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**Moving forward**

The group that convenes twice annually to discuss lighthouse heritage and conservation as part of ENG has recently been changed from the loosely-constituted ‘Heritage Forum’ to ENG Task Group 4, intended to integrate itself into the ENG work plan by adopting a task-based set-up.

As a result of member retirements, declining attendance figures and the aforementioned change to the group’s work setup, it seems appropriate to review the following aspects of the group’s involvement with the wider IALA framework:-

1. **Attendance:** 
   1. Minimum attendance figure for sessions; what happens if minimum not met?

Propose minimum attendance figure: 6;

If figure not met, continue work as desktop exercise (intersessional) or defer until next committee meeting.

* 1. Review presence at IALA Paris (currently twice annually with ENG sessions); alternative tech-based solutions such as tele/videoconferencing/live document sharing?

Propose alternative attendance options (if deemed necessary):

1. Make use of virtual conferencing facilities such as Skype if members cannot attend twice-yearly committee meetings
2. Make better use of file sharing systems, such as <http://www.iala-aism.org/file-sharing/>
3. …
4. …
5. …
   1. Recruitment; e.g. via Council; members propose relevant bodies to be invited on ad hoc or ongoing basis?

Propose recruitment ideas:

Suggest relevant bodies to consider inviting to TG4 on guest basis:

1. **ENG integration**
   1. The group should collectively consider its long-term involvement within ENG and within IALA; this could comprise a written list of goals for output and positioning by 2020.
      1. e.g. ‘TG4 should have a regular attendance of at least 12 members’;
      2. e.g. ‘TG4 should be working on at least [X] Tasks at any one time’

Propose long-term goals for TG4:

1. Draft and maintain a Heritage Checklist for site and/or area operators (Level 2) and managers (Level 1) as a guide to managing a historical site, which would cover minimum viable aspects of conservation (including basic inspection guidelines), physical access (i.e. health and safety, risk assessments), technological assessments (including checking optics and machinery), and cultural and educational guidelines for tourism and community use (including best practice for site interpretation, maintaining historical documentation); this can include references to existing guidelines and case studies.

This checklist could eventually integrate with the work of the IALA WWA as a resource for site/area operators and managers with limited resources and training.

1. Consider drafting criteria for minimum viable artefact and archive record catalogues, using standardised documentation elements (such as Unique ID number, name, location stored, brief description, image)
2. TG4 should be working on at least four Tasks at any one time;
3. TG4 should have a regular attendance of at least 12 members;
4. …
   1. The group should collectively consider its goals for better ENG integration;
      1. e.g. ‘TG4 should be in a position to consult regularly with other Task Groups in ENG on relevant lighthouse heritage/conservation matters’;
      2. e.g. ‘TG4 should be in a position to schedule and attract sufficient interest (80+ attendance) in workshops/seminars with global relevance’

Propose goals for better ENG integration:

1. TG4 should be in a position to consult regularly with other Task Groups in ENG on relevant lighthouse heritage/conservation matters;
2. TG4 should be in a position to schedule and attract sufficient interest (50+ attendance) in workshops/seminars with global relevance;
3. TG4’s work on the proposed Heritage Checklist should invite contributions from other ENG groups and should in turn (once complete) be useful to other groups when considering engineering on and access to historically sensitive sites;
4. …
5. …
   1. Given sufficient member commitment to working as a Task Group (with regular attendance as a presumed requirement), TG4 will prescribe a series of Tasks for approval by the Chair of Working Group 2 and/or relevant ENG personnel. The design and delivery of these Tasks and our integration in the ENG work programme are critical to the continuance of the Task Group.

Propose Tasks:

1. Review and update existing guidelines and the IALA Lighthouse Conservation Manual;
2. Commence drafting Heritage Checklist: define document scope, structure and headings for Level 1 (Level 2 to follow);
3. Commence drafting Heritage Checklist: research and draft content for Level 1 (Level 2 to follow);
4. Investigate options for hosting heritage workshop or seminar with 50+ attendees;
5. …
6. **Nature of TG4**
   1. Arguably, the group has seen its relevance wane along with its own focus; recent sessions have comprised short presentations, document reviewing and website/video browsing. It is hoped that by reasserting the group’s focus (through a Task-based programme) we can attract additional members to the group and secure a firmer position within IALA.
   2. TG4 may wish to review the following aspects of how it designs its workplan and sessions:
      1. One option would be to acknowledge the split between the material and the cultural aspects of lighthouse heritage, and then build into the session agenda and the Tasks a distinction between discussing material/ engineering/ conservation matters and cultural/ tourism/ education matters. For example, the winter committee could focus on the former, the spring committee on the latter. Attendees can then manage their involvement accordingly.

Suggest options for reasserting the group’s focus within ENG programme and IALA goals:

1. Alternate committees between material and cultural;
2. Once TG4 has 12+ regular attendees, identifying the split in expertise within the group and establishing two sub-groups for developing work along material and cultural lines; we can then invite relevant ENG members to address or work with the respective groups according to their expertise;
3. …
4. …
5. …
   * 1. With a view to the above suggestion, members could document their requirements and also their individual expertise along the above split; knowing our requirements and strengths will help us focus our work. This document could be maintained as a register available to all members of the group.

Suggest options for maintaining skills database, if this is deemed worthwhile:

* + 1. e.g. Trinity House would be more interested in the educational/tourism aspects of complementary lighthouse usage, as its material issues are handled as a matter of course by its engineering team; (2) Trinity House’s representative has experience with providing general and curriculum-based education through publications, campaigns and exhibition design. Trinity House also has extensive engineering experience and numerous case studies of lighthouse reengineering and complementary usage (lighthouse visitor centres, lighthouse cottages) to offer to the group via its representative.

Draft your organisation’s entry:

**Note**

The points above presume that the member bodies of IALA wish the work of Task Group 4 to continue and that they are willing to nominate personnel to attend the TG4 sessions on an ongoing regular or at least semi-regular basis. If this is not the case, then the suspension of the group can also be mooted, but this should be considered as a last resort, as the core function of the group—i.e. the furtherance of lighthouse and AtoN conservation and education around the world—is clearly a worthwhile one.

**Summary**

This paper invites the members of TG4 to consider and respond to the above points and reach a consensus on how to ensure a future for Task Group 4 which can be fed back to the Chair of Working Group 2.