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Welcome to Canberra and the 2013 AIMA Conference on Towards Ratification: Australia’s Underwater Cultural Heritage. It is not a coincidence that we meet in Australia’s capital city this year as it is here where the ratification of the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage will have to be endorsed by the country’s newly elected government. Rather sooner than later. This year’s conference provides us with another opportunity to continue to encourage the Australian Government towards immediate ratification of the UNESCO 2001 Convention and meet the international best practice for management of underwater cultural heritage. The maritime archaeological and diving community have been working hard in recent years to keep ratification on the agenda. Many participated, for example, in the 2009 Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976 review, which included a consideration of the requirements arising from the UNESCO 2001 Convention (http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/shipwrecks/review/), or signed and submitted letters to the Commonwealth Government to request ratification. The latter initiative gained momentum two years ago with the efforts of a student body called Take the Plunge—Protect Australia’s Heritage (https://www.facebook.com/TakethePlungeProtectAustraliasHeritage). If you see the students handing out letters at the conference for signing, do take a moment and support their cause. I hope that we can continue this forward momentum with our colleagues.

Delegates to this conference have gathered from around the world to present their research and engage in informal discourse with colleagues and students. The Conference themes highlight the variety and significance of our underwater heritage in Australian waters and overseas, and the significant positive value that Australia’s ratification would have in the region. The workshop and program promise some excellent days ahead with interesting papers, discussions, and great participants.

On behalf of AIMA I would like to thank the organising committee, Andrew Viduka, Jennifer Rodrigues, Graeme Henderson, Celeste Jordan, Madeleine McAllister, Grant Luckman, and Debra Shefi, along with the other volunteers who have been working busily to make this conference happen. I also want to thank The Australian National University for hosting our meeting, and all of the contributing sponsors for providing funding for this conference, workshop and other events.

I hope you enjoy the conference!

Sincerely,

Wendy van Duivenvoorde
Acting President, AIMA
Welcome to AIMA’s annual conference for 2013—Towards Ratification. This year’s conference theme and sessions are focused on highlighting the variety and significance of our underwater heritage in Australian waters and overseas. AIMA members are joined by a number of international colleagues who have taken the time to share with us their knowledge and experience, particularly in regards to the 2001 UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and their respective country’s efforts in ratification. We would like to welcome everyone to this timely and internationally significant conference.

With the 2010 Australian Underwater Cultural Heritage Intergovernmental Agreement, the Commonwealth, States and Northern Territory have agreed to align their domestic policies with the Annex Rules of the 2001 UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage to meet underwater cultural heritage management international best practices. While this is very positive news, AIMA is a strong advocate for Australia to ratify the Convention and join the International community’s response against the illicit trade in underwater cultural heritage.

We would very much like to recognise and thank all of this year’s conference sponsors and supporters who have made possible this gathering. Firstly, thank you to the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, who contribute funding to AIMA conferences annually through their Historic Shipwrecks Program. We are grateful to Professor Howard Morphy and The Australian National University, Research School of Humanities, who kindly provided the conference venue. We extend our sincere appreciation to this year’s Silver Sponsors: the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, SRA Information Technology and Cosmos Archaeology Pty Ltd; and to our Bronze Sponsors: Norfolk Island Museum, National Marine Sanctuaries (NOAA, USA), Silentworld Foundation and Flinders University. To all those who agreed to support our conference and its objectives, we thank you as well.

Lastly we would like to invite you to enjoy this year’s keynote addresses by Professor Mariano J. Aznar-Gómez on “Treasure hunters, sunken state vessels and the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage”, and by our own Tim Smith, who will be speaking on “HMA Submarine AE2”, Australia’s World War I submarine sunk in Turkish waters. Due to the proposed archaeological research activities on AE2 in the coming twelve months, AIMA has invited Assistant Professor A. Harun Özdaş from Dokuz Eylül University in Turkey, to give the AIMA Public lecture. Harun’s lecture will be on “Byzantine shipwrecks discovered along the southwestern coast of Turkey”.

Enjoy the conference.

Sincerely,

Andrew Viduka & Jennifer Rodrigues
Co-Chairs, AIMA13 Organising Committee
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AIMA and the Underwater Cultural Heritage

AIMA is concerned about the ongoing and damaging practice of treasure hunting and commercial exploitation of underwater heritage sites on both a local and international scale. AIMA actively lobbies both governments and international bodies to support the prohibition of such practices.

At the 19th Meeting of the Environment Protection and Heritage Council, the council endorsed Australia pursuing ratification of the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. This Convention sets out basic principles for the protection of underwater cultural heritage, provides a detailed State Party cooperation system and provides widely recognized practical rules for the treatment and research of underwater cultural heritage. These Rules, set out in the Annex to the Convention, are recognized as world best practice.

In May 2010, the Environment Protection and Heritage Council members agreed to an Australian Underwater Cultural Heritage Intergovernmental Agreement with the intent of enabling Australia to meet international best practice standards for management of underwater cultural heritage as outlined in the Rules of the Annex. The intergovernmental agreement:

1. supports Australia pursuing ratification of the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage, subject to Australia’s normal treaty making processes;

2. supports all necessary legislative changes that would enable Australia to ratify the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage.

On 4 June 2009, the Hon Peter Garrett MP, Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts, agreed to a review of the Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976 and consideration of the requirements arising from the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. To facilitate the review, the Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (now the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities) produced a discussion paper on whether the government should ratify the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage or meet international best practice in underwater cultural heritage management in a different way. To date, the Australian Government has not released its report on the review nor its recommendations stemming from the review.

In 2012, AIMA has continued to support the Take the Plunge—Protect Australia’s Heritage campaign, which focuses on promoting awareness and support for Australia’s ratification of the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. AIMA also initiated a letter writing campaign to the Prime Minister, the Hon Julia Gillard MP, and to the Hon Tony Burke MP, Minister for Heritage, calling on them to amend the Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976 so that it can protect all underwater cultural heritage, and to immediately announce the Australian Government’s intention to ratify the Convention.

The primary objective of the AIMA13 Conference is to continue to encourage the Australian Government towards immediate ratification of the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage to meet the international best practice standards for management of underwater cultural heritage. The Conference themes will highlight the variety and significance of our underwater heritage in Australian waters and overseas, and the significant positive value that Australia’s ratification would have in the region.
Australia is an island continent surrounded by three oceans and with seas to the North. During the last 60,000 years, which approximately equates to the period of occupation by Indigenous Australians, sea level has risen and fallen numerous times and, at one stage, was approximately 135 metres below its current level. During this period, the shape of Australia’s coastline was vastly different than today. Doubtlessly, an enormous amount of Indigenous cultural material would still exist, buried deep somewhere off our coastline. However, chances of finding physical evidence of this ancient heritage are remote. More easily discovered is the recent historical assemblage of shipwrecks that appeared in Australian waters from 1622 onwards. Approximately 8,000 shipwrecks are known in Australian waters, of which approximately 5,000 originated in other countries and have shared heritage values. During the 20th century, other historical heritage, such as aircraft, landing craft, tanks and other detritus of war, was added to the growing list of underwater cultural heritage. As Charles Lyell said in Principles of Geology 1830–1833, “It is probable that a greater number of monuments of the skill and industry of man will in the course of the ages be collected together in the bed of the oceans, than will exist at any one time on the surface of the continents.”

While Australians can rightly be proud of the scope and abundance of their underwater cultural heritage, they can be equally proud of the efforts of maritime archaeologists, individual members of the public and, particularly, avocational groups who have worked to locate, document and tell the story of Australia’s underwater cultural heritage. Through the work of various people and groups, sites such as Batavia, HMS Sirius, HMS Pandora, TSS Cumberland, SS Alert, the Japanese midget submarine M24, SS City of Launceston, HMAS Sydney II and Sydney Cove have come to light and added to our understanding of the European settlement of Australia, Australia at war, and our ongoing interactions with the world. Still much is left to be understood about the Indigenous use of the continent’s waters, colonisation, marine resource extraction, and cultural meanings.

Australian’s also can be proud of the efforts made by States and the Commonwealth to protect our underwater cultural heritage. In 1964, the Western Australian Government moved to protect historic shipwrecks in its waters via legislation. This was subsequently followed in 1976 by the Commonwealth introducing the Historic Shipwrecks Act. The Act protects all shipwrecks that are older than 75 years (whether or not their location is known) from disturbance, damage or interference from the low water mark to the edge of the continental shelf. Importantly, the Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976 established that historic shipwrecks and their associated relics (the legal term used to describe all objects/artefacts that are cargo, part of the ship, personal possessions or human remains) are of value to all Australians and not to be commercially exploited, either by governments or by private individuals.

Thirty-seven years later, the Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976 is now under review, as it no longer meets international best practice standards, including those outlined in the Annex rules to the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage, and does not protect other types of underwater cultural heritage, such as aircraft or Indigenous sites. During this time of legislative review, AIMA wishes to continue to advocate for Australia to ratify the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and become a part of the international community’s response to stopping the destruction and theft of humanity’s shared underwater cultural heritage.
AIMA13 Conference Theme

TOWARDS RATIFICATION: Australia’s Underwater Cultural Heritage

The theme of the 2013 AIMA Conference is ‘Towards Ratification: Australia’s Underwater Cultural Heritage’. The primary objective of this gathering is to continue to encourage the Australian Government towards immediate ratification of the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage to meet the international best practice for management of underwater cultural heritage.

Specifically, the conference aims to:

• Support and inform Australia’s ratification of the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage;
• Encourage discussion about Australia’s diverse underwater cultural heritage here and overseas;
• Exchange and disseminate information about underwater cultural heritage activities within Australasia, South East Asia and the countries of the Indian and Pacific Oceans;
• Facilitate professional development for maritime archaeologists and underwater cultural heritage managers in the Asia-Pacific region;
• Provide a forum for discussion on the pros and cons of ratification; and
• Review necessary legislative steps to becoming a party of the Convention.

The Conference session themes highlight the variety and significance of Australia’s underwater heritage in national waters and overseas. Topics include maritime archaeology, Australasia’s Indigenous underwater cultural heritage, the archaeology of aircraft and non-shipwreck sites as underwater cultural heritage, techniques and technology in maritime and deep-water archaeology, museology, in-situ preservation, conservation, legislation and protection policy, training, education and community participation with heritage.

Pre-Conference UNCPUCH Workshop

An expert panel meeting will be held on Thursday 3 October to discuss legal issues around ratification of the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage with specific reference to Australia and countries in South East Asia and the Pacific Region. This workshop is an opportunity to look closely at the status of the ratification process for Australia and other regional states, as well as the reasons that Australia and regional countries have yet to ratify the Convention. It intends to stimulate discussion and progress on the ratification of the Convention by States in the region and to stress the significant positive value that Australia’s ratification would have in the region.

AIMA encourages participation from the public, scholars, specialists and experts in the fields of archaeology, history, cultural heritage, international law, and members of other disciplines that complement and extend the interests of AIMA and the objectives of this conference.

The workshop is sponsored by:

• The Research School of Humanities, College of Arts and Social Sciences, The Australian National University
• Institute for Professional Practice in Heritage and the Arts, The Australian National University
Conference Poster

The conference poster is designed to emphasise the theme of the conference, ‘Towards Ratification: Australia’s Underwater Cultural Heritage’, and to interpret it in graphical form.

The overall look and colour scheme of the poster supports this aim. The various blue tints are in keeping with AIMA and a maritime theme, while also giving the poster a more monotone and graphical feel and simplicity. The red ‘Australia’s’ in the title text links it to the red Australia highlighted on the map and the red Australian underwater cultural heritage site markers.

The UNESCO-PUCH logos feature prominently in the top header. The vertical line of dots separating the two logos is extended down to Canberra, highlighting not only the location of the conference, but also its theme and the centre of the ratification effort and (hopefully) the place of its eventual realisation.

The main graphic of the poster is the map-collage, which is a graphical representation of Australia’s global UCH rather than a true ‘map’ showing exact locations of Australian UCH sites. The names and images provide a visualisation of some of these sites, while the markers give an indication of their geographical distribution. The site names are not necessarily in the actual geographical location of the sites or associated with particular markers, while terms such as ‘Indigenous’, ‘WWII’ and ‘Historical’ give an idea of the different types of UCH sites.

The photographic collage features images of shipwrecks, WWI and II sites, artefacts from UCH sites, investigations, excavations and monitoring of UCH sites that represent not only the sites themselves, but Australia’s ongoing care-taking of the sites and how the nation is preserving, interpreting and learning from them. The image of the Batavia exhibit in the Western Australian Museum’s Shipwreck Galleries symbolises public interpretation of the UCH. The photograph of the crew of HMAS Sydney II represents the very personal significance of many of these sites to the Australian public—the great sacrifices towards the nation-building of Australia that they represent—and the significance of these sites to the nation’s collective history, memory and culture.

The stamp represents how UCH is actively remembered and portrayed in modern Australian culture, demonstrating its continued importance. It also represents travel and the internationality of UCH and its multi-cultural nature, which is reflected also in the world map.

Finally, the logos of the conference sponsors and supporters are featured prominently below the central title bar in recognition and appreciation of their financial support for the conference and for their work and support of protecting the world’s underwater cultural heritage.

Sponsors

The Australasian Institute for Maritime Archaeology recognises and greatly appreciates the following organisations for their support and generous financial sponsorship of the 2013 Conference!

Silver Sponsors (>$/5,000)
Research School of Humanities, College of Arts and Social Sciences, The Australian National University
Institute for Professional Practice for Heritage and the Arts, The Australian National University
Cosmos Archaeology Pty Ltd
The Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
SRA Information Technology
The Australian Government, Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (DSEWPaC)

Bronze Sponsors (>$/1,000)
Flinders University, Maritime Archaeology Program
Norfolk Island Museum
United States Maritime Heritage Programme, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
Silentworld Foundation
The RSHA also administers the **Institute for Professional Practice in Heritage & the Arts**, which collaborates nationally and internationally with practicing heritage and arts professionals, cultural institutions, government agencies, private enterprise and other universities to address matters of professional practice and professional development within the heritage and arts sectors.

The Institute seeks to service the contemporary interests and professional development needs of individuals and organisations. It coordinates a range of professional development activities that are made available to its members and partners. It also utilises its membership base to provide expertise on matters relating to professional practice.

The Institute aims to advance professional practice in the heritage and arts sectors. It seeks to improve approaches to professional practice that can flow back into industry performance, public sector program delivery, and enhance academic teaching and research.

Professional practice in the heritage and arts sectors increasingly involves individuals pursuing flexible career options, including private consultancy practice and mobility within and across industry, academic and government environments. The Institute will concentrate on targeted activities that support the interaction of heritage and arts professionals across these environments.

**Cosmos Archaeology Pty Ltd** is an Australian based cultural heritage consultancy that specialises in historical and maritime archaeology and heritage projects. Cosmos Archaeology is one of the few Australian heritage consultancies with qualified maritime archaeologists on staff with ADAS certification. We work nationally and internationally for a range of clients and across many different types of sites.

Since its launch in 1997, Cosmos Archaeology has completed more than 300 projects relating to research, identification and preservation of cultural heritage items, both on land and underwater. Our work includes surveys, monitoring, underwater and land excavations, desktop studies, assessments and statements of heritage impact.

Cosmos Archaeology also provides archaeology specific GIS and heritage mapping, remote sensing interpretation, heritage management and conservation plans, as well as technical heritage and legislative advice. Our archaeologists are skilled at working in different jurisdictions, are flexible and adaptable as well as efficient communicators.

Cosmos Archaeology is experienced in a diversity of projects including the following successfully completed examples:

- **From 1999–2002**, Cosmos Archaeology undertook three field seasons on the World Heritage listed site of Port Arthur, Tasmania. This involved extensive surveying underwater and in the intertidal zone; the results of which formed the basis for a maritime archaeology heritage conservation management plan prepared for the Port Arthur Authority.
- **In 2006–2008**, Cosmos Archaeology was involved in the Channel Deepening Project with the Port of Melbourne Corporation. Our work comprised review of multibeam sonar records, inspection of anomalies, archaeological monitoring, wreck inspections and the excavation and relocation of the submerged remains of a historic pile light.
- **Cosmos Archaeology also has experience in directing excavations on land, such as the 2009 Burke and Wills 'Plant Camp' archaeological excavation. Including members of the public and staff of the Queensland Museum, the project aimed to locate the astronomical equipment left by the doomed expedition in 1861.**
- **Cosmos Archaeology has also been engaged in projects involving both terrestrial and underwater excavations. The Port of Echuca historical archaeology survey completed in 2011 is one of these. Underwater excavations identified the remains of a small wooden boat as well as part of the Wharf. Land excavations revealed deposits possibly associated with 19th century building that was once used as the town morgue.**

Cosmos Archaeology is currently engaged with projects across Australia including NSW, NT and Victoria.
The Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is proud to be involved in the 2013 AIMA Conference. This year’s theme, Towards Ratification, is very timely. The immediate ratification of the UNESCO 2001 Convention for the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage is indeed of great importance.

The discussion amongst experts on all topics of underwater cultural heritage is to be encouraged. For the Netherlands, the underwater cultural heritage in Australia has special significance, as part of this heritage is Dutch. In the 17th century, ships from the Dutch East India Company (VOC), such as Batavia, set sail to the Dutch East Indies (now Indonesia), of which some landed or wrecked on Australia’s coast. Some of these ships have been recovered, but there are still others hidden in Australian waters. These Dutch treasures in Australian waters are valuable, and we cherish the cooperation of Australia in the protection of this underwater cultural heritage. Part of this cooperation is sharing knowledge, and in this respect we are happy that renowned Dutch maritime archaeologist Martijn Manders will participate in this conference.

In 2016, we will commemorate the 400th anniversary of the landing of the VOC ship Eendracht, under Captain Dirk Hartog, on the coast of Western Australia. Since this landing, Australia and the Netherlands have grown a bilateral relationship that has expanded in many directions. Over time, we have developed a mutual understanding based on a rich shared cultural heritage—not only underwater!—that is beneficial to both our two countries.

Annemieke Ruigrok
Ambassador of the Kingdom of the Netherlands

Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands

SRA Information Technology is a software development company with offices in Canberra, Darwin, Adelaide, Brisbane, Perth, Houston and Singapore. We undertake projects all around Australia and internationally, focusing on customised applications in the domains of Heritage, Environment & Sustainability, Natural Resource Management, Compliance & Approvals, Business Intelligence and Community Welfare. SRA has worked with the Australian Federal Government for over 10 years, as a preferred supplier on a number of ICT panels and on various types of projects.

We recently developed the Australian National Shipwrecks Database (ANSDB) for the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (SEWPaC). SEWPaC needed to provide the location and details of all known historic shipwrecks in Australian waters to the public and to researchers in order to help protect and provide a better understanding of their stories. The ANSDB allows for attached images, it links shipwrecks to relics recovered from shipwreck sites, and it provides environmental information for divers and site managers and much more.

The application can be viewed on www.environment.gov.au/heritage/shipwrecks/database.html.

For more information about the project and about us, come and have a drink at the Inaugural Drinks—it’s on us! Also, we would love to see you at the SRA booth.

Contact Jim Rowe at Jim.Rowe@sra.com.au.

Australia has a rich and diverse maritime heritage
help discover and protect it

www.environment.gov.au/heritage/shipwrecks

The Office of National Marine Sanctuaries serves as the trustee for a network of 14 marine protected areas encompassing more than 170,000 square miles of marine and Great Lakes waters from Washington state to the Florida Keys, and from Lake Huron to American Samoa. The network includes a system of 13 national marine sanctuaries and the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument.

Our national marine sanctuaries are places of inspiration. Within their waters and along their shores, you can find vibrant tapestries of marine life, ancient mysteries of our past, and thriving communities of men and women who have relied on the sea for generations. Sanctuaries are places where anyone can go to experience the power and beauty of the ocean and form lasting memories in spectacular natural settings, from the vibrant coral reefs of American Samoa to the towering kelp forests of Monterey Bay.

For the past 40 years, our national marine sanctuaries have worked to protect special places in America’s ocean and Great Lakes waters, from the site of a single Civil War shipwreck to a vast expanse of ocean surrounding remote coral reefs and tiny atolls. Backed by one of the nation’s strongest pieces of ocean conservation legislation, the sanctuaries seek to preserve the extraordinary scenic beauty, biodiversity, historical connections and economic productivity of 14 of our most precious underwater treasures. By acting as responsible stewards of these special places, we strengthen our nation now and for future generations.

• Inspiring hope
• Building America’s Future
• Serving our communities
• Exploring our world
• Teaching our youth
• Preserving our heritage
Silentworld Foundation was founded to support maritime archaeology in Australia, especially relative to pre-colonial and early colonial history.

Funding for institutional research and especially field work is always limited and the subject so extensive that there is inevitably a constraint to the work that museums and universities can undertake. The Silentworld Foundation attempts to support the efforts of institutions, companies and individuals seeking to know more about our maritime past, through providing financial and physical support to projects and general research. In particular, the Foundation targets its support activities towards field work and the active search for, and identification of, shipwrecks of particular historical interest to Australia.

The Foundation’s interest is purely historical and academic with a view to furthering our nation’s knowledge of its maritime past. The Foundation does not participate in or support shipwreck hunting for financial gain and its objectives are purely philanthropic.

For major projects, the Foundation works primarily through and with respected public institutions such as the National Maritime Museum of Australia and The University of Sydney, although many smaller initiatives are undertaken alone or with other partners.

Lastly, from these early beginnings the Foundation’s objectives have expanded to include humanitarian and philanthropic assistance to remote communities, especially in the Pacific Islands. As the Foundation carries out research and exploration activities in very remote areas, so also we try to help the local communities with which we come into contact. This assistance can include medical help, provision of educational material, radios and communication equipment, training and other benefits.
Supporters

The following supporting organisations agree with the aims of the AIMA13 Towards Ratification conference and support Australia’s ratification of the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage.

UNESCO Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage

The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) International Committee on Underwater Cultural Heritage (ICUCH)

The International Council on Monuments and Sites, (ICOMOS) Australia

The International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), Italy

Assam University, Silchair, India

Centre for International Heritage Activities, The Netherlands

Centre for Maritime Archaeology, University of Southampton, England

Cosmos Archaeology Pty Ltd, New South Wales, Australia

Ename Centre for Public Archaeology and Heritage Presentation, Belgium

Global Development Research Centre, Japan

International Centre for Underwater Archaeology in Zadar, Croatia

Maritime Archaeology Program (MAP), Flinders University, South Australia

Maritime Archaeology Programme, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

Nautical Archaeology Society (NAS), United Kingdom

Norfolk Island Museum, Norfolk Island, Australia

Programa de Arqueologia Subacuatica, Instituto Nacional de Antropologia, Argentina

University of Southampton, United Kingdom

Western Australian Museum, Perth, Australia
Conference Registration

Registration

Full conference registration includes admission to the workshop and expert panel meeting on Thursday 3 October and all sessions and roundtable forum.

- Full conference registration include admission to:
- The welcome event on Thursday 3 October at the Fellows Bar and Cafe, University House, Australian National University;
- The workshop/expert panel meeting held on Thursday 3 October;
- All sessions and forums of the conference programme from Friday 4 October to Saturday 5 October;
- Lunch as well as morning and afternoon tea on each day of the Workshop and Conference; and
- A Conference show bag and programme.

Registration fees do NOT cover conference excursions (tours), local transportation costs or the Conference Dinner on Saturday 5 October.


Conference Registration Fees (AUD)

- AIMA Member registration from 16 August $250.00 incl. GST
- Non-member registration $300.00 incl. GST
- Full-time student registration$100.00 incl. GST
- Per day registration $150.00 incl. GST

Optional additional costs (AUD$):

- Conference dinner $80.00 incl. GST

1 Must provide proof showing current student status before payment will be processed.
2 The conference dinner will be held at Tazé Mediterranean Cuisine and will comprise a Turkish banquet meal and three hours of wine, beer and soft drinks. Cost is $80 per person and early bookings are encouraged, as there is a maximum of 80 places. See the Dinner Venue page for further details.
Venues, Transportation and Accommodation

AIMA13 Conference Venue

The UNCPUCH Workshop and the Conference are held in the same venue within the Australian National University precinct in Canberra. The ANU is located on the north side of Lake Burley Griffin, on the western edge of the city centre, in the suburb of Acton.

The Research School of Humanities & the Arts (RSHA) is located within the ANU precinct in the Sir Roland Wilson Building. RSHA is part of the ANU College of Arts & Social Sciences (CASS). Its primary focus is to build on its established strengths in research and education across the humanities and the creative arts. It places a strong emphasis on traditional humanities scholarship and on encouraging interdisciplinary, cross-cultural and practice led research.

http://rsha.anu.edu.au/

A map and building index of ANU precinct is located at the back of the Programme.

http://campusmap.anu.edu.au/displaybldg.asp?no=120

Getting to Canberra, Transport and Accommodation

The best up-to-date information on getting to Canberra, transport and accommodation is available on the Australian Capital Tourism website: http://www.visitcanberra.com.au/.

Getting to Canberra

The website provides information on:

Visa

Visas are required for people from overseas planning to visit Australia. For information to help you find the right Australian visa, go to the Australian Government’s Department of Immigration and Citizenship website (http://www.immi.gov.au/) or directly to Visa Wizard for assistance in applying for the right Australian Visa (http://www.immi.gov.au/visawizard/).

Transport

The following website has up to date information about buses, cycling, taxis and itineraries to do around the city: (http://www.visitcanberra.com.au/Getting-here-and-around.aspx).

Accommodation

In 2013 Canberra celebrates its 100th year. It is likely that accommodation may be heavily booked, so arranging for your accommodation early is encouraged.

Due to the central proximity of ANU in Canberra, easy accommodation options exist on both the north and south side of Lake Burley Griffin. The nearest accommodation to the conference venue is University House http://www.anu.edu.au/unihouse/ located on the ANU campus. This is also one of the cheaper accommodation options. To make a reservation or inquiry, please call +61 (0)2 6125 5276 or email UniHouse@anu.edu.au.

Other accommodation options, including backpackers and hostels, bed and breakfasts, hotels and motels, residential colleges, caravan and camping and rural properties, are available at (http://www.visitcanberra.com.au/Accommodation.aspx).
Canberra City and ANU Precinct Maps
Conference Dinner

The AIMA 2013 Conference dinner will be held at Tazé Mediterranean Cuisine, located in the heart of Canberra city at 21 Genge Street (Shop 4). Tazé is a spacious and contemporary venue where you can experience an exotic cuisine of unique style and quality. The fine art of Mediterranean cooking will dazzle your senses. The perfect place for tapas, meals, freshly prepared pastries and sweets, along with fine coffee and beverages in the lounge. This venue features a private mezzanine with balconies overlooking the city, perfect for group bookings and functions.

The dinner will feature a Turkish banquet and three hours of wine, beer and soft drinks. Cost is $80 per person. Please include this cost in your Registration fees payment (see Conference Registration page). Please book early, as there is a maximum of 80 places.

Tazé Mediterranean Cuisine
Shop 4 Genge Street, Canberra City
Phone: (02) 6262 6601
Web: www.taze.com.au

Directions
1. Head south toward Balmain Cres (29 m)
2. Turn left onto Balmain Cres (44 m)
3. Turn left onto Liversidge St (120 m)
4. Turn right onto McCoy Circuit (240 m)
5. Slight right to stay on McCoy Circuit (37 m)
6. At the roundabout, take the 1st exit onto Gordon St (280 m)
7. Turn left onto London Circuit/Tourist Drive 7 (650 m)
8. Turn left onto East Row (130 m)
9. Continue onto Mort St (120 m)
10. Turn right onto Bunda St (120 m)
11. Turn left onto Genge St, destination will be on the left

Map of directions to Tazé Mediterranean Cuisine.
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Speaker Profiles

Mariano J. Aznar-Gómez  Keynote Speaker
Professor of Public International Law, University Jaume I, Castellón, Spain
Chair of Public International Law at the University Jaume I of Castellón, Spain
Fellow of the Spanish National Scholarship Program of Research

Mariano Aznar-Gómez has been a visiting professor at the University of the Balearic Islands (1995), University of Naples “Parthénope” (2004), the Université de Paris II – Panthéon Assas (2005) and in the University of Rome “Tor Vergata” (2007). He has also been visiting scholar at University of Cambridge’s Lauterpacht Research Centre for International Law (2000). He has served as Secretary of the Scientific Advisory Board of the Bancaja Euromediterranean Courses of International Law (1997-2000, 2007–2011) and as a member of its Editorial Board (2000–2009); he is a founder member of the European Society of International Law (ESIL) and member of its Board (2004–2012).

Prof. Aznar-Gómez’s research focuses mainly on international responsibility of states, disarmament, maintenance of international peace and security and protection of underwater cultural heritage. His publications include: La verificación en el Derecho internacional del desarme (1995), Responsabilidad internacional y acción del Consejo de Seguridad de las Naciones Unidas (2000), La protección del patrimonio cultural subacuático (2004) and La administración internacionalizada del territorio (2008). He is also the author of numerous scientific articles and contributed to the Commentary to the UN Charter (Cot & Pellet, eds. 2005), the Commentary to the ICJ Statute (Oellers-Frahm, Tomuschat & Zimmermann, eds. 2006 and 2012) and the Commentary to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (Corten & Klein, eds. 2006 and 2011).

He co-author of the Green Book for the Protection of the Spanish Underwater Cultural Heritage (2010) and is a legal expert on the protection of the underwater cultural heritage for the Spanish Government. He is advocate and counsel of the Kingdom of Spain before the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, and representative of Spain before the Meeting of States Parties of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage.

Howard Morphy  Welcome to Conference
Professor of Anthropology, Director of the Research School of Humanities and the Arts, College of Arts and Social Sciences, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT

Howard Morphy is Professor of Anthropology and Director of the Research School of Humanities and the Arts at The Australian National University. He is president elect of the Council for Museum Anthropology of the American Anthropological Association, and is a member of the Kluge-Ruhe Advisory Council, University of Virginia, USA. He previously held the chair in Anthropology at University College London. Before that he spent ten years as a curator at the Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford.

He is an anthropologist of art and a visual anthropologist, and has co-edited two of the main source books in these respective fields. He has written extensively on Australian Aboriginal art and has co-produced a pioneering multimedia biography on the art of Narritjin Maymuru. He has conducted extensive fieldwork with the Yolngu people of Northern Australia, collaborated on many films with Film Australia and has curated many exhibitions, including Yingapungapu at the National Museum of Australia. With Frances Morphy he helped prepare the Blue Mud Bay Native Title Claim, which, as a result of the 2008 High Court judgement, recognised Indigenous
ownership of the waters over the intertidal zone under the Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act. His involvement in e-research and in the development of museum exhibitions reflects his determination to make humanities research as accessible as possible to wider publics and to close the distance between the research process and research outcomes.

**A. Harun Özdaş**  *Public Lecturer*

Assistant Prof., Dokuz Eylul University, Institute of Marine Science and Technology, Izmir, Turkey

Harun Özdaş completed his PhD at Hacettepe University, Ankara. Before became Assistant Prof. at Dokuz Eylul University, he worked in the Bodrum Museum of Underwater Archaeology in Turkey. He has participated in several land and underwater surveys and excavations, notably the 14th-century BC Late Bronze Age Uluburun shipwreck excavation with the Institute of Nautical Archaeology and the Black Sea Discoveries (Deep Black Sea) project with the Institute of Exploration and the National Geographic Society. Since 2008, he has been a coordinator of the Shipwreck Inventory Project of Turkey, which is conducting underwater archaeological surveys of the Turkish coast.

Dr Özdaş has represented the Turkish Ministry of Culture and lectured at international meetings in the UK, USA, Spain, Italy, France, and Tunisia. He is Vice President of the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage Committee, the Turkish National Commission for UNESCO, and Vice Director of Dokuz Eylul University’s Institute of Marine Sciences and Technology. He has been a visiting scholar at Texas A&M University and Duke University, and completed part of his research at the Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Studies Department in Harvard, Washington DC.
Workshop Experts Panel

Ulrike Guérin

Ulrike Guérin is responsible for the 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage at UNESCO. Before coming to UNESCO, she worked as a lawyer in a major international law firm in Germany. She holds a graduate degree from Dresden Technical University and a summa cum laude PhD from the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität/Max-Planck-Institute, Munich, Germany. She also obtained an LLM in International and Comparative Law in Chicago, USA, and studied cultural management in Vienna, Austria. Her publications include contributions to a recently published Manual on Activities directed at Underwater Cultural Heritage, a book on Underwater Cultural Heritage in Oceania and another one on intellectual property law, as well as many articles, in particular on the 2001 Convention and on the protection and return of cultural property.

Graeme Henderson
Research Associate, Western Australian Museum

Graeme Henderson's interest in shipwrecks was sparked as a 16-year-old when he found the 1656 wreck of the Dutch East India Company vessel Vergulde Draeck on the Western Australian coast.

After studying history at The University of Western Australia, Graeme worked at the Western Australian Museum as a maritime archaeologist, famously working on the shipwreck excavations of HMS Sirius, HMS Pandora, Rapid, Vergulde Draeck and Trial. In 1992 he became the first director of Western Australia’s Maritime Museum, serving in that role until 2005. During his career, Graeme pushed for legislation to protect and preserve shipwrecks, successfully lobbied for government funding to document the history of Australia’s coastline, and authored numerous books and journal publications. He developed the Museum’s colonial shipwrecks program and, during the 1980s, brought together a twenty-country committee to develop a charter that formed the core of the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage.

In 2002 Graeme was named Western Australian Citizen of the Year in the category of Arts, Culture and Entertainment. In 2012 he was honoured with an Order of Australia for “service to maritime archaeology in Western Australia through the documentation and preservation of Australia’s underwater cultural heritage, to international professional associations, and to the community.”

Martijn Manders
Head, Maritime Programme for the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, The Netherlands

Martijn Manders is a maritime archaeologist and head of the Maritime Programme for the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW). He teaches at the University of Leiden and Saxion (applied Sciences) in The Netherlands and also is involved with the UNESCO Foundation and Advanced Courses for Underwater Cultural Heritage Management in Thailand and Jamaica.
Marnix Pieters
Senior Advisor, Maritime and Underwater Heritage, Flanders Heritage Agency, Belgium

Marnix Pieters participated as an archaeologist and soil scientist in the Louvre excavations in Paris from 1989–1991, and afterwards directed the excavation and study of the deserted late medieval fishing settlement of ‘Walraversijde’, near Ostend, Belgium, from 1992–2005, which was the subject of his PhD dissertation. In 2003, he was the driving force for the start-up of maritime archaeology in Flanders (Belgium). From 2008–2012, Dr Pieters served on the board of directors of the Flanders Heritage Agency (and its forerunner), after which he became a senior advisor on maritime and underwater heritage at the Agency. An important part of his activities deal with advice, management and research of maritime heritage in the North Sea. Beginning this year, the Flanders Heritage Agency is participating in the multi-annual (2013–2016) Archaeology in the North Sea Project, which is devoted to the development of an efficient assessment methodology and approach towards a sustainable management policy and legal framework in Belgium.

Hans Van Tilburg
Maritime Heritage Coordinator, Maritime Heritage Program (Pacific Islands region) Unit Diving Supervisor for NOAA’s National Ocean Service in Hawai’i

Hans Van Tilburg’s mother was born in Honolulu to a large Chinese family, and his father is of Dutch extraction from Indiana. Hans was originally introduced to the ocean on board his father’s sloop Brunhilde at the age of eight. Also influenced by the old Sea Hunt series, he took up SCUBA in 1972. Since then he has worked as a carpenter and sport diving instructor, commercial diver, and a science diver in California, North Carolina, Louisiana and Wisconsin. He was a geography major and diver at the University of California Berkeley (BA, 1985), worked in the diving safety office while in East Carolina University’s Maritime History and Nautical Archaeology program (MA, 1995), and ran a graduate program in maritime archaeology and history while at the University of Hawai’i studying Asian and Pacific maritime history (PhD, 2002). Those field courses were the first of their kind for Hawai’i, and continue today as active NOAA/UH collaborations in support of Maritime Heritage Program goals. Dr Van Tilburg has taught numerous university courses in world and maritime history, has edited readers and proceedings, and has authored reports, book chapters, over 30 articles and book reviews, as well as three books. He has served as an expert consultant for UNESCO’s intangible cultural heritage program, and an instructor for Underwater Cultural Heritage Foundation courses in Thailand and Jamaica. He is married to Maria Da Silva and has one daughter, Sabina (who dives).

Robert Yorke
Chairman, Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee, United Kingdom

Robert Yorke was one of the founders in 1988 of the Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee (JNAPC), an accredited NGO to the States Parties and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body of the 2001 UNESCO Convention. Since then he has been working with stakeholders involved with maritime archaeology to gain better protection for the UK’s rich, but non-renewable, underwater cultural heritage. The JNAPC seeks better protection for historic wrecks in international waters by promoting ratification by the UK of the UNESCO Convention. The JNAPC held seminars on the subject in 2005 (Burlington House Seminar) and 2010 (JNAPC 21st Anniversary Seminar) following the seminar entitled ‘Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage in International Waters adjacent to the UK’. The respective proceedings are available at www.jnapc.org.uk.
AIMA13
Towards Ratification
Australia’s Underwater Cultural Heritage
Welcome to the Workshop

Technological developments during the 20th century extended human access to all parts of the seabed, and in the absence of effective protection, destruction of the underwater cultural heritage reached an unprecedented scale.

No protection was afforded under the existing UNESCO framework or via UNCLOS, so concerned NGOs drafted the Convention for the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage, adopted by UNESCO in 2001. The Convention was developed with the intention of providing a global matrix of protection, with States Party enacting consistent national legislation, and close cooperation between all ratified States Party.

To date 45 States have ratified the Convention and the emerging matrix of protection is having a major positive impact. Sadly, ratification is not uniform across the globe and our region, rich in significant underwater cultural heritage, is one of the slowest to take up the Convention. Australian legal experts and maritime heritage practitioners played important roles in the initiation and development of the Convention but the Australian government has not yet ratified. The Australian Government, State and Northern Territory Governments have moved closer to ratification by agreeing to the Australian Underwater Cultural Heritage Intergovernmental Agreement in 2010.

Unfortunately, amendment of existing legislation to make it consistent with the Convention has not kept pace and the Review of the Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976 and Consideration of Ratification of the Underwater Cultural Heritage Convention, commenced in 2009, has not yet even produced a report with recommendations. Australia remains some considerable distance from developing consistent legislation despite broad public, State and Territory government support and the opportunity to fix existing policy gaps such as the protection for sunken aircraft.

The Australasian Institute for Maritime Archaeology (AIMA) has arranged this Workshop to review the progress made overseas and at home since 2001 and, in the light of that progress, to develop a strategy for improving the management of Australia’s underwater cultural heritage and for pursuing ratification domestically. It is also intended that delegates from other countries take home useful insights about the processes involved.

Speakers will address the reasons for the drafting of the Convention, and the heightening need for effective protection. Speakers from States examining ratification will outline any progress towards ratification and the strategies employed, while those from ratified States will explain how ratification was achieved.

The final part of the workshop will be a roundtable discussion about options for the future. The intent is that this discussion will provide AIMA with the necessary information to develop the most effective strategy to encourage Australia’s ratification, thus enabling the protection of our overseas underwater cultural heritage through cooperative relations with other States Party to the Convention.

I encourage all those attending to contribute. It is a workshop, rather than a debate, and we welcome your thoughts as to the best way for us to proceed.

— Graeme Henderson
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 09:00–10:30   | The UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage  
                Chair: Lyndel Prott                                                   |
| 09:00–10:30   | The reasons for the Convention's drafting                              
                Patrick O'Keefe                                                    |
| 09:00–10:30   | The reasons for the Convention's drafting: A maritime archaeologist's perspective  
                Graeme Henderson                                                   |
| 09:00–10:30   | The need for Australia to ratify the 2001 Convention                   
                Craig Forrest                                                    |
| 10:30–11:00   | Morning tea break                                                     |
| 11:00–12:30   | Extent of progress towards ratification and the strategies employed    
                Chairs: Bill Jeffrey                                               |
| 11:00–12:30   | Australia's consideration of the ratification process and current position  
                Andrew Viduka                                                     |
| 11:00–12:30   | Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage developments in sub-Saharan Africa  
                Bill Jeffery, Shawn Berry, Chris Ngivingivi                      |
| 11:00–12:30   | The Netherlands towards ratification: activities in the light of the Convention  
                Martijn Manders                                                    |
| 11:00–12:30   | India towards ratification                                            
                Alok Tripathi                                                     |
| 12:30–13:30   | Lunch break                                                          |
| 13:30–15:00   | How ratification was achieved                                          
                Chairs: Craig Forrest                                             |
| 13:30–15:00   | Status and development of ratifications                               
                Ulrike Guérin                                                    |
| 13:30–15:00   | The processes and strategies employed in Spain                        
                Mariano J. Aznar-Gómez                                             |
| 13:30–15:00   | The processes and strategies employed in Belgium                       
                Marnix Pieters                                                  |
| 15:00–15:30   | Afternoon tea break                                                  |
| 15:30–17:00   | Achieving the ratification—Roundtable discussion                      
                Chairs: Patrick O'Keefe                                           |
| 15:30–17:00   | Implications of the above sessions and the Australian election for strategies for AIMA and the Department for Sustainability |
The reasons for the Convention’s drafting — Patrick O’Keefe

In 1988, the International Law Association established a Committee on Cultural Heritage Law and I was appointed as the Chair. We chose as our first activity the drafting of a Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. The first issue was that of jurisdiction. We created a ‘cultural heritage zone’, which would apply from the edge of the territorial sea to the outer limit of the continental shelf. Here a coastal State would control activities affecting the underwater cultural heritage. Outside that Zone, States would prohibit their nationals and ships flying their flag from activities not complying with the Charter produced by ICOMOS. Breach of the prohibition would lead to seizure of the heritage when brought ashore unless a permit had been issued. A State was also to use its territorial jurisdiction to deny the use of facilities to anyone acting contrary to the Charter. Warships were to be excluded from coverage by the Convention. The law of salvage was also to be excluded. The Charter could be revised by ICOMOS with the result binding on States Parties unless they specifically objected.

The reasons for the Convention’s drafting, a maritime archaeologist’s perspective — Graeme Henderson

Awareness of the need for a comprehensive international instrument can be viewed as a series of related events and developments expanding from the local to the international. Looting commenced with the discovery in 1963 of two 17th century Dutch shipwrecks off the Western Australian coast. The State Government passed legislation, supported by Western Australian Museum management programmes, but the destruction continued. A diver’s challenge to the legislation in the High Court prompted the passing in 1976 of Commonwealth legislation and development of nationwide programmes. Concerned about implications of the 1985 Titanic discovery at a depth of 3,700 metres and Christie’s Geldermalsen porcelain auction, Australian practitioners took roles in developing non-prescriptive codes of practice, within Australia and with the International Council of Maritime Museums. But even as these codes were published there was evidence that they would be ineffectual without legal force. In 1990 the International Law Association’s Committee on Cultural Heritage Law produced a draft UNESCO Convention. In 1991 Australia ICOMOS established an international committee (ICUCH) to develop a charter. The ILA Committee envisaged that for the Convention to be effective, nationals would be required to abide by specified criteria in excavating historic wreck sites. In 1991 they invited ICUCH to prepare these criteria, and a modified version of its draft ICOMOS Charter was used as the Annex of the UNESCO Convention.

The need for Australia to ratify the 2001 Convention — Craig Forrest

Ratification of the Convention by Australia will enhance and extend the existing protective regime operative in Australian waters and that applicable to Australia’s heritage in other waters, particularly that which lies beyond coastal state jurisdiction. Ratification is also needed for a great number of other, related, reasons. It will further the unification of laws across national jurisdictions that protect underwater cultural heritage; it will facilitate the more effective implementation of the evolving co-operative international regime that now exists with the coming into force of the convention; and it will provide a cornerstone for ratification and implementation throughout the Asia-Pacific region.
Extent of progress toward ratification and the strategies employed
Chair: Bill Jeffery

Australia’s consideration of the ratification process and current position — Andrew Viduka

In June 2009 the Australian Government commenced a review of the Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976 and consideration of the requirements arising from the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. The review involved consultation with individuals, Non-Government Organisations and State and Commonwealth Government agencies. This presentation gives an overview of the processes undertaken by the Australian Government, submission responses in regards to ratification and the current status of the legislative reform process and consideration of the requirements of the Underwater Cultural Heritage Convention.

Australia’s consideration of the ratification process and current position — Bill Jeffery, Shawn Berry, Chris Ngivingivi

The aim of this presentation is to provide an overview of the current status of the maritime and underwater cultural heritage programmes in Tanzania and South Africa. These countries have long histories of Indigenous cultures, foreign contacts and influences and African adaptations using coastal and inland waterways, as well as coastal communities exploiting the riches of inland communities. Today, they contain numerous examples of the tangible and intangible heritage related to this history and contemporary practices. Some exploratory research and training has been conducted in Tanzania but the implementation by local residents of their own MUCH programme is still at an early stage. In South Africa they are implementing their own MUCH programme but the misconception that MUCH is only linked to the colonial past has resulted in a general apathy, resulting in a lack of funding and hampering its growth. The UNESCO Convention is being used as a framework in the development of these programmes. It can assist in highlighting the extensive histories, cultural landscapes and cultural identity of communities provided it is made relevant and beneficial to local communities who need to support its implementation.

The Netherlands towards ratification: Activities in the light of the Convention — Martijn Manders

The Netherlands are studying further steps for ratification of the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and the implications this will have on the country’s legislation, obligations, (new) responsibilities and capacity needed for off-shore industries. Where does the Netherlands stand at the moment? Why this change in insight? What are—according to the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science—the benefits of this? The process towards ratification has not only a legal component. Practically, there is a need for maritime archaeologists and maritime cultural heritage managers to prepare for this as well. This is not only important for governments and those who work there, but also other stakeholders who become more and more involved in the management of the underwater cultural heritage. This paper will describe the process and examples of projects that are, or soon will be, done in the light of the Convention. Still, the Dutch Cultural Heritage Agency (RCE) is aiming for ratification by the end of 2014. Will we make that date?

India towards ratification — Alok Tripathi

The importance of underwater cultural heritage was realised in the second half of the last century. A small project, started in 1981, marked the beginning of underwater archaeology in the country. Due to limited underwater activities in Indian waters, much of the sunken cultural heritage remained preserved and undisturbed. But sudden awareness and interest about the sunken cultural heritage, in the recent past, have attracted many people and organizations towards the search and study of underwater cultural heritage. As a result, attempts of exploring underwater archaeological sites and retrieval of archaeological remains have increased.

India has been supporting the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage since it was passed and voted in its favour. It is thus committed to implement the provisions of the Convention. The rules annexed to the Convention were approved, with certain modifications, by the Standing Committee of the Central Advisory Board of Archaeology in 2004, as guidelines for maintaining professional standards while considering the proposals for the excavation of underwater archaeological sites in Indian Waters.

Since the Convention is to be implemented in vast water areas, active cooperation of several Ministries and Departments would be necessary. It is satisfying that concerned ministries have recommended for ratification of the Convention.

The process for ratification was started a while ago but the slow rate in ratification of the Convention by other countries had an adverse effect. After it came into force the process has geared up again. This paper deals with the progress of underwater archaeology in India as well as progress made towards ratification of the 2001 Convention.
How ratification was achieved
Chair: Craig Forrest

Status and development of ratifications — Ulrike Guérin

The 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage entered into force on 2 January 2009. Today, it has been ratified by 45 States, these being Albania, Antigua, Barbuda, Belgium, Argentina, Barbados, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, France, Gabon, Grenada, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Lithuania, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Palestine, Paraguay, Portugal, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, and Ukraine. Many more States are preparing to join. It is the foremost international treaty concerning submerged heritage. The Convention is strongly supported by underwater archaeologists who actively apply and enforce its regulations. Most professional associations of underwater archaeologists have thus officially endorsed the Convention and its Annex. Over time, it can be expected that the Convention will be ratified universally and that it will put an end to the brutal treasure hunting currently menacing major submerged archaeological sites. The paper will present the current status of ratifications and the functioning of the Convention, and will also give a short overview of the views of selected States on the Convention.

The processes and strategies employed in Spain — Mariano J. Aznar-Gómez

The UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (‘UNESCO Convention’) was ratified by Spain on 6 June 2005 and incorporated in the domestic legal order soon after its entry into force. Unfortunately, there were no sound discussions in Spain about the legal consequences in the domestic realm of the ratification and how it will affect the practical protection of underwater cultural heritage (UCH). However, the impact of the ratification on Spain’s international legal policy was deeply assessed, as well as the political message Spain wished to send to the rest of the negotiating States—particularly the Latin-American States, the European partners and the United States. This contribution will try to briefly evaluate some of these questions and discussions in order to offer a general tourd’horizon on the current position of Spain towards the UNESCO Convention and its implementation, both in the domestic and the international realm. It will try to (1) show the general views of Spain during the negotiation of the Convention and beyond; (2) evaluate the problems of implementation of the Convention in the Spanish domestic order and the measures already adopted; and (3) assess generally the future application of the Convention and the interests embodied by Spain in that process.

The processes and strategies employed in Belgium — Marnix Pieters

The UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (‘UNESCO Convention’) was ratified by Belgium very recently, on 5th of August 2013. After an introduction to the important constitutional and legal aspects of Belgium as well as to the recent development of maritime and underwater archaeology in this country, the ratification procedure, the intended implementations and the future challenges, will be presented in some detail. Although Belgium has a very short coastline (merely 67 kilometres) and, compared to other countries, a comparatively smaller sea area (about 3500 square km), we hope to be of some influence in the southern part of the North Sea and hope to stimulate, together with France, neighboring countries to ratify this convention as well. It would be very welcome for the protection of especially World War I sunken heritage if the other coastal states along the Southern North Sea (The United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Germany and Denmark) would ratify this convention and by doing so, protect effectively the very much-endangered maritime heritage linked to the previous century.

Achieving the ratification — Roundtable Discussion
Chair: Patrick O’Keefe

This session is dedicated to discussing the implications of the above sessions and presentations, and the Australian election for strategies for AIMA and the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (SEWPaC), Canberra.
**Friday 4th October**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00–08:50</td>
<td>Conference registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:50–09:00</td>
<td>Welcome to Ngunnawal Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00–09:20</td>
<td>Opening addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard Morphy, Professor of Anthropology, Director of the Research School of Humanities and the Arts, The Australian National University, Canberra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:20–10:20</td>
<td>Keynote address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mariano J. Aznar-Gómez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treasure hunters, sunken state vessels and the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20–10:50</td>
<td>Morning tea break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session 1**  
**Topics:** Australia’s Indigenous Underwater Cultural Heritage  
**Chairs:** Daina Fletcher • David Nutley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:50–11:05</td>
<td>Towards an Indigenous sea change: Developing meaningful heritage research partnerships with Indigenous communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:05–11:20</td>
<td>Sentient seascapes: Towards a cultural heritage of Indigenous spiritual relationships with the sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ian J. McNiven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20–11:35</td>
<td>The indigenous cultural landscape of the Dampier Archipelago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingrid Ward, R. Critchley, J. Bourget, M. O’Leary and Piers Larcombe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35–11:50</td>
<td>Continuity is sustainability: A theoretical perspective on inclusion of Indigenous practices into formal laws concerning the safeguarding of underwater cultural heritage. A case study in Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abhirada (Pook) Komoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:50–12:40</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session 2**  
**Topics:** Ratification of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and States’ Positions in that Regard  
**Chairs:** Ulrike Guérin • Graeme Henderson • Lyndel Prott

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:40–12:55</td>
<td>The UNESCO 2001 Convention—content, impact, organs and State adhesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ulrike Guérin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:55–13:10</td>
<td>The legal content of the 2001 Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mariano J. Aznar-Gómez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:10–13:25</td>
<td>The legal impact, potentials and importance of the 2001 Convention for Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Forrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martijn Manders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Yorke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:55–14:10</td>
<td>On the influence of China’s Ratification of the 2001 Convention on UCH conservation in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jing Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10–14:40</td>
<td>Afternoon tea break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session 3**  
**Topics:** The Archaeology of Aircraft as Underwater Cultural Heritage  
**Chairs:** Silvano Jung • Danielle Wilkinson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:40–14:55</td>
<td>&quot;Oceans to fly”: An introduction to underwater aircraft archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Wilkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session/Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:55–15:10</td>
<td>What's next? A paradigm for the future research and management of northern Australia's aircraft wreck legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:10–15:25</td>
<td>Ex-planeing aviation archaeology in Victoria: A management perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:25–15:40</td>
<td>Immersion into history: Abandoned WWII airfields and aviation sites in the Pacific—Chuuk Lagoon (the ‘Gibraltar of the Pacific’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session 4 In situ Preservation and Conservation of Cultural Heritage**  
*Chairs: Vicki Richards • Debra Shefi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session/Topic</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:40–16:00</td>
<td>Development of tools and techniques to survey, assess, stabilise, monitor and preserve underwater Archaeological Sites: SASMAP, a European research project</td>
<td>Martijn Manders, David Gregory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00–16:15</td>
<td>In situ preservation: A strategy on underwater cultural heritage management in Indonesia?</td>
<td>Agni Sesaria Mochtar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15–16:30</td>
<td>The Australian Historic Shipwreck Protection Project—reburial of the Clarence (1850) and James Matthews (1841) shipwreck sites</td>
<td>Vicki Richards, Ian MacLeod and Peter Veth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30–16:45</td>
<td>The Carpark Whalers of Bunbury—extent of preservation and in situ protection</td>
<td>Jon Carpenter and Vicki Richards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evening events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session/Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18:00–19:00| Public lecture  
*Byzantine shipwrecks discovered along the southwestern coast of Turkey* |

**Saturday 5th October**

**Session 5 Australia’s Overseas Underwater Cultural Heritage**  
*Chairs: Andrew Viduka*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session/Topic</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00–08:30</td>
<td>Conference registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 08:30–09:30| **Keynote address**  
HMA submarine AE2 | Tim Smith                                                                   |
| 09:30–09:50| Australian shipwrecks in New Zealand                                         | Andy Dodd                                                                   |
| 09:50–10:10| SS Papanui—the wreck and the island                                           | Adam Wolfe                                                                  |
| 10:10–10:30| Australia’s overseas sovereign shipwrecks and POW transports                 | Andrew Viduka                                                               |
| 10:30–11:00| Morning tea break                                                           |                                                                              |

**Session 6 General Session**  
*Chairs: Jennifer Rodrigues*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session/Topic</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00–11:15</td>
<td>In situ preservation and exhibition in a virtual environment: An initiative to archaeologically document HMS Protector with structured-light scanning technology</td>
<td>James Hunter, Emily Jateff, Anton van den Hengel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15–11:30</td>
<td>The Australian Historic Shipwreck Preservation Project BiblioBoard anthology: An innovative digital curatorial project for presentation of archaeological in situ preservation and research projects</td>
<td>Cassandra Phillipou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30–11:45</td>
<td>In situ preservation of underwater cultural heritage: Context versus management</td>
<td>Debra Shefi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45–12:00</td>
<td>The potential for maritime archaeology at missions to reveal the role of Indigenous people in Australia's maritime activities: An overview from a South Australian perspective</td>
<td>Madeline Fowler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00–13:15</td>
<td>Lunch break • Poster judging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7</td>
<td>Commercial Exploitation of UCH—Issues, Consequences and Options for Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair: Patrick O’Keefe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:15–13:35</td>
<td>Commercial exploitation of underwater cultural heritage—issues, consequences and options for control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Yorke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:35–13:55</td>
<td>Shipwrecks as stock for particle physics experiments: New uses of the underwater cultural heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Perez-Alvaroi and Fernando Gonzalez-Zalba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:55–14:15</td>
<td>Commercial exploitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick O’Keefe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Session 8 | The Edge of the Ocean |
| Chairs: Michael Ross • Rupert Gerritsen |
| 14:20–14:40 | Preliminary investigation into the provenance identification of 17th to 19th century Spanish coins recovered from Western Australian shipwrecks using Laser Ablation-Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry (LA-ICP-MS) |
| R. John Watling, Liesel Gentelli, Susan Lawrence, Jeremy Green |
| 14:40–15:00 | Tasman's abandoned anchor flukes |
| Grahame Anderson |
| 15:00–15:30 | Afternoon tea break |

| Session 9 | Capacity Building in UCH—Training Needs, Goals and Realities |
| Chairs: Martijn Manders • Hans Van Tilburg |
| 15:30–15:50 | Capacity building in underwater heritage management. Setting standards with the UNESCO Foundation Course, Chanthaburi, Thailand |
| Martijn Manders and Christopher Underwood |
| 15:50–16:10 | Underwater cultural heritage management in Kenya: Realities and capacity needs in the management of underwater cultural heritage in Kenya |
| Caesar Bita |
| 16:10–16:30 | Developing underwater cultural heritage tourism in Sri Lanka: With special reference to the Underwater Cultural Heritage Tourism Project (UCHTP) of the Maritime Archaeology Unit, Galle |
| Ama Dayananda, Mahinda Karunarathna |
| 16:30–16:50 | Intangible heritage as a tool for underwater heritage conservation: An interdisciplinary approach to increase capacity for sustainable heritage safeguarding |
| Montakarn Suvanatap |
| 16:50–17:10 | Capacity building in underwater cultural heritage—training needs, goals and realities |
| Elia Nakoro |
| 17:10–17:30 | It’s only the world’s largest ocean—building capacity in the Pacific Islands region |
| Hans van Tilburg |

| Session 10 | Poster Session |
| Chairs: Grant Luckman • Madeleine McAllister • Nicolas Bigourdan |
| Poster 1 | Investment for the future: The maritime archaeological explorations at a post-war area, along the east coast of Sri Lanka |
| W. M. Chandrartne |
| Poster 2 | Capacity building and forming strong relationship with a coastal community |
| K. D. Palitha Weerasingha |
| Poster 3 | Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 1/8 — Western Australia |
| Poster 4 | Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 2/8 — Northern Territory |
| Poster 5 | Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 3/8 — South Australia |
| Poster 6 | Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 4/8 — Queensland and Norfolk Island Territory |
| Poster 7 | Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 5/8 — New South Wales & Australian Capital Territory |
| Poster 8 | Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 6/8 — Victoria |
| Poster 9 | Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 7/8 — Tasmania & Australian Antarctic Territory  
| Poster 10 | Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 8/8 — New Zealand  
| Poster 11 | Project Nord: Survey and protection of a marine heritage site—the 1926–1932 Norwegian Whalers’ Base, Rakiura/Stewart Island  
Matthew Schmidt, Andy Dodd, Matthew Carter, David Dudfield, Jim Watt |
| Poster 12 | Reassessment of the South East Asian shipwreck resources of the Western Australian Museum collection: Scientific analysis on lead ingots from the Ko Shi Chang and Pattya shipwrecks  
Jennifer Rodrigues, R. John Watling, Masako Marui, Jun Kimura, Anna Bradley |
| Poster 13 | A medical study of health and hygiene on board the Swan River Colony’s private merchant vessels of the 19th century  
Rebecca Ryan |

Evening events

18:00–19:00 | AIMA Annual General Meeting  
Theatrette 2.02, Sir Roland Wilson Building |

19:30–23:30 | Conference dinner  
*Tazé Mediterranean Cuisine*, Shop 4/21 Genge Street, Canberra City, ACT 2601 |
KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Treasure hunters, sunken state vessels and the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage

Mariano J. Aznar-Gómez
Professor of Public International Law, Universitat Jaume I, Castellón, Spain
maznar@uji.es

Two sets of quite related judicial decisions in the US, regarding in rem actions directed at several Spanish State shipwrecks, have completed a new legal framework that must be kept in mind not only for treasure-hunter companies and any other persons trying to gain any right over the wrecks of sunken State vessels, but also for States trying to seek a clear interpretation of the legal status of those vessels in current international law. These decisions might complete the new legal layout given by the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage, in particular giving full meaning to the ‘without prejudice’ clause included in its Art. 2(8) relating to sovereign immunities and State vessels; they might also ease future ratification of that Convention by reluctant States like the United Kingdom, France or the United States.

SESSION 1

Australia’s Indigenous underwater cultural heritage
Chairs: Daina Fletcher
Australian National Maritime Museum, Sydney
dfletcher@anmm.gov.au

Papers were encouraged on inquiries made, and work which has been done, in the field of Indigenous maritime archaeology in Australia. These include investigating methodological, practical and theoretical frameworks for understanding the underwater cultural heritage of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in salt and freshwater environments. It covers occupation, spiritual and resource sites including seascapes, and how archaeological method and analysis have been informed by cross-cultural and multi-disciplinary perspectives. It could also cover the changing scope of what constitutes Indigenous underwater cultural heritage under UNESCO conventions. What are the issues and challenges facing the field today?

Towards an Indigenous Sea Change: Developing Meaningful Heritage Research Partnerships with Indigenous Communities
D. Johnston
Director, Aboriginal Archaeologists Australia/Chair, Australian Indigenous Archaeologists Association
davej@iimetro.com.au

In this paper, Indigenous Archaeologist Dave Johnston presents his aspirations for an Indigenous Marine Archaeological Discipline. Having worked with many Indigenous coastal Traditional Owner groups around Australia and in the development of Australian and International archaeological codes of ethics, Indigenous consultation guidelines and research ethics guidelines, the author will present his views on how meaningful heritage research partnerships with Indigenous communities can be achieved and his views on the scope of research that could evolve with such exciting partnerships.
Sentient seascapes: Towards a cultural heritage of Indigenous spiritual relationships with the sea
Ian J. McNiven
Professor of Indigenous Archaeology, School of Geography and Environmental Science, Monash University, Melbourne
ian.McNiven@monash.edu

Seascapes are much more than vistas of the sea. For Indigenous Australians, especially maritime peoples of northern Australia and Torres Strait, the sea is a sentient realm of spiritual forces and entities central to identity. Engagements with the sea for subsistence are underwritten by ritual practices that facilitate social relationships with these spiritual forces and entities of the living and the dead. The sea is also inscribed in tangible and intangible ways that require curatorship and protection in material and non-material ways. Such curatorship lays the foundations for engagements with discourses of cultural heritage. This paper explores what a cultural heritage of Indigenous seascapes may look like. My approach is informed by nearly two decades of researching Torres Strait Islander ritual orchestration of seascapes.

The Indigenous cultural landscape of the Dampier Archipelago
I. Ward*, R. Critchley, J. Bourget, M. O’Leary, Piers Larcombe
*Assistant Professor (Research), Eureka Archaeological Research and Consulting, The University of Western Australia, Perth
ingrid.ward@uwa.edu.au

Extensive discussions with representatives from the Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation (MAC) regarding the submerged landscape of the Dampier Archipelago have revealed a mutual desire to document traditional knowledge of this landscape and to link, through modern technology, the unknown architecture of the now drowned continental shelf. At the heart of the project is the opportunity for knowledge exchange and training between a scientific understanding and traditional knowledge of this marine cultural landscape.

This multi-disciplinary project aims to resolve the changing configurations of the post-glacial shoreline environment that was once exploited by past inhabitants, and which may be linked with onshore and offshore archaeological and ethnohistorical records. Extensive marine datasets acquired by the industry for offshore development will be used along with new geophysical survey data to develop a 3D palaeoenvironmental reconstruction of the submerged landscapes of the Dampier Archipelago. Innovative dating of palaeoshoreline sequences will be applied to provide age control for the palaeoenvironmental reconstruction.

This scientific data may be compared with traditional narratives of landscape change and coastal land use through major phases of climate and sea-level change, contributing to an ‘indigenous science’ that can be productively engaged as part of cultural land management. Although focused on the rich-archaeological landscape of the Dampier Archipelago, this research is ground-breaking in its approach and may potentially be applied to other parts of the continental shelf at risk from existing and future development.

Continuity is sustainability: A theoretical perspective on inclusion of Indigenous practices into formal laws concerning the safeguarding of underwater cultural heritage. A case study in Indonesia
Abhirada (Pook) Komoot
Lecturer in Cultural Resource Management, Silpakorn University, Thailand
abhirada.k@gmail.com

Australia is an island continent with a great cultural diversity. Long before Europeans settled in the area, Indigenous communities occupied the land. The Indigenous peoples’ cultural heritage normally comprises two elements: natural features and traces of human occupation. However, both of these also contain sacred significance that cannot be assessed through scientific enquiry.

This became an issue when non-Indigenous communities wanted to assign values to this heritage on the basis of scientific knowledge or aesthetic consideration. The European viewpoints that often appear in heritage laws have frequently put Indigenous ways of living to the backstage.

Therefore, in this paper, the aim is to suggest ways to incorporate Indigenous practices into heritage laws and the legal system from a theoretical perspective. A case study of shipwreck protection by indigenous practices in Bali (Indonesia) will illustrate this point. It is believed that this preliminary research and the appraisal of the Bali case-study can put forward a useful background for the efficient and inclusive management of indigenous maritime heritage in Australia. As a result, it is expected that tangible and intangible legacies can be successfully guarded.

Serving contemporary uses, the sites can, moreover, achieve the goal of sustainable development involving local communities.
SESSION 2

Ratification of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and States’ positions in that regard

Chair: Ulrike Guérin
Secretariat of the 2001 Convention, UNESCO Paris
u.guerin@unesco.org
Graeme Henderson
Research Associate, Western Australian Museum
gjk@iinet.net.au

Lyndel Prott
Honorary Professor, University of Queensland
lvprott@bigpond.com

This session shall serve to illustrate the legal content and practical impact of the UNESCO 2001 Convention. It shall also demonstrate what the positions of States are in regard of this treaty as well as which chances the Convention opens in terms of legal protection, State cooperation and the cohesion of the discipline of underwater archaeology on an international level. The free exchange on the cooperation of the community of underwater archaeologists with UNESCO is encouraged as well as questions on the operational work that has been done or should be done in the region.

The UNESCO 2001 Convention—content, impact, organs and State adhesion

Ulrike Guérin
Secretariat of the 2001 Convention, UNESCO Paris
u.guerin@unesco.org

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is a specialized agency of the United Nations (UN). It has 195 Member States and contributes to preserving cultural heritage. This also encompasses the world’s underwater cultural heritage.

UNESCO’s Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage was adopted by the UNESCO General Conference in 2001. It is the international community’s response to the destruction of submerged archaeological sites by treasure hunters and industrial activities. It reflects the growing recognition of the need to ensure the same protection to underwater heritage as that already accorded to land-based heritage. It provides legal protection, enables States Parties to adopt common approaches to preservation, and provides effective professional guidelines on how to deal with and research underwater heritage.

The paper will present the content, impact, and organs of the Convention as well as issues of State adhesion to the Convention.

The legal content of the 2001 Convention

Mariano J. Aznar-Gómez
Professor of Public International Law, University Jaume I, Castellon, Spain
maznar@uji.es

The 2001 UNESCO Convention offers a new legal canvas in the protection of UCH. It tries to fill the gaps left by the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, addressing further (and new) problems envisaging UCH worldwide. It will be discussed as four main issues of the Convention, namely (1) a mechanism of cooperation, (2) a scientific effort, (3) a neutral legal instrument, and (4) a departure point for future protection. The ongoing process of ratification may enhance this new legal regime, particularly once ‘focal States’ (like Australia) ratify the Convention and other States of the region subsequently ratify.

The legal impact, potentials and importance of the 2001 Convention for Australia

Craig Forrest
Associate Professor, TC Beirne School of Law, University of Queensland
c.forrest@law.uq.edu.au

The 2001 Convention is important to Australia for a number of reasons. It will, for example, provide a basis for better protection and management for objects and sites found in a larger geographical area. It also has the potential to facilitate co-operation in the protection and management of underwater cultural heritage and the enhancement of the Convention’s protective regime though supporting ratification of State with which Australia might co-operate, particularly in the Asia-pacific region. The legal impact of ratification will not only require Australian legislation to
evolve to meet the standards of the Convention, but so too will those of the co-operating States, bringing unification to the law across national jurisdiction that protect underwater cultural heritage.

The Netherlands, towards ratification of the UNESCO 2001 Convention: Legal issues
Martijn Manders
Dutch Cultural Heritage Agency, The Netherlands
M.Manders@cultureelerfgoed.nl

The Netherlands are studying further steps for ratification of the UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and the implications it will have on its own legislation and policy. Coming originally from a state that abstained during the voting for the convention in 2001, it has been a long process to come as far as it is now in the process. But where do we stand at the moment? What legal issues have to be solved? And as important: can they be solved? The paper will describe the legal process and the issues that have to be solved.

Ratification of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and States’ positions in that regard
Robert Yorke
Chair, Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee, United Kingdom
robert.yorke@btinternet.com

The United Kingdom (UK) has not ratified the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage 2001. However, an Impact Review has recently been carried out by the UK UNESCO Convention Review Group, an independent group of specialists in maritime archaeology and law, with the purpose of determining how compliant the UK already is with the Convention and what further measures would be required to make it fully compliant. The report includes:

1. A detailed clause-by-clause review to assess the broad administrative, legal and other implications of ratification and re-addresses the main reasons why the UK felt unable to endorse the Convention, and chose to abstain in the vote in 2001.
2. A consideration of the UK’s concern in respect of the question of sovereign immunity for sunken State vessels and aircraft.
3. A desk-based survey known as the Royal Navy Loss List, which quantifies the extent and location of Royal Navy vessel casualties between 1605 and 1945 to give an evidence base concerning the issue of sovereign immunity.
4. A consideration of the second key concern expressed by the UK Government, namely, the perceived requirement to protect all wreck sites in territorial waters adjacent to the UK.

The paper will discuss the findings from the Review and how they impact the UK and other maritime states that have held similar concerns. Finally, conclusions will be drawn as to whether the UK is in a better position to ratify the Convention today than it was in 2001.

On the influence of China’s ratification of the 2001 Convention on underwater cultural heritage conservation in China
Jing Wang
State Administration of Cultural Heritage Centre of Underwater Cultural Heritage, China
jing.verdandi@gmail.com

This paper focuses on the effects of ratification of the 2001 Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage by China. It first analyses national and international legislation as well as general principles, then assesses the practical experiences of State Parties and non-State Parties, while especially comparing the similarities and differences between the Convention and the current legislation and views in China. The status of preservation of underwater cultural heritage in China will be described; and the pros and cons, rights and duties, and key considerations and necessary steps for China to ratify the Convention will be analysed. Possible problems that might occur in case of non-ratification will also be considered.

As a country, which was from the earliest stages on involved in the drafting of the Convention, China’s views on the Convention were always positive, but concerns still exist of foreign affairs and maritime zones issues. However, since the ratification by Spain, Italy, France and other large countries working very actively in the field of underwater archaeology, and given the positive attitude of Australia concerning ratification, China should now rethink its opinion and consider becoming party to the Convention. Ratification of the Convention can improve the ethics, conceptual
approach, techniques, management, and overall establishment of the discipline of underwater archaeology in China. It will also provide an improved and internationally recognized working system and mechanism for underwater archaeology for China, since for now cultural heritage protection and research is a relatively un-emphasised field in the country, despite its rapid development in recent years.

China has to review its national legislation for the ratification of the 2001 Convention and with it, key issues such as jurisdiction and enforcement, mapping of heritage and the establishment of an inventory and database, as well as the streamlining of administrative measures.

### SESSION 3

#### The archaeology of aircraft as underwater cultural heritage

**Chairs:** Silvano Jung  
Archaeological Consultant  
Ellengowan Enterprises, Darwin  
silvano.jung@gmail.com  
Danielle Wilkinson  
Maritime Archaeologist/Consultant  
Cosmos Archaeology Pty Ltd, New South Wales  
daniellewilkinson11@gmail.com

Aviation heritage sites including crashed aircrafts of World War I and II, air bases and other support structures, represent a significant body of heritage that is poorly understood despite their enormous heritage value. Archaeology of the recent past is just as significant as sites that are thousands of years old. The survival of any archaeological site is precious and finite. Recent media coverage of ‘excavations’ of aircraft crash sites in England and France suggest that ‘smash and grab’ methods are alive and well, as they are in Australia.

In Australia, flying boats make up the largest percentage of the type of aircraft found, with Western Australia being the only state to protect located sites. It is hoped that aviation sites elsewhere will be formally recognised for their significance by heritage managers. Certainly it is hoped the rest of the world will see the value of such sites as the archaeological manifestations of a changing life way: “These sites are now fading from personal memory to collective history, and it is important that the dramatic changes brought to the area ... during this time are not forgotten” (Garrett *et. al.* 2006: 82). From a management perspective, there is very little information available to the public who visit these aviation wrecks. Papers invited for this session hope to cover any aspect of research and/or management of aviation heritage sites located in the marine or freshwater environments including associated structures and air bases, especially considering their inclusion for heritage protection similar to that of historic wreck sites.

#### “Oceans to fly”: An Introduction to underwater aircraft archaeology

Danielle Wilkinson  
Maritime Archaeologist/Consultant, Cosmos Archaeology Pty Ltd, New South Wales  
daniellewilkinson11@gmail.com

Aircraft have been used in a number of different ways since their innovation in the early 1900s. The military potential of aircraft was thoroughly exploited in World War II, becoming pivotal in naval encounters such as the Battle of the Coral Sea. Aircraft have also been used as an efficient means of exploration which received public interest owing to pilots such as Amelia Earhart. In recent times, the largest use of aircraft is as a means of transport by civilians. Aircraft have evolved dramatically, particularly technologically, during the last century, along with a changing society. Despite this, the potential of aircraft wreck sites as an archaeological resource has only just started to be recognised and explored on an international scale.

Underwater aircraft sites have the potential to yield lost information about aircraft construction and repair, the process of wrecking or discard and about site formation processes. Aircraft sites contribute to themes such as war, technology, exploration and loss. Associated infrastructure, including airfields, runways, and hangers, also contribute towards studies of aircraft development and use. This paper provides an introduction to underwater aircraft archaeology and the potential it holds, with international and Australian examples of studies that have started to tap this previously unrecognised resource.

#### What’s next? A paradigm for the future research and management of northern Australia’s aircraft wreck legacy

Silvano Jung  
Archaeological Consultant, Ellengowan Enterprises, Darwin  
silvano.jung@gmail.com
The Pacific war in northern Australia resulted in two significant underwater aircraft wreck loci—one in Darwin, Northern Territory, and the other in Broome, Western Australia. This paper will discuss current research strategies and set the stage for the discovery of a previously unlocated wreck in Broome. Twenty-one flying boat wrecks were sunk during the first air raids at Darwin and Broome. An understanding of the patterning in the archaeological record has helped to locate these sites. For instance, the Darwin ‘Catalina’ flying boats have now been found, in situ, but the patterning of cultural site formation processes in Broome suggests that at least three more flying boats still lie there. The wrecks in Broome represent a diversity of flying boat types: Catalinas, Dorniers and Short Empire flying boats, all of which are rare aircraft. But aside from the aircraft themselves, the wrecks are a poignant reminder of the human tragedy resulting from their loss, which in Broome involved Dutch women and children. The Dutch still commemorate the air raid and yet there is no national recognition of the raids in Australia despite the air raids being described as significant national events, i.e. ‘Australia’s Pearl Harbor’ (Darwin) and ‘Western Australia’s Pearl Harbor’ (Broome). None of the wrecks from those events are listed on the Commonwealth Heritage List. A test case involving three of Darwin’s United States Navy Catalinas has been put together to assess whether aviation archaeological sites can be included on the Commonwealth Heritage List as sites of value to all Australians. If successful, it is hoped that more aviation sites will follow.

**Ex-planeing aviation archaeology in Victoria: A management perspective**

Peter Harvey  
Manager, Maritime Heritage Unit, Heritage Victoria, Melbourne  
peter.harvey@dpcd.vic.gov.au

Toni Massey  
Maritime Archaeologist, Maritime Heritage Unit, Heritage Victoria, Melbourne  
toni.massey@dpcd.vic.gov.au

At least 350 aircraft crashes are thought to have occurred in Victoria during WWII. However, there are only 36 aircraft sites listed in the Victorian Heritage Database. It would seem that aircraft sites are amongst the least studied and most poorly recorded archaeological sites in Victoria. In this presentation, we will propose some reasons for this discrepancy and offer some observations and potential direction for a more complete future study of aircraft wrecks in Victoria.

**Immersion into history: Abandoned WWII airfields and aviation sites in the Pacific—Chuuk Lagoon (the ‘Gibraltor of the Pacific’)**

Kim Browne  
Lawyer of the Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory/PhD Candidate, Faculty of Law, University of Canberra, Canberra/Lecturer in Law, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Charles Sturt University, New South Wales  
kbrowne@csu.edu.au

Chuuk (Truk) Lagoon, in Micronesia, is home to an impressive array of Second World War naval and aviation heritage. During WWII, the Japanese established their principal military naval base at Chuuk Lagoon. The occupying Japanese forces bulldozed, levelled and transformed the small island of Eten into a military airstrip and used the island as a base for fighter planes. Chuuk also served as a staging point for aircraft ferried from Japan to the South Pacific. However, in February 1944 during ‘Operation Hailstorm’, American forces attacked Chuuk Lagoon and sank over 50 Japanese ships and bombed Eten’s airfield. In addition, a large number of aircraft was lost in the lagoon during the two day Allied bombardment of Chuuk. Today, what was a former warzone of unimaginable destruction and loss of life is now a renowned location of the largest array of unsalvaged WWW artefacts and unsurpassed wreck diving in the world. However, to the local Chuukese people these foreign owned State vessels and aircraft represent a reminder of a dark and painful period in their history and are a constant reminder of colonialism. There is little incentive for locals to protect these sites from looting, theft and vandalism. This paper argues that WWII terrestrial and underwater aviation remains and relics have significant heritage value and deserve legal protection no less than historic wrecks. Chuuk Lagoon is used as a case study to frame the discussion and to illustrate the value of aviation heritage sites.
SESSION 4

**In situ preservation and conservation of cultural heritage**

**Chairs:** Vicki Richards  
Dept. of Materials Conservation  
Western Australian Museum, Fremantle  
Vicki.Richards@museum.wa.gov.au  
Debra Shefi  
Dept. of Archaeology  
Flinders University, Adelaide  
debra.shefi@flinders.edu.au

The aim of this session is to broaden discussions with respect to *in situ* stabilisation and management of terrestrial and underwater cultural heritage sites and their associated archaeological finds. Papers discussing this basic theme including the ideology of on-site preservation and conservation; legislative requirements and present directions of *in situ* preservation; assessment of site and artefact deterioration; principles for development and implementation of mitigation and conservation strategies; long-term effects of past stabilisation and conservation techniques; *in situ* monitoring of sites to determine the effectiveness of management and conservation strategies; etc. are encouraged.

**Development of tools and techniques to survey, assess, stabilise, monitor and preserve underwater archaeological sites: SASMAP, a European research project**

Martijn Manders  
Dutch Cultural Heritage Agency, The Netherlands  
M.Manders@cultureelerfgoed.nl  
David Gregory  
Senior Scientist, Conservation Dept., National Museum of Denmark, Copenhagen  
david.john.gregory@natmus.dk

SASMAP’s purpose is to develop new technologies and best practices in order to locate, assess and manage Europe’s underwater cultural heritage in a more effective way than is possible today. SASMAP will take holistic- and process-based approaches to investigate underwater environments and the archaeological sites contained therein. SASMAP will benefit the management of underwater cultural heritage in Europe and in the rest of the world by providing valuable tools to plan the preservation of offshore archaeological sites and their contents in accordance with both the Treaty of Valletta (1992), UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and research driven investigations.

The need for SASMAP is based on the results from previous and current European Union (EU) initiatives, the networks resulting from these projects and on-going research at the consortium’s institutions. Within SASMAP, a holistic approach will be taken in locating, assessing, monitoring and safeguarding underwater cultural heritage. This will involve developing and utilising tools and technologies to allow “down-scaling” from the large scale regional level, moving on to the local site level and finally to the individual components of a site. Results obtained from the down-scaling approach for the proposed study areas will show the effectiveness of such an approach for locating and detailed mapping of archaeological sites and their preservation potential. The end results of this approach will be used to develop a plan for assessing archaeological sites in European waters. From a management point of view this is an up-scaling approach to planning (bottom up). All information and experiences obtained during the course of the project will be utilised to enhance and develop existing legislation and best practice for mapping and preserving Europe’s underwater and coastal heritage. The project started in September 2012 and the aim of the paper is to present a brief introduction to the project.

**In situ preservation: A strategy on underwater cultural heritage management in Indonesia?**

Agni Sesaria Mochtar  
Center of Archaeological Research, Yogyakarta Office  
agnimochtar@yahoo.co.id

Indonesia is often regarded as a country with a long and glorious maritime history. Various past activities relating to maritime culture have provided a significant volume of underwater archaeological remains, much of which await discovery or more detailed study to reflect this maritime past. Unfortunately, in terms of actual practice, these research and reconstruction efforts still face many ongoing challenges. Research methods, conservation methods, artefact security, lack of human resource, and limited equipment are just some of the issues that need to be resolved. In broader terms, some strategies for managing underwater cultural heritage also need to be well planned, along with the application of certain legislative aspects to ensure that such strategies will be implemented correctly.
Accounting for the fact that Indonesian underwater cultural heritage not only has national, but also regional and even international significance, it is necessary for stakeholders to share similar points of view in the management of Indonesia’s underwater cultural heritage. This paper presents some suggestions on the implementation of in-situ preservation as one strategy for underwater cultural heritage management in Indonesia.

The Australian Historic Shipwreck Protection Project—reburial of the *Clarence* (1850) and *James Matthews* (1841) shipwreck sites

Vicki Richards  
Dept. of Materials Conservation, Western Australian Museum, Fremantle  
Vicki.Richards@museum.wa.gov.au

Ian MacLeod  
Fremantle Museums and Maritime Heritage, Western Australian Museum, Fremantle  
Ian.Macleod@museum.wa.gov.au

Peter Veth  
Archaeology, School of Social Sciences, The University of Western Australia, Perth  
Peter.Veth@uwa.edu.au

The Australian Historic Shipwreck Protection Project (AHSPP) is a national collaborative project funded by an ARC (Australian Research Council) Linkage Grant. The project commenced in February 2012 and is the largest multi-government, multi-institutional maritime archaeological project ever initiated in Australia.

The AHSPP aims to investigate and preserve in situ, the *Clarence* (1850) shipwreck located in Port Phillip Bay, Victoria. This historically significant Australian-built colonial trading vessel is subjected to continuing anchor damage by illegal anglers and is under considerable threat. One of the main aims of the project was to develop a protocol for the excavation, detailed recording and reburial of significant shipwrecks, fostering a strategic national approach for the management of underwater cultural heritage sites at risk. However, since the inception of the AHSPP, it was duly noted that to be a truly national research project the in situ preservation of other sites around Australia would ideally be included in this longitudinal study for comparative analysis. Hence, due to careful project management and savings in the first year of the project, an innovative in situ preservation strategy using road ‘crash barriers’ will be implemented on the Western Australian ex-slaver *James Matthews* (1841) under the aegis of the AHSPP.

The *James Matthews* site has been the subject of a long-term detailed in situ conservation management research programme, with more than 10 years of accumulated data on the efficacy of remediation measures. Subsequent to reburial, on-site monitoring would then proceed as per the *Clarence* site. In this way, the efficacy of two very different but innovative reburial techniques will be tested systematically, providing a comparative analysis of practical protocols for the in situ preservation and management of historic shipwrecks at risk.

The Carpark Whalers of Bunbury—extent of preservation and in situ protection

Jon Carpenter  
Dept. of Materials Conservation, Western Australian Museum, Fremantle  
jon.carpenter@museum.wa.gov.au

Vicki Richards  
Dept. of Materials Conservation, Western Australian Museum, Fremantle  
Vicki.Richards@museum.wa.gov.au

At least twelve shipwrecks are buried in the reclaimed foreshore of Koombana Bay, Bunbury, Western Australia. All pre-1900 maritime archaeological sites are protected under the *Western Australian Maritime Archaeology Act 1973* and vested in the Western Australian Museum (WAM). In 2009, the City of Bunbury (CoB) announced their intentions to redevelop the foreshore (Lots 881 and 882) and build a Visitor Centre. Discussions then ensued between the WAM and the CoB regarding the conservation, protection and long-term site management of these shipwreck sites. Through a Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies, the WAM and CoB prepared a project brief and conducted archaeological test excavations of the geophysical anomalies previously identified in these areas to determine if any were maritime archaeological sites and, therefore, protected under the state legislation. An integral part of the project was to conduct extensive on-site conservation surveys of the test excavations to determine the extent of deterioration of the exposed remains and the physico-chemical nature of the site conditions. With this information, it was possible to identify possible threats and impacts to the sites and estimate their long-term stability. This knowledge was then used to implement the most appropriate and cost-effective mitigation strategy to preserve the sites long-term.
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Byzantine Shipwrecks Discovered along the Southwestern Coast of Turkey

Maritime trade in the Aegean developed naturally as seafront island towns began trading with one another and with the mainland, quickly becoming central to the economy of the established Anatolian city states. Since the Aegean Sea connects the Mediterranean, Marmara and Black Seas, it always has had a central role in the history of maritime trade. Hundreds of safeguarded bays and natural harbours along Aegean coasts provided a favorable environment for ancient seafaring. As the population of metropolitan cities increased, meeting their basic needs required products from other settlements, and shipment of those products by sea became the preferred method, as it was the cheapest and fastest.

During this survey of the region, several shipwrecks were discovered. The shipwrecks from the Roman period show a wide distribution, with a concentration of information to be gleaned from the Central and Northern Aegean regions. The most prevalent shipwrecks found to date are those from the Byzantine period. On almost every shoreline, shipwrecks and objects from this period can be found. During the five-year survey of the Mediterranean coast of southwestern Turkey, numerous shipwrecks were discovered or re-examined, and several were recorded; most of these are dated between the 5th and 12th centuries AD. The results of this survey indicate that there often was a great economical loss associated with transporting cargo by sea in this region. The evidence also serves as an indicator for general trade routes.

Dr. Harun Özdaş is an Assistant Professor at Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Marine Science and Technology, in İzmir, Turkey. He completed his PhD at Hacettepe University, Ankara, and worked at the Bodrum Museum of Underwater Archaeology before taking up his current position. Dr Özdaş has participated in several land and underwater surveys and excavations, including the Late Bronze Age Uluburun Shipwreck Excavation with the Institute of Nautical Archaeology and the Black Sea Discoveries (Deep Black Sea) Project with the Institute of Exploration and National Geographic Society. Since 2008, he has coordinated the Shipwreck Inventory Project of Turkey, a multi-annual underwater archaeological survey and shipwreck sites inventory project.
Australia’s overseas underwater cultural heritage
Chair: Andrew Viduka
Assistant Director Maritime Heritage, Wildlife, Heritage and Marine Division, Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, Canberra
Andrew.Viduka@environment.gov.au

Australia has a rich and diverse underwater cultural heritage that is not located in our waters or administered under our legislation. This session’s aim is to highlight the geographical range and variety of our overseas underwater cultural heritage; to encourage reports on individual sites located overseas to better understand their significance; to encourage understanding of how particular sites are currently managed by Coastal States; and to seek individual thoughts on potential issues or benefits to our overseas underwater heritage should Australia ratify the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage.

HMA Submarine AE2
Tim Smith
Director of Maritime Archaeology, New South Wales Office of Environment and Heritage/AE2 Commemorative Foundation Ltd
tim.smith@heritage.nsw.gov.au

A rare but unique heritage asset of Australian origin in foreign lands is HMA Submarine AE2. Lost in combat within the inland Turkish Sea of Marmara in 1915 during the infamous Dardanelles Campaign, the heritage site is subject of intense archaeological surveys by a joint Australian-Turkish team. The underwater heritage site symbolises the ideal of co-investigation of shared heritage sites as identified in the UNESCO Convention, best practice non-disturbance management approaches, and education and learning derived through knowledge. An additional survey operation scheduled for May 2014 will further examine the complexity of the hull and associated internal relics collections through more robust internal data via 3D imaging and video analysis. This interrogation of the archaeological remains will require an elevated archaeological approvals process due to the need for interference with the site’s only access point—the conning tower hatch. A barrier defence and cathodic protection system is also being considered for the site that requires careful design, approval and implementation, together with Australia-wide education school based resource materials. This paper will examine the complexities of working on this shared heritage site of special importance to the military history of both Turkey and Australia and the complex controls of Turkish approvals processes; initiatives to generate Australian Government support; and the perennial problem of long term management and site protection legacies beyond the short-intermediate project horizon.

Australian shipwrecks in New Zealand
Andrew Dodd
Subsurface Ltd., New Zealand
andyj.dodd@gmail.com

New Zealand and Australia share a lot of common themes, and the maritime history of both countries have always been closely intertwined on account of our geographical position and shared colonial past. Trans-Tasman trade accounted for a large amount of New Zealand’s 19th-century shipping movements, so it is perhaps not surprising that a significant number of New Zealand’s historic shipwrecks were Australian built, or registered to an Australian port at the time of their loss. This paper seeks to outline the extent of the Australian connection associated with historic shipping losses in New Zealand, and to review the current state of protection for these shipwrecks with the use of case studies to highlight differences in regional variation.

SS Papanui—the wreck and the island
Adam Wolfe
Georgetown, Ascension, South Atlantic
wolfeaah@yahoo.co.uk
The wreck of the SS *Papanui* (1911) is one of many that have a significant association with Australia and lie in the waters of the South Atlantic Ocean. Others include the wrecks of William Dampier’s HMS *Roebuck* (1702), located off Ascension Island, and the potential deep-water remains of the emigrant ship *Kapunda* (1882).

The SS *Papanui* is internationally significant. Before being chartered to bring emigrants to Western Australia it was associated with the early development of the New Zealand frozen meat trade. Further, historical evidence suggests that it was most likely the last casualty on the emigrant sea trade route between the United Kingdom and Australia. Today, largely unrecognised and neglected, the wreck lies in the shallow waters of Jamestown Bay at St Helena. Decay and years of private salvage have taken their toll. Despite this, the wreck can be considered as a monument to a part of the early 20th-century history of Western Australia and has potential to be managed as a significant international cultural heritage site.

This paper re-examines the history of the *Papanui*, its loss and the fate of the wreck. More particularly the paper considers some of the challenges and opportunities faced by a remote and isolated island community striving to develop its limited economy, while protecting its important heritage assets; and issues that are germane to the debate about the management and protection of historic shipwreck sites in remote and isolated places beyond the Australian shore.

**Australia’s overseas sovereign shipwrecks and POW transports**
Andrew Viduka
Assistant Director Maritime Heritage, Wildlife, Heritage and Marine Division, Dept. of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, Canberra
Andrew.Viduka@environment.gov.au

Australia’s overseas sovereign shipwrecks and shipwrecks are an important part of our maritime heritage. This paper looks at the location of our overseas sovereign shipwrecks and POW transports, where Australian servicemen, servicewomen and sometimes civilians lost their lives. The paper also identifies other countries that may share in the story of that heritage or that might work with Australia in the future to enhance the vessels’ respectful treatment and long-term conservation.

**In situ preservation and exhibition in a virtual environment: An initiative to archaeologically document HMCS *Protector* with structured-light scanning technology**
James Hunter
Lecturer in Maritime Archaeology, Dept. of Archaeology, Flinders University, Adelaide
James.Hunter@flinders.edu.au

Emily Jateff
Curator, South Australian Maritime Museum, Port Adelaide, South Australia
ejateff@history.sa.gov.au

Anton van den Hengel
Director, Australian Centre for Visual Technologies, University of Adelaide, Adelaide
anton.vandenhengel@adelaide.edu.au

Her Majesty’s Colonial Ship (HMCS) *Protector* was one of Australia’s first purpose-built warships. It arrived in Port Adelaide in September 1884 and served in the South Australian colonial navy, Commonwealth Naval Force and Royal Australian Navy. Requisitioned by the U.S. Army during the Second World War, it collided with another vessel and was eventually installed as a breakwater at Heron Island on the Great Barrier Reef.

The South Australian Maritime Museum (SAMM) in Port Adelaide is developing a *Protector*-oriented theme within an exhibition designed to coincide with the 100th anniversary of the start of the First World War. The planned exhibit will also highlight two significant dates in *Protector*’s history: the 130th anniversary of its arrival in Port Adelaide to commence service as South Australia’s first colonial warship (1884), and the 90th anniversary of its decommissioning from Australian naval service (1924).
SAMM and its partners have developed a collaborative venture in concert with this exhibition, and are exploring ways to ‘virtually’ transport Protector to South Australia from its in situ locale in Queensland. An essential component of this research initiative is to utilise 3D visualisation technologies to present a complete and accurate record of Protector as it currently appears at Heron Island. To this end, it will employ structured-light scan data to construct digital and physical 3D models that will comprise a significant part of the Museum exhibition, answer questions about the vessel’s construction and modification, and promote its future preservation and management.

The Australian Historic Shipwreck Preservation Project BiblioBoard anthology: An innovative digital curatorial project for presentation of archaeological in situ preservation and research projects

Cassandra Philippou
Research Assistant Professor & Project Manager, Australian Historic Shipwreck Preservation Project, School of Social Sciences, University of Western Australia, Perth
Cassandra.Philippou@uwa.edu.au

Early in 2013, the Australian Historic Shipwreck Preservation Project (AHSSP) team was approached by the team at BiblioBoard to create a digital anthology of the Clarence in situ preservation project. The concept was to curate a collection of images, documents and multi-media items (including video and audio via web streaming) into an ‘anthology’ as part of BiblioBoard’s new ‘Artefact of History’ module.

The module is made up of a wide range of historical sources that are focused on historical artefacts and archaeological discoveries. BiblioBoard has an array of anthologies arranged into modules that are accessible to the public through library database subscriptions, the web and also Apps (Applications) for Apple iPad and Android tablets.

The Clarence anthology brings together much of the AHSSP website content into a curated digital collection, enabling the story of Clarence to be told through presentation of historical information, previous research expedition results and a significant proportion of images, video and interviews from the current project.

First launched in late 2011, the BiblioBoard platform and its associated BioblioBoard Creator software is in its infancy, but shows great promise for future dissemination of primary source project material. The Clarence BiblioBoard anthology allows for enriched, well-curated content to be accessible to a broader, technologically-progressing audience. It may be an appropriate platform for future presentation of archaeological sites, in particular in situ preservation projects where artefacts are returned to the seabed for conservation and with no plan for future long-term museum curation.

In situ preservation of underwater cultural heritage: Context versus management

Debra Shefi
PhD Scholar, Dept. of Archaeology, Flinders University, Adelaide
Debra.Shefi@flinders.edu.au

As recommended by both the 1996 ICOMOS Charter on the Protection and Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage, in-situ preservation is considered the ‘first option’ for managing underwater cultural heritage (UCH)—but interestingly, to date, neither international organisation has provided a definition for in-situ preservation. Shifting trends in heritage management provide juxtaposed interpretations of the ‘first option’. Some practitioners refer to in-situ in accordance with the literal translation of the Latin term—in place—thus, discouraging the removal of UCH from its original context. More recently, however, the accepted implications of in-situ preservation have shifted beyond simply deterring anthropogenic interference, to also include active intervention with the purpose of mitigating degradation and destruction from impacting environmental factors. The latter interpretation includes the relocation of artefacts and archaeological structures to an environment more conducive to site protection and stabilisation. Many researchers, thus, suggest that in-situ management should aim to re-establish the pre-exposure (in situ) environment during time of reburial, not necessarily requiring in-situ materials to remain in place. This paper will therefore discuss these in-situ discrepancies—context versus management—to determine if a re-assessment of what constitutes the first option should take place.

The potential for maritime archaeology at missions to reveal the role of Indigenous people in Australia’s maritime activities: An overview from a South Australian perspective

Madeline Fowler
Dept. of Archaeology, Flinders University, Adelaide
fowl0067@flinders.edu.au
This paper advocates for the archaeological recording of maritime material culture, including vessels and infrastructure, to reinstate Indigenous people into the lacustrine, riverine and coastal waterways of the late 19th and early 20th century Australian landscape. It suggests that missions provide an under-utilised source of data for addressing Indigenous involvement in maritime activities in the post-contact period. An overview of previous archaeological studies at South Australian missions illustrates a lack of maritime focus, while previous post-contact Indigenous maritime archaeology reveals that the maritime emphasis requires substantially more consideration. Through a discussion of four themes—construction of vessels, working on vessels, construction of infrastructure and recreational use—it uses historical information on missions in South Australia to argue for future archaeological research into this interdisciplinary Indigenous, maritime and historical subject areas. While focusing on the potential of this data type, it also stresses Indigenous participation in research through oral histories and collaborative approaches.

**SESSION 7**

**Commercial exploitation of underwater cultural heritage—issues, consequences and options for control**

Chair: Patrick O’Keefe  
Honorary Professor, University of Queensland  
ockiff@bigpond.com

The 2001 Convention bans commercial exploitation of underwater cultural heritage. What is the meaning of this? Can there be circumstances where threats from deterioration, currents, fishing and other activities make commercial exploitation the only way to protect the heritage? If that path were to be taken, there will be issues of whether the excavator should be allowed a profit and if that profit be part or all of the objects raised. Does the Convention allow the deposition of recovered material in a collection run by a body formed to commercially exploit it?

**Commercial exploitation of underwater cultural heritage—issues, consequences and options for control**

Robert Yorke  
Chair, Joint Nautical Archaeology Policy Committee, United Kingdom  
robert.yorke@btinternet.com

The UK government has a mixed record concerning the commercial exploitation of historic wreck sites with varying attitudes and actions being shown by different departments and agencies. Ten years ago the Ministry of Defence entered into what was apparently a commercial salvage contract for the exploitation of the wreck of HMS Sussex lost off Gibraltar in 1694, although to date this wreck has not been excavated. More recently the Ministry of Defence gifted the wreck of HMS Victory, the 100-gun flagship of Admiral Sir John Balchen that sank in the English Channel in 1744, to the Maritime Heritage Foundation with the proviso that any future work should be undertaken in accordance with the annex to the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. However, following correspondence in national newspapers by the Maritime Heritage Foundation and press releases by its contractors, there has been speculation that the Foundation might wish to finance the recovery of the wreck by the sale of artefacts.

This paper reviews the issues raised with the wreck of HMS Victory, the potential consequences for the management of historic wrecks in international waters, and lessons that can be learnt for the future.

**Shipwrecks as stock for particle physics experiments: New uses of the underwater cultural heritage**

Elena Perez-Alvaroi  
PhD Candidate on Underwater Cultural Heritage, Ironbridge International Institute for Cultural Heritage, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom  
exp140@bham.ac.uk

Fernando Gonzalez-Zalba  
Research Scientist, Hitachi Cambridge Laboratory, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom  
mg507@cam.ac.uk

On 14 May 2011, a 2000-year-old shipwreck’s cargo was used as a source stock for experiments in particle physics. Italy’s new neutrino detector bought 120 archaeological lead bricks from a shipwreck, constructed more than 2,000
years ago and recovered from the sea 20 years ago, from the National Archaeological Museum of Cagliari in Sardinia. This “Roman lead”—mainly found in the anchors of sunken ships—was used because of its low radioactivity; being underwater for 2,000 years reduced by approximately 100,000 times the very low original radioactivity represented by one of its radionuclides, lead-210.

This use is ethically questionable. The fact is that underwater heritage, belonging to humanity and presumably legally (or not) excavated and recovered by a museum or company, and afterwards sold or transferred for its complete destruction for experiments for the benefit of humankind, introduces an entirely new legal aspect to the treatment and protection of this heritage. The dilemma is whether there is any justification in using underwater cultural heritage for legitimate, but commercial, purposes.

New uses of the oceans and their patrimony—development and use of the underwater cultural heritage for different purposes—have recently been invoked by relevant international law of the sea actors and their instruments. It is necessary to identify gaps and suggestions in order to analyse whether, and to what extent, the existing rules can be applied or modified to adequately deal with these new values.

Commercial exploitation
Patrick O’Keefe
Honorary Professor, University of Queensland
ock@bigpond.com

Some years ago Robert Grenier said, referring to Rule 2 of the Annex on commercial exploitation: “This is the core of everything: commercial exploitation is the source of all problems”. But what is “commercial exploitation”? What is or is not covered has profound implications. Who decides if an activity is “commercial exploitation”? When can such a decision be made? For example, does the excavator have to actually offer an object for sale before Rule 2 can operate? Rule 2 refers to incompatibility with the protection and proper management of underwater cultural heritage. Does this relate back to Articles 14 to 18 dealing with the enforcement provisions of the Convention? If the Convention can be read this way then, indeed, Rule 2 is one of its most important provisions.

The edge of the ocean

Chairs: Michael Ross
Independent Researcher
michael.ross.1401@gmail.com

Rupert Gerritsen
Chair, Australia on the Map Division of the Australasian Hydrographic Society/Petherick
Researcher of the National Library of Australia
rupertgerritsen@ozemail.com.au

There is a period prior to British colonisation when European and non-European voyagers encountered the coasts and peoples of Australia and New Zealand. Some of these were voyages of exploration and charting, some accidental encounters, others purposeful engagements. A proportion ended disastrously in shipwrecks, mutiny and the marooning of survivors including conflicts with Indigenous Australians and Maori. Other interactions, such as between the Macassans, the Yolngu, and other Indigenous groups, were enduring and mutually beneficial. These events resulted in different types of sites formed—shipwrecks are one manifestation; shipwreck survivor campsites have also been investigated to varying degrees. Research projects are now in progress or anticipated, to identify such sites or look at pre-existing sites more intensively.

Explorers also left artefacts behind, such as the recovered Hartog plate left in 1616 and the Vlamingh plate in 1697. Two bottles, deposited in 1772 and believed possibly to have contained French documents claiming possession of Australia, were recovered on Dirk Hartog Island in 1998. Potentially other such evidence exists. For example, de Surville left relics in New Zealand in 1769, including an anchor from the St. Jean Baptiste. Skeletal material has been recovered on Beacon Island, Western Australia, as a result of the Batavia mutiny in 1629. Potentially, there are similar sites elsewhere such as known killings of coastal Indigenous peoples or, as in New Zealand, of French explorer Marion du Fresne and 24 of his crew, in 1772. In recent years, rock art at an inland site in the Northern Territory has been dated to establish when the Macassans began coming to Australia. These, and other examples, show that the boundaries of maritime discovery, exploration and archaeology extend well beyond the edge of the ocean.
Preliminary investigation into the provenance identification of 17th to 19th century Spanish coins recovered from Western Australian shipwrecks using Laser Ablation-Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry (LA-ICP-MS)

R. John Watling  
The University of Western Australia, Centre for Forensic Science, Perth, Australia  
john.watling@uwa.edu.au

Liesel Gentelli  
PhD Candidate, The University of Western Australia, Centre for Forensic Science, Perth, Australia  
21286848@student.uwa.edu.au

Susan Lawrence  
Senior Lecturer, La Trobe University, Archaeology, Bundoora, Australia  
s.lawrence@latrobe.edu.au

Jeremy Green  
Head of Maritime Archaeology Department, Western Australian Museum, Fremantle, Australia  
jeremy.green@museum.wa.gov.au

Three hundred and six silver coins, or “pieces of eight”, from the collection of the Western Australian Museum were analysed using Laser Ablation-Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry (LA-ICP-MS). The coins are a selection from the shipwrecks Vergulde Draeck (1656), Zuytdorp (1712), Rapid (1811) and Correio da Azia (c. 1816), all wrecked off the coast of Western Australia. The coins represent four Spanish metropolitan mints and five Spanish American mints, and were minted between 1627 and 1816. LA-ICP-MS facilitated multi-element analysis without causing significant damage to the coins themselves. Thirty-eight elements were determined in triplicate for each coin, providing a unique elemental “fingerprint” for each coin. Data were interpreted using linear discriminant analysis (LDA), principal component analysis (PCA) and an in-house ranking algorithm which allowed the coins to be sorted into identifiable subgroups based on their trace and minor elemental composition. Chemical signatures, unique to their mint of origin and the sovereign under whom they were minted were identified in each coin. Differing ratios of elements within coins also reflects known debasements of currency in Spanish history. The search/match procedure has also provided preliminary identification of visually unidentifiable coins.

Tasman’s abandoned anchor flukes

Grahame Anderson  
Independent researcher and author  
ampersand1647@gmail.com

On departure from Tasmania in 1642, an anchor used by one of Tasman’s ships arrived at the surface minus the wrought iron flukes previously attached to the lower end of its central shank. Their abandonment is noted in the records of the voyage. While examining them in a copy of the ship’s journal, I realised that the accuracy of the illustrations would enable me to identify their anchorage locations in New Zealand and Tasmanian waters.

In 1994, with the assistance of GPS, a proton magnetometer, a motor-yacht and experienced Tasmanian divers, I established the approximate location of the anchor. I went out again in 1997, but on this occasion, equipment failure and strong winds prevented recovery of the flukes. Similar problems prevented their recovery in early 2005, when Australians Ian Moffat, Stirling Smith and Brad Williams worked with myself and local divers to re-survey an area close to where previous expeditions had indicated magnetic anomalies. But days of extreme weather conditions—gale force southerlies and ice-cold temperatures—made it impossible to keep the dive boat sufficiently steady for diving. The anchor was not located on this occasion, but the team recorded naturally occurring magnetic fields in the area, which added additional data to the project.

Two months later, with two Royal Australian Navy mine hunter ships, I went out to the anchorage again, this time accompanied by Dutch documentary makers, but after two days and nights at sea, urgent instructions from Navy headquarters in Canberra required us to leave the site for public relations reasons. On the way back to Hobart, having again failed to recover the artefacts, the Navy put ashore at Port Arthur, leaving Tasman’s 17th-century anchor flukes still on the seabed off North Bay.
SESSION 9

Capacity building in underwater cultural heritage—training needs, goals and realities

Chairs: Martijn Manders
Cultural Heritage Agency, The Netherlands
M.Manders@cultureelerfgoed.nl

Hans van Tilburg
Maritime Heritage Coordinator/Unit Diving
Supervisor, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, USA
hans.vantilburg@noaa.gov

Underwater archaeology is still executed by a fairly small community of professional archaeologists, a group unequal to meet the larger challenges of cultural resource management and preservation. With the UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and its Annex in place, however, there is a clear need for more archaeologists and cultural heritage managers with knowledge in underwater archaeology to execute these responsibilities. Only then can they fulfill these needs.

What are the current tools and practices for increasing capacity in UCH management? Are there new initiatives? Is there a balance to be achieved between resource management needs and the amount of people trained? Are there any plans to train other stakeholders that also have their place in the management of UCH, such as law enforcement bodies or avocational divers? Is there a level of standardization or minimal requirements for this training? Papers for this session aim to address one or more of these issues and will—together with the other papers—form the basis for discussion about the needs, goals and realities of capacity-building in underwater cultural heritage management and underwater archaeology.

Capacity building in underwater cultural Heritage management: Setting standards with the UNESCO Foundation Course, Chanthaburi, Thailand

Martijn Manders
UNESCO Trainer, The Netherlands
m.manders@cultureelerfgoed.nl

Christopher Underwood
UNESCO Trainer, Argentina
cju@hotmail.co.uk

Between 2009 and 2011, a venue had been established in Chanthaburi, Thailand, for capacity building in UCH management. This Regional Field Training Centre on UCH was established under the UNESCO regional capacity building programme entitled ‘Safeguarding the UCH in Asia and the Pacific’. This Centre has hosted a fieldschool for training in underwater archaeology and management. The fieldschool’s goals were to:

- Prepare participating countries for the ratification and implementation of the UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage;
- Encourage close collaboration among participating countries and experts;
- Build regional capacity in the protection and management of UCH among participating countries;
- Professionalize maritime archaeology among those who are already involved in maritime archaeology;
- Encourage and assist participating countries in establishing their own maritime archaeology units;
- Promote a multidisciplinary approach to the protection and management of UCH;
- Provide a platform for effective networking among participating countries in the Asia-Pacific Region;
- Disseminate best practices among participating countries; and
- Sustain maritime archaeological programmes in the Asia-Pacific countries.

To fulfill these aims, the Centre provided two levels of training courses: foundation and advanced. Trainers have come from The Netherlands, Thailand, Laos, the Philippines, Australia, USA, UK and Argentina. For the project period, the following deliverables were formulated:

- A minimum of two foundation courses;
- A minimum of two advanced courses;
- Written curriculum materials for all courses;
- A possible category II centre for UCH; and
- Active networking and information sharing in the Asian-Pacific Region.

In total, more than 70 students from 17 countries have been trained in UCH Management—an enormous achievement. This paper describes the background, delivery and results of this three-year project, and hopes to provoke discussion on the Centre’s future and quality of training in the international field of UCH management.
Underwater cultural heritage management in Kenya: Realities and capacity needs
Caesar Bita
Fort Jesus Museum, Kenya
mcbita@yahoo.com

Kenya is the first sub-Saharan country to initiate an underwater archaeological expedition, thus, formally recognising the value of underwater cultural heritage. Over the years there has been a growing importance of underwater archaeology including management of underwater cultural heritage and cultural tourism in Kenya. With the immense potential of underwater heritage in Kenya, a new research and heritage management perspective was required. Underwater archaeology research and documentation, thus, becomes the way in the management and preservation of this invaluable heritage resource. Though Kenya has a large pool of archaeologists, only two have received training in underwater archaeology. This is compounded by the fact that underwater archaeology is not an established academic discipline in Kenyan universities making it expensive to train underwater archaeologists overseas. The limited number of trained UCH managers versus the larger challenges of UCH management and preservation is a major challenge. To increase capacity in UCH management, the country, through National Museums of Kenya (NMK), is organising stakeholder workshops to educate them on UCH. There is, however, a need for more such workshops to develop policies and legal tools (guided by the UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage and its Annex); train more people including the public; and collaborate with other countries more advanced in UCH management for Kenya’s effective management of such sites. These, however, may not be achieved without adequate training of more people in the field of underwater archaeology and cultural heritage management. This paper explores the realities and UCH capacity needs in the management of underwater cultural heritage in Kenya.

Developing the underwater cultural heritage tourism in Sri Lanka with special reference to the Underwater Cultural Heritage Tourism Project (UCHTP) of the Maritime Archaeology Unit, Galle
Ami Dayananda
Central Cultural Fund, Sri Lanka
Mahinda Karunarathna
Central Cultural Fund, Sri Lanka
mahindakandy222@gmail.com

Tourism is the main economic field of the post-war period in Sri Lanka and underwater cultural tourism is a developing field in this country. Presently, unregulated underwater cultural tourism programmes are conducted in Southern and other regions of Sri Lanka by local divers and diving centres. The Maritime Archaeology Unit (MAU), established in 1992, has been working on underwater archaeological research of the hidden marine heritage. MAU organised an Underwater Cultural Heritage Tourism Project (UCHTP) in 2012 to raise public awareness of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (UCH) in relation with the sustainable economic development. Transferring proper knowledge about UCH by the well-trained maritime archaeologists is the main goal of the project. The project is in collaboration with the Sri Lankan Tourism Promotion Bureau (SLTPB), which is one of the authorities of the tourism field in Sri Lanka. The project uses the expertise of the MAU and the material resources of SLTPB. MAU has trained young graduates with a specific degree in archaeology for the project in the skills of diving and in conducting research in underwater archaeology. MAU and SLTPB launched the first underwater cultural tourism programme on 29 March 2013 as a pilot project. MAU now plans to develop the human resource aspect with greater diving capabilities, literacy of foreign languages, proper tourism hospitality and knowledge on underwater cultural heritage to be used within the underwater cultural tourism project. MAU also carried out a training programme on cultural heritage with the nonprofit organisation archaeology.lk, and used media interviews, newspaper articles, official websites, and newsletters for publicizing underwater cultural heritage projects.

Intangible heritage as a tool for underwater heritage conservation: An interdisciplinary approach to increase capacity for sustainable heritage safeguarding
Montakarn Suvanatap
UNESCO Bangkok
montie.suvanatap@gmail.com

This paper presents the possibilities and advantages of incorporating field studies on intangible cultural heritage (ICH) and community-based inventorying of indigenous cultural practices in the management and conservation of underwater heritage and the implementation of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage (2001). The ICH discipline can be a tool for better capacity-building among UCH managers and can lead to
a knowledge pool that involves more people and gives greater meanings to underwater sites.

The paper critically investigates research and field projects related to the promotion of traditional knowledge of seafaring communities in relation to the conservation of their cultural heritage sites. Although most of these undertakings geographically focus on Pacific sub-region, there are indeed good cases in other sub-regions of Asia, Europe, Caribbean, America, or even in landlocked countries with ancient waterways. These successful examples imply that intangible heritage perspective can provide more profound interpretations of value and integrity of tangible heritage, including maritime sites.

Despite that, there have been very few works directly addressing intangible heritage among UCH professionals. Main projects on underwater heritage protection today are still archaeology-heavy and technology-heavy, as the main concern has been to keep pace with looters, environmental change and industrial threats. Managerial professionals have overlooked that understanding the existing community’s way of life can gain for them stronger support and channels for conservation against exploitation.

It is time that underwater heritage professionals explore more seriously cross-disciplinary efforts to upscale safeguarding capacity by involving bigger and grass-root communities as heritage stakeholders.

Capacity building in underwater cultural heritage—training needs, goals and realities
Elia Nakoro
Researcher, Fiji Museum, Fiji
rocksfel@yahoo.com.au

The Fiji Museum is mandated under legislation to preserve Fiji’s tangible cultural materials for future generations. Although not specifically outlined in the legislation, however, the general clause covers any objects that are of archaeological, anthropological, ethnological, prehistoric or historical interest. As such, the Fiji Museum has collated information and constructed a shipwreck database of all known ships that have sunk in Fijian waters.

The institution is a statutory body of the Fijian government and is dependent on the diminutive government grant that is only adequate to cover staff salary. Thus, it is capable of huge improvements and its endeavors are limited and hindered by a lack of financial support. This is further aggravated by the frequent change in Government as grants received vary, often dwindling.

Fiji comprises more than 300 islands of which approximately 106 are inhabited. Enclosed with a total sea area of about 1,260,000km2 of its Exclusive Economic Zone, the History Archaeology Department of the Fiji Museum has already identified resource materials documenting more than 500 shipwrecks, a great number of which wrecked less than 50 years ago.

Fiji has so far ratified two UNESCO Conventions on culture and heritage and is currently preparing to ratify the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. Administering the need to preserve all cultural and heritage aspects of Fiji, the Department of National Heritage, Culture and Arts (DNCHA) is also aware of the importance of underwater cultural heritage and soon will be preparing the platform for the ratification of the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. Prior to the ratification efforts, works also are underway to identify areas that need to be strengthened in the current legislation on the preservation of cultural heritage and capacity building.

It’s only the world’s largest ocean—building capacity in the Pacific Islands region
Hans van Tilburg
Maritime Heritage Programme Coordinator for Pacific Islands Region/Unit Diving Supervisor, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, USA
hans.vantilburg@noaa.gov

In 2002, the United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA) Office of National Marine Sanctuaries launched its Maritime Heritage Program, designed to support maritime heritage discovery and preservation across its 14 marine sanctuary sites. Efforts in the Pacific build upon a decade of maritime archaeology field courses conducted by the University of Hawaii’s Marine Option Programme. Majority of projects focus on the Hawaiian archipelago and American Samoa, and significant discoveries has been made regarding historic Pacific whaling vessels, plantation-era steamships, and World War II aircraft and amphibious craft. NOAA’s maritime heritage efforts go beyond site assessments and research, so the related themes of training and information sharing, as well as engaging the public in support of preservation management, are very high priority topics. NOAA continues to lead collaborative field training courses in maritime archaeology surveying techniques (MAST class) with the University
of Hawaii. NOAA's archaeologists also teach Nautical Archaeology Society (NAS) introductory and part one courses to sport divers and dive shop owners, thus, bringing citizen "scientists" into the fold. Responsible heritage tourism, in the form of shipwreck heritage trails, is being discussed for the islands. In addition to this, NOAA supports a local three-day maritime heritage symposium in Hawaii (now in its 25th year), and is assisting in organising the second Asia Pacific Regional Conference on Underwater Cultural Heritage, to be held in Honolulu from 12 to 16 May, 2014.

Posters may cover any aspect of maritime archaeological research in Australian waters, however, posters about shipwrecks of significance to Australia, which are located overseas, are especially encouraged.

**Poster 1**

*Investment for the future: The maritime archaeological explorations at a post-war area, along the east coast of Sri Lanka*

W. M. Chandrartne  
Central Cultural Fund, Sri Lanka  
chandraratne7@yahoo.com

The Maritime Archaeology Unit (MAU) of Central Cultural Fund (CCF) has been actively involved in protecting the UCH of Sri Lanka since it was founded in 1992. During the last few years, essential steps have been taken to develop the infrastructure and the human resources of the Unit. Six archaeology graduates who received special training under the MAU were recruited in 2011. These new recruits went through a series of training such as swimming, snorkeling, lifesaving, first aid and basic diving. They were also introduced to the fundamentals of underwater archaeology and were encouraged to start their postgraduate studies and to gain their international diving license.

After a year of training they were directed to carry out an underwater archaeological investigation along the East coast of Sri Lanka from 13 June to 26 August, 2012. The exploration was scheduled in a favorable window to test their skills and training. The trainees were under the supervision of four senior maritime archaeologists. The northern and eastern areas of the country were freed after thirty years of terrorism in 2009. Consequently, more than two years were needed to secure the area from post-war hazards such as land mines. For the whole MAU team this was a new experience and an opportunity to search this area after a long period of inaccessibility. The team uncovered over 15 wrecks and four other underwater archaeological sites in the region.

**Poster 2**

*Capacity building and forming strong relationship with a coastal community*

K. D. Palitha Weerasingha  
Department of Archaeology, Sri Lanka  
palithamarc@gmail.com

Human presence in Sri Lanka dates back to some 150,000 years. The number of shipwrecks around the island is conservatively estimated at two hundred. As an island nation, situated at the cross road of the Silk Route of the Sea, Sri Lanka had maritime links with many seafaring nations, absorbed maritime traditions from all, preserved them and had a history of seafaring.

There are sufficient and powerful legal mechanisms to protect archaeological sites in the sea around Sri Lanka. These are afforded protection by the Antiquities Ordinance No.9 of 1940 and Antiquities (Amendment) Act No24 of 1998.
The general public is often the most helpful group for the protection of underwater cultural heritage sites. Forming a good relationship with the public is important both for information gathering and for the protection of archaeological sites. As a result of good relationships with stakeholders, the institution was handed over 25 objects recovered from the western coastal belt of Sri Lanka. These objects are dated from first century AD to the 19th century. They include significant objects such as a Buddha statue, a stone bench and a bronze Dutch cannon. These reflect local traditions and artistic styles and eastern and western relationships. Through these objects given by the public the unit was able to identify some shipwrecks in this area.

Therefore, a rich underwater heritage exists in Sri Lanka, making the pursuit of maritime archaeology an attractive and exciting prospect in this country. However there is not enough involvement for protection of these recently identified sites on the western coast of Sri Lanka as a result of insufficient technical facilities and financial resources. However, without the good relationship with the coastal communities, it would be impossible to protect sites at all.

Poster 3

Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 1/8, Western Australia
Kurt Bennett, Lauren Davison, Celeste Jordan, Chelsea Colwell-Pasch, Josh Russ, Jeff Schaeffer, Vanessa Sullivan, Andrew Wilkinson
Maritime Archaeology Program, Flinders University, Adelaide
scha0143@flinders.edu.au

Australia and New Zealand have yet to ratify the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. In order to do so, national and state legislation pertaining to maritime cultural heritage need to be consistent with the aforementioned 2001 Convention. A series of posters titled “Changing the tides of legislation for ratification” discusses the legislative changes needed for Australia, its states and territories specifically, and New Zealand to meet the requirements for ratification. The first poster in this series of eight stipulates the required changes in the state legislation of Western Australia (WA). The data presented in this poster results from a review of literature, research into state and national legislation, the Convention itself, and correspondence with the Government of Western Australia’s State Heritage Office. This poster presents suggested legislative changes at a state level, in accordance with the 2001 Convention, which would make national ratification easier.

Poster 4

Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 2/8, Northern Territory
Kurt Bennett, Lauren Davison, Celeste Jordan, Chelsea Colwell-Pasch, Josh Russ, Jeff Schaeffer, Vanessa Sullivan, Andrew Wilkinson
Maritime Archaeology Program, Flinders University, Adelaide
sull0136@uni.flinders.edu.au

Australia and New Zealand have yet to ratify the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. In order to do so, national and state legislation pertaining to maritime cultural heritage need to be consistent with the aforementioned 2001 Convention. A series of posters titled “Changing the tides of legislation for ratification” discusses the legislative changes needed for Australia, its states and territories specifically, and New Zealand to meet the requirements for ratification. The second poster in this series of eight stipulates the required changes in the state legislation of Australia’s Northern Territory (NT). The data presented in this poster results from a review of literature, research into state and national legislation, the Convention itself, and correspondence with the Heritage Branch of Northern Territory Government's Department of Lands, Planning and the Environment. This poster presents suggested legislative changes at a state level, in accordance with the 2001 Convention, which would make national ratification easier.

Poster 5

Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 3/8, South Australia
Kurt Bennett, Lauren Davison, Celeste Jordan, Chelsea Colwell-Pasch, Josh Russ, Jeff Schaeffer, Vanessa Sullivan, Andrew Wilkinson
Maritime Archaeology Program, Flinders University, Adelaide
Andrew.wilkinson@flinders.edu.au

Australia and New Zealand have yet to ratify the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. In order to do so, national and state legislation pertaining to maritime cultural heritage need to be consistent with the aforementioned 2001 Convention. A series of posters titled “Changing the tides of legislation for ratification” discusses the legislative changes needed for Australia, its states and territories specifically, and New Zealand to meet the requirements for ratification. The third poster in this series of eight stipulates the required changes in the state legislation of South Australia (SA). The data presented in this poster results from a review of literature, research into state and national legislation, the Convention itself, and correspondence with the Government of South Australia’s Heritage Council. This poster presents suggested legislative changes at a state level, in accordance with the 2001 Convention, which would make national ratification easier.
for ratification” discusses the legislative changes needed for Australia, its states and territories specifically, and New Zealand to meet the requirements for ratification. The third poster in this series of eight stipulates the required changes in the state legislation of South Australia (SA). The data presented in this poster results from a review of literature, research into state and national legislation, the Convention itself, and correspondence with the South Australian Heritage Branch under the Department of Environment, Water, and Natural Resources. This poster presents suggested legislative changes at a state level, in accordance with the 2001 Convention, which would make national ratification easier.

Poster 6

**Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 4/8, Queensland & Norfolk Island**

Kurt Bennett, Lauren Davison, Celeste Jordan, Chelsea Colwell-Pasch, Josh Russ, Jeff Schaeffer, Vanessa Sullivan, Andrew Wilkinson

Maritime Archaeology Program, Flinders University, Adelaide
eruss2@hotmail.com

Australia and New Zealand have yet to ratify the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. In order to do so, national and state legislation pertaining to maritime cultural heritage need to be consistent with the aforementioned 2001 Convention. A series of posters titled “Changing the tides of legislation for ratification” discusses the legislative changes needed for Australia, its states and territories specifically, and New Zealand to meet the requirements for ratification. The fourth poster in this series of eight stipulates the required changes in the state legislation of Queensland (QLD) and the territory of Norfolk Island (NI). It should be noted that NI is a self-governing territory and, for this poster presentation, is placed with QLD because of geographic proximity. The data presented in this poster results from a review of literature, research into state and national legislation, the Convention itself, and correspondence with the Heritage Branch of QLD’s Department of Environment and Heritage Protection. This poster presents suggested legislative changes at a state level, in accordance with the 2001 Convention, which would make national ratification easier.

Poster 7

**Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 5/8, New South Wales & Australian Capital Territory**

Kurt Bennett, Lauren Davison, Celeste Jordan, Chelsea Colwell-Pasch, Josh Russ, Jeff Schaeffer, Vanessa Sullivan, Andrew Wilkinson

Maritime Archaeology Program, Flinders University, Adelaide
chelsea_colwell@hotmail.com

Australia and New Zealand have yet to ratify the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. In order to do so, national and state legislation pertaining to maritime cultural heritage need to be consistent with the aforementioned 2001 Convention. A series of posters titled “Changing the tides of legislation for ratification” discusses the legislative changes needed for Australia, its states and territories specifically, and New Zealand to meet the requirements for ratification. The fifth poster in this series of eight stipulates the required changes in the state legislation of New South Wales (NSW) and the Australian Capital Territory (ACT). It should be noted ACT falls under NSW’s cultural heritage legislation. The data presented in this poster results from a review of literature, research into state and national legislation, the Convention itself, and correspondence with the Heritage Branch of NSW’s Department of Environment and Heritage. This poster presents suggested legislative changes at a state level, in accordance with the 2001 Convention, which would make national ratification easier.

Poster 8

**Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 6/8, Victoria**

Kurt Bennett, Lauren Davison, Celeste Jordan, Chelsea Colwell-Pasch, Josh Russ, Jeff Schaeffer, Vanessa Sullivan, Andrew Wilkinson

Maritime Archaeology Program, Flinders University, Adelaide
celestemjordan@gmail.com

Australia and New Zealand have yet to ratify the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. In order to do so, national and state legislation pertaining to maritime cultural heritage need to be consistent with the aforementioned 2001 Convention. A series of posters titled “Changing the tides of legislation for ratification” discusses the legislative changes needed for Australia, its states and territories specifically, and New Zealand to meet the requirements for ratification. The sixth poster in this series of eight stipulates the required changes in the state legislation of Victoria (VIC). The data presented in this poster results from a review of literature,
Research into state and national legislation, the Convention itself, and correspondence with Heritage Victoria under the Department of Planning and Community Development. This poster presents suggested legislative changes at a state level, in accordance with the 2001 Convention, which would make national ratification easier.

**Poster 9**

**Changing the tides of Legislation for ratification: Poster 7/8, Tasmania & Australian Antarctic Territory**

Kurt Bennett, Lauren Davison, Celeste Jordan, Chelsea Colwell-Pasch, Josh Russ, Jeff Schaeffer, Vanessa Sullivan, Andrew Wilkinson

Maritime Archaeology Program, Flinders University, Adelaide
davi0649@flinders.edu.au

Australia and New Zealand have yet to ratify the 2001 UNESCO *Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage*. In order to do so, national and state legislation pertaining to maritime cultural heritage need to be consistent with the aforementioned 2001 Convention. A series of posters titled “Changing the tides of legislation for ratification” discusses the legislative changes needed for Australia, its states and territories specifically, and New Zealand to meet the requirements for ratification. The seventh poster in this series of eight stipulates the required changes in the state legislation of Tasmania (TAS) and the Australian Antarctic Territory (AAT). It should be noted AAT falls under Commonwealth legislation and is included with TAS due to geographic proximity. The data presented in this poster results from a review of literature, research into state and national legislation, the Convention itself, and correspondence with Heritage Tasmania under the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment. This poster presents suggested legislative changes at a state level, in accordance with the 2001 Convention, which would make national ratification easier.

**Poster 10**

**Changing the tides of legislation for ratification: Poster 8/8, New Zealand**

Kurt Bennett, Lauren Davison, Celeste Jordan, Chelsea Colwell-Pasch, Josh Russ, Jeff Schaeffer, Vanessa Sullivan, Andrew Wilkinson

Maritime Archaeology Program, Flinders University, Adelaide
kurt.t.bennett@gmail.com

Australia and New Zealand have yet to ratify the 2001 UNESCO *Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage*. In order to do so, national and state legislation pertaining to maritime cultural heritage need to be consistent with the aforementioned 2001 Convention. A series of posters titled “Changing the tides of legislation for ratification” discusses the legislative changes needed for Australia, its states and territories specifically, and New Zealand to meet the requirements for ratification. The eighth and final poster in this series stipulates the required changes in the national legislation of New Zealand. The data presented in this poster results from a review of literature, research into national legislation, the Convention itself, and correspondence with both the Heritage Services Branch under the Ministry for Culture and Heritage and the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. This poster presents suggested legislative changes at a national level, in accordance with the 2001 Convention, which would make ratification possible.

**Poster 11**

**Project Njord: Survey and protection of a marine heritage site—the 1926–32 Norwegian Whalers’ Base, Rakiura/Stewart Island, a SCHIP cultural heritage project**

Matthew Schmidt, Andy Dodd, Matthew Carter, David Dudfield, Jim Watt

New Zealand
andyj.dodd@gmail.com

A survey of the Norwegian Whalers Base in Prices Inlet, Stewart Island, New Zealand, was carried out between 7 and 12 March 2013. The project aims were to identify and report on the archaeological values of the site with the intention of preparing a case to have ‘The Base’ declared an archaeological site by the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. The Base included the remains of a slipway and a deliberately scuttled mid-nineteenth century ex-whaling vessel, the Othello. The survey included terrestrial and underwater recording of the base. This poster briefly outlines the results of that survey.
Poster 12
Reassessment of the South East Asian shipwreck resources of the Western Australian Museum collection: Scientific analysis on lead ingots from the Ko Shi Chang and Pattaya shipwrecks
Jennifer Rodrigues
Department of Maritime Archaeology, Western Australian Museum, Fremantle
Jennifer.Rodrigues@museum.wa.gov.au
R. John Watling
Professor of Forensic and Analytical Chemistry, Centre for Forensic Science, The University of Western Australia, Perth
john.watling@uwa.edu.au
Masako Marui
Sophia University, Tokyo
m-masako@hoffman.cc.sophia.ac.jp
Jun Kimura
Asia Research Centre, Murdoch University, Perth
J.Kimura@murdoch.edu.au
Anna Bradley
Ph.D. Candidate, Centre for Forensic Science, The University of Western Australia, Perth
anna.bradley@uwa.edu.au

The Western Australian Museum’s Maritime Archaeology Department was engaged in the pioneering underwater archaeological excavations on shipwrecks in Thailand in the 1970s and 1980s. Excavations of the Ko Shi Chang and Pattaya wrecks revealed important results in the study of hull construction of South China Sea ships as well as South East Asian seaborne ceramics. However, methods of scientific material analysis applicable for archaeological artefacts were not as advanced as they are today. Thus, recently, researchers from the Institute for Asian Cultures at Sophia University (Japan), Centre for Forensic Science at University of Western Australia, Murdoch University and the Western Australian Museum conducted XRF (X-ray Fluorescence) and LA-ICP-MS (Laser Ablation-Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry) analysis on lead ingots from these Thai shipwrecks. The objective was to obtain qualitative and quantitative information on the ingots including their origin. This poster presents the advancement on the study of these artefacts with consideration on applicable methodologies on the South East Asian regional study of shipwreck cargo.

Poster 13
A medical study of health and hygiene on board the Swan River Colony’s private merchant vessels of the 19th century
Rebecca Ryan
Honours Researcher, Archaeology, School of Social Sciences, The University of Western Australia, Perth
20742991@student.uwa.edu.au

This research attempts to provide insights into the medical practices on board 19th century Swan River Colony merchant ships by qualitative analysis of the archaeological artefacts. Three shipwrecks of the James Matthews (1841), Eglinton (1852) and Sepia (1898), all merchant vessels carrying passengers and cargo to the Swan River Colony, are used as case studies.

Most maritime medical practices have explored the experiences of convicts, government-assisted emigrants and their surgeons voyaging to the colonies. However, little work has been done on the private merchant vessels. Furthermore, limited research has been conducted solely on the Swan River Colony and the conditions on board vessels and, in addition, most of these works are attributed to historical studies such as Bateson (1959), Haines (2005) and Foxhall (2012), rather than archaeological investigations.

The health and medical practices of 19th century Britain are considered in this research when investigating the conditions in which passengers and crew faced on voyages to the colonies as well as the advancements of maritime medicine with the advent of long voyages. It is hoped that archaeological examination of these merchant shipwrecks will fill gaps in information about the types of ailment crew and passengers suffered from, the types of treatments prescribed, and the types of medical equipment being imported into the colony.
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In 2016, AIMA will jointly hold its annual International Maritime Archaeology Conference with IKUWA, the International Congress on Underwater Archaeology (Internationaler Kongreß für Unterwasserarchäologie) founded in 1999 in Sassnitz, on the island of Rügen on the coast of the Baltic Sea in Germany. This will be the sixth IKUWA conference and the first to be held outside of Europe.

The year 2016 marks the anniversary of a number of significant events for Australia, as well as overseas nations, not least of which is the quadricentennial of the Dutch seafarer Dirk Hartog’s landing in Australia on 25 October 1616—an important celebration for Australia and The Netherlands. Hartog set foot on what is now known as Dirk Hartog Island and marked his landing place with a pewter plate inscribed with a description of his landing. This plate and its post are the first archaeological remains from Europeans found in Australia. 2016 also marks the bicentennial of the wrecking of the Portuguese “galera” Correio da Azia, which was sailing from Lisbon to China when it was wrecked on Ningaloo Reef off Western Australia on 26 November 1816. This is an important shared heritage between Australia and Portugal. There are of course many more commemorative events to be celebrated during this important year.

The conference theme will cover a number of subject areas and the organisers would like to invite those interested to consider participating. In due course, the AIMA/IKUWA6 Australian conference organisers will put out a worldwide Call for Papers and Posters once the venue and conference dates have been confirmed and a timetable has been established.

IKUWA6 Committee
Jennifer Rodrigues
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Andy Viduka
Arianna Traviglia
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<th>No.</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University House</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>10T1</td>
<td>Chancery</td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Molly Huxley Building</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pauline Griffin Building</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>26 Balmain Crescent</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Melville Hall</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>Emeritus Faculty</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Beryl Rawson Building</td>
<td>F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1X</td>
<td>Davey Lodge</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>13A</td>
<td>Building 13A</td>
<td>F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Menzies Building</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>13B</td>
<td>Asian Studies Demountable</td>
<td>E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2X</td>
<td>Kinloch Lodge</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>13T1</td>
<td>Building 13T1</td>
<td>F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Old Administration Area</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>13T2</td>
<td>Building 13T2</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3G</td>
<td>G Block, Old Administration Area</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>A.D. Hope Building</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3H</td>
<td>H Block, Old Administration Area</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chifley Building</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3I</td>
<td>I Block, Old Administration Area</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Arts Centre</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3J</td>
<td>J Block, Old Administration Area</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>16T</td>
<td>ANU Connect Ventures</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3K</td>
<td>K Block and J Block, Old Administration Area</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Concessions &amp; Student Facilities Building</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3L</td>
<td>Cafe Pepercorn</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>University Health Service and Counselling Centre</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3T</td>
<td>Fellows Lane Cottage</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sport and Recreation Centre</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3X</td>
<td>Warrumbul Lodge</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>19A</td>
<td>Sports Union Extension</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Old Administration Area</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>University Union Building</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Boiler House</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hanna Neumann Building</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Block D, Old Administration Area</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Haydon-Alien Building</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Block E, Old Administration Area</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Haydon-Alien Lecture Theatre</td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>F Block and E Block, Old Administration Area</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Copland Building</td>
<td>F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4X</td>
<td>Lena Karmel Lodge</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Copland Lecture Theatre</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Law School, South Wing — ANUCOL</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>25A</td>
<td>Armdt Building, H W</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5X</td>
<td>121 Marcus Clarke Street</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Crisp Building</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Law School, North Wing — ANUCOL</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>26A</td>
<td>Manning Clark Centre</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Sparker Helmore Law Theatres</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>26B</td>
<td>P.A.P. Moran Building</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Law Link &amp; Law Link Lecture Theatre</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>26C</td>
<td>College of Business and Economics</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Coombs Building — Extension</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>John Dedman Mathematical Sciences Building</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>Coombs Lecture Theatre</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Constable's Cottage</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Coombs Building</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Drill Hall Gallery</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chancery Building</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Toad Hall Gallery</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A</td>
<td>Chancery Block A</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ian Ross Building</td>
<td>G4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10B</td>
<td>Human Resources Division</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Engineering Building</td>
<td>F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>Chancery Block C</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Grid</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Chemistry Building</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>33A</td>
<td>800 MHz NMR Facility</td>
<td>G4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Arthur Hambly Lecture Theatres</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Birch Building</td>
<td>G4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35A</td>
<td>Craig Building</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>RSC Lecture Theatre</td>
<td>G4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>W.E.H. Stanner Building</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Physics Building</td>
<td>F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38A</td>
<td>Physics Link Building</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>38B</td>
<td>Gravity Wave Building</td>
<td>G5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Psychology Building and Physics</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bruce Hall</td>
<td>F5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40A</td>
<td>Packard Wing (Bruce Hall)</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Peter Baume Building</td>
<td>F5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42A</td>
<td>Peter Baume Building</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Hancock Building - West Wing</td>
<td>F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Banks Building (RSB)</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>John Yencken Building</td>
<td>E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45A</td>
<td>University Maintenance</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>RN Robertson Building, Research School of Biology (RSB)</td>
<td>E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46C</td>
<td>Controlled Environment Facility</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>46E</td>
<td>R. N. Robertson Lecture Theatre</td>
<td>E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46G</td>
<td>Entrance to RSB Delivery Dock</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>46H</td>
<td>Old Growth Chambers</td>
<td>E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Department of Earth and Marine Sciences</td>
<td>E5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Fenner School of Environment and Society</td>
<td>E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48A</td>
<td>SRES Geography Building</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Burton and Garran Hall</td>
<td>E5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ursula Hall</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>50T1</td>
<td>Laurus Wing</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>John XXIII College</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Burgmann College</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Building Name</td>
<td>Grid</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Building Name</td>
<td>Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Central Store</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7 Liversidge Street</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>John Curtin School of Medical Research</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28 Balmain Crescent</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54D</td>
<td>Solvent Store</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22 Balmain Crescent</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Leonard Huxley Building</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Old Canberra House</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Nuclear Physics Building</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>73A</td>
<td>Old Canberra House Block A - Chauffeur's Cottage</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Cockcroft Building</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>73B</td>
<td>Old Canberra House Block B - Gardener's Cottage</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58A</td>
<td>Heavy Ion Accelerator Facility</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58B</td>
<td>Erich Weigold Building</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58C</td>
<td>John Carver Building</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>75A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58D</td>
<td>Cockcroft/Oliphant Link Building</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>75D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Le Couteur Building</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>75E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Oliphant Building</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>75F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Jaeger Building</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>75G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61A</td>
<td>Jaeger, Old Hospital Building A</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>75H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>M Block</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>75I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62A</td>
<td>M Block Extension</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>75T1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Centre for Research on Ageing, Health and Wellbeing and Centre for Mental Health Research - N Block</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>75T2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63A</td>
<td>N Block Extension, CMHR and CRAHW</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63T1</td>
<td>N Block Extension - Transportable building1, CRAHW</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>76A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63T2</td>
<td>N Block Extension - Transportable building2</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Gardeners Depot</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>77A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64A</td>
<td>Gardeners Cottage</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64B</td>
<td>University General Store</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>20 Balmain Crescent</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>18 Balmain Lane</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>83A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>16 Balmain Lane</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67A</td>
<td>14 Balmain Lane</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67B</td>
<td>12 Balmain Lane</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>86A</td>
<td>Tennis Court</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67C</td>
<td>1 Liverside Street</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>86A</td>
<td>Tennis Shed</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>3 Liverside Street</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>South Oval</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5 Liverside Street</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>South Pavilion</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88T1</td>
<td>Information Services</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Fellows Oval</td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Willows Oval</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>North Road Tennis Courts</td>
<td>H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Building Name</td>
<td>Grid</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Building Name</td>
<td>Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>John Curtin School of Medical Research - Stage1</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>132A</td>
<td>GJ Yeend Wing</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131A</td>
<td>John Curtin School of Medical Research - Stage2</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Wes Whitten Building (RSB)</td>
<td>E5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>JG Crawford Building</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Linnaeus Building, Research School of Biology (RSB)</td>
<td>E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Central Plant</td>
<td>E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sciences Teaching Building</td>
<td>F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Birt Building</td>
<td>F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Fenner Building</td>
<td>E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jaeger 8</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Computational Infrastructure</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>