suggests that shorter maximum terms of office may result in facilitating wider membership leadership development and participation.

In Australia, the 3x2 year terms for EC members and maximum term of 3 years for the president has resulted in a dynamic and ever changing ICOMOS family and committee structure.

AI therefore recommends a combination of the electoral systems proposed ie two 3-year terms, with half the members retiring at each election. This would mean that the some of the first Executive members elected under the new system would only serve for three years – however this could apply to those have already served on the previous Executive. The issue would be removed thereafter.

Another way of increasing opportunities for leadership would be to include a provision that ex officio members of the ExCom by virtue of their positions on other statutory bodies, eg AdCom and SC, should have their ex officio terms included in the maximum term of office on the ExCom. AI also understands that there is a proposal to hold General Assemblies every four years instead of every three as now, as it has become increasingly difficult for National Committees to undertake to host them. If the election of the Executive remains tied to the General Assembly, this would extend terms of office from three to four years. For the reasons given above, AI is reluctant to support such a proposal; although if the four year term is adopted, AI would again recommend a maximum of two consecutive terms. An alternative that could be considered is to separate elections from the GAs and have electronic voting as many organisations (eg RIBA) now do. The advantages of electronic voting are that more of the general membership (those who cannot attend the GA) can find out about the candidates – but only through written manifestos rather than personal contact. Electronic voting would likely be cheaper than the present system, and would free up about half a day of the GA program.

Election of Board and President –Currently ICOMOS International elects the office bearers as well as the Executive members. The ICOMOS system makes the elections longer and more complicated because those who do not get elected to the Bureau can stand again for ExCom. A possible alternative might be the general election of the Board and the President, then election of other Bureau members by the Board. This would also make it easier for office bearers to be replaced if they become unable to continue to serve. Note that AI elects all its office bearers from within the Executive Committee and this is considered to work well – however, election of the President internationally by all members is supported.

Voting rights

Should affiliate members (ie interested but not professionally active in cultural heritage) have a vote? The previous category of sustaining members did not. This needs to be further debated, and determined if it is absolutely necessary under French law. Allowing voting rights to affiliates may discourage younger member involvement. For the same reason, the question of affiliate members being eligible for election to the Board also needs further discussion.

AI supports the sliding scale system of votes (System 2).

Regional Committees – AI welcomes the recognition of regional committees (ie. Pasifika) as outlined in Recommendation Nr 16 – Regional Groups – which states that “Based on ICOMOS’ longstanding tradition, the working group recommends to use the existing regional groups (or continents) to check that there is minimal representation of all regions in the activities”. For the same reason, AI also welcomes the statutory recognition of trans-National groups. After more than more than ten years of active involvement from Australia ICOMOS the Pacific Islanders can now take an equal role in the future of ICOMOS (as well as other regions with sparse levels of professional positions).

Comment on Suggestions for Running of ADCOM meetings – Appointment of the minute secretary before the meeting is suggested. This would greatly assist the minute Secretary – who could set up the minutes in advance. The provision of written summaries of items to be presented should be provided a minimum of 2 weeks prior to the meeting and presentation of items at ADCOM meetings without written pre circulated documentation should not be allowed except in genuine emergency/ late business situations. This is so that item reports can be effectively shared amongst the broader ICOMOS international community. These suggested changes could be incorporated into the Rules of Procedure.

ICOMOS Belgique

Contribution envoyée en français par Mme Miek Goossens, Présidente, 2011-01-31

English translation follows

- 1 Les documents soumis à la 3^{ième} consultation des membres sont clairs et précis ; les défis pour ICOMOS sont bien présentés et les propositions soumises y apportent des réponses logiques et appropriées. La qualité des documents a facilité la discussion au sein de ICOMOS Belgique qui adresse ses félicitations et remerciements au groupe de travail.

Sur le fond

- 2 ICOMOS Belgique réitère la position formulée suite à la deuxième consultation, notamment pour ce qui concerne la gouvernance, les élections, la composition du Conseil d'administration et la cooptation (voir compilation des contributions à la deuxième consultation). Les textes soumis à la troisième consultation ont beaucoup évolué et par conséquent ICOMOS Belgique n'a que quelques observations supplémentaires à formuler.

- 3 ICOMOS Belgique apprécie les efforts de clarification faits pour les 'Principes éthiques'. Toutefois, le texte qu'il convient de soumettre à l'approbation de l'Assemblée générale de 2014 doit:

- Etre limité à l'essentiel et être plus court (max. 1 page) ;
- Se concentrer sur l'engagement des membres : proposition de rédaction « les membres de l'ICOMOS s'engagent à » « ICOMOS members undertake to » ;
- Etre complémentaire aux Statuts : les dispositions sur les sanctions éventuelles doivent figurer dans les Statuts ;
- Etre facile à comprendre et à assimiler par les membres, et donc à traduire ;
- Porter un titre facilement reconnaissable qui reflète la nature du texte.

Une proposition de rédaction révisée du texte est jointe ainsi qu'une proposition de modification de l'article 7 (Sanctions) des Statuts dont l'intitulé devient 'Sanctions et perte de la qualité de membre'.

Après une discussion de l'usage, de la perception et des difficultés de traduction en français et en anglais des différents termes 'Code de déontologie' et 'Code d'éthique', ICOMOS Belgique s'exprime en faveur de 'Code d'éthique', un code de déontologie étant le plus souvent lié à l'exercice d'une profession (réglementée).

- 4 ICOMOS Belgique est d'avis que la durée totale d'appartenance au Conseil d'administration doit être réduit plutôt qu'allongé, et s'exprime en faveur du maintien du rythme actuel des grandes assemblées (tous les 3 ans).

Concernant les questions principales

- 5 Catégories de membres
ICOMOS Belgique approuve l'inclusion d'une catégorie de 'jeunes membres' et de 'membres affiliés' pour des personnes engagées ou intéressées par la conservation du patrimoine culturel.

ICOMOS Belgique note que techniquement ces deux catégories ne sont pas nécessaires : l'ICOMOS pourrait se limiter à trois catégories de membres à savoir les membres individuels, les membres institutionnels et les membres d'honneur. L'inclusion des catégories de 'jeunes membres' et de 'membres affiliés' reflète néanmoins la volonté d'ouverture de l'ICOMOS, ce qui est essentiel pour le développement de l'association.

- 6 Diversité culturelle et multilinguisme
ICOMOS Belgique s'interroge si l'article 21 ne doit pas mieux clarifier la différence entre :
 - 'les langues de diffusion' – utilisées pour la traduction et la diffusion de contenus professionnels dont les textes doctrinaux,

- 'les langues de travail' – utilisées lors des réunions statutaires et pour la communication avec les membres, et
- 'les langues officielles' - dans lesquelles doivent être traduits tous les textes officiels tels que Statuts, Règlement intérieur etc. ICOMOS Belgique observe que la phrase de l'actuel préambule qui porte sur la version des Statuts qui fait foi, doit être transférée vers l'article 21.

L'ICOMOS n'a pas les ressources financières pour faire traduire tous les textes officiels (Statuts, Règlements etc.) dans deux de ses quatre langues officielles actuelles, ni pour adopter une troisième langue de travail ; même si des ressources supplémentaires devaient être disponibles à l'avenir, il conviendrait d'accorder la priorité à la traduction et la diffusion de contenus professionnels dans les 'langues de travail supplémentaires' ou 'langues de diffusion'.

ICOMOS Belgique appuie par conséquent les propositions du groupe de travail en particulier :

- l'adoption d'une politique sur la diversité culturelle qui devrait aussi permettre d'utiliser le plein potentiel des outils existants de l'ICOMOS (ex. groupes de traduction et thesaurus) et la diffusion des textes doctrinaux dans plus de langues;
- la possibilité d'adopter des 'langues de travail supplémentaires' lors des réunions ;
- la possibilité d'adopter des 'langues de diffusion' ou 'langues de travail temporaires' ;
- la mise en conformité des Statuts avec la réalité.

Ces mesures devraient donner lieu à l'utilisation de plus de langues que ce n'est le cas aujourd'hui tout en offrant la flexibilité nécessaire si les besoins et les ressources disponibles devaient augmenter.

7 Durée et nombre maximal des mandats des administrateurs

ICOMOS Belgique est favorable à l'option A, un mandat de 6 ans, non renouvelable immédiatement, avec l'élection de 10 nouveaux membres tous les 3 ans : ainsi l'intention de continuité et de rotation prévue dans les statuts depuis 1965 sera réellement appliquée. ICOMOS Belgique est d'avis qu'il faut accroître la rotation en réduisant la durée maximale consécutive à 6 ans.

Quelles sont les mesures transitoires pour mettre en place le nouveau système? Il serait souhaitable de l'expliquer. Le mécanisme suivant pourrait être envisagé :

- Les administrateurs qui ont été élus en 2008 et/ou 2011 et seront réélus en 2014 auront eu 2 ou 3 mandats successifs de trois ans et ne pourront être réélus en 2017;
- Les administrateurs qui seront élus en 2014 pour un premier mandat de 3 ans pourront être élus en 2017 et leur mandat prendra fin en 2020 ;
- Les nouveaux administrateurs élus en 2017 seront élus pour un mandat de 6 ans ;
- S'il y a plus de 10 nouveaux administrateurs élus en 2017, l'on tirera au sort celui/ceux dont le mandat se terminera après 3 ans : 10 administrateurs nouveaux auront un mandat unique de 6 ans, les autres (tirés au sort) auront un mandat de 3 ans afin de mettre en route le renouvellement des administrateurs par moitié.

8 Election des membres du Bureau

ICOMOS Belgique est favorable à l'option 1 – l'élection des membres du Bureau par le Conseil d'administration parmi ses membres. En effet, le Conseil d'administration est mieux placé que l'Assemblée générale pour juger qui parmi ses membres est suffisamment disponible et a les qualités nécessaires pour remplir des responsabilités additionnelles.

De plus, si une fonction devient vacante, le Conseil d'administration peut remplir la fonction sans avoir à attendre la prochaine Assemblée générale. Des mandats d'un an offrent plus de flexibilité ; les membres sont obligés de montrer des résultats à leurs pairs.

9 Attribution des voix

ICOMOS Belgique souhaite que l'attribution des voix tienne compte du nombre de membres dans chaque Comité national en termes absolus et en termes relatifs (= par rapport à la population totale du pays), et de l'évolution du nombre de membres pendant les trois années précédentes. ICOMOS Belgique est favorable à une limitation du nombre total des voix attribué à chaque Comité national pour éviter des déséquilibres et des dominances. Toutes ces modalités doivent être précisées dans les Statuts et les Comités nationaux doivent être avertis du nombre des voix au moins 3 mois avant l'Assemblée générale.

S'agissant du système de procurations, ICOMOS Belgique est favorable à une limitation du nombre de procurations par personne afin de faire participer plus de membres aux votes. Etant donné que l'Assemblée générale doit approuver les comptes et le budget annuel, ICOMOS Belgique demande que le groupe de travail poursuive la réflexion car il paraît impensable de mettre en place des mécanismes de vote différents pour les Assemblées annuelles et celles où il y a des élections.

Sur la forme

- 10 ICOMOS Belgique se félicite de la nouvelle structure, de la simplification de rédaction et de l'utilisation de la terminologie consacrée aux associations – la seule exception étant le terme de Secrétaire général perçu par les membres et les tiers comme une fonction réservée à un salarié.
Une relecture attentive du texte final devra être faite ; ICOMOS Belgique est prête à y contribuer pour ce qui concerne la version française. Quelques coquilles sont déjà signalées à titre d'information.

Sur les recommandations

- 11 ICOMOS Belgique a pris note des recommandations formulées par le groupe de travail et suggère que le groupe les transforme en résolutions à adopter par l'Assemblée générale.

En conclusion

- 12 ICOMOS Belgique est très favorable aux propositions soumises : ICOMOS doit se mettre en conformité par rapport à la législation et la réglementation et les pratiques internationales. Aussi, les modifications doivent impérativement être adoptées lors de l'Assemblée générale de cette année. Au vu de la qualité des propositions soumises par le groupe de travail instauré par la 17^{ième} Assemblée générale, cet objectif est réaliste et ICOMOS Belgique invite le Comité exécutif à fournir son plein appui au groupe de travail. Le réel enjeu sera ensuite de mettre en œuvre les modifications.

ICOMOS Belgium

Original contribution in French sent by Ms Miek Goossens, President, 2011-01-31

Translation into English by ICOMOS UK

- 1 The documents submitted to the 3rd member consultation are clear and precise; the challenges facing ICOMOS are well-presented, and the submitted proposals provide logical and appropriate responses to these challenges. The quality of the documents facilitated the discussion within ICOMOS Belgium, who express their congratulations and thanks to the working group.

Matters of substance

- 2 ICOMOS Belgium reiterates the position adopted following the second consultation, notably with regard to governance, elections, the makeup of the Board and cooption (see aggregated responses to the second consultation). The texts submitted to the third consultation have developed considerably; thus, ICOMOS Belgium has only a few supplementary observations to put forward.
- 3 ICOMOS Belgium appreciates the efforts made to clarify the 'Ethical Principles'. Nonetheless, to be suitable for submission for approval at the 2014 General Assembly, the text must:
 - Be limited to essential content and be shortened (max. 1 page);
 - Focus on the involvement of members: proposed edit "ICOMOS members must undertake to";
 - Be complementary to the Statutes: arrangements for potential sanctions should appear in the Statutes;
 - Be easy for members to understand and absorb, and thus to translate;
 - Carry an easily recognisable title that reflects the nature of the text.

A proposed revised version of the text is attached, as is a proposal to amend Article 7 (Sanctions) of the Statutes, the title of which would become 'Sanctions and loss of membership'.

Following a discussion on usage, perception and the difficulties of translating into English and French the differing terms 'Professional Code [Code de déontologie]' and 'Code of Ethics' [Code d'éthique], ICOMOS Belgium expresses support for 'Code of Ethics', as Professional Codes usually apply to the exercise of a regulated profession.

- 4 ICOMOS Belgium is of the opinion that the maximum term of Board membership should be reduced rather than extended, and is in favour of maintaining the current frequency of General Assemblies (every 3 years).

Major Questions

- 5 Membership Categories
ICOMOS Belgium agrees to the inclusion of categories for 'Young Members' and 'Affiliate Members' for those involved or interested in cultural heritage conservation.
ICOMOS Belgium notes that technically, these two categories are not necessary; ICOMOS could limit the membership categories to three: Individual members, Institutional members and Honorary members. However, including categories for 'Young Members' and 'Affiliate Members' reflects the desire for openness, which is essential for the development of the organisation.
- 6 Cultural Diversity and Multilingualism
ICOMOS Belgium questions whether Article 21 should not better clarify the distinction between:
 - 'dissemination languages' – used for translating and disseminating professional content including doctrinal texts,
 - 'working languages' – used during statutory meetings and for communication with members, and

- 'official languages' – into which all official texts such as Statutes, Rules of Procedure, etc must be translated. ICOMOS Belgium observes that the sentence of the current preamble, which covers the version of the Statutes that is in effect, should be transferred to Article 21.

ICOMOS does not have the financial resources to translate all the official texts (Statutes, Rules of Procedure, etc.) into two of its four current official languages, or to adopt a third working language; even if additional resources were to become available in the future, priority should be given to the translation and dissemination of professional content in 'additional working languages' or 'dissemination languages'.

ICOMOS Belgium therefore supports the proposals of the working group, specifically:

- the adoption of a policy on cultural diversity which should also permit use of existing ICOMOS tools (e.g., translation teams, thesaurus) to their full potential and the dissemination of doctrinal texts in more languages;
- the possibility of adopting some 'additional working languages' during meetings;
- the possibility of adopting 'dissemination languages or 'temporary working languages';
- aligning the Statutes with reality.

These measures should lead to the use of more languages than at are currently used, while still offering the necessary flexibility if needs and available resources should increase.

7 Duration and maximum number of terms for Board Members

ICOMOS Belgium favours option A, one term of 6 years, not immediately renewable, with the election of 10 new members every 3 years: thus, the aim of providing both continuity and rotation, as defined in the Statutes since 1965, will actually be achieved. ICOMOS Belgium takes the view that rotation must increase by reducing the maximum consecutive term to 6 years.

What transitional measures are needed to introduce the new system? This should be explained. The following mechanism is one possibility:

- Those Board Members elected in 2008 and/or 2011 who are due for re-election in 2014, who have served 2 or 3 successive terms, will not be eligible for re-election in 2017;
- Board Members elected in 2014 for an initial term of 3 years will be eligible for re-election in 2017 and their term will expire in 2020;
- New Board Members elected in 2017 will be elected for a term of 6 years;
- If more than 10 new Board Members are elected in 2017, lots will be drawn to establish those whose terms will end after 3 years: 10 new Board Members will have a single term of 6 years; the others, selected by lot, will have a term of 3 years in order to establish the renewal of half the Board Members at a time.

8 Election of the Bureau

ICOMOS Belgium favours option 1 – the election of the Bureau by the Board from among its members. The Board is better positioned than the General Assembly to judge who among its members is sufficiently available and has the necessary qualities to take on additional responsibilities. Further, if a position becomes vacant, the Board may fill it without having to wait for the next General Assembly. One-year terms offer more flexibility; members are obliged to demonstrate results to their peers.

9 Allocation of votes

ICOMOS Belgium would like the allocation of votes to take into account the number of members in each National Committee in both absolute and relative terms (i.e., with regard to the total population of the country), and the change in the number of members over the three previous years. ICOMOS Belgium favours a limit on the total number of votes allocated to each national Committee to avoid imbalances and over-dominance. All these points need to be detailed in the Statutes, and the National Committees need to be advised of the number of votes at least three months before the General Assembly.

With regard to the system of proxies, ICOMOS Belgium favours a limit to the number of proxies per person in order to encourage more members to vote.

Given that the General Assembly has to approve the accounts and the annual budget, ICOMOS Belgium requests that the working group give this further thought as it would seem

unthinkable to put in place different voting mechanisms for the annual Assemblies and those that include elections.

Structure

- 10 ICOMOS Belgium welcomes the new structure, the simplified wording and the use of appropriate terminology dedicated to voluntary bodies – the sole exception being the title of Secretary General, perceived by members and third parties as a job title reserved for an employee. The final text should be re-read carefully; ICOMOS Belgium is ready to contribute to that of the French version. Some editing points have already been indicated for information.

Recommendations

- 11 ICOMOS Belgium has taken note of the recommendations drafted by the working group, and suggests that the group turn these recommendations into resolutions to be adopted by the General Assembly.

Conclusion

- 12 ICOMOS Belgium strongly supports the submitted proposals: ICOMOS must bring itself into line with legislation and international procedures and policies. In addition, the changes absolutely must be adopted at this year's General Assembly. In view of the quality of the proposals submitted by the working group set up by the 17th General Assembly, this goal is realistic and ICOMOS Belgium invites the Executive Committee to give its full support to the working group. The real challenge will then be to put the changes into practice.

English text as suggested	28/01/2014	Texte français suggéré	28/01/2014
Review of the Ethical Commitment Statement Proposal of Anne Mie Draye and ICOMOS Belgium		Révision de la Déclaration d'engagement éthique Proposition de Anne Mie Draye et ICOMOS Belgique	
Code of Ethics for ICOMOS members Adopted by the 13 th General Assembly (Madrid, 2002) and amended by the 18 th General Assembly (Florence, 2014)		Code d'éthique pour les membres de l'ICOMOS Adoptés par la 13 ^{ème} Assemblée générale (Madrid, 2002) et amendés par la 18 ^{ième} Assemblée générale (Florence, 2014)	
<p>1 ICOMOS members undertake to advocate the conservation of cultural heritage, in conformity with the Statutes of the association.</p> <p>2 ICOMOS members undertake to act in accordance with doctrinal texts validly adopted by the ICOMOS General Assembly as well as with international conventions and recommendations of UNESCO and other international organisations dealing with cultural heritage conservation.</p> <p>3 ICOMOS members undertake to conduct their activities in an open, tolerant, objective and impartial manner:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a They undertake to acknowledge and respect cultural and linguistic diversity;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b They undertake to combat misrepresentation, false information and/or misuse of work and of heritage itself;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c They undertake to oppose any concealment or manipulation of data and findings related to cultural heritage;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">d They undertake to ensure that the general scope and context of their work, including where relevant budgetary or other constraints, are adequately explained.</p> <p>4 ICOMOS members undertake to be loyal and collegiate, and to conduct activities with younger generations in a spirit of transfer of knowledge and skills.</p> <p>5 ICOMOS members undertake to conduct any mandate, whether at the request of ICOMOS or not, in an independent, honest and accountable manner:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a They must avoid, or as appropriate publicly declare, any real or apparent conflict of interest that could compromise the independent, objective and impartial execution of their work;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b They must respect the confidential nature of any data, including documents, opinions and discussions, to which they have had access in the course of their mandate;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c They must quote, reference, and publish in an accurate and faithful way the intellectual, material and practical contributions of other participants;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">d They must specify whether the views and opinions they express are their personal views or those of the institution they represent.</p> <p>6 ICOMOS members undertake to act responsibly towards the association, in particular:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a They must be mindful that the ICOMOS name and logo belong to ICOMOS.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b They must not act or speak on behalf of ICOMOS or one of</p>		<p>1 Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'engagent à promouvoir la conservation du patrimoine culturel, conformément aux Statuts de l'association.</p> <p>2 Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'engagent à agir conformément aux textes doctrinaux valablement adoptés par l'Assemblée générale de l'ICOMOS et aux conventions et recommandations de l'UNESCO et autres organisations internationales relatives à la conservation du patrimoine culturel.</p> <p>3 Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'engagent à mener leurs activités dans un esprit d'ouverture et de tolérance, d'objectivité et d'impartialité :</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a Ils s'engagent à reconnaître et à respecter la diversité culturelle et linguistique ;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b Ils s'engagent à lutter contre les présentations déformées, les fausses informations et/ou l'usage abusif de travaux et du patrimoine lui-même;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c Ils s'engagent à s'opposer à toute dissimulation ou manipulation de données et de découvertes liées au patrimoine culturel ;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">d Ils s'engagent à expliquer de façon appropriée le cadre général et le contexte de leurs travaux et, le cas échéant, les contraintes budgétaires ou autres.</p> <p>4 Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'engagent à être loyaux et collégiaux, et à mener des activités avec les jeunes générations dans un esprit de transmission de connaissance et de savoir-faire.</p> <p>5 Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'engagent à mener tout mandat, qu'il soit effectué à la demande de l'ICOMOS ou non, de façon indépendante, honnête et responsable :</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a Ils doivent éviter, ou le cas échéant déclarer, tout conflit d'intérêt, apparent ou réel, de nature à compromettre l'exercice indépendant, objectif et impartial de leur mandat ;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b Ils doivent respecter la nature confidentielle des données, y compris les documents, avis et discussions, auxquelles ils ont pu avoir accès lors de l'exercice de leur mandat ;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c Ils doivent citer, référencier et publier de façon précise et fidèle les contributions intellectuelles, matérielles et pratiques d'autres intervenants ;</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">d Ils doivent préciser si les points de vue et opinions qu'ils expriment sont les leurs ou ceux de l'institution qu'ils représentent.</p> <p>6 Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'engagent à agir de façon responsable à l'égard de l'association, plus particulièrement :</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a Ils doivent être conscients que le nom et le logo de l'ICOMOS appartiennent à l'ICOMOS.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b Ils ne doivent pas agir ou parler au nom de l'ICOMOS ou</p>	

English text as suggested	Texte français suggéré
its Committees without the authority of the relevant ICOMOS body or Committee and in such cases must strictly adhere to the institutional views of the relevant ICOMOS body or Committee or organ.	de l'un de ses Comités sans l'autorisation de l'organe ou du Comité de l'ICOMOS concerné et dans ces cas, ils doivent se conformer strictement aux points de vue institutionnels de l'organe ou du Comité de l'ICOMOS concerné.
c They must not use their position within ICOMOS for their personal advantage.	c Ils ne doivent pas utiliser leur position au sein de l'ICOMOS à leur profit personnel.

ICOMOS Belgique – Annexe 2

Original contribution in French, except for article 7 submitted in two languages

Translation in English by ICOMOS UK follows

Modifications suggérées au texte des Statuts

Légende

texte ~~barré~~ texte à supprimer

texte rouge nouveau texte à insérer

texte bleu texte provenant des 'Principes éthiques'

Définitions

c ~~a~~ présente un intérêt

d ~~a~~ présente un intérêt

Article 6bis Droits et obligations des membres

b « Les membres d'honneur sont dispensés des cotisations. »

Article 7 Sanctions et perte de la qualité de membre

a Le non-respect des obligations des membres peut faire l'objet d'enquêtes et de sanctions. Les enquêtes sont menées de façon confidentielle par le Comité national, ou en absence de celui-ci le Bureau, ou le Comité scientifique international. Les Comités scientifiques internationaux consultent le Comité national du membre intéressé lorsqu'une sanction est envisagée et réciproquement. Les sanctions qui peuvent être imposées sont :
- l'avertissement,
- la suspension de l'adhésion pour une certaine durée,
- la perte la qualité de membre de l'ICOMOS.
Avant qu'une sanction ne soit prononcée, le membre intéressé est préalablement informé des charges et appelé à fournir des explications. Une procédure d'appel existe devant le Conseil d'administration. La décision du Conseil d'administration est définitive. Toute la procédure est confidentielle ; l'avertissement est confidentiel, les autres sanctions sont rendues publiques.

Article 7 Sanctions and loss of membership

a Non-compliance with the obligations by members may lead to investigations and sanctions. Investigations shall be conducted in a confidential manner by the National Committee, or if none exists by the Bureau, or by the International Scientific Committee. International Scientific Committees shall confer in a confidential manner with the National Committee of the member concerned when a penalty is envisaged and vice versa. Penalties that may be imposed are:
- Admonition,
- Suspension of membership for a period of time,
- Loss of ICOMOS membership.
Before a penalty is imposed, the member concerned shall be informed of the charges and shall be called to provide explanations. An appeal procedure shall be available at the ICOMOS Board. The decision of the Board is final. All proceedings shall be confidential, as is the imposition of an admonishment; all other penalties shall be made public.

Article 9 Assemblée générale

d-1 « Entendre les rapports du Président de l'ICOMOS et du Trésorier... » : ICOMOS Belgique relève que cette expression est plus forte que « Prendre connaissance » ou « Prendre acte » et estime que cela est approprié.

Article 10 Conseil d'administration

a « ... peut inviter des experts à assister avec voix consultative à titre consultatif sans droit de vote. » - pour la cohérence

- d-9 « ...et la révision ~~périodique~~ du Code de déontologie, **si nécessaire**. »
d-12 « en cas **de sanction ou** de radiation... » - pour la cohérence avec l'article 7 tel que modifié

Article 11 Bureau

- a « **Le Bureau** rend compte... » - alignement sur l'anglais, plus clair
e Le préambule indique que tous les termes utilisés pour des fonctions peuvent s'appliquer indifféremment aux hommes et aux femmes : la rédaction peut donc être simplifiée.

Article 12 Conseil consultatif

- a Le Conseil consultatif est un organe ~~bicaméral composé des~~ **à deux composantes, à savoir** les Présidents des Comités nationaux et les Présidents des Comités scientifiques internationaux, ces derniers formant le Conseil scientifique.»

Article 14 Comités scientifiques internationaux

- b « Les demandes d'adhésion à un Comité scientifique international doivent être adressés au Comité **scientifique international** concerné avec copie pour information au Comité national, ... »

Article 15 Secrétariat international

- c-8 « Etablir le rapport annuel sur les activités de l'association incluant les contributions des Comités nationaux et des Comités scientifiques internationaux et les comptes annuels **et les diffuser aux membres** ;

Article 16 Observateurs

- « L'UNESCO, ~~du~~ **le** Centre international ... »

Article 21 Langues

(voir également remarques générales)

- a « La version française des Statuts de l'ICOMOS fait foi. » - transfert de la phrase du préambule
b « ... le(s) Comités(s) concerné(s)... »

Article 21bis Règlement intérieur

- « ... à la majorité ~~des~~ **ses** membres votants présents ou représentés. »

Article 19 Modification des Statuts

- « ... quel que soit le nombre de membres **votants** présents ou représentés. (...) à la majorité de deux tiers des membres **votants** présents ou représentés. »

ICOMOS Belgium – Attachment 2

Suggested Modifications to the text of the Statutes

Key

~~Strikethrough~~ text to be deleted

Text in **red** new text to be inserted

Text in **blue** text taken from the 'Ethical Principles'

Definitions

c ~~are of offer~~ value

d ~~are of offer~~ value

Article 7 **Sanctions and loss of membership**

- a ~~Non-compliance with members' obligations may lead to investigations and sanctions. Investigations shall be conducted in a confidential manner by the National Committee, or if none exists by the Bureau, or by the International Scientific Committee. International Scientific Committees shall consult with the National Committee of the member concerned when a sanction is envisaged and vice versa. Sanctions that may be imposed are:~~
- Admonition,
 - Suspension of membership for a period of time,
 - Loss of ICOMOS membership.
- ~~Before a penalty is imposed, the member concerned shall be informed in advance of the charges and shall be called to provide explanations. An appeal procedure shall be available at the ICOMOS Board. The decision of the Board is final.~~
- ~~All proceedings shall be confidential, as is the imposition of an admonishment; all other penalties shall be made public.~~

Article 10 **Board**

d-9 "... and the ~~periodic~~ review of the [Code of Ethics], **if necessary.**"

d-12 "... refuse membership requests, **impose sanctions or** strike members from the register..." – for consistency with Article 7 as amended

Article 11 **Bureau**

e The Preamble indicates that all terms used for roles can apply equally to men and women; the text can therefore be simplified.

Article 12 **Advisory Council**

a "The Advisory Council shall be a ~~bicameral organ~~ **body** composed of **two parts**, the Presidents of the National Committees and of the International Scientific Committees, the latter being the Scientific Council."

Article 14 **International Scientific Committees**

b "Applications for membership **to an International Scientific Committee** must be sent to the relevant International Scientific Committee with a copy for information to the National Committee or when no National Committee exists, to the International Secretariat.

Article 15 **International Secretariat**

c-8 "Produce the draft annual report on the activities of the association, with the contributions of the National and International Committees and the annual accounts, **and distribute them to members;**"

Article 21 **Languages**

(see also general comment)

a "The French version of the ICOMOS Statutes shall be the authentic version" – transposition of this sentence from the Preamble

ICOMOS Brazil

Contribution sent in Spanish by Mr Eugênio de Ávila Lins, President, 2014-01-30

Spanish

Sobre la revisión en curso, de los estatutos de ICOMOS, queremos manifestar nuestra desacuerdo a la propuesta de suprimir el idioma español como una das lenguas oficiales de ICOMOS, alterando con eso el artículo nº21 del Estatuto de la Organización a la cual pertenecemos. Las razones de nuestra declaración están debidamente explicadas en los documentos enviados por los diversos Comités Nacionales de los Países de lengua española.

Ratificamos que la lengua española siempre fue un medio de permitir mayor acceso a las informaciones oriundas de esta institución tanto para los miembros del Comité Brasileiro, cuanto para un público cada vez más interesado en las cuestiones de la conservación del patrimonio.

ICOMOS Canada

Contribution sent in English by Julian Smith, President, 2014-01-31

The following are the comments of ICOMOS Canada with respect to the proposed amendments. These comments are the result of discussion within the Board of ICOMOS Canada, and with some of our partner National Committees.

1. Amendments to clarify the text

We support these amendments, and will await the separate distribution of a proposed revision to the document on ethics.

2. Membership Categories and Financial Stability

2.1 Creation of a category of young members (Article 6-a-3).

We support this amendment, and favour the use of 'young members' as opposed to 'young professionals' to allow the inclusion of advanced students

2.2 Adjustment of the 'sustaining members' category, now called 'affiliate members'

Support

2.3 Compliance with the [Code of Ethics] is part of the membership conditions (Article 6bis-a).

We support this in principle but will await the proposed revisions (above)

2.4 Clarification on the collection of the membership dues (Article 6bis-b).

Support

2.5 Distribution of annual report and the accounts

Support

3. General Assembly

3.1 Adjustment of the system to allocate votes (Article 9-a).

We support retaining the maximum number of votes and proxies at their current levels. We see the other proposals leading to administrative and political issues, including questions about fluctuating member counts.

3.2 Clarification of the quorum for General Assemblies (Article 9-c).

Support

3.3 Clarification of the governance and of the responsibilities of the General Assembly that are specific to ICOMOS (Article 9-d).

Support

4. Board and Bureau

4.1 The number of members of the Board elected by the General Assembly (20) remains unchanged even if the size of the Board is reduced from 26 to 21 Board members allowing ICOMOS to seek 'public interest' status at some point (Article 10-a).

Support

4.2 Elected Board members come from different countries (Article 9-d-6).

Support

4.3 The Vice-President of the Advisory Council, originating from the other component than its President, has observer status (Article 10-a).

Support

4.4 Clarification of the governance and of the responsibilities of the Board and Bureau that are specific to ICOMOS (Articles 9-d and 10-d).

Support

4.5 The position of a Secretary General is being maintained with a redefinition of the responsibilities to avoid any overlapping with other functions (Article 11-d-4).

Support

4.6 The system of co-option has been dropped. The current Executive Committee favours maintaining a system of co-option.

We do not have enough information on the pros and cons of this change to have a recommendation

4.7 Board members must defend the general interest of the association and shall not represent their National or International Scientific Committee (Article 10-d); they shall not serve in more than 2 positions within ICOMOS (Articles 9-d-6).

Support

4.8 Two options are presented for the duration and maximum number of terms for Board members (Article 9-d-6).

We support Option 1 - election of all 20 members every three years. We share concerns about a voluntary professional organization relying on six-year commitments, and also see a need for evolution as well as continuity.

4.9 Two options are proposed for the election of Bureau members (Article 10-d-3 et Article 9- d-7.

We support Option 1, elections of Bureau members directly by the General Assembly. We feel this has been an important part of voter engagement and decision-making.

5. Advisory Council

5.1 Explicit recognition of the Scientific Council and of the bicameral character of the Advisory Council (Article 12-a).

Support

5.2 The President and Vice-President originate from both components of the Advisory Council and come from 2 different countries (Article 12-a).

Support

5.3 The President and the Vice-President are elected by the Advisory Council from among coordinators from its 2 components (Article 12-a).

Support

5.4 Clarification of the governance and of the responsibilities of the Advisory Council that are specific to ICOMOS (Article 11-d).

Support

5.5 Reinforcement of the role of the Advisory Council as advisory organ where all structures with an advisory capacity meet, and possibility for the Advisory Council to create ad hoc groups or working groups (Article 12-d)

Support

- 5.6 Extension of the principle already applied to the Board that there should be a balanced representation of the different regions of the world for the elected positions of all international structures of ICOMOS (Articles 12-d et 14-a).

Support. Also, we strongly support continuing inclusion of Canada as part of the Americas.

6. National and International Scientific Committees

- 6.1 Recognition of Transnational Groups where the creation of National Committees is not (yet) possible (Article 13-e).

Support

- 6.2 Clarification on membership applications to International Scientific Committees (Article 14-b).

Support

7. Languages

- 7.1 Working languages are maintained (Article 21-a) but the notion of official languages has been dropped.

Support

- 7.2 Adoption of a 'Policy on cultural diversity and multilingualism' by the Board who has to report on it to the General Assembly and the Advisory Council (Article 10-d-8).

We strongly support development of policies on cultural diversity and multilingualism. We hope that there will be a continuing evolution of ICOMOS towards a more multi-lingual organization in all aspects of its work and its administration.

- 7.3 Possibility to recognise 'temporary working languages' provided that an action plan has been agreed within the framework of the above-mentioned Policy (Article 21-c).

Support

- 7.4 Possibility to use other languages than the working languages in statutory meetings provided that solutions have been found to cover the additional costs (Article 21-b).

Support

8. Rules of Procedure

Integration of all Rules, Principles, Guidelines etc. in the ICOMOS Rules of Procedure with a view to have one consolidated text and to have clear and transparent procedures to amend them (Article 21bis).

Support

9 Amendments related to content but not to the functioning

- 9.1 Use of the generic term "cultural heritage conservation"; all terms of this shorthand are explained in the subsequent definitions, which remain unchanged.

Support

- 9.2 Addition of "cultural and spiritual value" in the 3 definitions (monuments, groups of buildings and sites) and use of the same series of adjectives.

We strongly support this amendment

- 9.3 The list of exceptions to the definitions has been deleted (paragraph d of the Definitions in the text of the 2nd consultation).

Support

- 9.4 A reference is made to the intangible dimension of cultural heritage in the article on the aims of the association (Article 4).

We strongly support this amendment

9.5 A reference to the World Heritage Convention has been added in the article on Activities and Actions (Article 5-g).

Support

10. Aims, Activities and actions, definitions

10.1 The founding principles of ICOMOS remain valid, but some members wondered whether a complete overhaul of the descriptions in Article 4 (Aims) and Article 5 (Activities and actions) and/or of the definitions of cultural should be envisaged. With the exception of some minor editing, the working group considered that such a global revision would fall outside of its current mandate. After the adoption of the proposed amendments, which are more urgent, the General Assembly may adopt a resolution to conduct this complementary work if deemed appropriate.

Support

We very much appreciate the efforts of the working group and will be pleased to provide further comment as appropriate.

ICOMOS China

Contribution received in English, 2014-01-27

ICOMOS CHINA has organized among our executive members a discussion and consultation on the issue of statutes amendments, and reached the following consensus:

1. ICOMOS CHINA members would like to express our sincere appreciation and admiration to our colleagues of the working group for what they have done for the amendment of statutes and the excellent results that they achieved.
2. Concerning the Recommendation No. 17 “The working group invites the candidate Board members to demonstrate in their CV that they have the required competences and experience to lead a large international association”, we find this requirement rather unrealistic nor fair for candidates from most of the countries, we think it is probably more appropriate to change “to lead a large international association” into something like “to participate in the activities of ICOMOS or other large international associations alike”
3. About the 5 major questions, our comments are as below:
 - 1) Membership Categories: yes
 - 2) Cultural diversity& multilingualism: yes
 - 3) Duration and maximum number of terms for board members: A
 - 4) Election of the bureau members: B
 - 5) Attribution of votes: Yes. We suggest increasing in a proper scale the votes of the national committees which have over 100 members.

ICOMOS Colombia

Contribution sent by Ms Natalia López Aguilar, Treasurer, on behalf of the President, 2014-01-31

Note: this is the text of Petition Nr 2

Spanish

Sobre la revisión en curso de los Estatutos de ICOMOS

Manifiesto mi desacuerdo y oposición radical a la propuesta de suprimir las lenguas oficiales existentes de ICOMOS contempladas en el artículo 21 de sus estatutos.

Ésta es una **propuesta contradictoria** con el espíritu de ICOMOS, organización multicultural que proclama como valores de su actuación el espíritu de colaboración y de respeto a las diferencias culturales y religiosas de sus miembros. Asimismo, ICOMOS declara como su misión última el conseguir una armoniosa unión y entendimiento entre las personas y las culturas. Mas la pretendida supresión del español como lengua oficial es una clara e inaceptable discriminación de los miembros hablantes de lengua española y cultura hispana, que verán aumentadas las dificultades para participar en encuentros y debates.

ICOMOS, organización que trabaja por la conservación y defensa del Patrimonio Cultural (tangibles e intangibles), no puede negar estatutariamente el valor y función capital que tiene la lengua española en los trabajos y entre los miembros de ICOMOS. De los 95 Comités Nacionales de ICOMOS 21 de ellos hablan en español. De igual modo, en el Comité Ejecutivo de ICOMOS el español es la lengua materna del Presidente Gustavo Araoz, un Vicepresidente, Alfredo Conti, y dos Vocales del Comité Ejecutivo, Olga Orive y Daniel Young.

Ésta es una **propuesta incoherente** ya que una organización que estudia y protege el Patrimonio Cultural, no puede desconocer el excepcional valor patrimonial que representa la lengua española. Eliminar una lengua es eliminar una cultura y una agresión a la vitalidad y funcionalidad de ese bien patrimonial. Las contingencias económicas no pueden ser excusa para no proteger los bienes patrimoniales

La lengua crea al hombre y le da un instrumento para la comunicación y el intercambio de ideas, mas para muchos de los miembros de ICOMOS, la lengua española es el símbolo identitario de su cultura hispana, es una lengua y es una cultura compartida: *"Para todos los hombres y mujeres de nuestra lengua la experiencia de pertenecer a una comunidad lingüística está unida a otra: esa comunidad se extiende más allá de las fronteras nacionales. Trátase de un argentino o de un español, de un chileno o de un mexicano, todos sabemos desde nuestra niñez que nuestra lengua nacional es también la de otras naciones"* (Octavio Paz).

Según el artículo 2.2.a, de la Convención para la Salvaguardia del Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial, el patrimonio cultural inmaterial se manifiesta, entre otros ámbitos, en "las tradiciones y expresiones orales, incluido el idioma como vehículo del patrimonio cultural inmaterial". Por ello es incoherente eliminar una lengua, el español, en los debates, propuestas y trabajos sobre los numerosos bienes culturales inmateriales y materiales hispánicos analizados en una lengua que a su vez es un bien del patrimonio cultural inmaterial y está ligado a la declaración como Patrimonio Mundial del bien Monasterios de San Millán de Yuso y de Suso (1997).

No se puede eliminar el español como lengua oficial de ICOMOS -debería ser lengua de trabajo- cuando son extraordinariamente numerosos los bienes del Patrimonio Cultural inscritos en la Lista del Patrimonio Mundial que son fruto de una cultura compartida por una comunidad de países que habla en lengua española.

Ésta es una **propuesta injustificada**. En aras de la utilidad y la demografía, el español debería tener lugar prioritario en el seno de ICOMOS. La lengua española es hoy una lengua hablada por 495 millones de personas, la segunda como lengua materna (5,85%) después del chino mandarín (14,1), y la segunda también como lengua de comunicación internacional, después del inglés.

Ésta es una **propuesta inoportuna** ya que en un futuro próximo (2030), aumentará considerablemente el número de hispanohablantes, de 5,85% a 7,5%, a diferencia con los hablantes de ruso, alemán, francés o inglés que sufrirán un retroceso o estancamiento.

Nombre (*name*): NATALIA LÓPEZ AGUILAR
Miembro de (*member of*) ICOMOS Colombia

English

On the ICOMOS Statutes undergoing revision

On behalf of ICOMOS-Nicaragua and as international member of ICOMOS, I wish to express my disagreement with and steadfast opposition to the proposal to eliminate the existing ICOMOS official languages contemplated in article 21 of the statutes.

This proposal contradicts the spirit of ICOMOS, a multi-cultural organization that proclaims as the values underlying its actions a spirit of collaboration and respect for its members' cultural and religious differences. Furthermore, ICOMOS declares its ultimate mission to be the achievement of a harmonious union **and** understanding between people and cultures. However, the intended elimination of Spanish as an official language is a clear and unacceptable discrimination of the Spanish-speaking members and Hispanic cultures, who will encounter increased difficulties when participating in meetings and discussions.

As an organization working to preserve and defend tangible and intangible Cultural Heritage, ICOMOS cannot deny in its statutes the value and capital function of the Spanish language for the works of ICOMOS and among its members. Of the 95 ICOMOS National Committees, 21 speak Spanish. In the same way, Spanish is the mother tongue of the ICOMOS Executive Committee's President, Gustavo Araoz, one of its Vice-Presidents, Alfredo Conti, and of two of its Ordinary Members, Olga Orive and Daniel Young.

This proposal is inconsistent as an organization studying and protecting Cultural Heritage cannot ignore the exceptional heritage value represented by the Spanish language. Eliminating a language represents the elimination of a culture and an assault against the vitality and functionality of that heritage asset. Economic contingencies cannot be the excuse for not protecting heritage assets.

Languages have created the specific personality of different groups of people throughout history and endow us with a tool for communication and the exchange of ideas; in addition, for many of the members of ICOMOS, the Spanish language is the hallmark of their Hispanic culture, a shared language and culture: *"For all the men and women speaking our tongue, the experience of belonging to a linguistic community is linked to another: that community extends beyond our national frontiers. Whether it is from Argentine or from Spain, a Chilean or a Mexican, we all know from our childhood that our national language is also that of other nations"* (Octavio Paz. Nobel Prize of Literature).

According to article 2.2.a of the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, intangible cultural heritage is manifested, among other areas, in "oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle for intangible cultural heritage". For this reason, it is inconsistent to eliminate a language, Spanish, from discussions, proposals and work on the numerous items of Hispanic intangible and tangible culture analysed in a language that is in

and of itself an item of intangible cultural heritage and is linked to the declaration of the Monasteries of San Millán de Yuso and San Millán de Suso as World Heritage sites (1997).

It is not feasible to eliminate Spanish as an official ICOMOS language; instead, it should be considered by the Statutes as a working language because of the extraordinary amount of Cultural Heritage properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List as the fruit of a culture shared by a community of Spanish-speaking countries.

This proposal is unwarranted. In terms of usefulness and demographics, Spanish should be given priority within ICOMOS. The Spanish language is nowadays spoken by 495 million people as a mother tongue, it is therefore the second-largest mother tongue (5.85%) after Mandarin Chinese (14.1%), and also the second most important language for international communication, after English.

This proposal is far from timely as, in the near future (2030), the number of Spanish speaker will considerably increase from 5.85% to 7.5%, unlike the case of speakers of Russian, German, French or English, who will all undergo stagnation or decline.

Name: NATALIA LÓPEZ AGUILAR
Member of ICOMOS Colombia

ICOMOS Costa Rica

Contribution sent in English by Ms Ofelia Sanu Alfaro, President, 2014-01-31

In the attached document you will find the commentaries and recommendations made by the National Committee of ICOMOS Costa Rica, regarding the amendment of the ICOMOS Statutes. We congratulate you for your great effort and hope to contribute to your fine work. We have no doubt that the work carried on by your working group will largely enrich ICOMOS.

ISSUE

Definitions

COMMENTARIES

Since Cultural Heritage is a generic category that includes tangible and intangible heritage, we believe that the definition of Cultural Heritage should embrace, aside from monuments, groups of buildings and sites, other aspects related to Intangible Heritage. For example, the aspects described in Faro, 27.X.2005, Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, article 2, Definitions:

a. cultural heritage is a group of resources inherited from the past which people identify, independently of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time;

III. Members

Major issue - membership categories Do you approve the inclusion of a 'Young Members' category and the adjustment of the 'Affiliate Members' category? If not, what amendments do you propose?

We approve the inclusion of Young Members category.

However we believe that this category should be better explained. It is ambiguous which criteria it uses: whether it is the age, or the lack of experience, or the fee, etc. For example, in which category would fit a person who is in his forties but is a neophyte in his field? Can a professional younger than 30 be in the Individual category? What criteria will be used to determine when they change from this category? Perhaps a better denomination for this category could be Neophyte.

In the case of Individual and Affiliate, it is not clear what the difference between these categories is. Is it the expertise and activism in the areas of competence? Is the Affiliate a more passive and less expert member? What are the differences between the rights and duties of these categories?

Article 7. Loss of Membership

What is the standard deadline to decide a person loses the membership?
Is there another time limit to give the person the possibility to pay?

Article 9. General Assembly

Major issue – allocation of votes. Do you agree to maintain the maximum number of votes and proxies at approximately the current levels thereby allowing National Committees to cast all their votes with 2 or 3 representatives at the General Assemblies? Do you have any additional suggestions to address the problems caused by the current system of allocation of the votes?

We would rather maintain the current system. The other possibilities could give hegemony to the more populated countries.

We agree with the articles 2 and 3:

2. Voting members at the General Assembly shall be designated by their National Committee in accordance with Article 13- d-4 or, if none exists, by the Bureau. The Bureau may delegate this responsibility to an independent ad hoc committee.

3. Voting members duly nominated by their National Committee under Article 13-d-4 may give a proxy to another member of their Committee. No member shall have more than 5 votes in addition to his own.

Article 9-b

Major issue - duration and maximum number of the terms for Board members. Which option do you prefer?

We prefer option A:

- Option A - one single term of 6 years, half of the seats (10) shall be renewed every 3 years,

Change in positions' nomenclature: Chairman to President

The former title of the "Chairman" of the Advisory Committee is now changed to "President". It was clearer in the former nomenclature, where the leader of the Advisory Committee was differentiated from the leader of the Executive Committee, solely by the name of their position.

Major issue – election of the Bureau members Which option do you prefer?

We prefer option 2:

- Option 2: Election of the Bureau by the General Assembly for a 3-year term.

Major issue – cultural diversity and multilingualism Do you approve the proposals made to ensure ICOMOS' compliance with its own Statutes and rules and the addition of 3 new measures? If not, what amendments do you suggest without putting compliance at risk?

We believe that ICOMOS should integrate Spanish as another working tongue.

ICOMOS Costa Rica supports the text entitled: "On the proposal of suppression of the ICOMOS official languages", presented by the Spanish-speaking members of the Executive Committee: Gustavo Araoz, Alfredo Conti, Olga Orive and Daniel Young. This text was sent to the International Secretariat, in the context of the third consultation on the amendment of the ICOMOS Statutes.

ICOMOS Cuba

Text of 2014-01-28 in Spanish by José E. Fornés, President,
transmitted by Gustavo Araoz, 2014-01-30

Spanish

El Comité Cubano de ICOMOS también se opone a la eliminación del español como lengua oficial porque lo que debería ser es LENGUA DE TRABAJO también, dada la cantidad de países hispanoparlantes que hay en el mundo y son miembros de ICOMOS. No se debe olvidar que el español es la segunda lengua internacional, ligeramente por encima del inglés en cuanto a la cantidad de hablantes, solo detrás del mandarín, también conocido como pequinés, principal idioma que se habla en China.

Estamos seguros que la argumentación será contundente y por tanto la apoyamos aún antes de conocerla.

ICOMOS Finland

Contribution in English sent by Margaretha Ehrstöm, President, 2014-01-31

ICOMOS Finland thanks the Working Group on Statutes Revision for the work carefully done on the draft amendments and for the openness of the revision process since the 17 GA. It agrees that amendments are needed for fulfilling the legal requirements of the French law concerning associations and sees that these are fully justified, because ICOMOS holds its headquarters in France and it needs to be recognized as a legal body.

ICOMOS Finland has reflected the major questions presented for the 3rd round of Consultations and wants to propose the following:

1. Questions: Membership categories (Article 6). Do you approve the inclusion of a 'Young Members' category and the adjustment of the 'Affiliate Members' category? If not, what amendments do you propose?

ICOMOS Finland: Young Member status is very much desirable though this status hardly exists in the present membership. The NC is happy with the change proposed, and notes that the Affiliate member status does not exist in practice at the moment in the NC of Finland. What criteria would be used for this status could be studied later with the determination of the scope of professional engagement in this membership category. Would a paragraph or sentence on donors bring clarity in the status of Affiliate members? In order to clarify a little what kind of the institutional members ICOMOS welcomes, ICOMOS Finland proposes that 6-a-2 should read *... institutions and organisations of any kind engaged professionally in the areas of competence of the association as defined in Article 4 of the Statutes or those that own or have in their charge monuments, groups of buildings or sites.*

2. Questions: Cultural diversity & multilingualism (Articles 10-d-8 et 21). Do you approve the proposals made to ensure ICOMOS' compliance with its own Statutes and rules and the addition of 3 new measures? If not, what amendments do you suggest without putting compliance at risk?

ICOMOS Finland proposes that the Para 21-b should read *"... other languages ... may be used ... in accordance to terms and conditions agreed with the concerned Committee(s) about the additional costs caused by the interpretation into one of the TWO working languages."*

3. Questions: Duration and maximum number of terms for Board members (Article 9-d-6). Which option do you prefer?
 - Option A - One single term of 6 years, half of the seats (10) shall be renewed every 3 years,
 - Option B - Maximum 2 successive terms of 3 years, all seats (20) shall be renewed every 3 years.

ICOMOS Finland agrees to the proposal of the WG, based on the good experiences of active mandates, on max. two successive terms of 3 years for the board members (Para?) as well as for the officers of the Advisory Council (para 12-a), and that all the seats would be renewed every 3 years.

5. Questions: Attribution of votes (Article 9-a-1). Do you agree to maintain the maximum number of votes and proxies at approximately the current levels thereby allowing National Committees to cast all their votes with 2 or 3 representatives at the General Assemblies? Do you have any additional suggestions to address the problems caused by the current system of allocation of the votes?

ICOMOS Finland sees that when keeping the 18 votes per NC, min. 3 members should be allowed to use all the votes, and recommends that further study should be commenced on the advantages of having 5 votes per NC in the GA, as is the practice in ICOMOS' sister organisation ICOMr. In no circumstances should only 1 person be able to use all the votes of an NC. ICOMOS Finland sees that a country's population number cannot be a basis for the membership nor to the votes in its GA, though encouragement of creation and growth of national committees would be beneficial to ICOMOS.

Thoughts on some paragraphs of the statutes

9-a-1: ICOMOS Finland recommends that casting votes electronically in the GA should be allowed in the future, and especially when videoconferencing is available and in use.

10-d-3: If the post of the President would be left vacant during his/her term, the Board should elect an 'Acting President' from among its members for the remaining period, and similarly regarding the posts of Secretary General and Treasurer General.

13-d: "any individual concerned" is broader than in art. 6 and should be applied similarly.

14bis: ICOMOS Finland agrees that a principle that will avoid the conflicts of interests (incl. for ex. the employer/employee status), should be expressed in the statutes, but sees that referring only to "payment" would not cover the unwanted relations, and would like to see this reworded or abandoned.

On terminology

"Advisory Council" would be more consistent as a name in the administrative structure than Advisory Committee.

The use of the "Board" has overcome the use of the "Executive Committee" over the past decennia, for ex. In ICOMOS Finland, and is a normal practice that ICOMOS should also adopt.

Definitions c (groups of buildings): Proposal for addition: "... which because of their architecture, spatial organization, homogeneity or place in the landscape,...".

ICOMOS France

Contribution envoyée en français par Mme Isabelle Palmi, Directrice du Secrétariat de ICOMOS France, 2014-01-31

English translation follows

Deux remarques liminaires:

1- Statuts d'ICOMOS et droit français des associations.

Plusieurs modifications proposées ont pour objet de mettre les statuts de l'ICOMOS en conformité avec le droit français, ICOMOS France ne peut que les soutenir.

2- le texte français.

Une relecture générale à caractère linguistique s'impose. Le comité français apportera son concours au groupe de travail pour l'établir dès que le texte sera stabilisé sur le fond. Deux observations à ce stade :

- il faut parler de la **loi de 1901** sur les associations et non de la loi 1901 ;
- le terme « restauration » signifie de plus en plus travaux de restauration et s'applique essentiellement aux monuments historiques. Nous réfléchissons à la possibilité de proposer un terme plus large, éventuellement « *préservation* ».

Propositions de modifications affectant le fonctionnement de l'ICOMOS

A- les membres

- **Les catégories de membres (art 6):**

- Nous sommes opposés à la création de la catégorie de *membres affiliés*. Cette notion n'existe pas en droit français des associations, et nous ne pouvons l'accepter. Nous proposons de rétablir les *membres bienfaiteurs* pour les personnes qui sont prêtes à aider financièrement l'ICOMOS. La définition des membres bienfaiteurs pourrait être : « *les membres bienfaiteurs sont les personnes physiques ou les institutions versant une cotisation dont le montant minimum est fixé chaque année par l'assemblée générale* ».

- La définition donnée aux *membres individuels* est trop restrictive : elle conduirait l'ICOMOS à se priver du concours de nombreuses personnes qui ont une compétence dans le domaine du patrimoine et sont très engagées dans sa conservation du patrimoine sans être pour autant des professionnels du patrimoine. Nous proposons : « *la qualité de membre individuel est reconnue à des professionnels et des personnes engagées dans les domaines de compétence de l'association...* »

- Dans ce contexte, nous préférons qu'il ne soit pas créé une catégorie *jeune membre*. En revanche, nous souhaiterions qu'une recommandation proposée à l'assemblée générale de voter un montant de cotisation réduit pour les membres âgés de moins de 30 ans.

- **Droits et obligations des membres (art 6bis)**

Dans cet article figure une disposition prévoyant que le versement des cotisations par les comités nationaux doit être effectué avant le 1^{er} mai. Nous comprenons parfaitement que l'ICOMOS ait besoin de connaître son budget et de disposer de ressources le plus rapidement possible dans l'année. Cependant, les comités nationaux qui bénéficient de concours publics ne reçoivent les sommes correspondantes qu'assez tard dans l'année ; un versement rapide de la totalité des cotisations avant le 1^{er} mai risque de les mettre en difficulté. Nous proposons donc d'étaler ce versement en ne demandant que les 2/3 des cotisations avant le 1^{er} mai.

B- L'assemblée générale (art 9)

- **Le droit français des assemblées générales**

- Le droit français impose la tenue d'une assemblée générale annuelle qui vote le budget de l'année en cours et approuve les comptes de l'année précédente ; elle doit également voter tous les ans le montant des cotisations.

Une recommandation pourrait être de proposer que l'AG durant laquelle ont lieu les élections demeure, comme c'est le cas actuellement, l'occasion d'une grande rencontre des membres de l'ICOMOS et soit accompagnée d'un important symposium, les autres AG annuelles, plus modestes, se tenant à l'occasion de la réunion du CA et du conseil consultatif.

- Le nombre de voix : il est envisagé de ne plus donner systématiquement 18 voix à tous les comités nationaux, mais d'essayer d'établir un lien entre le nombre des membres des comités, la population des pays concernés et le nombre de voix. C'est un travail délicat et intéressant auquel ICOMOS France est favorable.

- **Les procurations**

Toutes les AG sont ouvertes à tous les membres de l'ICOMOS et tout membre d'un comité national a la possibilité d'être un membre votant pour son comité lors des AG sans dépasser le nombre de voix attribuées à son comité. Mais, il faut distinguer entre les membres et le nombre de voix attribué à un comité.

Les AG où auront lieu les élections réuniront plus de membres que les AG annuelles « simples ». Une question importante est de veiller à ce que les membres présents aux réunions des AG puissent disposer de la totalité des voix attribuées à leur comité. Actuellement, le nombre des procurations est limité à 5. S'il est facile de réunir suffisamment de membres pour fonctionner avec ce système de procuration pour les AG actuelles, qui réunissent beaucoup de monde, il sera plus difficile de le faire pour les AG annuelles « simples » où, bien souvent, un comité sera représenté par un seul membre.

ICOMOS France propose donc de revoir le système des procurations et de prévoir que toutes les voix d'un comité puissent, le cas échéant, être détenues par un seul membre de ce comité.

- **Le quorum**

Le quorum actuel est $\frac{1}{4}$ des membres votants. Pour éviter de donner une trop grande prépondérance à certains pays, nous pourrions examiner la possibilité d'associer davantage les diverses parties du monde, par exemple, en ayant un quorum constitué par $\frac{1}{4}$ des membres votants et $\frac{1}{4}$ des comités nationaux.

C- Le conseil d'administration. (Art 10)

- **Durée des mandats**

Nous sommes d'accord pour que la durée maximale des mandats soit de 6 ans (soit 2x3ans), plutôt que 9 ans, qui nous semble une durée très longue.

Nous préférons conserver la formule actuelle du renouvellement en totalité du conseil d'administration tous les 3 ans plutôt que par tiers.

- **Election des membres du bureau**

Nous sommes favorables au maintien du système actuel d'élection directe des membres du bureau par l'AG, cela donne plus de légitimité aux élus.

Nous souhaitons que le mandat de membres du bureau ait, *a priori*, la même durée que celle du CA, soit 3 ans.

- **Composition du CA**

Le projet de réforme prévoit que le CA est composé de 20 membres élus et d'un membre de droit : le président du conseil consultatif.

Nous sommes favorables au maintien des membres cooptés, et pensons qu'il serait souhaitable que le vice-président du conseil consultatif soit également membre et non pas seulement membre observateur du CA.

Nous proposons donc que le CA soit composé de :

-18 membres élus ;

-2 membres de droit : le président et le vice-président du conseil consultatif ;

-4 personnalités, membres de l'ICOMOS, cooptées.

- **Rôle du CA et du bureau**

-Rôle du président : nous suggérons de prévoir que «*En cas de partage des voix, le président a voix prépondérante* ».

-Rôle du CA : rédaction à revoir pour la désignation du directeur (point 4) : c'est le CA qui décide. Il faudrait donc écrire : « *il désigne le directeur ... sur proposition du bureau* ».

-Le secrétaire général : il faut lui donner un rôle plus actif, en écrivant « *il veille à...* » à la place de « *il vérifie que...* » et ajouter qu'il veille à *l'envoi des convocations aux réunions statutaires*.

D- Conseil consultatif (art 12)

Nous proposons :

-que le président du conseil consultatif soit élu par les présidents des comités nationaux et des comités scientifiques internationaux, parmi les présidents des comités nationaux ;

-que le président des CSI soit élu par les présidents des CSI parmi les présidents de ceux-ci,

-que le président des CSI soit vice-président du conseil consultatif et membre de droit du CA ;

- que la durée des mandats soit calée sur celle du CA et soit donc de 3 ans, renouvelable une fois.

E- les comités nationaux (art 13)

- les comités nationaux

Ajouter « *les autorités locales* » au 13-d

- **Les groupes régionaux**

Nous sommes d'accord sur le principe de créer des groupes régionaux, mais leur création doit s'entourer de quelques précautions :

- *a priori*, nous ne pensons pas qu'ils puissent avoir un droit de vote ;

- Dans leur dossier de présentation, ils doivent préciser les raisons pour lesquelles ils se constituent et indiquer si leur objectif est général ou particulier ;

- Ils doivent être agréés par le CA après avis du conseil consultatif et des comités nationaux, lorsqu'ils existent ;

- Ils doivent fournir un rapport d'activité annuel ;

- Leur mode de fonctionnement devra être précisé dans le règlement intérieur.

- **Les comités scientifiques internationaux (art 14)**

Nous proposons que

-les demandes d'adhésion à un CSI soient transmises par l'intermédiaire des comités nationaux ;

- les CSI établissent tous les ans un rapport sur leurs travaux. Une recommandation pourrait prévoir qu'une dizaine de ces rapports sont présentés chaque année à l'occasion de l'AG.

F- Secrétariat international (art 15)

Il faut lui donner un rôle plus actif : il n'est pas là simplement pour assurer la gestion quotidienne : prévoir qu' « *il est chargé de la mise en œuvre des décisions du CA* ».

G- Les langues (art 21)

Nous sommes tout à fait d'accord sur les orientations qui sont proposées pour assurer la présence du plus grand nombre de langues dans les activités de l'ICOMOS. Nous pensons toutefois qu'il serait souhaitable de ne pas supprimer la notion de langues officielles pour que les avancées proposées ne puissent pas être considérées comme un recul pour l'espagnol et le russe.

Les recommandations

-Nous sommes favorables aux recommandations prévues, notamment celles qui visent l'augmentation des membres des comités nationaux et la dégressivité des cotisations.

Nous proposons que cette dégressivité intervienne par paliers successifs à partir de 100 membres.

-Une remarque concernant la recommandation 15, « système d'élection » : tout ce qui touche les élections est statutaire et ne peut être organisé par le règlement intérieur.

Autre remarque

Nous avons eu connaissance d'un souhait du CIVVH de compléter les définitions - c en ajoutant les termes " organisation spatiale" ou "plan". Nous sommes favorables à cette suggestion.

Remarques d'ICOMOS France sur le projet de déclaration d'engagement éthique

ICOMOS France a pris connaissance avec intérêt de ce document dont elle estime qu'il présente une avancée sensible par rapport au texte de 2002.

I Remarques générales

La déclaration de 2002 distinguait les membres de l'ICOMOS et les membres associés ; elle considérait que les premiers devaient être essentiellement des « professionnels » au sens avant tout d'architectes maîtres d'œuvre. ICOMOS France avait alors fait part de sa réserve sur ce texte en diffusant un document intitulé « Laissons ouvertes les portes d'ICOMOS » prônant une ouverture de notre ONG à l'ensemble des acteurs de la protection et de la valorisation du patrimoine.

Le rapport intermédiaire de 2008 observait que la déclaration était peu utilisée, notamment au sein des comités francophones et hispanophones. C'est pourquoi l'Assemblée générale de 2011 a décidé d'intégrer la déclaration d'éthique dans les statuts, ce qui nous paraît être une bonne mesure. Le titre est devenu : « Déclaration d'engagement éthique », nous pouvons accepter ce titre mais préférons « Code d'éthique » ou « Code de déontologie »

Le nouveau projet a une vision plus large, plus ambitieuse et plus complète que le document de 2002 ; sa structuration est claire ; l'intégration dans un document (d'éthique) unique des différents textes faisant référence à l'éthique et notamment à ceux des orientations de l'UNESCO, est une bonne formule. Enfin et surtout, la distinction entre les membres d'ICOMOS et les membres associés a disparu.

Toutefois les difficultés qu'avait rencontrées ICOMOS France sur le texte de 2002 demeurent encore largement présentes : elles concernent la définition du concept de « conservation » et des conditions à remplir pour pouvoir être membres d'ICOMOS, qui en découlent directement. Nous retrouvons, pour partie, cette même difficulté pour la définition de membres dans le projet de réforme des statuts.

Les remarques d'ICOMOS France touchent à la fois la forme, le fond et l'approche linguistique.

II- Le concept de « conservation du patrimoine » et ses effets sur la capacité à être membre d'ICOMOS

1) La définition de la notion de "conservation".

2)

Ce projet utilise parfois le concept de « conservation » dans sa dimension la plus large, comme dans le préambule, parfois au contraire il semble ne lui conférer que le sens étroit de l'intervention directe sur les monuments historiques.

En particulier, dans les articles 2, 4 et 5, le terme « conservation » semble avoir une interprétation étroite. La lecture donne le sentiment que le document ne vise pas les interventions dans les autres domaines de la préservation du patrimoine et ne s'applique pas notamment aux ensembles et aux paysages culturels.

Il faut marquer plus clairement qu'on sort du champ strict des monuments pour aborder le patrimoine dans son sens le plus large. Il faut marquer également que le texte vise l'ensemble des intervenants de ce large champ.

C'est pourquoi nous préférons, au terme trop étroit de "conservation", celui de « préservation » du patrimoine qui peut englober la totalité de la chaîne : connaissance, protection, entretien,

conservation, mise en valeur, gestion, transmission du patrimoine, et qui s'applique aisément à la fois aux monuments, aux villes, aux paysages et aux sites.

La transmission du patrimoine aux générations futures est en particulier au centre des responsabilités des acteurs du patrimoine et donc d'ICOMOS. Il serait bon de faire apparaître cet objectif dans le préambule et dans l'article 2 du texte.

2) Les membres d'ICOMOS.

ICOMOS France considère que l'ensemble des acteurs de la "préservation" du patrimoine, dans son sens le plus large tel que nous l'avons défini ci-dessus, ont vocation à être membres d'ICOMOS. Il serait souhaitable que cette diversité des membres soit évoquée dès le préambule.

3) les connotations à incidence professionnelle et commerciales

Nous proposons de supprimer toutes les indications qui visent les relations entre clients et fournisseur : il s'agit d'un code de déontologie qui s'applique à tous type de relation. (1-c, notion de faute professionnelle ; 4-d contraintes budgétaires ; 5-b et d, notion de droit de confidentialité client employeur,

III- principes éthiques et responsabilité en vis-à-vis des missions d'expertise d'ICOMOS

Les interventions au titre du patrimoine mondial sont susceptibles d'entraîner des dérives qu'il faut prévenir dans notre document d'éthique. Nous en avons relevé trois qui s'apparentent toutes à la notion de conflit d'intérêt :

1) Cadeaux et libéralités

Les membres d'ICOMOS mais aussi les comités nationaux et ICOMOS doivent éviter de recevoir des cadeaux ou des libéralités en lien avec leurs missions au titre du patrimoine mondial notamment ;

2) Le membre d'ICOMOS concerné par un dossier ne participe pas aux votes sur ce dossier

Les interventions au titre du patrimoine mondial ne s'effectuent pas seulement dans le cadre des expertises d'ICOMOS lui-même. Il nous semble utile de préciser qu'un membre d'ICOMOS qui intervient, à quelque titre que ce soit, dans son pays, sur un bien inscrit ou candidat au patrimoine mondial et qui est membre d'instances officielles appelées à se prononcer sur ce bien, ne doit pas participer aux votes ;

3) Les délits d'initiés

Les connaissances acquises à l'occasion de travaux sur les dossiers du patrimoine mondial peuvent donner lieu à de délits d'initiés. Ils sont, bien évidemment proscrits, mais peut-être est-il bon de citer nommément ce risque.

IV – La version française du document

Le document est souvent d'une lecture difficile en français et cette difficulté à parfois des incidences sur la bonne compréhension du fond. ICOMOS France est prêt à revoir ce document lorsque sa version sera stabilisée.

A ce stade, seules quelques améliorations de forme ont été proposées. Les corrections figurant sur le texte sont surtout des précisions ou des modifications :

Art 2

- A l'art 2-c, on parle de « techniciens » ; nous préférons le terme de « spécialistes » ;
- nous proposons d'introduire la notion de développement durable à l'art 2-d ;

Article 4

-A l'article 4-b et d, on parle de « travaux » ; il serait utile, selon les cas, de préciser « travaux intellectuels » et de remplacer « travaux » par « interventions » pour éviter tout ce qui pourrait sembler limiter le sujet aux travaux d'architecture.

-A l'art 4-e, nous proposons une modification car nous pensons qu'une décision ne doit pas être collective mais résulter d'une large concertation

Comments	English text as suggested	Texte français suggéré	Commentaire
	<p>01/10/2013 31/01/2014</p> <p>Draft review of the Ethical Commitment Statement Suggestions from ICOMOS France</p>	<p>01/10/2013 31/01/2014</p> <p>Projet de révision de la Déclaration d'engagement éthique Suggestions ICOMOS France</p>	
	<p>Ethical Principles for ICOMOS Members</p> <p>Adopted by the 13th General Assembly (Madrid, 2002) and amended by the 18th General Assembly (Florence, 2014)</p>	<p>Principes éthiques pour les membres de l'ICOMOS</p> <p>Adoptés par la 13^{ème} Assemblée générale (Madrid, 2002) et amendés par la 18^{ième} Assemblée générale (Florence, 2014)</p>	
	<p>Preamble</p> <p>The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) is a non-governmental organisation whose objective is to further the conservation of cultural heritage (monuments, groups of buildings and sites) in their tangible and intangible aspects.</p> <p>By virtue of their collective expertise, members of ICOMOS share common values and principles.</p> <p>ICOMOS considers that the conservation and transmission of the diverse cultural heritage of the world is the responsibility and privilege a duty of current generations as well as the privilege and right of future generations.</p> <p>The objective of the ICOMOS Ethical Principles is primarily to provide a tool to improve and clarify ethical principles and practice of cultural heritage conservation preservation for its members. It may also be useful for non-members who are active in the conservation of cultural heritage.</p>	<p>Préambule</p> <p>Le Conseil des Monuments et des Sites (ICOMOS) est une organisation non gouvernementale dont l'objet est de promouvoir la conservation du patrimoine culturel (monuments, ensembles et sites) dans ses dimensions matérielles et immatérielles.</p> <p>Au titre de leurs compétences, Les membres d'ICOMOS se retrouvent autour de principes et de valeurs partagés.</p> <p>L'ICOMOS considère que la conservation et la transmission du patrimoine culturel du monde, dans toute sa diversité, relève de la responsabilité et est un privilège est un devoir pour les générations actuelles et est un droit et un privilège pour les générations futures.</p> <p>L'objectif des Principes éthiques de l'ICOMOS est de fournir aux membres un instrument permettant d'améliorer et de clarifier les principes et les pratiques éthiques de la conservation préservation du patrimoine culturel. Ces Principes peuvent être utiles également pour les non-membres intervenant dans le ce domaine.</p>	<p>En conformité avec le préambule et l'article 4 du projet révisé des Statuts.</p>
	<p>Article 1 Application</p> <p>a The Ethical Principles shall apply to all members</p>	<p>Article 1 Champ d'application</p> <p>a Les Principes éthiques s'appliquent à tous les</p>	

Comments	English text as suggested	Texte français suggéré	Commentaire
First part of ECS Article 15	of ICOMOS.	membres de l'ICOMOS.	
	b By maintaining membership in ICOMOS and the payment of the annual membership due to ICOMOS, ICOMOS members signify their commitment to adhere to these Ethical Principles.	b L'adhésion à l'ICOMOS et le règlement de la cotisation annuelle à l'ICOMOS emporte adhésion aux Principes éthiques.	
	c Failure to act in conformity with these Ethical Principles may constitute unprofessional misconduct and that brings the member and in some cases ICOMOS into disrepute; it therefore may result in sanctions as detailed under Article 8 of these principles.	c Le non-respect de ces Principes éthiques peut constituer une faute professionnelle et qui peut nuire à la réputation du membre et, dans certains cas, à celle de l'ICOMOS ; en conséquence, des sanctions peuvent être envisagées conformément à l'article 8 de ces Principes.	Première partie de l'article 15 de la DEE
Article 2 Responsibility to the cultural heritage of the world		Article 2 Responsabilité à l'égard du patrimoine culturel du monde	
First part of ECS Article 2	a ICOMOS members should must do their utmost to advocate the conservation preservation of cultural heritage, and its transmission to future generations , so that its significance is retained as reliable evidence of the past, doing as much as is necessary to care for it and support its on-going use and maintenance while at the same time affecting it as little as possible. This requires a global , comprehensive, holistic, dynamic and multidisciplinary approach aiming to conserve to guarantee authenticity and integrity and to present and interpret significance.	a Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent de s'appliquent à promouvoir la conservation préservation du patrimoine culturel et sa transmission aux générations futures de manière à ce que sa signification et son importance soient préservées et constituent un témoignage fiable du passé, de à faire le nécessaire pour en prendre soin et favoriser son utilisation et son entretien courants en l'altérant le moins possible. Cette démarche requiert une approche globale , holistique, dynamique et pluridisciplinaire, pour visant à conserver l'authenticité et l'intégrité du patrimoine culturel et en faire apparaître la signification.	Première partie de l'article 2 de la DEE
First part of ECS Article 3	b ICOMOS members should respect the diverse and dynamic tangible and intangible values of cultural heritage that may hold different meaning for various groups and communities, enriching human culture.	b Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent de respecter les valeurs multiples et dynamiques, matérielles et immatérielles du patrimoine culturel auxquelles divers groupes et populations peuvent attacher un sens différent, ce qui est une source d'enrichissement pour la culture humaine.	Première partie de l'article 3 de la DEE
ECS Article 6	c Considering that most conservation preservation projects require an interdisciplinary approach, ICOMOS members should make every effort to set up collaborative teams amongst architects,	c Comme la plupart des projets de conservation préservation requièrent une approche interdisciplinaire, les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent de mettre en place des équipes	Article 6 de la DEE

Comments	English text as suggested	Texte français suggéré	Commentaire
	specialists, technicians , crafts persons, administrators, site-managers and communities.	mixtes comprenant des architectes, des techniciens spécialistes , des artisans, des administrateurs, des gestionnaires de sites et des représentants des habitants	
Last sentence of ECS Article 2	d ICOMOS members shall recognise the historical, economic and social role of heritage conservation as a driver of sustainable development in local and world development.	d Les membres de l'ICOMOS reconnaissent le rôle historique, économique et social de la conservation du patrimoine comme moteur du développement durable dans le développement local et mondial.	Dernière phrase de l'article 2 de la DEE
ECS Article 8	e In an emergency, where cultural heritage is in immediate danger or at risk, ICOMOS members should render all assistance practicable provided they do not put their own health and safety or that of others in jeopardy.	e Lorsque le patrimoine culturel est menacé par un danger imminent ou est en péril, les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent d'offrir toute l'assistance possible, tout en s'assurant qu'ils ne mettent pas en danger leur santé et sécurité ou celle des autres.	Article 8 de la DEE
Article 3 Responsibility to the public		Article 3 Responsabilité à l'égard du public	
Second part of ECS Article 3	a ICOMOS members should promote effective community involvement in cultural heritage preservation conservation . Members should collaborate with people or communities associated with the cultural heritage concerned and recognise, respect and encourage the co-existence of diverse cultural values.	a Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent de promouvoir l'engagement effectif des populations locales dans la conservation préserve conservation du patrimoine culturel . Ils s'efforcent de collaborer avec les personnes ou les collectivités impliquées dans la conservation préservation du patrimoine concerné et par la reconnaissance, le respect et le soutien de la coexistence de diverses valeurs culturelles.	Deuxième partie de l'article 3 de la DEE
First part of ECS Article 5	b ICOMOS members should promote public awareness, appreciation, access and support for cultural heritage: members should foster informed debate, education, training programmes and in particular, exchange of knowledge at the international level.	b Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent d'encourager la sensibilisation du public, l'appréciation, l'accès et le soutien au patrimoine culturel : ils s'efforcent de favoriser les débats éclairés, l'éducation, les programmes de formation et, en particulier, les échanges internationaux de savoirs.	Première partie de l'article 5 de la DEE
ECS Article 9	c ICOMOS members must be aware that they have a general responsibility for cultural heritage conservation preservation and transmission to the present and future generations, and a particular responsibility for activities conducted under their own leadership.	c Les membres de l'ICOMOS doivent être conscients qu'ils ont une responsabilité générale en matière de conservation préservation et transmission du patrimoine culturel devant les générations actuelles et futures, et une responsabilité spécifique pour les activités conduites sous leur direction.	Article 9 de la DEE

Comments	English text as suggested	Texte français suggéré	Commentaire
	Article 4 Responsibility for ethical conduct	Article 4 Responsabilité éthique	
First part of ECS Article 12 and second part of ECS Article 13	a ICOMOS members shall conduct their activities in a manner of openness, probity, honesty, impartiality, tolerance, accountability and objectivity manner	a Les membres de l'ICOMOS mènent leurs activités dans un esprit d'ouverture, d'honnêteté de probité et d'impartialité, de façon responsable et objective.	Première partie de l'article 12 et deuxième partie de l'article 13 de la DEE
Third part of ECS Article 13	1 They must at all times avoid or publicly declare any real or apparent conflict of interest that could compromise the independent, impartial and objective nature of their work mandate . They must not commit insider dealing	1 Ils évitent ou doivent déclarer tout conflit d'intérêt, apparent ou réel, qui serait de nature à compromettre l'exercice indépendant, impartial et objectif de leur mandat mission . Ils ne commettent pas de délits d'initiés.	Troisième partie de l'article 13 de la DEE
Resolution 17GA 2011/11	2 They must indicate whether the views and opinions they express are their personal views or the views of the institution they represent.	2 Ils doivent préciser si les points de vue et opinions qu'ils expriment sont les leurs ou ceux de l'institution qu'ils représentent.	Résolution 17AG 2011/11
First part of ECS Article 10 and second part of ECS Article 10	b ICOMOS members should actively discourage misrepresentation, false advertising and/or misuse of intellectual work. They must acknowledge, record and publicise the intellectual, material and practical contributions of others.	b Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent de lutter contre les présentations déformées, les fausses informations et/ou l'usage abusif de travaux intellectuels . Ils doivent citer, référencier et publier de façon précise et fidèle les contributions intellectuelles, matérielles et pratiques d'autres intervenants.	Première partie de l'article 10 de la DEE et deuxième partie de l'article 10 de la DEE
First part of ECS Article 11	c ICOMOS members shall oppose any concealment or manipulation of data and findings related to cultural heritage to meet outside demands.	c Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'opposent à toute dissimulation ou manipulation de données et de découvertes liées au patrimoine culturel pour répondre à des demandes externes.	Première partie de l'article 11 de la DEE
Second part of ECS Article 11	d ICOMOS members should ensure that the general scope and context of their interventions work , including budgetary constraints of whatever kind, or other factors , are adequately explained.	d Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent d'expliquer de façon appropriée le cadre général et le contexte de leurs travaux interventions et, le cas échéant, les contraintes budgétaires ou autres de quelque nature qu'elles soient .	Deuxième partie de l'article 11 de la DEE
Last sentence of Article 11 of the Venice Charter	e ICOMOS members should ensure that important decisions on preservation conservation projects are not taken by the author of the project only but are the result of a collective decision-making process of interdisciplinary review .	e Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent de faire en sorte que les choix importants dans les projets de conservation préservation ne soient pas pris par le seul auteur du projet mais que la décision résultent d'un processus de prise de décision réflexion interdisciplinaire collective .	Dernière phrase de l'article 11 de la Charte de Venise
Last sentence of ECS Article 4	f ICOMOS members may also be members of the professional organisations affiliated with their training and field of work, and should adhere to their relevant codes and disciplinary standards.	f Les membres de l'ICOMOS peuvent adhérer aux organisations professionnelles liées à leur formation et à leur champ d'activité et s'efforcent de respecter leurs codes et règles	

Comments	English text as suggested	Texte français suggéré	Commentaire
	g ICOMOS members must not accept gifts or largesse offered to them because of their work. This applies equally to national committees and ICOMOS itself.	professionnels. g Les membres d'ICOMOS n'acceptent pas de cadeaux ou de libéralités qui pourraient leur être faits en raison de leurs fonctions. Ceci vaut également pour les comités nationaux et pour ICOMOS.	
	Article 5 Standards of professional practice for heritage preservation	Article 5 -Règles de conduite professionnelle pour la préservation du patrimoine	
ECS Article 1	a ICOMOS members should act in accordance with all doctrinal texts validly adopted by the ICOMOS General Assembly as well as international conventions and recommendations of UNESCO and other international organisations related to cultural heritage conservation preservation .	a Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent d'agir conformément aux textes doctrinaux valablement adoptés par l'Assemblée générale de l'ICOMOS et aux conventions et recommandations de l'UNESCO et autres organisations internationales relatives à la conservation préservation du patrimoine culturel.	Article 1 de la DEE
First part of ECS Article 4	b ICOMOS members should maintain, refine and update their knowledge of cultural heritage conservation preservation , including conservation philosophy, practice, techniques and relevant legal requirements. They should where applicable further their development, exchange information and share experience subject to any duties of a client's or employer's right any duties of a client's or employer's right of confidentiality.	b Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent d'entretenir, de perfectionner et de mettre à jour leurs connaissances en matière de la conservation préservation du patrimoine culturel, y compris dans les domaines de la philosophie de la conservation, des pratiques et des techniques de conservation, des réglementations y afférentes. Ils s'efforcent le cas échéant de les développer, d'échanger des informations et de partager des expériences dans la limite du droit devoir de confidentialité du client ou de l'employeur.	Première partie de l'article 4 de la DEE
First part of ECS Article 7	c ICOMOS members shall ensure that conservation preservation decisions are based on adequate knowledge and research, that viable options are explored and that chosen options are justified.	c Les membres de l'ICOMOS veillent à ce que les décisions prises en matière de conservation préservation soient fondées sur des connaissances et des recherches appropriées, à ce que différentes options réalisables aient été explorées et à ce que celles qui ont été adoptées soient justifiées.	Première partie de l'article 7 de la DEE
Second part of ECS Article 7	d ICOMOS members should make complete, durable and accessible records of the conservation process and works carried out (including surveys, documentary and historical studies, diagnostic examination, monitoring	d Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent de constituer des dossiers complets, durables et accessibles sur le processus de conservation et les travaux engagés (relevés, étude documentaire et historique, diagnostics,	Deuxième partie de l'article 7 de la DEE

Comments	English text as suggested	Texte français suggéré	Commentaire
	<p>techniques, managerial methods, preventive conservation and restoration intervention) in the framework of all projects for which they are responsible.</p> <p>They shall ensure that such documentation is placed in a permanent archive and made publicly accessible as promptly as possible, subject to any necessary requirements of client/employer confidentiality, security and privacy, and where this is culturally appropriate.</p>	<p>techniques de contrôle, méthodes de gestion, conservation préventive et intervention de restauration) entrepris sous leur responsabilité. Ils veillent à ce que ces documents soient conservés dans les archives et soient accessibles au public aussi rapidement que possible, dans la limite des obligations de confidentialité dues au client, du respect de la sécurité et de la vie privée qui s'imposent en matière, et lorsque c'est opportun sur le plan culturel.</p>	
Second part of ECS Article 5	<p>e ICOMOS members should support fellow professionals and mentor junior colleagues by promoting ethical cultural heritage preservation conservation practice to advance the wider understanding of heritage preservation conservation philosophy, standards and methods.</p>	<p>e Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent d'apporter leur appui à leurs collègues et de former les plus jeunes en promouvant les pratiques éthiques de conservation conservation préservation du patrimoine culturel afin de mieux faire comprendre la philosophie, les règles et les méthodes de la conservation préservation du patrimoine.</p>	Deuxième partie de l'article 5 de la DEE
Article 6 Responsibility to ICOMOS		Article 6 Responsabilité à l'égard de l'ICOMOS	
First part of ECS Article 13	<p>a ICOMOS members should be respectful of cultural diversity, collegial, loyal and considerate.</p> <p>b ICOMOS Members should enhance and uphold the reputation of ICOMOS.</p>	<p>a Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent de respecter la diversité culturelle, d'être collégiaux, loyaux et attentionnés.</p> <p>b Les membres de l'ICOMOS s'efforcent de mettre en valeur et soutenir la réputation de l'ICOMOS.</p>	Première partie de l'article 13 de la DEE
ECS Article 14	<p>1 They must be mindful that the ICOMOS name and logo belongs to ICOMOS</p> <p>2 They must not act or speak on behalf of ICOMOS or one of its Committees, without the authority of the relevant ICOMOS Committee or organ and in such cases shall strictly adhere to the institutional views of the relevant ICOMOS Committee or organ.</p> <p>3 They must not use their position within ICOMOS for their personal advantage.</p>	<p>1 Ils doivent être conscients que le nom et le logo de l'ICOMOS appartiennent à l'ICOMOS.</p> <p>2 Ils ne doivent pas agir ou parler au nom de l'ICOMOS ou de l'un de ses Comités sans l'autorisation de l'organe ou du Comité de l'ICOMOS concerné et dans ces cas, ils doivent se conformer strictement aux points de vue institutionnels de l'organe ou du Comité de l'ICOMOS concerné.</p> <p>3 Ils ne doivent pas utiliser leur position au sein de l'ICOMOS à leur profit personnel.</p>	Article 14 de la DEE

Comments	English text as suggested	Texte français suggéré	Commentaire
Article discussed by the Advisory Committee in 2004	4 Candidates for office within ICOMOS may campaign but only by means accessible to all members and must not ask their country, avoid mobilising government, public or private organisations to from-campaigning on their behalf.	4 Les candidats à des fonctions au sein de l'ICOMOS peuvent mener une campagne mais uniquement par des moyens accessibles à tous et ils doivent s'abstenir de mobiliser leur gouvernement ne doivent pas faire appel au soutien de leur pays , des organisations publiques ou privées pour mener campagne à leur profit.	Article discuté par le Comité consultatif en 2004
	Article 7 Responsibility for expert work carried under the name of ICOMOS	Article 7 Responsabilité vis-à-vis de missions d'expertise confiées par l'ICOMOS	
§ 148 b and c of the World Heritage Operational Guidelines	a When they carry out expert work for ICOMOS, ICOMOS members must be objective, rigorous and scientific in their evaluations, which should be conducted with a constant degree of professionalism. They must justify their views appropriately.	a Lorsque des missions d'expertise leur sont confiées par l'ICOMOS, les membres de l'ICOMOS doivent rendre des évaluations objectives, rigoureuses et scientifiques, et travailler avec un degré constant de professionnalisme. Ils doivent justifier leur point de vue de manière appropriée.	§ 148 b et c des Orientations pour la Convention du Patrimoine mondial
§ 4 of the World Heritage Policy Paper	<p>b ICOMOS members and Committees must avoid any actual or apparent conflict of interest.</p> <p>1 ICOMOS members involved in ICOMOS World Heritage work must disclose to ICOMOS any direct advice given on nominations and the conservation and management of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List, along with the particular circumstances of the service provided. This applies to mission experts, desk reviewers, advisors, members of the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel and members of the World Heritage Working Group. This is not intended to include academic commentaries of a general nature.</p> <p>2 National Committees and International Scientific Committees shall be asked to disclose to ICOMOS any involvement they have in World Heritage nominations and the conservation and management of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List, as well as identifying their members involved</p>	<p>b Les membres et Comités de l'ICOMOS doivent éviter tout conflit d'intérêt réel ou apparent.</p> <p>1 Les membres de l'ICOMOS associés au travail de l'ICOMOS sur le patrimoine mondial doivent informer l'ICOMOS de tout conseil directement donné sur des propositions d'inscription ainsi que sur les circonstances spécifiques du service rendu. Ceci vaut pour tous les experts qu'ils soient ou non en déplacement, les conseillers, les membres de la Commission de l'ICOMOS pour le Patrimoine mondial et les membres du Groupe de travail du Patrimoine mondial. Cette obligation ne s'applique pas aux commentaires académiques à caractère général.</p> <p>2 Les Comités nationaux et les Comités scientifiques internationaux sont invités à communiquer à ICOMOS toute participation qu'ils ont dans des propositions d'inscription et la conservation et la gestion des biens déjà inscrits sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondial et à indiquer le nom de leurs</p>	§ 4 des Principes d'application du mandat de l'ICOMOS pour le Patrimoine mondial

Comments	English text as suggested	Texte français suggéré	Commentaire
	in such work. 3 ICOMOS World Heritage Panel and World Heritage Working Group members must not participate in any discussions related to nominations and state of conservation reports related to properties in their own countries.	membres impliqués dans un tel travail. 3 Les membres de la Commission de l'ICOMOS pour le patrimoine mondial et du Groupe de travail du patrimoine mondial ne doivent pas participer à des discussions ayant trait aux propositions d'inscription et aux rapports sur l'état de conservation concernant des biens de leur pays.	
§ 5 of the World Heritage Policy Paper	4 ICOMOS members involved in the preparation of nominations files must not take part in any discussion of the nomination at the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel or the World Heritage Working Group or undertake missions or desk evaluations for these nominations. The same principle applies for state of conservation reports. Involvement in a nomination file or conservation of a property includes advising or providing recommendations or in any way furthering such a nomination but excluding any academic work of a general nature. If an ICOMOS member is involved in preparing a report on a property and takes part in national consultative or decision-making proceedings on the property, the member must not take part in the vote.	4 Les membres de l'ICOMOS étant impliqués dans la préparation d'une proposition d'inscription ne doivent prendre part à aucune discussion concernant cette proposition d'inscription au sein de la Commission de l'ICOMOS pour le Patrimoine mondial ou du Groupe de travail du Patrimoine mondial ni entreprendre des missions ou des évaluations sur dossier concernant ces propositions d'inscription. Le même principe s'applique pour les rapports sur l'état de conservation des biens inscrits sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondial. L'implication dans une proposition d'inscription ou la conservation d'un bien inclut la formulation de conseils ou de recommandations et la promotion d'une quelconque manière mais exclut tout travail académique à caractère général. Si un membre de l'ICOMOS est impliqué dans le traitement d'un dossier concernant un bien et participe à des instances consultatives ou décisionnelles nationales appelées à se prononcer sur ce bien, il ne prend pas part au vote.	§ 5 des Principes d'application du mandat de l'ICOMOS pour le Patrimoine mondial
§ 12 of the Word Heritage Policy Paper	c The recommendations and opinions of ICOMOS experts, the ICOMOS World Heritage Panel and Word Heritage Working Group are confidential.	c Les recommandations et avis des experts de l'ICOMOS, de la Commission de l'ICOMOS pour le Patrimoine mondial et du Groupe de travail Patrimoine mondial sont confidentiels.	§ 12 des Principes d'application du mandat de l'ICOMOS pour le Patrimoine mondial
§ 12 of the World Heritage Policy Paper	1 ICOMOS members must not disclose this information and the discussions that have taken place to any person or organisation that	1 Les membres de l'ICOMOS ne doivent pas divulguer cette information et les discussions qui ont eu lieu à des personnes ou des	§ 12 des Principes d'application du mandat de l'ICOMOS pour le Patrimoine mondial

Comments	English text as suggested	Texte français suggéré	Commentaire
	was not present in those discussions.	organisations qui n'étaient pas présentes à ces discussions.	
§ 12 of the World Heritage Policy Paper	2 ICOMOS members involved in ICOMOS World Heritage work must not in their independent capacity engage the media, representatives of the State Party or any other individual or organisation that may or may not have an interest in the property concerned.	2 Les membres de l'ICOMOS impliqués dans le travail de l'ICOMOS sur le Patrimoine mondial ne doivent pas approcher à titre individuel les médias, des représentants de l'État partie ou toute autre personne ou organisation qu'ils aient ou non un intérêt pour le bien concerné.	§ 12 des Principes d'application du mandat de l'ICOMOS pour le Patrimoine mondial
Guidelines for the Operational Management of the ECS	Article 8 Operational management	Article 8 Mise en application	Indications pour la mise en œuvre de la DEE
Part of paragraph 3 of the ECS Guidelines for the Operational Management	a Operational management of the implementation of the Ethical Principles shall be done through the National and International Scientific Committees in conformity with the ICOMOS Statutes and Rules of Procedure. It shall primarily include educational activity.	a Les Comités nationaux et les Comités scientifiques internationaux veillent à la mise en application des Principes éthiques, dans le respect des Statuts et du Règlement intérieur de l'ICOMOS. Ceci implique en premier lieu une activité pédagogique.	Partie du paragraphe 3 des indications pour la mise en œuvre de la DEE
Paragraph 3 of the ECS Guidelines for the Operational Management, Article 7-b of the Revised Draft Statutes	b Inappropriate conduct may be investigated, conducted in a confidential manner. They may result in sanctions. The member concerned shall be informed of the charges and shall be called to provide explanations.	b Des comportements inadaptés peuvent faire l'objet d'enquêtes, qui seront menées de façon confidentielle. Elles peuvent donner lieu à des sanctions. Le membre concerné est informé des charges et appelé à fournir des explications.	Paragraphe 3 des indications pour la mise en œuvre de la DEE, article 7-b du projet révisé des Statuts
Last part of ECS Article 15	c Penalties that may be imposed are: - Admonition, - Suspension of membership for a period of time, - Loss of ICOMOS membership.	c Les sanctions qui peuvent être imposées sont : - l'avertissement, - la suspension de d'adhésion pour une certaine durée, - la perte de la qualité de membre de l'ICOMOS.	Dernière partie de l'article 15 de la DEE
	d International Scientific Committees shall confer in a confidential manner with the National Committee of the member concerned when a penalty is envisaged and vice versa.	d Les Comités scientifiques internationaux consultent le Comité national du membre concerné lorsqu'une sanction est envisagée et réciproquement.	
In conformity with Article 7-b of the Revised Draft Statutes Paragraph 3 of the ECS Guidelines for the Operational Management	e An appeal procedure shall be available at the ICOMOS Board f All proceedings shall be confidential, as is the imposition of an admonishment; however all other penalties shall be made public.	e Une procédure d'appel existe devant le Conseil d'administration de l'ICOMOS. f Toute la procédure est confidentielle ; l'avertissement est confidentiel, les autres sanctions sont rendues publiques.	En conformité avec l'article 7-b du projet révisé des Statuts Paragraph 3 des indications pour la mise en œuvre de la DEE
	Article 9 Amendments	Article 9 Modifications	

Comments	English text as suggested	Texte français suggéré	Commentaire
Last sentence of the Preamble and the sentence following Article 15.	These Ethical Principles shall be reviewed at least every six years by the ICOMOS Board and amendments shall be adopted by the ICOMOS General Assembly in conformity with its Statutes.	Ces Principes éthiques sont examinés au moins tous les six ans par le Conseil d'administration de l'ICOMOS et les modifications sont adoptées par l'Assemblée générale de l'ICOMOS conformément à ses Statuts.	Dernière phrase du préambule et phrase suivant l'article 15 de la DEE

ICOMOS France

Contribution sent in French by Ms Isabelle Palmi, Director of ICOMOS France Secretariat, 2014-01-31

Translation into English by ICOMOS UK

Two preliminary remarks:

1. ICOMOS Statutes and French law on non-profit organisations

Several proposed modifications aim to bring the ICOMOS Statutes in line with French law. ICOMOS France can only support these.

2. The text in French

A general review of linguistic style is required. The French Committee will support the working group to ensure that the text is settled in substance. Two observations at this stage:

- we must use the phrase “**la loi de 1901**” [the law of 1901] for non-profit organisations and not “la loi 1901” [the law 1901].
- the term “restauration” is used increasingly to mean restoration work and applies essentially to historic monuments. We are thinking about the possibility of proposing a wider term, perhaps “préservation”.

Amendments that affect the functioning of ICOMOS

A Membership

• Membership categories (article 6)

- We are opposed to the creation of the category *affiliated members*. This concept does not exist in French law on non-profit organisations, and we cannot accept it. We propose re-defining *sustaining members* for those who are prepared to support ICOMOS financially. The definition of sustaining members could be “sustaining members are individuals or institutions paying a fee, the minimum for which is determined each year by the General Assembly.”

- The definition provided for individual members is too restrictive: it would lead to ICOMOS depriving itself of the support of many people with heritage expertise and who are involved in heritage preservation but who are not professionally engaged. We suggest “Individual membership shall be open to professionals and others engaged in the areas of competence of the organisation...” [« *la qualité de membre individuel est reconnue à des professionnels et des personnes engagées dans les domaines de compétence de l'association...* »]

- In this context, we would prefer not to create a category of *young member*. Instead we suggest a recommendation to the General Assembly to offer reduced fee rates to members aged less than 30 years old.

• Rights and duties of members (article 6bis)

This article features a proposed rule that National Committees must pay their membership fees before 1st May. We completely understand that ICOMOS needs to know its budget and organise its resources as soon as possible in the year. However, those National Committees which benefit from public funds do not receive their funding until later in the year; early payment of the total membership fees before 1st May risks putting them in a difficult situation. We propose therefore to stagger the payment so that only two-thirds of the fees are required before 1st May.

B. General Assembly (article 9)

• French law and the General Assembly

French law requires an annual meeting of the General Assembly to vote on the current year's budget and approve the accounts for the previous year; there must also be a vote on the level of membership fees.

One recommendation might be to propose that the GA during which the elections take place, as currently happens, is the opportunity for a large meeting of ICOMOS members, accompanied by an important symposium; the other annual GAs could be more modest and provide the opportunity for a meeting of the Board and the Advisory Council.

- The number of votes: it is no longer planned to give 18 votes routinely to every National Committee, but to try to establish a link between the number of members of the committees, the population of the countries concerned and the number of votes. It is a delicate and interesting task and ICOMOS France is in favour.

- **Proxies**

All GAs are open to all ICOMOS members and every member of a National Committee can be a voting member for their committee during the GA without exceeding the number of votes allocated to that Committee. But it is necessary to distinguish between members and the number of votes allocated to the Committee.

The GAs where the elections take place bring together more members than the 'simple' GAs. An important issue is to make sure that the members present at GA meetings can use all the votes allocated to their Committee. Currently the number of proxies is limited to 5. While it is easy to assemble enough members for this proxy system to work for current GAs, which bring everyone together, it will be more difficult to make it work for the 'simple' GAs where often a Committee will be represented by a single member.

ICOMOS France therefore proposes a revision of the proxy system to ensure that all the votes of a Committee can, where necessary, be cast by a single Committee member.

- **The Quorum**

The current quorum is one quarter of voting members. To avoid giving too great a preponderance to any particular country, we should examine the possibility of drawing together various parts of the world more, for example, by having a quorum made up by a quarter of voting members and a quarter of National Committees.

C. The Board (article 10)

- **Length of terms of office**

We agree that the maximum term of office should be 6 years (that is, 2x3 years), rather than 9 years, which is too long.

We would rather keep the current arrangements to renew the entire Board every three years, rather than a third of the membership each year.

- **Election of Bureau members**

We are in favour of keeping the current system of direct election of Bureau members by the GA, which gives more legitimacy to those elected.

We would like the term of office of Bureau members in principle to be the same duration as Board members, that is, 3 years.

- **Composition of the Board**

The reforms propose a Board made up of 20 elected members and the president of the Advisory Council. We are in favour of keeping co-opted members and think that it would be desirable for the Vice-President of the Advisory Council to be a full member and not just an observer of the Board.

We therefore propose that the Board should be composed of:

- 18 elected members
- 2 members as of right: the President and Vice-President of the Advisory Council
- 4 leading figures, co-opted from ICOMOS

- **Role of the Board and the bureau**

- Role of the President: we suggest the arrangement that «*En cas de partage des voix, le président a voix prépondérante.*» [“in the case of a tie, the president has the casting vote” – the English phrase would remain the same.]

- Role of the Board: remove the revision for the appointment of the director (point 4): it is the Board that decides this. It is therefore necessary to say “the Board shall appoint a director ... following a proposal by the bureau”.

- the Secretary General needs a more active role. The phrase “he shall verify that...” should be replaced by “he shall ensure that...”. It is also his role to ensure the dispatch of notifications of statutory meetings.

D. The Advisory Council (art 12)

We propose:

- that the President of the of the Advisory Council be elected by the presidents of the National Committees and the International Scientific Committees, from among the presidents of the National Committees
- that the President of the ISCs be elected by the presidents of the International Scientific Committees from among those presidents
- that the President of the ISCs be Vice-President of the Advisory Council and member as of right of the Board
- that the term of office shall be based on those of the Board and thus shall be 3 years, renewable once.

E. National Committees (art 13)

- National Committees

Add "local authorities" at 13d.

- **Regional Groups**

We agree with the principle of creating regional groups, but their creation must be circumscribed by certain precautions:

- as a matter of principle, we do not think that they should have voting rights
- in their proposal, they must set out clearly the reasons for their creation and indicate if their objective is general or particular
- they must be approved by the Board after advice from the Advisory Council and the National Committees when they exist
- they must submit an annual report of their activities
- their way of working must be set out in the rules of procedure

- **The International Scientific Committees (art 14)**

We propose that:

- requests to join an International Scientific Committee be sent through the National Committees
- the International Scientific Committees establish an annual report on their work. A recommendation could be that about ten of these reports are presented each year at the GA.

F. International Secretariat (art 15)

It is necessary to give this group a more active role. It does not exist simply to oversee day-to-day operations. Provide for it to "implement the decisions of the Board."

G. Languages

We completely agree with the proposed direction to ensure more languages are used in ICOMOS activities. We think it is desirable not to delete the concept of official languages because the improvements proposed must not be seen as a step backwards for Spanish or Russian.

The recommendations

- We are in favour of the recommendations, particularly those that aim to increase the membership of the National Committees and the gradual reduction of membership fees. We propose that this reduction occur in progressive stages starting from 100 members.
- One remark concerning recommendation 15 on the election system: everything concerning the elections is statutory and cannot be changed by internal rules.

Another remark

We note the desire of CIVVH to complete the set of definitions by adding the terms "spatial organisation" or "plan". We agree with this suggestion.

Comments by ICOMOS France on the Ethical Commitment Statement

ICOMOS France has studied this document with interest and thinks it offers a sensible advance on the 2002 text.

I. General comments

The 2002 Statement distinguished between ICOMOS members and associated members; it considered that the former were essentially professionals, meaning first and foremost architects. ICOMOS France indicated doubts about the text, distributing a document entitled "Let's open the doors of ICOMOS" which advocated opening our NGO to everyone involved in heritage protection and evaluation.

The intermediate report of 2008 observed that the Statement had been little-used, particularly in the French- and Spanish-speaking committees. That is why the General Assembly of 2011 decided to integrate the Ethical Statement into the Statutes, which seems to us a good notion. The title in French became "Déclaration d'engagement éthique." We could accept this title but would prefer "Code d'éthique" or "Code de déontologie."

The new draft has a scope that is broader, more ambitious and more extensive than the 2002 document. Its structure is clear. It seems to us a good approach to integrate different texts that refer to ethics, particularly the guidance from UNESCO, into a single document. Finally and most importantly, the distinction between ICOMOS members and associated members has disappeared.

Nevertheless, the difficulties encountered by ICOMOS France with the 2002 text remain largely present: they concern the definition of the concept of "conservation" and, stemming directly from that, the conditions required to be a member of ICOMOS. We find the same problem, in part, in the definition of members in the draft reform of the statutes.

The comments from ICOMOS France concern style, substance and linguistic approach.

II. The concept of "conservation of cultural heritage" – and its effect on the ability to be a member of ICOMOS

1) The definition of the notion of "conservation"

This draft sometimes uses the concept of "conservation" in its larger sense, as in the Preamble, and sometimes, quite the opposite, it seems to signify no more than the narrow sense of direct intervention at historic monuments.

In particular, in Articles 2, 4 and 5, the term "conservation" seems to have a narrow interpretation. There is the feeling that the document does not apply to interventions in other areas of preservation, particularly to groups of buildings or cultural landscapes.

It is necessary to indicate more clearly that this document does not just apply to the narrow field of monuments, but to heritage in its wider sense. It is necessary as well to indicate that the text is aimed at everyone who works in this wide area.

That is why we prefer, instead of the narrow term "conservation", that of "preservation" which can cover everything: knowledge, protection, maintenance, conservation, valorisation, management and passing on of heritage, and which easily applies at the same time to monuments, towns, landscapes and sites.

The passing on of heritage to future generations is right at the heart of the responsibilities of those who work in the heritage field, and therefore of ICOMOS. It would be good to include this objective in the preamble and in article 2.

2) ICOMOS members

ICOMOS France considers that all those who work on heritage “preservation”, in its largest sense as we have defined it above, are suitable to be ICOMOS members. It would be desirable to include the sense of this diversity of membership from the preamble onwards.

3) References to professional and commercial impact

We propose deleting all the references aimed at the relationship between client and contractor. This is a Code of Ethics that applies to all relationships. (1-c, unprofessional conduct, 4-d, budgetary constraints, 5-b and d, employer confidentiality.)

III. Ethical principles and responsibility for expert work carried under the name of ICOMOS

Interventions in the name of World Heritage are more likely to give rise to deviations from normal standards. We must warn about these in our ethical document. We have noted three that come under the heading of conflict of interest:

1) Gifts and largesse

ICOMOS members as well as National Committees and ICOMOS itself must particularly avoid accepting gifts and largesse linked to their work in regards to world heritage

2) Any member of ICOMOS involved in a project must not take part in any vote on that project. Interventions regarding world heritage are not only carried out within the framework of ICOMOS expertise. It seems to us useful to spell out that an ICOMOS member who is involved, in any way, in his country with an inscribed property or a candidate for world heritage inscription, and who is called on in an official capacity to pronounce on this property, must not take any part in voting.

3) Insider dealing [les délits d’initiés]

Information gained as a result of work on world heritage nominations could give rise to insider dealing. This is obviously not allowed, but perhaps it would be as well explicitly to note this risk.

IV The French version of the document

The document is frequently difficult to follow in French and this may lead to difficulties grasping the meaning. ICOMOS France is ready to review the document once a final draft is prepared.

At this stage, only a few stylistic improvements are proposed. The corrections shown on the text are above all clarifications or modifications:

Article 2

- article 2-c refers to “techniciens” – we prefer the term “spécialistes”
- we propose introducing the idea of sustainable development in article 2-d

Article 4

- article 4-b and d refer to “work” – it would be useful as the case may be to spell out “intellectual work” and to replace “work” by “interventions” – to avoid any sense that this is limited to architectural [building] work
- for article 4-e we suggest an alteration because we think that a decision cannot be collective but should be the result of interdisciplinary consultation

ICOMOS Hungary

Contribution sent in English by Gergely Nagy, 2014-01-31

1. (Time of ACM)

Springtime for AC meeting is perhaps good for the ICOMOS International, but there is another aspect, the organizers' and the participants' view. The financial support belongs to the governmental budget. Generally the budget is adopted by the end of the year. Therefore the most effective, the governmental cultural financial funds can start to work only in February. The matter will be decided only in the end of the second quarter of the year. Organisers and participants haven't get enough time to find financial support earlier than August.

2. (Elections)

The available system is a bit strange. At present those countries not belonging to the region elect the regional presidents! Ingenious that the GA elect the vice presidents. In this way the VPs aren't elected by the region but the world. Just the same as if the national presidents would be elected by the regional group and not by the NC-s!

Suggestions:

one possibility is:

Regional presidents should be elected by the region and they would be delegated (as delegated members by the region) to the bureau as members. In this case only two general VP would be elected by the GA (World)

other possibility is:

5 VPs should be elected as now - but all of them separately only by the representatives of the countries of the region.

3. (Voting)

The increasing membership is common interest of NCs and the International ICOMOS. Those NCs can increase the number of their membership where the scientific work is serious. Icomos needs good, young, new experts, they come from mainly the strong National Committees. I agree with the 18 votes for every NCs. But if there are stronger I NCs where the number of members is more than 10 /million I would rather give them additional bonus votes. (1,2,3,4,.....) In this way every NC could be urged for a better scientific work.

ICOMOS Ireland

Contribution sent in English by Mona O'Rourke, 2014-01-30

Comments on the 3rd Consultation on the Statutes of ICOMOS prepared by the National Scientific Committee on Legal and Financial Matters (NCLAFI), approved by both the Executive and the National Committee and Submitted on behalf of ICOMOS Ireland.

ICOMOS Ireland would like to acknowledge the sterling and dedicated work that has been carried out by the International Working Group on the Statutes. We are pleased to note that many of our observations on the second consultative document have been adopted into the most recent version. We hope that our observations, both general and specific, on the third consultative document may assist the process in its final stages.

The Irish NSC-NCLAFI met on Wednesday 8th January to review the issues for consideration.

The proposed modifications on the Statutes include the following:

- Definition of cultural heritage in the activities of ICOMOS;
- Categories and conditions of membership.
- Constitution and activity of national and international committees;
- Duration of the period between general assemblies;
- Reform of the current Executive committee and officers duties;
- Election of the ICOMOS leadership;
- Voting rights and their attribution.

This response is in three parts: The first part deals with **specific observations on the text** of the Statutes; the second part gives **general responses to the issues raised by the consultative document**; the third part is concerned with **linguistic issues** and makes suggestions for the approach to be taken concerning clarity over textual divergence.

Part 1: Specific Observations on the proposed amendments to the text of the Statutes

We note that the draft upon which we are commenting states at the outset that any remaining differences between the French and English versions will be corrected on the final linguistic check. However in a spirit of helpfulness we have the following specific observations and suggestions to make on the text:

Heading IV reads "Administration **and functioning**"

We suggest changing heading IV to read "**Administration and Operation**" instead of "**Administration and functioning**"

In the **preamble** it states that

"The Ethical Principles complement and **completes** these Statutes."

We suggest that the term "completes" is not appropriate here although we understand what is intended by it, so we suggest the following text:

"The Ethical Principles complement these Statutes and should be adhered to in conjunction with them". It may also be appropriate to include the words "and the Rules of Procedure" here also. It would then read **"the ethical Principles complement these Statutes and the Rules of Procedure and should be adhered to in conjunction with them."**

Also in relation to the **preamble** : The statement:

"The French version of the Statutes shall be the authentic one"

Please see our general observations on linguistics. We suggest changing the term "authentic" to "definitive"

Article 2 should read “**this** may be changed “instead of “**it** may be changed”

In the document the statement that “**English and French** shall be the working languages of ICOMOS” should read “**French and English**” if it is supposed to be the closest translation to\ or intended to mirror the French wording.

Article 5.g Change the word “**advise**” to “**advice**”

Article 6 bis: Please refer to our general observations on the issues raised in the consultative document.

The category of “**affiliate**” membership is new. Overall we can envisage circumstances where it could be very useful, where for example ICOMOS has working agreements with groupings who share some of our objectives. However **we question the idea of an affiliate member holding an office on a Statutory body. This is really rooted in the fact that ICOMOS has certain responsibilities to ensure appropriate Governance and Compliance with our Statutes, our Rules of Procedure and our Ethical Statement, and that cannot be implemented properly if office holders are not members.**

Consequently, we do not agree with the proposed change in 6 Bis e “Only individuals **and affiliate members** shall be eligible for office within ICOMOS .“ **We propose deletion of “and affiliate members” from the text.**

Article 8 in the proposed draft reads as follows:

The **statutory bodies** of ICOMOS shall consist of the:

- General Assembly,
- Board **and its Bureau**,
- Advisory Council,
- National Committees,
- International Scientific Committees,
- International Secretariat.

Please refer to the general comments about the Statutory bodies of ICOMOS as well as our specific remarks on the text.

We make the following suggested **changes to Article 8:** Instead of “The **statutory bodies** of ICOMOS shall consist of the: **We suggest that it should read as follows:**

The **statutory bodies** of ICOMOS are:

- **The** General Assembly,
- **The** Board **and its Bureau**,
- **The** Advisory Council **and it's Scientific Council**
- **The** National Committees,
- **The** International Scientific Committees,
The International Secretariat.

(This list then recognises the Statutory Status of the Scientific Council).

Article 9 : General Assembly: Please refer also to the general comments and remarks about the Statutory bodies of ICOMOS.

Article 10.1bis

Ensure that “**Its functioning**” is in compliance with the legislation applicable to associations;

We suggest changing the wording in the following terms: either: “to ensure that it operates in compliance with” or “To ensure that it functions in compliance with” instead of “its functioning”

Article 10.d.11: Establish International Scientific Committees as defined in Article 14-a following consultation of the Advisory Council and ascertain that their By-laws and operation are in conformity with the Statutes, Rules of Procedure and Ethical Principles of ICOMOS. The Board may, following consultation of the Advisory Council, dissolve International Scientific Committees whose work has been completed or whose organisation or activities are not in conformity, after having asked them to provide explanations;

We suggest following “consultation with” instead of “consultation of”

Article 12 : The Advisory Council

The Advisory Council shall be a bicameral organ composed of the Presidents of the National Committees and of the International Scientific Committees, the latter being the Scientific Council.

Board members shall have observer status.

Please refer to our observations about the Statutory Bodies in the general responses.

Article 21 Bis: The Rules of Procedure shall specify and provide the procedures for putting into effect the provisions of the Statutes and the operating procedures for ICOMOS international statutory bodies. They may be amended on the proposal of the organ concerned or of a tenth of the voting members present or represented at the General Assembly. The draft Rules of Procedure and any proposal for their amendment must be transmitted to the members in the working languages at least 4 months before the opening of the General Assembly. They shall be adopted by the General Assembly with a majority of voting members present and represented.

We suggest the wording “operating procedures for ICOMOS “ should read the “operational procedures”

Article 22: These Statutes were adopted by the Constituent Assembly of ICOMOS on 22 June 1965 in Warsaw (Poland), and amended by the Vth General Assembly at Moscow (U.S.S.R.) on 22 May 1978 and the XVIIIth General Assembly on [date] 2014 in Florence (Italy).

We suggest: They shall come into force immediately after the closing of the XVIIIth General Assembly.

We also suggest either amending article 22 to read “after the closure of” or “following the closure of” instead of “after the closing”.

General responses to the issues raised by the consultative document:

In the Definitions Section we agree with the approach taken of relating the definition of “cultural heritage conservation” back the World Heritage Convention.

Affiliate Membership: We do not agree with affiliate members being office holders but we do agree with its introduction as a category of membership.

The Election of the Bureau:

A question has been raised by the consultative document about whether the election of the Bureau of the Board should be by its own members or alternatively should the election of the Bureau be by the General Assembly. Under the current system the General Assembly elects the officers to the Bureau. We think that the option of the General Assembly electing the Bureau is preferable. This review grouping does not have a sense that these provisions are not operating well so we would suggest that the status quo be maintained.

Re: Statutory Bodies of ICOMOS

The Statutory status of the Scientific Council we understand has been accepted and approved in Costa Rica but this decision has not been reflected in this list of Statutory Bodies in the current draft of the Statutes. There needs to be clarification here about the status of the Scientific Council in terms of giving it a statutory recognition or not. If it has statutory status it should have been included in the list. See our suggested amendment to Article 8 *ibid* **We suggest maintaining the existing structural relationship between the Advisory Council and the Scientific Council**, as we think this could still work even with the Scientific Council as a statutory body.

We suggest that to alter the existing relationship between these two bodies would not be appropriate. Since the functions of the Advisory Council and the Scientific Council are different the Scientific Council should continue to feed its proposals to the Advisory Council as is the current position. It would be helpful to clarify the role of the Scientific Council and also to reinforce its existing structural role (which is unchanged) by stating that **“the Advisory Council shall be assisted in its work by the Scientific Council. “**

Article 9 : General Assembly

In relation to Article 9 concerning the voting procedures at the General Assembly **we are not aware of any difficulty or unfairness within the current voting system so would preserve the status quo.**

Re Article 9 section 6

We have been asked to answer a question in the consultative document about the duration and the maximum number of terms for Board Members and we have been given the option of one single term of 6 years with half the seats being renewed after 3 years or alternatively a maximum of two successive terms of 3 years with all seats being renewed every 3 years.

We consider a six year term to be very long in circumstances where for example an individual may not be working well within the Board or indeed where there could be other unforeseen reasons why 6 years would be too long and we also think it is a long time in terms of an individuals initial commitment, so that it might operate as an obstacle preventing people from coming forward for election. However having set out all of those reasons **we do understand that the 6 year option is a response to the idea of promoting continuity of the work of the Board** and that **it is already possible for those elected to the Board to do a second 3 year term if elected.** We do see merit in the idea of continuity by staggering a six year term but overall **we think the status quo in relation to the election of the bureau should remain.** In effect, the current system allowing re-election after 3 years, for another term does provide for some continuity in that some may go after one term and others may go on to do a second term. If the option chosen is a six year term rotating half of the Board every three years the appropriate transitional clauses would have to be drawn up to make this workable.

Article 9.7 A question has been raised by the consultative document about the election of the Bureau of the Board from its own members or alternatively the election of the Bureau by the General assembly.

We address this issue in the general responses to the consultation. The current situation is that the GA elect the officers to the Bureau.

We would have thought it is more workable that the first option of the GA electing the bureau would be preferable. The best candidates for the Bureau are those with appropriate skill-sets for the particular role and also those who can make adequate time available to implement their role, which is likely to be rather more onerous than the role of the other Board members. As we don't have a sense that these provisions are not operating well we would suggest that the status quo be maintained.

Article 12: The proposals re article 12 are described as being clarifications as suggested to make the bicameral nature of the Advisory Council due to its composition more explicit. We would comment that this is fine but again **we also need to clarify the Statutory status that was agreed to the Scientific Council, setting out its role and if necessary work out any changes that would need to be made to effect smooth operation of the Statutory Bodies with one and other.**

General Observations on linguistics:

We would like to make some general observations in relation to linguistics because we believe that there are some issues, which could arise where clarity may assist. Obviously the mission of ICOMOS is to achieve as wide a collaboration as possible between members worldwide in regard to our shared interest in the dissemination of knowledge and the introduction of appropriate standards in the interests of the protection of our combined cultural heritage.

We note that the working group states (with great regret) that French and English are in the current circumstances the two “working languages” of ICOMOS.¹ There is, understandably, a lot of pressure to increase the number of working languages in ICOMOS. Also there is a requirement of flexibility concerning languages, to facilitate proceedings or meetings taking place in a range of locations. The working group use the terms “working languages” and “temporary working languages” for the moment. We would suggest that Rules of Procedure outside the Statutes can provide an operational methodology in this regard.

Whilst the requirement of flexibility is necessary in terms of how the organisation works in practice, we would suggest that a different approach to linguistics, **limited solely to the interpretation of the text of the ICOMOS Statutes themselves**, should be applied. We suggest that **for legal reasons the Statutes in the French language should take precedence should a question of interpretation arise on a specific phrase within the Statutes**. A question challenging the interpretation of the Statutes may never arise but in the event of an issue arising this approach provides clarity. This is not to contradict the current proposal of two “working languages” or the clear policy and aspiration of promoting linguistic diversity through use of “temporary working languages”.

We have looked to our own experience in Ireland to assist here. We have a **written Constitution** from 1937 which provides ² that **we have two official languages**: *“The Irish language as the national language is the first official language”*³ and *“The English language is recognized as the second official language”*⁴.

Where there is a challenge to the constitution the precedence of the “national language” has been provided for in the text to the constitution.⁵

“In the case of a conflict of a law enrolled under this section in both the official languages, the text in the national language shall prevail.”

We suggest that this approach to **linguistics provides some level of clarity where interpretation is required**. In our view both versions cannot be equal and one must take precedence. It is also noteworthy that the Irish Supreme Court has articulated the view that the provision of texts in both languages is a **constitutional duty** of the state.

In litigation which has concerned the conflict of texts the principle which the Irish courts will adopt approaching a question of possible discordance between the texts was set out by **Budd J. in O’Donovan v Attorney General [1961] IR 114**.and we think it is helpful for our purposes here on the subject of language:

“Both texts of the Constitution are authoritative. It is not to be thought that those who framed or enacted the Constitution would knowingly do anything so absurd as to frame or enact texts with different meanings in parts. It could only happen by inadvertence. It would seem to follow as a matter of commonsense that one should not approach the elucidation of the meaning of either text with a view seeking a conflict, but rather with a view to seeing can they be properly reconciled. I say “properly” advisedly because if in fact the words used are not in a form really found to correspond the Irish text must prevail”.....

¹ Article 21

² in Article 8

³ Article 8.1

⁴ Article 8.2

⁵ Article 25.4

Budd J. went on to say that in the particular instance before him he could find no evidence of “**material discordance**” between the Irish and English texts. The approach of Budd J. was subsequently approved by the Irish Supreme Court.

It can also be said that it is also a practice of the Courts generally even where a case is being conducted in English to look to the Irish text **not to find a conflict but to elucidate the meaning** of the corresponding English Expression. This type of approach we would suggest is reasonable and may assist the working group in its deliberations. Also, **we suggest that another reason for giving precedence to one language over others is that should the Statutes of ICOMOS be translated into other languages if one starts with two of equal priority further translations could potentially become further and further apart unless the translations are from the language of precedence.**

We do note the observations of the working group concerning the term “official language” having been removed and we do not wish to challenge that approach. We would not wish to impose on ICOMOS additional “duties” in terms of requirements imposed for the dissemination of information. However, should ICOMOS wish to pursue the requisite policies concerning cultural diversity and multilingualism this pragmatic issue of precedence still needs be addressed. We suggest that it is important as a practice to make translations of the Statutes start from the French Version and if necessary look to the English version. This is not to find a conflict but rather to elucidate the meaning. So even if the concept of ‘official language’ has not been adopted but rather the concept of “working languages” the statutes in French, we suggest, should take precedence and some apt term should be found to define this. We **suggest changing the wording “the French version of the ICOMOS Statutes shall be the authentic version” as the word “authentic” does not give the appropriate sense of precedence that is required. Perhaps it could be set out simply by saying “the French version of the ICOMOS Statutes is the definitive one and shall take precedence in the event of there being a material discordance on the texts.”**

Bearing the foregoing views in mind we have no difficulty with the proposal of the working group to allow for the fulfillment of the mission of ICOMOS through the introduction of three measures in the Statutes:

- The adoption of a policy on cultural diversity and multilingualism (Article 10-d-8);
- The opportunity to use more languages during meetings, whenever possible (Article 21-b);
- The possibility to recognise other ‘temporary working languages’ (Article 21-c).

The working group acknowledges that the term ‘temporary working language’ might be improved.

ICOMOS Mexico

Contribution sent in Spanish by Ms Olga Orive, President, 2014-01-31

Spanish

Anexo la carta enviada por los cuatro miembros hispanohablantes del Comité Ejecutivo, que ha sido ratificada por el Consejo Directivo de ICOMOS México y la mayoría de sus miembros.

Note: the attached text in Spanish and English is the text of the joint contribution of Mr Gustavo Araoz, Mr Alfredo Conti, Ms Olga Orive, Mr Daniel Young

Acerca de la propuesta de supresión de las lenguas oficiales del ICOMOS

Estimados colegas del Grupo de Trabajo sobre la enmienda de los Estatutos,

Los miembros hispanohablantes del Comité Ejecutivo de ICOMOS agradecen el arduo trabajo que estáis llevando a cabo para la revisión y enmienda de los Estatutos del ICOMOS. Queremos expresar nuestra profunda desilusión en relación con la propuesta de eliminación de las actuales lenguas oficiales del ICOMOS, a la vez que expresar nuestro enérgico rechazo a la misma, en base a las siguientes consideraciones:

1.- Estamos de acuerdo con la idea de que el actual esquema de lenguas oficiales del ICOMOS podría aparecer obsoleto. Debemos recordar que el mismo fue concebido en el marco de un contexto global social y cultural completamente diferente al actual. Consideramos, no obstante, que la solución no sería eliminar las lenguas oficiales sino, más bien, revisar dicho esquema, en que otras lenguas deberían quizás ser agregadas. Consideramos que la eliminación de las lenguas oficiales aparece en clara oposición a la declaración que "ICOMOS tiene la obligación de respetar la diversidad cultural y promover el multilingüismo" incluida en el documento que introduce la tercera ronda de consulta.

Somos conscientes de las dificultades prácticas, y especialmente financieras, para poner en práctica un funcionamiento multilengua o de nuestro organismo. Pero consideramos que no será la eliminación de las lenguas oficiales lo que resuelva el problema; ésta parece una respuesta fácil y poco imaginativa para resolver un asunto de tal importancia. El Grupo de Trabajo sobre Estatutos ha propuesto algunas medidas concretas que celebramos, como el reconocimiento de lenguas de trabajo temporarias. Permítasenos recordar, en relación con el español, que un grupo de trabajo que incluye a miembros de comités nacionales hispanohablantes ha colaborado activamente en la traducción de textos y documentos de ICOMOS, lo que sería por cierto posible para otras lenguas (tal como efectivamente sucede) y que varios comités internacionales aceptan y aprueban trabajos científicos y contribuciones en lengua española.

2.- En relación con el español, por Resolución 17 GA 2011/ 42, la Asamblea General requirió al Grupo de Trabajo sobre Estatutos "estudiar la factibilidad de integrar una propuesta conducente a la corrección de los Estatutos de ICOMOS para incluir el español como lengua de trabajo". La respuesta del Grupo de Trabajo sobre los Estatutos es que "con gran pesar, en las actuales circunstancias, no es posible integrar una tercera lengua de trabajo". Una vez más, somos conscientes de los problemas prácticos que la implementación de esta Resolución implica pero consideramos absolutamente inapropiado responder a una Resolución de la Asamblea General eliminando al español como lengua oficial.

Nos permitimos recordar que durante el proceso de estudiar la incorporación del español como lengua de trabajo, nuestra distinguida colega Ángela Rojas elaboró un valioso informe en el que demuestra la importancia del español a escala global y en el seno del ICOMOS, teniendo en cuenta la cantidad de miembros y comités nacionales hispanohablantes y la mayoría de bienes inscritos en la Lista del Patrimonio Mundial localizados en países que cuentan con el español como lengua oficial. No parece que este informe haya sido tenido en cuenta en el momento de proponer la eliminación del español como lengua oficial.

En síntesis, consideramos que la eliminación del esquema actual de lenguas oficiales implicará un paso atrás y un empobrecimiento del espíritu y de la imagen de ICOMOS como una organización multicultural mundial. El tema merece una reflexión más profunda y amplia; entretanto, proponemos que el esquema actual de lenguas oficiales sea mantenido en los Estatutos y que las medidas prácticas propuestas por el Grupo de Trabajo sobre los Estatutos y por otros miembros de ICOMOS sean discutidas de modo de acordar su adecuada implementación.

Gustavo Araoz, Alfredo Conti, Olga Orive, Daniel Young.

English

On the proposal of suppression of the ICOMOS official languages

Dear colleagues of the Statutes Working Group,

The Spanish-speaking members of the ICOMOS Executive Committee appreciate the hard working you are carrying out for the amendment of the ICOMOS Statutes. We would like to express our deep disappointment regarding the proposal of eliminating the current ICOMOS official languages and our strong rejection of such a proposal, on the grounds of the following considerations:

1.- We agree that the current scheme of ICOMOS official languages could appear obsolete. We must remember that it was conceived in the framework of a global social and cultural context which was completely different from the current one. But the solution would not be getting rid of the official languages but revise that scheme in which other languages should maybe be added. We consider that the elimination of the official languages appears clearly in opposition to the statement that "ICOMOS has an obligation to respect cultural diversity and to promote multilingualism" included in the document that introduces the third round of consultation.

We are conscious of the practical and especially financial difficulties to put in place a multilingual functioning of our organization. But we consider that it is not the elimination of the official languages that will solve the problem; this seems to be an easy and unimaginative way of addressing such an important issue. The Statutes Working Group has proposed concrete measures that we welcome, like the recognition of temporary working languages. Let us recall, with regard to Spanish, that a working group including members from Spanish-speaking national committees has actively collaborated in the translation of ICOMOS texts and that this would certainly be possible (as it actually happens) also for other languages. Several international committees accept and welcome scientific papers and contributions in Spanish.

2.- As for Spanish, by its Resolution 17 GA 2011/ 42, the General Assembly requested the Statutes working group "to study the feasibility of integrating a proposal towards the amendment of the ICOMOS Statutes to include Spanish as a working language". The response by the Statutes Working Group is that "with great regret,... in the present circumstances, it is not possible to integrate a 3rd working language". Again, we are aware of the practical constraints that the implementation of that Resolution implies, but we consider that it becomes absolutely unappropriated to respond to a Resolution of the General Assembly by eliminating Spanish as an ICOMOS official language.

Let us recall that during the process of studying the possibility of incorporating Spanish as a working language, our distinguished colleague Angela Rojas elaborated a valuable report which demonstrates the importance of Spanish as a language at global scale and within ICOMOS, taking into account the number of Spanish-speaking members and national committees and the number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in countries that have Spanish as official language. This report does not seem to have been taken into account at the moment of proposing the elimination of Spanish as an official language.

In summary, we consider that the elimination of the current scheme of official languages will imply a step backward and impoverish the spirit and the image of ICOMOS as a multicultural world-wide organization. The issue deserves a deeper and wider reflection; in the meanwhile, we propose that the current scheme of official languages be maintained in the Statutes and that practical measures proposed by the Statutes Working Group and by ICOMOS members be further discussed to agree their proper implementation.

Gustavo Araoz, Alfredo Conti, Olga Orive, Daniel Young

Note: the full report of distinguished colleague Angela Rojas, member of the Former Task Force on languages was circulated to the members of the Merged Working Group on Statutes and the members of the Bureau and used as a starting point for their work. The members of the former Task Force on languages and of the Bureau were invited by the Merged Working Group to contribute to the draft proposals on the use of languages; no responses were received at the time.

ICOMOS Nicaragua

Contribution sent in English and Spanish by Ms Maira Vargas Roa, President, 2014-01-30

Note: this is the text of Petition Nr 2

English

On the ICOMOS Statutes undergoing revision

On behalf of ICOMOS-Nicaragua and as international member of ICOMOS, I wish to express my disagreement with and steadfast opposition to the proposal to eliminate the existing ICOMOS official languages contemplated in article 21 of the statutes. (...)

Follows the text of Petition Nr 2

Translation of the above text in Spanish:

Follows the text of Petition Nr 2 in Spanish

ICOMOS Norway

Contribution sent in English by Ms Marie Louise Anker, President, 2014-01-31

Our comments will be given as answers related to questions posed in the general presentation.
ADCOM 2013/10 5-9-1 EN. Ver. 25/09/13

A - 2 Amendments to ensure conformity:

We have to accept that ICOMOS has its office in France and thereby fall in under French legal regulations, and that ICOMOS statutes have to be adjusted to this understanding concerning the organizations responsibilities between its organs and office, democratic functioning and administrative and financial responsibilities.

A - 3 What ICOMOS do we want?

Membership categories:

ICOMOS Norway wants few categories, to keep the oversight, but we will support a category of young professionals/students. This is to give young people with professional aspirations and students a possibility to get known with the organization and its work for cultural heritage. This category needs some kind of regulation moving from this category to ordinary member (max nr. of years, finished studies etc.). ICOMOS Norway have not discussed any preference of the notion of the category, nor have we discussed the rights of such a category, but as in Norway we will assume that there should be no difference between ordinary professionals and young aspirants voting rights in this. The difference should be in the membership fee.

Cultural diversities and multilingualism:

Being a small country with several languages to be treated equally, we know the costs of translation and will support a choice of two official working languages, as to day. At the moment we cannot see that ICOMOS should use its limited finances in this way.

We will therefor primarily vote against a proposal for a third working language. Secondly: We cannot vote for an extra language before a principle for choice of the language is decided, if not there are no limits for the discussion. Is it the number of people in the world speaking or understanding?, the number of ICOMOS members speaking the language?, or is it the geographical spread of the language?

In any case we would also support the possibility for the regional groups to add more common working languages for the work inside the groups. For Instance: the Scandinavian countries understand each other languages and it would ease their common work related to their common heritage if they used their mother languages, for then to translate their agreements or resolutions in to one of the official ICOMOS languages.

Election of the Board and Bureau:

We would think of the most practical solution if the period between the general assemblies is four years. We will then support that the Bureau members was elected by the Board members. All the board members will be elected by the GA and a GA knowing that the members to the board also have a possibility being a Bureau member.

Voting rights:

ICOMOS is an NGO, founded by its members. ICOMOS also ask every country to establish National committees. Is ICOMOS then an organization to be understood as consistent of its National committee members or by all the personal members, or a mix? The National committees and much of the work is organized as regional work (where region is understood as in the UN). In UN each member state has one vote, independent on how rich the state is or how many people living inside its borders. We think this should be the principle for ICOMOS, but this does not give the individual member or the minority voices in the National committees the opportunity to be heard (giving diversity to the opinion), we therefore support the number of voices given to each National committee as proposed (max 18) but according to a minimum number of members behind the voice.

ICOMOS Norway will support the voting possibilities for the National committees to be as equal as possible. To give the possibilities for a minority opinions voice inside the national committee to be shown in the GA, no national committee representative in the GA can hold more than 5 vote proxies beside its own. As a consequence this will need the minimum of three persons to hold the maximum votes for a NC.

ICOMOS Norway will work for the small and poor countries national committee opportunities to take part in the general assembly to use their legal right for voting.

Overview of the proposed amendments

B - 1 Amendments to clarify the text:

Articles 9 to 12, 13 and 14

ICOMOS Norway will support the proposals. We are neither fellows nor scholars in the English or the French languages but we have been told that there are put different weight in to the notions "committee" and "council" in English and in French, translated in to Norwegian we cannot find this to be a major principal difference

B - 2 Amendments that affect the functioning of ICOMOS Membership categories and financial stability:

Article 6a -3 and 6bis – b

ICOMOS Norway will support the proposals

General assembly:

Article 9-a, 9-c, 9-d

As a consequence of what is written above ICOMOS Norway will be in favor of System 1 (article 9-a-1).

Article 9- c

ICOMOS Norway will support the proposals.

Board and Bureau:

ICOMOS Norway will support the proposals.

Article 9-d-6

We are in favor of option A – one 6-year term, half of the seats to be renewed every 3.years.

Alternative:

If meetings in in statutory bodies are changed to be every fourth year:

- Advisory body (Advisory committee/council consistent of the presidents of national committees and scientific committees) shall meet every year, as present practice, but every second year in Paris.
- Scientific Symposium shall take place every second year in connection with the AC meeting.

Article 9-d-6 should then be Option B maximum two successive 4-year terms.

Article 9-d-7, 10 –d-3

ICOMOS Norway will support the option one. Election of Bureau members shall be by the Board among its elected members from the GA.

Advisory Council /Advisory Committee

Article12- a

ICOMOS Norway is in favor of a simplified organization and a simplified bureaucracy. We will support an advisory body consistent of the presidents for the National Committees and the International Scientific Committees. This can be named Advisory Council or Advisory Committee (reasoned over), giving advises to the Board and by this have the function of a statutory organ. ICOMOS Norway is of the opinion that the International Scientific Committees can give professional advices on question from the Board on specific cases and principles.

Except for the proposal of a Scientific Council as a statutory body, ICOMOS Norway will support the proposals in Articles 12- a, 11-d , 12-d and 14-a

National and International Scientific Committees

Articles 13,14 and 14bis.

ICOMOS Norway support the proposals

Languages

Article 21

As reasoned over, ICOMOS Norway support the proposals

Rules of Procedure

Article 21bis.

ICOMOS Norway support the proposals

B - 3 Amendments related to content but not to the functioning

ICOMOS Norway support the proposals

B - 4 Aims, Activities and actions, definitions

ICOMOS Norway gives its support

C Recommendations

ICOMOS Norway support the proposals to be sent to the Executive Committee for further handling.

ICOMOS Romania

Contribution sent in English by Sergiu Nistor, President, 2014-01-31

ICOMOS Romania would like first to congratulate all the specialists and bodies involved in the process of up-dating the Statutes of ICOMOS for the work they have done.

Analyzing the proposals submitted to the ICOMOS members in the 3rd Consultation on the amendment of the ICOMOS Statutes, Report of the merged working group (Ver. 24/09/2013), after consultation with Romanian ICOMOS members, the Board of ICOMOS Romania convened upon the following:

Amendment of Art. 6.3 – Young membership.

ICOMOS Romania agrees with the amendment and suggests that the procedure of transfer from the Young Member category to the Individual Member category should be provided in the ICOMOS Rules of Procedure.

Amendment of Art. 6.4 – Affiliate membership

ICOMOS Romania agrees with the amendment and suggests that within the ICOMOS Rules of Procedure the conditions and the terms of this kind of membership should be provided (who proposes and on what grounds, in what conditions the Affiliate Membership is terminated, etc.). There is also a difference in meaning between the two versions (English and French). The Board of ICOMOS Romania favours the French version meaning.

Amendment of Art. 6.bis – Rights and duties of members

The Board of ICOMOS Romania agrees with the text.

Amendment of Art. 7 – Loss of membership

ICOMOS Romania agrees with the text but suggests that mention should be made that the ICOMOS Rules of Procedures establishes how membership is recovered if lost through the effects of Art. 7.a.1.

Amendment of Art. 9.a – General Assembly

The Board of ICOMOS Romania is favourable to the present system of voting (Art. 9.a) which resembles more to the UNESCO system than the proposed one.

Amendment of Art. 9.b – General Assembly

The Board of ICOMOS Romania is favourable to the present day 3 year frequency of GA. If to be changed, The Board of ICOMOS Romania considers that a yearly GA is not feasible and proposes a GA each 2 years (as the General Assembly of UNESCO). Consequently the terms of office of the ICOMOS Administrators shall be based on that sequence.

Amendment of Art. 9.d.6. – General Assembly

The Board of ICOMOS Romania is favourable to a system of 2 mandates of a maximum of 3 years of office, (option B) or in case the system of a 2 year frequency of GA is adopted, to a 3 mandate of 2 years of office non renewable.

Amendment of Art. 10.d.3

The Board of ICOMOS Romania is favourable to an election of the Bureau members by the Board from among its members with a mandate equal to the one of the Board members.

Art. 21 : Languages

The Board of ICOMOS Romania is favourable to the present day system but considers that a provision that National Committees are encouraged to disseminate in their working languages the documents of ICOMOS would be useful.

ICOMOS Spain

Contribution sent in Spanish and English by Ms María Rosa Suárez-Inclán Ducassi, President,
2014-01-31 at 3:29

Note: this is the text of Petition Nr 2

ICOMOS Sweden

Contribution sent in English by Nils Ahlberg, President, 2014-01-31

Supported by Riin Alatalu, President of ICOMOS Estonia, 2014-01,29

Proposed changes in red

Article etc.	Text / comment	Proposal
General, terminology	<p><i>Advisory Council (current Advisory Committee)</i></p> <p>In the view of ICOMOS SWEDEN both expressions are all right. It is however preferable to use the same word in English and French (Council/Counseil or Committee/Comitée).</p>	
Definitions c	<p><i>Groups of buildings: groups of structures freestanding or joined together and their surroundings, built or natural, which because of their architecture, spatial organization, homogeneity or place in the landscape, are of historical, archaeological, artistic, aesthetic, scientific, social, ethnological, anthropological, cultural or spiritual value.</i></p> <p><u>Comment:</u> In Swedish translation (and probably many other languages) it sounds very illogical that cities and towns in WH terms should fall under 'Groups of buildings' and it is important to signal something about the urban structure/planning in the definition. And the plans themselves can be of great interest (for instance Amsterdam, Neuf-Brisach, Palmanova).</p> <p>For the choice of terminology, cf. Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, art 9). Alternatively one could perhaps write: ... <i>because of their architecture, planning, homogeneity ...</i></p>	Addition
6-a	<p><i>... five categories of members ...</i></p> <p><u>Comment:</u> ICOMOS strength and raison d'être is being an expert organisation for professionals. Therefore it is a danger for the credibility of ICOMOS if other people, who are just 'engaged' (have an interest) in cultural heritage conservation, without having the professional expertise, can present themselves as full ICOMOS members.</p> <p><u>Proposal:</u> The term 'Member' should only be used for full professional members within conservation, with a sufficiently high degree of training and expertise.</p> <p>Young members should not form a separate category, but be regarded as [young] Individual Members and pay half the fee as long as they are less than 30 years old. Then they should automatically pay the full fee of Individual Members. Young members should have full qualification for membership. Otherwise they should be regarded as students. Doctoral students should be regarded as qualified for full individual membership.</p> <p>Students could be mentioned here but should be a separate group and not named 'Members' but rather something like 'ICOMOS Candidates' or 'ICOMOS Aspirants'. You only become a 'member' when you have the full qualifications.</p>	Change

Affiliate Members should accordingly be called **ICOMOS Affiliates**, **'ICOMOS Friends'** or something of the kind – not 'Members'.

(This of course means changes in several articles.)

6-a-2	<p><i>... institutions and organisations of any kind engaged in the areas of competence of the association as defined in Article 4 of the Statutes or those that own or have in their charge monuments, groups of buildings or sites, if they possess the needed professional expertise.</i></p> <p><u>Comment:</u> The qualification should be that within the institution/organisation etc. there is the needed professional competence. Just being 'engaged in' (having an interest) is not enough.</p>	Addition
6-e	<p><i>Only individual and affiliate members shall be eligible for office within ICOMOS.</i></p> <p><u>Comment:</u> Only members with full professional expertise should be eligible for office. (This of course means changes in several articles.)</p>	Change
9-a-1	<p><i>... voting members appointed within the following limits and principles:...</i></p> <p><u>Proposal:</u> Vote 1 to 10: 1 vote per 1 member and then vote 11 to 18: 1 vote per 10 members.</p> <p>(This means 10 members = 10 votes, 20 members = 11 votes, 30 members = 12 votes, 40 members = 13 votes and so on to 90 members = 18 votes)</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> This encourages membership growth, but still gives small committees quite a strong position – a good balance between small and large Committees.</p>	Change
9-a-1, last paragraph	See Recommendation 13 (at the end).	
9-a-3	<p><i>... may give a proxy to another member of their Committee. No member shall have more than 5 votes in addition to his own.</i></p> <p><u>Comment/problem:</u> Basically ICOMOS SWEDEN supports maintaining the number of votes and system for proxies as it is today. However, most committees can only afford to send one person for the 2 hour General Assembly meetings within the annual Advisory Committee meetings (see 9-b).</p> <p><u>Proposal/possible change (?):</u> Perhaps max 6 votes should be allowed for these 2 hour General Assembly meetings within the annual Advisory Committee meetings? Or the president should have the full number of committee votes automatically on these occasions?</p>	Change?

9-b	<p><i>The General Assembly shall be convened at least once a year [organised in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Advisory Council]</i></p>	Change?
	<p><u>Question/proposal:</u> Would it be possible to introduce an 'Annual Meeting' (just to approve the annual accounts and vote the budget) as a specific form of meeting to separate it from the large General Assembly every three years? And use the term General Assembly only for the large meeting every three years?</p> <p>If it is necessary to use the same terminology for this meeting every year, the 'Annual Meeting' could be the same kind of 2 hour meeting within the General Assembly.</p> <p><u>A clarification:</u> ... <i>the annual meeting of the General Assembly [should] be organised in the beginning of the year (April or May at the latest)</i>(Recommendation 9) – does this mean that the large General Assembly every three years should take place this time of the year in the future?</p>	
9-d-6	<p>Election of Board members, option B, <i>Elect at each statutory election, which is after three years, 20 members of the Board by secret ballot for a 3-year term, renewable once.</i></p>	Option B
	<p>ICOMOS SWEDEN definitely prefers option B with terms of 3 years for the Board and the Bureau.</p> <p>However, we also support the Ex Com proposal of 3 consecutive terms of 3 years (but not changing into 4-year terms).</p> <p><u>Comment:</u> There are many reasons for this: difficult for the candidate to promise that he/she has the time and financial possibility to serve such a long period as 6 years; risk of recurrent by-elections; a better guarantee for a good balance of rotation and continuity; if somebody does not function well he/she will not block a post longer than three years;</p>	
9-d-7	<p>ICOMOS SWEDEN definitely prefers election of the Bureau by the General Assembly for a 3-year term.</p> <p>If vacancies occur, the Board should have the mandate to fill in from amongst its members for the rest of the term.</p> <p>A major reason for this is transparency and democracy – it is open and you know what/who you vote for, and the candidate knows what is expected of him/her and guarantees that he/she is prepared to take this on (specific tasks, workload, time, costs, etc)</p>	
9-e	<p><i>Minutes shall be kept of the General Assembly meetings. The minutes shall be signed by the President and the Secretary General and made available to the members.</i></p>	Addition
	<p><u>Comment:</u> Just to make sure there is no misunderstanding</p>	

10-a	<i>The Board shall be ... composed of maximum 21 members, ...</i>	OK
	ICOMOS SWEDEN supports the suggestion of 21 Board members and no co-option as well as having the possibility to invite experts in a non-voting advisory capacity.	
10-d-3	<i>Election of the Bureau ...</i>	Option 2
	ICOMOS SWEDEN definitely prefers Option 2: Election of the Bureau by the General Assembly for a 3-year term. (See 9-d-7)	
11-c	<i>... The decisions of the Bureau shall be taken by majority of the members present and represented. In case of a tie, the President has the casting vote.</i>	Addition
	Possible addition.	
11-e-2	<i>The Vice-Presidents shall assist and take the place of the President in his/her absence. ...</i>	Addition
11-e-4	<i>The Secretary General shall ...</i>	
	Very good that the position of Secretary General has been kept!	
11-e-4	<i>... He/she shall verify that the minutes of the Statutory meetings are established</i>	Addition
	<i>He/she shall present an annual report to the Board.</i>	
12a	<i>... the National Committees Presidents and the Scientific Council shall each elect minimum 3 coordinators for a term of office of 3 years, renewable once. Among them, the Advisory Council shall elect for a single term of office of 3 years, a President and Vice-President from two different countries</i> <i>... The longest continuous term of service allowed as a combination of President and Vice-President is 6 years.</i>	Change?
	To ICOMOS SWEDEN the possibility of 3 consecutive 3-year terms of office would be all right.	
13b	<i>... In the event of a National Committee or Bureau refusing an application for membership, there shall be an appeal procedure to the ICOMOS Board.</i>	
	ICOMOS SWEDEN certainly agrees, but as part of the process there must also be a possibility for the National Committee to comment and explain its reasons.	
13-d-4	<i>Designate their voting members at the General Assembly ... and communicate their names of not less than one month before the General Assembly.</i>	OK
	This is fine. However, the deadline for handing in proxies must be late afternoon/evening of the first day of the General Assembly.	
14bis	<i>Members of the Board, of the Advisory Council, of the International Scientific Committees, and of all other bodies established by them may not receive any payment from ICOMOS International for their</i>	Addition (or delete com-

functions within ICOMOS. Only the reimbursement of expenses necessarily incurred in the discharge of their functions may be allowed. pletely)

Alternative:

... may not receive any payment from ICOMOS central funds for their functions within ICOMOS. ...

Comment:

This article might be a useful clarification for the time being. However, in principle the attitude and aim of ICOMOS in the long run ought to be that professional work should be properly paid.

To be able to serve as an ICOMOS officer it is, with few exceptions, necessary to have at least some payment. In some cases people can do this as part of their normal work (= payment from the employer) but in other cases National Committees have to find extra funding from for instance government sources or funds to give some payment to the person (= payment from ICOMOS National Committee). We can't have a situation where only senior citizens and very wealthy persons can take on a function!

21-a	<i>English and French shall be the working languages of ICOMOS.</i>	OK
	ICOMOS SWEDEN, for practical and economical reasons, supports this, even though we very much regret that it is not possible to have more than two working languages.	
<hr/>		
21bis 19	<i>... amended on the proposal of the organ concerned or of a tenth of the voting members present or represented at the General Assembly. ... any proposal for their amendment must be transmitted to the members in the working languages at least 4 months before the opening of the General Assembly.</i>	Change?
	This sounds illogical. Who 'the voting members present or represented at the General Assembly' are can only be settled at the beginning of the General Assembly. It is accordingly impossible for them to send in their proposal '4 months before the opening of the General Assembly'	
<hr/>		
Recom 3 (p. 12)	<i>a scale for decreasing membership dues for the National Committees with more [200] members and/or than 10 members per million inhabitants</i>	Change
	ICOMOS SWEDEN does not agree of a system where NCs with more than [200] members have a reduction. All countries should be treated the same way and it is very inequitable with a system that favours large countries but is practically impossible to fulfil for small countries.	
	However, in order to stimulate membership growth we are generally in favour of a scale for decreasing membership dues. But this must be based on the number of members in proportion to the number of inhabitants of the country, such as having more than 10 members per million inhabitants.	

Recom 4 (p. 12)	... the National Committees to make every possible effort to transfer the membership dues in the beginning of the year	OK
	Self-evident!	
Recom 5 (p. 12)	... develop procedures allowing: members who paid their membership due to receive their membership card by 1st January	OK
	Self-evident!	
Recom 13 (p. 13)	Resolutions (decisions) by the General Assembly must be taken by voting members only.	OK
	<p><u>Comment:</u> ICOMOS SWEDEN agrees to this, but can see practical problems. It means that, to be strict, you can't have a system of clapping hands or raising hands, since many non-voting members also will take part in this.</p> <p>One possible solution could be to hand out some sort of fair-sized voting cards to the voting members, one for each vote/proxy, and then vote by raising these.</p> <p>GA resolutions/decisions. <i>For each agenda item the minutes must provide the results of the votes (adoption by consensus, or number of voting members, required majority, votes in favour, votes against, abstentions, invalid votes etc.)</i></p> <p>To ICOMOS SWEDEN this is self-evident and should apply to all decisions.</p>	

ICOMOS Uruguay

Contribution sent in Spanish by Ricardo Béhèran, President, 2014-01-31

Spanish

El Comité Uruguayo, ICOMOS/Uruguay, apoya en todos sus términos el documento elaborado por los colegas Gustavo Araoz, Alfredo Conti, Olga Orive y Daniel Young que fue enviado a la Secretaría Internacional respecto a la supresión de dos lenguas oficiales de ICOMOS.

En particular la supresión del español como lengua oficial, y que como consecuencia aleja aún más la posibilidad de que sea una lengua de trabajo, demanda legítima desde hace mucho tiempo, resulta un hecho muy grave por su carácter excluyente y discriminador.

En los últimos tiempos, varios países hispanohablantes han dado y están dando muestras de apertura cultural, inclusión social, lucha contra la discriminación que significan avances sociales y culturales ejemplares a nivel global, en este contexto resulta aún más agravante la modificación de estatutos propuesta.

Es una solución facilista a un problema que requeriría ser tratado con imaginación y amplitud, todo lo contrario a lo propuesto.

ICOMOS Venezuela

Contribution sent in Spanish by Francisco Pérez Gallego, President, 2014-01-31

Spanish

Venezuela apoya por unanimidad el pronunciamiento de rechazo desarrollado por los integrantes de habla hispana del Comité Ejecutivo ante la propuesta de supresión del idioma español como lengua oficial de ICOMOS. Y en contraste, sumándonos a otros mensajes de la región, clamamos porque se consolide como lengua de trabajo, tal como lo ha venido demostrando en la práctica en los múltiples encuentros técnicos desarrollados en el área de Hispanoamérica.

Basándonos en el porcentaje de población hispanohablante a nivel mundial, y en el hecho irrefutable de que nuestra lengua es parte fundamental de nuestro patrimonio cultural, abogamos por que la propuesta sea reconsiderada, sin que ello vaya en detrimento de los otros planteamientos incluidos como el considerar cualquier idioma como lengua de trabajo si esta fuera la lengua principal de cualquier nación anfitriona de un encuentro o intercambio a nivel mundial.

Comités scientifiques internationaux
International Scientific Committees

ISC on Historic Towns and Villages (CIVVIH)

Contribution sent in English by Ms. Sofia Avgerinou Kolonias, President, 2014-02-02

A great majority of CIVVIH members and myself we are suggesting:

- a) The preservation of the current official languages, especially the Spanish language as official language of ICOMOS;
- b) The ICOMOS Sweden proposal as below:

Article etc.	Text / comment	Proposal
Definitions c	<p><i>Groups of buildings: groups of structures freestanding or joined together and their surroundings, built or natural, which because of their architecture, spatial organization, homogeneity or place in the landscape, are of historical, archaeological, artistic, aesthetic, scientific, social, ethnological, anthropological, cultural or spiritual value.</i></p> <p><u>Comment:</u> In Swedish translation (and probably many other languages) it sounds very illogical that cities and towns in WH terms should fall under 'Groups of buildings' and it is important to signal something about the urban structure/planning in the definition. And the plans themselves can be of great interest (for instance Amsterdam, Neuf-Brisach, Palmanova).</p> <p>For the choice of terminology, cf. Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, art 9). Alternatively one could perhaps write: ... <i>because of their architecture, planning, homogeneity ...</i></p>	Addition

As I am informed, this proposal is supported by ICOMOS France also.

Article 6 Membership categories

General comment: It must be clear what rights and obligations are connected to each category. The existence of several categories entails an obligation by the organisation to verify that members are in the right category. It should be considered if, for example, the young and students might be admitted as Individual Members with temporarily discounted dues.

3. Young members

Comment A. The proposed text is not clear on whether people older than 30, but still students, are eligible. Young members should be either less than 30 years of age or in the relevant profession for fewer than five years.

Comment B. Admitting young members should be unproblematic; their CVs should clarify that they qualify. But what is to happen once a young member has turned 30 or has ceased to be a student? If at that time he/she qualifies for Individual Membership, it seems natural that they transfer to this category, but there are no provisions as to how this should come about. Should they apply again? If they do not re-apply or do not qualify, how do they cease to be members? Article 7 Loss of membership does not seem to deal with this situation. It seems uncertain that Young Members will always report that they no longer qualify. If not, it would be up to NCs to perform this check, but the financial consequences of non-compliance would reflect on the whole organisation, so the international secretariat may have to use its resources for this check as well. A way to solve this problem would perhaps be to time-limit young membership to e.g. three or five years.

4. Affiliate members

Comment: According to the draft, affiliate members are to have voting rights at the General Assembly, which sustaining members do not have under the current statutes. As they do not qualify as professionals, some may question this enfranchisement. Since there seems to be no sustaining members anymore, it should be considered to abolish this category rather than changing its name. Prospective candidates for affiliate membership could be involved either as Individual members (Article 4 is wide enough), or be attracted as sponsors, which does not need statutory support aside from what is provided for in Articles 10 d 5 and 17.

5. Honorary members

Comment A: Is it obvious that there is no longer a need for conferring honorary membership on distinguished ICOMOS members?

Comment B: The intention to clarify voting rights does not seem to have been attained. Under Article 6bis d. voting rights at the GA can be exerted by honorary members. On principal grounds it must be questioned that this right should belong to non-ICOMOS members.

Article 6bis Rights and Duties of Members

Comment: What is said above may reflect on the contents of d. and e.

Article 7 Loss of membership a 1 and 4

Comment: There are several situations in which members may be expelled "for any serious cause": The first category is a violation of GA, Bureau, or ExCom decisions. The decision to discipline or expel members should be made by the Bureau with a right of appeal to the ExCom.

The second situation is found at the level of NatCom or ISC. The National Committee should be able to decide whether to expel one of its members because of a violation of its decisions, with an appeal to the ExCom. An ISC should be able to expel a member from its ISC, with an appeal to the ExCom, and should be able to recommend to the Bureau further disciplinary measures to include expulsion from ICOMOS.

Another situation is an ethical violation at either the international or national level. On the national level, a decision to discipline or expel a member for an ethical violation may be taken by the NatCom, with an appeal to the ExCom. On the international level, a decision to discipline or expel a member for an ethical violation may be taken by an ISC, with an appeal to the ExCom. The Bureau may, on its own initiative, discipline or expel a member of ICOMOS for an ethical violation as well, with an appeal to the ExCom. ICOMOS Belgium has introduced some interesting ideas as to the interpretation of the ethical document, but these will not be discussed further here.

Another situation is when a young member ceases to be “young” as elaborated under Article 6 3. It is unfortunate if the latter situation can only be dealt with as an expulsion. Therefore, it could be considered to add to 1 the following provision: “...not paid, or when qualifications for young membership are no longer met, and the member has not been admitted as an Individual Member;”

Article 9 General Assembly

d 7

Comment: An advantage of electing the Bureau at the General Assembly is that candidates to the Board will know what is expected of them. This would avoid possible confusion at the first Board meeting, and the calamity that Board members may not be found willing to accept the added workload of being in the Bureau. Since the Bureau members are expected to be hard working, their selection should not be limited in any way, regionally or otherwise. They should be elected for the potential to contribute to the organization and not any other consideration.

Provided that the General Assembly does meet annually, a possible vacancy should not be for long. Alternatively, the Board could be called on to fill vacancies from among its members.

Article 10 Board

d 4

Comment: The insertion of the words “whenever it falls vacant” would avoid the impression that every new Board would have to renew the position of Director General. If – on the contrary – the intention is just that, it should be similarly clarified.

Article 22 Entry into force

Comment: It should be considered to set the date at 1 January 2015. This would facilitate both editing and publication of the General Assembly’s decision before it becomes valid, and a smooth transition to the new provisions in Article 17bis on accounting.

ISC on Vernacular Architecture (CIAV)

Contribution sent by Mr Gisle Jakhelin, President, 2014-01-31

The board of CIAV has studied and discussed the documents presented as the 3rd consultation from the merged working group Ver. 24/09/2013 as distributed by the Secretariat e-News no 94.

We have the following comments to the proposals, following the structure of the report from the working group:

B-1 Amendments to clarify the text

Articles 9 to 12, 13 and 14

We support the proposals except the change of Advisory Committee to Advisory Council, however we gather that the difference should be commented on by true English speaking scholars.

B-2 Amendments that affect the functioning of ICOMOS Membership categories and financial stability

Article 6-a-3 and 6bis-b

We support the proposals.

General Assembly

Article 9-a, 9-c, 9-d

We are in favor of System 1 (Article 9-a-1), allowing the National Committees to exercise all their votes with 2 or 3 representatives at the GA.

Article 9-c We support the proposals.

Board and Bureau

We support the proposals.

Article 9-d-6 – Maximum number of terms for Board members

We are in favor of Option A – one 6 year term, half of the seats to be renewed every 3 years.

However, we are proposing a change to the period of meetings of the statutory bodies based on the hope of reducing the cost of arranging the statutory meetings as well as reducing the cost for each ICOMOS member:

- The General Assembly shall take place every 4 years in order to save money, i.e. giving more members the ability to take part in the meetings. This is also based on the following:
- The Advisory Committee meets every year, of these every 2nd year in Paris at the ICOMOS Secretariat.
- The Scientific Symposium takes place every 2nd year, in connection with the Advisory Committee meeting.

Following this the alternatives for Article 9-d-6 should be Option B – maximum 2 successive terms of 4 years.

Article 9-d-7, 10-d-3 - Election of Bureau members

We are in favor of Option 1 – Election of the Bureau by the Board from among its members.

Advisory Council – Advisory Committee

Article 12-a – Scientific Council (SC)

We support the Scientific Council resolution at the Costa Rica meeting 2013, topic 4- 1:

“The SC unanimously recommends that it be incorporated into the statute revision as a statutory sub-committee of the Advisory Committee.”

Being a sub-committee of the AdCom there should not be any need to have an additional body for the National Committees.

We support all the other proposals: article 12-a, 11-d, 12-d, 14-a.

National and International Scientific Committees

We support the proposals.

Languages

We support the proposals. We do stress the need for including Spanish as a third official language, however, understand the proposal as it is based on the financial restrictions.

Rules of Procedure

We support the proposals

B-3 Amendments related to content but not of the functioning

We support the proposals

C Recommendations

We support the proposals as to be sent the Executive Committee for further handling.

Membres individuels – plusieurs thèmes
Individual Members – several themes

Mr Dinu Bumbaru

Membre de ICOMOS Canada, membre du Comité exécutif, anc. Secrétaire général

Contribution envoyée en français, 2014-01-31

English translation follows

A titre personnel et conformément à l'appel lancé dont l'échéance est fixée au 31 janvier, voici quelques commentaires sur le projet de modification des statuts avancé dans le cadre de la 3e consultation:

Définitions:

Considérant l'intérêt de ces définitions en lien avec le texte de plusieurs articles des statuts proposés, il serait préférable de les intégrer formellement dans les statuts sous forme d'un article distinct plutôt que de les situer entre le préambule et les articles.

Article 4:

Le texte devrait être plus spécifique quant à la nature du patrimoine culturel auquel l'ICOMOS s'intéresse. Cela pourrait être atteint en incluant une référence aux définitions voire l'inclusion à l'article 4 des définitions actuellement placées après le préambule.

Article 7:

Les Comités "scientifiques" internationaux ne constituent pas des instances d'enregistrement des membres de l'ICOMOS. En conséquence, ils ne sont pas clairement habilités à les radier et devraient être soustraits de la liste des instances habiles à prononcer la perte de qualité de membres.

Par ailleurs, la nature des échanges au sein de l'ICOMOS et de ses comités, notamment les comités internationaux, se prête souvent à des débats animés sur des questions de doctrine qui relèvent davantage de la diversité des points de vue sur une pratique éminemment culturelle et interdisciplinaire comme peut l'être la conservation du patrimoine. Il faudrait éviter que ces différences qui témoignent en partie de la santé intellectuelle de l'ICOMOS soient confondues avec des justifications véritables pour une exclusion ou une radiation.

Le rôle du Bureau devrait être d'agir en prononçant une suspension de la qualité de membre en attendant d'une décision du Conseil d'administration plutôt que d'agir comme mécanisme suppléant à l'absence d'un Comité national.

Article 9:

La définition de l'Assemblée générale à l'article 9a devait être simplifiée pour exprimer le fait qu'elle est constituée des "délégués officiels des comités de l'ICOMOS tels qu'identifiés à l'article 9XX (à définir)".

La formule d'identification des délégués officiels devrait être simplifiée quitte à favoriser une délibération plus active au sein des comités nationaux par la réduction du nombre de délégués officiels et l'instauration de règles des délégations plus démocratiques et aptes à représenter le membership. En ce sens, les formules fondées sur le nombre de membres par comité national ne sont pas satisfaisantes.

La convocation d'une assemblée générale annuelle ne semble pas une avenue réaliste tant en termes logistiques que pour permettre la mise en œuvre des résolutions et programmes de travail adoptés lors d'une assemblée générale.

Article 13:

Il faudra statuer sur la question de la résidence réelle des membres en lien avec leur appartenance à un comité national ou un autre.

Article 14:

L'inclusion de l'adjectif "scientifique" est contraignante et reste vague compte tenu du fait que l'ICOMOS est une organisation d'abord professionnelle et interdisciplinaire ce qui l'amène à se situer dans une forme d'action qui est différente de celle des sciences. Par ailleurs, les comités en question sont les outils dont dispose l'ICOMOS pour mener des actions dans un cadre de collaboration et de réflexion qui transcende le seul niveau national et ce, pas uniquement en termes scientifiques - pensons à la formation des métiers, la sensibilisation des citoyens ou aux relations entre les secteurs professionnels et les politiques publiques en matière de conservation de sites, constructions et ensembles patrimoniaux.

Outre le retrait du qualificatif "scientifique" de leur désignation, il est proposé de préciser que leur mission est liée à la réalisation de celle de l'ICOMOS et non seulement d'être lié très généralement à la conservation du patrimoine culturel, même pas décrite en relation avec la définition de celle-ci dans les statuts de l'ICOMOS.

Article 15:

La création d'un poste de directeur général en lien avec le secrétariat devrait-elle être faite dans les statuts ou établi comme pouvoir du Conseil d'administration, laissant les statuts se concentrer sur la mission du Secrétariat international? Compte tenu de la différence des cycles d'évolution des statuts (en 1978 la dernière fois) par rapport aux évolutions de modèles administratifs (nombreux depuis 2008), il est préférable d'inscrire clairement dans les statuts le pouvoir et la responsabilité de voire à la saine gestion du secrétariat en la confiant au Conseil d'administration par la voie du Secrétaire général.

Article 16:

Il serait pertinent d'identifier l'UNESCO, l'ICCROM et l'ICOM comme observateur statutaires et, séparément, d'établir le pouvoir du Conseil d'administration d'inviter des organisations à assister à titre d'observateur à ses réunions comme à celles du Conseil consultatif ou de l'Assemblée générale.

Article 21:

L'obligation d'établir, de mettre en oeuvre et de mettre à jour une politique / pratique de diversité régionale, disciplinaire et culturelle y compris linguistique est très importante. Outre la présence de langues officielles, il y a la réalité de la vitalité d'un réseau d'échange international, interdisciplinaire et interculturel qu'il faut voir comme essentiel à l'existence de l'ICOMOS.

Mr Dinu Bumbaru

Member of ICOMOS Canada, member of the Executive Committee, former Secretary General
Contribution submitted in French, 2014-01-31
Translation into English by ICOMOS UK

In a personal capacity and in line with the consultation with a deadline of 31 January, herewith some comments on the project to amend the Statutes put forward in the 3rd consultation.

Definitions:

Considering the significance of these definitions, with links to the text of several Articles in the proposed Statutes, it would be better to integrate them formally into the Statutes as a separate Article rather than to place them between the Preamble and the Articles.

Article 4:

The text needs to be more specific as to the nature of cultural heritage with which ICOMOS is concerned. This could be achieved by including a reference to the Definitions or even by the inclusion of the Definitions currently appearing after the Preamble within Article 4.

Article 7:

The International 'Scientific' Committees are not bodies that register ICOMOS members. Consequently, they are clearly not authorised to strike them off and must be removed from the list of bodies able to determine loss of membership status.

Moreover, the nature of discussions within ICOMOS and its Committees, especially the International Committees, often lends itself to lively debates on questions of doctrine which benefit from the diversity of points of view on a practice that is particularly cultural and interdisciplinary, just as the conservation of heritage can be. Such differences, which demonstrate the intellectual health of ICOMOS, must not be confused with genuine reasons for exclusion or striking off.

The role of the Bureau should be to act in declaring a suspension of membership pending a decision of the Board, rather than as a mechanism substituting for an absent National Committee.

Article 9:

The definition of the General Assembly in Article 9a should be simplified to express the fact that it is made up of "official delegates of ICOMOS Committees as identified in Article 9XX (to be defined)".

The formula for identifying the official delegates should be simplified, even if it means favouring a more active debate within the National Committees through reduction of the number of official delegates and the introduction of delegation rules that are more democratic and suited to representing the membership. From this point of view, formulae based on the number of members per National Committee are not satisfactory.

Calling an annual General Assembly does not seem a realistic prospect either in logistical terms or for enabling the execution of resolutions and work programmes adopted during a General Assembly.

Article 13:

A ruling is needed on the matter of the true residence of members as regards their belonging to one National Committee or another.

Article 14:

The inclusion of the adjective “scientific” is restrictive and remains vague considering that ICOMOS is first and foremost a professional and interdisciplinary organisation, which leads it to take a different approach from that of scientific bodies. Moreover, the Committees in question are tools at the disposal of ICOMOS to undertake actions in a context of collaboration and reflection which transcends the merely national level – and not only in scientific terms – for instance, consider the learning of a trade, citizen awareness-raising, or relationships between professional sectors and public policies in matters such as the conservation of sites, structures and heritage entities.

In addition to withdrawing the term “scientific” from their titles, it would be advisable to specify that their purpose is linked to the accomplishment of that of ICOMOS, and not merely, in a general sense, to cultural heritage conservation, as their purpose is not even described relative to that of ICOMOS within the Statutes.

Article 15:

Should the creation of the post of Director General, linked to the Secretariat, be written into the Statutes or established as a power of the Board, leaving the Statutes to concentrate on the purpose of the International Secretariat? Bearing in mind the different change cycles in the Statutes (most recently in 1978) versus the changes in administrative models (several since 2008), it would be better to write into the Statutes a clear power and responsibility to oversee the healthy management of the Secretariat, entrusting it to the Board via the Secretary General.

Article 16:

It would be useful to identify UNESCO, ICCROM and ICOM as statutory observers and, separately, to establish the power of the Board to invite organisations to attend meetings such as those of the Advisory Council or the General Assembly with Observer status.

Article 21:

The obligation to establish, undertake and update policy and practice dealing with diversity (regional, disciplinary and cultural, including linguistic) is very important. Beyond the presence of official languages, there is the reality of the vitality of a network for international, interdisciplinary and intercultural exchange which must be seen as essential to the existence of ICOMOS.

Ms Angela Rojas

Member of ICOMOS Cuba, former member of the Executive Committee

Contribution sent in English, 2014-01-30

1. General considerations

Most of the official documents and doctrinal texts are already translated to Spanish.

Present circumstances show an economic crisis, hopefully transitory, but present circumstances also show that Spanish is the second language in the world

The category of Official Languages is a symbol of the history of ICOMOS, the same as the Pegasus. It has to be respected as it is.

Cultural diversity is not limited to languages issue but they are the vehicle to achieve it.

2. With regard to recommendations:

N. 17: Profile of candidate Board member.

To add "and proved experience as a professional engaged in the areas of competence of ICOMOS"

No. 18

To add to Tabet's recommendation: that for the "hard core" should also be required a high professional level in conservation, not only knowledge of WH texts and procedures.

Recommendation No. 20: Section on languages in the Rules of Procedures

Article 28

a) is not acceptable. Spanish should be a working language.

b) is acceptable if Spanish is a working language and all the already translated texts preserve their official character

c) is acceptable if Spanish is a working language.

d) is acceptable if Spanish is a working language.

e) is acceptable if Spanish is a working language.

Article 29 can be accepted

3. III Revised draft Statutes

Definitions:

To include: towns, villages, canals and cultural routes.

Article 6: Membership categories

The affiliate membership category is acceptable, but:

Article 6bis: Rights and Duties of Members

e) Affiliate members should not be eligible for office within ICOMOS because they have not necessarily proved to be professionals engaged in the areas of competence of ICOMOS.

Article 9. General Assembly

I agree to maintain the current allocation of votes: maximum 18 and 5 proxies.

Duration and maximum numbers of terms: I agree with option A: one single term of 6 years and to renew 10 seats every three years

Election of the Bureau. It should be kept as it is: by the General Assembly (Option 2).

A new proposal: to accept in some cases such as the changes of the name of the organization, change of Statutes or other key decisions, the possibility of voting by mail but with a maximum of 18 votes each national committee.

Article 21

a) To change the proposed text to:

"English, French, Spanish and Russian are the official languages of ICOMOS.

English, French and Spanish should be the working languages."

b) I agree c) I agree

Mr Emad Khalil

Member of ICOMOS Egypt

Contribution sent in English, 2014-01-31

I have one comment/suggestion concerning membership.

Would it be feasible for ICOMOS to open membership for institutions as well. I am sure you are aware of the UNESCO UniTwin theme, so I am thinking along the same line for ICOMOS. To tell you the truth, based on my experience in and some other countries, national ICOMOS which are mostly formed through the governmental agencies, are neither active nor responsive. So, I think if ICOMOS membership was to be open for Universities, NGOs, etc. that would give ICOMOS a significant boost both in its effect and long term impact.

Mr Grellan Rourke

Member of ICOMOS Ireland, Member of the Executive Committee

Contribution received in English, 2014-01-31

Preamble. heading IV

'Administration and functioning.' does not sound right. It should be changed to 'Administration and operation.'

Preamble. 5th statement (before definitions)

'The French version of the ICOMOS Statutes shall be the authentic version.' Sorry to bring this up but I think the word 'authentic' does not sit well. I think 'The French version of the ICOMOS Statutes shall be the authoritative version.'

Article 2

'It may be changed....' should be changed to 'This may be changed...'

Article 5.g

'advise' is incorrect. The word should be changed to 'advice'.

Article 6bis.e

In my view 'Affiliate Members' should **not** be eligible for office within ICOMOS. I think it is inappropriate.

Article 8

There is the issue of the Scientific Council. There was a definite desire in Costa Rica to make this a Statutory Body of ICOMOS and I see no problem in doing this. I do not envisage two distinct bodies - Advisory Council and Scientific Council. I think the Scientific Council is part of the Advisory Council and that should stand. We have said 'The Board and its Bureau so why not say 'The Advisory Council its Scientific Council'.

One could say 'the Advisory Council shall be assisted in its work by the Scientific Council'. See Article 12 below.

Article 9.d.6

I would go for a 3-year renewable option, as I think the 4-year option is too long. I agree with the EXCOM in that two additional terms should be possible if a member is elected to the Bureau.

I would be concerned with the inclusion of 'no member shall serve in more than two positions within ICOMOS'. Is that in their lifetime? I think it is too limiting.

Article 10.d.1bis

I think it would be better to say 'ensure that it operates in compliance with...'

Election of the Bureau. I think that given the nature of the international organisation the election to the Bureau needs to come from the membership at the GA. Candidates need to present at the GA for these particular positions and set out their background and suitability.

There is the issue of the Vice-Presidents. I think they need to have particular responsibilities and these could be decided at Board level and not necessarily written into the Statutes.

Article 10.d.11

'...following consultation of...' should read '...following consultation with...'

Article 12

One needs to read this article very carefully; in group discussions the wrong interpretation was taken by some.

I refer to 'Among them, the Advisory Council shall elect for a single term of office of three years, a President and Vice-President from two different countries, one of whom.....' Some thought it meant 2 Vice-President! It becomes clear thereafter but I suggest adding two words (in bold) which would make it clearer to read 'Among them, the Advisory Council shall elect for a single term of office of three years, a President and **a** Vice-President **both** from two different countries, one of whom.....'

Article 21bis

In the first paragraph, third line '...the operation procedures for...' should read '...the operational procedures for...'

Article 22

'... after the closure of...' sound better.

In general, I am satisfied that the voting procedure should remain as before and that a 6-year term should not be introduced, as I think the disadvantages outweigh the benefits.

Mr Toshiyuki Kono

Member of ICOMOS Japan, Member of the Executive Committee

Contribution received in English, 2014-01-31

“Director General” in Art.10 (a), Art.10 (d)(4), Art.10 (e)(1)a and b, Art.15(b) should be replaced with “Managing Director”.

The term “Director General” is confusing, since Secretary General should have the power to make final decisions and to instruct the international secretariat. Instead of “Director General”, we should use “Managing Director”, because his/her job should be managing the international secretariat. It should be internal work, and he/she should not represent ICOMOS in international fora.

Mr Jad Tabet

Membre de ICOMOS Liban

Contribution envoyée en français, 2014-01-31

English translation follows

C'est avec grand intérêt que j'ai pris connaissance du rapport du groupe de travail consolidé pour la modification des statuts de l'ICOMOS.

Je me réjouis de constater que la recommandation N°18 du Groupe de Travail concernant les rapports entre le Conseil d'administration et le Panel du Patrimoine Mondial reprend la recommandation que j'avais faite dans mon audit de 2009 sur l'examen des méthodes de travail et des procédures de l'ICOMOS pour l'évaluation des biens culturels et mixtes proposés pour inscription sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondial de l'UNESCO.

Cette recommandation (que j'avais classé en PRIORITE LA PLUS HAUTE) vise à prendre en compte les différences de nature entre les responsabilités du conseil d'administration (ex comité exécutif) et le Panel du Patrimoine Mondial, à éviter les chevauchements entre les deux organes qui ont chacun une mission bien distincte, et, pour ce qui est des prestations de l'ICOMOS en tant qu'organe consultatif de l'UNESCO pour l'évaluation des biens proposés pour inscription sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondial, d'améliorer la qualité de ces prestations et de répondre aux 4 problèmes qui étaient apparus lors de l'audit: le problème de l'équilibre dans la représentation des régions culturelles dans le Panel, celui de la parité hommes/femmes, celui de l'expertise de ses membres par rapport à la Convention du Patrimoine mondial et enfin, celui de la fréquence de la présence au sein de la Commission de membres appartenant au même pays que l'un des biens examinés.

Mr Jad Tabet

Member of ICOMOS Lebanon

Contribution submitted in French, 2014-01-31

Translation into English by ICOMOS UK

It is with great interest that I have studied the report of the merged working group for the modification of ICOMOS's Statutes.

I am delighted to see that recommendation No 18 of the Working Group, concerning interactions between the Board and the World Heritage Panel, incorporates the recommendation that I had made in my 2009 audit regarding working methods and procedures at ICOMOS for the evaluation of cultural and mixed assets proposed for inscription on UNESCO's World Heritage List.

This recommendation (which I had ranked as HIGHEST PRIORITY) aims to take into account the differences in nature between the responsibilities of the Board (formerly Executive Committee) and the World Heritage Panel, in order to avoid overlaps between the two bodies, each of which has a well defined purpose; and, as concerns the services of ICOMOS as a consultative body to UNESCO for evaluating assets proposed for inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List, to improve the quality of these services and to address the 4 problems identified by the audit. These problems are as follows: the lack of balance in the representation on the Panel of cultural regions; equality between men and women; the expertise of members in relation to the World Heritage Convention; and finally, the frequent presence within the Commission of members belonging to the same country as one of the assets under consideration.

Mr Roland Silva

Member of ICOMOS Sri Lanka, Honorary President

Contribution sent in English, 2014-01-30 via Dinu Bumbaru

The 30 paged document, adds to the many thousands of pages of many reports circulated in the past years. These, to a very large extent reiterates the inner thoughts of Shakespeare when he prophetically 1600 AD, spoke through Hamlet when he replied Polonius who asked "... *What do you read, my Lord ?*" "..... *Words, words, words*".

STATUS QUO OF ICOMOS

Be that as it may, the Founder Fathers of ICOMOS and their successors in their wisdom had set out the procedures for World Heritage Listing as spelt out in the ICOMOS Web Page of January 2014 as follows:-

"The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) is a professional association that works for the conservation and protection of cultural heritage places around the world..... and offers advice to UNESCO on World Heritage Sites.

- 1 ICOMOS Structure
 - 1.1 National Committees
 - 1.2 International Committees
- 2 ICOMOS Charters and Doctrinal Texts
- 3 ICOMOS and the World Heritage Convention
 - 3.1 Nara Document on Authenticity
- 4 References
- 5 External links
 - 5.1 National committee websites

ICOMOS Structure

As extracted from the ICMOS Web Page- January 2014, "ICOMOS is composed of its National Committees, to which individuals and institutions apply for membership. In addition to the National Committees, ICOMOS has a series of International Scientific Committees, in which experts in certain field of activity within the context of heritage conservation exchange and debate.

The Advisory Committee is composed of the Chairpersons of the National Committees, the Chairpersons of the International Scientific Committees and the President of ICOMOS as an *ex officio* member. The Advisory Committee was given the task to advise and make recommendations to the General Assembly and the Executive Committee on matters which concern policy and programme priorities

"National Committees

National Committees are subsidiary organizations created in the countries which are members of UNESCO. They bring together individual and institutional members and offer them a framework for discussion and an exchange of information. ICOMOS currently has over 110 National Committees. Each National Committee adopts its own rules of procedure and elaborates its own program according to the goals and aims of ICOMOS

International Committees

Usually known as 'International Scientific Committees', these entities focus on specialised areas of heritage conservation and are made up of members of the organisation drawn from those specialist areas. The scientific programmes of the organisation are coordinated by the 'Scientific Council' made up of the Presidents of ISCs. The following ISCs operate within ICOMOS:

- Analysis and Restoration of Structures of Architectural Heritage (ISCARSAH)
- Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM)
- Cultural Landscapes ICOMOS-IFLA (ISCCL)
- Cultural Routes (CIIC)
- Cultural Tourism (ICTC)
- Earthen Architectural Heritage (ISCEAH)
- Economics of Conservation (ISEC)
- Fortifications and Military Heritage (Ico Fort)
- Heritage Documentation (CIPA)
- Historic Towns and Villages (CIVVIH)
- Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites (ICIP)
- Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICICH)
- Legal, Administrative and Financial Issues (ICLAFI)
- Mural (Wall) Painting
- International Polar Heritage Committee (IPHC)
- Risk Preparedness (ICORP)
- Rock Art (CAR)
- Shared Built Heritage (ISCSBH)
- Stained Glass (ISCV)
- Stone (ISCS)
- Theory and Philosophy of Conservation and Restoration
- International Training Committee (CIF)
- Underwater Cultural Heritage (ICUCH)
- Vernacular Architecture (CIAV)
- Wood (IWC)
- 20th Century Heritage (ISC20C)”

“ICOMOS Charters and Doctrinal Texts as prepared by the Advisory

In the tradition of the Athens and Venice Charters ICOMOS has in the years since its formation developed and adopted a number of other charters and doctrinal texts which provide guidance to heritage conservation professionals in their work. Most such documents are created by the international committees of the organisation and thereafter adopted by the triennial General Assembly. The texts each address a specific area of professional practice in the heritage conservation professions. Following the 17th ICOMOS General Assembly held in Paris in November 2011, the list of charters is as follows:

- Historic Gardens -Florence Charter 1981
- Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (Washington Charter) 1987
- Charter for the Protection and Management of Archaeological Heritage 1990
- Charter on the Protection and Management of Underwater Cultural Heritage 1996
- International Cultural Tourism Charter - Managing Tourism at Places of Heritage Significance 1999
- Principles for the Preservation of Timber Structures 1999
- Charter on the Built Vernacular Heritage 1999
- ICOMOS Charter - Principles for the Analysis, Conservation and Structural Restoration of Architectural Heritage 2003
- ICOMOS Principles for the Preservation and Conservation-Restoration of Wall Paintings 2003
- ICOMOS Charter on Cultural Routes 2008
- ICOMOS Charter for the Interpretation and Presentation of Cultural Heritage Sites also known as the 'Ename Charter' 2008
- Joint ICOMOS – TICCIH Principles for the Conservation of Industrial Heritage Sites, Structures, Areas and Landscapes 2011

- The Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas 2011 (Supersedes the Washington Charter)

In addition to the above there are fourteen other doctrinal texts. These include the 'Nara Document'. Many of the national committees of ICOMOS have adopted their own charters which set standards for heritage conservation practice at national level.

ICOMOS and the World Heritage Convention

In 1972, ICOMOS was named by the UNESCO World Heritage Convention as one of the three formal advisory bodies to the World Heritage Committee, along with the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM). As the professional and scientific adviser to the Committee on all aspects of the cultural heritage, ICOMOS is responsible for the evaluation of all nominations of cultural properties made to the World Heritage List with the criteria laid down by the World Heritage Committee. In addition to the basic criterion of “outstanding universal value,” ICOMOS evaluates nominations for aspects related to authenticity, management, and conservation as specified in the World Heritage Convention.”

“The evaluation of nominations involves consultation between the wide-ranging expertise represented by the organization’s membership and its National and Scientific Committees. Members are also sent on expert missions to carry out on-site evaluations of nominated properties. This extensive consultation results in the preparation of detailed recommendations that are submitted to the World Heritage Committee at its annual meetings.”

ICOMOS is also involved, through its International Secretariat and its National and Scientific Committees, in the preparation of reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. It advises the UNESCO World Heritage Centre on requests for technical assistance received from States that are party to (i.e. have ratified) the World Heritage Convention. ICOMOS maintains a full archive of nominations and reports at the Documentation Centre of its Paris headquarters.

Nara Document on Authenticity

In November 1994, at the Nara Conference on Authenticity, ICOMOS published the Nara Document on Authenticity, which addresses the need for a broader understanding of cultural diversity and cultural heritage in conservation efforts involving cultural heritage sites.” [EXTRACT FROM THE WEB PAGE OF ICOMOS – January 2014]

POINTS FOR CONSIDERATION

The above extract of the ICOMOS WEB PAGE of January 2014 points out very clearly the *modus operandi* of the Organisation as recently as January 2014. If the Organisation is thinking of REFORMING the procedures, it is necessary to question itself if it has abided to the procedures that were already in place up to January 2014 as set out by the Founder Fathers and their successors? Accordingly:-

- Has every nomination been referred to the National Committees of ICOMOS for their review?
- Has every nomination been referred to the relevant International Scientific Committees for their review?
- Are the Experts sent by ICOMOS to examine these sites the right expertise to assess the Nominations that they are expected to report on in terms of their speciality on the subject and in terms of their regional knowledge of the culture?
- Are the Bureau Members examining the Nomination although elected at the General Assembly but voting for the nominations adequately knowledgeable of the subject?

We feel that these are the matters that need to be righted before any other refinements are contemplated. Namely:-

- Ensure that all National Committees Report are received on the due date by requesting the State Party that has signed the Nominations being assigned this task to coordinate this requirement. This responsibility may be enshrined on the Vice President of ICOMOS coordinating the work in the respective Continent. For this purpose a Professional Assistant may be assigned to the respective Vice President who may need to be a National from the respective Continent.
- Ensure that all International Scientific Committee Reports are obtained in time. This responsibility may be enshrined in the Vice President of ICOMOS coordinating the work of the International Scientific Committees. For this purpose a Professional Assistant may be assigned to the respective Vice President who is selected by the Chair of the Advisory Committee.
- In order to ensure that the right Experts are sent by ICOMOS to assess the Nominations that they are expected to report on in terms of their speciality on the subject and in terms of their regional knowledge of the culture, ICOMOS may retain an 'Experts List' of persons who can report in terms of the speciality on the subject and in terms of their regional knowledge of the culture.
- With a view to ensuring that those who occupy the elevated positions of the Bureau who are the final Experts in selecting the right Monuments and Sites to be on the World Heritage List, it would be well for each Candidates applying for such a post to present a detailed curriculum vita at the time of the Triennial Elections. Thus the Membership that elects such a person will be well aware of the professional standing of the Vice Presidents.
- One last point that ICOMOS may consider is the Professional Quality of the ICOMOS Members at the National, International, Executive and Bureau levels. It is for this reason that the ICOMOS Directory that was cyclostyled for many years was formatted to a Professional Level by ICOMOS – Netherlands in 1999, with specific details of the professional qualifications of the Members of 107 Member States and printed to book of 812 pages by ICOMOS Sri Lanka. Such a Directory will highlight this specific need that its Members need to be professionals as given in the opening statement of the ICOMOS Web Page of January 2014 that, "ICOMOS" is a professional association that works for the conservation and protection of cultural heritage."

Proposals made by Dr. Roland Silva

- President ICOMOS 1990 – 1999.
- Associate of the Royal Institute of Architects (ARIBA) – 1961.
- Postgraduate Diploma in Archaeology (London) -1958
- Diploma Di Perfezionamento in Studio dei Monumenti (Rome) -1968.
- Doctor of Letters (Leiden) - 1988.
- Doctor of Science (Honoris Causa - Moratuwa) - 2000.
- Director General of Archaeology, Sri Lanka (1983 – 1991)
- Director General, UNESCO-Sri Lanka Project of the Cultural Triangle (1980-1996)
- President Institute of Architects, Sri Lanka, (1971-1972).
- President Council of Archaeologists, Sri Lanka (1996).

The above information is for the knowledge of the recent Members of the Executive Body of ICOMOS with reference to the above Honorary President of ICOMOS who was accidentally elected President in 1990 and was re-elected to continue to its legal limit of three terms ending in 1999. During his nine year term, ICOMOS with the support of the Executive Committee, Advisory Committee and the Secretariat was able to increase its Membership from 68 to 107 Nations and the frontline International Scientific Committees of Conservation advanced from 11 to 24 and had 222 World Heritage Sites listed during the nine years.

It is also well to record that this Honorary President of ICOMOS, studied the practice in the Conservation of Monuments and Sites at the University of Rome under the First and Second Presidents of ICOMOS, namely, Prof. Gazzola and Prof. Lemaire who were the Founder Fathers of ICOMOS and so assimilated their thought processes in the formative years of ICOMOS and in the evolution phases of formulating the concepts for the listing of World Heritage Monuments and Sites.

We urge that ICOMOS be the Professional Body that UNESCO in 1965 intended it to be.

Mr John Hurd

Member of ICOMOS UK, President of ISC Earthen Architecture,

President of the Advisory Committee

Contribution sent in English, 2014-01-25

NB¹. John Hurd bases his comments on discussions with the officers and many members of the ICOMOS Advisory Committee, some members of ISCEAH and comments from the ICOMOS Executive Committee.

A. General comments on introduction.

1. At A3. Hurd is concerned that the 3rd consultation does not entirely reflect the responses to the 2nd consultation. He requests that the WG note the rest of the ADCOM comments, from the March 2013 meeting of the Executive meeting in Paris. (*See also comments from the Executive Committee*).

2. Hurd notes that the working group refers to a non existent body, the Advisory Council, if the WG is here mentioning the Advisory Committee he advises that you correct your errors in the name.

3. In the section, 'elections', two models are offered and the advisory committee also propose a third model.

General Assembly shall take place every 4 years (*perhaps the EXCOM also prefers this*).

The Advisory committee continues to meet every year, but meets with the officers and occasional members, every other year in the secretariat and every other year in a member state. (*this will allow more in depth discussion including the Scientific Council Symposia in a sustainable and manageable form and frequency*).

The Scientific Council symposia take place every two years.

4. Hurd believes that Option 1. Election of Bureau members by the board from among its members is the right direction.

5. Voting rights deserves much discussion. Of course National Committees will vary in size, and while we all encourage expanding membership, small countries representation should not be regarded as having less significance than States with larger membership. We need to be very careful here and interpret the demographics very carefully.

6. Hurd reflects on the words "What ICOMOS do we want".

What does "we" mean here?

It should surely mean all members of the ICOMOS General Assembly, but in the middle of a consultation process it seems unlikely that this has yet been achieved. Perhaps "we" is at present a smaller unit, not representative enough to reflect the wants of the greater "we"?

B. Overview of the proposed amendments.

B1. Text.

Agree in general.

B2. function.

Article 3-a-6, young members.

Hurd prefers that the title young members be more carefully considered. New professionals, Student members may be more appropriate, limits and division by physical age seem not appropriate.

¹ This note is part of the contribution

Articles 4-6. Support.

General Assembly.

Articles 9-a, 9-c, 9d. Support System 1, with NCs exercising their votes with 2-3 representatives at the General Assembly.

Board and Bureau.

Once again in this section a non-existent body, the Advisory Council is mentioned, please correct to Advisory Committee.

Hurd supports 9-6 Option A one 6 year term, with half the seats to be renewed every 3 years.

However I join with others in the Advisory Committee to propose a change of the period of meetings of the statutory bodies, based on the intent of reducing costs to both the host country and to attending ICOMOS members.

That the GA takes place every 4 years.

That the ADCOM meets internationally every 2 years.

That the Scientific Council hold a symposium every 2 years at the time of the ADCOM International Meetings.

In this alternative Article 9-d-6 may be option B, maximum of 2 successive terms of 4 years.

Article 9-d-7, 10-d-3, Election of Bureau from EXCOM members.

Advisory Committee. (Hurd notes that this is again a misquote of the existing name of the committee, Advisory Council should be corrected).

Hurd considers it reasonable to include the scientific Council as a statutory arm of the Advisory Committee, including its officers and organisation. Hurd does not feel that the National Committees need a separate council to mirror the SC, this proposal was discussed at Malta and rejected, but the Advisory Committee should evolve its organisation to encourage better connection to the National Committees.

12-a Once again the word "council" should be corrected.

If a separate National Committee group is formed to mirror the work of the Scientific Council, then this should be an internal decision of the Advisory Committee and not a statutory decision. This needs to be discussed within the Advisory Committee before Hurd can comment. Hurd is aware that both views exist within the committee. The Advisory Committee seems very split in this matter and Hurd is disappointed that no one raised this in the ADCOM meeting recently held in Costa Rica. However, Hurd will open internal discussion within the Advisory Committee during 2014 and before the general Assembly.

National Committees.

All proposals support.

International Scientific Committees.

All proposals support.

NB. The para on article 14bis, voluntary nature of positions is incomprehensible, what is "the advisory council of the International Scientific Committees"? this is another completely illusory body who does not exist, the WG must please stop renaming groups in advance of any democratic decision by the GA. 14 bis needs a rewrite to be understandable.

International Secretariat.

Support.

Languages.

Support.

Rules of Procedure.

Support.

Mr Smriti Pant

Member of ICOMOS UK

Contribution sent in English, 2014-01-10

First of all many thanks to you all, and other ICOMOS members who are supporting you in your work, for putting together such a comprehensive overview of the proposed recommendations and amendments to the ICOMOS Statutes. I am currently a member of ICOMOS UK and my feedback on the five major questions you have posed is as follows:

Membership categories (Article 6)

Yes, I very much approve the inclusion of a 'Young Members' category and the adjustment of the 'Affiliate Members' category.

Cultural diversity & multilingualism (Articles 10-d-8 and 21)

Yes, I approve the proposals made to ensure ICOMOS' compliance with its own Statutes and rules and the addition of 3 new measures.

Duration and maximum number of terms for Board members (Article 9-d-6)

I prefer Option A – One single term of 6 years, half of the seats (10) shall be renewed every 3 years.

Election of the Bureau members (Article 9-d-7 or 10-d-3)

I prefer Option 1 – Election of the Bureau by the Board from among its members, for a 3-year term.

Attribution of votes (Article 9-a-1)

As long as there is no mechanism in place, in the statutes and/or otherwise, to annually review that the (new and old) members have been actively contributing towards the goals/working of ICOMOS International, Nat Coms, etc., I suggest maintaining the status-quo regarding the maximum number of votes and proxies allocated to each Nat Com. For if this is not the case, adoption of the proposed alternative (System 2: 9-a-1) may result in sudden increase in Nat Com memberships with no adequate means of ensuring that the increased membership is in fact beneficial to the overall working of ICOMOS vis-a-vis the voting advantage such Nat Coms may be getting in comparison to smaller, yet more active, Nat Coms.

Ms Darwina L. Neal

Member of US-ICOMOS, member of ISC Landscapes

Contribution sent in English, 2014-01-28

Per the invitation in the ICOMOS enews to comment on the proposed amendments to the ICOMOS Statutes as part of the third consultation of the members, I have reviewed the report of the ICOMOS Working Group on the Statutes and their comments, questions and proposed changes to the Statutes and have attached my comments on them.

This is the third time that I have reviewed the Statutes and submitted comments on them and want to compliment the Working Group on their hard work that has resulted in greatly improved proposals and thoughtful recommendations. Although I did review the Preliminary information and Recommendations and had comments on them and the Questions in them, I have incorporated most of my comments on those in my comments on the Statutes to make them more relative. One of the comments I had, however, was not directly related to the proposed changes to the Statutes, so I am including it here and referencing it in the Statutes comments.

One of the sources listed from which resources may be derived is "Gifts". In the preliminary presentations on p. 3 under "Administrative and Financial Responsibilities", in regard to clarification of annual resources, it states that ICOMOS belongs to a category of organizations that cannot receive donations and bequests. In order to help ICOMOS achieve a better financial status, and increase contributions to such funds as the Victoria Falls Fund, it would seem prudent to have ICOMOS legally change its category so that it can accept these. For example, US/ICOMOS is established as a US 501C3 non-profit corporation, which allows it to receive donations and bequests that are US tax-deductible for the donors. Likewise, expenses incurred by US/ICOMOS EXCO, Board and Committees in the performance of their duties, such as attending official meetings, are also considered to be tax-deductible contributions to US/ICOMOS.

If it is not possible for ICOMOS to so incorporate under French law, perhaps a separate ICOMOS Foundation could be established to receive donations and bequests. In any case, tax deductibility of contributions could be an advantage in securing funds for special purposes.

General

The ICOMOS Working Group is to be commended on the time and effort they have expended in developing these proposed revised Statutes. I agree with most of the recommendations they have made and appreciate the opportunity to again comment on these, as I have done on two previous versions. In that regard, I was pleased to see that a number of my recommendations have been incorporated, but I have repeated some That I still feel are valid.

Although I had comments on some of the recommendations, I have incorporated those into the format of comments on the Statutes for ease of reference. My answers to the five Working Group questions are incorporated there as well.

Throughout the General Presentation and Recommendations, references are variously made to "Board (current Executive Committee)", "Advisory Council (current Advisory Committee)" and "Bureau", which is confusing, since there has been no previous recommendation or explanation about why/how these terms are being changed, and these terms are not consistently used throughout the documents. For example, on p.6, one option for Election of Bureau members recommends "Election of the Bureau by the Board from among its members", with no prior explanation of what the Bureau would be.

It is my understanding that what is now in current Statutes called “The Executive Committee” is proposed to be called “The Board”, “The Advisory Committee” is proposed to be called “The Advisory Council” and the Officers are to be called “The Bureau”.

Changing the first two terms is in conformance with those used by other organizations, but I have always found the term “Bureau” to be confusing, and found it even more so in reviewing these Statutes. Consequently I strongly recommend that “Executive Committee”, which is generally used and understood in all of the other professional organizations to which I belong, such as US/ICOMOS, ASLA, IFLA, and local historic preservation organizations, be used instead of “Bureau” throughout this document to refer to the Officers of ICOMOS – i.e., President, Vice Presidents, Secretary-General and Treasurer.

In any case, an explanation of these revised terms should be included at the beginning of the explanatory document that transmits the next version of the proposed revised Statutes.

The following comments are organized in the Statute format.

Preamble:

“All terms used in these Statutes to designate a person with responsibilities are to be interpreted as implying that men and women are equally eligible to exercise such responsibilities.”

I had previously stated that the prior version of this was a “cop out” and that the statutes should be edited where apropos to make them non-specific gender reference throughout, as ASLA did with theirs almost 40 years ago, as was done with the IFLA C&BL a few years ago, and as US/ICOMOS has done with their Bylaws. For example, either eliminate the need for use of he or she, or add both references where he/his/him is used, such as her/him she/he. Most of these changes have been made, but a few “he’s” remain and should be changed.

II Aims and Activities

Article 5 Activities and actions

5. g. (p.5) Correct to read: “Provide **advice** (not advise) on...”

III Members

Article 6 Membership Categories

6. a. (p.21) I approve the addition of “Young Members” and the adjustment of “Affiliate Members”.

Article 6bis Rights and Duties of Members

6bis. e. (p.23) Affiliate Members are not professionals and should not be eligible for office within ICOMOS.

Article 7 Loss of Membership

7. a. 4. (p.23) Modify the first sentence to read: “If struck from the register by the Board, by a National Committee, or if none exists by the Bureau, or by an International Scientific Committee, **for violation of the Code of Ethics or any other** serious cause.”

IV Administration and Functioning

Article 9 General Assembly (GA)

9. a. (p.24) Regarding allocation of votes, I basically prefer System 1, which would allocate number of votes based on number of members, but this should be based only on number of **dues-paying** Members, with no regard to the number of inhabitants of their country or number of new members, as proposed in the last paragraph.

The Working Group has stated that it needs to study further what an equitable number of votes per Committee would be. I suggest that this should be something like one vote per 50 Members, with a maximum cap such as 15, since text on p.7 states that 50 is the median membership size of

National Committees. I don't feel that all attending Members should have the right to vote, since attendance is usually greater from countries that are nearer to the location where the GA is held, thus tending to give a significant advantage to nominees from that area.

9. b. (p.25) I question whether/how the GA should convene at least once a year, since the 2 off-year meetings are previously recommended to be only 2 hours or so in length and in conjunction with the Advisory Council Meetings. It would be more logical and equitable to have the full GA meet every 3 years, as it does now, with the Board acting for it in the other 2 years, meeting in conjunction with the Advisory Council. In any case, The Board should approve the Budget, not the GA.

9. d. 2. (p.26) Delete this provision to "Approve the annual report and accounts which shall be distributed to the members, and vote the budget;" since per above this should be done by the Board at their annual meetings.

9. d. 3. provides for the level of approval needed by the GA:
"Vote the ICOMOS General Programme and budgetary guidelines for the next triennium, the membership dues and minimum levels to categorise gifts". What is meant by the latter part in regard to gifts? Simplify text to explain what this means.

9. d. 6. (p.26) In regard to duration and maximum number of terms for Board members, I propose a hybrid Option C instead: A maximum of 2 successive terms of 3 years with 10 seats renewed every 3 years, with only individual members being eligible. With other corrections, this Option C would read:

"Elect by secret ballot at each statutory election, which is after three years, 10 members of the Board for a **3-year term, renewable once**. The members of the Board shall be individual ~~or affiliate~~ members chosen with regard to their competencies to direct an association and to ensure that the different regions of the world and different **specializations** ~~specialisms~~ are represented in so far as possible. Retiring Board members may not be re-elected before the expiration of a 3-year term. No country shall be represented on the Board by more than one member, with the exception of the President of the Advisory Council. No member shall serve in more than 2 positions within ICOMOS. These rules shall apply to all elected positions in ICOMOS' international statutory bodies;"

This new option allows maximum flexibility and provides that half of the Board would remain to retain institutional memory.

I oppose the current EXCO preference that would maintain the option for 3 successive terms and extend them to 4 years each to allow 12 years of service, vs. 9. This would lead to an "entrenched bureaucracy" and limit opportunities for new leadership.

9. d. 7. (p.27) Delete: Option 2 Election of the Bureau by the GA; instead use Option 1 under Article 10 Board, which would provide for election of the Bureau by the Board.

Article 10 Board

10. a. Modify the last sentence of the first paragraph as follows:

"The Director General of the International Secretariat **shall** ~~may be invited by the President to~~ attend the meetings in a non-voting advisory capacity."

This is standard procedure for all of the other professional organizations to which I have belonged, unless an Executive Session is called.

10. d. 2. Modify to read:

"Ensure the implementation of the ICOMOS General Programme and budgetary guidelines for the triennium and **approve the** annual budget. ~~voted by the General Assembly;~~"

10. d. 3. I prefer **Option 1: Election of the Bureau by the Board from among its members, but for a 3-year term, which may be renewed once.** This would allow maximum flexibility and

election of those who have proven their competence and capability for leadership, rather than having elections be a “popularity contest” based on campaigning to and by National Committees and the GA.

10. d. 6. (p.29) Revise to read:

“**Approve the** ~~Propose a draft~~ annual budget for the next year **and as well as** the draft ICOMOS General Programme and budgetary guidelines for the next triennium, as well as the membership dues and minimum levels to categorize gifts (Clarify?), as proposed by the Bureau;”

10. d. 8. A policy on cultural diversity should be approved, but I question whether it should be listed like this in the Statutes. Instead, it would be preferable for the Board to develop and approve such a policy for approval at the next GA, then include in the statutes:

“Report annually to the Advisory Council and triennially to the General Assembly on the state of cultural diversity and multilingualism in ICOMOS in compliance with such ICOMOS policy;

Article 11 Bureau (p.30) As previously cited, I recommend that this should be “**Executive Committee**”, instead, to be in compliance with generally accepted use in other international professional organizations. If so, this term should be changed throughout the document, but my succeeding comments will be in terms of what is written in these Statutes.

11. e. 1. (p.31) Revise last sentence of first part to read:

“... **He/she** shall chair the sessions of the Board and Bureau and approve expenditures **recommended by the Treasurer.**” This reflects what should be the reality, since no President should unilaterally approve expenditures, especially not without consent of the Treasurer; the dual approval is a safeguard.

11. e. 2. Revise the first sentence to read:

“The Vice-Presidents shall assist and take the place of the President in **his/her** absence.

11. e. 3. In regard to the Treasurer, revise the second sentence to read:

“**He/she** shall verify the handling of the receipts and expenditure by the International Secretariat **and recommend expenditures for approval by the President.**” This is in conformance with 11. e. 1. comment above.

11. e. 4. (p.32) In regard to Secretary General, change two “he’s” in text to “he/she”.

Article 12 Advisory Council

12. a. c. Correct third sentence to read:

“At its first session following the statutory elections by the General Assembly, the National Committees’ Presidents and the Scientific Council shall each elect **a** minimum **of** 3 coordinators for a term of office of 3 years, renewable once.

Correct first sentence of fourth paragraph to read:

“The Vice President shall assist the President or take **his/her** place in **his/her** absence.”

12. b. (p.33) Revise to read:

“The Advisory Council shall meet at least once a year in conjunction with **the Board or** the General Assembly, convened by its President on a date and at a place chosen by the Board. This reflects having the Board act for the GA in between its triennial meetings.

12. d. 5. Correct to read:

“Seek to ensure competence and balanced representation of the diverse **specializations** ~~specialisms~~ and different regions of the world in the activities and international bodies of ICOMOS.

Article 13 National Committees

13. d. 4. (p.35) Revise to read:

“Designate their voting members at the General Assembly within the numerical limits laid down in article 9-a and in accordance with their own Statutes and Rules of Procedure, and communicate their names ~~of~~ not less than one month before the General Assembly. ~~A majority of the~~ Voting members of each National Committee shall ~~be comprise~~ individual ~~and affiliate~~ members. ~~Representatives of Institutional Members shall be mandated by their institution.~~”
This change reflects previous comment that only individual members, who are professionals, should vote.

Article 14 International Scientific Committees

14. bis. Volunteer Nature of Positions (p.37) In order to clarify the reimbursement process and put it in conformance with approval of other expenses, revise to read:

“Members of the Board, ~~Bureau, of the~~ Advisory Council, ~~of the~~ International Scientific Committees, and ~~of~~ all other bodies established by them may not receive any payment for their functions within ICOMOS. Only the reimbursement of expenses necessarily incurred in the discharge of their functions may be allowed. These must be pre-approved by the Board, in the absence of the interested parties. Supporting documentation (receipts) must be produced as a basis for payment recommended for approval by the Treasurer and approved by the President, except that a Vice President must approve payment of expenses incurred by the President. All such payments which will be audited.”

Article 15 International Secretariat (p.37)

15. b. Revise to read:

“All activities of the International Secretariat shall be carried out under the authority of its Director General, who shall be accountable to the Bureau and Board for his/her actions and the activities of the International Secretariat.

15. c. 1. In order to reflect approval of the budgets by the Board, rather than the GA, revise to read:

“Coordinate and implement the ICOMOS General Programme and budgetary guidelines for the triennium voted by the General Assembly, as well as the annual budgets and decisions approved by the Board.”

15. d. 5. (p.37-38) Revise to read:

“Prepare the preliminary drafts for the ICOMOS General Programme and budgetary guidelines for the next triennium, based on the recommendations of the Board ~~Advisory Council~~, and the preliminary projects for the annual budget;” This reflects that the AC makes recommendations to/through the Board.

V Resources (p.38) (See recommendation regarding change of ICOMOS legal status to enable receipt of donations and bequests in transmittal message.)

Article 17 Resources

(New) Article 17bis Accounting (p.38-39) This seems unnecessarily detailed for inclusion in the Statutes. Recommended simplified wording is:

“The accounting system shall be based on the calendar year and be in a format consistent with generally accepted accounting principles. Funds for special programs and International Scientific Committees shall be separately tracked within it. The use of funds from all grants and gifts shall be approved by the Board.”

VI Various Provisions (p.39)

Article 18 Legal Status (See recommendation regarding change of ICOMOS legal status to enable receipt of donations and bequests in transmittal message.)

(Note: Where are Articles 19 and 20? Renumber to reflect their elimination.)

Article 21 Languages - I agree with the Working Group Recommendations 19 and 20 that English and French shall be the working languages of ICOMOS and the accompanying provisions.

Mr Bernd Paulovitz & Mr Romain Prado

Mr Bernd Paulovitz is a member of ICOMOS Austria, both are under contract for the International Secretariat

Contribution sent in English, 2014-01-31

In our work on funding and guidelines we have realized that within the Statutes there should be a reference to "projects/services" ICOMOS provides by applying for international funding. In order to meet demands by donor organisation (World Bank and EU) (or actually, to anticipate questions in this direction), we propose to amend the Statues in the following sections:-----General a part on Impartiality that will help obtaining projects and supports the Ethical commitment

Impartiality: **ICOMOS does not favour any of its executive members while implementing its activities.** ICOMOS provides institutional advice **and technical assistance**, relying on an interdisciplinary global network of members who give independent technical assessments whilst respecting the ethical commitment.-----Specific -----Article 5 – e (Statutes)e **Manage technical assistance projects and** co-operate in the preparation of training programmes for specialists and in the conservation, protection and enhancement of monuments, groups of buildings and sites;-----

Membres individuels – langues
Individual Members – languages

Spanish

Acerca de la propuesta de supresión de las lenguas oficiales del ICOMOS

Estimados colegas del Grupo de Trabajo sobre la enmienda de los Estatutos,

Los miembros hispanohablantes del Comité Ejecutivo de ICOMOS agradecen el arduo trabajo que estáis llevando a cabo para la revisión y enmienda de los Estatutos del ICOMOS. Queremos expresar nuestra profunda desilusión en relación con la propuesta de eliminación de las actuales lenguas oficiales del ICOMOS, a la vez que expresar nuestro enérgico rechazo a la misma, en base a las siguientes consideraciones:

1.- Estamos de acuerdo con la idea de que el actual esquema de lenguas oficiales del ICOMOS podría aparecer obsoleto. Debemos recordar que el mismo fue concebido en el marco de un contexto global social y cultural completamente diferente al actual. Consideramos, no obstante, que la solución no sería eliminar las lenguas oficiales sino, más bien, revisar dicho esquema, en que otras lenguas deberían quizás ser agregadas. Consideramos que la eliminación de las lenguas oficiales aparece en clara oposición a la declaración que "ICOMOS tiene la obligación de respetar la diversidad cultural y promover el multilingüismo" incluida en el documento que introduce la tercera ronda de consulta.

Somos conscientes de las dificultades prácticas, y especialmente financieras, para poner en práctica un funcionamiento multilingua o de nuestro organismo. Pero consideramos que no será la eliminación de las lenguas oficiales lo que resuelva el problema; ésta parece una respuesta fácil y poco imaginativa para resolver un asunto de tal importancia. El Grupo de Trabajo sobre Estatutos ha propuesto algunas medidas concretas que celebramos, como el reconocimiento de lenguas de trabajo temporarias. Permítasenos recordar, en relación con el español, que un grupo de trabajo que incluye a miembros de comités nacionales hispanohablantes ha colaborado activamente en la traducción de textos y documentos de ICOMOS, lo que sería por cierto posible para otras lenguas (tal como efectivamente sucede) y que varios comités internacionales aceptan y aprueban trabajos científicos y contribuciones en lengua española.

2.- En relación con el español, por Resolución 17 GA 2011/ 42, la Asamblea General requirió al Grupo de Trabajo sobre Estatutos "estudiar la factibilidad de integrar una propuesta conducente a la corrección de los Estatutos de ICOMOS para incluir el español como lengua de trabajo". La respuesta del Grupo de Trabajo sobre los Estatutos es que "con gran pesar, en las actuales circunstancias, no es posible integrar una tercera lengua de trabajo". Una vez más, somos conscientes de los problemas prácticos que la implementación de esta Resolución implica pero consideramos absolutamente inapropiado responder a una Resolución de la Asamblea General eliminando al español como lengua oficial.

Nos permitimos recordar que durante el proceso de estudiar la incorporación del español como lengua de trabajo, nuestra distinguida colega Ángela Rojas elaboró un valioso informe en el que demuestra la importancia del español a escala global y en el seno del ICOMOS, teniendo en cuenta la cantidad de miembros y comités nacionales hispanohablantes y la mayoría de bienes inscritos en la Lista del Patrimonio Mundial localizados en países que cuentan con el español como lengua oficial. No parece que este informe haya sido tenido en cuenta en el momento de proponer la eliminación del español como lengua oficial.

En síntesis, consideramos que la eliminación del esquema actual de lenguas oficiales implicará un paso atrás y un empobrecimiento del espíritu y de la imagen de ICOMOS como una organización multicultural mundial. El tema merece una reflexión más profunda y amplia; entretanto, proponemos que el esquema actual de lenguas oficiales sea mantenido en los Estatutos y que las

medidas prácticas propuestas por el Grupo de Trabajo sobre los Estatutos y por otros miembros de ICOMOS sean discutidas de modo de acordar su adecuada implementación.

Gustavo Araoz, Alfredo Conti, Olga Orive, Daniel Young.

English

On the proposal of suppression of the ICOMOS official languages

Dear colleagues of the Statutes Working Group,

The Spanish-speaking members of the ICOMOS Executive Committee appreciate the hard working you are carrying out for the amendment of the ICOMOS Statutes. We would like to express our deep disappointment regarding the proposal of eliminating the current ICOMOS official languages and our strong rejection of such a proposal, on the grounds of the following considerations:

1.- We agree that the current scheme of ICOMOS official languages could appear obsolete. We must remember that it was conceived in the framework of a global social and cultural context which was completely different from the current one. But the solution would not be getting rid of the official languages but revise that scheme in which other languages should maybe be added. We consider that the elimination of the official languages appears clearly in opposition to the statement that "ICOMOS has an obligation to respect cultural diversity and to promote multilingualism" included in the document that introduces the third round of consultation.

We are conscious of the practical and especially financial difficulties to put in place a multilingual functioning of our organization. But we consider that it is not the elimination of the official languages that will solve the problem; this seems to be an easy and unimaginative way of addressing such an important issue. The Statutes Working Group has proposed concrete measures that we welcome, like the recognition of temporary working languages. Let us recall, with regard to Spanish, that a working group including members from Spanish-speaking national committees has actively collaborated in the translation of ICOMOS texts and that this would certainly be possible (as it actually happens) also for other languages. Several international committees accept and welcome scientific papers and contributions in Spanish.

2.- As for Spanish, by its Resolution 17 GA 2011/ 42, the General Assembly requested the Statutes working group "to study the feasibility of integrating a proposal towards the amendment of the ICOMOS Statutes to include Spanish as a working language". The response by the Statutes Working Group is that "with great regret,... in the present circumstances, it is not possible to integrate a 3rd working language". Again, we are aware of the practical constraints that the implementation of that Resolution implies, but we consider that it becomes absolutely unappropriated to respond to a Resolution of the General Assembly by eliminating Spanish as an ICOMOS official language.

Let us recall that during the process of studying the possibility of incorporating Spanish as a working language, our distinguished colleague Angela Rojas elaborated a valuable report which demonstrates the importance of Spanish as a language at global scale and within ICOMOS, taking into account the number of Spanish-speaking members and national committees and the number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in countries that have Spanish as official language. This report does not seem to have been taken into account at the moment of proposing the elimination of Spanish as an official language.

In summary, we consider that the elimination of the current scheme of official languages will imply a step backward and impoverish the spirit and the image of ICOMOS as a multicultural world-wide organization. The issue deserves a deeper and wider reflection; in the meanwhile, we propose that the current scheme of official languages be maintained in the Statutes and that practical measures proposed by the Statutes Working Group and by ICOMOS members be further discussed to agree their proper implementation.

Gustavo Araoz, Alfredo Conti, Olga Orive, Daniel Young

Ms Margarita Ruiz

Member of ICOMOS Cuba

Contribution sent in Spanish, 2014-01-28

Spanish

Como miembro de ICOMOS-CUBA protesto firmemente ante la posibilidad de eliminar el idioma español como lengua oficial de ICOMOS. Solo seria posible aceptar que se le declarara como lengua de trabajo igual al frances o al ingles. Es absurdo pensar en esa posibilidad cuando sigue creciendo en America Latina la conciencia acerca de la proteccion que debemos brindar a nuestros monumentos y sitios y donde se robustecen los comites nacionales de ICOMOS. En la medida en que crece a nivel mundial la poblacion hispanoparlante y que el español es aceptado como idioma de trabajo en cada vez mayor numero de foros internacionales, es una lamentable contradiccion que ICOMOS pretenda eliminarlo.

Por tanto me adhiero al documento de Conti - Araoz - Orive - Young

Ms Elisa Serrano Gonzalez

Member of ICOMOS Cuba

Contribution sent in Spanish, 2014-01-31

Spanish

Ante todo mi respeto y deseo de exitos en la propuesta de enmienda de Estatutos del ICOMOS elaborada por el Grupo de Trabajo constituido a efecto.

Mi proposito en este mensaje es apoyar la propuesta de algunos miembros del Comité Ejecutivo de ICOMOS (Alfredo Conti, Vice Presidente de ICOMOS, Gustavo Araoz, Olga Orive, y Daniel Young) de mantener el espanol como lengua oficial del ICOMOS, dada su importancia cultural y la cantidad de

personas que lo habla y escribe (más de 450 millones de personas) en países hispanoparlantes.

Ms Mónica Luengo

Member of ICOMOS Spain, President of the ISC Cultural Landscapes ICOMOS-IFLA
Contribution sent on January 29, 2014 in Spanish with an English and French translation

Spanish

En relación a la propuesta de revisión de nuestros estatutos quiero hacer presentar mi más enérgica oposición a la supresión de las lenguas oficiales de ICOMOS, siendo sustituidas por dos lenguas de trabajo.

Resulta cuando menos sorprendente que el español no fuera aprobado hasta la Asamblea General de París, pero es un claro retroceso el suprimirlo en estos momentos, en los que se está hablando de pluralidad y diversidad cultural. Más sorprendente aún es el hecho de que se menosprecie el español que es lengua oficial del mayor número de Comités Nacionales de ICOMOS ((19 de los 101) ¿Podría darse el caso de una Asamblea General en algún país latinoamericano (por ejemplo) donde las lenguas utilizadas solo fueran el inglés y el francés, en detrimento de la lengua española que es común a prácticamente todo el continente americano, más aún si se tiene en cuenta que en Estados Unidos comienza a ser considerada como segunda lengua en algunos estados? Por otra parte, todos los datos actuales indican que el español es la segunda lengua de comunicación internacional .

Por otra parte, España, siempre que se le ha requerido, se ha hecho cargo siempre de la traducción de los principales documentos de trabajo, cartas internacionales y textos doctrinales.

En numerosas ocasiones he expresado mis quejas por el creciente dominio del inglés como única lengua en nuestra organización y el escaso empleo de otras lenguas, cualquiera que ellas fueran. Incluso en nuestra reunión del Comité Consultivo en Dublín tuve la ocasión de disponer de 5 minutos para demostrar que no las comunicaciones oficiales, pero sí aquellas entre , por ejemplo, los presidentes de Comités Científicos (lista de correo a la que estoy adscrita) se realizaban ya únicamente en inglés, e incluso con acrónimos incomprensibles, comprometiendo con ello seriamente la intervención y la colaboración de muchos de nuestros miembros. En nuestro Comité de Paisajes Culturales hacemos un serio esfuerzo por comunicarnos siempre en al menos dos lenguas, cuando no tres, para conseguir que el mayor número de nuestros miembros se sientan incluidos en esta gran organización que es ICOMOS. Esto supone mucho más trabajo, pero una tremenda satisfacción. No comprendo cómo podemos renunciar al uso de otras lenguas, que no son tan solo eso, lenguajes, sino expresión de una riqueza cultural y de un patrimonio que nosotros, especialmente nosotros, deberíamos ser los primeros en defender. ¡ Tras plantear este cambio resulta paradójico, y aún irónico, que a continuación se quiera poner énfasis en la diversidad cultural!

Por ello, expreso rotundamente mi total oposición a la revisión propuesta, y propongo mantener el artículo referido a las lenguas tal y como está en la actualidad.

English

In relation to the proposed amendments of our statutes I want to present my strongest opposition to the supression of the official languages of ICOMOS, being replaced by only two working languages.

It is at least surprising that Spanish was not approved until the General Assembly in Paris , but it is a clear setback to supress it right now , when we are talking of plurality and cultural diversity. Even more surprising is the fact that Spanish is the official language of the greatest number of national committees of ICOMOS (19 of 101) Could it be the case of a General Assembly in a Latin American country (for example) where only English and French were used, to the detriment of the Spanish language, that is common to virtually the entire American continent , especially if you consider that in the United States it begins to be considered as a second language in some states ?

on the other hand, all current data indicate that Spanish is the second language of international communication.

Moreover, Spain, always that it has been requested, has always taken care of the translation of the main papers, international charters and doctrinal texts.

On numerous occasions I have expressed my complaints about the growing dominance of English as the only language in our organization and the limited use of other languages, whatever they were. Even in our Advisory Committee meeting in Dublin I had the opportunity to have 5 minutes to show that not in official communications, but in those between, say, the presidents of Scientific Committees (mailing list to which I am attached) were performed only in English, including incomprehensible acronyms, thereby seriously compromising the intervention and collaboration of many of our members. In our Cultural Landscapes Committee we make a serious effort to always communicate in at least two languages, if not three, to get as many of our members feeling included in this great organization that is ICOMOS. This is much more work, but a great satisfaction. I do not understand how we can give up the use of other languages, which are not just that, languages, but an expression of a rich cultural heritage that we, especially us, should be the first to defend. After considering this change it is paradoxical, even ironic, that you want to put emphasis on cultural diversity!

I therefore, categorically express my total opposition to the proposed revision, and I propose to keep the article on language as it stands.

Français

En ce qui concerne la proposition de révision de nos statuts, je veux présenter ma plus vive opposition à l'abolition des langues officielles de l'ICOMOS, étant remplacés par deux langues de travail.

Il est pour le moins surprenant que l'espagnol n'a pas été approuvé jusqu'à l'Assemblée générale à Paris, mais il s'agit d'un net recul de sa suppression en ce moment, où il est question de la pluralité et de la diversité culturelle. Encore plus surprenant est le fait que l'espagnol est la langue officielle du plus grand nombre de comités nationaux de l'ICOMOS (19 sur 101). Il pourrait être le cas d'une assemblée générale dans un pays d'Amérique latine (par exemple) où on utilise uniquement l'anglais et le français, au détriment de la langue espagnole qui est commun à pratiquement tout le continent américain, en particulier si l'on considère que, dans les Etats-Unis commence à être considéré comme une seconde langue dans certains Etats? Par contre, toutes les données actuelles indiquent que l'espagnol est la deuxième langue de communication internationale.

En outre, l'Espagne, toujours qu'on l'a demandé, a toujours pris soin de la traduction des principaux documents, chartes internationales et textes doctrinaux.

À de nombreuses reprises, j'ai exprimé mes plaintes au sujet de la domination croissante de l'anglais comme seule langue dans notre organisation et l'utilisation limitée des autres langues, quelles qu'elles soient. Même dans notre réunion du Comité consultatif à Dublin j'ai eu l'occasion d'avoir 5 minutes pour montrer qu'aucune communication officielle, mais ceux entre, par exemple, les présidents des comités scientifiques (liste de diffusion à laquelle je suis attaché) ont été effectuées uniquement en anglais, même avec des acronymes incompréhensibles, ce qui compromet gravement l'intervention et la collaboration d'un grand nombre de nos membres. Dans notre Comité des paysages culturels nous faisons un sérieux effort de toujours communiquer dans au moins deux langues, sinon trois, pour obtenir le plus grand nombre de nos membres qui se sentent inclus dans cette grande organisation qui est l'ICOMOS. C'est beaucoup plus de travail, mais une très grande satisfaction. Je ne comprends pas comment on peut renoncer à l'utilisation d'autres langues, qui ne sont seulement que des langues, mais une expression de la richesse culturelle et du patrimoine que nous, surtout nous, devrions être les premiers à défendre. Après avoir examiné ce changement est paradoxal, même ironique, qu'on veut alors mettre l'accent sur la diversité culturelle!

Par conséquent, j'exprime catégoriquement mon opposition totale à la proposition de révision, et je propose de garder l'article sur la langue telle qu'il est aujourd'hui.

Mme Mabel Contin

Membre de ICOMOS Argentine, Membre CSI Paysages culturels ICOMOS-IFLA
Contribution recue en Espagnol, 2014-01-29

Espagnol

Quiero expresar mi más profundo acuerdo con lo expresado por nuestra presidenta Mónica Luengo. Es decir "presentar mi más enérgica oposición a la supresión de las lenguas oficiales de ICOMOS".

Ms Margrethe Floryan

Member of ICOMOS Denmark, Member of ISC Landscapes ICOMOS-IFLA
Contribution received in English, 2014/01/31

English

I send this as a sign of my disapproval of the project as to remove Spanish from the list of the official UNESCO languages.
And I strongly support the arguments that Prof. Monica Luengo has formulated.

Mme Renata Lodari

Membre de ICOMOS Italie, Membre du CSI Paysages culturels ICOMOS-IFLA
Contribution recue en français, 2014/01/30

Français

Je soutiens avec force et conviction le message que nôtre Présidente Monica Luengo a envoyé au secrétariat général ICOMOS à propos de la révision des statuts ICOMOS (voir ci-dessus la communication déjà adressée par Elle au Secrétariat Générale).
Je demande ainsi de bien vouloir considérer l'espagnol comme langue officielle de l'ICOMOS.

Ms Margarita Montañez

Member of ICOMOS Uruguay, Member of IFLA, Member of ISC Cultural Landscapes ICOMOS-IFLA
Contribution sent in Spanish and English, 2014-01-26 (sent twice)

Spanish

Estoy completamente de acuerdo con Betina Adams, es muy importante que el español y el portugués sean considerados como lenguas oficiales del Comité Científico Internacional de Paisajes Culturales.

English

I agree with Betina Adams, is very important that Spanish and Portuguese will be considered official languages at the ISCCCL.

Ms Margarita Montañez

Member of ICOMOS Uruguay, Member ISC Cultural Landscapes ICOMOS-IFLA
Contribution received in Spanish, 2014-01-29

Espagnol

A quien corresponda: Estoy completamente de acuerdo con la Presidenta de nuestro CCIPC, de la necesidad de mantener el idioma español como lengua oficial, por las razones que Mónica Luengo ha expuesto tan claramente.

Mr Fernando Britos Di Clemente

Member of ICOMOS Uruguay, member ISC Cultural Landscapes ICOMOS-IFLA
Contribution sent in Spanish and English, 2014/01/31

Spanish

Como uno de los miembros hispano parlantes por URUGUAY del Comité Científico Internacional de Paisajes Culturales ICOMOS IFLA estoy muy sorprendido que en este momento histórico en que las comunicaciones nos GLOBALIZAN y que nos encontramos con la mayor DIVERSIDAD posible se piense en esta propuesta de revisión de los Estatutos sobre la supresión de las lenguas oficiales de ICOMOS.

La realidad de exclusión que tratamos durante años de hacer desaparecer en nuestra América Latina según un esquema de CENTRO – PERIFERIA y que yo pienso como CENTRO – EXCLUSION es inadmisibile en este momento. Los lenguajes nos deben acercar y facilitar las relaciones y el flujo de intercambio de ideas y opiniones que nos enriquece a todos. Además es ignorar la realidad estadística de los idiomas en el mundo.

Adhiero plenamente a lo expresado por la señora Presidente de nuestro Comité, Arquitecta Mónica Luengo, y que fue expresado en el mail de más abajo. Espero que la sensatez y el énfasis en la diversidad cultural permita mantener el artículo que refiere a las lenguas.

English

As one of the Spanish-speaking members by URUGUAY of the International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes ICOMOS IFLA I am very surprised that in this historical moment in which we globalize communications that we find the greatest possible DIVERSITY, you think this proposed revision of the statutes on the abolition of the official languages of ICOMOS.

The reality of exclusion for years trying to dispel in our Latin America according to a scheme CENTER - PERIPHERY and I think as CENTRO - EXCLUSION is inadmissible at this time. The languages we should approach relationships and facilitate the flow and exchange of ideas and opinions that enriches us all. It is also to ignore the statistical reality of the languages in the world.

Fully endorse the statement by the President of our Committee, Architect Monica Luengo, and that was expressed in the mail below. I hope that common sense and an emphasis on cultural diversity let maintain the article refers to languages.

Mr Manuel Vila

Member ICOMOS Argentina, Member ISC Fortifications
Contribution sent in Spanish, 2014-01-27

Spanish

Como primer representante ICOFORT de Argentina, donde estamos dando forma a la integración de representantes de las distintas disciplinas involucradas en el estudio, mantenimiento y administración de las construcciones fortificadas, así como de las diferentes regiones del país, rechazo la propuesta de eliminar el español de los idiomas oficiales de ICOFORT. Obedece este rechazo a considerar que la lengua que emplea una parte importantísima de la población del mundo y que abarca una superficie también amplia, y en desarrollo, no puede ser ignorada haciendo prevalecer otras que no tienen en los países donde el español es lengua oficial, una utilización común a sus habitantes. Hacerlo implicaría una discriminación a los países de habla hispana y al mismo tiempo una degradación de la importante obra que España y sus antiguas colonias aportaron al patrimonio universal en relación a las construcciones fortificadas.

Mr Juan Pedro Dillon

Member of ICOMOS Argentina
Contribution sent in English, 2014-01-29

English

On the ICOMOS Statutes undergoing revision. We do not agree with the proposal of suppressing the existing official languages of ICOMOS. Spanish is in fact the second language in expansion, there are a large number of ICOMOS National Committees whose official common language is Spanish and that cultural heritage of the corresponding countries is really outstanding in world terms. His members need the incorporation of his language. This one is a tool indispensable, social and economically, for the development of his tasks in the local area.

Ms Betina Adams

Member of ICOMOS Brazil

Contribution sent in Spanish and English, 2014-01-26

Note : this text is similar to the text of Petition Nr 1

Spanish

Sobre la revisión en curso de los Estatutos de ICOMOS

No estamos de acuerdo con la propuesta de suprimir las lenguas oficiales existentes de ICOMOS.

Por favor, téngase también en cuenta que, sin ánimo de hacer comparaciones desagradables, el español es de hecho la segunda lengua en expansión, que hay un elevado número de Comités Nacionales de ICOMOS cuya lengua oficial común es el español, que también es comprendido por los que hablan el portugués y que el patrimonio cultural de sus correspondientes países es verdaderamente sobresaliente a escala mundial.

Complementariamente es importante añadir que ya fueran hechos grandes esfuerzos por los colegas hispano y portugués hablantes acerca de un mayor uso del idioma español. La realidad en Hispano-América es que ahí hay expertos que no se sienten cómodos en participar de las reuniones internacionales debido no solo por el alto costo que representa, más especialmente por no dominar bien el inglés o francés. América es un gran continente con una expresiva diversidad cultural. Ahí hay una predominancia de países que tienen el español como idioma oficial. Datos obtenidos rápidamente de Wikipedia demuestran que el número de hablantes nativos en español (5,8%) junto con el portugués (3,08%) representan 8,08% de la población mundial. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_languages_by_number_of_native_speakers)

English

On the ICOMOS Statutes undergoing revision

We do not agree with the proposal of suppressing the existing official languages of ICOMOS.

Please, consider that, even trying to avoid any unpleasant comparison, nowadays Spanish is in fact the second language in expansion, there is a large number of ICOMOS National Committees whose official common language is Spanish that also is understood by the Portuguese speaking colleagues and that cultural heritage of the corresponding countries is really outstanding in world terms.

Additionally it is important to add that great efforts were made by the Spanish and Portuguese speaking colleagues in regard a greater use of Spanish. The Hispano-America reality is that there is a great number of outstanding experts who do not feel comfortable in participating in the international meetings, not only because of the high costs involved, but especially because they do not know so well the English or French, and do not want to expose themselves. America is a huge continent with an expressive cultural diversity. There is a predominance of countries with Spanish as the official language. Data obtained from Wikipedia show that the number of native speakers in Spanish (5.8%) together with the Portuguese (3.08%) represent 8.08% of the world population. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_languages_by_number_of_native_speakers)

Mr Orestes Mr del Castillo del Prado

Member of ICOMOS Cuba, Member of ISC Structures
Contribution sent in Spanish, 2014/01/28 and 2014/01/30

Spanish

Me dirijo a usted respetuosamente para expresar mi protesta y rechazo a la propuesta de eliminar el idioma español como lengua oficial de ICOMOS.

Si se tiene en cuenta la cantidad total de hispanoparlantes del planeta y la significativa cantidad de miembros de ICOMOS que tenemos ese idioma como lengua materna, incluidos cuatro miembros del Comité Ejecutivo, la propuesta parece un despropósito desafortunado que recomiendo no sea tenido en cuenta.

Espero que exista una reconsideración de este asunto y al final se mantenga el idioma español como una de las lenguas oficiales de nuestra Institución.

Ms Nidia Cabrera Huerta

Membre de ICOMOS Cuba
Contribution envoyée en Espagnol, 2014-01-29

Espagnol

Sirva el presente correo como vía para expresar mi mas profunda indignación por la intención de eliminar como lengua oficial de la UNESCO el español.

En la última reunión de elaboración del informe final sobre el estado de conservación de los sitios del Patrimonio Mundial, celebrada en Chile en diciembre del 2012, fue un reclamo unánime de todos los administradores de sitios allí presentes la necesidad de que el español tuviera mayor preponderancia dentro de las informaciones que la UNESCO nos solicitaba.es decir se convirtiera en idioma de trabajo.

Ejemplo fehaciente lo constituyó el llenado de los cuestionarios por parte de cada uno de nosotros en el recién finalizado período de evaluación de los sitios de América Latina y el Caribe.

Nos fue necesario primero traducir al español las preguntas, después traducir las respuestas al inglés y algo parecido por no decir peor sucedió con la elaboración de OUV y su revisión por parte de los organismos consultivos. Todo lo anterior demandó de cada cada uno de nosotros un esfuerzo y un tiempo que nos es sumamente escaso.

Mr Daniel Taboada Espiniella

Membre de ICOMOS Cuba
Contribution envoyée en Espagnol, 2014-01-29

Espagnol

esperando que coincidamos en otras nuevas situaciones, te doy mi opinión personal y oficial como Presidente de Honor y Miembro "antiguo" de ICOMOS. Cuba:

El número histórico de Official Languages no creo sea lo mismo que el Pegasus. Lo primero no hay que recordarlo porque era un símbolo de discriminación.

El Pegaso tanto el nacido de Medusa decapitada por Perseo, como la costelación boreal son un símbolo.

Recuerdo perfectamente de Malta, que el requerimiento del Español, fue el primer acuerdo de casi todos los grupos latinos y de algunos europeos. En el borrador no apareció y se protestó, nos contestaron que había sido un olvido. En el texto oficial no apareció y ya eso es historia.

Independientemente de todos los problemas económicos, que también los sufrimos en carne propia, es un asunto de identidad.

Mr Athanasios Nakasis

President of ICOMOS Hellenic

Contribution sent in English, 2014-01-27

English

Regarding the ongoing revision of the Statutes of ICOMOS I would like to state that I do not agree with the proposal for the suppression of the Spanish Language as an official working language of ICOMOS (along with English and French).

Mme Maria De Guadalupe Zepeda Martinez
Membre de ICOMOS Mexique
Contribution envoyée en espagnol, 2014-01-31

Espagnol

Conservemos la Lengua Español como idioma de trabajo en los comités del ICOMOS.

Mr Francisco López Morales

Membre de ICOMOS Mexico, Membre du CSI Itinéraires culturels, Anc. Vice-Président de ICOMOS
Contribution envoyée en espagnol, 2014/01/30 (note: signataire de la Pétition No 1)

Espagnol

He seguido con mucha atención los comentarios con respecto a la supresión del español como lengua de trabajo en las tareas del ICOMOS y del CIIC específicamente.

Quisiera recordar que la lucha por la defensa del idioma en el seno de los organismos internacionales como la UNESCO y en este caso, precisamente en el ICOMOS, se ha librado desde hace mucho tiempo. Esta ha sido una batalla constante en las reuniones internacionales de los comités intergubernamentales en el sector cultura, para mantener la interpretación y la traducción simultánea del español no sólo como lengua de trabajo obligada sino también como símbolo identitario de la cultura de nuestros pueblos.

Con este afán, quisiera citar a premio Nobel de Literatura, Octavio Paz, que expresa de manera clara y contundente algunas de las razones por las cuales es fundamental enarbolar la preservación de nuestra lengua:

“Los hombres somos hijos de la palabra. Ella es nuestra creación; también es nuestra creadora; sin ella no seríamos hombres. A su vez la palabra es hija del silencio: nace de sus profundidades, aparece por un instante y regresa a sus abismos...”

En el caso de las comunidades de lengua española aparecen otras características que conviene destacar. Para todos los hombres y mujeres de nuestra lengua la experiencia de pertenecer a una comunidad lingüística está unida a otra: esa comunidad se extiende más allá de las fronteras nacionales. Trátese de un argentino o de un español, de un chileno o de un mexicano, todos sabemos desde nuestra niñez que nuestra lengua nacional es también la de otras naciones. Y hay algo más y no menos decisivo: nuestra lengua nació en otro continente. En España, hace muchos siglos. El castellano no sólo trasciende las fronteras geográficas sino las históricas: se hablaba antes de que nosotros los hispanoamericanos tuviésemos existencia histórica definida. En cierto modo la lengua nos fundó, o al menos hizo posible nuestro nacimiento como naciones. Sin ella, nuestros pueblos no existirían o serían algo muy distinto a lo que son.”

Además de estas razones tan contundentes, está claro que debemos sumar los argumentos de aquellos miembros del CIIC que se han expresado en esta plataforma y que sin duda, no sólo fortalecen esta defensa sino que le dan legitimidad a la causa.

Desde nuestro punto de vista existe otra razón importante. De los Itinerarios Culturales reconocidos actualmente en la Lista del Patrimonio Mundial, los más relevantes se encuentran en regiones hispanoparlantes. Es oportuno hacer mención del Camino Principal Andino el cual se encuentra en proceso de evaluación; este itinerario atraviesa 6 países de lengua española en Sudamérica. Por lo tanto, nos parece lógico y fundamental contar con la herramienta lingüística del español para poder entender y gestionar la esencia de estas rutas culturales.

Por último, quisiera expresar mi completa disposición y adhesión en esta lucha por nuestra lengua materna en la palestra internacional.

No podemos permitir de ninguna manera que el ICOMOS se empobrezca como organismo consultivo de UNESCO, reduciendo a dos lenguas a toda la comunidad internacional.

Celia Martínez Yáñez

Member of ICOMOS Spain, Member of ISC Cultural Routes

Contribution sent in Spanish and English, 2014-01-31

Spanish

Acerca de la propuesta de supresión de las lenguas oficiales del ICOMOS

Quiero expresar mi profunda desilusión y malestar en relación con la propuesta de eliminación de las actuales lenguas oficiales del ICOMOS. **Eliminar el español, y cualquier otro idioma, como lengua de trabajo, es anacrónico, irrespetuoso, arrogante y, desde luego, contrario a los principios de ICOMOS.** La eliminación de las lenguas oficiales aparece en clara oposición a la declaración incluida en el documento que introduce la tercera ronda de consulta: *“ICOMOS tiene la obligación de respetar la diversidad cultural y promover el multilingüismo”*.

Además, mi rechazo a esta propuesta se basa en las siguientes consideraciones:

1.- La lengua española es hoy una lengua hablada por **495 millones de personas**, la segunda como lengua materna (5,85%) después del chino mandarín (14,1), y la segunda también como lengua de comunicación internacional, después del inglés. Es más, en un futuro próximo (2030), aumentará considerablemente el número de hispanohablantes, de 5,85% a 7,5%.

2.- Por lo tanto, eliminar el español es **especialmente negativo en relación con uno de los objetivos que ICOMOS debería fijarse urgentemente: ampliar su impacto científico y social en todo el mundo** (que no alcanza a día de hoy la excelencia de otros tiempos, a pesar del loable trabajo de muchos Comités y miembros individuales).

3.- La lucha por la defensa del idioma en el seno de los organismos internacionales como la UNESCO y en este caso en ICOMOS, se ha librado desde hace mucho tiempo. Esta ha sido una batalla constante en las **reuniones internacionales de los comités intergubernamentales en el sector cultura, que mantienen la interpretación y la traducción simultánea del español** no sólo como lengua de trabajo obligada, sino también como un reconocimiento a una cultura a la vez particular y global.

4.- A pesar de ser consciente de las dificultades prácticas, y especialmente financieras, para poner en práctica un funcionamiento multilingua de nuestro organismo, creo que la eliminación de las lenguas oficiales no resolverá el problema; Ésta parece una **respuesta fácil y poco imaginativa para resolver un asunto de tal importancia**. Permítaseme recordar, en relación con el español, que un grupo de trabajo que incluye a miembros de comités nacionales hispanohablantes ha colaborado activamente en la traducción de textos y documentos de ICOMOS, lo que sería por cierto posible para otras lenguas (tal como efectivamente sucede) y que varios comités internacionales aceptan y aprueban trabajos científicos y contribuciones en lengua española.

5.- En relación con el español, por **Resolución 17 GA 2011/ 42**, la Asamblea General requirió al Grupo de Trabajo sobre Estatutos “estudiar la factibilidad de integrar una propuesta conducente a la corrección de los Estatutos de ICOMOS para incluir el español como lengua de trabajo”. La respuesta del Grupo de Trabajo sobre los Estatutos es que *“con gran pesar, en las actuales circunstancias, no es posible integrar una tercera lengua de trabajo”*. Me parece absolutamente inapropiado e irrespetuoso responder a esta Resolución de la Asamblea General eliminando al español como lengua oficial.

6.- Durante el proceso de estudiar la incorporación del español como lengua de trabajo, nuestra distinguida colega Ángela Rojas elaboró un **valioso informe en el que demuestra la importancia del español a escala global y en el seno del ICOMOS**, teniendo en cuenta la cantidad de miembros y comités nacionales hispanohablantes y la mayoría de bienes inscritos en la Lista del Patrimonio Mundial localizados en países que cuentan con el español como lengua oficial. No parece que este informe haya sido tenido en cuenta en el momento de proponer la eliminación del español como lengua oficial.

En síntesis, considero que la eliminación del esquema actual de lenguas oficiales implicará un paso atrás y un empobrecimiento del espíritu y de la imagen de ICOMOS como una organización multicultural mundial. El tema merece una reflexión más profunda y amplia; entretanto los Estatutos deberían mantener el esquema actual de lenguas oficiales y discutirse las medidas prácticas propuestas por el Grupo de Trabajo sobre los Estatutos y por otros miembros de ICOMOS para acordar su adecuada implementación.

English

On the proposal of suppression of the ICOMOS official languages

I would like to express my deep disappointment regarding the proposal of eliminating the current ICOMOS official languages. To delete Spanish, and any other working language, is an **anachronistic, disrespectful and arrogant proposal**, a proposal certainly **contrary to the principles of ICOMOS**, such as the statement included in the document that introduces the third round of consultation: *"ICOMOS has an obligation to respect cultural diversity and to promote multilingualism"*.

Together with this, my strong rejection of such a proposal is based on the following grounds:

1) The Spanish language is nowadays spoken by **495 million people as a mother tongue**. It is therefore the second-largest mother tongue (5.85%) after Mandarin Chinese (14.1%), and also the second most important language for international communication, after English. Besides, in the near future (2030), the number of Spanish speakers will considerably increase from 5.85% to 7.5%.

2) To delete Spanish as a working language is therefore **particularly negative in relation to one of the objectives that ICOMOS must urgently achieve: expanding its scientific and social impact around the world** (which does not reach today the excellence of the past, despite the laudable work of many committees and individual members).

3) The defense of diverse languages within international organizations such as UNESCO, and especially within ICOMOS, got rid of a long time. It has particularly been a constant battle in the **international meetings of intergovernmental committees** in the cultural sector, which **maintain simultaneous interpretation and translation of Spanish**, not only as a working language but also as recognition of a particular and global culture.

4) Although being conscious of the practical and especially financial difficulties to put in place a multilingual functioning of our organization, I consider that the elimination of the official languages will not solve the problem; this seems to be an **easy and unimaginative way of addressing such an important issue**. Let me recall, with regard to Spanish, that a working group including members from Spanish-speaking national committees has actively collaborated in the **translation of ICOMOS texts** and that this would certainly be possible (as it actually happens) also for other languages. Several international committees accept and welcome scientific papers and contributions in Spanish.

5- As for Spanish, by its **Resolution 17 GA 2011/ 42, the General Assembly** requested the Statutes working group "to study the feasibility of integrating a proposal towards the amendment of the ICOMOS Statutes to include Spanish as a working language". The response by the Statutes Working Group is that *"with great regret,... in the present circumstances, it is not possible to integrate a 3rd working language"*. In my opinion responding to that Resolution of the General Assembly by eliminating Spanish as an ICOMOS official language is absolutely inappropriate and disrespectful.

6- During the process of studying the possibility of incorporating Spanish as a working language, our distinguished colleague Angela Rojas elaborated a valuable **report which demonstrates the importance of Spanish as a language at global scale and within ICOMOS**, taking into account the number of Spanish-speaking members and national committees and the number of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in countries that have Spanish as official language.

This report does not seem to have been taken into account at the moment of proposing the elimination of Spanish as an official language.

Summing up, I consider that the elimination of the current scheme of official languages will imply a **step backward and impoverish the spirit and the image of ICOMOS as a multicultural worldwide organization**. The issue deserves a deeper and wider reflection; in the meanwhile, the current scheme of official languages should be maintained in the Statutes and practical measures proposed by the Statutes Working Group and by ICOMOS members to be further discussed and agree their proper implementation.

Mr Jorge Benavides Solís

Member of ICOMOS Spain, Founding President of ICOMOS Ecuador

Contribution sent in Spanish, 2014-01-27

Spanish

Manifiesto mi oposición a que se prescindiera del Castellano (español) en los estatutos

Me parece una propuesta contraria al proceso y a la realidad histórica.

Basta tener en cuenta tanto el número de castellanohablantes como el número de bienes patrimonio de la humanidad que existen en los países de habla hispana. El castellano ayuda mucho más que el francés a integrar a los países de habla portuguesa. En Brasil la segunda lengua de estudio es el castellano.

Por favor, téngase también en cuenta que, sin ánimo de hacer comparaciones desagradables, el español es de hecho la segunda lengua en expansión, que hay un elevado número de Comités Nacionales de ICOMOS cuya lengua oficial común es el español y que el patrimonio cultural de sus correspondientes países es verdaderamente sobresaliente a escala mundial.

Mr Miguel Ángel Odriozola Guillot

Member of ICOMOS Uruguay

Contribution sent in Spanish, 2014-01-27

Spanish

Comparto plenamente lo expresado por Jorge Benavides Solís.

Ms Ana Luengo

Member of ICOMOS Spain

Contribution sent in English, 2014-01-27

English

Taking into account the new proposal for ICOMOS statutes, I want to defend that the official languages are kept as they are.

Mr Cristóbal García García

Membre de ICOMOS Espagne

Contribution envoyée en espagnol, 2014-01-31

Espagnol

Me parece un sueño el comentario que me llega "quieren eliminar la Lengua Española del ICOMOS.

Y me pregunto ¿alguien se puede permitir hacer realidad esto?

¿Es que nadie habla la lengua española?

¿quién tiene interés en su eliminación? ¿quizás algún incompetente que no tiene otra cosa que inventar?

¿a quién beneficia?

Mr Luis Mansilla Plaza

Membre de ICOMOS Espagne

Contribution envoyée en Espagnol, 2014-01-31

Espagnol

Con estas palabras quiero manifestar mi apoyo al texto elaborado por ICOMOS ESPAÑA para evitar la propuesta de suprimir las lenguas oficiales existentes en ICOMOS y contempladas en el artículo 21 de sus estatutos, ya que esto supondría una auténtica tropelía y un profundo retraso en todo lo conseguido hasta ahora por esta institución.

Mr Guillermo Laine San Roman

Membre de ICOMOS Espagne

Contribution envoyée en Espagnol, 2014-01-31

Espagnol

Apoyo a Icomos España. No al abandono de la lengua Española

Mr José Dueñas Molinas

Membre de ICOMOS Espagne

Contribution envoyée en Espagnol, 2014-01-31

Espagnol

Por medio de la presente quiero manifiesto mi apoyo al manifiesto de la **NO ELIMINACIÓN** del uso de la lengua española en las sesiones de trabajo de ICOMOS.

Ms Hal Moggridge

Member of ICOMOS UK

Contribution sent in English, 2014-01-27

English

It has been suggested to me that there is a proposal to suppress the use of Spanish for ICOMOS. My personal experience suggests that this would be damaging as Spanish speaking delegates contribute much to our work.

Therefore I write to urge that the use of Spanish is encouraged whenever appropriate and remains a statutory ICOMOS language.

Contributions individuelles de non-membres, professeurs de langues et autres
Individual contributions from non-members, language teachers and others

Mr Angel Losa Ubeda

Contribution envoyée le 2014-01-31

Espagnol

llengua espanyola:castellà

doncs és increïble que vulguen eliminar esta llengua. estic totalment en contra d'açò.

Mr Miguel Angel Troitiño Vinuesa

Contribution envoyée le 2014-01-28 (deux fois) (a aussi signé la pétition No 1)

Espagnol

Adjunto mi escrito de profunda disconformidad y malestar, personal e intelectual, con la propuesta de modificación de los Estatutos de Icomos donde desaparece el español como lengua oficial, solicitando que se elimine dicha propuesta.

Ms Juana Velasco

Profesora de Español

Contribution envoyée le 2014-01-31

Espagnol

Me han comunicado su intención de prescindir del español como una de las lenguas oficiales de su organismo. Me gustaría, mediante la presente, expresarle que consideren esta propuesta, y que den marcha atrás en su proyecto.

He sido durante algunos años profesora de español en Londres, y créame que la mayoría de mis alumnos eran profesionales que querían expandir sus negocios en ámbitos internacionales y creían que el español les ayudaría en su nueva labor.

Creo que entre todos podemos apoyar y difundir una lengua que a todos por igual nos interesa de un modo u otro, y es expresión de una cultura internacional que abarca ampliamente a dos continentes.

Mr Octavio Puche i Riart

Espagne, Profesor de Historia de la Geología y de la Minería, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid

Contribution envoyée le 2014-01-31

Espagnol

¡No enérgico a la eliminación de la lengua española en ICOMOS!

¡Somos 400 millones de personas que hablamos en español!

Mr Francisco Miguel Bravo Bastida

Espagne, Profesor de Enseñanza Secundaria

Contribution envoyée le 2014-01-31

Espagnol

Me parece absurdo, por no decir aberrante, que un comité asesor de la UNESCO, agencia de las Naciones Unidas para la "Educación y la Cultura", pretenda suprimir el idioma español como lengua habitual de uso. Máxime cuándo es la segunda lengua del mundo, hablada casi por 500 Millones de habitantes de este planeta.

Mr Luis José García Pulido

Contribution envoyée le 2014-01-31

Espagnol

Manifiesto mi desacuerdo a la propuesta de suprimir las lenguas oficiales existentes de ICOMOS contempladas en el artículo 21 de sus estatutos.

Iñaki García Pascual

Geólogo ambiental, Limpías, Cantabria.

Contribution envoyée le 2014-01-31

Espagnol

Enterado de las intenciones de eliminar el castellano como lengua oficial en el ICOMOS, apoyo con entusiasmo el escrito de protesta de Antonio Álvarez Tejedor, estando de acuerdo con todos y cada uno de sus extremos.

Mr Guillermo Meléndez Hevia

Profesor Titular, Paleontología

Contribution envoyée le 2014-01-31

Espagnol

Por el presente mensaje deseo adherirme a la carta de protesta sobre la propuesta de Supresión de la Lengua Española como lengua oficial en ICOMOS.

Sobre la revisión en curso de los Estatutos de ICOMOS

Manifiesto mi desacuerdo y oposición radical a la propuesta de suprimir las lenguas oficiales existentes de ICOMOS contempladas en el artículo 21 de sus estatutos.

Mr Xavier Aurell

Bach. Geòleg

Contribution envoyée le 2014-01-31

supressió del castellà

No estic d'acord en què se suprimeixi una de les llengües més parlades del món

Mr Xavier Adot Fernández

Contribution envoyée le 2014-01-31

Als responsables d'ICOMOS: no estic d'acord amb l'eliminació del castellà, una de les llengües més parlades al món.

Ms Josefa Morón Manzano

Humanista i Treballòloga

Contribution envoyée le 2014-01-31

Espagnol

No estoy de acuerdo en que se elimine el español de los Comités de ICOMOS. Ruego que lo reconsideren. Se trata de una de las lenguas que más se hablan en el mundo.

A mi entender es una cuestión de respeto y Justicia humana y cultural.

Mr Virginio Mantesso

Sao Paulo, Brésil, Geologo / Historiador

Contribution envoyée en espagnol, 2014-01-31

Espagnol

El español es una lengua muy importante en todo el mundo, y no es aceptable que un organismo internacional como ICOMOS elimine este medio de comunicación en sus sesiones de trabajo.

Victor Marin Crespo

Bureau de l'UNESCO, La Havanne, Cuba

Contribution transférée par Mr Gustavo Araoz, 2014-01-30

Espagnol

ICOMOS, como órgano consultivo de la convención del Patrimonio Mundial es un actor imprescindible en la conservación y gestión del patrimonio y una entidad que produce, además importante información para sus miembros y cuya labor constituye a la vez un referente mundial. La supresión de una de sus lenguas de trabajo empobrece y reduce su labor.

En el caso de la lengua española la situación afecta directamente a América Latina y el Caribe, además de a la amplia comunidad de investigadores hispano hablantes de todo el mundo.

Pétitions
Petitions

Petition nr 1

Contribution in Spanish and English sent separately by 61 members from 8 National Committees (including 42 members of ICOMOS Spain) and 2 non-ICOMOS members (figures pending verification)

This text was sent by ICOMOS Argentina as its contribution to the third consultation

List of the signatories after the text of the petition

Spanish

Sobre la revisión en curso de los Estatutos de ICOMOS

No estamos de acuerdo con la propuesta de suprimir las lenguas oficiales existentes de ICOMOS. Por favor, téngase también en cuenta que, sin ánimo de hacer comparaciones desagradables, el español es de hecho la segunda lengua en expansión, que hay un elevado número de Comités Nacionales de ICOMOS cuya lengua oficial común es el español y que el patrimonio cultural de sus correspondientes países es verdaderamente sobresaliente a escala mundial.

English

On the ICOMOS Statutes undergoing revision

We do not agree with the proposal of suppressing the existing official languages of ICOMOS. Please, take also into account that, even trying to avoid any unpleasant comparison, nowadays Spanish is in fact the second language in expansion, there are a large number of ICOMOS National Committees whose official common language is Spanish and that cultural heritage of the corresponding countries is really outstanding in world terms.

List of signatories per National Committee

Argentina

Ms Liliana Nidia Carnevale, 2014-01-30

Ms Adriana Potenzoni, 2014-01-30

Ms Alicia Leonor Cahn, 2014-01-24 (signataire des 2 pétitions)

Brasil

Ms Maria Anilta Nunes, 2014-01-30

Ms Cristiane Galhardo Biazin, 2014-01-27

Mr Francisco do Vale Pereira, 2014-01-26

Ms Fátima Regina Althoff, 2014-01-28

Ms Suzane Albers Araujo, 2014-01-25

Cuba

Ms Tamara Blanes Martín, 2014-01-26 (signataire des 2 pétitions)

Domenican Republic

Ms Nerva Fondev, 2014-01-30

Mexico

Mr Jose Manuel Gonzalez Ramirez, 2014-01-28

Mr Rocio Marcela Acosta Chavez, 2014-01-27

Mr Edgar Urban, 2014-01-29

Mr Vicente Poveda Sánchez, Spain

Ms Maria Cecilia Calderon Puente, 2014-01-27 (non signé)

Norway

Ms Roberta Luciani Havran, 2014-01-31

Portugal

Mr Domingos José Caldeira Almeida Bucho, 2014-01-31

Spain

Ms María Bernal Sanz, 2014-01-30

Mr Antonio Ramírez Ramírez, 2014-01-30

Ms Carmen Añón, 2014-01-30

Mr Javier Ibargüen Soler, 2014-01-31

Mr Adolfo Rodríguez González, 2014-01-29

Ms Asunción Martínez Valle, 2014-01-29

Ms Diana Sánchez Mustieles, 2014-01-30

MS Alicia Castillo Mena, Member of ISC Archaeological Heritage, 2014-01-29

Ms María Isabel Sardón de Taboada, 2014-01-31

Ms Idoia Camiruaga, 2014-01-31

Ms Pilar Roig Picazo, 2014-01-29

Mr Cristóbal Vallhonrat Anduiza, 2014-01-30

Mr Juan Carlos Molina Gaitán, 2014-01-28 (signataire des 2 pétitions)

Ms Susana Mora Alonso-Muñoyerro, 2014-01-28 (signataire des 2 pétitions)

Mr Manuel Casares Porcel, 2014-01-28

Mr José Alberto Sáez de Haro, 2014-01-28

Ms Abigail Pereta Aybar, 2014-01-28

Mr José Adolfo Rodríguez Asensio, 2014-01-28

Mr Fernando J. García-Diego, 2014-01-28

Mr Pedro de Manuel González, 2014-01-27

Ms Carmen Jusue Simonena, 2014-01-27

Mr José Castillo Ruiz, 2014-01-27

Mr Germán J. Delgado Pérez, 2014-01-27

Mr Milagros Palma Crespo, 2014-01-27

Ms Joan Casadevall Serra, 2014-01-27

Ms María Esther del Castillo Fondevila, 2014-01-26 (envoyé deux fois)

Mr Antonio Almagro Gorbea, Honorary member of ISC Documentation, 2014-01-27

Ms Caridad de Santiago Restoy, 2014-01-30

Mr Fernando Cobos-Guerra, Member of ISC Fortifications, 2014-01-27

Mr Fernando Espinosa de los Monteros, Vice-President of ISC 20th Century, 2014-01-27

Ms María Esther del Castillo Fondevila, 2014-01-26

Mr Jose María García de Miguel, 2014-01-24

Mme Ana Goy Diz, 2014-01-28, Espagne

Mme Rosa Benavides García, 2014-01-28

Dirección General de Cultura del Gobierno de La Rioja, 2014-01-27 (non signé)

Ms Natividad Martín Moro, 2014-01-28

Ms Pilar Roig Picazo, 2014-01-29

Mr José María García de Miguel, 2014-01-24

Ms María J. Peréx, 2014-01-29 (non signé)

Mr Victor Salinas, 2014-01-28

Mr Rocio Silva Peres, 2014-01-31

Mr Antonio Garcia Garcia, 2014-01-28 (est signataire des 2 pétitions et a envoyé une contribution individuelle)

Non members

Mme Giselle Sánchez Céspedes, 2014-01-25

Mr Javier de Cárdenas, 2014-01-25 (non signé)

Petition nr 2

Contribution in Spanish and English, sent separately by 58 membres from 14 National Committees, 1 ISC Cultural Routes, and 5 non-ICOMOS members (figures pending verification)

List of the signatories after the text

This text was also sent by ICOMOS Colombia, Nicaragua and ICOMOS Spain as their contribution

Spanish

Sobre la revisión en curso de los Estatutos de ICOMOS

Manifiesto mi desacuerdo y oposición radical a la propuesta de suprimir las lenguas oficiales existentes de ICOMOS contempladas en el artículo 21 de sus estatutos.

Ésta es una **propuesta contradictoria** con el espíritu de ICOMOS, organización multicultural que proclama como valores de su actuación el espíritu de colaboración y de respeto a las diferencias culturales y religiosas de sus miembros. Asimismo, ICOMOS declara como su misión última el conseguir una armoniosa unión y entendimiento entre las personas y las culturas. Mas la pretendida supresión del español como lengua oficial es una clara e inaceptable discriminación de los miembros hablantes de lengua española y cultura hispana, que verán aumentadas las dificultades para participar en encuentros y debates.

ICOMOS, organización que trabaja por la conservación y defensa del Patrimonio Cultural (tangible e intangible), no puede negar estatutariamente el valor y función capital que tiene la lengua española en los trabajos y entre los miembros de ICOMOS. De los 95 Comités Nacionales de ICOMOS 21 de ellos hablan en español. De igual modo, en el Comité Ejecutivo de ICOMOS el español es la lengua materna del Presidente Gustavo Araoz, un Vicepresidente, Alfredo Conti, y dos Vocales del Comité Ejecutivo, Olga Orive y Daniel Young.

Ésta es una **propuesta incoherente** ya que una organización que estudia y protege el Patrimonio Cultural, no puede desconocer el excepcional valor patrimonial que representa la lengua española. Eliminar una lengua es eliminar una cultura y una agresión a la vitalidad y funcionalidad de ese bien patrimonial. Las contingencias económicas no pueden ser excusa para no proteger los bienes patrimoniales

La lengua crea al hombre y le da un instrumento para la comunicación y el intercambio de ideas, mas para muchos de los miembros de ICOMOS, la lengua española es el símbolo identitario de su cultura hispana, es una lengua y es una cultura compartida: *"Para todos los hombres y mujeres de nuestra lengua la experiencia de pertenecer a una comunidad lingüística está unida a otra: esa comunidad se extiende más allá de las fronteras nacionales. Trátese de un argentino o de un español, de un chileno o de un mexicano, todos sabemos desde nuestra niñez que nuestra lengua nacional es también la de otras naciones"* (Octavio Paz).

Según el artículo 2.2.a, de la Convención para la Salvaguardia del Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial, el patrimonio cultural inmaterial se manifiesta, entre otros ámbitos, en "las tradiciones y expresiones orales, incluido el idioma como vehículo del patrimonio cultural inmaterial". Por ello es incoherente eliminar una lengua, el español, en los debates, propuestas y trabajos sobre los numerosos bienes culturales inmateriales y materiales hispánicos analizados en una lengua que a su vez es un bien del patrimonio cultural inmaterial y está ligado a la declaración como Patrimonio Mundial del bien Monasterios de San Millán de Yuso y de Suso (1997).

No se puede eliminar el español como lengua oficial de ICOMOS -debería ser lengua de trabajo- cuando son extraordinariamente numerosos los bienes del Patrimonio Cultural inscritos en la Lista del Patrimonio Mundial que son fruto de una cultura compartida por una comunidad de países que habla en lengua española.

Ésta es una **propuesta injustificada**. En aras de la utilidad y la demografía, el español debería tener lugar prioritario en el seno de ICOMOS. La lengua española es hoy una lengua hablada por 495 millones de personas, la segunda como lengua materna (5,85%) después del chino mandarín (14,1), y la segunda también como lengua de comunicación internacional, después del inglés.

Ésta es una **propuesta inoportuna** ya que en un futuro próximo (2030), aumentará considerablemente el número de hispanohablantes, de 5,85% a 7,5%, a diferencia con los hablantes de ruso, alemán, francés o inglés que sufrirán un retroceso o estancamiento.

Nombre (*name*):

Miembro de (*member of*)

English

On the ICOMOS Statutes undergoing revision

I wish to express my disagreement with and steadfast opposition to the proposal to eliminate the existing ICOMOS official languages contemplated in article 21 of the statutes.

This proposal contradicts the spirit of ICOMOS, a multi-cultural organization that proclaims as the values underlying its actions a spirit of collaboration and respect for its members' cultural and religious differences. Furthermore, ICOMOS declares its ultimate mission to be the achievement of a harmonious union **and** understanding between people and cultures. However, the intended elimination of Spanish as an official language is a clear and unacceptable discrimination of the Spanish-speaking members and Hispanic cultures, who will encounter increased difficulties when participating in meetings and discussions.

As an organization working to preserve and defend tangible and intangible Cultural Heritage, ICOMOS cannot deny in its statutes the value and capital function of the Spanish language for the works of ICOMOS and among its members. Of the 95 ICOMOS National Committees, 21 speak Spanish. In the same way, Spanish is the mother tongue of the ICOMOS Executive Committee's President, Gustavo Araoz, one of its Vice-Presidents, Alfredo Conti, and of two of its Ordinary Members, Olga Orive and Daniel Young.

This proposal is inconsistent as an organization studying and protecting Cultural Heritage cannot ignore the exceptional heritage value represented by the Spanish language. Eliminating a language represents the elimination of a culture and an assault against the vitality and functionality of that heritage asset. Economic contingencies cannot be the excuse for not protecting heritage assets.

Languages have created the specific personality of different groups of people throughout history and endow us with a tool for communication and the exchange of ideas; in addition, for many of the members of ICOMOS, the Spanish language is the hallmark of their Hispanic culture, a shared language and culture: *"For all the men and women speaking our tongue, the experience of belonging to a linguistic community is linked to another: that community extends beyond our national frontiers. Whether it is from Argentine or from Spain, a Chilean or a Mexican, we all know from our childhood that our national language is also that of other nations"* (Octavio Paz. Nobel Prize of Literature).

According to article 2.2.a of the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, intangible cultural heritage is manifested, among other areas, in "oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle for intangible cultural heritage". For this reason, it is inconsistent to eliminate a language, Spanish, from discussions, proposals and work on the numerous items of Hispanic intangible and tangible culture analysed in a language that is in and of itself an item of intangible cultural heritage and is linked to the declaration of the Monasteries of San Millán de Yuso and San Millán de Suso as World Heritage sites (1997).

It is not feasible to eliminate Spanish as an official ICOMOS language; instead, it should be considered by the Statutes as a working language because of the extraordinary amount of Cultural Heritage properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List as the fruit of a culture shared by a community of Spanish-speaking countries.

This proposal is unwarranted. In terms of usefulness and demographics, Spanish should be given priority within ICOMOS. The Spanish language is nowadays spoken by 495 million people as a mother tongue, it is therefore the second-largest mother tongue (5.85%) after Mandarin Chinese (14.1%), and also the second most important language for international communication, after English.

This proposal is far from timely as, in the near future (2030), the number of Spanish speaker will considerably increase from 5.85% to 7.5%, unlike the case of speakers of Russian, German, French or English, who will all undergo stagnation or decline.

Name: xxx

Member of ICOMOS xxx

List of signatories

Argentina

Mr Daniel Bichner, 2014-01-31

Mme Alice Leonor Cahn, Membre CSI Itinéraires Culturels, Membre CSI Villes et villages historiques, sous-comité sur les villes historiques ibéro-américain ([signataire des 2 pétitions](#))

Mme Maria Cristina Monfort, 2014-01-31

Mme Ana Maria Boscolo, 2014-01-31

María Rebeca Medina, 2014-01-31

Brazil

Ms Bettina Adams, 2014-01-31 ([this member sent this as a reaffirmation of her other messages](#))

Ms Suzane Albers Araujo, 2014-01-31 ([sent 2 messages](#))

Costa Rica

Ms Giselle Chang Vargas, Member of ISC Intangible Cultural Heritage, 2014-01-31

Cuba

Ms Tamara Blanes Martín, Member of ISC Cultural routes, Member and Coordinator for the Americas ISC Fortifications, 2014-01-31

Ms Angela Rojas ([sent in addition to her general contribution](#))

Germany

Mr Hans-Rudolf Neumann, Member of ISC Fortifications, 2014-01-31

Italy

Mme Rosa Anna Genovese, Membre CSI Itinéraires culturels, Membre CSI Théory & Philosophie, 2014-01-31

Mexico

Mr Rocío Marcela Acosta Chávez, 2014-01-31

Mr Francisco Javier López Morales, Member of ISC Cultural Routes, 2014-01-31 ([sent in addition to his other contribution on languages](#))

Mr Jesús Victoriano Villar Rubio, 2014-01-31

Nicaraguay

Ms Maira Vargas Roa, President, 2014-01-30

Paraguay

Mr Claudio Bueno Cabral, 2014-01-31 (presentation légèrement différente)
Mme María Teresa Gaona, 2014-01-31 (presentation légèrement différente)
Mr Cristina Quiroga Granados, 2014-01-31 (presentation légèrement différente)
Mr Claudio Bueno Cabral, 2014-01-30 (en Espanol uniquement)

Spain

Mr Antonio Almagro, Honorary Member of ISC Documentation, 2014-01-27 (signataire des 2 pétitions)
Ms Ana Avila Alvarez,
Mr Antonio Garcia Garcia (signataire des 2 pétitions)
Mr Enrique Saiz Martín,
Ms Idoia Camiruaga Osés (signataire des 2 pétitions)
Ms María Bernal Sanz,
Ms María Rosa Suárez-Inclán Ducassi, President, Honorary President of ISC Cultural routes, Member of ISC Historic Towns and Villages (envoyé en son nom personnel)
Ms Dolores Asensio Varela,
Mr Gonzalo Capellán de Miguel,
Mr Miguel Tain Guzman,
Ms Elena Begoña Bernal Santa Olalla, member of ISC Interpretation & Presentation, member of ISC Cultural Routes
Mr José Manuel Pérez Rivera,
Mr José María Mata Perelló, 2014-01-31
Ms María Isabel Navarro Segura, Member of ISC Historic Towns and Villages, Member of ISC Cultural Routes, Member of ISC 20th Century Architecture
Ms Natividad Matin Moro, 2014-01-30
Mr Jordi Tresserras Juan, Member ISC Interpretation and Presentation, 2014-01-30
Ms María Jesus Perex Agorreta, 2014-01-30 (signataire des 2 pétitions)
Mr Juan Carlos Molina Gaitan, 2014-01-31 (signataire des 2 pétitions)
Ms Ana Goy Diz, 2014-01-31
Mr Pedro De Manuel González, 2014-01-30
Ms Caridad de Santiago Restoy, 2014-01-30 (signataire des 2 pétitions)
Mr Javier de Cárdenas Chávarri, 2014-01-31 (envoyé deux fois)
Mr José García Conde Tartière, 2014-01-31
Mr Germán J. Delgado Pérez, 2014-01-31
Ms María Esther del Castillo Fondevila, 2014-01-26 (signataire des 2 pétitions)
Mr Juan Manuel Monterroso, 2014-01-30
Ms Susana Mora Alonso-Munyerro, 2014-01-30
Mr Antonio Alvarez Tejedor, 2014-01-31
Ms Abigail Pereta, 2014-01-31
Dirección General de Bellas Artes y Bienes Culturales y de Archivos y Bibliotecas. Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, 2014-01-31 (non signé)

Sri Lanka

Ms Samitha Manawadu, former President ICOMOS Sri Lanka, Member ISC Cultural Routes, Member ISC Shared Heritage, 2014-01-31

United States

Mr Milagros Flores-Roman, President ISC Fortifications

Uruguay

Mr Ricardo Béhèran, President
Ms Mariella Russi Podestá, Member ISC Cultural Routes, 2014-01-31
Ms Ruben Garcia Miranda, Member ISC Cultural Routes, 2014-01-31
Mr Ernesto Spósito, 2014-01-31

Venezuela

Ms Carmen Daly Schelbert, Member of ISC Cultural Routes, 2014-01-31

ISC Cultural Routes

Mr José María García De Miguel, President, Member of ICOMOS SPAIN, Member of ISC Stone,
2014-01-31

Non membres / non members

Mr Luis-Tomas-Salelles,

Mr Domingo Javier Carvajal Gomez

Mr Ernest Gatell, 2014-01-31

Ms Maria Pilar Amaré Taffala, Secretaria General de la Sociedad Española para la Defensa del
Patrimonio Geológico y Minero, Madrid, España

Mr Enrique Orche García, Presidente de la Sociedad Española para la Defensa del Patrimonio
Geológico y Minero, Madrid, España