

Comité scientifique international pour la pierre
International Scientific Committee for Stone

ICOMOS ISCS 13th meeting

Monday, September 15th and Thursday September 18th 2008

Our host: Jadwiga Lukaszewicz, within the frame of the 11th international conference deterioration and conservation of stone Torun, 15_19 September 2008

**Next meeting:
Quebec city, Canada
September 29th 2008**

Report

Content:

Report; Annex 1: The Torun Guidelines –version 15/09/08; **Annex 2:** The Torun Guidelines –version 17/09/08; **Annex 3:** The Torun Guidelines; **Annex 4:** Transcript of the discussion on the round table / E. Bourguignon

Participants

		Tuesday sep 16	Thursday sep 18
Philippe Bromblet	M	P	P
Hilde De Clercq	PSC- I	P	Excused
Eric Doehne	PSC- I	P	P
Milos Drdacky	M	P	P
Vasco Fassina	PSC- I	P	P
Jadwiga W. Lukaszewicz	PSC- I	P	P
Daniel Kwiatkowski	VM	P	P
Stefan Simon	VM	P	Excused
Akos Török	PSC- I	P	P
Véronique Vergès-Belmin	VM	P	P
Johannes Weber	PSC- I	excused	P
Jose Delgado-Rodrigues	M	P	Excused
Vasu Poshyanandana	M	P	P
Elsa Bourguignon	M	P	P
Claire Moreau	O	P	Excused
Christoph Franzen	VM	P	P
Heiner Siedel	O	P	Excused
Myrsini Varti-Matarangas	VM	P	P
Ann Bourgès	O	–	P
Lise Leroux	O	–	P
Jean-Marc Vallet	M	excused	P
David Young	VM	P	P

Legend
M = ISCS member
VM = ISCS voting member
PSC = PSC member
I = invited
O = Observer
p = present

Excused members : Clifford Price, Apy Elena Charola, Ewan Hyslop, Ingal Maxwell, Isabelle Pallot-Frossard, Jean-Didier Mertz, Jo Ann Cassar, Kyle Normandin, Marisa Tabasso, Dagmar Michoinova, Per Storemyr, Rob Van Hees, George Scherer, Tamara Anson- Cartwright.

Monday, September 15th

Meeting 1

Common meeting with the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee for the organisation of conferences on Stone deterioration and conservation (PSC). Presentation of the Illustrated Glossary on Stone deterioration Patterns, issued on Friday september 12, 2008.

Presentation of the Draft of Torun Charter/Document (Annex 1), followed by discussion

A joint subcommittee ISCS/PSC is constituted in order to edit the document renamed « Guidelines » and propose a new draft at the next meeting. (E. Doehne, H. De Clerq, E. Bourguignon, D. Young , V. Vergès-Belmin + V. Poshianandana as observer)

(Wednesday : Distribution of an edited version of the guidelines to Torun delegates)

Thursday September 18th 2008

Meeting 2

Attending: see table 1

Common meeting with the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee for the organisation of conferences on Stone deterioration and conservation (PSC).

- Report by David Young on the editing work performed on the « Guidelines » by joint subcommittee ISCS/PSC (E. Doehne, H. De Clerq, E. Bourguignon, D. Young & V. Vergès-Belmin)

- Discussion on the « guidelines »,

- Preparation of the round table

Round table :

- Chairing : Fassina, Vergès-Belmin - Doehne - Young

- Reporting : Bourguignon - Bromblet

- Introduction by Vergès-Belmin : presentation of both PSC and ICOMOS-ISCS, explanations on the articles of the « guidelines »

- Discussion

(Friday: Guidelines distributed to delegates)

ANNEX 1

DRAFT

VERSION 15/09/08

INTERNATIONAL CHARTER/DOCUMENT FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF CONFERENCES IN THE FIELD OF STONE CONSERVATION

(The Torun Charter /Document - 2008)

11th International Congress on Deterioration and Conservation of Stone, Torun, 2008
13th meeting of the ICOMOS International Stone Committee, Torun, 2008

Scientific knowledge on stone conservation has grown significantly over the past 20 years. This is partly due to the dissemination of knowledge by university-based researchers, national institutions or by international ones such as ICOMOS, ICCROM, IIC, to the continuous efforts of the European Community to fund research programs on the topic, and also to the contributions of private institutions such as the Getty Institute.

As the general knowledge increases, the teams working on stone conservation have become more and more specialised and isolated from each other. Thirty years ago, only one main difficulty of this type could be identified: the communication was difficult between scientists in favour of microbiological deterioration and those in favour of pure physical and chemical deterioration. But at least these two points of view struggled every four years within the frame of one common and general congress on stone deterioration and conservation.

Nowadays, the numerous subgroups of scientists which have appeared make separate reflections on complementary issues like for instance air pollution impacts¹, non-destructive testing², use of lasers in the conservation of artefacts³, stone consolidation⁴ or salt deterioration⁵. Historical, Architectural and ethical issues are often treated separately as well.

Information is disseminated in specific journals, congresses and workshops, which are not readily available and sometimes even not understandable to specialists of the other fields of stone conservation. The general congresses on stone deterioration and conservation, organised every 4 years since 1978 are not any more able to digest all the different trends of stone conservation.

This situation leads naturally to dissemination and communication problems. This means that the knowledge does not reach its goals. One of the consequences is that the new teams which enter the field may have incomplete information, and some create what might be called a high level of background noise, if we may take the analogy with spectroscopic techniques. The new teams sometimes re-discover things that are already known by the stone conservation community.

Clifford Price published in 1996 a very clear overview on stone conservation⁶. Although not detailed, this work was intended to give a strategic overview of the whole field and to identify areas of strength and weakness where further research should be focused. It is quite interesting to notice what this author stressed about conferences:

"Conferences provide unparalleled opportunities for meeting fellow researchers: for making new contacts, finding new collaborators, comparing notes, sharing ideas, and keeping up to date. They also provide a much-needed opportunity to stop and think, and to see one's research in a broader context. On the negative side, however, conferences often provide an opportunity for publishing substandard,

¹ Published in journals such as « Science of the total environment » or « Atmospheric Environment »..

² Published in series of congresses on non-destructive testing, since 1995

³ Published within the frame of the proceedings of the « LACONA » congresses held every two years since 1995.

⁴ One of the congresses organized within the frame of European Community financed projects : Stone consolidation in cultural heritage - research and practice. Lisbon, May 2008.

⁵ Salt weathering on Buildings and Stone Sculptures, October 2008, organized by various Danish institutions under RILEM auspices.

⁶ Price, C.A. Stone Conservation: An Overview of Current Research. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 1996.

nonrefereed work. The proliferation of conferences, however desirable it may be, can all too easily lead to a proliferation of poor quality papers.”

In the past decade since the publication of this overview, several of Price's suggestions have come to pass, such as more review articles, for example in the *Reviews in Conservation* journal and elsewhere. Multi-author textbooks such as *Stone Conservation*, edited by Alison Henry, give new researchers some of the background needed. And the proliferation of full text articles from most journals makes the peer-reviewed literature more readily available to students in many universities.

Nevertheless, most conference proceedings still have limited electronic distribution. Dissemination of conference reviewing by acknowledged experts is not yet in practice, although it was proven to be a highly valuable resource in other fields.

It is clear that the fundamental problem of conferences and proceedings remains, and much needs to be done to address these issues from the side of conference organizers. The following charter/document aims at defining rules to improve the quality of the dissemination of knowledge through congresses in the field of stone conservation.

Accordingly, the 11th International Congress on Deterioration and Conservation of Stone, and the 13th meeting of the ICOMOS International Stone Committee, which met in Torun on September 15th to 20th 2008, approved the following text,

ARTICLE 1

Organisers will review beforehand conferences already scheduled in the field, in order to plan their own conference at least six months away from the other ones. Web sites such as ICCROM can be easily consulted with that respect.

ARTICLE 2

The organising committee will make the commitment of seeking for and refusing doublons, i.e. papers that have been already published in another congress proceedings or in a journal. To make this commitment possible, organising committees, as soon as their program is set up and the papers are ready to be printed, will send (on demand, and under confidentiality) to the organising committees of later conferences the full text of questionable papers.

ARTICLE 3

Approval for communication, either oral or as a poster will meet minimum standards:

- Precisely defined research methodology
- Appropriate reference quotations
- Advancing useful knowledge in the field

ARTICLE 4

The organising and scientific committees will not base the acceptance of papers on the basis of a short abstract. Only extended abstracts (4 pages) including results or full papers will serve as a basis for acceptance.

ARTICLE 5

If complete papers are to be published in the proceedings after the conference, their selection will be based on a thorough review by two experts, that may include the congress scientific committee members and other volunteering experts.

ARTICLE 6

If preprints are to be issued at the time of the conference, scientific committee will insist on seeing and evaluating the full text of a paper before deciding whether to accept it for presentation and publication.

ARTICLE 7

Organizers accept that some means of electronic dissemination of the full text conference proceedings be arranged within a set period of time to ensure that the results achieve a wide distribution.

The following persons took part in the work of the Committee for drafting the international Charter/Document for the organisation of conferences in the field of stone conservation.

First name	Family name	Country

ANNEX 2

DRAFT

VERSION 17/09/08

THE TORUN GUIDELINES

FOR CONFERENCES IN THE FIELD OF STONE CONSERVATION

2008

INTRODUCTION

Scientific knowledge on stone conservation has grown significantly over the past 20 years. This is partly due to the dissemination of knowledge by university-based researchers, by national institutions, by international ones such as ICOMOS, ICCROM, IIC, ICOM, to the continuous efforts of the European Community to fund research programs on the topic, and also to the contributions of private institutions. In an era of increasing knowledge and changing dissemination technology it seems a good moment to pause and reflect on ways to improve the quality, accessibility, and level of knowledge in the field of stone conservation.

As general knowledge increases, teams working on stone conservation have become more and more specialised, increasing the potential for isolated perspectives. Thirty years ago, only one main difficulty of this type could be identified: the divide between scientists in favour of microbiological deterioration and those in favour of pure physical and chemical deterioration. But at least these two points of view struggled every few years within the frame of a common and general congress on stone deterioration and conservation.

Nowadays, scientists increasingly attend specialized meetings on complementary issues such as air pollution impacts⁷, non-destructive testing⁸, use of lasers in the conservation of artefacts⁹, stone consolidation¹⁰ or salt deterioration¹¹. Historical, architectural and ethical issues are often treated separately as well.

Information is disseminated in specific journals, congresses and workshops, which are not readily available and sometimes even not understandable to specialists of the other fields of stone conservation. The general congresses on stone deterioration and conservation, organised every 4 years since 1972 give a useful snapshot of the different trends of stone conservation and provide a multidisciplinary forum for discussion, complementing the specialist meetings. However, it can be difficult for them to encompass all the different trends and fields of stone conservation.

The dramatic increase in volume and relative inaccessibility of some information (such as conference proceedings), along with the relative lack of good textbooks and review articles within the conservation field means that the knowledge does not reach its goals. One of the consequences is that new teams which enter the field may have incomplete information, and some create what might be called a high level of background noise, if we may use a spectroscopic analogy. The new teams sometimes re-discover things that are already known by the stone conservation community.

Clifford Price published in 1996 a very clear overview on stone conservation¹². Although not detailed, this work was intended to give a strategic overview of the whole field and to identify areas of strength and weakness where further research should be focused. It is quite interesting to notice what this author stressed about conferences:

“Conferences provide unparalleled opportunities for meeting fellow researchers: for making new contacts, finding new collaborators, comparing notes, sharing ideas, and keeping up to date. They also provide a

⁷ Published in journals such as « Science of the total environment » or « Atmospheric Environment »..

⁸ Published in series of congresses on non-destructive testing, since 1995

⁹ Published within the frame of the proceedings of the « LACONA » congresses held every two years since 1995.

¹⁰ One of the congresses organized within the frame of European Community financed projects : Stone consolidation in cultural heritage - research and practice. Lisbon, May 2008.

¹¹ Salt weathering on Buildings and Stone Sculptures, October 2008, organized by various Danish institutions under RILEM auspices.

¹² Price, C.A. Stone Conservation: An Overview of Current Research. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 1996.

much-needed opportunity to stop and think, and to see one's research in a broader context. On the negative side, however, conferences often provide an opportunity for publishing substandard, non-refereed work. The proliferation of conferences, however desirable it may be, can all too easily lead to a proliferation of poor quality papers."

In the past decade since the publication of this overview, several of Price's suggestions have come to pass, such as more review articles, for example in the *Reviews in Conservation* journal and elsewhere. Multi-author textbooks such as *Stone Conservation*, edited by Alison Henry, give new researchers some of the background needed. And the proliferation of full text articles from most journals makes the peer-reviewed literature more readily available to students in many universities.

Nevertheless, most conference proceedings still have limited electronic distribution (e.g. PDF files). The reviewing of conferences by acknowledged experts is not yet in practice in stone conservation, although it has proven to be a highly valuable resource in other fields. User reviews of conservation books (e.g. on Amazon or Google Books) are still relatively rare, although their positive impact in other fields is clear. The use of new models for organizing information (Wiki, YouTube, etc) is just beginning to impact the field of conservation. (merge these two sentences)

It is clear that the fundamental problem of conferences and proceedings remains, and much needs to be done to address these issues from the side of conference organizers. The following guidelines aim to improve the quality of the dissemination of knowledge through congresses in the field of stone conservation.

Accordingly, the 11th International Congress on Deterioration and Conservation of Stone, and the 13th meeting of the ICOMOS International Stone Committee, which met in Torun on September 15th to 20th 2008, adopted the following text.

THE GUIDELINES

1 Planning

When planning conferences organisers should review other conferences already scheduled in the field, in order to separate their own conference from others by at least six months. The aim is to increase the potential pool of participants and to increase the likelihood of original research being presented.

2 Selection of papers

The selection of papers for formal conferences should be based on a thorough review by at least two experts. Published papers (whether oral or poster) should meet minimum standards, including:

- precisely defined research methodologies
- appropriate reference citations
- advancing knowledge in the field.

3 'Doublons'

Organisers should seek out and refuse 'doublons', i.e. papers that have been, or are about to be, published in proceedings of another conference, or in a journal. To make this possible, organising committees should send the full text of submitted papers (on demand, and under confidentiality) to the organising committees of later conferences.

4 Informal communication

Organisers should encourage informal communication among conference participants, and should include time for exchanging ideas.

5 Dissemination strategy

Organisers should ensure rapid dissemination of the ideas presented at the conference, which should include electronic dissemination of the conference proceedings. This should be arranged within a short period of time (such as one year) to ensure that the results achieve a wide and long-lasting distribution.

6 Measuring outcomes

Organisers should consider ways of measuring the outcomes of their conference. Measures adopted may include reviews of conferences and opportunities for user feedback, such as quality or usefulness rankings (number of downloads of papers, citations, impact factor, etc.).

The following persons took part in drafting these guidelines.

First name	Family name	Country

ANNEX 3

THE TORUN GUIDELINES

FOR CONFERENCES IN THE FIELD OF STONE CONSERVATION

INTRODUCTION

In an era of increasing information and changing dissemination technology it seems an appropriate moment to reflect on ways to improve the quality and accessibility of knowledge in the field of stone conservation.

As knowledge increases rapidly, teams working on stone conservation have become more specialised and often present their results at specialist meetings. This trend may increase the potential for isolated perspectives and the risk that knowledge may not reach its intended goals.

The general congresses on stone deterioration and conservation, organised every 4 years since 1972 give a useful snapshot of the different trends of stone conservation and provide a multidisciplinary forum for discussion, complementing the specialist meetings. However, it can be difficult for them to encompass all the different trends and fields of stone conservation.

In recent decades there have been a number of calls to improve the quality and impact of knowledge in the conservation field. In response, there have been a number of improvements, such as more review articles and multi-author textbooks which give new researchers some of the background needed. Electronic publication of full text articles from most journals makes the peer-reviewed literature more readily available. Nevertheless, most conference proceedings still have limited electronic distribution.

With the aim of improving the quality and the dissemination of knowledge through congresses in the field of stone conservation, the 11th International Congress on Deterioration and Conservation of Stone, and the 13th meeting of the ICOMOS International Stone Committee, which met in Torun on September 15th to 20th 2008, adopted the following text.

THE GUIDELINES

1 Planning

When planning conferences organisers should review other conferences already scheduled in the field, in order to separate their own conference from others by at least six months. The aim is to increase the potential pool of participants and to increase the likelihood of original research being presented.

2 Selection of papers

The selection of papers for formal conferences should be based on a thorough review by at least two experts. Organisers, assisted by their scientific committees, should check for and refuse 'doublons', i.e. papers that have been, or are about to be, published in proceedings of another conference. Published papers (whether oral or poster) should meet minimum standards, including:

- precisely defined research methodologies
- appropriate reference citations
- advancing knowledge in the field.

3 Communication among participants

Organisers should encourage formal and informal communication among conference participants. These may include discussion sessions, panel discussions and workshops.

4 Seeking quality and measuring outcomes

Organisers, assisted by their scientific committees, should ensure good quality papers. In addition, organisers should measure the outcomes of their conference. Measures adopted may include reviews of the conference and opportunities for user feedback, such as a web page for participant responses, and quality rankings.

5 Dissemination strategy

To facilitate rapid dissemination of the ideas presented at the conference, organisers should plan for electronic dissemination of the proceedings. This should be arranged within a short period of time (e.g. a year) to ensure that the results achieve a wide and long-lasting distribution.

ANNEX 4

TRANSCRIPT OF ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION ON TORUN GUIDELINES

Friday September 18th

Prepared by Elsa Bourguignon,

Round table participants: Vasco Fassina (VF), David Young (DY), Eric Doehne (ED), moderated by Véronique Vergès-Belmin (VVB).

Discussion

[J. Kemp?] (V & A museum) proposes to organize the feedback of the conference by the participants themselves during the event itself via a Wiki website, site which can be set up in less than 10 minutes. VVB asked him for a demonstration after the round table.

Eric Doehne announces the plan to publish a review of the Stone 2008 conference in one of the conservation academic journal and agrees with J. Kemp about the usefulness of direct user feedback.

Carlotta Grossi suggests that only the extended abstracts could be published in the conference proceedings and that only after the conference, selected full-length papers be published in a special issue of a journal. She feels that writing a full-length paper is a lot of work for a publication (the proceedings) which is not going to be widely read.

G. Hauff asks how many members of the Permanent Scientific Committee (PSC) read each paper during the review process and wonders if asking for two reviewers is realistic considering that the work of the PSC is on a strict volunteer basis. Does the PSC have enough time, may be people outside the PSC could help with the review process.

Vasco Fassina considers that it is part of the duty of the PSC to review the papers and that conferences which do not use two reviewers are not good but acknowledges the fact that experts outside the PSC could review the conference papers.

Véronique Vergès-Belmin suggests that if non-PSC members help with the reviewing process, they could be acknowledged in the proceedings of the conference.

Jadwiga Lukaszewicz, who chairs the Stone 2008 organizing committee, explains that for this conference, the abstracts were first evaluated by 2 persons, and then the full papers were requested for the abstracts selected. The full papers were then evaluated by one person from the organizing committee, only if a paper was rejected, the opinion of a second reviewer was sought.

[Nonni Maravelaki] suggests that the chair of each session should provide an introduction and a conclusion for his/her session to help prepare the audience for the talks and put things into perspective at the end. She underlines that discussion time is very important and also prefers that the full-length papers are requested at the end of the conference and not in advance (post-prints preferred to preprints).

Carlotta Grossi proposes that the review process of the papers for conference should be the same at the process for a journal, reviewer could be found outside the PSC, especially for specialized topics.

Marisa Pamplona argues for a better review process and better feedback and suggests as a possible model that agreement should be sought in advance with a journal/publishing house to publish the best conference papers in a special issue (with the normal journal review process). It is better for academics to publish in journal because of rankings, impact factor, etc., so it makes the conference more attractive for authors.

Véronique Vergès-Belmin asks who in this case reviews the papers, the conference organizers or the journal.

Akos Torok (Hungary) agrees that the best papers (30-40 papers) should be published in a special issue of a journal but argues that conference proceedings still have a value and are a good place for conservators (who do not care about ranking and impact factor) to publish, it also provides a good place to present intermediary results and for student works.

John Hughes shares his experience with conference organization. To publish the best papers in the special issue of a journal works very well. He thinks that the Torun guidelines are a very good idea but asks if the expectation is that people attending the conference are going to sign up? He also wonders about the enforcement of these guidelines in practice. Guidelines are also very good to get support from sponsors [I am not sure I got this last point right].

David Young expresses his hopes that the Stone 2008 participants will sign up, as well as the ICOMOS-ISCs and the PCS. The text can then be placed on the web (ICOMOS website, etc.). The issue of compliance is difficult to insist on but one should try to encourage people to sign up on the guidelines.

Véronique Vergès-Belmin suggests that compliance with the guidelines could become a mark of quality, a sort of label, that conference organizers could display and advertise ('a Torun guidelines compliant conference').

J. Weber suggests to better define the profile of the quadrennial stone conference. This conference has a long tradition, is held every four years, it should distinguish itself from the other stone conferences in the field. He also agrees on the publication of a selection of papers in a special issue of a journal and to ask authors for extended abstracts only, this will enable to reduce the delay between the time the papers are submitted for selection and the conference itself, allowing for novelty to be presented. He also suggests that every author should be asked two questions about his/her paper: what is the novelty of it and what are the practical implications of the research (for the practitioner).

[A. Tavukcuoglu?] (Turkish woman) underlines the importance of having a paper published in the conference proceedings to be able to ask for financial support from one's home institution. If only extended abstracts are published, institution may not fund the attendance to the conference.

Véronique Vergès-Belmin suggests that 'short papers' could be published in the proceedings instead of 'extended abstracts'.

Eric Doehne asks the audience opinion on the issue of conference proliferation and also on the general meeting versus specialized meetings issue. He also suggests that the next congress be more innovative.

Piero Tiano underlines the importance of publishing in journals because of ranking, impact factor, etc. and sees the conferences primarily as a place where to meet people, which is very important. Time for discussion should be enforced, the sessions need to have a homogeneous topic and discussion should happen per session. Selection of papers should be based on novelty. He also points out that there is an economic issue to conferences, the organizers need people to come to their conference so it is both a scientific and an economic issue.

[Akos] (Hungary) thinks that it is good to have full papers at hand during the conference as it allows one to read the papers before the talks are given. Post-prints with the full papers given a year later are useless to his opinion. He also sees this conference which is held only every four years as providing a good overview of the field which specialized meetings cannot give, in that way it is a good teaching tool.

Carlotta Grossi agrees that a general conference held every four years is very good. The small workshops are more for talk among the specialists. She expressed frustration of not having session per theme during this conference.

Véronique Vergès-Belmin proposes different ideas such as having keynote speakers on specific themes, having session reviewers.

[Man from the National Museum of Krakow] expresses the need for longer formal discussions, saying that one or two questions per talk are not enough. He envisions an hour-long discussion at the end of the each day which should be recorded so that it can be published. He also raises the question of the end

users, the restorers. Good things may be said during the conference but they do not reach the practitioners.

Véronique Vergès-Belmin suggests the possibility to ask specific persons to make a critical review at the end of each session.

Daniel Kwiatkowski, who organized the 2004 Stone conference in Stockholm, says that keynote speakers and session reviewers were tried in Stockholm and this requires a reduction in the number of oral presentations but conference attendees expect to be able to give oral presentations, so there is an inherent conflict, may be the conference need to be longer.

Maureen Young proposes to devote more time to practical 'workshops' rather than formal presentations. These 'workshops' will confront the conference attendees with real case studies on site. They will help start the discussion between scientists and conservators. She considers that there is too much scientific information which is never applied to real cases.

Vasco Fassina, who organized the 2000 Venice stone conference, shares that the idea of having reviewers during the conference was put into practice in Venice. During the closing remarks, the highlights of the conference were given. Another possibility is to do that at the end of each day or to have the session chairs give summaries and lead the discussions.

David Young shares the latest draft of the Torun guidelines with the audience, explaining the changes from the previous version. He explains that the aim is revise again the document taking into account the audience remarks and to present a new version tomorrow for the attendees endorsement.