



REPORT OF THE AE2 OPTIONS WORKSHOP OUTCOMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Prepared By
AE2 Commemorative Foundation Ltd.
Registered Office: 51 Arkaringa Crescent, Black Rock, VIC 3193

	Name	Position	Signature
Prepared By:	KJ GREIG	Company Secretary	
Approved By:	TA ROACH	Director Operations	
Authorised By:	PD BRIGGS	Chairman	

Issue:	Final
Date:	30 May 2008
Number of Pages:	16

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Objectives of the AE2 Project	4
1.2 The Aim of the Workshop	5
1.3 Objectives of this Paper	5
1.4 Australian Support	5
1.5 Completion of the Assessment Phase	5
1.6 Evaluation Options	5
1.7 Timescales and Recommendations	6
2.0 Consideration of Options	7

Annexes

Annex A - Report of the AE2 Options Workshop Outcomes and Recommendations – Turkish Translation

Annex B - List of personnel attending the Workshop

Annex C - The HMAS AE2 Options, 2008 Workshop Scoping Paper, Dated 31ST March

Annex D - 2008 Matrix of Options used to guide the Workshop Discussions

Annex E - Transcript of the Workshop Discussions (available on Request).

Annex F - Media release issued following the workshop.

**SIA/TINA Workshop on Future Management of HMAS AE2
Istanbul, 26-27 APRIL 2008
Outcomes and Recommendations**

1.0 Introduction

A workshop was convened in Istanbul over the period 26-27 April 2008 to scope the options available for future the management of HMAS AE2 and make a succinct recommendation to the Turkish and Australian governments as to the preferred option.

The Submarine Institute of Australia and the Turkish Institute of Nautical Archaeology convened the workshop jointly. The intention was to gather together those from both nations with the greatest knowledge and interest in the project in order that the conclusions and recommendations of the workshop would carry the greatest authority.

The workshop was honoured to have the Australian Minister of Defence, the Honourable Joel Fitzgibbons MP to formally open the proceedings. Also present was the Chief of the Australian Air Force, Air Marshall Geoffrey Shepherd RAAF. The Deputy Head of Mission, Mr Nigel Stanier who was accompanied by the Australian Defence Attaché, Col. Wayne Fleming, represented the Australian Ambassador. Mr Umut Gorgulu represented the Turkish Authorities, from the Ministry of Culture and Tourism together with representatives of the Governor of Çanakkale and the Universities of Çanakkale and Bogazici. A total of fifty-nine delegates were present, their details are listed at Annex A.

The University of Bahçeşehir who generously made available their high quality facilities including professional interpreters and excellent hospitality hosted the workshop. The Rector of the University, Professor Dr Deniz Ulku Aribogan attended the opening of the workshop.

The workshop opening was also attended by some twenty representatives of the media, which led to positive reporting in the press both in Turkey and Australia. A media release was issued immediately following the workshop, which again led to positive reporting in both countries. A copy of the release is at Annex E.

The main objective of the workshop was to define and agree the options for the future management of the HMAS AE2 and to make recommendations to the respective governments for the preferred option. Those recommendations were cognisant of the overall project objectives, which have already been identified as follows.

1.2 Objectives of the AE2 Project

- *To promote an understanding in Australia and Turkey of the submarine HMAS AE2 and the Turkish torpedo boat Sultanhisar roles in the Gallipoli campaign, as a basis for ongoing friendship and respect between the two nations.*
- *To achieve an outcome acceptable to both Parties as to how HMAS AE2 should be preserved and presented to the international public for the foreseeable future.*

These Objectives are supported by activities to:

- *Preserve, protect and promote the fragile archaeological HMAS AE2's structure, with a view to engaging public knowledge of, and learning from, the role of AE2 and Sultanhisar, the Dardanelles Campaign generally and the importance of the wreck to both nations involvement in the campaign.*
- *This work is to be undertaken in a professional manner, within the controls of the Turkish Ministry of Culture and meet the highest international professional maritime archaeological standards, giving regard to the rules annexed to the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage 2001.*
- *Preserve the AE 2 wreck as far as practicable so that future generations can use it as a means of achieving the Objectives.*
- *This includes surveys to ascertain the materiel state of the wreck and obtain comprehensive images of the wreck.*
- *The results of the archaeological investigations and surveys should be presented with absolute transparency and with no underlying agendas.*
- *Establish public education opportunities, including developing interpretation centres in Turkey and Australia to tell the story of the engagement of AE2 engagement with Sultanhisar and other Turkish defence forces and the conservation status of the wreck.*
- *The intention is to have these centres available for celebration of the centennial of the landing in 2015.*
- *Provide protection to the wreck by:*
 - *Exploring opportunities to provide greater Turkish legislative protection to the wreck*
 - *Preventing inadvertent damage by fishing activities.*
 - *Possibly initiating anodic protection of the site to further physical retention.*
 - *Obtaining a comprehensive assessment of the site's conservation status through targeted studies, including an archaeological corrosion survey."*

These objectives are reflected in the jointly agreed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) entered into between the Turkish Institute of Nautical Archaeology (TINA) and the AE2 Commemorative Foundation (May 2006).

The project builds on the extraordinary relationship established between Turkey and Australia arising from the Gallipoli experience. It offers an excellent opportunity to further build on the peace and friendship that is at the core of this relationship.

1.3 The Aim of the Workshop

The aim of the Workshop was to complete the Assessment Phase of the project by reaching agreement on a recommended course of action to be made to the Australian and the Turkish governments as to the future management of the submarine and to encourage a co-operative enterprise by both Governments with both the SIA and TINA.

1.4 Objective of this Paper

This report is intended to summarise the outcomes and recommendations of the Workshop held in Istanbul 26/27 April 2008 and record the process by which a jointly agreed recommended option for the future management of HMAS AE2 was reached.

The workshop has been guided by The HMAS AE2 Options 2008 Workshop Scoping Paper (attached at Annex B) by Rear Admiral Peter Briggs RAN Rtd dated 31 March 2008, which also provides the background for this paper.

1.5 Australian Support

The Australian Government accepted an offer by the SIA to lead the conduct of the Assessment Phase currently underway and provided 50% of the necessary funding. The balance of funding was raised from sponsorship within Australia.

1.6 Completion of the Assessment Phase

This Workshop and subsequent report completes this Phase of the project.

1.7 Evaluation of Options

Five major Options were identified for development, which may be summarised as follows:

- Option 1 - Do nothing,
- Option 2 - Preserve in situ,
- Option 3 – Relocate to a shallow water site
- Option 4 – Relocate to a shore site keeping the submarine wet
- Option 5 – Relocate to a shore site keeping the submarine dry

These options are described in detail at Annex C.

There are numerous variations possible but the workshop considered the options under these five main headings and assessed the advantages and disadvantages broadly against the following criteria.

- Risks before mitigation.
- Risk mitigation measures to be applied.
- Remaining risk after mitigation measures.
- Security of AE2.
- Preservation of AE2.
- Legislative approvals required
- Environmental factors.
- Ethical considerations.
- Tells the AE2 story.
- Tells the Turkish side of the story;
- Significant progress by 2015.
- Political risks.
- Self-funding potential.
- Establishment costs.
- Running costs.

1.8 Timescales of Recommendations

The recommendations made by the Workshop are categorised by the urgency of completing them:

- Near term Actions, i.e. as soon as possible
- Medium Term Actions, this is defined as completion by 2015 and
- Longer Term Actions, post 2015

2.0 Consideration of Options

Each option set out in the matrix at Annex B was considered and analysed and the following recommendations defined. Each recommendation was put to a formal vote and each carried unanimously except where indicated.

AE2 Site Management Option 1 - Do nothing further

Description

This option envisages no further interaction or expenditure on fresh initiatives relating to the AE2 submarine. Current educational activities to tell the AE2 story would continue however and will be decided by a separate resolution.

Recommendation #1

This Workshop resolves that the option to do nothing further to protect and preserve the AE2 submarine is entirely rejected.

Decision: Carried unanimously.

Discussion supporting the decision

This option will do nothing to mitigate the continued damage from local fishing operations, possible anchor damage, or arrest the natural decay of AE2, particularly the possibility of heightened corrosion arising from the accidental damage inflicted by the divers' shot line weight during the Maritime Archaeological Assessment. This option scores poorly against the consideration of the risks and objectives of site protection, preservation and telling the story of AE2. The site was considered by the workshop to be of national heritage significance to Australia and a focal point of Turkish commemoration of their involvement in the Dardanelles campaign. Hence it warrants a commensurate level of protection and interpretation. To do nothing carries significant political risk of adverse public commentary as public awareness of the importance of the site grows.

Recommendation #2

This Workshop recognises the need to obtain the approval of the Turkish Ministry of Culture and other Turkish Government agencies to proceed with its recommendations regarding the AE2 site.

Decision: Carried unanimously

Discussion supporting the decision

The Workshop recognised the need to formally acknowledge that permission must be obtained from the Ministry of Culture, the Governor of Çanakkale and other affected agencies for any archaeological or interventionist actions at the AE2 site under existing Turkish cultural heritage and other legislation. In this, it recognises the need for due process and formal written approval for many of the Options or actions that members of this Workshop recommend to be enacted at the AE2 site.

Recommendation #3a

This Workshop recognises, as a first step, the need to engage in public relations activities and the development of a broad range of educational materials to tell the AE2 story to the public in Turkey and Australia.

Decision: Carried unanimously

Discussion supporting the decision

The Workshop recognised the need to engage with the public and Governments of Turkey and Australia, and related bodies, to increase knowledge of the AE2 and *Sultanhisar* story. It was considered imperative to promote a broad understanding of the importance of the story and the importance of the historic wreck site, as a means of engendering support for the activities and options being considered at the Workshop. There was broad recognition of the skills and capacity of TINA/SIA Members to undertake these initiatives, and recognition that several key projects and educational programs were currently being implemented or under consideration. The need to develop materials for a targeted range of interest groups was agreed. It was further agreed that this recommendation does not intend to restrict any educational activities being developed outside of TINA/SIA umbrella.

Recommendation #3b

This Workshop recognises the potential benefit of establishing formal or informal Educational Working Parties within the TINA and SIA organisations, to further the development and implementation of educational and public relations initiatives.

Decision: Carried unanimously.

Discussion supporting the decision

The Workshop recognised the potential benefits of establishing dedicated Education Working Parties within each organisation, consisting of Members with expertise in media and educational areas. This would focus the delivery of a broad range of educational and public awareness activities, and assist in engaging relevant Government agencies and their staff in supporting activities related to the AE2 site. It was recognised that there is a body of expertise within TINA and the SIA. It was further agreed that there is a need to raise awareness of the AE2 and *Sultanhisar* story within Turkey and Australia. There was unanimous support for a co-operative program of exchanging educational ideas and materials between the Member organisations to facilitate delivery.

AE2 Site Management Option 2 - Protect and Preserve *in situ*

Description

This option envisages leaving AE2 in its current position and conducting activities to:

- a) Install a cathodic protection system.
- b) Provide underwater shielding from drop and drag damage and site intrusion.
- c) Conduct an additional internal archaeological examination using ROV borne cameras to map and document the interior and determine the internal condition of the wreck together with preservation factors. This could also assist in locating the remaining torpedo.
- d) Obtain high resolution digital images
- e) With approval, to recover and conserve selected artefacts for research and display.

Recommendation #4

This Workshop recommends:

- a) The urgent and early installation of a cathodic protection system at the AE2 site.**
- b) The urgent provision of underwater barriers to limit further drop and drag damage to the site.**

- c) **The urgent implementation of a comprehensive remote operated vehicle (ROV) archaeological inspection and documentation of the interior of the AE2 site.**
- d) **The development of a wide range of interpretative materials related to the submarine site, not restricted to but including high resolution digital images obtained from the ROV.**

Recommendation #4a

Decision: Carried unanimously.

Recommendation #4b

Decision: Carried unanimously.

Recommendation #4c

Decision: Carried unanimously.

Recommendation #4d

Decision: Carried unanimously.

Recommendation #4e

This Workshop recommends that the voting on AE2 Site Management Option 2e - potential recovery of artefacts for research and display, be deferred for future deliberation.

Recommendation #4a

Decision: Carried with 2 abstentions

Discussion supporting the decisions

The Workshop endorsed the implementation of Site Management Options 2a-d. Members agreed to defer the recommendation 2e, being the potential recovery of artefacts for research and display, recognising the need for further deliberation regarding the merits of this option. This requires an assessment of the consequences of removing an artefact compared with its value in telling the story, etc. This judgement can only be made after the artefacts have been identified, probably during the internal assessment.

Recommendation #5

This Workshop recommends that as an extension of Option 2:

- A. A Naval Heritage Site be established ashore to record accurately the events surrounding AE2's passage into the Sea of Marmara, her engagement with *Sultanhisar* and subsequent sinking.**

Recommendation #5a

Decision: Carried unanimously.

Discussion supporting the decisions

The Workshop recognised the importance of recording the role played by the Turkish Armed Forces and particularly the role of *Sultanhisar* in neutralising the threat to their military operations offered by AE2's presence. It was proposed that story could best be told by a large scale display representing the climax of the engagement. The display would be enhanced by use of the extensive underwater footage of AE2 obtained from recent and future surveys. The display would be made more vivid by the fact that the footage is taken from the well preserved AE2 lying where it fell after the engagement.

- B. The Naval Heritage Site will also record the personal stories of the crews of *Sultanhisar* and *AE2*, their families and descendants.**

Recommendation #5b

Decision: Carried unanimously.

Discussion supporting the decisions

The Workshop recognised the interest shown today in the personnel who contributed to historic events and how the events then affected their personal lives. The Naval Heritage Site would be an ideal location in which to record the personal aspects of the engagement.

- C. The Naval Heritage Site be established in order that it may host an event to mark the centenary of 30 April 1915 – being the centenary of the *Sultanhisar/AE2* engagement.**

Recommendation #5c

Decision: Carried unanimously.

Discussion supporting the decisions

The Workshop recognised that the upcoming centenary is a significant milestone, it provides an incentive for action, whilst leaving sufficient time for

the programme to be realised. Furthermore the Workshop recognised that the events held annually with growing popularity over recent years are focussed largely on the role played by the Anzac land forces with little recognition of the maritime contribution made to the events or of the decisive role played by the Turkish forces. It was generally agreed that the establishment of the Naval Heritage site would aim to redress that balance and that the ambition to achieve it by 2015 was realistic.

D. The 30 April, the date of the *Sultanhisar*/AE2 engagement, should become the date on which the Turkish and Australian people in a spirit of peaceful co-operation and friendship can commemorate the naval events on annual basis.

Recommendation #5d

Decision: Carried unanimously.

Discussion supporting the decision

The Workshop recognised the importance of acknowledging the maritime contribution made to the events of April 1915 and the decisive roles played by the *Sultanhisar* and AE2 which could successfully be achieved by encouraging a regular annual event to be held at a time when interested parties were in the area for the landing commemorations. It was agreed that this had potential to complement the 25 April commemorations and also open tourism opportunities for the area by extending the period for which visitors may remain in the area. By focussing on the engagement between the two vessels, the event would be a source of interest and respect to both the Turkish and the Australian people.

AE2 Site Management Options 3, 4 and 5 – Remove the wreck to an alternative location.

Description

Options 3, 4 and 5 envisage completing the operations described in Option 2 as a pre-requisite to the more complex options of:

Option 3 - relocating AE2 to a prepared position in shallow water

Option 4 - relocating AE2 for wet conservation in a site ashore

Option 5 - relocating AE2 for dry conservation in a site ashore

Recommendation #6

This Workshop recommends that Options 3, 4 and 5 not be pursued at this time but that they may be studied in greater detail at an appropriate time in the future.

Recommendation #6

Decision: Carried with one vote against

Discussion supporting the decisions

The Workshop recognised the following points (presented in brief summary) in reaching this decision:

Arguments for relocation:

- The Maritime Archaeological Assessment has provided sufficient information to demonstrate that the wreck has sufficient structural integrity to be judged robust enough to be moved although further survey work would be needed to finalise a lifting plan.
- Sketch designs have been completed for a lifting barge, which could then become part of an exhibition site and provide a workshop and research facilities.
- Options 3, 4 and 5 could improve the security of the wreck.
- Options 3, 4 and 5 could improve access for future preservation work, research and study.
- Options 3, 4 and 5 all allow visitors to approach the submarine and see it “close up” albeit to different degrees.

Arguments against relocation:

- The ethics and morality of intervening with what is an archaeological site by removing its principal component is highly questionable.
- It is difficult to predict the reaction of the Turkish authorities to a proposal for relocation of the wreck.
- The costs of these Options have been defined only in broad order magnitude but appear prohibitive. Whilst there are probably opportunities to reduce these estimates significantly by using local providers, they would probably still remain outside the range of what will be a (principally) publicly funded project.
- The value of the AE2 as an historic or tourism exhibit while held in wet or dry conservation would possibly not be any greater than that offered by Option 2. The layout of the AE2 is such that it would be impractical to allow visitors on board hence the view of the interior would only be by camera. The prospect of using the images taken from the wreck whilst still in its historic resting place would be just as, if not more, appealing.

- The risk and expense of neutralising the torpedo, present an uncertainty to the outcomes of these three Options.
- The wreck's present good state of conservation is largely due to the benign environment which it has enjoyed since its sinking. Removal to another site would require careful management of its environment for a period of decades.
- Security for the wreck is largely assured by its position. Removal to another site will introduce additional security implications.

On balance it was concluded that the objective to "tell the story" could be achieved with greater certainty by not pursuing Options 3, 4 and 5 at this time. However, it was recognised that taking this decision now and limiting aspirations to Option 2 did not preclude a return to the discussion at some other time in the future.

Management of future operations

Recommendation #7

This Workshop recommends that TINA and SIA establish a working group or groups with the specific aims of:

- **Conducting further studies into the ethical, scientific, historical, cultural, environmental and technical issues surrounding the recommendations of this workshop.**
- **Developing an implementation plan for Option 2 and**
- **Making recommendations to the respective governments in relation to the future options.**

Recommendation #7

Decision: Carried unanimously.

Discussion supporting the decisions

The Workshop recognised that it was necessary to appoint a specific body to be responsible for implementing the findings of the workshop without which it would be unlikely that any progress would be made in the future.

Vote of Thanks

Recommendation #8

This Workshop acknowledges with grateful thanks the support given to TINA and SIA by:

- **The Governments of Turkey and Australia and particularly by the**
 - **Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the**

- Australian Department of Defence
- The Rector of Bahcesehir and the use of the excellent conference facilities, provision of the highly professional interpreters and for the University's warm hospitality.

Recommendation # 8

Decision: Carried unanimously with acclamation

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P Briggs', with a long horizontal stroke extending from the end of the signature.

Peter Briggs AO CSC
Rear Admiral RAN Rtd
Chairman AE2 Commemorative Foundation
Co-Convenor

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Selcuk Kolay', with a large, sweeping flourish that curves upwards and to the right.

Selcuk Kolay OAM
Turkish Institute of Nautical Archaeology
Co-Convenor

3.0 Annexes:

Annex A - Report of the AE2 Options Workshop Outcomes and Recommendations – Turkish Translation

Annex B - List of personnel attending the Workshop

Annex C - The HMAS AE2 Options, 2008 Workshop Scoping Paper, Dated 31ST March

Annex D - 2008 Matrix of Options used to guide the Workshop Discussions

Annex E - Transcript of the Workshop Discussions (available on Request).

Annex F - Media release issued following the workshop.