



**Extraordinary Session of the Executive Council
Paris, 13 February, 2016**

Minutes and Records of Decisions

Members attending:

Prof. Dr Hans-Martin Hinz (Germany), President

Prof. Dr Tereza Cristina M. Scheiner (Brazil), Vice-President

Peter Keller (Austria), Treasurer

Dr Ossama A. W. Abdel Meguid (Egypt)

In-kyung Chang (Republic of Korea)

Luisa de Peña Díaz (Dominican Republic)

Alberto Garlandini (Italy)

Merete Ipsen (Denmark)

Diana Pardue (USA)

Prof. Dr Regine Schulz (Germany)

Suay Aksoy (Turkey), Chair of the Advisory Committee, *ex-officio* member of the Executive Council

Excused members:

Prof. George H. Okello Abungu (Kenya), Vice-President

Prof. Dr Laishun An (China)

Dr Willem De Vos (Belgium)

Goranka Horjan (Croatia)

Prof. Dr Anne-Catherine Robert-Hauglustaine was present as Director General.

Aedín Mac Devitt was recording secretary for the meeting.

The session began on 13 February, 2016 at 9:20am.

PRESIDENT'S OPENING REMARKS

The President opened the meeting by explaining that a final draft of the Statutes was now ready, and he thanked Diana Pardue for helping to reword certain sections.

He said that the Internal Rules and Regulations were on today's agenda.

He explained that four members were unable to attend today's meeting: George Abungu (proxy to Ossama El Meguid), Laishun An (proxy to Inkyung Chang), Wim De Vos (proxy to Hans-Martin Hinz) and Goranka Horjan (proxy to Peter Keller).

1/ Agenda

The President presented the meeting's agenda.

Inkyung Chang said she would like to discuss the ICOM archives in "Other items".

The President replied that this item would be on the agenda of the next EC meeting, but Inkyung Chang said she would rather discuss it now as she had learned since the last meeting that a transfer of ICOM's archives had been carried out in the past. She felt ICOM had to be realistic about its archives, i.e. that it cannot hold on to everything unless a full-time archivist is employed and there is adequate space to store them.

The president reminded Executive Council members of the heated discussion that had taken place on the archives at the last EC meeting in December. The discussion had to be cut short due to time constraints. Since this type of decision on the archives will have a strong impact on ownership and use of the archives, he said that the Council would need to receive a more detailed note about the pros and cons in order to be able to make a wise decision. He said that if there was time at the end of the meeting, the item could be discussed again; otherwise he said it would be on the EC meeting agenda in July.

The President then distributed a draft agenda for the next EC meeting, to be held on 1 and 2 July in Milan.

Decision 01

The Executive Council approved the agenda for the extraordinary session of 13 February, 2016.

2/ Internal Rules and Regulations

The President welcomed Per Rekdal, Chair of the Working Group on the Statutes, Internal Rules and Regulations and Governance, and thanked him for his hard work on the subject. He then asked him to lead the discussion.

The members discussed each of the proposed changes that were highlighted in the latest version received from Per Rekdal.

A long discussion took place regarding the inclusion of a list of museum professions members should fit into (2.2.2 Tasks and Professions Practised in Museums). Many EC members felt that this list was not necessary, and that it could give rise to possible exclusion. They felt that a list could never be exhaustive. Per Rekdal said he did not have strong feelings about the list, but was concerned that without one, some National Committees would continue to grant membership to academics only.

Members then discussed the inclusion of volunteers in the list. Although many members spoke of the importance of volunteers to museum work, and the fact that they should be recognised, some pointed out that the term volunteer should not be used, as it was not an actual profession, but a status.

One member commented that the use of volunteers in museums could be controversial because in some countries, employees were concerned about volunteers replacing them. However, as long as the work carried out by volunteers corresponds to museum activity, EC members agreed that they should be eligible for ICOM membership.

Per Rekdal then suggested that the list be deleted and that “all those paid or unpaid” should be added to the description of individual members of ICOM. All members were happy with this proposal as a good compromise.

When discussing whether the General Secretariat should have the right to review membership applications (2.3 Membership Application and Approval), the Director General pointed out that since she had arrived as DG, there had been many different cases. She felt that the General Secretariat should not have the responsibility to reject an application. Many EC members agreed that it should be an elected person or body that would make the decision.

It was therefore agreed that the Bureau would make a decision on a contested application refusal, and the Internal Rules and Regulations would be modified to reflect this.

One member expressed concern that such a decision would take too long given that the EC met only twice a year. It was agreed that an urgent decision could be made by email.

The President confirmed that in these individual cases, the Secretariat would prepare the case for the Bureau. The Bureau would make a decision, which would then need to be validated by the Executive Council.

One member suggested that it be stated that a candidate could appeal the decision of the Bureau, by taking it to the Executive Council. However, Samia Slimani pointed out that this could create conflict between the Bureau and the Executive Council. It was therefore suggested that it be stated that the candidate could present his or her arguments before a final decision be made by the Executive Council.

EC members then discussed a candidate’s eligibility for election to the EC at length (3.1.2 Ineligibilities). Some felt that candidates should already fulfill all the requirements on the day that they submit their candidacy. Others felt that the moment of election at the General Assembly would be the perfect deadline. After discussing the issue, a compromise was reached that a specific date should be chosen by which all candidates must meet the requirements. It was decided that 31 December of the year prior to when the election of the EC would take place would be the cut-off

date, meaning that former employees of ICOM or its Committees would be eligible for election only if their contract had expired at least two years prior to 31 December preceding the election year.

One member suggested that a sentence be added stating that anyone elected to an ICOM body could not be a paid consultant or employee of ICOM.

The mandates of the different Technical Committees were then discussed (Article 6 – Standing and Ad-Hoc Committees). One member suggested that for legal issues and emergency situations, although there should be clear rules for committees, there should be some flexibility in the mandate period. It was suggested that as they are advisors, not elected persons, the rules should be slightly different.

The Director General said that the role of the Secretariat within these Technical Committees should also be clarified. For instance, some required permanent assistance and others needed help for just one meeting. She also said that clarification was required on what exactly a Standing/Technical committee actually is.

Another member suggested that the possibility for an ad-hoc committee to renew its three-year mandate should be included.

Per Rekdal and Samia Slimani said that they would work together to review, update and complete the list of Technical Committees.

In the General Provisions, one member asked that it be mentioned that a Spanish version is also an obligation.

Another member commented that it was difficult for those members who worked for different periods of time in different countries to change their membership affiliation. She asked whether it would be possible to specify a period during which you could travel to and work in another country without having to change your membership affiliation to a different National Committee.

The Director General wished to clarify whether the rules should be referred to as Internal Rules and Regulations or simply Internal Rules. Per Rekdal clarified that it should be Internal Rules, and that this would be harmonised within the text.

He added that it would be important to have cross references between the Statutes and the Internal Rules to improve the members' comprehension.

Samia Slimani pointed out that cross referencing would involve a lot of work, and although she understood it was intended to be pedagogical, from a legal standpoint, she said it was not standard. She asked Per Rekdal therefore to propose a method of cross-referencing.

Members agreed that a final version of the Internal Rules could be agreed upon electronically by the EC members.

The Director General reminded members of the process: the legal department would make the amendments discussed to the document; it would then go back to Per Rekdal for approval and potential suggestions regarding the cross-referencing. The EC would then validate the final version, the Secretariat would arrange to have the translation done, and the translation would be checked. She also reminded members that the French version would be the one to prevail. She therefore suggested asking a Francophone member to check the French version, as it was always good to have a second opinion.

It was suggested that Dominique Ferriot, present Chair of NEC (Nominations and Elections Committee), and Rina Pantalony, Chair of the Legal Affairs Committee, could check the French version. It was suggested that Luisa de Peña Díaz and Tereza Scheiner could check the Spanish version.

3/ New Strategic Plan 2016-2022

Regine Schulz and Diana Pardue presented a final draft of the Strategic Plan 2016-2022 to EC members.

They reminded members that Michael Ryan and the Strategic Plan Working Group had been asked to develop a draft. During the process, many people had been consulted, and this included a large survey sent out to members. She said that a lot of ideas from ICOM members all over the world had been included in this draft, and that they had made sure to include the opinions of younger members in particular.

The EC members then discussed each page of the Plan. The amendments can be seen in Appendix 1.

The Director General pointed out that some parts of the Plan were too specific, for instance where a specific Standing Committee (DRTF) or programme (Red Lists/Observatory) were mentioned. It was agreed that more general wording would be used, for instance “cultural property protection” rather than “Red List”. Also, in terms of staffing needs for the Secretariat, she said it would be better to reflect this as a general need rather than pointing to one particular post that needs to be created.

Aedín Mac Devitt said she would propose a revised paragraph on publications so that it would be clear for the Secretariat how to proceed on this point.

There was a discussion as to whether the Plan should be subject to review or not. It was decided that it would be reviewed by the Executive Council every two years.

Diana Pardue and Regine Schulz confirmed that the Plan would be revised according to the comments made during the meeting, in order to secure a final version quickly.

4/ Other matters

Tereza Scheiner spoke of ICOM honorary member Vиноš Sofka, who had passed away, and asked that ICOM write an obituary for him as soon as possible.

The meeting was closed at 6:45pm.